Evaluation of the Hamilton County Community Corrections

Electronic Monitoring Program
FISCAL YEARS 2011-2012, 2012-2013

and

Adult Residential Program
FISCAL YEAR 2012-2013

Draft Report

REPORT SUBMITTED TO:

Ralph B. Watson
Executive Director
Hamilton County Community Corrections
Noblesville, Indiana

PREPARED BY:

Paula Smith, Ph.D.
Associate Professor, Division of Criminal Justice

Ryan M. Labrecque, M.S. (ABD)
Research Assistant, Center for Criminal Justice Research

*This project was supported by a grant from Hamilton County Community Corrections. The opinions, findings, conclusions, and recommendations expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of Hamilton County Community Corrections. Please address all correspondence regarding this report to Paula Smith, Ph.D., Associate Professor, University of Cincinnati, P.O. Box 210389, Cincinnati, OH 45221-0389, Telephone: (513) 556-2775, Email: Paula.Smith@uc.edu

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report is the product of the efforts and collaboration of many individuals. The authors would like to thank everyone involved in the project for their time and cooperation. Specifically, we would like to express our sincere gratitude to the staff members at HCCC who assisted in the collection of data for this project: Ralph Watson, Stephanie Ruggles, Penny Givan, Mark May, Jessica Privett, Shannon Harshman, Chad Long, and Deana McMurray. We also wish to thank John Schwartz and Kyle Williamson at the University of Cincinnati who devoted their time to the completion of this project.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This evaluation is the ninth report of a continued joint effort between the Hamilton County Community Corrections (HCCC) and the University of Cincinnati Corrections Institute (UCCI). The UCCI began its collaboration with HCCC in 2002 in order to help facilitate evidence-based practices and has produced a program evaluation report each year since. Six of the previous eight reports have evaluated the Adult Residential Program (ARP), and two have evaluated the Electronic Monitoring Program (EMP) individually. This is the first evaluation of the ARP and EMP combined in the same report.

The purpose of this report is to provide a process and outcome evaluation of EMP services rendered between July 1, 2011 and June 30, 2013, and ARP services rendered from July 1, 2012 and June 30, 2013. The process evaluation describes the EMP and ARP service delivery models, program participant characteristics, and the nature and quality of services the participants received during these report years. The outcome evaluation summarizes each programs direct impact on participants, details participant outcomes (i.e., recidivism and employment rates), and provides an evaluation of pretest and posttest changes in offender risk scores and other participant assessments. Finally, this report compares the results from the current samples with the samples from the previous EMP and ARP reports where possible.

The majority of participants in these two samples were white (EMP = 86.7% & ARP = 77.6%) males (EMP = 65.7 & ARP = 80.4%) in their early thirties (Mean age EMP = 34.8 & ARP = 31.6). Similar to the previous reports, the most common instant offenses for HCCC participants was driving while under the influence of alcohol (EMP = 44.1% & ARP = 20.0%) or a drug offense (EMP = 17.1% & ARP = 22.0%). Also, intake assessment data indicates the majority of program participants enters the program with an average IQ, holds pro-social values,

and is low to moderate risk to reoffend. The program participants continue to demonstrate high needs in two criminogenic areas: (1) Education, Employment, and Finances; and (2) Substance Abuse.

HCCC continues to do a good job of administering assessments and identifying the needs of participants. Moreover, HCCC staff use an override decision to counter these referral decisions infrequently. About half of the participants in both programs that met the eligibility criteria actually attended a core treatment program. The discrepancies in which participants should be assigned to treatment seem to be explained partially by sentence length and other factors (i.e., court order, offense type, behavior in program, case manager and/or field service coordinator discretion). However, these factors do not account for all of the differences, so the matching of participants and services should remain an area for improvement for HCCC.

HCCC program staff continues to consistently administer assessments and identify the risk/need levels of its participants. HCCC continues to excel in addressing the criminogenic need area of offender unemployment. Analyses revealed that 73.1% of the EMP sample worked more than 90.0% of the time with in the program and there were 40.0% more ARP participants employed at discharge than there were at intake. HCCC also continues to administer participant satisfaction surveys on a routine basis and consistently solicits positive results. Participant surveys demonstrate that participants had an overwhelmingly positive experience during their time in the EMP and ARP programs. The majority of participants found the field services coordinators to be helpful and respectful. Furthermore, most participants felt confident that they could obtain/maintain employment upon release. Finally, participants indicated that they received the help they needed for both substance abuse and emotional problems, and that the program had reduced their likelihood of committing an offense in the future.

Evaluation of outcome measures demonstrated that 83.0% of EMP participants were successfully discharged, which was markedly higher than that of ARP participants (51.1%). Given the number of administrative hearing where participants were found guilty and the number of positive drug screen while in the program, only an extremely small percentage of participants actually committed a new offense while in the program (3.0% for the EMP and 2.3% for the ARP).

The following recommendations are offered based on the findings of this report:

- Many more participants are referred to treatment than are able to actually participate in the available programming. HCCC should ensure moderate to high-risk offenders (as indicated by overall risk/needs score) receive priority for treatment services before the low-risk offenders with moderate to high-risk needs in one particular domain area.

- One way for HCCC to achieve this goal is to alter its treatment program eligibility criteria to more accurately reflect what proportion of participants it can realistically accommodate with the available treatment resources. This effort could help close the gap between the number of participants referred to treatment and the number of participants who actually engage in treatment.

- A good test of the efficiency of new criteria standards would be to monitor the percentage of risk appropriate program completers for each treatment group. HCCC should take steps to get this number as close as possible to 100%.

- Ideally, HCCC should structure its referral system to target and treat the highest risk cases with the most intensive forms of treatment. Furthermore, HCCC staff should infrequently override departmental criteria. Some program participants will not meet the eligibility criteria. It should be just as important to screen out inappropriate referrals as it is to target the appropriate ones.

- Given the large number of low-risk participants, HCCC should continue to minimize the contacts between lower risk participants and higher risk participants. If low-risk participants must be served, there should be separate groups for lower risk and higher risk participants available to keep the contact between the two groups to a minimum.

- HCCC should continue to expand the menu of programming options that are available to participants. However, the assessment data should drive which program choices are made and also which programs are offered more frequently.

- It appears that it might be time to reconsider the assessment currently used to evaluate antisocial attitudes. The CSS has been used in this project since 2002 and has

consistently shown non-significant increases in criminal sentiments from pretests to posttests across the report years. Some suggestions for possible new assessments include the Criminal Sentiment Scale-Modified (CSS-M), How I Think Questionnaire (HIT), and Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles (PICTS).

- Results from the satisfaction surveys continue to be outstanding. This is no doubt a reflection of the hard work and professionalism from HCCC team members. HCCC should continue to solicit offender feedback in order to monitor their high level of services. However, it may be time to discuss alternative ways to elicit helpful (and perhaps more specific) feedback.

- It is imperative that HCCC continue to improve efforts towards maximizing fidelity. This should include group observation and training in advanced CBT topics and skills related to service delivery.

- There has been stability in the type of information UC has provided to HCCC, especially in the past few years. It is recommended that HCCC consider their ongoing data collection and technical assistance needs to ensure that the contract with UC continues to provide useful information that will improve the program. This could include an outcome study and/or additional training/technical assistance on the content of assessment, case management, and treatment.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES

INTRODUCTION

The Hamilton County Community Corrections (HCCC) provides custody, supervision, and programming to adult and juvenile offenders admitted from local courts as well as the Indiana Department of Correction (IDOC). Participants in HCCC programming are typically convicted of low-level felonies (i.e., theft, habitual traffic violations, second-time DUI) or misdemeanors (i.e., first-time DUI, possession of drugs). HCCC currently consists of five program components: adult residential, electronic monitoring, adult day reporting, adult pretrial services and juvenile electronic monitoring.

This evaluation is the ninth report of a continued joint effort between the HCCC and the University of Cincinnati Corrections Institute (UCCI). The UCCI began its collaboration with HCCC in 2002 in order to help facilitate evidence-based practices and has produced a program evaluation report each year since. Six of the previous eight reports have evaluated the Adult Residential Program (ARP; formally known as the Adult Work Release Program [AWR]) and two have evaluated the Electronic Monitoring Program (EMP) individually. This is the first evaluation of the ARP and EMP together in the same report. The current sample examined in this report includes all program participants receiving services through the EMP from July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2013 and the ARP from July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2013.

For more than a decade, administrators from the HCCC have used the information gleaned from the UCCI evaluation reports to assist in modifying their program to be more in line with evidence-based practices (see Smith & Labrecque, 2012; Smith, Labrecque, & Thompson, 2012; Spiropoulos & Van Voorhis, 2004; 2006; Smith & Myer, 2009; Smith, Myer & Ndrecka, 2008; Smith, Myer, & Thompson, 2010; Van Voorhis & Spiropoulos, 2003). Consistent with the previous evaluations, the current report seeks to provide HCCC with information regarding its

delivery of services and their effect on its program participants. In order to do so, this report is divided into the following six sections. The first section provides a description of the HCCC programs. Within this section, a discussion is provided on the treatment services offered by HCCC. The second section of this report is the method and describes the data collection procedures, a description of the sample and variables, and the research design. The process evaluation encompasses the third section of this report. The process evaluation describes the service delivery model, the characteristics of program participants, and the nature and quality of the services the participants received. The fourth section reports the findings from the outcome evaluation by describing the program's impact on its participants and detailing program participant outcomes (e.g., recidivism and employment rates). This section also evaluates pretest and posttest changes in offender risk scores and other program participant assessments. It should be noted that comparisons have been made between the current sample and the results from the previous samples when applicable. The fifth section offers a discussion of the findings, and the sixth section provides recommendations based on findings from this report.

DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAMS

The adult Electronic Monitoring Program (EMP) was the second program of the HCCC when it was established in October of 1990. The Adult Residential Program (ARP), formally known as the Adult Work Release Program (AWR), was added next when it was established in April of 1991. Over the years, the services provided by HCCC have continued to expand. The HCCC began as a residential 8-bed unit within the county jail. The HCCC ARP was expanded to include 75 beds after it received additional funding from the Indiana Department of Corrections (IDOC) and the Hamilton County Council. In July of 2009, the ARP moved to a new facility where it remains today. The new facility has the capacity to serve 200 participants. The majority of the EMP and ARP participants are men and women who have been convicted of non-violent class C and D felonies. Participants are referred to the HCCC from local courts, probation, and the IDOC. Referrals are made through executed sentences, direct commitments from court, split sentences, violations of community supervision, conditions of probation, and transitions from prison.

All new participants of both programs are assessed with several standardized instruments at intake. These instruments include: an intake form, the Brief Jail Mental Health Screen (BJMHS), the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE), the Criminal Sentiments Scale (CSS; Shields & Simourd, 1991), the Culture Fair IQ test (Cattell & Cattell, 1973), the Texas Christian University Client Evaluation of Self and Treatment (TCU-CEST; Joe, Broome, Rowan-Szal, & Simpson, 2002),[1] and the Indiana Risk Assessment System-Community Supervision Tool (IRAS-CST). The results of these assessments are then used to make decisions about placement in HCCC programs. Currently, HCCC offers programming to address anger management

[1] The University of Cincinnati validated this instrument on a pilot sample of both Adult Residential participants (Myer & Smith, 2008a) and Electronic Monitoring participants (Myer & Smith, 2008b).

(*Washington Aggression Interruption Training*), antisocial attitudes and values (*Thinking for a Change*), financial planning (*Financial Management*), substance abuse (*Phase 2 and Phase 3*) and employment (*Employment Skills*). HCCC has adopted the cognitive-behavioral model across all components of the program. The program also seeks to emphasize offenders' relationships and responsibilities to their families.

Program participants who attend the *Financial Management* and *Washington Aggression Interruption Training* programs are administered pretest and posttest assessments, as well as participant evaluation forms. Furthermore, all program participants are assessed on intermediate outcomes and service delivery measures. All participants must also complete a participant evaluation form for the entire program quarterly, as well as a specific program evaluation at the completion of each program in which they participate. Finally, the IRAS-CST and the CSS are re-administered upon release to participants who successfully complete the program.

Program participants are required to work in the community. Participants are monitored while off-site, and are required to meet with their field services coordinator and case manager while in the program. Moreover, participants must submit to random monthly drug and alcohol testing. The average length of stay in the EMP during the current period examined is 93 days, and in the ARP is 183 days.

Treatment Programming

The core treatment interventions offered at the HCCC include *Thinking for a Change* (*T4C*), *Financial Management*, *Employment Skills and Practices*, *Washington Aggression Interruption Training* (*WAIT*), *Phase 2* and *Phase 3* substance abuse treatment.

Thinking for a Change. The cognitive-behavioral program *Thinking for a Change* (Bush, Taymans, & Glick, 1998) is delivered on-site to participants by internal staff. The

curriculum was developed by the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) and has received favorable evaluation results in previous research evaluations (see Golden, 2002; Wingeard, 2008). *Thinking for a Change* is designed to target criminal attitudes and antisocial thinking for change. Classes meet two times a week for 10 weeks. A total of 23 cycles of *Thinking for a Change* were offered between July 1, 2011 and June 30, 2013.

Financial Management. As some financial issues may be related to subsequent criminal behavior, HCCC offers a financial component in its core treatment. *Financial Management* is a program modeled from the *Making Your Money Work* program from the Purdue University Cooperative Extension Service. It is designed to teach skills related to budgeting, financial goal setting, savings, debt management, and financial management. The *Financial Management* class meets once a week for five weeks. There were a total of 11 financial management cycles offered between July 1, 2011 and June 30, 2013.

Employment Skills and Practices. The *Employment Skills and Practices* program is designed to provide participants with a variety of skills needed to be successful in the workplace. It also targets attitudes and values regarding employment. The *Employment Skills and Practices* class meets once a week for eight weeks. There were a total of six employment skills and practices cycles offered between July 1, 2011 and June 30, 2013.

Washington Aggression Interruption Training. *Washington Aggression Interruption Training* (*WAIT*) is a cognitive behavioral program seeking to teach participants new thoughts, attitudes and skills necessary to prevent aggressive behavior (relatedly, see Goldstein, Glick & Gibbs, 1998). *WAITs* curriculum is comprised of three components: teaching of skills, anger control training, and moral reasoning. Offenders are taught pro-social skills and behaviors to replace aggressive behaviors (e.g., negotiating skills, responding to an accusation). The anger

control training component seeks to enhance offenders' skills for self control in high risk situations. Based on Kohlberg's (1976) Moral Stages, the moral reasoning training component attempts to develop feelings of empathy, support, and respect for others in program participants. The *WAIT* class meets twice per week for 10 weeks. There were two *WAIT* cycles offered between July 1, 2011 and June 30, 2013.

Phase 2 Substance Abuse Program. The *Phase 2* program is an intensive out patient (IOP) substance abuse educational program that meets twice a week for 12 weeks. The curriculum is designed to educate and motivate participants to understand their substance abuse patterns. The goal of the course is to provide participants with information about the physical, emotional, social, and legal consequences of drug and/or alcohol use. There were 12 *Phase 2* cycles offered between July 1, 2011 and June 30, 2013.

Phase 3 Substance Abuse Program. The *Phase 3* program is a maintenance substance abuse program that is designed to motivate participants to stay on track and to build a life without drugs and alcohol. The *Phase 3* program meets once a week for 12 weeks. The program includes components of developing coping skills, communicating effectively, managing anger, and making life goals. There were 10 *Phase 3* cycles offered between July 1, 2011 and June 30, 2013.

The University of Cincinnati research team collected data on referral, attendance, participant evaluation, and pretest and posttest measures for these core program components. UCCI also collected data on referrals to a variety of treatment services by external service providers and external agencies that conducted treatment at the HCCC facility. These included GED classes, mental health counseling, other substance abuse treatment programs, individual and/or group counseling, and sex offender treatment/assessment.

METHOD

Research Design

University of Cincinnati researchers employ pretest-posttest analyses as well as a repeated measures design to evaluate the effects of the treatments offered by HCCC and its contracted services. All participants are assessed with the Indiana Risk Assessment System-Community Supervision Tool (IRAS-CST) and the Criminal Sentiment Scale (CSS) upon admission and before discharge from the program. Participants are assessed with the IRAS-CST in order to differentiate between offenders based on their risk for future offending. Participants are assessed with the CSS in order to measure their level of antisocial beliefs, feelings, and attitudes. For a full description of the assessment instruments and measures see Appendix A. A pretest-posttest design allows for a comparison between intake and discharge scores to determine the impact of the treatment received. A repeated measures design allows for a comparison of measures from the current process and outcome evaluation to previous process and outcome evaluations. Sample demographics, attendance rates, completion rates, and intermediate outcome figures are compared across the current and the previous sample. Repeated measures analysis is designed to evaluate changes in participant characteristics and programming outcomes that have occurred since the collaboration began between HCCC and UCCI.

Sample

The sample for the evaluation is comprised of all men and women who received services through the EMP between July 1, 2011 and June 30, 2013 and the ARP between July 1, 2012 and June 30, 2013. Data collection for outcome measures on program participants admitted during this time frame ended on June 30, 2013. The current evaluation has intake information for 510 EMP participants and 250 ARP participants. These samples are further disaggregated into

participants serving community sanctions (n = 265 for EMP and n = 182 for ARP) and participants who have been released from prison (n = 45 for EMP and n = 68 for ARP). In addition, discharge and intermediate outcome data are provided for 394 individuals from the EMP and 174 from the ARP who were discharged with sufficient time for their outcomes to be reported in this evaluation.

Data Collection Procedures

To ensure that all information was obtained for each of the program participants, the data collection process required ongoing communication and cooperation between the UCCI research team and HCCC staff. Data for the report were sent to the University of Cincinnati from HCCC, and upon receipt, data were entered into a secure database. If any information was missing, a UCCI researcher contacted the Program Team Leader, Mark May, to obtain the missing data.

University of Cincinnati researchers obtained both intake and discharge data on program participants. Intake data included the HCCC Intake forms, pretest IRAS-CST, pretest CSS, Culture Fair IQ test, and the Brief Jail Mental Health Screen (BJMHS). Discharge measures include the HCCC service delivery/discharge forms, posttest IRAS-CST, posttest CSS, as well as participants' treatment referral, attendance, and program completion information. It should be noted that discharge measures were not available on all participants because some individuals had not yet completed the program by June 30, 2013. Participant evaluation forms were obtained from the program participants who participated in the *Thinking for a Change*, *Financial Management, Employment Skills, WAIT*, *Phase 2,* and *Phase 3* programs. In addition, data were collected on referrals to a variety of treatment services by external service providers and external agencies that conducted treatment at the HCCC facility, including GED classes, mental health counseling, substance abuse treatment, individual and/or group counseling, anger management

training, and sex offender treatment/assessment. Lastly, overall program evaluation forms were also collected and analyzed.

Variables Examined

Participant Characteristics. Descriptive characteristics of program participants were collected, which include participants' gender, race, age, marital status, education, IQ, employment at intake, nature of the convicted offense, type of court order, and time to be served in the program. Furthermore, intake data for the IRAS-CST and CSS were collected. This report is now able to present comparisons of ARP participant characteristics for the fiscal years 2003-2004, 2005-2006, 2007-2008, 2009-2010, 2011-2012, and 2013; as well as comparisons of the EMP participant characteristics for the fiscal years 2007-2009, 2010-2011, and 2012-2013. These comparisons were done in an effort to provide an overview of the type of participants who have participated in the HCCC ARP and EMP over the last ten years.

Participant Outcomes. Outcome data includes program completion, reasons for unsuccessful completions, educational attainment while in the program, reward level achieved, employment information, illegal drug use, new offenses while in the program, and data on administrative hearings. Comparisons of outcome data are provided across all of the available report years.

Program Characteristics. Descriptive data are provided regarding the distribution of referrals of program participants to core and additional treatment modules, participation rates, and completion rates. This information will now be compared across all of the available report years for both the ARP and EMP programs. This information offers a comprehensive description of HCCC's service delivery efforts.

PROCESS EVALUATION

The process evaluation provides information on the characteristics of the ARP participants and their attendance in treatment programs throughout the fiscal years 2012-2013. These data were obtained from the intake form, the initial IRAS-CST, Culture Fair IQ test (Cattell & Cattell, 1973), and the Criminal Sentiments Scale (CSS). Moreover, this section also provides an evaluation of the program participant evaluations of the core programs (*Thinking for a Change*, *Financial Management*, *Employment Skills, WAIT, Phase 2,* and *Phase 3*). The participant evaluation forms were designed by the University of Cincinnati to assess program participant satisfaction with staff (i.e., correctional staff, field services coordinators, case managers, and treatment instructors), as well as determine program participant perceptions of the effectiveness of their program (e.g., will they apply what they learned in class, were class exercises helpful, etc.). Throughout this section, characteristics of the entire sample are reported.

Table 1a indicates the number of participants admitted to the HCCC EMP by sentence type. There were 510 admissions to the EMP between July 1, 2011 and June 30, 2013. The majority of EMP participants were admitted from executed sentences (42.7%), followed by probation violations (20.2%) and conditions of probation/parole (15.8%). The EMP sample is comprised of 465 participants (or 91.2% of the total sample) that are classified to be in the community sentence sample and 45 participants (or 8.8% of the total sample) that are classified to be in the post-prison sample. Where appropriate throughout this report, comparisons will be made between the total sample, community sample, and prison sample.

Table 1a

Admissions to the Electronic Monitoring Program by Sentence Type (N = 510)

Sentence Type	*N*	%
Executed sentence	218	42.7
Condition of probation/parole	81	15.8
Probation violation	103	20.2
Direct commitment	63	12.4
Split sentence	31	6.1
Community transition	14	2.7

Note. Total of percentages is not 100 because of rounding.

Table 1b indicates the number of participants admitted to the HCCC ARP by sentence type. There were 250 admissions to the ARP between July 1, 2012 and June 30, 2013. The majority of ARP participants were admitted from executed sentences (30.8%), followed by a split sentence (26.0%) and probation violation (22.8%). The ARP sample is comprised of 182 participants (or 72.8% of the total sample) that are classified to be in the community sentence sample and 68 participants (or 27.2% of the total sample) that are classified to be in the post-prison sample. Again, where appropriate throughout this report, comparisons will be made between the total sample, community sample, and prison sample.

Table 1b

Admissions to the Adult Residential Program by Sentence Type (N = 250)

Sentence Type	*N*	%
Executed sentence	77	30.8
Condition of probation/parole	31	12.4
Probation violation	57	22.8
Direct commitment	17	6.8
Split sentence	65	26.0
Community transition	3	1.2

Table 2a presents a comparison of the EMP subsamples across fiscal report years. Note that there was a 3.7% increase in the number of prison referrals for the current report (2012-2013) compared to the previous report (2010-2011). Although the current report period reveals the highest percentage of prison release participants across all of the report years examined, direct admits from prison still comprise a small minority of the total EMP participants (8.8%).

Table 2a

Comparison of Community Sentence and Prison Release Admissions Across Report Years for the Electronic Monitoring Program

Fiscal Report Years	% Community Sentence	% Prison Releases
2007-2009	98.7	1.3
2010-2011	94.3	5.1
2012-2013	91.2	8.8

Table 2b presents a comparison of the ARP subsamples across fiscal report years. Note that there was an 11.5% decrease in the number of prison referrals for the current report (2013) compared to the previous report (2011-2012). This means that approximately 75% of the ARP participants are admitted as part of a community sentence.

Table 2b

Comparison of Community Sentence and Prison Release Admissions Across Report Years for the Adult Residential Program

Fiscal Report Year(s)	% Community Sentence	% Prison Releases
2003-2004	71.0	29.0
2005-2006	60.0	40.0
2007-2008	62.3	37.7
2009-2010	69.8	30.2
2011-2012	61.3	38.7
2013	72.8	27.2

Table 3a describes the demographic characteristics of the EMP participants. The majority of the total sample is male (65.7%) and white (86.7%). The average age of the EMP participants is approximately 35 years old. The majority of the participants (87.6%) had at least a high school diploma or GED and about a quarter (21.6%) were married at admission. Three quarters of the total sample (72.4%) was employed at the time of admission. The most frequent occupations were service worker (26.1%) and laborer (21.8%). Table 3a also describes and compares the participant demographic characteristics by sentence type. There were no significant differences found between the community sentence and prison release samples.

Table 3a

Demographic Characteristics of the Electronic Monitoring Program Participants by Sentence Type

	Total Sample (N = 510)		Community Sentences (N = 465)		Prison Releases (N = 45)	
Characteristic	***n***	**%**	***N***	**%**	***n***	**%**
Male	335	65.7	300	64.5	35	77.8
White	442	86.7	403	86.7	39	86.7
Married	110	21.6	99	21.3	11	24.4
Mean age (SD)	34.8	11.3	34.8	11.3	35.0	11.7
Education						
Less than high school	63	12.4	58	12.5	5	11.1
High school/GED	251	49.2	230	49.5	21	46.7
More than high school	196	38.4	177	38.1	19	42.2
Employment status at admission						
Employed	369	72.4	334	71.8	35	77.8
Not employed	120	23.5	111	23.9	9	20.0
Student / Retired / Disabled	21	4.1	20	4.3	1	2.2
Occupation						
No occupation	97	19.0	91	19.6	6	13.3
Professional	27	5.3	23	4.9	4	8.9
Managerial or administrative	36	7.1	28	6.0	8	17.8
Sales	43	8.4	40	8.6	3	6.7
Clerical	14	2.7	13	2.8	1	2.2
Craftsman	29	5.7	27	5.8	2	4.4
Transportation	9	1.8	9	1.9	0	0.0
Laborer	111	21.8	103	22.2	8	17.8
Farmer	2	0.4	2	0.4	0	0.0
Service worker	133	26.1	120	25.8	13	28.9
Student	4	0.8	4	0.9	0	0.0
Housewife or househusband	5	1.0	5	1.1	0	0.0

Note. Totals of percentages are not 100 for every characteristic because of rounding.

Table 3b describes the demographic characteristics of the ARP participants. The majority of the total sample is male (80.4%) and white (77.6%). The average age of the EMP participants is approximately 32 years old. The majority of the participants (77.2%) had at least a high school diploma or GED and a relatively small percentage (12.4%) were married at admission. More than half of the total sample (56.8%) of the total sample was not employed at the time of admission. The most frequent occupations of those that were employed at admission were laborer (20.4%) and service worker (15.6%). Table 3b also describes and compares the participant demographic characteristics by sentence type. There are two significant differences found between the community sentence and prison release samples. First, the prison sample is significantly more likely to be male ($\chi^2 = 5.13$, $df = 1$, $p = .023$) and the community sample is significantly more likely to be white ($\chi^2 = 3.87$, $df = 1$, $p = .049$).

Table 3b

Demographic Characteristics of the Adult Residential Program Participants by Sentence Type

	Total Sample (N = 250)		Community Sentences (N = 182)		Prison Releases (N = 68)	
Characteristic	***n***	**%**	***N***	**%**	***n***	**%**
Male*	201	80.4	140	76.9	61	89.7
White*	194	77.6	147	80.8	47	69.1
Married	31	12.4	23	12.6	8	11.8
Mean age (SD)	31.6	9.1	31.6	9.4	31.4	8.5
Education						
Less than high school	57	22.8	46	25.3	11	16.2
High school/GED	142	56.8	100	54.9	42	61.8
More than high school	51	20.4	36	19.8	15	22.1
Employed at admission						
Employed	104	41.6	81	44.5	23	33.8
Not employed	142	56.8	98	53.8	44	31.0
Student / Retired / Disabled	4	1.6	3	1.6	1	25.0
Occupation						
No occupation	130	52.0	88	48.4	42	61.8
Professional	10	4.0	8	4.4	2	2.9
Managerial or administrative	4	1.6	3	1.6	1	1.5
Sales	4	1.6	3	1.6	1	1.5
Clerical	6	2.4	5	2.7	1	1.5
Craftsman	4	1.6	3	1.6	1	1.5
Transportation	2	0.8	1	0.5	1	1.5
Laborer	51	20.4	41	22.5	10	14.7
Service worker	39	15.6	30	16.5	9	13.2

Note. Totals of percentages are not 100 for every characteristic because of rounding.
* $p < .05$.

Information on the current offense, as well as criminal history for EMP participants is reported in Table 4a. Approximately 93% of participants that were admitted to the EMP were

referred on a non-violent offense. Similar to the previous reports, the most common instant offenses for EMP participants was driving while under the influence of alcohol or on a drug-related offense, accounting for 44.1% and 17.1% of offense referrals, respectively. A relatively small amount of participants tested positive on their baseline drug screen when admitted to the EMP (16.1%). Table 4a further indicates less than half of the total sample (38.6%) has had at least one prior felony conviction and the majority of the sample (83.5%) had not previously served a prior prison sentence. Finally, the median days to be served were approximately 93 days. Most offenders (49.2%) were admitted with fewer than 90 days to serve and a very small percentage (3.9%) had more than a year to serve.

Table 4a also describes and compares the participant criminal history information by sentence type. There was only one significant difference found between the community sentence and prison release samples. Specifically, the community sentence participants (17.5%) are significantly more likely than the prison release participants (1.2%) to test positive at the baseline drug screen test ($\chi^2 = 7.05$, $df = 1$, $p = .008$).

Table 4a

Criminal History Information of the Electronic Monitoring Program Participants by Sentence Type

	Total Sample (N = 510)		Community Sentences (N = 465)		Prison Releases (N = 45)	
Characteristic	***n***	**%**	***N***	**%**	***n***	**%**
Nature of convicted offense						
Battery	15	2.9	13	2.8	2	4.4
Burglary/residential entry	5	1.0	5	1.1	0	0.0
Conversion/theft/fraud	71	13.9	69	14.8	2	4.4
Driving alcohol offense	225	44.1	202	43.4	23	51.1
Drug offense	87	17.1	80	17.2	7	15.6
Forgery/check deception	10	2.0	8	1.7	2	4.4
Identity deception	2	0.4	2	0.4	0	0.0
Resisting law enforcement	7	1.4	5	1.1	2	4.4
Robbery	2	0.4	2	0.4	0	0.0
Sex offense	9	1.8	8	1.7	1	2.2
Traffic violation	42	8.2	39	8.4	3	6.7
Other	35	6.7	32	6.9	3	6.7
Violent current offense	37	7.3	31	6.7	6	13.3
One or more prior felony convictions	197	38.6	181	38.9	16	35.6
One or more prior prison term	84	16.5	76	16.3	8	17.8
Positive baseline drug screen*	82	16.1	81	17.5	1	1.2
Days to be served						
0-90	251	49.2	228	49.0	23	51.1
91-180	119	23.3	115	24.7	4	3.4
181-365	120	23.5	104	22.4	16	35.6
366+	20	3.9	18	3.9	2	4.4
Median days to be served (QD)	93	47.0	93	46.5	90	82.8

Note. Totals of percentages are not 100 for every characteristic because of rounding.
* $p < .01$.

Information on the current offense, as well as criminal history for ARP participants is reported in Table 4b. Approximately 82% of participants that were admitted to the ARP were referred on a non-violent offense. Similar to the previous reports, the most common instant offenses for ARP participants was a drug offense or driving while under the influence of alcohol, accounting for 22.0% and 20.0% of offense referrals, respectively. The number of individuals who tested positive on their baseline drug screen when admitted to the ARP decreased from 18.9% in the previous report to 15.2% in the current report. Table 4b further indicates although approximately half of the total sample (53.2%) has had at least one prior felony conviction; most participants (63.6%) had not previously served a prior prison sentence. Finally, the median days to be served were approximately 183 days. Most offenders (44.4%) had between 181 and 365 days to be served and 12.0% had more than a year to serve. Slightly less than a quarter of the total sample (19.6%) had less than 90 days to be served, and 24.0% had between 91 and 180 days to be served.

Table 4b also describes and compares the participant criminal history information by sentence type. There are two significant differences found between the community sentence and prison release samples. First, the prison release participants (50.0%) are significantly more likely than the community sentence participants (31.3%) to have served a prior prison term (χ^2 = 7.46, df = 1, p = .006). Second, the community sentence participants (18.7%) are significantly more likely than the prison release participants (5.9%) to test positive at the baseline drug screen test (χ^2 = 6.30, df = 1, p = .012).

Table 4b

Criminal History Information of the Adult Residential Program Participants by Sentence Type

	Total Sample (N = 250)		Community Sentences (N = 182)		Prison Releases (N = 68)	
Characteristic	***n***	**%**	***N***	**%**	***n***	**%**
Nature of convicted offense						
Battery	6	2.4	6	3.3	0	0.0
Burglary/residential entry	22	8.8	13	7.1	9	13.2
Causing death driving	2	0.8	0	0.0	2	2.9
Conversion/theft/fraud	42	16.8	38	20.9	4	5.9
Driving alcohol offense	50	20.0	32	17.6	18	26.5
Drug offense	55	22.0	43	23.6	12	17.6
Forgery/check deception	8	3.2	3	1.6	5	7.4
Identity deception	1	0.4	1	0.5	0	0.0
Intimidation	2	0.8	2	1.1	0	0.0
Resisting law enforcement	3	1.2	2	1.1	1	1.5
Robbery	12	4.8	3	1.6	9	13.2
Sex offense	15	6.0	11	6.0	4	5.9
Traffic violation	20	8.0	19	10.4	1	1.5
Other	12	4.8	9	4.9	3	4.4
Violent current offense	44	17.6	28	15.4	16	23.5
One or more prior felony convictions	133	53.2	92	50.5	41	60.3
One or more prior prison term**	91	36.4	57	31.3	34	50.0
Positive baseline drug screen*	38	15.2	34	18.7	4	5.9
Days to be served**						
0-90	49	19.6	42	23.1	7	10.3
91-180	60	24.0	50	27.5	10	14.7
181-365	111	44.4	38	55.9	73	40.1
366+	30	12.0	17	9.3	13	19.1
Median days to be served (QD)	183	84.4	180	86.0	183	92.6

Note. Totals of percentages are not 100 for every characteristic because of rounding.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Information on the admission assessments of the EMP participants is found in Table 5a. Approximately three quarters of the total EMP participants had an IQ between 86 and 114 (71.3%), which is in the normal range, and the average IQ across the sample was 100.7. Administration of the Criminal Sentiments Scale (CSS) at admission revealed that 62.5% of the sample scored as exhibiting pro-social sentiments (i.e., higher scores), with only 15.6% exhibiting scores indicative of antisocial attitudes and values (i.e., lower scores). Table 5a also displays information regarding the risk for recidivism at admission. The IRAS-CST was instituted as the risk assessment tool for all HCCC programs beginning on December 1, 2010, when it took the place of the LSI-R. Nearly three-quarters (71.8%) of EMP participants assessed with the IRAS-CST during admission scored low-risk to reoffend, with only 2.9% scoring high or very-high risk.

Table 5a also describes and compares the participant admission assessment information by sentence type. There is only one significant difference found between the mean scores of the admission assessments between the community sentence and prison release samples. The prison release participants (M = 106.4) had significantly higher scores compared to the community sentence participants (M = 100.1) on the Culture Fair (IQ) test (t = -2.39, df = 499, p = .017).

Table 5a

Admission Assessment Information for the Electronic Monitoring Program Participants by Sentence Type

	Total Sample (N = 510)		Community Sentences (N = 465)		Prison Releases (N = 45)	
Scale	***n***	**%**	***N***	**%**	***n***	**%**
IQ[a*]						
Lower than average	58	11.6	57	12.4	1	2.3
Average	357	71.3	328	71.6	29	67.4
Higher than average	86	17.2	73	15.9	13	30.2
Mean IQ* (SD)	100.7	16.6	100.1	16.6	106.4	15.2
Pretest CSS[b]						
Prosocial	316	62.5	287	62.3	29	64.4
Moderate	111	21.9	100	21.7	11	24.4
Antisocial	79	15.6	74	16.1	5	11.1
Mean CSS score (SD)	68.4	20.0	68.4	20.2	68.3	17.2
Pretest IRAS-CST						
Low	366	71.8	332	71.4	34	75.6
Low-moderate	23	4.5	23	4.9	0	0.0
Moderate	106	20.8	97	20.9	9	20.0
High	14	2.7	12	2.6	2	4.4
Very high	1	0.2	1	0.2	0	0.0
Mean IRAS-CST score (SD)	11.1	5.8	11.2	5.7	10.3	6.2

Note. Totals of percentages are not 100 for every characteristic because of rounding.
[a] $n = 501$. [b] $n = 506$. * $p < .05$.

Information on the admission assessments of the ARP participants is found in Table 5b. More than three quarters of the total ARP participants had an IQ between 86 and 114 (78.9%), which is in the normal range, and the average IQ across the sample was 102.1. Administration of the Criminal Sentiments Scale (CSS) at admission revealed that 53.3% of the sample scored as exhibiting pro-social sentiments (i.e., higher scores), with only 22.8% exhibiting scores indicative of antisocial attitudes and values (i.e., lower scores). Table 5a also displays

information regarding the risk for recidivism at admission. The majority of ARP participants (69.2%) assessed with the IRAS-CST during admission scored low to moderate-risk to reoffend, with 30.8% scoring high or very-high risk.

Table 5b also describes and compares the participant admission assessment information by sentence type. There are no significant differences found between the mean scores of the admission assessments between the community sentence and prison release samples.

Table 5b

Admission Assessment Information for the Adult Residential Program Participants by Sentence Type

	Total Sample (N = 250)		Community Sentences (N = 182)		Prison Releases (N = 68)	
Scale	***n***	**%**	***N***	**%**	***n***	**%**
IQ[a]						
Lower than average	16	6.5	14	7.7	2	3.0
Average	195	78.9	141	77.9	54	81.8
Higher than average	36	14.6	26	14.4	10	15.2
Mean IQ (SD)	102.1	15.7	101.4	16.5	104	13.3
Pretest CSS[b]						
Prosocial	131	53.3	98	54.4	33	50.0
Moderate	59	24.0	41	22.8	18	27.3
Antisocial	56	22.8	41	22.8	15	22.7
Mean CSS score (SD)	64.7	22.4	64.8	22.2	64.5	23.0
Pretest IRAS-CST						
Low	67	26.8	50	27.5	17	25.0
Low-moderate	3	1.2	2	1.1	1	1.5
Moderate	103	41.2	75	41.2	28	41.2
High	65	26.0	46	25.3	19	27.9
Very high	12	4.8	9	4.9	3	4.4
Mean IRAS-CST score (SD)	18.0	6.8	17.9	6.9	18.4	6.4

Note. Totals of percentages are not 100 for every characteristic because of rounding.
[a] $n = 247$. [b] $n = 246$.

Table 6a presents a breakdown of the risk/needs domains of the IRAS-CST assessment for the EMP sample. Participants were counted as demonstrating need in an area if they exhibited 50% or more of the score in a domain. According to the IRAS-CST, a couple criminogenic need areas were found to be more problematic for the total sample. The highest need domain was substance abuse (37.8%) and education, employment, and finances (37.3%).

Table 6a also describes and compares the participant admission assessment high risk/needs domains for participants by sentence type. There is one significant difference found between the community sentence and prison release participants. Specifically, the community sentence participants (39.4%) were significantly more likely than the prison release participants (22.2%) to be high risk in the domain of substance abuse ($\chi^2 = 5.12$, $df = 1$, $p = .024$).

Table 6a

Admission Assessment High Risk/Needs Domains for the Electronic Monitoring Program Participants by Sentence Type

	Total Sample (N = 510)		Community Sentences (N = 465)		Prison Releases (N = 45)	
Domain	***n***	**%**	***N***	**%**	***n***	**%**
IRAS-CST						
Education, employment	190	37.3	176	37.4	16	35.6
Family, social support	46	9.0	41	8.8	5	11.1
Neighborhood problems	20	3.9	18	3.9	2	4.4
Substance abuse*	193	37.8	183	39.4	10	22.2
Peer associations	51	10.0	48	10.3	3	6.7
Criminal attitudes	15	2.9	15	3.2	0	0.0

Note. * $p < .05$.

Table 6b presents a breakdown of the risk/needs domains of the IRAS-CST assessment for the ARP sample. Again, participants were counted as demonstrating need in an area if they exhibited 50% or more of the score in a particular domain. According to the IRAS-CST, a

couple criminogenic need areas were found to be more problematic for the total sample. The highest need domain was education, employment, and finances (69.6%), followed by substance abuse (61.2%). There were no significant differences found in high risk domains between the community sentence and prison release participants.

Table 6b

Admission Assessment High Risk/Needs Domains for the Adult Residential Program Participants by Sentence Type

	Total Sample (N = 250)		Community Sentences (N = 182)		Prison Releases (N = 68)	
Domain	***n***	**%**	***N***	**%**	***n***	**%**
IRAS-CST						
Education, employment	174	69.6	126	69.2	48	70.6
Family, social support	51	20.4	42	23.1	9	17.6
Neighborhood problems	20	8.0	11	6.0	9	13.2
Substance abuse	153	61.2	115	63.2	38	55.9
Peer associations	54	21.6	42	23.1	12	22.2
Criminal attitudes	23	9.2	18	9.9	5	7.4

Demographics, Intake Assessments, and Pretest Scores Across Report Years

Table 7a provides a comparison of demographics for the EMP across report years. There are some notable shifts in the age demographics of participants in this report compared to the previous reports. Namely, the participants of the EMP are older in the current report year compared to those in the two previous report periods. There were more participants who were 30 and older during this report year compared to last two reports, and subsequently less participants who were 29 and younger. Table 7a also examines the prevalence of participants with violent offenses, prior felony convictions, and prior prison terms. Although the percentage of participants meeting these three criteria has remained relatively low across all periods

examined, the percentage of participants in each category has increased slightly during each successive report period.

Table 7a

Comparison of Demographic Characteristics of the Total Sample Across Report Years for the Electronic Monitoring Program

Characteristic	% in 2007-2009	% in 2010-2011	% in 2012-2013
Age			
21 and younger	9.8	9.3	8.8
22 – 29	36.8	32.5	30.2
30 – 39	28.7	28.0	29.0
40 and older	24.7	29.6	32.0
Violent offense	6.1	6.6	7.3
Prior felony convictions	32.6	36.8	38.6
Prior prison term	12.0	14.7	16.5

Note. Totals of percentages are not 100 for every characteristic because of rounding.

Table 7b provides a comparison of demographics for the ARP across report years. There are some noticeable shifts in the age demographics of participants in this report compared to the previous report. The biggest increase occurred in the percentage of participants that were 30-39 years old, with an increase from 30.7% to 34.4%. There were also notably more 22-29 year olds (38.0%) during this report year compared to last, and subsequently far less 21 and younger (8.0%) and 40 and older participants (19.6%). Table 7b also examines the prevalence of participants with violent offenses, prior felony convictions, and prior prison terms. In comparison with the previous five report periods, the current sample had the highest percentage participants with a violent offense (17.6%) and the lowest percentage of participants with a prior felony conviction. The percentage of participants who have served a prior prison term during

this report is slightly fewer than the last report (36.4% compared to 36.7%), although it is still more than the previous four periods.

Table 7b

Comparison of Demographic Characteristics of the Total Sample Across Report Years for the Adult Residential Program

Characteristic	% in 2003-2004	% in 2005-2006	% in 2007-2008	% in 2009-2010	% in 2011-2012	% in 2013
Age						
21 and younger	20.4	10.1	26.5	22.0	15.8	8.0
22 – 29	31.1	40.3	26.0	23.6	36.4	38.0
30 – 39	26.5	41.7	23.1	23.8	30.7	34.4
40 and older	22.0	33.7	30.3	25.9	17.1	19.6
Violent offense	13.5	14.7	12.4	14.9	14.7	17.6
Prior felony convictions	60.7	59.5	61.0	54.0	54.7	53.2
Prior prison term	29.3	32.3	33.1	33.9	36.7	36.4

Note. Totals of percentages are not 100 for every characteristic because of rounding.

Service Delivery

The HCCC service delivery model is analyzed in this report in four ways. First, the number of program participants deemed eligible (i.e., projected referrals) to actual services provided to participants for the current report years is presented for the total sample of both the EMP (FY 2012-2013) and ARP (FY 2013). Second, the ability of HCCC to match program participants to treatment program is examined. This information is presented by examining the percentage of participants that met the program risk criteria, were referred to the program, attended and also met risk criteria, attended and did not meet risk criteria, and completed the program and met the risk criteria for each core program. Third, a presentation of external

treatment programs is presented. Finally, participant satisfaction survey results for both the six core programs and the overall EMP and ARP are provided.

Referrals and Services. Table 8 presents the number of program participants deemed eligible by HCCC staff at admission to meet the requirements for a treatment program referral by program type. According to forms collected from intake for both programs, the cognitive skills program (*Thinking for a Change)* and the financial management program received the highest percentage of referrals. Similar to previous reports, there are far fewer referrals made to sex offender treatment, GED training, and mental health treatment. Table 8 also includes the number of program participant referrals to treatment programming that were overridden by HCCC staff at admission. As the table clearly shows, overrides are a very infrequent occurrence during the admission period.

There are a variety of reasons why HCCC staff would not refer program participants to the core programs. Table 9 describes the reasons listed for override decisions. The only two reasons given were that treatment has recently been completed and additional treatment was not possible. Interestingly, there are far fewer overrides in the ARP compared to the EMP.

Table 8

Participant Program Referrals by Treatment and Sample Type

	EMP Sample (N = 510)	ARP Sample (N = 250)
Scale	***N***	***N***
Cognitive skills program		
Projected referral	213	203
Overrode referral	7	3
Employment skills program		
Projected referral	146	161
Overrode referral	3	1
Financial management program		
Projected referral	217	198
Overrode referral	3	0
WAIT treatment program		
Projected referral	31	114
Overrode referral	4	0
Substance abuse evaluation ordered	262	151
Phase 2 treatment program		
Projected referral	111	127
Overrode referral	3	0
Phase 3 treatment program		
Projected referral	102	105
Overrode referral	3	0
Referral to sex offender treatment	10	14
Overrode referral	0	0
Referral to GED training	53	52
Overrode referral	2	0
Referral to mental health evaluation	76	62
Overrode referral	5	0

Table 9

Referral Overrides to Treatment Programs by Sample Type

Scale	EMP Sample (N = 510) *N*	ARP Sample (N = 250) *n*
Cognitive skills program overrides		
Treatment has recently been completed	7	3
Employment skills program overrides		
Treatment has recently been completed	2	0
Additional treatment not possible	1	1
Financial management program overrides		
Treatment has recently been completed	3	0
WAIT program overrides		
Treatment has recently been completed	4	0
Phase 2 program overrides		
Treatment has recently been completed	1	0
Treatment ordered by another agency	1	0
Additional treatment not possible	1	0
Phase 3 program overrides		
Treatment has recently been completed	1	0
Treatment ordered by another agency	1	0
Additional treatment not possible	1	0
GED training override		
Treatment has recently been completed	1	0
Additional treatment not possible	1	0
Mental health evaluation override		
Treatment has recently been completed	2	0
Treatment ordered by another agency	3	0

Table 10 examines the program status of the EMP and ARP participants at discharge. The number of participants who were referred to each program was determined from the intake

form and the number of participants who attended, completed, and is still in the program was determined from the discharge summary form. Table 10 shows a similar trend to previous reports, which is that large portions of participants being referred to treatment programs are not attending them. To demonstrate, 80.0% of ARP participants were referred to the *Thinking for a Change* program, but only 32.0% actually attended the class. The *Thinking for a Change* program was the most utilized program with 32.0% of ARP participants and 19.8% of EMP participants attending.

Table 10 further shows the number of program participants who completed the indicated core program. The percentage of participants who completed the program is derived from dividing the number of completing participants by the total number of participants who attended the specific program. The table reveals that participant completion rates vary by treatment type and program type. For the EMP sample, the treatment program with the highest completion rate at discharge was *WAIT* (53.5%), followed closely by *Financial Management* (53.2%) and *Phase 2* (52.9%). For the ARP sample, the treatment program with the highest completion rate at discharge was *Employment Skills* (73.5%), followed by *Employment Skills* (69.2%), *Phase 3* (58.6%), and *Thinking for a Change* (50.6%).

Table 10

Treatment Program Participation and Completion Rates by Treatment and Sample Type

	EMP		ARP	
Scale	***n***	**%**	***n***	**%**
Cognitive skills program				
Referred	206	40.4	200	80.0
Attended program	86	19.8	83	32.0
Completed program	26	30.3	42	50.6
Still in program	15	17.4	23	27.7
Employment skills program				
Referred	143	28.0	160	64.0
Attended program	27	6.2	13	5.0
Completed program	7	25.9	9	69.2
Financial management program				
Referred	214	42.0	198	79.2
Attended program	47	10.8	34	13.1
Completed program	25	53.2	25	73.5
Still in program	2	4.3	2	5.9
WAIT treatment program				
Referred	27	5.3	114	45.6
Attended program	15	3.5	12	4.6
Completed program	8	53.3	5	41.7
Still in program	2	13.3	6	50.0
Phase 2 treatment program				
Referred	108	21.2	127	50.8
Attended program	34	7.8	47	18.1
Completed program	18	52.9	18	38.3
Still in program	8	23.5	22	46.8
Phase 3 treatment program				
Referred	99	19.4	105	42.0
Attended program	28	6.5	29	11.2
Completed program	11	39.3	17	58.6
Still in program	8	28.6	10	34.5

Note. Referred percentages are based on the total number of admissions (EMP = 510; ARP = 250).
Attended percentages are based on the total number of discharges (EMP = 434; ARP = 259).
Completed and still in program percentages are based on the number of participants attending the program.

Table 11 examines the number of core programs that EMP and ARP participants attended and completed during the current report period. The ARP participants were nearly twice as likely to attend treatment compared to the EMP participants, which indicates HCCC is using its services more with the participants of the residential program rather than those on electronic monitoring. In both groups, the majority of participants who engaged in treatment services participated in one type of service, while a relatively small percentage engaged in multiple service programs. It should be noted, that at discharge, the majority of both the EMP sample (83.5%) and the ARP sample (70.0%) had not completed any treatment programs.

Table 11

Frequency of Core Treatment Programs Attended and Completed by Sample Type

	EMP Sample (N = 510)		**ARP Sample (N = 250)**	
Scale	***n***	**%**	***n***	**%**
Number of core programs attended				
Zero	364	71.4	101	40.4
One	96	18.8	100	40.0
Two	25	4.9	33	13.2
Three	17	3.3	12	4.8
Four	4	0.8	4	1.6
Six	4	0.8	0	0.0
Number of core programs completed				
Zero	426	83.5	175	70.0
One	65	12.7	47	18.8
Two	10	2.0	17	6.8
Three	7	1.4	9	3.6
Four	2	0.4	2	0.8

In Table 11, the percentages of program completers were limited to those that had done so by the time of their discharge. However, it is not uncommon for a participant to remain in the

treatment program despite being discharged from the EMP or ARP. A good example would be that the participant was discharged from the HCCC program, but remained on probation/parole and as part of his/her conditions of supervision and thus remains in the treatment program. Therefore, Table 12 includes all of the participants that completed the treatment program, regardless of discharge date. In Table 12, the number of participants completing each program is determined from the attendance forms that are completed by the group facilitator. The treatment program with the highest overall completion rate was *Employment Skills* (74.1%), followed closely by *Phase 3* (71.3%), *Financial Management* (69.9%) and *Thinking for a Change* (67.4%). The *Phase 2* and *WAIT* programs both had completion rates of approximately 56.0%.

Table 12

Frequency and Percentage of Participants Completing Core Treatment Programs, by Type

Program	*n*	%
Cognitive skills	152	67.3
Employment skills	20	74.1
Financial management	79	69.9
WAIT	14	56.0
Phase 2	60	56.1
Phase 3	57	71.3

There were a variety of reasons why program participants did not complete the core programs that they attended. These reasons, which were reported by the facilitators of the programs on the attendance forms, are listed in Table 13 for each of the core programs. The most often sited reasons were for attendance issues, being sent to jail, or referred back to court.

Table 13

Reasons for Participant Failure to Complete Core Treatment Programs

Reason	*n*	%
Cognitive skills program		
Attendance	37	50.0
Sent to jail	17	23.0
Absconded	3	4.1
Referred back to court	10	13.5
Released	3	4.1
No reason given	4	5.4
Employment skills program		
Attendance	6	85.7
Referred back to court	1	14.3
Financial management program		
Attendance	28	82.4
Sent to jail	1	2.9
Absconded	1	2.9
Referred back to court	1	2.9
Released	1	2.9
Violated program	1	2.9
No reason given	1	2.9
WAIT treatment program		
Attendance	6	54.5
Sent to jail	5	45.5
Phase 2 treatment program		
Attendance	24	51.1
Sent to jail	6	12.8
Absconded	5	10.6
Referred back to court	5	10.6
Released	4	8.5
Violated program	2	4.3
Moved to a different class	1	2.1
Phase 3 treatment program		
Attendance	10	43.5
Sent to jail	7	30.4
Referred back to court	4	17.4

Released	1	4.3
Violated program	1	4.3

Note. Totals of percentages are not 100 for every characteristic because of rounding.

Table 14 presents the external treatment program and provider information for the EMP and ARP samples. There were 262 EMP and 151 ARP participants with substance abuse evaluation orders. The specific type of treatment ordered for both samples are also listed in Table 14. Please note that if two types of treatment were ordered, only the more severe type was listed. Similar to previous reports, the most common substance abuse treatment was intensive outpatient treatment followed by relapse prevention. Also, similar to prior reports the most frequently cited substance abuse provider was Aspire.

Table 14

External Treatment Program and Provider Information by Sample Type

	EMP Sample (N = 510)		ARP Sample (N = 250)	
	n	**%**	***n***	**%**
Substance abuse				
Evaluation ordered	262	51.4	151	60.4
Type of treatment ordered				
IOP	99	37.8	72	47.7
Relapse prevention	37	14.1	26	17.2
Aftercare	5	1.9	10	6.6
Dual diagnosis	8	3.1	9	6.0
Individual counseling	23	8.8	8	5.3
Education	11	4.2	0	0.0
Prime for life	9	3.4	3	2.0
Recovery management	5	1.9	0	0.0
Sober living	3	1.1	4	2.6
Methadone treatment	1	0.4	0	0.0
12 step/AA/NA	21	8.0	15	9.9
Not specified	40	15.3	4	2.6
Provider				
Aspire	78	29.8	70	46.4
Proactive	25	9.5	0	0.0
Serenity	19	7.3	6	4.0
Fairbanks	17	6.5	3	2.0
HCCC	12	4.6	35	23.2
Fall Creek	0	0.0	3	2.0
Gallahue	1	0.4	2	1.3
12 step program	21	8.0	14	9.3
Other	15	5.7	9	6.0
Not reported	74	28.2	9	6.0

Note. Totals of percentages are not 100 for every characteristic because of rounding.

Matching Program Participants to Services and Programs. As previously mentioned, fewer program participants actually attended the core programs relative to those who were deemed eligible to attend. Therefore, analyses were conducted to determine the extent to which participants who were assessed as needing treatment actually attended and completed the

appropriate program(s). Adequate matching of program participants to programs means that HCCC participants were referred to (and attended) programs appropriate for their needs as identified through the intake assessment protocol.

Table 15a and Table 15b assess the EMP and ARP programs ability to appropriately match participants to treatment services. It is important to emphasize that these tables only portray the assessment-program participant match as suggested by the IRAS-CST. Recall that HCCC considers other program participant characteristics for referral to each of the four core programs (see Appendix B). As such, the program participant selection criteria used here were as follows:

- Risk category. The risk principle (Andrews & Bonta, 2010) maintains that moderate and high risk offenders should be assigned to programs. Any program participant who scored in the moderate to high-risk range was assigned to this category. Placement in this category included any participant who scored moderate or high risk on the IRAS-CST (scores of 15 or higher for males and scores of 14 or higher for females) on their admission risk/needs assessment.

- Thinking for a Change. The *Thinking for a Change* program is assigned on the basis of IRAS-CST total score and *Criminal Attitudes* subscale domain score. Placement in this category included any participant who scored moderate or high risk on the IRAS-CST (scores of 15 or higher for males and scores of 14 or higher for females) and had 50% or more of the indicators in the IRAS-CST domain of *Criminal Attitudes*.

- Employment skills. The *Employment Skills* program is assigned on the basis of the IRAS-CST total score and *Education, Employment, and Financial Situation* subscale domain score. Placement in this category included any participant who scored moderate or high risk on the IRAS-CST (scores of 15 or higher for males and scores of 14 or higher for females) and had 50% or more of the indicators in the IRAS-CST domain of *Education, Employment, and Financial Situation*.

- Financial management. The *Financial Management* program is assigned on the basis of the IRAS-CST total score and *Education, Employment, and Financial Situation* subscale domain score. Placement in this category included any participant who scored moderate or high risk on the IRAS-CST (scores of 15 or higher for males and scores of 14 or higher for females) and had 50% or more of the indicators in the IRAS-CST domain of *Education, Employment, and Financial Situation*.

- Washington Aggression Interruption Training. The *Washington Aggression Interruption Training* program is assigned on the basis of IRAS-CST total score and *Criminal Attitudes* subscale domain score. Placement in this category included any participant who scored moderate or high risk on the IRAS-CST (scores of 15 or higher for males and scores of 14 or higher for females) and had 50% or more of the indicators in the IRAS-CST domain of *Criminal Attitudes*.

In Table 15a and Table 15b, the first rows indicate the percentage of participants who met program eligibility criteria based on the admission risk/needs assessment information described above. The second rows indicate the percentage of program participants determined by HCCC staff at intake to need a referral to the indicated program. The third rows, entitled "*assigned/needed*," indicate the percentage of program participants who fit the program participant selection criteria in row one and began one of the four core programs. The fourth rows, entitled "*participated/not needed*," indicate the percentage of program participants who did not fit the program participant selection criteria in row one but were assigned to one of the four core programs anyway. The fifth rows, entitled "*completed/needed*," indicate the percentage of program participants who completed the program and were also determined to need the program based on the program participant selection criteria.

According to Table 15a, about a quarter of EMP participants (23.7%) met the need criteria described above. Specifically, 2.5% of the EMP participants were found to be in need of the cognitive skills and WAIT programs, while 18.8% were found to be in need of the employment skills and financial management programs. Table 15a shows that a great deal more participants were referred to treatment than were found to be appropriate by the risk criteria. Table 15a also reveals that slightly more than half (52.4%) of the participants who were rated as moderate- to high-risk to reoffend participated in at least one core treatment program. However, the results from the four individual programs are not as encouraging. For those participants meeting the individual program risk criteria described above, less than a quarter were actually

attended the program. Instead the vast majority of participants in the four treatment programs did not meet the risk criteria standard. Most troubling is that the participants most in need of the treatment services did not complete the program by discharge. Specifically, the completion rates range from a low of 0% in the *WAIT* program to a high of 9.2% in the Financial Management program.

Table 15a

Integration of the Risk/Needs Assessment Information in Programming Decisions of Electronic Monitoring Participants

Scale	Meet Criteria[a]	Referred[b]	Assigned/ Needed[c]	Participated/ Not Needed[d]	Completed/ Needed[e]
Risk	23.7	66.5	52.4	65.9	31.0
Cognitive skills	2.5	40.4	27.3	96.0	9.1
Employment skills	18.8	28.0	7.7	79.2	1.5
Financial management	18.8	42.0	16.9	71.8	9.2
WAIT	2.5	5.3	9.1	90.9	0.0

[a] Number of participants that met program eligibility criteria based on risk/need assessment information / number of participant admissions.
[b] Number of participants referred to program during admission / number of participant admissions.
[c] Number of participants assigned to program and met eligibility criteria / number of participants that met need criteria.
[d] Number of participants that participated in program and did not meet eligibility criteria / total number of participants assigned to program.
[e] Number of participants that completed program and met eligibility criteria / total number of participants that met need criteria.

According to Table 15b, approximately three quarters of ARP participants (72.0%) met the need criteria described above. Specifically, 9.2% of the ARP participants were found to be in need of the cognitive skills and *WAIT* programs, while 60.8% were found to be in need of the employment skills and financial management programs. Table 15b shows that a great deal more participants were referred to the cognitive skills and *WAIT* program than were found to be

appropriate by the risk criteria described above. The percentage of referrals for the employment skills and financial management program were only slightly larger than the percentage meeting the risk criteria. Table 15a also reveals that less than half (41.9%) of the participants who were rated as moderate- to high-risk to reoffend participated in at least one core treatment program. However, the results from the four individual programs are not as favorable. Although 42.1% of the participants meeting the risk definition for the cognitive skills program actually attended the program, the attendance rates for the appropriate participants in the other three programs were particularly low (< 7%). A considerable proportion of the participants in the four treatment programs did not meet the risk criteria standard. Moreover, the participants most in need of the treatment services did not complete the program by discharge. Specifically, the completion rates range from a low of 3.7% in the Financial Management program and 25.0% in the *WAIT* program.

Table 15b

Integration of the Risk/Needs Assessment Information in Programming Decisions of Adult Residential Participants

Scale	Meet Criteria[a]	Referred[b]	Assigned/ Needed[c]	Participated/ Not Needed[d]	Completed/ Needed[e]
Risk	72.0	94.4	41.9	28.8	19.4
Cognitive skills	9.2	80.0	42.1	84.3	15.8
Employment skills	60.8	64.0	6.5	22.2	6.5
Financial management	60.8	79.2	6.5	56.3	3.7
WAIT	9.2	45.6	5.3	90.0	25.0

[a] Number of participants that met program eligibility criteria based on risk/need assessment information / number of participant admissions.
[b] Number of participants referred to program during admission / number of participant admissions.
[c] Number of participants assigned to program and met eligibility criteria / number of participants that met need criteria.

[d] Number of participants that participated in program and did not meet eligibility criteria / total number of participants assigned to program.
[e] Number of participants that completed program and met eligibility criteria / total number of participants that met need criteria.

It should be noted that HCCC uses additional criteria (i.e., court order, offense type, behavior in program, case manager and/or field service coordinator discretion) beyond the risk/needs assessment information from the IRAS-CST to determine program eligibility. These differences may help partially explain why the higher risk participants were not assigned to the HCCC core treatment programs. Also, case managers and field service coordinators must use their judgment to determine which treatment areas to address for the participants they supervise. Since participants must pay fees in both the EMP and ARP program, work is a priority for most participants, which takes away from the amount of time participants have to engage in treatment programs. Also, the court often orders some forms of treatment (e.g., substance abuse treatment), and the mandated treatment must take priority over other appropriate treatment options (e.g., T4C, ART).

Another potential reason that higher risk participants may not be engaging in the core treatment programming is that for some their length of commitment is not long enough to complete the program. Table 16a and Table 16b compare the amount of time to be served for the EMP and ARP participants separated by risk/need criteria and treatment assignment. The first column includes the participants that attended a treatment program and were moderate to high-risk to reoffend. The second column includes participants that did not attend any treatment program, and were moderate to high-risk to reoffend. The third column includes participants that attended a treatment program, but were not moderate to high-risk to reoffend. Finally, the fourth column includes participants that did not attend a treatment program, and were not moderate to high-risk to reoffend.

According to Table 16a, the higher risk EMP participants were more likely to participate in treatment if they had longer sentences. Specifically, those attending treatment had an average of 270.8 days to serve, while those in need of treatment who did not receive it had only 148.7 days to serve. The participants that did not need treatment, but participated anyway had a very dispersed range of length of stays, with most serving less than 150 days. It is also particularly noteworthy that lower risk participants who did not engage in treatment served the least amount of time in the program. Such a finding indicates that lower risk participants are having the least amount of contact with the HCCC system and is in support of the risk principle.

Table 16a

Comparison of Time Served for EMP Participants Separated by Risk/Need Criteria and Treatment Assignment

	Attended and needed		**Did not attend but needed**		**Attended but did not need**		**Did not attend and did not need**	
Time in program	***n***	**%**	***n***	**%**	***N***	**%**	***n***	**%**
< 50 days	0	0.0	4	66.7	46	37.1	171	66.0
50-99 days	2	40.0	0	0.0	33	26.6	54	20.8
100-149 days	2	40.0	2	33.3	41	33.1	33	12.7
≥ 150 days	1	20.0	0	0.0	4	3.2	1	0.4
Mean days (SD)	270.8	165.4	148.7	132.9	168.4	132.5	118.4	74.9

According to Table 16b, the higher risk ARP participants were more likely to participate in treatment if they had longer sentences. Specifically, those attending treatment had an average of 315.7 days to serve, while those in need of treatment who did not receive it had only 196.8 days to serve. Here, however, as opposed to the findings from the EMP program, the majority of the higher risk but did not attend treatment group (61.1%) had more than 150 days to be served,

which should be enough time to engage in a single treatment program. Most of the participants that did not need treatment, but participated anyway had more than 150 days to serve. In the ARP sample, as in the EMP sample, the lower risk participants who did not engage in treatment served the least amount of time in the program compared to the other three groups. However, in the ARP program 96.6% served more than 50 days and 58.7% served more than 100 days. This finding suggests that these lower risk participants are spending a great deal of time in the ARP while not engaging in treatment services.

Table 16b

Comparison of Time Served for ARP Participants Separated by Risk/Need Criteria and Treatment Assignment

	Attended and needed		**Did not attend but needed**		**Attended but did not need**		**Did not attend and did not need**	
Time in program	***n***	**%**	***n***	**%**	***N***	**%**	***n***	**%**
< 50 days	0	0.0	3	4.3	0	0.0	1	3.4
50-99 days	3	5.8	22	30.6	4	19.0	11	37.9
100-149 days	3	5.8	3	4.2	3	14.3	6	20.7
≥ 150 days	46	88.5	44	61.1	14	66.7	11	37.9
Mean days (SD)	315.7	182.9	196.8	143.8	225.2	182.9	143.2	182.9

Given the findings of this study, it is reasonable to conclude that HCCC consistently adheres to the risk principle in assigning participants to treatment. About half of the participants in both programs that met the eligibility criteria actually attended a core treatment program. The discrepancies in which participants should be assigned to treatment seem to be explained partially by sentence length and other factors (i.e., court order, offense type, behavior in program, case manager and/or field service coordinator discretion). However, these factors do

not account for all of the differences, so the matching of participants and services should remain an area for improvement for HCCC.

Participant Satisfaction Surveys. Results of participant evaluations of core treatment programming are presented in Appendix C through Appendix H on an item-by-item basis. The original responses to these items were indicated on 5-point Likert scale ranging from "1" *strongly agree* to "5" *strongly disagree*, with a score of "3" indicating *no opinion*. The appendices report the mean score for each item. It should be noted that some items are reverse coded and appropriately labeled to reflect this in the table. Moreover, all items are reported so that the higher the mean score, the more positive the response. These appendices suggest that program participants had a very positive experience in HCCC core treatment programming overall—there is not a single item with a mean score of less than three. Table 17 further summarizes these participant evaluations by providing one overall mean value of all of the evaluation items. The mean values range from 4.1 (*Phase 3*) to 4.4 (*Employment Skills* and *Financial Management*).

Table 17

Mean Participant Evaluation Scores for the Core Treatment Programs

Program	*Mean*	*SD*
Cognitive skills program[a]	4.3	0.4
Phase 2[b]	4.2	0.5
Phase 3[c]	4.1	0.5
WAIT program[d]	4.3	0.7
Financial management program[e]	4.4	0.4
Employment skills program[f]	4.4	0.3

Note. [a] $n = 57$. [b] $n = 115$. [c] $n = 15$. [d] $n = 5$. [e] $n = 36$. [f] $n = 15$.

Along with completing evaluations on satisfaction with core programming, participants were also asked quarterly to evaluate the HCCC program. Table 18 shows the results of this evaluation for all program participants who completed the evaluation. The reporting of the HCCC participant evaluation items was similar to the reporting of the core program's participant evaluation items described above. The original responses to these items were indicated on 5-point Likert scale ranging from "1" *strongly agree* to "5" *strongly disagree*, with a score of "3" indicating *no opinion*. Results from quarterly participant evaluations suggest strong satisfaction with the services provided by HCCC. The mean of all the items was 4.2 (SD = 0.6). In fact, no single item has a mean score of less than 3.6.

Table 18

***Summary of HCCC Participant Program Evaluations (*N = 718)**

Item	*Mean*	*SD*
The living unit coordinators are helpful to me	4.2	0.9
The field coordinators are helpful to me	4.5	0.8
The case managers are helpful to me	4.5	0.7
The living unit coordinators treat me with dignity and respect	4.2	0.9
The field coordinators treat me with dignity and respect	4.6	0.7
My case manager treats me with dignity and respect	4.7	0.6
The staff seems to recognize and reward outstanding performance	4.1	1.1
I feel that I can be honest with at least some staff…	4.5	0.8
When I make mistakes the staff show me how to improve	4.2	1.0
Staff understand me	4.3	1.0
The program allows me to maintain adequate communication with family	4.3	1.0
Staff treat me fairly	4.5	0.8
I feel confident that I can obtain employment once I am released	4.7	0.6
I feel confident that I can keep a job upon my release	4.8	0.5
Program rules and regulations are unreasonable (*reverse coded*)	3.6	1.2
I received the help I needed for my substance abuse problems	4.2	0.9
I received the help I needed for my emotional problems	4.0	1.0
I will be a better employee for having completed this program	4.1	1.0
The programs I participated in will reduce my likelihood of committing an offense in the future	4.5	0.9
My living area was adequate	4.2	1.0
I felt safe while I was here	4.4	0.8

OUTCOME EVALUATION

The purpose of the outcome evaluation is to inspect evidence of program participant success by the end of their time in HCCC. Outcome measures for participants were collected prior to discharge from the program. These measures describe termination status (successful or unsuccessful), educational attainments while in the program, employment status at discharge, reward level achieved while in the program, as well as drug use and new offenses while participants were enrolled in the program. These findings are descriptive in nature since no comparison group is included. Pretest-posttest analysis of the standardized tests and comparison to findings from the previous years are also reported.

Table 19a presents frequency and percentage distribution of intermediate outcome and service delivery measures for EMP sample. A total of 394 (77.3% of those admitted during the current report period) program participants admitted to the EMP between July 1, 2011 and June 30, 2013 were discharged in time for their outcomes to be reported in this report. Of the 394 participants, 327 (83.0%) were successfully discharged. The most common reason for unsuccessful discharge from the program was for a positive urinalysis (59.7%), followed by a technical violation (19.4%) and a new arrest or conviction (14.9%). Concerning employment, 77.4% of those discharged were employed at discharge. Further, 73.1% of the total sample was employed more than 90% of the time they were in the EMP. These numbers suggest that HCCC continues to excel at placing participants into employment opportunities and maintaining employment for program participants. Only 3.8% of the EMP participants were fired from a job while in the program.

Additionally, Table 19a presents information on the number and percentage of program participants for each reward level achieved while in the EMP. More than half of all participants

(62.5%) achieved a reward level of A or B. Only 15 (or 3.8%) of EMP participants did not receive any reward level. About a quarter of EMP participants (25.9%) were found guilty at an administrative hearing and 14.2% were referred back to court. Although 29.8% of participants had a positive drug test in the EMP program, only 3.0% (or 12 participants) committed a new offense.

Table 19a

Intermediate Outcomes of Electronic Monitoring Program Participants by Sentence Type

	Total Sample (N = 394)		Community Sentences (N = 368)		Prison Releases (N = 26)	
Measure	***n***	**%**	***n***	**%**	***n***	**%**
Successful termination	327	83.0	304	88.5	23	88.5
Reason for unsuccessful termination						
New arrest or conviction	10	14.9	10	15.6	0	0.0
Technical violation	13	19.4	12	18.8	1	33.3
Positive urinalysis	40	59.7	38	59.4	2	66.7
Failure to return	3	4.5	3	4.7	0	0.0
Reason not reported	1	1.5	1	1.6	0	0.0
Educational achievement						
No change	362	91.9	338	91.8	24	92.3
Attending program	28	7.1	26	7.1	2	7.7
Completed program	4	1.0	4	1.1	0	0.0
Employed at discharge						
Employed at discharge	305	77.4	283	76.9	22	84.6
Remained employed	278	70.6	259	70.4	19	73.1
Employed ≥ 90% of the time	288	73.1	266	72.3	22	84.6
Fired from a job on EMP	15	3.8	13	3.5	2	7.7
Reward Level Achieved						
A	94	23.9	84	22.8	10	38.5
B	152	38.6	147	39.9	5	19.2
C	79	20.1	70	19.0	9	34.6
D	54	13.7	52	14.1	2	7.7

No reward received	15	3.8	15	4.1	0	0.0
Guilty at administrative hearing	102	25.9	98	26.6	4	15.4
Referral back to court	56	14.2	53	14.4	3	11.5
Committed new offense	12	3.0	12	3.3	0	0.0
Any positive drug test	82	29.8	79	21.5	3	11.5

Note. Totals of percentages are not 100 for every characteristic because of rounding.

Table 19b presents frequency and percentage distribution of intermediate outcome and service delivery measures for ARP sample. A total of 174 (69.6% of those admitted during the current report period) program participants admitted to the ARP between July 1, 2012 and June 30, 2013 were discharged in time for their outcomes to be reported in this report. Of the 174 participants, 89 (51.1%) were successfully discharged. The most common reason for unsuccessful discharge from the program was for a positive urinalysis (49.4%), followed by a technical violation (35.3%). Concerning employment, 81.6% of those discharged were employed at discharge. It is important to emphasize that according to the admission documents, only 41.6% of the sample was employed at intake. Therefore, HCCC ensured that most program participants who did not have a job at intake had secured one by the time they were discharged from the program, with an increase of 40.0% of those employed. Further, 41.6% of the total sample was employed more than 90% of the time they were in the ARP. These numbers suggest that HCCC continues to excel at placing participants into employment opportunities and maintaining employment for program participants. There were unfortunately 13.2% of the ARP participants who were fired from a job while in the program.

Additionally, Table 19b presents information on the number and percentage of program participants for each reward level achieved while in the ARP. More than half of all participants

(51.7%) did not receive any reward level. The next most common reward level was level D (19.5%), followed by level B (13.2%) and level C (11.5%). Reaching the reward level of A was the least common outcome (4.0%). More than half of the ARP participants (65.5%) were found guilty at an administrative hearing and 35.6% were referred back to court. Although 38.5% of participants had a positive drug test in the ARP program, only 2.3% (or 4 participants) committed a new offense.

Table 19b

Intermediate Outcomes of Adult Residential Program Participants by Sentence Type

	Total Sample (N = 174)		**Community Sentences (N = 129)**		**Prison Releases (N = 45)**	
Measure	***n***	**%**	***n***	**%**	***n***	**%**
Successful termination	89	51.1	71	55.0	18	40.0
Reason for unsuccessful termination						
New arrest or conviction	5	5.9	2	3.4	3	11.1
Technical violation	30	35.3	18	31.0	12	44.4
Positive urinalysis	42	49.4	34	58.6	8	29.6
Failure to return	6	7.1	4	6.9	2	7.4
Sentencing stay	2	2.4	0	0.0	2	7.4
Educational achievement						
No change	148	85.1	106	82.2	42	93.3
Attending program	16	9.2	14	10.9	2	4.4
Completed program	10	5.7	9	7.0	1	2.2
Employed at discharge						
Employed at discharge	142	81.6	111	86.0	31	68.9
Remained employed	105	60.3	86	66.7	19	42.2
Employed ≥ 90% of the time	88	50.6	70	54.3	18	40.0
Fired from a job on ARP	23	13.2	13	10.1	10	22.2
Reward Level Achieved						
A	7	4.0	3	2.3	4	8.9
B	23	13.2	18	14.0	5	11.1

C	20	11.5	18	14.0	2	4.4
D	34	19.5	23	17.8	11	24.4
No reward received	90	51.7	67	51.9	23	51.1
Guilty at administrative hearing	114	65.5	83	64.3	31	68.9
Referral back to court	62	35.6	45	34.9	17	37.8
Committed new offense	4	2.3	2	1.6	2	4.4
Any positive drug test	67	38.5	50	38.8	17	37.8

Note. Totals of percentages are not 100 for every characteristic because of rounding.

Table 20a and Table 20b present the pretest and posttest CSS and IRAS-CST assessment scores for the EMP and ARP samples, respectively. This information is useful in determining whether or not the HCCC succeeded in producing a variety of beneficial outcomes for the program participants. According to Table 20a, the CSS scores of the EMP participants in all three groups increased slightly from pretest to posttest. Although none of the differences were significant, this increase in score indicates that participants were slightly less antisocial at posttest than pretest. When examining the mean pretest and posttest risk scores for the EMP samples, there is a significant reduction in risk ($p < .05$) for all three groups. Although the mean pretest risk scores at pretest are relatively low to begin with ($M = 10.4$), there is an average reduction of two points at posttest for the total sample. These results suggest that EMP participants were discharged from the program with a lower probability to reoffend compared to when they entered the program.

Table 20a

Electronic Monitoring Program Participant Pretest and Posttest CSS and IRAS-CST Scores by Sentence Type

	Total Sample			Community Sentences			Prison Releases		
Measure	***n***	***Mean***	***SD***	***n***	***Mean***	***SD***	***n***	***Mean***	***SD***
CSS total score									
Pretest	316	68.8	20.5	294	68.6	20.7	22	72.2	17.8
Posttest		69.0	21.6		68.7	21.7		73.6	19.9
IRAS-CST total score									
Pretest	323	10.4**	5.4	301	10.5**	5.4	22	8.7*	5.0
Posttest		8.4**	5.7		8.5**	4.7		6.9*	3.1

Note. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .001$.

According to Table 20b, the CSS scores of the ARP participants in all three groups increased slightly from pretest to posttest. Although none of the differences were significant, this increase in score indicates that participants were slightly more antisocial at posttest than pretest. When examining the mean pretest and posttest risk scores for the ARP samples, there is a significant reduction in risk for all three groups ($p < .001$). The mean risk score at pretest for the total sample was 16.1 and the average risk score at posttest was 12.4, indicating there was an average reduction of 3.7 points from pretest to posttest for the total sample. These results suggest that ARP participants were discharged from the program with a lower probability to reoffend compared to when they entered the program.

Table 20b

Adult Residential Program Participant Pretest and Posttest CSS and IRAS-CST Scores by Sentence Type

	Total Sample			Community Sentences			Prison Releases		
Measure	***n***	***Mean***	***SD***	***n***	***Mean***	***SD***	***n***	***Mean***	***SD***
CSS total score									
Pretest	171	62.7	21.4	127	64.0	21.0	44	59.1	22.4
Posttest		60.6	21.5		61.2	22.1		58.4	19.3
IRAS-CST total score									
Pretest	174	16.1**	6.2	129	16.0**	6.3	45	16.7**	6.1
Posttest		12.4**	5.4		12.0**	5.3		13.8**	5.4

Note. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .001$.

Table 21a provides the frequency and percentage distribution of program duration for participants who did not complete the EMP successfully. This table is provided in order to further evaluate the participants who were unsuccessfully discharged from the program. As demonstrated from this table, there is variation in the time non-successful program participants take to be discharged from the program, with most non-completers being discharged after serving at least 50 days.

Table 21a

Program Duration for Electronic Monitoring Program Non-Completers by Sentence Type (N = 67)

	Total Sample		Community Sentences		Prison Releases	
Scale	***n***	**%**	***n***	**%**	***n***	**%**
Time in the program						
< 50 days	2	3.0	2	3.1	0	0.0
50-99 days	22	32.8	21	32.8	1	33.3
100-149 days	12	17.9	12	18.8	0	0.0
≥ 150 days	31	46.3	29	45.3	2	67.7

Note. Total of percentages is not 100 because of rounding.

Table 21b provides the frequency and percentage distribution of program duration for participants who did not complete the ARP successfully. This table is provided in order to further evaluate the participants who were unsuccessfully discharged from the program. As demonstrated from this table, most non-completers were discharged after already serving at least 150 days.

Table 21b

Program Duration for Adult Residential Program Non-Completers by Sentence Type (N = 84)

	Total Sample		Community Sentences		Prison Releases	
Scale	***n***	**%**	***n***	**%**	***n***	**%**
Time in the program						
< 50 days	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
50-99 days	11	13.1	11	19.3	0	0.0
100-149 days	4	4.8	2	3.5	2	7.4
≥ 150 days	69	82.1	44	77.2	25	92.6

Note. Total of percentages is not 100 because of rounding.

Comparison of Intermediate and Service Delivery Measures Across Report Years

A comparison of the intermediate outcome and service delivery measures for the current report year(s) are compared to the previous HCCC program report years. A positive percentage change indicates there was an increase in the percentage reporting that particular measure from one time period to the next.[2] Conversely, a negative percentage change indicates there was a decrease in the percentage reporting that particular measure from one time period to the next. A positive or negative percentage change can indicate benefit or detriment to the sample depending on the measure.

Table 22a lists the percentage change of the intermediate outcome and service delivery indicators for the EMP sample across the three reports. This table demonstrates improvements in most of the intermediate outcome variables examined from the last report period to the current report. Positive results include less positive drug screens (-12.1%), more employed 90% of the time (+1.7%), more successful terminations (+4.3%), less fired from a job (-22.4%), and less new offenses committed (-44.4%). It should also be noted that there were a couple of negative results: less participants remaining employed (-0.8%), less employed at discharge (-0.3%), however, both results are very close to zero and do not indicate much of a change.

[2] Percent change is calculated using the equation [(% year b - % year a) / % year a].

Table 22a

Percentage Change of Intermediate Outcomes Across Report Years for the Electronic Monitoring Program Total Sample

Characteristic	2006-2009 to 2009-2011	2009-2011 to 2011-2013
Positive drug screen	-2.6	-12.1
Remained employed	-6.8	-0.8
Employed 90% of the time	-9.4	+1.7
Successful termination	+2.6	+4.3
Employed at discharge	-50.7	-0.3
Fired from job	-18.3	-22.4
New offense	+28.6	-44.4

Table 22b lists the percentage change of the intermediate outcome and service delivery indicators for the ARP sample across the six reports. This table demonstrates reductions in all of the intermediate outcome variables examined from the last report period to the current report with the exception of one category (committed a new offense). Negative results include: more positive drug screens (+45.3%), less participants remaining employed (-5.8%), less employed 90% of the time (-18.8%), less successful terminations (-26.3%), less employed at discharge (-1.3%), and more fired from a job (+34.7%). It should be noted that there were fewer new offenses committed by ARP participants (-33.3%).

Table 22b

Percentage Change of Intermediate Outcomes Across Report Years for the Adult Residential Program Total Sample

Characteristic	2002-2003 to 2003-2004	2003-2004 to 2004-2006	2004-2006 to 2006-2008	2006-2008 to 2008-2010	2008-2010 to 2010-2012	2010-2012 to 2012-2013
Positive drug screen	+59.9	-23.8	+35.5	-3.3	+14.7	+45.3
Remained employed	+34.3	-8.8	+20.6	+5.1	-16.2	-5.8
Employed 90% of the time	+12.6	-5.9	+10.2	+3.1	-20.9	-18.8
Successful termination	+1.7	-1.1	+9.6	+16.3	-14.7	-26.3
Employed at discharge	-3.5	+10.0	-8.0	-8.1	-8.4	-1.3
Fired from job	-41.1	+69.8	-28.9	+35.9	+11.5	+34.7
New offense	-75.0	+25.0	+230.0	-81.8	+200.0	-33.3

Table 23a and Table 23b compare the CSS and risk assessment pretest and posttest scores over time for the EMP and ARP samples, respectively. These year-to-year comparisons are presented as mean differences with statistical significance tests conducted to evaluate the magnitude of changes. A summary of the findings from the previous reports to the present sample is provided below the findings for each sample per report year. Note that an increase in CSS scores would indicate an improvement (i.e., more pro-social values), whereas a reduction in risk scores would indicate an improvement (i.e., less risk for reoffending). It should also be noted that the risk score differences were calculated using the LSI-R risk score up until 2010, when the IRAS-CST replaced the LSI-R as the risk/needs assessment.

Table 23a indicates that the EMP sample has continued to produce small non-significant increases in CSS scores (i.e., decreases in criminal sentiments) across all three of the report periods. Table 23a also shows there is stability in the small significant reductions in risk for recidivism over all time periods.

Table 23a

Pretest to Posttest Mean Difference Comparisons of the CSS and Participant Risk Assessment Scores Across Report Years for the Electronic Monitoring Program

Measure	2007-2009	2010-2011	2012-2013
CSS mean difference	+1.6	+1.0	+0.2
Risk assessment mean difference	-2.3*	-2.9*	-2.0*

Note. Risk score differences were calculated using LSI-R risk scores in the first two columns. For the last column in the table (2013), the risk score differences were calculated using the IRAS-CST total scores.

Table 23b indicates that there have been only small non-significant decreases in CSS scores (i.e., increases in criminal sentiments) for the ARP sample across all of the report periods. A possible reason for this result could be that most participants entering the ARP come into the program with pro-social values already. The other potential confounding variable is that as the participants become more familiar with facilitators over time, they may be apt to be more honest on the posttest CSS compared to the pretest. Table 23b also shows there are stability in the small significant reductions in risk for recidivism over all time periods.

Table 23b

Pretest to Posttest Mean Difference Comparisons of the CSS and Participant Risk Assessment Scores Across Report Years for the Adult Residential Program

Measure	2003-2004	2005-2006	2007-2008	2009-2010	2011-2012	2013
CSS mean difference	-0.7	-0.8	-1.0	-0.2	-3.0	-1.6
Risk assessment mean difference	-4.0*	-4.1*	-3.1*	-4.5*	-21.1*	-3.7*

Note. Risk score differences were calculated using LSI-R risk scores up until 2010, when the IRAS-CST replaced the LSI-R as the risk/need assessment. For the column in the table labeled 2011-2012, the risk score differences were calculated using LSI-R or IRAS-CST categories, where 1 = low-risk, 2 = moderate-risk, and 3 = high-risk. For the last column in the table (2013), the risk score differences were calculated using the IRAS-CST total scores.

DISCUSSION

This evaluation is the ninth report of a continued joint effort between the HCCC and the University of Cincinnati Corrections Institute (UCCI). The UCCI began its collaboration with HCCC in 2002 in order to assist with the implementation of evidence-based practices, and has produced a program evaluation report each year since. Six of the previous eight reports have evaluated the Adult Residential Program (ARP; formally known as the Adult Work Release Program [AWR]) and two have evaluated the Electronic Monitoring Program (EMP) individually. This is the first evaluation of the ARP and EMP together in the same report. The current sample examined in this report includes all program participants receiving services through the EMP from July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2013 or the ARP from July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2013.

Demographics revealed that the majority of program participants from both programs were male, white, and in their early thirties. Data from assessments administered at intake demonstrated that the majority of program participants had an average IQ. Moreover, in a stable finding across reports, the majority of program participants held pro-social values, as indicated by scores on the CSS. In addition, the IRAS-CST scores produced by intake assessments demonstrated that the vast majority EMP participants were low-risk to reoffend, whereas the ARP participants were more likely to be moderate-risk. In fact, the majority of program participants from both programs was non-violent and had not had a previous felony or prison sentence. Analysis of the IRAS-CST identified needs demonstrated that the program participants of both programs demonstrated high needs in two areas: Education, Employment, and Finances, and Substance Abuse. The most common offenses that solicited a referral to the EMP and ARP were a drug offense and an alcohol offense while driving.

Evaluation of outcome measures demonstrated that 83.0% of EMP participants were successfully discharged, which was markedly higher than that of ARP participants (51.1%). Given the number of administrative hearing where participants were found guilty and the number of positive drug screen while in the program, only an extremely small percentage of participants actually committed a new offense while in the program (3.0% for the EMP and 2.3% for the ARP).

HCCC continued to perform well in the area of employment. Analyses revealed that 73.1% of the EMP sample worked more than 90% of the time with in the program and there were 40.0% more ARP participants employed at discharge than there were at intake. HCCC continues to also do a good job of administering assessments and identifying the needs of participants. Moreover, HCCC staff use an override decision to counter these referral decisions infrequently. About half of the participants in both programs that met the eligibility criteria actually attended a core treatment program. The discrepancies in which participants should be assigned to treatment seem to be explained partially by sentence length and other factors (i.e., court order, offense type, behavior in program, case manager and/or field service coordinator discretion). However, these factors do not account for all of the differences, so the matching of participants and services should remain an area for improvement for HCCC.

Finally, inspection of HCCC participant evaluations demonstrated that program participants had an overwhelmingly positive experience while in core treatment programs. Across all programs and evaluations, items were scored very positively.

The next section offers recommendations to HCCC based on the findings noted above.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This section provides recommendations based on the results discussed in the previous section.

- Many more participants are referred to treatment than are able to actually participate in the available programming. HCCC should ensure moderate to high-risk offenders (as indicated by overall risk/needs score) receive priority for treatment services before the low-risk offenders with moderate to high-risk needs in one particular domain area.

- One way for HCCC to achieve this goal is to alter its treatment program eligibility criteria to more accurately reflect what proportion of participants it can realistically accommodate with the available treatment resources. This effort could help close the gap between the number of participants referred to treatment and the number of participants who actually engage in treatment.

- A good test of the efficiency of new criteria standards would be to monitor the percentage of risk appropriate program completers for each treatment group. HCCC should take steps to get this number as close as possible to 100%.

- Ideally, HCCC should structure its referral system to target and treat the highest risk cases with the most intensive forms of treatment. Furthermore, HCCC staff should infrequently override departmental criteria. Some program participants will not meet the eligibility criteria. It should be just as important to screen out inappropriate referrals as it is to target the appropriate ones.

- Given the large number of low-risk participants, HCCC should continue to minimize the contacts between lower risk participants and higher risk participants. If low-risk participants must be served, there should be separate groups for lower risk and higher risk participants available to keep the contact between the two groups to a minimum.

- HCCC should continue to expand the menu of programming options that are available to participants. However, the assessment data should drive which program choices are made and also which programs are offered more frequently.

- It appears that it might be time to reconsider the assessment currently used to evaluate antisocial attitudes. The CSS has been used in this project since 2002 and has consistently shown non-significant increases in criminal sentiments from pretests to posttests across the report years. Some suggestions for possible new assessments include the Criminal Sentiment Scale-Modified (CSS-M), How I Think Questionnaire (HIT), and Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles (PICTS).

- Results from the satisfaction surveys continue to be outstanding. This is no doubt a reflection of the hard work and professionalism from HCCC team members. HCCC should continue to solicit offender feedback in order to monitor their high level of services. However, it may be time to discuss alternative ways to elicit helpful (and perhaps more specific) feedback.

- It is imperative that HCCC continue to improve efforts towards maximizing fidelity. This should include group observation and training in advanced CBT topics and skills related to service delivery.

- There has been stability in the type of information UC has provided to HCCC, especially in the past few years. It is recommended that HCCC consider their ongoing data collection and technical assistance needs to ensure that the contract with UC continues to provide useful information that will improve the program. This could include an outcome study and/or additional training/technical assistance on the content of assessment, case management, and treatment.

REFERENCES

Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (1995). Level of Service Inventory-Revised. North Tonawanda, NY: Multi-Health Systems, Inc.

Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (2010). *The psychology of criminal conduct* (5th ed.). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing.

Andrews, D. A., Wormith, S., & Kiessling, J. (1985). Self-reported criminal propensity and criminal behavior: Threats to the validity of assessment and personality. Programs Branch User Report: Ottawa: Solicitor General of Canada.

Bush, J., Taymans, J., & Glick, B. (1998). Thinking for a change. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Corrections.

Cattell, R., & Cattell, A. (1973). Measuring Intelligence with the Culture Fair Tests: Manual for Scales 2 & 3. Champaign, IL: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing.

Golden, L. (2002). Evaluation of the Efficacy of a Cognitive Behavioral Program for Offenders on Probation: Thinking for a Change. Dallas, TX: University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas.

Goldstein, A., Glick, B., & Gibbs, J. (1998). *Aggression replacement training: A comprehensive intervention for aggressive youth.* Champaign: Research Press.

Joe, G. W., Broome, K. M., Rowan-Szal, G. A., & Simpson, D. D. (2002). Measuring patient attributes and engagement in treatment. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 22(1): 183-196.

Kohlberg, L. (1976). Moral stages and moralization. In T. Lickona (ed.), *Moral Development and Behavior.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston

Myer, A. J., & Smith, P. (2008a). Descriptive Statistics from the TCU CEST and CESI Scales for the Hamilton County Community Corrections Adult Residential Program. [Unpublished Report]. University of Cincinnati, Center for Criminal Justice Research.

Myer, A. J., & Smith, P. (2008b). Descriptive Statistics from the TCU CEST and CESI Scales for the Hamilton County Community Corrections Electronic Monitoring Program.[Unpublished Report]. University of Cincinnati, Center for Criminal Justice Research.

Roy, R. &Wormith, S. (1985). The effects of incarceration: measuring criminal sentiments. Ottawa, Canada: Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada.

Smith, P., & Labrecque, R. M. (2012). *Evaluation of the Hamilton County Community Corrections Adult Residential Program: Fiscal Years 2010-2011, 2011-2012.* Cincinnati, OH: University of Cincinnati.

Smith, P., Labrecque, R. M., & Thompson, C. (2012). *Evaluation of the Hamilton County Community Corrections Electronic Monitoring Program: Fiscal Years 2009-2010, 2010-2011.* Cincinnati, OH: University of Cincinnati.

Smith, P., Myer, A. J., & Ndrecka, M. (2008). Evaluation of the Hamilton County Community Corrections Adult Residential Program: Fourth Report, FY 2006 and 2007. [Unpublished Report]. University of Cincinnati, Center for Criminal Justice Research.

Spiropoulos, G. V., & Van Voorhis, P. (2004). Evaluation of Hamilton County Community Corrections' Adult Residential Work Release: Year 2 Evaluation. [Unpublished Report]. University of Cincinnati, Center for Criminal Justice Research.

Spiropoulos, G. V., & Van Voorhis, P. (2006). Evaluation of Hamilton County Community Corrections' Adult Residential Work Release: Third Evaluation, Years 3 & 4." [Unpublished Report]. University of Cincinnati, Center for Criminal Justice Research.

Shields, I., & Simourd, D. (1991). Predicting predatory behavior in a population of young offenders. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 18, 180-194.

Van Voorhis, P., & Spiropoulos, G. V. (2003). Adult Annual Work Release Program: Annual Evaluation. [Unpublished Report]. University of Cincinnati, Center for Criminal Justice Research.

Wingeard, L. (2008). Preliminary Evaluation of the *Thinking for a Change* Program Research in Review, 11, 5-7.

Wormith, S., & Andrews, D. A. (1984). Criminal sentiments and criminal behavior: A construct validation. Ottawa, Canada: Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada.

Wormith, S., & Andrews, D. A. (1995). The development and validation of three measures of criminal sentiments and their role in the assessment of offender attitudes. Paper presented at the annual convention of the Canadian Psychological Association, Charlottetown, Canada.

APPENDIX A

Description of the Assessment Instruments and Measures

The Indiana Risk Assessment System-Community Supervision Tool (IRAS-CST) is a risk assessment instrument that classifies male offenders according to four risk levels (low, moderate, high, and very high) and female offenders according to three risk levels (low, moderate, and high). The IRAS-CST also serves as a needs assessment, thereby screening for education, employment, and finances, family and social support, neighborhood problems, substance abuse, antisocial associations, and antisocial attitudes and behavioral problems. These characteristics are called *criminogenic needs,* because they are needs associated with future offending. IRAS-CST scores are obtained through semi-structured intake and pre-termination interviews with offenders. HCCC staff administering the IRAS-CST were trained and certified according to the guidelines established by its publisher, the University of Cincinnati Corrections Institute.

The Criminal Sentiments Scale (Shields & Simourd, 1991) is an assessment of antisocial beliefs, feelings, and attitudes. CSS is a paper and pencil test containing 42 self-reported items. It contains several subscales, but the evaluation used only the total CSS score, where higher scores indicate prosocial attitudes. The CSS is one of the most widely used measures of criminal attitudes in evaluation studies of offender populations. Its validity and reliability with adult offenders has been established through a series of studies (see Andrews, Wormith, & Kiessling, 1985; Roy & Wormith, 1985; Wormith, & Andrews, 1984; 1995).

The Culture Fair Intelligence Test (Cattell & Cattell, 1973) is a non-reading intelligence test designed to minimize biases due to verbal skills, educational levels and cultural differences. The test contains 46 items, and is completed by offenders upon admission to work release. The

test has been in use for some time. Psychometric test results are available in the manual (Cattell & Cattell, 1973) or from Edits, its publisher.

APPENDIX B

Hamilton County Community Corrections' Education and Treatment Program Guidelines

Employment Services
The following guidelines will be used when determining placement in *Employment Services.*

1. Program participants who score a 1 to question 2.4 on the *Education, Employment and Financial* domain of the IRAS-CST.
2. Self-employed participants who are more than $210.00 in arrearage.
3. Program participants who have been terminated from employment during residential work release or electronic monitoring participation.
4. By order of the Administrative Hearing Officer.
5. By order of the sentencing court.
6. Case manager and/or field services coordinator discretion.

Financial Management
The following guidelines will be used when determining placement in *Financial Management*.

1. Program participants who score 1 to question 2.6 on the IRAS-CST.
2. Fee arrearage of more than $210.00 for residential work release participants and $140 for electronic monitoring participants.
3. Those program participants with prior Hamilton County Community Corrections fee balances.
4. Those program participants who are ordered to pay child support.
5. Those program participants who must pay restitution as part of their sentencing order.
6. By order of the Administrative Hearing Officer.
7. By order of the sentencing court.
8. Case manager and/or field services coordinator discretion.

Thinking for a Change
The following guidelines will be used when determining placement in *Thinking for a Change*.

1. Program participants who score a 15 or higher on the IRAS-CST.
2. Program participants who score a 2 or higher in the *Peer Associations* domain of the IRAS-CST.
3. Program participants who score a 4 or higher in the *Criminal Attitudes and Behavior Patterns* domains of the IRAS-CST.
4. By order of the Administrative Hearing Officer.
5. By order of the sentencing court.
6. Case manager and/or field services coordinator discretion.

Mental Health
The following guidelines will be used when determining referral for mental health evaluation.

1. All female program participants scoring a 5 or higher on the *Correctional Mental Health Screen for Women* and all male program participants scoring a 6 or higher on the *Correctional Mental Health Screen for Men*.
2. All program participants who or are currently on psychotropic medication shall be required to receive a psychiatric evaluation and follow any recommendations of said evaluation.
3. By order of the Administrative Hearing Officer.
4. By order of the sentencing court.
5. Case manager and/or field services coordinator discretion.

Substance Abuse Evaluation

The following guidelines will be used when determining referral for a substance abuse evaluation.

1. All program participants who receive a score of 3 or more in the Substance Abuse domain of the IRAS-CST shall be required to obtain a substance abuse evaluation and complete any recommended treatment.
2. All program participants who have attempted to complete a substance abuse program and failed, as well as those who have completed a substance abuse program and relapsed.
3. By order of the Administrative Hearing Officer.
4. By order of the sentencing court.
5. Case manager and/or field services coordinator discretion.

Washington Aggression Interruption Training

The following guidelines will be used when determining placement in *Washington Aggression Interruption Training.*

1. Any program participant who has a history of violent behavior in the last five years.
2. Any male program participants who has a total score of 24 or higher and any female program participant who has a total score of 22 or higher on the IRAS-CST.
3. Any program participant who scores a 9 or higher on the *Criminal Attitudes and Behavioral Patterns* of the IRAS-CST.
4. By order of the Administrative Hearing Officer.
5. By order of the sentencing court.
6. Case manager and/or field services coordinator discretion.

G.E.D

All program participants without a high school diploma or equivalent shall be required to participate in adult education or G.E.D classes.

Sex Offender Treatment

All program participants convicted of a crime of a sexual nature shall be required to complete an approved sex offender treatment program.

APPENDIX C

Summary of Cognitive Skills Program Participant Evaluations (N = 57)

Item	*Mean*	*SD*
My thoughts and feelings seem clearer to me now	3.7	1.2
People arrived to class on time	4.1	0.8
By using the skills I have learned, I know how to get out of a bad situation	3.9	0.8
The other group members treated me with respect	4.7	0.6
The skills and examples seemed pretty realistic	4.1	0.8
The instructor treated me with respect	4.9	0.4
Group members cooperated with the instructor	4.6	0.6
The exercises were helpful	3.8	1.2
The instructors seemed enthusiastic about teaching the class	4.5	0.8
I could understand the activities and handouts in this class	4.4	0.8
The instructor gave me suggestions for how to improve	4.5	0.6
We practiced and role played parts of the lessons	4.4	0.6
Sometimes group members were teased (*reverse coded*)	4.5	0.9
We had good discussions	4.4	0.8
Just a few people seemed to do all the talking (*reverse coded*)	3.8	1.2
I felt the instructor understood where I was coming from	4.4	0.6
Instructors used examples to help us understand the skills	4.4	0.7
I participated in the class	4.5	0.7
I felt comfortable stating my opinions in the class	4.3	0.9
Most class members participated	4.4	0.6
I had several chances to practice	4.3	0.5
Most group members took the class seriously	4.0	0.8
The instructor did a good job giving us examples	4.5	0.6
The instructor told me I was doing a good job	4.5	0.7
The classes met for the entire time period	4.3	0.6

APPENDIX D

Summary of Employment Skills Program Participant Evaluations (N = 15)

Item	*Mean*	*SD*
I believe that my employment goals fit my skills and abilities	4.0	0.9
In class, my instructor let me know how I was doing	4.9	0.4
The instructor treated me with respect	5.0	0.0
The other participants treated me with respect	4.9	0.3
I think this class has improved my ability to get and keep a job	4.7	0.6
I could understand the activities, assessments, and handouts in class	4.9	0.4
People arrived to class on time	4.5	0.5
The handouts and assessments were difficult to read (*reverse coded*)	4.9	0.3
The instructor was enthusiastic about teaching this class	4.9	0.4
The instructor seemed knowledgeable about employment matters	4.9	0.3
Because of this class, I know where the job opportunities are in this area	4.3	0.8
We had good discussions about job matters	4.7	0.5
We role played and practiced skills that are needed to get and hold a job	4.6	0.5
I participated in the class	4.7	0.5
The instructor used a variety of techniques to present the lessons	4.6	0.5
I felt comfortable stating my opinion in class	4.8	0.4
Most class members participated	4.5	0.5
Most of the participants seemed to take the classes seriously	4.5	0.5
After the class, I have a good idea of the type of work I would like to do	4.4	0.8
The classes were too easy (*reverse coded*)	3.6	1.5
The instructor suggested ways I could personally improve my work skills	4.7	0.6
The instructor sometimes told me that I was doing a good job	4.5	0.6
Some of the students were disruptive (*reverse coded*)	4.8	0.6
The instructor did a good job of giving us examples	4.5	0.8
Just a few people seemed to do all the talking in the class (*reverse coded*)	4.1	1.0
The instructor seemed to know where I was coming from	4.5	0.6
Classes met for the entire time period	4.7	0.5

APPENDIX E

Summary of Financial Management Program Participant Evaluations (N = 36)

Item	*Mean*	*SD*
I am more aware of my behaviors regarding how I manage money	4.0	1.0
This class was enjoyable	4.2	1.0
The instructor treated me with respect	4.9	0.4
The other participants treated me with respect	4.8	0.5
The classes seemed relevant to me and my finances	4.1	1.2
People arrived to class on time	4.2	0.9
The activities will help me to be financially sound	4.1	1.0
The instructor was enthusiastic about teaching the class	4.8	0.5
The instructor seemed knowledgeable about the subject matter	4.9	0.4
We had good discussions about money management issues	4.9	0.4
The discussions helped me to learn new ways to manage my money	4.6	0.7
Most people participated in the class	4.6	0.7
The instructor used a variety of techniques to present the lessons	4.3	0.8
I felt comfortable stating my opinion in class	4.8	0.5
I think I participated a lot in these classes	4.4	0.7
Most of the participants seemed to take the classes seriously	4.5	0.6
I understood the lessons being taught	4.6	0.5
I will be making different spending choices	4.1	1.1
The classes were too easy (*reverse coded*)	3.5	1.1
We practiced money management techniques in class	4.6	0.6
The instructor sometimes told me I was doing a good job	3.7	0.9
Some of the students were disruptive (*reverse coded*)	4.5	0.9
Classes met for the entire class time period	4.6	0.5

APPENDIX F

Summary of WAIT Program Participant Evaluations (N = 5)

Item	*Mean*	*SD*
My thoughts and feelings seem clearer to me now	4.4	0.9
People arrived to class on time	4.2	0.8
By using the skills I have learned, I know how to get out of a bad situation	4.2	0.8
The other group members treated me with respect	4.4	0.9
The skills and examples seemed pretty realistic	4.2	0.8
The instructor treated me with respect	5.0	0.0
Group members cooperated with the instructor	4.4	0.5
The exercises were helpful	4.6	0.9
The instructors seemed enthusiastic about teaching the class	4.4	0.9
I could understand the activities and handouts in this class	4.6	0.9
The instructor gave me suggestions for how to improve	4.6	0.9
We practiced and role played parts of the lessons	4.4	0.9
Sometimes group members were teased (*reverse coded*)	5.0	0.0
We had good discussions	4.0	0.7
Just a few people seemed to do all the talking (*reverse coded*)	3.4	1.1
I felt the instructor understood where I was coming from	4.4	0.9
Instructors used examples to help us understand the skills	4.0	0.7
I participated in the class	4.4	0.9
I felt comfortable stating my opinions in the class	4.4	0.9
Most class members participated	4.0	0.7
I had several chances to practice	4.6	0.9
Most group members took the class seriously	4.0	0.7
The instructor did a good job giving us examples	4.4	0.9
The instructor told me I was doing a good job	4.6	0.9
The classes met for the entire time period	4.2	0.8
I go through times when I can't cope with difficult people (*reverse coded)*	3.4	1.5

APPENDIX G

Summary of Phase 2 Program Participant Evaluations (N = 119)

Item	*Mean*	*SD*
My thoughts and feelings seem clearer to me now	3.9	1.1
People arrived to class on time	4.1	0.8
By using the skills I have learned, I know how to get out of a bad situation	4.1	0.8
The other group members treated me with respect	4.6	0.6
The skills and examples seemed pretty realistic	3.9	1.1
The instructor treated me with respect	4.7	0.7
Group members cooperated with the instructor	4.4	0.8
The exercises were helpful	3.9	1.2
The instructors seemed enthusiastic about teaching the class	4.6	0.9
I could understand the activities and handouts in this class	4.5	0.9
The instructor gave me suggestions for how to improve	4.4	0.7
We practiced and role played parts of the lessons	3.5	1.2
Sometimes group members were teased (*reverse coded*)	4.4	0.8
We had good discussions	4.5	0.9
Just a few people seemed to do all the talking (*reverse coded*)	3.5	1.1
I felt the instructor understood where I was coming from	4.4	0.9
Instructors used examples to help us understand the skills	3.9	1.1
I participated in the class	4.3	1.0
I felt comfortable stating my opinions in the class	4.5	0.8
Most class members participated	4.3	0.8
I had several chances to practice	4.1	0.8
Most group members took the class seriously	4.0	1.0
The instructor did a good job giving us examples	4.4	0.8
The instructor told me I was doing a good job	4.1	0.8
The classes met for the entire time period	4.7	0.7

APPENDIX H

Summary of Phase 3 Program Participant Evaluations (N = 15)

Item	*Mean*	*SD*
My thoughts and feelings seem clearer to me now	3.5	1.0
People arrived to class on time	3.9	1.2
By using the skills I have learned, I know how to get out of a bad situation	4.0	0.7
The other group members treated me with respect	4.8	0.4
The skills and examples seemed pretty realistic	4.0	0.7
The instructor treated me with respect	4.9	0.4
Group members cooperated with the instructor	4.5	0.8
The exercises were helpful	3.7	0.9
The instructors seemed enthusiastic about teaching the class	4.3	1.0
I could understand the activities and handouts in this class	4.6	1.0
The instructor gave me suggestions for how to improve	4.2	0.6
We practiced and role played parts of the lessons	3.1	1.5
Sometimes group members were teased (*reverse coded*)	4.2	0.7
We had good discussions	4.2	0.8
Just a few people seemed to do all the talking (*reverse coded*)	3.3	1.1
I felt the instructor understood where I was coming from	4.3	0.7
Instructors used examples to help us understand the skills	3.5	1.2
I participated in the class	4.4	0.5
I felt comfortable stating my opinions in the class	4.6	0.5
Most class members participated	4.3	0.6
I had several chances to practice	4.1	0.7
Most group members took the class seriously	3.9	0.9
The instructor did a good job giving us examples	4.3	0.6
The instructor told me I was doing a good job	4.1	0.7
The classes met for the entire time period	4.3	1.0