

**Evaluation of the Hamilton County Community Corrections  
Adult Residential Program**

**FISCAL YEARS 2010-2011, 2011-2012**

**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  
Director, Corrections Institute

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

---

\*This project was supported by a grant from Hamilton 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 Director, University of Cincinnati Corrections Institute, 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, Omeed Ilchi, Gabrielle Isaza, Spencer Hochstetler, and Jessica Adkins at the University of Cincinnati who devoted their time to the completion of this project.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This evaluation is the eighth report of a continued joint effort between the Hamilton County Community Corrections (HCCC) and the University of Cincinnati Corrections Institute (UCCI). It is the sixth report that evaluates the Adult Residential Program (ARP) specifically. The UCCI began its collaboration with HCCC in 2002 in order to help facilitate evidence-based practices and planning in the Adult Residential Program (ARP).

The purpose of this report is to provide a process and outcome evaluation of the ARP for services rendered between July 1, 2010 and June 30, 2012. The process evaluation describes the ARP service delivery model, program participant characteristics, and the nature and quality of services the participants received during the report years. The outcome evaluation summarizes the program's 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, the report compares the results from the current sample with the sample from the previous ARP reports.

The majority of participants in this sample were white males and the average age was 31. 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 roughly 27% and 20% of offense referrals, respectively. Also, intake assessment data indicates the majority of program participants enters the program with an average IQ, holds pro-social values, and is low-moderate risk to reoffend. The program participants continue to demonstrate high needs in three criminogenic areas: use of leisure time, use of alcohol and drugs, and education/employment/finances.

HCCC program staff continues to consistently administer assessments and identify the risk/need levels of the ARP participants. HCCC continues to excel in addressing the criminogenic need area of offender unemployment. Approximately 83% of participants were employed at the time of their discharge. However, the attendance data suggests that HCCC did not provide a considerable proportion of participants with services to address their identified needs. Furthermore, there was a sizable number of offenders who did not meet the risk criteria for programs, but participated in them anyway.

HCCC 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 ARP. 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 69.3% of participants were successfully discharged. In comparison with the previous ARP report, there were notable increases in the number of program participants found guilty of an administrative hearing (from 47.9% to 65.2%) and in the number of administrative hearings that were referred back to court (from 16.2% to 25.0%). While the percentage of participants that committed a new offense also increased from the previous ARP report to the current report (from 0.6% to 1.8%), it should be noted that the actual number of new offenses was two in 2008-2010 and six in 2010-2012. Moreover, there was a

slight, but significant reduction in risk of recidivism for ARP participants from pretest and posttest according to the LSI-R and IRAS-CST.

Given the findings of this evaluation, the following is recommended:

- More ARP offenders 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, for the new system to be effective, HCCC staff would need to continue to 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 ARP 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 low and high-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 ARP 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.
- Given the amount of HCCC data collected since 2002, it is recommended that a long-term outcome study be conducted.
- 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. Across the eight reports, HCCC has evidenced that they continue to provide treatment effectively to program participants. However, it may be time to discuss what types of additional information or services can be provided to HCCC in order to continue to improve the content of programming.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Topic	Page
Acknowledgements.....	2
Executive Summary.....	3
List of Figures and Tables.....	8
Introduction.....	10
Description of the Program.....	12
Treatment Programming.....	13
Thinking for a Change.....	13
Financial Management.....	14
Employment Skills and Practices.....	14
Washington Aggression Interruption Training.....	14
Phase 2 Substance Abuse Program.....	15
Phase 3 Substance Abuse Program.....	15
Method.....	16
Research Design.....	16
Sample.....	16
Data Collection Procedures.....	17
Variables Examined.....	18
Participant Characteristics.....	18
Participant Outcomes.....	18
Program Characteristics.....	18
Process Evaluation.....	19
Demographics, Intake Assessments, and Pretest Scores Across Report Years.....	29
Service Delivery.....	30
Referrals and Services.....	31
Matching Program Participants to Services and Programs.....	40
Participant Satisfaction Surveys.....	44
Outcome Evaluation.....	47
Comparison of Intermediate and Service Delivery Measures Across Report Years.....	53
Discussion.....	59
Recommendations.....	62
References.....	64

## LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES

Table	Title	Page
Table 1	Admissions to the Adult Residential Program by Sentence Type	20
Table 2	Comparison of Community Sentence and Prison Release Admissions Across Report Years	20
Table 3	Demographic Characteristics of Participants by Sentence Type	22
Table 4	Criminal History Information of Participants by Sentence Type	24
Table 5	Admission Assessment Information for Participants by Sentence Type	26
Table 6	Admission Assessment High Risk/Needs Domains for Participants by Sentence Type	28
Table 7	Comparison of Demographic Characteristics of the Total Sample Across Report Years	30
Table 8	Participant Program Referrals by Treatment Type	32
Table 9	Referral Overrides to Treatment Programs for the Total Sample	33
Table 10	Treatment Program Participation and Completion for the Total Sample	35
Table 11	Reasons for Participant Failure to Complete Core Treatment Programs	36
Table 12	Percentage of Participants Attending Core Treatment Programs Across Report Years	37
Table 13	Percentage of Participants Completing Core Treatment Programs Across Report Years	38
Table 14	Outsourced Treatment Program and Provider Information	40
Table 15	Integration of the Risk/Needs Assessment Information in Programming Decisions	43
Table 16	Mean Participant Evaluation Scores for the Core Treatment Programs	45
Table 17	Summary of HCCC Participant Program Evaluations	46
Table 18	Intermediate Outcomes of Participants by Sentence Type	48



---

Table 19	Participant Pretest and Posttest CSS, LSI-R, and IRAS-CST Scores by Sentence Type	51
Table 20	Program Duration for Non-Completers	53
Table 21	Percentage Change of Intermediate Outcomes Across Report Years for the Total Sample	54
Table 22	Percentage Change of Intermediate Outcomes Across Report Years for Community Sentences	55
Table 23	Percentage Change of Intermediate Outcomes Across Report Years for Prison Releases	56
Table 24	Pretest to Posttest Mean Difference Comparisons of the CSS Across Report Years	57
Table 25	Pretest to Posttest Mean Difference Comparisons of Offender Risk Across Report Years	58
Appendix A	Description of the Assessment Instruments and Measures	66
Appendix B	Hamilton County Community Corrections' Education and Treatment Program Guidelines	68
Appendix C	Summary of Cognitive Skills Program Participant Evaluations	70
Appendix D	Summary of Employment Skills Program Participant Evaluations	71
Appendix E	Summary of Financial Management Program Participant Evaluations	72
Appendix F	Summary of WAIT Program Participant Evaluations	73
Appendix G	Summary of Phase 2 Program Participant Evaluations	74
Appendix H	Summary of Phase 3 Program Participant Evaluations	75

---

## INTRODUCTION

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). HCCC currently consists of five program components: adult residential, electronic monitoring, adult day reporting, adult pretrial services and juvenile electronic monitoring.

This report extends the continued joint effort between HCCC and the University of Cincinnati Corrections Institute (UCCI). This collaboration began in 2002 to facilitate evidence-based practice and planning in the Adult Residential Program (ARP), formally known as the Adult Work Release Program (AWR). The current report presents performance and outcome measures for services rendered between July 1, 2010 and June 30, 2012. Any participant who completed intake at HCCC in the ARP is included in the current sample. This report represents the sixth evaluation on the ARP individually.

Previous reports produced by UCCI provided feedback to HCCC administrators and influenced a series of program modifications (see Van Voorhis & Spiropoulos, 2003; Spiropoulos & Van Voorhis, 2004; 2006; Smith, Myer & Ndrecka, 2008). In short, findings from the previous evaluations led to: (1) the validation of the Level of Service Inventory-Revised (LSI-R) risk assessment instrument on the population of offenders served by HCCC; (2) modifications to the assessment protocol (i.e., discontinuing the Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment Systems (CASAS) and replacing these with need domains of the LSI-R as well as

pretest and posttest instruments developed by UCCI); and (3) the implementation of the *Washington Aggression Interruption Training* in November 2005.<sup>1</sup>

A new team of researchers from the University of Cincinnati took over the project in 2006 (see Smith, Myer & Ndrecka, 2008). It was decided that future reports would be conducted in two-year intervals for the ARP and the EMP separately. Consistent with the initial program report, the current document provides information on the delivery and performance of the HCCC ARP. This report is divided into six sections. The first section provides a description of the ARP. 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> During this time, the agency also discontinued its substance abuse treatment program called *First Step*. It should be noted, however, that program participants still participate in a drug and alcohol treatment program offered in-house.

## DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAM

The HCCC Adult Residential Program (ARP), formally known as the Adult Work Release Program (AWR), was established in April 1991. The program 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 programs participants are men and women who have been convicted of non-violent class C and D felonies. Participants are referred to the ARP from local courts, probation, and the IDOC. Referrals through the ARP 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 are assessed with several standardized instruments at intake. These instruments include: an intake form, the Correctional Mental Health Screen (CMHS), 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—Intake (TCU-CESI) and the Client Evaluation of Self and Treatment (TCU-CEST; Joe, Broome, Rowan-Szal, & Simpson, 2002),<sup>2</sup> and the Level of Service Inventory-Revised (LSI-R; Andrews & Bonta, 1995) or 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, the ARP offers programming to address anger management

---

<sup>2</sup> The University of Cincinnati validated these instruments 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.

ARP 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, program participants are assessed on intermediate outcomes and service delivery measures. ARP participants 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. The LSI-R or IRAS-CST and the CSS are re-administered upon release to participants who successfully complete the program.

Participants of the ARP are required to live in the facility and work in the community. Participants are monitored while off-site and are required to meet with their field services coordinator at least once a week. Moreover, participants are submitted to random monthly drug and alcohol testing. The length of stay is 150 days.

### **Treatment Programming**

As previously mentioned, the core treatment interventions for the HCCC EMP 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; Wingard, 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 25 cycles of *Thinking for a Change* were offered between July 1, 2010 and June 30, 2012.

***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 13 financial management cycles offered between July 1, 2010 and June 30, 2012.

***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 five financial management cycles offered between July 1, 2010 and June 30, 2012.

***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). *WAIT's* 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 five *WAIT* cycles offered between July 1, 2010 and June 30, 2012.

***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, 2010 and June 30, 2012.

***Phase 3 Substance Abuse Program.*** The *Phase 3* program is maintenance substance abuse program that is designed to motivate participants to stay on track and to build a life without drugs and alcohol. 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, 2010 and June 30, 2012.

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 Level of Service Inventory-Revised (LSI-R) or Indiana Risk Assessment System-Community Supervision Tool (IRAS-CST), and the Criminal Sentiment Scale (CSS) upon admission and before discharge of the ARP program. 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 collaboration began between HCCC and UCCI.

### Sample

The sample for the evaluation is comprised of all men and women who received services through the HCCC ARP between July 1, 2010 and June 30, 2012. Data collection for outcome measures on program participants admitted during this time frame ended on June 30, 2012. The current evaluation has intake information for 450 program participants. This sample is disaggregated into participants serving community sanction ( $n = 276$ ) and participants who have been released from prison ( $n = 174$ ). In addition, discharge and intermediate outcome data are



provided for 336 individuals 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 the 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 LSI-R or IRAS-CST, pretest CSS, Culture Fair IQ test, and the Correctional Mental Health (CMHS) screening tool. Discharge measures include the HCCC service delivery/discharge forms, posttest LSI-R or 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, 2012. 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 LSI-R or IRAS-CST and CSS were collected. This report is now able to present comparisons of program participant characteristics for the fiscal years 2002-2004, 2004-2006, 2006-2008, 2008-2010, and 2010-2012. These comparisons were done in an effort to provide an overview of the type of participants who have participated in the HCCC ARP over time.

***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 ARP 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 ARP report years. 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 2010-2012. These data were obtained from the intake form, the initial LSI-R or 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 1 indicates the number of participants admitted to the HCCC ARP by sentence type for the total sample. It should be noted that while there were actually 456 admissions during this time period, 6 participants (or 1.3% of the total sample) refused consent to be a part of the study which reduced the sample to 450. The majority of participants were admitted from split sentences (33.6%), followed by executed sentences (24.0%) and probation violations (21.6%). The sample is comprised of 276 participants (or 61.3% of the total sample) that are classified to be in the community sentence sample and 174 participants (or 38.7% of the total sample) that are classified to be in the post-prison sample. Where possible throughout this report, comparisons will be made between the total sample, community sample, and prison sample.

**Table 1*****Admissions to the Adult Residential Program by Sentence Type (N = 450)***

<b>Sentence Type</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Executed sentence	108	24.0
Condition of probation/parole	9	2.0
Probation violation	97	21.6
Direct commitment	62	13.8
Split sentence	151	33.6
Community transition	23	5.1

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

Table 2 presents a comparison of the subsamples across fiscal report years. Note that there was an 8.5% increase in the number of prison referrals for the current report (2010-2012) compared to the previous report (2008-2010). This coincided with a decrease in the numbers of community sanction referrals.

**Table 2*****Comparison of Community Sentence and Prison Release Admissions Across Report Years***

<b>Fiscal Report Years</b>	<b>% Community Sentence</b>	<b>% Prison Releases</b>
2002-2004	71.0	29.0
2004-2006	60.0	40.0
2006-2008	62.3	37.7
2008-2010	69.8	30.2
2010-2011	61.3	38.7

Table 3 describes the demographic characteristics of the current sample. The majority of the total sample is male (81.6%) and white (75.8%). The average age of the ARP participants is 31 years old. Only 12.4% of the total participants were married at admission and 58.0% have not had any schooling beyond a high school diploma or GED. Slightly less than half of the total sample (47.3%) was employed at the time of admission. The most frequent occupations were laborer (16.2%) and service worker (15.3%).

Table 3 also describes and compares the participant demographic characteristics by sentence type. There are three significant differences found between the community sentence and prison release samples. First, the prison release participants (86.2%) are significantly more likely than the community sentence participants (78.6%) to be male ( $\chi^2 = 4.08, df = 1, p = .043$ ). Second, the prison release participants ( $M = 32.3$ ) are also significantly more likely than the community sentence participants ( $M = 30.2$ ) to be older ( $t = 2.45, df = 448, p = .015$ ). Third, the community sentence participants (55.1%) are significantly more likely than the prison release participants (35.6%) to be employed at admission ( $\chi^2 = 17.53, df = 1, p < .001$ ).

**Table 3*****Demographic Characteristics of Participants by Sentence Type***

Characteristic	Total Sample (N = 450)		Community Sentences (N = 276)		Prison Releases (N = 174)	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Male*	367	81.6	217	78.6	150	86.2
White	341	75.8	215	77.9	126	72.4
Married	56	12.4	37	13.4	19	10.9
Mean age* (SD)	31.0	9.2	30.2	9.0	32.3	9.5
Education						
Less than high school	88	19.6	44	15.9	44	25.3
High school/GED	173	38.4	111	40.2	62	35.6
More than high school	189	42.0	121	43.8	68	39.1
Employed at admission**	213	47.3	152	55.1	61	35.6
Occupation						
No occupation	237	52.7	124	44.9	113	64.9
Professional	23	5.1	17	6.2	6	3.4
Managerial or administrative	16	3.6	7	2.5	9	5.2
Sales	16	3.6	8	2.9	8	4.6
Clerical	4	0.9	3	1.1	1	0.6
Craftsman	9	2.0	7	2.5	2	1.1
Transportation	3	0.7	3	1.1	0	0.0
Laborer	73	16.2	57	20.7	16	9.2
Service worker	69	15.3	50	18.1	19	10.9

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

\*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .001$ .

Information on the current offense, as well as criminal history for ARP participants is reported in Table 4. Approximately 85% of individuals that were admitted to 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 roughly 27% and 20% of offense referrals, respectively. The number of individuals who tested positive on their baseline drug screen when admitted to the ARP increased from 12.7% in the previous report to 18.9% in the current report. Table 4 further indicates while approximately half of the total sample (54.7%) has had at least one prior felony conviction; the majority of the sample (63.3%) had not previously served a prior prison sentence. Finally, the average time to be served was approximately 238 days, which is up slightly from the previous report ( $M = 211$  days).

Table 4 also describes and compares the participant criminal history information by sentence type. There are three significant differences found between the community sentence and prison release samples. First, the prison release participants (63.2%) are significantly more likely than the community sentence participants (49.3%) to have one or more prior felony convictions ( $\chi^2 = 8.37, df = 1, p = .004$ ). Second, the prison release participants (43.7%) are significantly more likely than the community sentence participants (32.2%) to have served a prior prison term ( $\chi^2 = 6.01, df = 1, p = .014$ ). Third, the community sentence participants (25.7%) are significantly more likely than the prison release participants (8.0%) to test positive at the baseline drug screen test ( $\chi^2 = 21.77, df = 1, p < .001$ ).

**Table 4*****Criminal History Information of Participants by Sentence Type***

<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>Total Sample</b>		<b>Community Sentences</b>		<b>Prison Releases</b>	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Nature of convicted offense						
Arson	4	0.9	0	0.0	4	2.3
Battery	15	3.3	11	4.0	4	2.3
Burglary/residential entry	33	7.3	13	4.7	20	11.5
Conversion/theft/fraud	56	12.4	39	14.1	17	9.8
Driving alcohol offense	88	19.6	48	17.4	40	23.0
Drug offense	121	26.9	88	31.9	33	19.0
Forgery/check deception	24	5.3	14	5.1	10	5.7
Identity deception	3	0.7	1	0.4	2	1.1
Intimidation	6	1.3	6	2.2	0	0.0
Involuntary manslaughter	1	0.2	1	0.4	0	0.0
Reckless homicide	1	0.2	1	0.4	0	0.0
Resisting law enforcement	2	0.4	1	0.4	1	0.6
Robbery	21	4.7	5	1.8	16	9.2
Sex offense	17	3.8	8	2.9	9	5.2
Traffic violation	37	8.2	27	9.8	10	5.7
Other	21	4.7	13	4.7	8	4.6
Violent current offense	66	14.7	36	13.0	30	17.3
One or more prior felony convictions**	246	54.7	136	49.3	110	63.2
One or more prior prison term*	165	36.7	89	32.2	76	43.7
Positive baseline drug screen***	85	18.9	71	25.7	14	8.0
Mean days to be served (SD)	238.2	188.8	254.8	210.6	227.7	173.2

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

\*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ . \*\*\*  $p < .001$ .

Information on the admission assessments is found in Table 5. Approximately three quarters of the participants had an IQ between 86 and 114 (73.2%), which is in the normal range, and the average IQ across the sample was 103.6. Administration of the Criminal Sentiments



Scale (CSS) at admission revealed that 45.2% of the sample scored as exhibiting pro-social sentiments (i.e., higher scores), with only 29.1% exhibiting scores indicative of antisocial attitudes and values (i.e., lower scores). Table 5 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. Given the transition between assessments occurred during the current report period, some participants at the beginning of the report period were assessed with the LSI-R ( $n = 138$ ), while the majority of the sample was assessed with the IRAS-CST ( $n = 309$ ). According to the LSI-R admission data, 56.9% of the total sample scored in the low-moderate risk category, and 9.5% scored in the low-risk category. Only 33.6% of this sample was scored to be either moderate or moderate-high risk. No participants scored in the high-risk category of the LSI-R during this time period. The distribution of risk is slightly different with the IRAS-CST. The majority of ARP participants assessed with the IRAS-CST during admission scored either low-risk (39.5%) or moderate-risk (36.5%), with only 24.3% scoring as high or very-high risk. The results from both assessments indicate that the population being served by the HCCC ARP is decidedly low to low-moderate risk.

Table 5 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 ( $M = 21.9$ ) have significantly higher scores compared to the community sentence participant scores ( $M = 19.8$ ) on the LSI-R assessment ( $t = 2.08$ ,  $df = 135$ ,  $p = .035$ ). While this finding indicates the prison sample is more criminogenic than the community sentence sample, it should be noted that the magnitude of the difference is only 2.1 points.

According to the comparisons between both groups on the IRAS-CST the mean scores are exactly the same ( $M = 16.6$ ), which falls in the moderate-risk category.

**Table 5**

*Admission Assessment Information for Participants by Sentence Type*

Scale	Total Sample		Community Sentences		Prison Releases	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
IQ <sup>a</sup>						
Lower than average	28	6.3	13	4.7	15	8.7
Average	327	73.2	202	73.7	125	72.3
Higher than average	92	20.6	59	21.5	33	19.1
Mean IQ (SD)	103.6	16.6	104.5	15.7	102.2	17.9
Pretest CSS <sup>b</sup>						
Prosocial	202	45.2	122	44.4	80	46.5
Moderate	115	25.7	75	27.3	40	23.3
Antisocial	130	29.1	78	28.4	52	30.2
Mean CSS score (SD)	59.6	22.3	60.1	21.2	58.7	24.0
Pretest LSI-R <sup>c</sup>						
Low	13	9.5	11	12.9	2	3.8
Low-moderate	78	56.9	50	58.8	28	53.8
Moderate	43	31.4	23	27.1	20	38.5
Moderate-high	3	2.2	1	1.2	2	3.8
Mean LSI-R score* (SD)	20.6	5.6	19.8	5.9	21.9	5.0
Pretest IRAS-CST <sup>d</sup>						
Low	122	39.5	75	39.7	47	39.2
Moderate	112	36.2	69	36.5	43	35.8
High	70	22.7	41	21.7	29	24.2
Very high	5	1.6	4	2.1	1	0.8
Mean IRAS-CST score (SD)	16.6	6.8	16.6	6.9	16.6	6.7

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

<sup>a</sup>  $n = 447$ . <sup>b</sup>  $n = 448$ . <sup>c</sup>  $n = 138$ . <sup>d</sup>  $n = 309$ .

\*  $p < .05$ .

Table 6 presents a breakdown of the risk/needs domains for both the LSI-R and IRAS-CST assessments. Participants were counted as demonstrating need in an area if they exhibited

50% or more of the score in a domain. According to the LSI-R several need areas were found to be problematic for the total sample. The highest need domain was Leisure/Recreation (93.5%), followed by Education/Employment (49.3%), Family/Marital (45.7%), and Alcohol/Drugs (44.2%). Similar to the LSI-R, the IRAS-CST need domains are also broken down in Table 6 and individuals were also counted as demonstrating needs if they exhibited 50% or more of the score in a domain. The findings from the IRAS-CST need domains were slightly different than the LSI-R. The information from the IRAS-CST demonstrates that the highest need area was Education, Employment, and Finances (66.0%), followed by Substance Abuse (52.8%) and Criminal Attitudes (43.4%). It should be noted that the IRAS-CST need domains differ from those of the LSI-R and the sample size producing the percentages for the LSI-R results was smaller ( $n = 138$ ) compared to the IRAS-CST ( $n = 309$ ).

According to the results from both of the risk/needs assessments, approximately two-thirds of the participants have needs in the areas of education/employment/finances, roughly two-fifths of the participants have needs in the areas of family/marital/social support, about half have needs in the area of substance abuse, and the least frequent area of concern is accommodation/neighborhood problems which account for about one-tenth of all participants. What is interesting in comparing the results of the LSI-R and the IRAS-CST is that there are two areas in which the IRAS-CST scores the need areas as much more problematic for the sample in comparison with the LSI-R scores. In particular, the IRAS-CST indicates 43.4% of the participants demonstrate a need in the area of Criminal Attitudes, but the LSI-R indicates there are only 8.7%, which meet such a need in the area of Attitudes/Orientation. Similarly, the IRAS-CST indicates 39.8% demonstrate a need in the area of Peer Associations, but the LSI-R indicates there are only 21.0%, which meet such a need in the area of Companions.

**Table 6***Admission Assessment High Risk/Needs Domains for Participants by Sentence Type*

Domain	Total Sample		Community Sentences		Prison Releases	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
LSI-R						
Education/employment <sup>***</sup>	68	49.3	30	35.3	38	71.7
Financial <sup>*</sup>	117	84.8	68	80.0	49	92.5
Family/marital	63	45.7	35	41.2	28	52.8
Accommodation	6	4.3	4	4.7	2	3.8
Leisure	129	93.5	78	91.8	51	96.2
Companions	29	21.0	16	18.8	13	24.5
Alcohol/drug <sup>**</sup>	61	44.2	46	54.1	15	28.3
Emotional/personal	22	15.9	12	14.1	10	18.9
Attitude/orientation <sup>*</sup>	12	8.7	4	4.7	8	15.1
IRAS-CST						
Education, employment <sup>*</sup>	204	66.0	115	60.8	89	74.2
Family, social support	125	40.5	82	43.4	43	35.8
Neighborhood problems <sup>*</sup>	44	14.2	21	11.1	23	19.2
Substance abuse <sup>*</sup>	163	52.8	110	58.2	53	44.2
Peer associations	123	39.8	76	40.2	47	39.2
Criminal attitudes	134	43.4	81	42.9	53	44.2

Note. <sup>\*</sup>  $p < .05$ . <sup>\*\*</sup>  $p < .01$ . <sup>\*\*\*</sup>  $p < .001$ .

Table 6 also describes and compares the participant admission assessment high risk/needs domains for participants by sentence type. There are four significant differences found on LSI-R high risk/need domain prevalence between the community sentence and prison release samples. The prison release participants are significantly more likely than the community sentence participants to have high needs in the domains of Education/Employment, Finances, and Attitudes/Orientation ( $p < .05$ ), and the community release participants are significantly more likely than the prison release participants to have high needs in the domain of Alcohol/Drug ( $p = .003$ ). There are also three significant differences found on the IRAS-CST high risk/need domain prevalence between the two groups. The prison release participants are

significantly more likely than the community sentence participants to have high needs in the domains of Education, Employment, and Finances, and Neighborhood Problems ( $p < .05$ ), and the community release participants are significantly more likely than the prison release participants to have high needs in the domain of Substance Abuse ( $p = .016$ ).

### **Demographics, Intake Assessments, and Pretest Scores Across Report Years**

Table 7 provides a comparison of demographics 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 22-29 years old, with an increase from 23.6% to 36.4%. There were also notably more 30-39 year olds during this report year compared to last, and subsequently far less 21 and younger and 40 and older participants. Table 7 also examines the prevalence of participants with violent offenses, prior felony convictions, and prior prison terms. While the percentage of participants with a violent offense and that had at least one prior felony conviction has remained relatively stable across the five reports, the percentage of participants that have served a prior prison term has slowly, but steadily increased from the first report to the current report (from 29.3% to 36.7%).

**Table 7*****Comparison of Demographic Characteristics of the Total Sample Across Report Years***

<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>% in 2002- 2004</b>	<b>% in 2004- 2006</b>	<b>% in 2006- 2008</b>	<b>% in 2008- 2010</b>	<b>% in 2010- 2012</b>
Age					
21 and younger	20.4	10.1	26.5	22.0	15.8
22 – 29	31.1	40.3	26.0	23.6	36.4
30 – 39	26.5	41.7	23.1	23.8	30.7
40 and older	22.0	33.7	30.3	25.9	17.1
Violent offense	13.5	14.7	12.4	14.9	14.7
Prior felony convictions	60.7	59.5	61.0	54.0	54.7
Prior prison term	29.3	32.3	33.1	33.9	36.7

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

**Service Delivery**

The HCCC ARP 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 ARP participants for the current report years (2010 through 2012) is presented for the total sample. 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 out-sourced treatment programs is presented. Finally, participant satisfaction survey results for both the six core programs and the overall 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. According to forms collected from intake, the program with the largest amount of program participants referred for treatment for all new admissions for years 2010 through 2012 was the cognitive skills program, *Thinking for a Change* ( $n = 351$ ), which was followed closely by *Financial Management* ( $n = 340$ ). Similar to previous reports, there are far fewer referrals made to sex offender treatment ( $n = 18$ ), GED training ( $n = 80$ ), and mental health treatment ( $n = 96$ ). 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.

**Table 8*****Participant Program Referrals by Treatment Type***

---

<b>Scale</b>	<b><i>n</i></b>
Cognitive skills program	
Projected referral	351
Override referral	12
Employment skills program	
Projected referral	251
Override referral	3
Financial management program	
Projected referral	340
Override referral	3
WAIT treatment program	
Projected referral	180
Override referral	1
Substance abuse evaluation ordered	243
Phase 2 treatment program	
Projected referral	55
Override referral	2
Phase 3 treatment program	
Projected referral	67
Override referral	1
Referral to sex offender treatment	18
Override referral	
Referral to GED training	80
Override referral	1
Referral to mental health evaluation	96
Override referral	1

---



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.

**Table 9**

***Referral Overrides to Treatment Programs for the Total Sample***

Scale	<i>n</i>
Cognitive skills program overrides	
Treatment has recently been completed	11
Additional treatment not possible	1
Employment skills program overrides	
Treatment has recently been completed	1
Additional treatment not possible	2
Financial management program overrides	
Treatment has recently been completed	2
Additional treatment not possible	1
WAIT program overrides	
Treatment has recently been completed	1

Table 10 examines the frequency and percentage of participants that both participated and completed treatment during the current report period. The number of participants that attended each program is determined from the attendance forms that are filled out by the group facilitators. The percentage of participants that attended the program is derived from the number of attending participants divided by the total number of ARP admissions ( $n = 450$ ). Table 10 shows a similar trend to previous reports, which is that large portions of ARP participants being referred to treatment programs are not attending them. To demonstrate, 78% of ARP participants

in years 2010 through 2012 were referred to the *Thinking for a Change* program, but only 23.1% of the total sample actually attended the class. The *Thinking for a Change* program was the most utilized program with 23.1% of participants attending. The *Financial Management* program had the next highest percentage of attendance with 12.4%, followed by *Phase 2* (11.8%), *Phase 3* (10.4%), *WAIT* (4.7%), and *Employment Skills* (4.0%).

Table 10 further shows the number of program participants who completed the indicated core program. The percentage of participants that completed the program is derived from the number of completing participants divided by the total number of participants that attended the specific program. This table reveals that once a program participant attended a core program offered by HCCC, the overwhelming majority of attendees were likely to complete the program. In comparison to the previous report, three core program completion rates decreased, while one increased. The *Financial Management* program (82.1%), *WAIT* (71.4%), and *Thinking for a Change* (70.2%) showed decreased percentages of participants completing the program once attending. The only program that showed an increase in the percentage of participants completing the program was the *Employment Skills* program (72.2%). However, while the *Financial Management*, *WAIT*, and *Thinking for a Change* program completion percentages decreased from the last report, the majority of participants that attended each program are still completing it successfully. Also increasing from the previous report years is the percentage of participants attending at least one of the core programs. In the previous ARP report, 26.6% of participants participated in at least one core program compared to 44.9% for the current sample. However, there was also a decrease from the previous report to the current report in the percentage of participants who completed at least one core program, from 78.9% to 74.3%.

**Table 10*****Treatment Program Participation and Completion for the Total Sample***

Scale	<i>n</i>	%
Cognitive skills program		
Attended program	104	23.1
Completed program	73	70.2
Employment skills program		
Attended program	18	4.0
Completed program	13	72.2
Financial management program		
Attended program	56	12.4
Completed program	46	82.1
WAIT treatment program		
Attended program	21	4.7
Completed program	15	71.4
Phase 2 treatment program		
Attended program	53	11.8
Completed program	31	58.5
Phase 3 treatment program		
Attended program	47	10.4
Completed program	34	72.3
Attended one or more core program(s)	202	44.9
Completed one or more core program(s)	150	74.3

*Note.* Attended percentages are based on the total number of admissions ( $n = 450$ ).

Completed percentages are based on the number of participants that attended the program.

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 11 for each of the core programs. The most often cited reasons were for attendance issues and violating the ARP rules.

**Table 11*****Reasons for Participant Failure to Complete Core Treatment Programs***

<b>Reason</b>	<b><i>n</i></b>	<b>%</b>
Cognitive skills program <sup>a</sup>		
Attendance	17	54.8
Released	2	6.5
Sent to jail	5	16.1
Violated program	4	12.9
No reason given	3	9.7
Employment skills program <sup>b</sup>		
Attendance	2	40.0
Violated program	1	20.0
No reason given	2	40.0
Financial management program <sup>c</sup>		
Attendance	8	80.0
No reason given	2	20.0
WAIT treatment program <sup>d</sup>		
Attendance	5	83.3
Violated program	1	16.7
Phase 2 treatment program <sup>e</sup>		
Attendance	11	50.0
Released	3	13.6
Sent to jail	3	13.6
Violated program	5	22.7
Phase 3 treatment program <sup>f</sup>		
Attendance	4	30.8
Released	2	15.4
Removed to another class	1	7.7
Sent to jail	1	7.7
Violated program	4	30.8
No reason given	1	7.7

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

<sup>a</sup> *n* = 31. <sup>b</sup> *n* = 5. <sup>c</sup> *n* = 10. <sup>d</sup> *n* = 6. <sup>e</sup> *n* = 22. <sup>f</sup> *n* = 13.

The percentage of participants who attended a core treatment program across report years is presented in Table 12. In the last report, the number of participants to attend the *Thinking for a Change* and *Financial Management* programs was noted to be diminishing both from the 2004-2006 to 2006-2008 and 2006-2008 to 2008-2010 report periods. In the current report, the number of *Thinking for a Change* and *Financial Management* attendees has risen compared to the previous report, but is still not as high as it was in the 2004-2006 or 2006-2008 time periods. The number of participants involved in the *Employment Skills* program has considerably decreased over time. The percentage in the current report period (4.0%) is six times smaller than the percentage during the 2004-2006 time period (24.8%). Finally, compared to the last three report periods the *WAIT* program has seen the fewest amount of participants during the current report period (4.7%).

**Table 12**

***Percentage of Participants Attending Core Treatment Programs Across Report Years***

<b>Program</b>	<b>2002-2003</b>	<b>2003-2004</b>	<b>2004-2006</b>	<b>2006-2008</b>	<b>2008-2010</b>	<b>2010-2012</b>
Cognitive skills	21.6	29.0	34.9	26.9	10.2	23.1
Employment skills	14.4	13.0	24.8	n/a	8.3	4.0
Financial management	8.0	13.0	22.1	23.8	8.5	12.4
WAIT	n/a	n/a	5.1	17.9	6.1	4.7

The percentage of participants who completed a core treatment program across report years is presented in Table 13. Over the last three report periods, the percentage of participants to complete the *Thinking for a Change*, *Financial Management*, and *Employment Skills* programs has noticeably diminished. In the current report the *Thinking for a Change* and *WAIT* programs

had their second lowest completion percentage since HCCC began their relationship with UC in 2002. Also, during this report period, the *Financial Management* program had its lowest percentage of completion (82.1%).

**Table 13**

*Percentage of Participants Completing Core Treatment Programs Across Report Years*

<b>Program</b>	<b>2002-2003</b>	<b>2003-2004</b>	<b>2004-2006</b>	<b>2006-2008</b>	<b>2008-2010</b>	<b>2010-2012</b>
Cognitive skills	70.4	62.0	78.6	78.6	78.6	70.2
Employment skills	77.8	80.0	77.1	n/a	63.6	72.2
Financial management	90.0	83.0	89.2	85.5	88.6	82.1
WAIT	n/a	n/a	76.5	67.3	76.0	71.4

Beginning in 2003, information on the referral of HCCC program participants to outsourced treatment programs has been forwarded to University of Cincinnati researchers. External providers also provided data on participants in other treatment programs (see Table 14). There were 156 participants (34.7%) that received substance abuse treatment in years 2010 through 2012. Table 14 also lists all of the substance abuse treatment programs and providers that were used by HCCC. Program participants selected the providers of this service themselves. As such, there was limited information available to HCCC on service providers in this regard. Similar to the previous report, the most common substance abuse treatment was intensive outpatient treatment provided by Aspire (40.4%). 53.3% of the HCCC participants who attended outsourced substance abuse treatment successfully completed the treatment group. It should be noted, however, that completion information was unknown for 36 participants (23.1%).

In addition to substance abuse treatment, roughly 45% of program participants ( $n = 203$ ) attended Alcoholic Anonymous/Narcotics Anonymous meetings. 72.4% of participants completed the 12-step program. Again, a sizable portion of completion information (28.6%) is unknown for the AA/NA participants. Similar to last report, only a small percentage of participants participated in sex offender treatment, and the majority of those that did received treatment services from the Path of Prevention. Sex offender treatment had a completion rate of 55.6%, with information unavailable for 5 participants. The number of GED participants during this time period was seven, compared to last report of 14. Similar to the previous reports, the majority of participants received GED services through HCCC. 33.3% of participants successfully completed the GED program, with information unavailable for one participant.

Almost three-quarters of program participants received CARE assessments (69.1%), with 92.5% of those referred to CARE assessments completing the assessment (only 6 participants had unknown information). Less than a quarter of program participants (20.7%) were engaged in mental health treatment. 47.1% of those participants successfully completed their mental health program, with information unavailable for 23 participants.

**Table 14*****Outsourced Treatment Program and Provider Information***

<b>Program</b>	<b><i>n</i></b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Provider</b>	<b><i>n</i></b>	<b>%</b>
Substance abuse <sup>a</sup>					
Aftercare	32	20.5	Aspire	63	40.4
IOP	56	35.9	Aspire-HCCC	22	14.1
Prime for life	8	5.1	Fairbanks	5	3.2
Relapse prevention	17	10.9	Indy Tx Center	3	1.9
Sober living	16	10.3	Kolbe Center	2	1.3
Other	27	17.3	Proactive-HCCC	45	28.8
			Serenity	7	4.5
			Other	9	5.8
12 step/AA/NA <sup>b</sup>	203	100.0	Suburban North	107	52.7
			Other	96	47.3
Sex offender treatment <sup>c</sup>	14	100.0	Path of prevention	10	71.4
			Other	4	28.6
GED <sup>d</sup>	7	100.0	HCCC	6	85.7
			Riverview	1	14.3
CARE Assessment <sup>e</sup>	311	100.0	Adult probation	311	100.0
Mental Health Treatment <sup>f</sup>	93	100.0	Aspire	77	82.8
			Other	16	17.2

Note. <sup>a</sup> *n* = 156. <sup>b</sup> *n* = 203. <sup>c</sup> *n* = 14. <sup>d</sup> *n* = 7. <sup>e</sup> *n* = 311. <sup>f</sup> *n* = 93.

***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 it. 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 15 reports the HCCC program participant matching process. It is important to emphasize that this figure only portrays the assessment-program participant match as suggested by the LSI-R and IRAS-CST. Recall that HCCC considers other program participant characteristics for referral to each of the four core programs (see Appendix B). As in previous reports, the current analysis used the criteria established by HCCC to determine who was eligible for core programming. As such, the program participant selection criteria 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 LSI-R (scores of 23 or higher) or IRAS-CST (scores of 15 or higher for males and scores of 14 or higher for females) on their admission risk/needs assessment. As shown in Table 15, 69.1% of program participants admitted to the residential program met these criteria in years 2010 through 2012.
- Thinking for a Change. The *Thinking for a Change* program is assigned on the basis overall risk and/or on the LSI-R and IRAS-CST criminal attitudes subscales. Placement in this category included any participant who scored moderate or high risk on the LSI-R (scores of 23 or higher) or IRAS-CST (scores of 15 or higher for males and scores of 14 or higher for females) and/or had 50% or more of the indicators in the LSI-R domain of *Attitudes/Orientation* or IRAS-CST domain of *Criminal Attitudes*. According to these criteria, 74.7% of the program participants met this requirement and were thus appropriate for the *T4C* program.
- Employment skills. The *Employment Skills* program is assigned on the basis of the LSI-R score on the *Employment/Education* domain or the IRAS-CST score on the *Education, Employment, and Financial Situation* domain. Placement in this category included any participant that scored 50% or more on either domain at admission. According to these criteria, 60.4% of the participants met these criteria and were thus appropriate for the *Employment Skills* program.
- Financial management. The *Financial Management* program is assigned on the basis of the *Financial* domain of the LSI-R or the *Education, Employment, and Financial Situation* domain of the IRAS-CST. Placement in this category includes any participant that scored 50% or more on either domain at admission. According to

these criteria, 71.3% of the participants met these criteria and were thus appropriate for the financial management program.

- Washington Aggression Interruption Training. The *Washington Aggression Interruption Training* program is assigned on the basis of overall risk status and/or LSI-R question 10 (any official history of assault/violence). Placement in this category included any participant who scored moderate-high risk on the LSI-R (scores of 34 or higher) or IRAS-CST (scores of 22 or higher). According to these criteria, 26.9% of the EM participants met these criteria and were thus appropriate for the *WAIT* program.

In Table 15, the first row indicates the percentage of participants that met program eligibility criteria based on the admission risk/needs assessment information described above. The second row indicates the percentage of program participants determined by HCCC staff at intake to need a referral to the indicated program. The third row, entitled “*assigned/needed*,” indicates 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 row, entitled “*participated/not needed*,” indicates 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 row, entitled “*completed/needed*,” indicates 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 15, a sizable portion of participants was identified as needing core treatment programming. Nearly 70% of the participants qualified under the risk principle. Offender needs varied by type. For example, 74.7% of participants were identified as needing cognitive skills training, whereas only 26.9% of participants were identified as needing aggression reduction training. Further examination of Table 15 reveals that HCCC did well in referring individuals to treatment components; however, it should be noted that while only 69.1% of the sample met the overall risk criteria (moderate to high-risk), 90.7% of the sample

was referred for some type of service. Upon further inspection, this discrepancy is due in large part because of the inclusion criteria of many of the moderate-high risk domain criteria. There is also some disparities noted in some of the core programming criteria and actual participants referred for service. For example, while only 26.9% of the sample qualified as needing *WAIT* programming, 40.0% of the sample was referred to the *WAIT* program.

**Table 15**

***Integration of the Risk/Needs Assessment Information in Programming Decisions***

<b>Scale</b>	<b>Meet Criteria<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Referred<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>Assigned/ Needed<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>Participated/ Not Needed<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>Completed/ Needed<sup>e</sup></b>
Risk	69.1	90.7	49.2	24.3	26.0
Cognitive Skills	74.7	78.0	26.2	15.4	17.9
Employment Skills	60.4	55.8	5.9	11.1	4.8
Financial Management	71.3	75.6	14.3	17.9	11.8
WAIT	26.9	40.0	6.6	61.9	5.0

<sup>a</sup> Number of participants that met program eligibility criteria based on risk/need assessment information / number of participant admissions.

<sup>b</sup> Number of participants referred to program during admission / number of participant admissions.

<sup>c</sup> Number of participants assigned to program and met eligibility criteria / number of participants that met need criteria.

<sup>d</sup> Number of participants that participated in program and did not meet eligibility criteria / total number of participants assigned to program.

<sup>e</sup> Number of participants that completed program and met eligibility criteria / total number of participants that met need criteria.

HCCC did a moderate job at using the risk principle to assign participants to treatment. Nearly half of the participants that met the HCCC eligibility criteria actually attended a treatment services. The best results came from the T4C program, where 26.2% of eligible participants actually participated in the program. Fewer eligible participants attended the Financial Management (14.3%), WAIT (6.6%), or Employment Skills (5.9%) programs.

It is also evident that HCCC needs to better ensure that participants that do not meet a treatment need do not participate in treatment programs, especially when not all needy participants have the opportunity to participate in those programs. For example, 61.9% of the *WAIT* participants did not meet the minimum risk criteria for the program. More troubling, is that only 6.6% of the participants identified as meeting the risk criteria for the program actually participated in it. While the *Employment Skills*, *T4C*, and *Financial Management* programs serviced far less participants that did not meet the risk criteria (11.1% to 17.9%), each of the three programs still did not provide a very large proportion of services to the participants identified as meeting the risk criteria (5.9% to 26.2%).

Finally, Table 15 reveals that, with the exception of the risk principle (26.0%), less than a quarter of the offenders initially assessed to need the T4C program (17.9%), *Employment Skills* program (4.8%), *Financial Management* program (11.8%), and *WAIT* program (5.0%) actually completed the programming.

***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 16 further

summarizes these participant evaluations by providing one overall mean value of all of the evaluation items. The mean values range from 4.2 (*Phase 2*) to 4.5 (*Employment Skills*).

**Table 16**

***Mean Participant Evaluation Scores for the Core Treatment Programs***

<b>Program</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
Cognitive skills program <sup>a</sup>	4.3	0.4
Phase 2 <sup>b</sup>	4.2	0.6
Phase 3 <sup>c</sup>	4.3	0.5
WAIT program <sup>d</sup>	4.3	0.4
Financial management program <sup>e</sup>	4.4	0.4
Employment skills program <sup>f</sup>	4.5	0.4

*Note.* <sup>a</sup> *n* = 189. <sup>b</sup> *n* = 88. <sup>c</sup> *n* = 65. <sup>d</sup> *n* = 48. <sup>e</sup> *n* = 125. <sup>f</sup> *n* = 23.

Along with completing evaluations on satisfaction with core programming, participants were also asked quarterly to evaluate the HCCC ARP. Table 17 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 while in the ARP. The mean of all the items was 4.0 (SD = 0.6). In fact, no single item has a mean score of less than 3.2.

**Table 17*****Summary of HCCC Participant Program Evaluations***

<b>Item</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
The living unit coordinators are helpful to me	4.1	0.8
The field coordinators are helpful to me	3.9	1.0
The case managers are helpful to me	4.4	0.7
The living unit coordinators treat me with dignity and respect	4.1	0.9
The field coordinators treat me with dignity and respect	4.2	1.0
My case manager treats me with dignity and respect	4.6	0.6
The staff seems to recognize and reward outstanding performance	3.6	1.1
I feel that I can be honest with at least some staff...	4.1	0.9
When I make mistakes the staff show me how to improve	3.4	1.2
Staff understand me	3.4	1.2
The program allows me to maintain adequate communication with family	3.6	1.2
Staff treat me fairly	4.0	0.9
I feel confident that I can obtain employment once I am released	4.6	0.7
I feel confident that I can keep a job upon my release	4.7	0.6
Program rules and regulations are unreasonable ( <i>reverse coded</i> )	3.2	1.2
I received the help I needed for my substance abuse problems	3.9	1.0
I received the help I needed for my emotional problems	3.6	1.1
I will be a better employee for having completed this program	3.6	1.2
The programs I participated in will reduce my likelihood of committing an offense in the future	4.1	1.0
My living area was adequate	3.8	1.0
I felt safe while I was here	4.2	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 HCCCs ARP. 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 18 presents frequency and percentage distribution of intermediate outcome and service delivery measures for each sample. A total of 336 (74.7% of those admitted during the current report period) program participants admitted to the ARP in years 2010 through 2012 were discharged in time for their outcomes to be reported in this report. Of the 336 participants, 223 (69.3%) were successfully discharged. The most common reason for unsuccessful discharge from the program was for a technical violation (50.5%), followed by a positive urinalysis (28.2%), and failure to return (16.5%).

As demonstrated in Table 18, 11% of the participants took advantage of educational resources, and just about 38% of those who did participate in an educational program completed it. Similar to previous reports, the small number of individuals that took advantage of educational services while in the program is most likely due to the high education status of participants at admission (refer back to Table 3).

**Table 18*****Intermediate Outcomes of Participants by Sentence Type (N = 336)***

<b>Measure</b>	<b>Total Sample</b>		<b>Community Sentences</b>		<b>Prison Releases</b>	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Successful termination*	233	69.3	136	64.8	97	77.0
Reason for unsuccessful termination						
New arrest or conviction*	4	3.9	1	1.4	3	10.3
Technical violation	52	50.5	35	47.3	17	58.6
Positive urinalysis*	29	28.2	26	35.1	3	10.3
Failure to return	17	16.5	11	14.9	6	20.7
Sentencing stay	1	1.0	1	1.4	0	0.0
Educational achievement						
No change	285	84.8	177	84.3	108	85.7
Attending program	37	11.0	23	11.0	14	11.1
Completed program	14	4.2	10	4.8	4	3.2
Employed at discharge						
Employed at discharge	278	82.7	170	81.0	108	85.7
Remained employed	215	64.0	137	65.2	78	61.9
Employed ≥ 90% of the time	210	62.3	134	63.5	76	60.3
Fired from a job on ARP	33	9.8	17	8.1	16	12.7
Reward Level Achieved						
A	13	3.9	10	4.8	3	2.4
B	47	14.0	26	12.4	21	16.7
C	33	9.8	20	9.5	13	10.3
D	64	19.0	41	19.5	23	18.3
No reward received	179	53.3	113	53.8	66	52.4
Guilty at administrative hearing	219	65.2	140	66.7	79	62.7
Referral back to court*	84	25.0	62	29.5	22	17.5
Committed new offense	6	1.8	2	1.0	4	3.2
Any positive drug test**	89	26.5	71	33.8	18	14.3

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

\*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .001$ .



Concerning employment, 82.7% of those discharged were employed at discharge. It is important to emphasize that according to discharge data collection instruments, only 47.3% 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 35.4% of those employed. Further, 62.3% 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. Only 9.8% of the ARP participants were fired from a job while in the program.

Additionally, Table 18 presents information on the number and percentage of program participants for each reward level achieved while in the ARP. Slightly more than half of all participants (53.3%) did not receive any reward level. The next most common reward level was Level D (19.0%), followed by reward Level B (14.0%). Reaching the reward Level of A was the least common outcome (3.9%).

The number of participants to have an administrative hearing where they were found guilty increased quite markedly from 47.9% in the previous report to 65.2% in the current report. Similarly, the percentage of participants to have had an administrative hearing that referred them back to court also increased from the previous report (16.2%) to the current report (25.0%). While the percentage of participants that committed a new offense also increased from the previous ARP report to the current report (from 0.6% to 1.8%), it should be noted that the actual number of new offenses was two in 2008-2010 and six in 2010-2012. Finally, the percentage of participants that had at least one positive urinalysis test while in the program was 26.5%, which is very similar to the percentage during the last report period (23.1%).

Table 18 also describes and compares the participant intermediate outcomes by sentence type. There are five significant differences found between the community sentence and prison release samples. First, the prison release participants (77.0%) are significantly more likely than the community sentence participants (64.3%) to be successfully terminated from the ARP program ( $\chi^2 = 5.53$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p = .019$ ). However, when unsuccessfully terminated from the program the prison release participants (10.3%) are also significantly more likely than the community sentence participants (1.4%) to be terminated for a new arrest or conviction ( $\chi^2 = 4.52$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p = .034$ ). The community sample participants are both more likely to have a positive urinalysis test during the program and be unsuccessfully terminated for a positive urinalysis test compared to the prison release sample ( $p < .05$ ). Finally, the community sentence participants (29.5%) are also significantly more likely than the prison release participants (17.5%) to receive a referral back to court ( $\chi^2 = 6.11$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p = .013$ ).

Table 19 presents the pretest and posttest assessment scores for the CSS, LSI-R, and IRAS-CST. This information is useful in determining whether or not the ARP succeeded in producing a variety of beneficial outcomes for the program participants from 2010 through 2012. As indicated in Table 19, CSS total scores and *Thinking for a Change* group CSS scores decreased slightly from all pretests to posttests. This indicates that participants were slightly more antisocial at posttest than pretest. However, it should be noted that only in the community sentences sample were the changes statistically significant ( $t = 2.12$ ,  $df = 133$ ,  $p = .036$ ).

As indicated previously, HCCC replaced the LSI-R with the IRAS-CST during the current data collection time period. As a result, pretests and posttests included in this report fall into one of three categories: LSI-R pretest and LSI-R posttest ( $n = 49$ ), LSI-R pretest and IRAS-CST posttest ( $n = 42$ ), or IRAS-CST pretest and IRAS-CST posttest ( $n = 138$ ). There are several

differences between the LSI-R and the IRAS-CST assessments. For example, the LSI-R contains 54 items falling into 10 domains, whereas the IRAS-CST contains 35 items falling into 7 domains. Due to the differences between risk assessments, comparing pretest and posttest total scores may not be as meaningful as comparing pretest and posttest risk categories. Therefore, Table 19 presents the means of the risk categories (where 1 = *low-risk*, 2 = *moderate-risk*, and 3 = *high-risk*), rather than the means of the total scores. For ease of interpretation, a mean risk category score of 1.5 would bisect the low and moderate-risk categories.

**Table 19**

*Participant Pretest and Posttest CSS, LSI-R, and IRAS-CST Scores by Sentence Type*

Measure	Total Sample			Community Sentences			Prison Releases		
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
CSS total score									
Pretest	230	62.2	21.0	134	63.5*	20.2	96	60.4	22.0
Posttest		60.4	21.6		60.6*	21.3		60.3	22.1
T4C Pretest	44	60.9	19.6	26	59.2	16.7	18	63.4	23.4
T4C Posttest		58.6	20.7		56.9	18.6		61.1	23.6
Risk category score									
Pretest	229	1.9**	0.7	133	1.9***	0.7	96	1.8***	0.8
Posttest		1.5**	0.6		1.5***	0.6		1.5***	0.6
LSI-R pretest	49	2.3***	0.6	32	2.3***	0.6	17	2.2*	0.6
LSI-R posttest		1.8***	0.6		1.8***	0.6		1.9*	0.5
LSI-R pretest	42	2.2***	0.6	25	2.1***	0.6	17	2.5***	0.6
IRAS posttest		1.4***	0.6		1.3***	0.6		1.6***	0.5
IRAS pretest	138	1.6***	0.7	76	1.6*	0.7	62	1.6*	0.7
IRAS posttest		1.5***	0.6		1.5*	0.6		1.4*	0.6

Note. \*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ . \*\*\*  $p < .001$ .

When examining the mean pretest and posttest risk categories of the total sample, there is a significant reduction ( $p < .001$ ) in risk for the LSI-R pretest and LSI-R posttest group (2.3 to 1.8), the LSI-R pretest and IRAS-CST posttest group (2.2 to 1.4), and the IRAS-CST pretest and IRAS-CST posttest group (1.6 to 1.5). Table 19 also describes and compares the participant risk category pretest and posttest information by sentence type. All of the pretest-posttest comparisons (LSI-R to LSI-R, LSI-R to IRAS-CST, IRAS-CST to IRAS-CST) are significant for both the community sentence and prison release samples ( $p < .05$ ).

When all of the assessments are analyzed together, there is a small, but significant reduction in general risk for recidivism from pretest to posttest ( $t = 3.1, df = 137, p = .002$ ). The overall mean risk category score is 1.9 at pretest, compared 1.5 at posttest. This means while offenders at both pretest and posttest were most likely to be low-risk, at the pretest the group average tended to lean more toward the low/moderate range, and at the posttest the group average tended to lean closer toward the low range. A similar finding occurs in both the community sentence and prison release samples ( $p < .001$ ). Similar to the previous report, there was a significant decrease in risk of recidivism from pretest to posttest. These results suggest that HCCC ARP participants were discharged from the program with a lower probability to reoffend compared to when they entered the program.

Table 20 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, there is variation in the time non-successful program participants take to be discharged from the program, with most non-completers being discharged before 100 days.

**Table 20*****Program Duration for Non-Completers (N = 103)***

Scale	Total Sample		Community Sentences		Prison Releases	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Time in the program						
< 50 days	28	27.2	23	31.1	5	17.2
50-99 days	34	33.0	25	33.8	9	31.0
100-149 days	19	18.4	13	17.6	6	20.7
≥ 150 days	22	21.4	13	17.6	9	31.0

*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 years are compared to the previous ARP 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.<sup>3</sup> 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 21 lists the percentage change of the intermediate outcome and service delivery indicators for the total sample across the five reports. This table demonstrates reductions in all of the intermediate outcome variables examined from the last report period to the current report. Negative results include: more positive drug screens (+14.7%), less participants remaining employed (-16.2%), less employed 90% of the time (-20.9%), less successful terminations (-14.7%), less employed at discharge (-8.4%), more fired from a job (+11.5%), and more new

<sup>3</sup> Percent change is calculated using the equation  $[(\% \text{ year b} - \% \text{ year a}) / \% \text{ year a}]$ .

offenses committed (+200.0%). It should be noted that while there was a rather large percentage increase in new offenses committed between 2008-2010 and 2010-2012, there were only four additional offenses committed in the latter time period.

**Table 21**

*Percentage Change of Intermediate Outcomes Across Report Years for the Total Sample*

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

Table 22 examines percentage change of the intermediate outcome and service delivery indicators for community sentences samples across the five report years and Table 23 does the same for the prison release samples. In examining the two tables a few interesting findings emerge. First, while the community sentence sample has a rather large increase in positive drug screens from the last report period to the current report period (+37.4%), the prison sample actually saw a rather drastic decrease in the number of positive drug screens (-24.7%). Second, the community sample saw a decrease in the percentage of successful terminations (-21.5%), while the prison sample had a very similar percentage of successful terminations compared to the

previous report (-0.01%). Third, the prison sample had a large increase in the percentage of participants that were fired from a job (+78.9%) and who committed a new offense (+320.0%). These results were not similar to the community sample, with -13.8% and +11.1% changes respectively.

**Table 22**

*Percentage Change of Intermediate Outcomes Across Report Years for Community Sentences*

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
Positive drug screen	+100.0	-5.3	+2.6	+2.9	+37.4
Remained employed	+53.4	-25.3	+20.3	+7.9	-15.1
Employed 90% of the time	+22.7	-7.4	-9.9	+6.8	-14.0
Successful termination	+4.8	-5.2	+8.8	+15.2	-21.5
Employed at discharge	+4.2	-3.6	-13.7	-8.2	-11.9
Fired from job	-25.4	+78.0	-25.8	+42.4	-13.8
New offense	+18.2	+41.7	+76.5	-70.0	+11.1

**Table 23***Percentage Change of Intermediate Outcomes Across Report Years for the Prison Releases*

<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>2002-2003 to 2003-2004</b>	<b>2003-2004 to 2004-2006</b>	<b>2004-2006 to 2006-2008</b>	<b>2006-2008 to 2008-2010</b>	<b>2008-2010 to 2010-2012</b>
Positive drug screen	+29.9	-55.8	+138.0	-20.2	-24.7
Remained employed	+4.3	+71.7	+21.0	+0.4	-17.8
Employed 90% of the time	+8.4	-2.4	-10.6	-6.1	-16.0
Successful termination	-2.6	+14.2	+10.6	+16.3	-0.01
Employed at discharge	-27.8	+44.3	+1.9	0.0	0.0
Fired from job	-48.7	+55.9	-33.7	+14.1	+78.9
New offense	-100.0	0.0	+390.0	-100.0	+320.0

A comparison of the pretest to posttest differences for the CSS over time is shown in Table 24. 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). Table 24 indicates that there have been only small non-significant decreases in CSS scores (i.e., increases in criminal sentiments) for the total sample across all report years. An examination of the community sentences sample across report years generally shows similar small increases in criminal sentiment from pretest to posttest. However, there is a small, but significant increase in criminal sentiments (-4.6%) during this report year only. The prison release sample indicates a somewhat different pattern. The prison sample has had three reports



where there were small non-significant reductions in criminal sentiments, one had a slight increase, and the current year witnessed no change. Translating the results means that there continues to be no measurable increase in pro-social values as measured by the CSS. 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 24**

*Pretest to Posttest Mean Difference Comparisons of the CSS Across Report Years*

Sample	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
Total sample	-0.7	-0.8	-1.0	-0.2	-3.0
Summary	Small non-significant increases in criminal sentiments				
Community sentences	-0.4	-1.6	-0.7	-1.2	-4.6*
Summary	Small increases in criminal sentiments Only this report is statistically significant				
Prison releases	+1.4	+0.4	-1.5	+3.0	0.0
Summary	Generally small non-significant decreases in criminal sentiments One year had a slight increase and this report had no change				

A comparison of the pretest to posttest differences for the risk/need assessments over time is shown in Table 25. 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 reductions 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. For the last column in this table, the risk score difference were calculated using LSI-R or IRAS-CST categories, where 1 = *low-risk*, 2 = *moderate-risk*, and 3 = *high-risk*. Therefore, the value in the last column is not directly comparable to those that precede it. However, the direction and significance level are important to examine in relation to the others. The risk/needs assessment scores continue to demonstrate stability in favorable outcomes over time, regardless of how it is measured. Table 25 shows there are stability in the small reductions in risk for recidivism over all time periods.

**Table 25**

***Pretest to Posttest Mean Difference Comparisons of Offender Risk Across Report Years***

Sample	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
Total sample	-4.0*	-4.1*	-3.1*	-4.5*	-21.1*
Summary	Stability in small reductions in risk for recidivism				
Community sentences	-4.1*	-3.9*	-3.0*	-4.1*	-21.1*
Summary	Stability in small reductions in risk for recidivism				
Prison releases	-3.9*	-4.4*	-3.3*	-5.4*	-16.7*
Summary	Stability in small reductions in risk for recidivism				

*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 last column in the table (2008-2010 to 2010-2012), the risk score differences were calculated using LSI-R or IRAS-CST categories, where 1 = low-risk, 2 = moderate-risk, and 3 = high-risk.

## DISCUSSION

This report represents the eighth report of a continued joint effort between Hamilton County Community Corrections (HCCC) and the University of Cincinnati Corrections Institute (UCCI), and the sixth report that is based exclusively on the HCCC Adult Residential Program (ARP). The current report provided a process evaluation and an outcome evaluation of the ARP services rendered between July 1, 2010 and June 30, 2012. The process evaluation provided information on the characteristics of the ARP participants and their attendance in treatment programs, while the outcome evaluation provided evidence of program participant accomplishments by the end of their term in the ARP.

Demographics revealed that the majority of program participants were male, white, and had an average age 31 years old. 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, both the LSI-R and IRAS-CST scores produced by intake assessments demonstrated that the vast majority program participants were low-moderate risk to reoffend. In fact, the majority of program participants was non-violent and had not had a previous felony or prison sentence. Analysis of LSI-R identified needs demonstrated that the program participants of the EMP demonstrated high needs in four areas: Leisure/Recreation, Education/Employment, Family/Marital, and Alcohol/Drugs. Because the IRAS-CST need areas are factored differently, the IRAS-CST identified a high need in three areas: Education, Employment, and Finances, Substance Abuse, and Criminal Attitudes.

The most common offense that solicited a referral to the EMP was a drug offense, followed by an alcohol offense while driving, accounting for roughly 27% and 20% of offense

referrals, respectively. Inspection of outsourced treatment services suggested that substance abuse treatment was the most common outsourced treatment, with 34.7% being referred to treatment. Nevertheless, only 53.3% of referred substance abuse program participants completed treatment.

Evaluation of outcome measures demonstrated that 69.3% of ARP participants were successfully discharged. However, 65.2% of program participants had an administrative hearing where they were found guilty and 26.5% had a positive drug screen while in the program. Despite these findings, an extremely small percentage of participants (1.8%) actually committed a new offense while in the program.

HCCC continued to perform well in the area of employment. Analyses revealed that 62.3% of the sample worked more than 90% of the time with in the program. Taking into account that only 47.3% of participants were employed at intake, HCCC did well in the fact that an additional 35.4% of participants were employed at discharge.

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. However, participant attendance to referred programs is an area that remains in need of improvement. Program referral data revealed that HCCC does well in identifying the needs of program participants and referring program participants to the appropriate programs based on these needs for the majority of the time. However, inspection of attendance data indicated that only portions of program participants who are referred to programs are attending. HCCC also needs to better ensure that participants that do not meet a treatment need do not participate in treatment programs anyway, especially when other more needy participants do not have the opportunity to engage in the program because of the limited

programming capacity. The most concerning finding regarding assessment and programming data is that less than a quarter of the offenders initially assessed to need one of the core treatment programs actually went on to complete the programming.

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.

- More ARP offenders 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, for the new system to be effective, HCCC staff would need to continue to 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 ARP 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 low and high-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 ARP 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 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.

- Given the amount of HCCC data collected since 2002, it is recommended that a long-term outcome study be conducted.
- 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. Across the eight reports, HCCC has evidenced that they continue to provide treatment effectively to program participants. However, it may be time to discuss what types of additional information or services can be provided to HCCC in order to continue to improve the content of programming.

## 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* (5<sup>th</sup> 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., 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.
- Wingard, 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 Level of Service Inventory-Revised (Andrews & Bonta, 1995) is a risk assessment that classifies offenders according to four levels of risk for future offending. One of the distinct advantages of the LSI-R is that it also serves as a needs assessment, thereby screening for education, employment, financial, family/marital, use of leisure time, living arrangements, substance abuse, criminal attitudes, mental health, and anti-social peers and attitudes. These characteristics are called *criminogenic needs*, because they are needs associated with future offending. LSI-R scores are obtained through semi-structured intake and pre-termination interviews with offenders. HCCC staff administering the LSI-R were trained and certified according to the guidelines established by its publisher, MultiHealth Systems. The LSI-R has been validated successfully on numerous community correctional populations (see Andrews & Bonta, 2010).

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.

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).

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 = 189)*

<b>Item</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
My thoughts and feelings seem clearer to me now	3.8	0.9
People arrived to class on time	4.1	0.9
By using the skills I have learned, I know how to get out of a bad situation	4.0	0.8
The other group members treated me with respect	4.7	0.6
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	4.6	0.6
The exercises were helpful	3.9	1.0
The instructors seemed enthusiastic about teaching the class	4.6	0.7
I could understand the activities and handouts in this class	4.5	0.7
The instructor gave me suggestions for how to improve	4.4	0.6
We practiced and role played parts of the lessons	4.4	0.7
Sometimes group members were teased ( <i>reverse coded</i> )	4.3	0.9
We had good discussions	4.3	0.7
Just a few people seemed to do all the talking ( <i>reverse coded</i> )	3.6	1.1
I felt the instructor understood where I was coming from	4.2	0.7
Instructors used examples to help us understand the skills	4.3	0.6
I participated in the class	4.5	0.7
I felt comfortable stating my opinions in the class	4.5	0.7
Most class members participated	4.3	0.6
I had several chances to practice	4.3	0.6
Most group members took the class seriously	3.9	0.8
The instructor did a good job giving us examples	4.4	0.6
The instructor told me I was doing a good job	4.1	0.8
The classes met for the entire time period	4.4	0.7

## APPENDIX D

### *Summary of Employment Skills Program Participant Evaluations (N = 23)*

<b>Item</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
I believe that my employment goals fit my skills and abilities	4.1	0.9
In class, my instructor let me know how I was doing	4.7	0.8
The instructor treated me with respect	4.8	0.7
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	4.4	0.5
I could understand the activities, assessments, and handouts in class	4.8	0.5
People arrived to class on time	4.4	0.8
The handouts and assessments were difficult to read ( <i>reverse coded</i> )	4.8	0.5
The instructor was enthusiastic about teaching this class	4.7	1.0
The instructor seemed knowledgeable about employment matters	4.8	0.7
Because of this class, I know where the job opportunities are in this area	3.7	1.0
We had good discussions about job matters	4.5	0.9
We role played and practiced skills that are needed to get and hold a job	4.2	1.2
I participated in the class	4.7	0.7
The instructor used a variety of techniques to present the lessons	4.7	0.7
I felt comfortable stating my opinion in class	4.7	0.5
Most class members participated	4.6	0.5
Most of the participants seemed to take the classes seriously	4.4	0.6
After the class, I have a good idea of the type of work I would like to do	4.1	1.0
The classes were too easy ( <i>reverse coded</i> )	3.7	1.0
The instructor suggested ways I could personally improve my work skills	4.7	0.5
The instructor sometimes told me that I was doing a good job	4.6	0.5
Some of the students were disruptive ( <i>reverse coded</i> )	4.5	0.8
The instructor did a good job of giving us examples	4.7	0.6
Just a few people seemed to do all the talking in the class ( <i>reverse coded</i> )	4.0	1.0
The instructor seemed to know where I was coming from	4.4	0.7
Classes met for the entire time period	4.7	0.4

## APPENDIX E

### *Summary of Financial Management Program Participant Evaluations (N = 125)*

<b>Item</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
I am more aware of my behaviors regarding how I manage money	4.2	0.6
This class was enjoyable	4.4	0.8
The instructor treated me with respect	4.9	0.4
The other participants treated me with respect	4.8	0.6
The classes seemed relevant to me and my finances	4.4	0.9
People arrived to class on time	4.3	0.6
The activities will help me to be financially sound	4.3	0.8
The instructor was enthusiastic about teaching the class	4.8	0.5
The instructor seemed knowledgeable about the subject matter	4.9	0.6
We had good discussions about money management issues	4.7	0.5
The discussions helped me to learn new ways to manage my money	4.5	0.7
Most people participated in the class	4.3	0.7
The instructor used a variety of techniques to present the lessons	4.4	0.8
I felt comfortable stating my opinion in class	4.7	0.6
I think I participated a lot in these classes	4.3	0.7
Most of the participants seemed to take the classes seriously	4.3	0.6
I understood the lessons being taught	4.6	0.7
I will be making different spending choices	4.4	0.7
The classes were too easy ( <i>reverse coded</i> )	3.0	1.2
We practiced money management techniques in class	4.5	0.7
The instructor sometimes told me I was doing a good job	3.9	0.8
Some of the students were disruptive ( <i>reverse coded</i> )	4.3	1.2
Classes met for the entire class time period	4.6	0.6



## APPENDIX F

### *Summary of WAIT Program Participant Evaluations (N = 48)*

<b>Item</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
My thoughts and feelings seem clearer to me now	3.7	1.0
People arrived to class on time	4.1	0.9
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	4.7	0.5
The skills and examples seemed pretty realistic	3.9	0.9
The instructor treated me with respect	4.9	0.3
Group members cooperated with the instructor	4.5	0.6
The exercises were helpful	4.0	1.1
The instructors seemed enthusiastic about teaching the class	4.7	0.5
I could understand the activities and handouts in this class	4.5	0.7
The instructor gave me suggestions for how to improve	4.5	0.6
We practiced and role played parts of the lessons	4.8	0.5
Sometimes group members were teased ( <i>reverse coded</i> )	4.2	1.1
We had good discussions	4.6	0.6
Just a few people seemed to do all the talking ( <i>reverse coded</i> )	3.9	1.0
I felt the instructor understood where I was coming from	4.4	0.6
Instructors used examples to help us understand the skills	4.3	0.8
I participated in the class	4.6	0.5
I felt comfortable stating my opinions in the class	4.4	0.9
Most class members participated	4.4	0.6
I had several chances to practice	4.5	0.6
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	4.3	0.7
The classes met for the entire time period	4.4	0.9
I go through times when I can't cope with difficult people ( <i>reverse coded</i> )	3.7	1.1

## APPENDIX G

### *Summary of Phase 2 Program Participant Evaluations (N = 88)*

Item	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
My thoughts and feelings seem clearer to me now	3.8	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	4.0	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	4.3	0.8
The exercises were helpful	3.9	1.2
The instructors seemed enthusiastic about teaching the class	4.5	0.9
I could understand the activities and handouts in this class	4.4	0.9
The instructor gave me suggestions for how to improve	4.5	0.7
We practiced and role played parts of the lessons	3.5	1.2
Sometimes group members were teased ( <i>reverse coded</i> )	4.3	0.8
We had good discussions	4.4	0.9
Just a few people seemed to do all the talking ( <i>reverse coded</i> )	3.4	1.1
I felt the instructor understood where I was coming from	4.3	0.9
Instructors used examples to help us understand the skills	3.8	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	4.2	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	4.3	0.8
The instructor told me I was doing a good job	4.1	0.8
The classes met for the entire time period	4.6	0.7

## APPENDIX H

### *Summary of Phase 3 Program Participant Evaluations (N = 65)*

Item	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
My thoughts and feelings seem clearer to me now	3.9	1.0
People arrived to class on time	4.3	0.7
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	4.7	0.7
The skills and examples seemed pretty realistic	4.2	0.6
The instructor treated me with respect	4.8	0.5
Group members cooperated with the instructor	4.6	0.6
The exercises were helpful	4.2	0.9
The instructors seemed enthusiastic about teaching the class	4.6	0.7
I could understand the activities and handouts in this class	4.6	0.7
The instructor gave me suggestions for how to improve	4.4	0.7
We practiced and role played parts of the lessons	3.8	1.0
Sometimes group members were teased ( <i>reverse coded</i> )	4.3	1.0
We had good discussions	4.5	0.7
Just a few people seemed to do all the talking ( <i>reverse coded</i> )	3.9	1.0
I felt the instructor understood where I was coming from	4.4	0.8
Instructors used examples to help us understand the skills	3.9	1.0
I participated in the class	4.5	0.9
I felt comfortable stating my opinions in the class	4.5	0.7
Most class members participated	4.2	0.7
I had several chances to practice	4.1	0.7
Most group members took the class seriously	4.1	0.8
The instructor did a good job giving us examples	4.2	0.9
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