171620

TRANSMITTAL FOR FINAL REPORTS AND OTHER GRANT PRODUCTS

National Criminal Justice Reference Service
National Institute of Justice

TO: Manager; NCJRS Acquisition Department **DATE:** 6/26

FROM: Voncile Gowdy **TELEPHONE** _____
PROJECT MONITOR

ADDRESS: National Institute of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue
Washington, DC 20531

GRANT #: 93-IJ-CX-K021

FINAL REPORT TITLE: State Evaluation Capacity Building

OTHER DOCUMENTS PRODUCED FROM GRANT:

_____ _____

_____ _____

GRANTEE NAME: California State Board of Corrections **TELEPHONE:** (916) 323-8580

ADDRESS: 600 Bercut Drive
Sacramento CA 95814

Attached please find the Final Report for this grant.

TRANSMITTAL FOR FINAL REPORTS AND OTHER GRANT PRODUCTS

National Criminal Justice Reference Service
National Institute of Justice

TO: Voncile Gowdy **DATE:** _____

FROM: NCJRS Acquisition Department **GRANT #:** 93-IJ-CX-K021

☐ This material has been entered into the NCJRS data base, with the NCJ accession number(s) listed below.

FINAL REPORT: _____
OTHER DOCUMENTS: _____ _____

_____ _____

☐ Letter sent by NCJRS to grantee. **DATE:** _____

EVALUATION OF JAIL TRAINING PROGRAMS

SUBMITTED BY CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF CORRECTIONS

JOHN KOHLS, Ph.D.
AND
DOUGLAS A. HOLIEN

JUNE 1996

Supported under award #93-IJ-CX-K021 from the National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position of the U.S. Department of Justice.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Board of Corrections' staff would like to thank the following people who have provided invaluable assistance to this project:

Joyce Bell ..... Education Coordinator, Elk Grove Adult Education, RCCC
Tim Bynum, Ph.D. . . NIJ Consultant, Michigan State University
Lt. Mark Dickerson . Sacramento County Sheriff's Department
Leslie Hamilton .... Teacher, Elk Grove Adult Education, RCCC
Lt. Gary Iames .... Sacramento County Sheriff's Department
Robert Keldgord .... Chief Probation Officer, Sacramento County
Tim Mauldin ..... Education Coordinator, Elk Grove Adult Education, RCCC
Tony Mattox ..... Sacramento County Sheriff's Department
Ed McGarrell, Ph.D. NIJ Consultant, University of Indiana
Rebeca Moody ..... Deputy Probation Officer, Sacramento County Probation Department
Robert Otto ..... Education Paraprofessional, Elk Grove Adult Education, RCCC
Shellie Solomon .... NIJ Program Manager
Bill Whitaker ..... Supervisor, Sacramento County Probation Department
Gail Zittel ..... Principal, Elk Grove Adult Education

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In October 1993, the California Board of Corrections (BOC) and the federal National Institute of Justice (NIJ) entered into a cooperative agreement to conduct process and outcome evaluations of selected jail training programs. This evaluation effort was designed to build evaluation protocols that could be integrated into jail training projects supported by BOC distributed federal Perkins Act training funds.

There were many disappointments encountered during implementation of this project, some not directly related to this effort, including termination of distribution of Perkins Act funds through the BOC; lack of necessary program infrastructure to support evaluation in certain sites; repeated personnel changes at the primary evaluation site; a much higher than projected program participant attrition rate; and, a much lower than projected program participant completion rate, which combined to result in very low numbers of inmates in the outcome study.

Our outcome findings show that very serious inmates are in jail custody: most are current felons, many with prior felony convictions; most have an education of less than 12 years; most have abused alcohol and drugs; and, most were unemployed at the time of incarceration. Outcome results of the program served cohort showed that almost half received disciplinaries while incarcerated; and over 40 percent were arrested, convicted or in violation of probation within six months of release, though numbers are so low that these results are very inconclusive.

On the process side, we were able to chronicle what it takes to do successful program evaluation in jail settings, based on the literature and on our experiences in this project. We offer a practical developmental approach which can assist program operators in building necessary infrastructure for evaluation:

- Clear goal specification of the overall program.
- Target group identification to ensure that participants have the ability to benefit from the program participation.
- Selection or gatekeeping methods to ensure the target group is served by the program;
- Training methods and achievement standards to enable participants to attain program objectives;
- Recordkeeping and information systems to enable baseline evaluation data to be collected that measures participant performance and program achievement.

Major process findings are:

- Researchers should first assess the operational adequacy of programs and the independent variable. If needed, programs should be further developed before attempting formal evaluation.
- Length of stay and expected program achievement should be carefully considered when identifying dependent variables. Short-term jail programming for repeat felons is unlikely to have a significant impact on propensity for criminality or raising employment skills unless programming is combined with some type of tailored post-release services.
- Self-selection and attendance variability are major issues to consider in developing and/or evaluating jail programs. It is essential that screening mechanisms are in place to assure that participants can benefit from program participation. Closer integration of program selection methods with inmate custody classification procedures may help programs in identifying target group candidates in the inmate population, and reduce reliance on inmate self-selection into the program candidate pool. Incentives may also be needed to reduce attendance variability, and conflicting work assignments should be avoided.

CHAPTER 1
BACKGROUND

REASON FOR INVESTIGATION

In October 1993, the California Board of Corrections and the federal National Institute of Justice (NIJ) entered into a cooperative agreement under NIJ's *State Evaluation Capacity Building Program* initiative. This program, now called the *Participatory Evaluation Program*, has the four major goals of:

1) creating a partnership with States;
2) building evaluation capacity at State and local levels;
3) increasing stakeholder "buy-in" to developing evaluation strategies; and,
4) using evaluation findings and sharing information between States.

Under this initiative, the Board of Corrections proposed to conduct process and outcome evaluations of jail training programs. The proposal resulted from the Board of Corrections' newly acquired responsibility to disseminate federal Perkins Act funds to local jurisdictions in California.[1] The Perkins Act was established to fund local training operations; however, the money was specifically not to be used for evaluation. Nevertheless, the Board has always been committed to evaluation, and wished to include evaluation as part of its involvement in local training. Therefore, the Board applied for and received a grant from NIJ to evaluate the training which was funded through the Perkins Act.

With the assistance of NIJ, the Board was able to include the key factor of evaluation in the training which it funded. The findings of evaluation research could serve many useful purposes including: 1) refining the process of selection of training to be funded in the future, and 2) establishment of research-based evaluation protocols into local training programs. Three local programs that received Perkins Act grant awards were selected as potential sites for evaluation. The final selection of the evaluation site was made after site visits and reviews by Board of Corrections researchers and NIJ evaluation consultants.[2]

This final report describes the research methods and findings of the training evaluation project. Included is: a) review of the literature, b) discussion of the procedures and criteria used to select the training sites, c) description of the methodology, d) process evaluation results, e) outcome evaluation results, and f) assessment of the implication of the findings.

LITERATURE REVIEW FINDINGS

The Board of Corrections conducted a literature review of training-evaluation research performed in adult custody settings. Several computerized searches were conducted using the resources of the National Criminal Justice Reference Service, as well as manual searches of other relevant data bases.

One readily apparent finding in this review is that the vast majority of the literature in this area is based on programs operated in state prison settings, with inmates having a relatively longer length of stay in training programs and incarceration than do county jail inmates. There have been few

rigorous evaluations of county jail training programs involving short lengths of stay that have been published in professional journals.

A recent update of a baseline study of California's education programs in county jail settings showed that while at least 30 counties operated programs, only eleven counties attempted to measure learning progress, and less than one percent of jail-education inmates took both pre-tests and post-tests to measure achievement (Stern, 1994). This study also found that many programs do not track positive outcomes and that the programs are flawed by a self-selection bias and inadequate specification of both outcome (dependent) variables and the nature of the programs (independent variables). Stern calls for more evaluation of jail education programs, especially those presumed to have a measurable public impact, and indicates that without such evaluation it will be difficult to sustain support for jail education programs.

The vocational evaluation literature in adult custody settings has focussed mainly on program participation variables, such as attendance figures (Zumpetta, 1988; Khatibi, 1988, Gleason 1986). There have been fewer evaluations focused on the post-release behavior of incarcerated adults, and those that did focus on post-release variables have shown mixed results. There are now increasing calls for evaluations containing post-release outcome measures as legislators and policy makers focus on determining the "public paybacks" of institutional programs (Statewide Jail Education "Town Hall" Summit, Sacramento, 1994).

Inmates completing both academic and vocational training programs were found to have significantly higher rates of post-release employment when compared to a control group (Hackett, 1988). A major

study of over 7,000 inmates in federal prisons showed that inmates participating in industrial skills training did significantly better than untrained controls on measures of institutional adjustment, employment, and adjustment on supervision after release (Saylor and Gaes, 1992). A Canadian study found that life skills training in three facilities resulted in better personal and social functioning of inmates when compared to untreated controls (Marshall, et al, 1989).

Other studies have found little or no significant difference between program and control groups on general measures of post-release adjustment and employment (Florida DOC, 1979, among others), while some have found that inmates who found jobs directly related to their training had moderately higher success rates in the community (Markley, et al., 1983).

Several studies found that programs had such significant design and operational flaws, that outcome results were inconclusive (Riechers, et al., 1992) and that some vocational programs had little effect on behavior because they were weak or poorly implemented (Lattimore, et al., 1990, Marye 1979, among others).

The conclusion of the our review of the literature is that given the "right conditions," vocational training of inmates probably has a positive impact on post-release behavior. However, achieving the right conditions has been difficult in many sites. The right conditions include:

- inmates who are willing to participate in and put forth enough effort to master the content of the training program;

- inmates who possess the requisite basic skills (e.g., language and math) to benefit from the training;

- a training program which teaches useful, job-related skills;

- sufficient opportunity for the inmate to benefit from the training (e.g., in terms of the ease of course attendance, the length and depth of the course), so as to significantly improve occupational and/or life skills; and,

- a job market for the skills taught in training, so that the inmate has a reasonable chance, upon release from jail, to apply what was learned in the jail training program.

The above conditions are necessary, but not sufficient, prerequisites for demonstrating that jail training produces positive results. One must also be able to conduct well designed evaluation research. This type of research requires the following:

- well defined goals for the training in terms of the expected post-release behavior of inmate trainees;

- reliable and valid measures of pre-training and post-training skills;

- a sufficient sample size;

- a relevant control group;

- the ability to track inmate behavior in the post-release setting; and,
- the ability to control variables which, if left uncontrolled, might confound the results of a study.

ASSESSING FEASIBILITY OF EVALUATION

At the time the current project began, the Board of Corrections had funded three training programs under the aforementioned Perkins Act . The first question which we addressed in our training evaluation project was this: ***"To what extent do the three training sites meet the eleven conditions for conducting evaluation research of jail training?"***

To answer these questions, we conducted an assessment of the three training programs. Board of Corrections researchers, accompanied by our NIJ consultants, conducted desk reviews of written program descriptions. We also visited each site, viewed their training facilities, observed the training being presented, talked with trainees, reviewed the training data which was collected and determined the availability of follow-up data. Programs were assessed according to the "right conditions" previously described. In addition, frank discussions were had with program staff regarding willingness and ability to participate in a formal program evaluation, likely workload implications of participation, and local issues and needs.

By amiable and mutual agreement, two of the three programs voluntarily withdrew from participation in a formal program evaluation. Both of these programs, to significant degrees, lacked the necessary program infrastructure to adequately support the training evaluation research without making major program or recordkeeping changes. For example, one program did not track names of completers; another "program" consisted of distributing books to inmates in their cells. Local staff time and resources were not available to quickly make the changes necessary to improve program quality and make evaluation feasible. Both programs were interested in further developing their capacity to support evaluation through training and development assistance in the future.

Our assessment of the feasibility of doing evaluation of jail training programs produced some interesting findings which will be discussed further in the results section. The main reasons for concluding that evaluation was infeasible at the two sites which were eliminated from the study are as follows:

- The goals of the training programs, in terms of the behavior expected of who successfully complete the programs, were not specifically stated.

- Participation in the course was often a "hit and miss" proposition (class attendance was either not tracked, or was sporadic in a manner not conducive to mastery of the material).

- The biggest problem in terms of feasibility for evaluation was the lack of a tracking system regarding the inmates who were participating in the training. At both sites which were eliminated from the research, significant additional data gathering procedures would have

been required to simply identify, track, and verify the training achievement of the research subjects. In addition, there was very little likelihood of monitoring the post-release success or failure of the research subjects. Finally, obtaining a reasonable control group was virtually impossible in these two sites.

SELECTION OF THE RESEARCH SITE

The results of our assessment was that training evaluation was feasible in one training site: the Rio Consumnes Correctional Center (RCCC) which is run by the Sacramento County Sheriff's Department. RCCC is a county jail for prisoners sentenced up to one year in custody. The training program at RCCC is operated by the Elk Grove Unified School District.

The type of vocational training to be evaluated at RCCC is called "Office Technology Training." One purpose of this training is to familiarize students with the use of computers in an office or business setting. Beyond computer familiarization, specific instruction in several types of common office software is provided, including: word processing and desktop publishing. The assumptions behind the choice of this type of instruction are:

- There are good opportunities in the Sacramento area for people with office technology skills;
- There is a growing tendency for most types of jobs to involve computer use in some important respect; and,

- Substantial progress in the areas of computer operating skills and office computer software skills can be achieved in the relatively short time that most inmates spend in the county jail.

HYPOTHESES

The issue to be explored in this research is as follows: to what extent do inmates who achieve a certificate of completion in at least one component of Office Technology training differ in their institutional adjustment and post-release behavior from those inmates who choose no training? Does the training group achieve better results than the control group in the post-release setting in the following respects: institutional adjustment, employment, and legal behavior.

The hypotheses which will be tested, stated in general terms, are as follows:

> ***Graduates of Office Technology training will demonstrate better institutional adjustment and, upon release, demonstrate a higher level of personal and community adjustment than a matched sample of inmates who opted for no training.***

The major dependent variables are described in more detail later in this section; in general terms they are:

- Institutional adjustment (measured by the number of major and minor disciplinary actions while in custody);

- Employment (including factors such as: wages, total time worked, and type of work); and,

- Legal behavior (including factors such as: number and type of arrests and convictions).

For the remainder of this section, inmates who took Office Technology training will be referred to as the "training group." The comparison subjects will be referred by the traditional label of "control group."

HURDLES TO OVERCOME IN THE RESEARCH DESIGN

Even in the one site chosen for evaluation, we knew that we would have to overcome significant hurdles to successfully complete the research. For example, we realized that the tracking of research subjects would be quite difficult for a number of reasons including:

1) a number of individuals start training, but drop out before completion due to a number of factors (as a result, an almost daily monitoring of who was in or out of the research sample was required);

2) job assignments for inmates, early releases, and court or attorney matters sometimes interfered with class attendance;

3) custody staff were responsible for one type of needed data (e.g., booking date, release date, disciplinary actions), while training staff kept other types of needed data (e.g., course

completion, grades, pre and post test scores); maintaining and reconciling the two types of data input presented a logistical problem;

4) most inmates released from the jail were released into "banked" probation caseloads; therefore, tracking them required special assistance from the probation department, and we could only expect to get the kind of data which might be available without direct probation officer and probationer contact.

CONCLUSION

Our initial goal was to determine whether well designed and presented jail-inmate training would make a difference in post-release adjustment. However, as we proceeded with the choice of research sites and research design, we realized that questions regarding "feasibility" and "design" of evaluation research in the areas of jail training loomed large. We expanded our focus to include an analysis of the issues that arise when one tries to conduct evaluation research in this type of setting.

CHAPTER 2

METHOD

SETTING

The research was conducted at the Rio Consumnes Correctional Center (RCCC) managed by the Sacramento County Sheriff's Department. Most training programs are operated on-site by the Elk Grove Unified School District. The facility has a daily population of approximately 1,200 sentenced inmates serving up to 365 days inmates. Actual length of stay is considerably shorter for most inmates. About 84% of the inmates are men and 16% women.

TRAINING AT RCCC

There are a number of training opportunities available at RCCC for inmates. The courses span a broad range including:

- basic education courses (to prepare people who have not graduated from high school to obtain a GED), or basic study-skills courses;

- life skills training regarding such topics as parenting, domestic violence, driving while intoxicated, and money management; and,

- job skills training in such areas as culinary arts, office technology, and how to get a job.

The training that was chosen for this research project was the Office Technology training. The purpose of this training was to familiarize students with the use of computers in an office or business setting. The reason this training was chosen for study was described in the previous section.

Office Technology training at RCCC consists of a number of separate course topics or modules such as: keyboarding, word processing, and desktop publishing. The minimum time for successfully completing a module is approximately 30 days. The students are able to spend up to three hours per day in class. They can also study the class material on their own time (although they only have access to a computer during regular class time).

CRITERIA FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE RESEARCH

For inmates to be considered for possible participation in the research (in either in the treatment or control groups), they had to:

1) be classified in the minimum security housing in the facility;

2) achieve a minimum score on a literacy test called the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE);

3) be sentenced for long enough period of time to complete an Office Technology module;

4) be able to be easily followed-up after their release from RCCC (i.e., they must be residents of Sacramento County, they must be released to Sacramento County, and they must be on probation in Sacramento County).

TREATMENT AND CONTROL GROUPS

In addition to the above criteria for participation in the research, the treatment group subjects had to meet the following additional criteria:

1) sign up for, and be accepted into, Office Technology training; and,

2) successfully complete at least one Office Technology module.

In addition to the above criteria for participation in the research, the control group subjects had to meet the following additional criteria:

1) sign up for no training of any kind at RCCC; and,

2) be matched to the treatment group in terms of gender, risk assessment score (described below) and employment history; these matching criteria were determined by the research staff in consultation with the NIJ project consultants.

Ideally, the control group would have been a random sample of those inmates who had expressed interest in, and qualified for, Office Technology training. Assuming there were training slots for approximately half of those inmates who were interested in the training, this strategy would have been feasible. Unfortunately, the number of inmates interested in, and eligible for, the training often did not exceed the number of training slots. Therefore, we had to revert to the less desirable matching strategy of comparing the outcomes of those inmates who completed training, versus those who did not sign up for any training. We chose this alternative as a fall back position because we were not interested at this time in comparing Office Technology with some other type of training, and we were interested in knowing if those who completed Office Technology training were better able to cope in the post-release situation. Of course, if the Office Technology group were to perform better, we would be unable to conclude that the results were due exclusively to the training. Beyond the matching factors of gender, risk assessment score and employment history, the treatment group might be fundamentally different from the control group (e.g., they might simply be more interested in training and more motivated to do well after release from jail). Given this caveat, we established the best comparison group possible given the situation which confronted us.

CHOOSING RESEARCH SUBJECTS

All candidates who come into the RCCC facility are expected to attend an orientation session. As part of the orientation, inmates complete an academic skills proficiency test which is part of the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE). The form which they fill out is called the "Locator." It is a preliminary test which "locates" or identifies the difficulty level of more in-depth assessment exams

which should be given (e.g., it determines the approximate level of academic achievement so that the appropriate follow-up test can be used).

Inmates are counseled regarding options for training programs for which they can apply. Inmate options are partially based upon the their academic achievement scores. Inmates interested in signing up for training programs attend sessions where they are administered the appropriate follow-up exam.

When the test results indicate that inmates have the capability to benefit from the training, those still interested are put on a list from which the available training slots are filled. For the current research, when an inmate was accepted into the Office Technology training, s/he was put into the treatment group. Those selected were tracked in terms of training performance and post-release behavior (assuming that they completed the training and did not drop out for some reason, such as failure in training, loss of interest, could not be found after release).

Initial candidates for the control group were all inmates who:

- achieved the minimum score on the TABE Locator;
- did not sign up for any training; and,
- met all the other criteria for participation in the control group (e.g., released on probation to Sacramento County).

We expected that these criteria would produce a group much larger than the treatment group. For this larger group, we then planned to select final control group members based upon the criteria of: 1) gender; 2) pre-sentence employment history; and 3) "Risk Assessment" score (a validated instrument used by Sacramento Probation to quantify a person's standing on a variety of factors statistically related to likelihood of re-offending).

Training staff estimated that approximately 15 inmates would meet the criteria and complete Office Technology training requirements in the 12 months beginning July 1, 1994. We planned to select a similar number for the final control group.

Both men and women inmates were included in the research. The number of men versus women depended upon the actual number who qualified for, and actually complete, the Office Technology Training during the 12 month period of this phase of the research.

RESEARCH VARIABLES

It is very difficult to conduct research regarding training outcomes in the best of circumstances. There are a number of reasons for this including: a) the students' beginning level of skill often varies significantly, b) it is often difficult to define and measure a practical, meaningful criterion on training achievement (since the training is usually designed to help the students in their lives sometime after the training is completed), and c) there are often serious potential confounding variables such as

other educational experiences that occur simultaneously with the specific training one is studying.

To be in the best position possible to understand the research outcomes in the study, we designed a lengthy list of variables to measure. The list of all the variables appears in Appendix A.

The data sources included the following (the data collection forms appear in Appendix B):

1) Registration Form: this form was filled out partially by the newly arrived inmates at RCCC during an orientation meeting. The inmates provided basic information about themselves such as social security number, gender and ethnicity. In addition, the training staff indicated the training achievement score (the Test of Adult Basic Education, Locator score) and classes the inmate had signed up to take.

2) Supplemental Form: this form was called "supplemental" because we intended for it to supplement the initial information about the research subjects. Most of the information requested on this form related to the inmates' employment.

3) Evaluation by Student: this form was filled out by the student at the completion of Office Technology training. The students were asked to indicate their prior experience with computers and the software used in Office Technology training, their evaluation of the training they received and their assessment of whether the new skills would be helpful in securing employment or better employment.

4) Evaluation of the Student: this form was filled out by the instructor in the Office Technology class. She rated a number of factors including the student's class behavior, attitude and skills achieved.

5) Probation Report: when an inmate was identified as a potential member of the training group or control group, his or her name was forwarded to the Sacramento County Probation Department. The probation staff filled out a form prepared by the Board research staff. The form covered the following areas:

- History: including employment, education, and drug and alcohol abuse.

- Juvenile Record: including number of adjudications, types of charges and use of force.

- Adult Record: including felony and misdemeanor convictions, alcohol and drug involvement, types of sentences, and fact or admission of culpability or not.

- Risk Assessment Form: this form is filled out by the Probation Officer. It rates a number of factors related to risk (such as inmate age as of first conviction, number of address changes in recent past, and employment) to produce a total Risk Assessment score. The assumption is that the higher the Risk Assessment score the worse the prognosis for the inmate's future behavior.

- Follow-up Form: this form was filled out by the Probation Officer within one week (before or after) of the six month anniversary of the inmate's release from RCCC. This form measured such variables as: disciplinary problems at RCCC, employment since leaving RCCC, and arrest/conviction/incarceration record since leaving RCCC.

INDEPENDENT MEASURES

A wide range of independent measures were gathered in this research. The categories of independent variables are as follows:

- basic descriptive information such as: age, marital status, gender, and ethnicity;
- educational background;
- employment and military background;
- legal background, in terms of the following:
  - drug possession/sale/use;
  - juvenile legal record;
  - adult legal record;
  - information about the offense which resulted in the most recent incarceration;

- social adjustment information related to such things as domestic violence, alcohol abuse, and gang involvement;

- verification of completion of at least one module of Office Technology training (training group only);

- documentation of other training (in addition to Office Technology, if any) for the training group;

- program assessment information such as: evaluation ratings of the Office Technology program by inmates and teachers; satisfaction with, and numbers of people benefiting from, program participation.

The most important independent variable is completion of at least one module of the Office Technology program versus no training for the control group. The minimum time required to complete one module is about 30 days. The students can spend up to three hours per day in class. They can also study the class material on their own time (they only have access to a computer during class time). The control group is comprised of those individuals who qualify to take the Office Technology training, but choose not to take the training, or any other kind of training available at the RCCC facility.

Ideally those interested in, and qualified for, Office Technology training would be randomly assigned to either the training group or control group. Random assignment to the treatment group was not

possible in this research because often there were more training slots available in the class than people interested in taking the class.

Having fewer students than training slots also created a problem in terms of the control group. Our initial hope was that the treatment and control groups would be matched on the important variable of "interest in Office Technology training." Failure to match the research groups on this variable was unfortunate because any differences on the dependent variables could result from the inmates who are interested in Office Technology training being fundamentally different from inmates who are not interested in such training.

As previously indicated, the training group and control groups were matched on three factors: 1) gender, 2) presentence employment, and 3) the Risk Assessment score. As we analyzed the data, we also looked for other factors on which we could match the treatment and control group (based upon the homogeneity of the treatment group).

DEPENDENT MEASURES

Several dependent measures were gathered. Data relating to the dependent measures were gathered by staff of the Sacramento County Probation Department. The variables measured were designed to address the following question: do graduates of Office Technology training, when compared with inmates who do not attend training programs, perform better in terms of: 1) institutional adjustment, 2) post-incarceration employment, and 3) post-incarceration legal behavior?

The "employment" dependent variables were:

a) Total time worked: this variable was operationalized in terms of the number of weeks that the probationer had been employed during the six months after being released from RCCC;

b) Time to Employment: this variable was number of weeks between the time of release from RCCC and the probationer's first employment;

c) Wages and Employment Type: the average wage per hour for the training group members and control group members were compared. If data quality permitted, we intended to also compare types of employment between the treatment and control groups.

The "legal behavior" and "institutional adjustment" dependent variables were:

a) Arrests: the number and type of arrests which occurred after release for the training group versus the control group;

b) Convictions: the number and type of convictions which occurred after release for the training group versus the control group;

c) Institutional Adjustment: the number and type of disciplinary actions during RCCC confinement.

PROCESS EVALUATION/CAPACITY BUILDING

A main goal in this research was to conduct an outcome study related to jail training. We also sought to conduct a process evaluation of the training, and to develop our state-level capacity for conducting training evaluation research. Products of this research, and lessons learned, will also be used to further develop local capacity.

In terms of developing these capacities, we sought to explore a wide range of variables. As already stated, nearly 500 variables were collected and analyzed in this study, and are summarized in Appendix A. Our purpose in including such a large number of variables was to ensure that our data base includes sufficient information that will help explain outcomes. In addition to the variables mentioned earlier, supplemental variables included:

a) Inmate background data, such as prior occupation, use of alcohol/drugs, prior income, and prior training history;

b) Community status data such as living situation, use of transportation for employment, reliance on public assistance, numbers of people to support; and,

c) Criminal history data such as crimes committed while under the influence of alcohol/drugs, use of weapons, history of violence, victim loss, admitting culpability for most recent criminal activity.

CHAPTER 3

OUTCOME RESULTS

SUBJECTS

The design consisted of gathering data regarding the following groups:

1) those who completed Office Technology training (Training Group);

2) those who began Office Technology training, but dropped out for whatever reason (Non-Attendance Group);

3) selected members of the control group who were matched to subjects who completed Office Technology Training (Comparison Group).

4) the rest of the minimum security inmates who took no training at RCCC and therefore were potential candidates for the control group (Control-Remaining).

Since we suspected that gender was related to many of the variables we were studying (such as disciplinary actions while incarcerated and employability), we partitioned each of the above four groups by gender when possible (as will be discussed below, there were no Comparison Group or Other Control Group females in the sample).

Data for the training (treatment) group were gathered between July 1, 1994 and December 31, 1995. Data for the control group were gathered between January 1, 1995 and December 31, 1995. The reason for waiting to collect control group subjects is that we wanted to determine whether there needed to be additional control group selection criteria based upon the characteristics of the training group assembled in the first six months of data gathering. As it turned out, we did not add any additional criteria for participation in the control group.

New inmates arrived at RCCC about twice per week. All minimum security inmates were given an orientation during which they were tested for academic achievement and told about the training options. The training staff at RCCC collected data on incoming subjects and forwarded it to the Board of Corrections. The research staff at the Board of Corrections reviewed the returns and entered the data into the computer for processing.

Having the data collection procedures in place, we waited for the data to pour in. We were immediately disappointed. While we expected a number of potential subjects to drop out along the way (e.g., they might not be given probation, or they may reside in another county than Sacramento), we did not expect the extremely small numbers of people who entered into the research. There were a number of reasons for the small numbers:

1) The training staff at RCCC had given us anecdotal reports of the number of students they thought would satisfy the criteria for entering the research and would successfully complete the training. They did not have the kind of data which would allow them to make accurate projections. As it turns out, their estimates were inflated by a factor of 10!

In other words, we ended up with about 11% of the number of treatment subjects that we expected (17 Training Group subjects instead of 150). We were not prepared for the estimates being that far off.

2) We were also told that once people started training, their attendance was fairly good. In fact, 43 inmates qualified for training, were included in our Training Group, and subsequently dropped out of training reportedly due to lack of motivation.

3) More people than we expected also dropped out of the study as a result of not satisfying one or more of the other criteria for participation: a) be sentenced long enough to complete an Office Technology module, b) be residents of Sacramento County, c) be released to Sacramento County, and d) be on probation in Sacramento County.

4) If all these problems had not occurred, we still would have had problems getting data needed to complete the study. Due to personnel changes in the training staff at RCCC and lack of staff time and resources to gather the data needed, the data were most often late, incomplete or difficult to interpret.

5) The only method we had for isolating out the effects of Office Technology training and establishing the basis for a reasonable comparison, was to compare the results of Office Technology training with "no training." In other words, if an inmate had signed up for any training other than Office Technology then he or she could not become part of the control group. An unanticipated consequence of this criterion was to eliminate females from the

control group. All the women who otherwise qualified for participation in the control group had signed up for some kind of training at RCCC other the Office Technology training. In comparison, there were many male inmates who qualified for Office Technology training who did not take any training at all at RCCC.

Due to the small sample sizes, we have decided to present descriptive statistics only. Inferential findings, even when statistically significant, might result in conclusions which are misleading. The reader should be careful to avoid drawing unwarranted conclusions from the descriptive findings. After describing the research sample which resulted from our procedures, we will describe the findings for some of the major independent and dependent variables.

The research sample we were able to obtain appears in Table 1:

1) Treatment Group. There were only 17 inmates who completed at least one module of Office Technology training (7 of whom were male).

2) Comparison Group. Since there are no females in the control group, the comparison group was selected to match as closely as possible the 7 males in the Treatment Group.

3) Control Group (Remaining). This group is the remainder of the control group minus the 7 males selected to form the matched sample comparison Control group.

4) Non-Attend Group. This group contains the individuals that were selected into and began Office Technology training, but stopped coming to the classes.

Table 1. Research Subjects					
Gender	Treatment Group	Comparison Group	Control Group (Remaining)	Non-Attend Group	Total
Female	10	0	0	21	31
Male	7	7	74	22	110
Total	17	7	74	43	141

As Table 1 illustrates, of the 60 inmates that started training (31 females and 29 males), 17 (10 females and 7 males) completed the training. Ten of 31 females who started the training completed it. Seven of the starting 29 males completed the training. We were surprised to find these ratios. We were led to believe that a higher percentage of students completed the Office Technology training.

Table 2 provides the ethnic breakdown for the female sample, and Table 3 for the male sample.

Table 2. Female Research Subjects and Ethnicity						
Ethnicity	Treatment Group		Non Attend		Total	
Hispanic	1	10.0%	3	14.3%	4	12.9%
Black	5	50.0%	7	33.3%	12	38.7%
White	4	40.0%	10	47.6%	14	45.2%
Other	0	0.0%	1	4.8%	1	3.2%
Total	10		21		31	

Table 3. Male Research Subjects and Ethnicity										
Ethnicity	Training Group	%	Comparison Control	%	Control (Remaining)	%	Non Attend	%	Total	%
Hispanic	2	28.6%	1	14.3%	10	13.5%	2	9.1%	15	13.6%
Black	2	28.6%	2	28.6%	15	20.3%	8	36.4%	27	24.5%
White	3	42.9%	3	42.9%	45	60.8%	7	31.8%	58	52.7%
Other	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	4	5.4%	5	22.7%	10	9.1%
Total	7		7		74		22		110	

As stated before, no conclusions are drawn from these tables due to the small sample sizes.

COMPARISON GROUP

Since there were only males in the control group, we selected 7 from that group to match the 7 males in the Training Group. We have called these 7 subjects from the control group the "Comparison Group." The remaining subjects in the control group have been labeled the "Control (Remaining)."

The Comparison Group was chosen in the following way. We felt that the primary requirement for the Comparisons Group subjects (other than their being males) is that they have a record of employment at the time of being arrested which is comparable to that of the Training Group. Therefore, our goal was to chose 2 Comparison Group subjects who were employed and 5 who were not employed.

The next criterion was ethnicity. The Training Group consisted of 1 Hispanic, 2 Blacks, 3 Caucasians and 1 Native American. For the Comparison Group we were able to select 2 Hispanics, 2 Blacks and 3 Caucasians.

The third criterion was their highest grade completed in school. The mean highest grade for the Treatment Group was 12.1 years and for the Comparison Group 11.7 years.

We used 2 additional criteria. Both groups had 5 subjects who admitted culpability, and 2 who did not. The average Risk Assessment score for the Treatment Group was 21.0 and for the Comparison Group 21.7.

Using these criteria resulted in a Comparison Group somewhat younger than the Training Group (a mean of 32.8 years versus 38.6 years respectively). However, to produce a more comparable mean age we would have had to compromise on some other matching variable which we considered more important.

Obviously such small Treatment and Comparison Groups make any definitive conclusions impossible. We consider this report to be a statement of our intent in terms of the research design (had an adequate sample materialized), and we hope that this report will serve as a guide to those who might follow us in attempting to conduct this kind of research. Therefore, we did not want to leave out any of the basic steps in the results section even though the data are inadequate.

The result of this step is the selection of a Comparison Group that is matched to the Training Group in important respects such as gender, basic education, prior work history, the acceptance of responsibility for their actions, and the risks of re-offending as measured by a Risk Assessment scale.

RESULTS

In this section, we present the results for a number of key variables for 6 groups (for a full list of research variables, see Appendix A):

1) The female Training Group (10 subjects who successfully completed Office Technology training).

2) The male Training Group (7 subjects who successfully completed Office Technology training).

3) The Comparison Group (7 males from the control group who were matched to the male Training Group but who took no training at RCCC).

4) The Control (Remaining) Group (74 males who were potential members of the Comparison Group, who took no training at RCCC, but who were not selected into the Comparison Group).

5) The female Non-Attend Group (22 subjects who started Office Technology training, but failed to complete the training).

6) The male Non-Attend Group (21 subjects who started Office Technology training, but failed to complete the training).

For each variable mentioned, we have provided a table and a short discussion. In each table, there is a column entitled "missing." The numbers in this column are counts of the missing data; i.e., data which we were unable to obtain for whatever reason.

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES: BACKGROUND

Education

One of the background variables related to education. We asked the reporting Probation Officer to indicate the highest grade in school that the research subject achieved. Table 4 presents the results.

Table 4. Highest Grade in School

Research Groups	Mean	Highest	Lowest	SD	N	Missing
Training Group (Female)	11.6	14	10	0.7	9	1
Training Group (Male)	12.1	18	10	2.7	7	0
Comparison Group	11.7	12	11	0.5	7	0
Control (Remaining)	11.6	12	10	0.7	73	1
Non-Attend (Female)	11.1	12	10	0.9	12	9
Non-Attend (Male)	11.2	12	7	1.4	18	4
Totals	11.5	18	7	1.0	126	15

All six groups have a similar mean grade, with the Training Group being slightly higher due to the fact that one of the subjects had 18 years of education.

Employed at the Time of the Offense

Obviously the employment status before incarceration has some relationship to employability after incarceration. Across all six research groups (as can be seen in Table 5), the majority of the research subjects were not employed at the time they committed the offense that resulted in their incarceration

(67.7%). This result is fairly similar across the six groups with the exception of the Non-Attend Female group, none of whom were employed at the time of their offense.

Table 5. Employed at Time of Offense						
Research Groups	Yes	%	No	%	Total	Missing
Training Group (Female)	4	40.0%	6	60.0%	10	0
Training Group (Male)	2	28.6%	5	71.4%	7	0
Comparison Group (Male)	2	28.6%	5	71.4%	7	0
Control (Remaining)	27	37.0%	46	63.0%	73	1
Non-Attend (Female)	0	0.0%	15	100.0%	15	6
Non-Attend (Male)	8	38.1%	13	61.9%	21	1
Totals	43	32.3%	90	67.7%	133	8

Part-Time/Full-Time Employment

Of those who were employed, approximately 80% had full-time jobs. The percentage holding full-time jobs ranged from 50% to 100%, but the numbers are so small that this range could change dramatically with the addition of one or two subjects.

Table 6. Full Time / Part Time						
Research Groups	FT	%	PT	%	Total	Missing
Training Group (Female)	2	50.0%	2	50.0%	4	0
Training Group (Male)	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	2	0
Comparison Group	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	2	0
Control (Remaining)	23	85.2%	4	14.8%	27	0
Non-Attend (Female)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0
Non-Attend (Male)	6	75.0%	2	25.0%	8	0
Totals	34	79.1%	9	20.9%	43	0

Prior Alcohol Abuse

A majority of the total sample reported prior alcohol abuse. The highest percentage (71.4%) occurred with the Training Group (Male), and the lowest (46.7%) with the Non-Attend (Female) group. The overall average was 58.4% across the entire sample.

Table 7. Alcohol Abuse

Research Groups	Yes	%	No	%	Total	Missing
Training Group (Female)	5	50.0%	5	50.0%	10	0
Training Group (Male)	5	71.4%	2	28.6%	7	0
Comparison Group	4	57.1%	3	42.9%	7	0
Control (Remaining)	43	58.9%	30	41.1%	73	1
Non-Attend (Female)	7	46.7%	8	53.3%	15	6
Non-Attend (Male)	11	52.4%	10	47.6%	21	1
Totals	75	56.4%	58	43.6%	133	8

Prior Drug Abuse

The rate of prior drug abuse is even higher than alcohol abuse (83.3%). The range of percentages of abuse for the various research groups is 57.1% to 87.5%.

Table 8. Drug Abuse

Research Groups	Yes	%	No	%	Total	Missing
Training Group (Female)	7	70.0%	3	30.0%	10	0
Training Group (Male)	4	57.1%	3	42.9%	7	0
Comparison Group	6	85.7%	1	14.3%	7	0
Control (Remaining)	63	87.5%	9	12.5%	72	2
Non-Attend (Female)	13	86.7%	2	13.3%	15	6
Non-Attend (Male)	17	81.0%	4	19.0%	21	1
Totals	110	83.3%	22	16.7%	132	9

JUVENILE LEGAL HISTORY

Juvenile Criminal Record

A minority of the research subjects have juvenile criminal records. The percentage who had criminal records from the research groups ranged from zero percent to 42.9% in the Comparison Group. Overall, 23.1% of the subjects in the research sample have juvenile criminal records.

Table 9. Juvenile Criminal Record

Research Groups	Yes	%	No	%	Total	Missing
Training Group (Female)	0	0.0%	10	100.0%	10	0
Training Group (Male)	2	28.6%	5	71.4%	7	0
Comparison Group	3	42.9%	4	57.1%	7	0
Control (Remaining)	20	27.0%	54	73.0%	74	0
Non-Attend (Female)	3	20.0%	12	80.0%	15	6
Non-Attend (Male)	3	14.3%	18	85.7%	21	1
Totals	31	23.1%	103	76.9%	134	7

ADULT LEGAL HISTORY

Felony Convictions Prior to Current Offense

Relevant to the topic of the types of people who participated in our sample is their criminal record prior to the offense which resulted in the most recent incarceration. For our sample, 73.8% of the subjects had felony convictions prior to the offense which led to their most recent incarceration. The

percentages for the research groups ranged from 50% to 100%. Of the 79 subjects who had prior felony convictions, 32 or 41% had 2 or more prior felony convictions.

Table 10. Felony Convictions Prior to Current Offense

Research Groups	Yes	%	No	%	Total	Missing
Training Group (Female)	6	75.0%	2	25.0%	8	2
Training Group (Male)	4	80.0%	1	20.0%	5	2
Comparison Group	5	100.0%	0	0.0%	5	2
Control (Remaining)	47	78.3%	13	21.7%	60	14
Non-Attend (Female)	6	50.0%	6	50.0%	12	9
Non-Attend (Male)	11	64.7%	6	35.3%	17	5
Totals	79	73.8%	28	26.2%	107	34

Current Offense

Almost all of the offenses which resulted in the most recent incarcerations of the subjects in our research sample were felonies (97%). In fact, only three of the charges were misdemeanors, and those three subjects were members of the Control (Remaining) Group.

Table 11. Felony Versus Misdemeanor: Current Offense

Research Groups	Felony	%	Mis Demeanor	%	Total	Missing
Training Group (Female)	10	100.0%	0	0.0%	10	0
Training Group (Male)	7	100.0%	0	0.0%	7	0
Comparison Group	7	100.0%	0	0.0%	7	0
Control (Remaining)	69	94.5%	4	5.5%	73	0
Non-Attend (Female)	15	100.0%	0	0.0%	15	6
Non-Attend (Male)	21	100.0%	0	0.0%	21	1
Totals	129	97.0%	4	3.0%	133	7

Admits Culpability

Overall, across the six research groups, 63% of the subjects were willing to admit culpability for their offenses. The two female groups (the Training Group and the Non-Attend Group) have a lower percentage than the male groups.

Table 12. Admits Culpability

Research Groups	Yes	%	No	%	Total	Missing
Training Group (Female)	5	50.0%	5	50.0%	10	0
Training Group (Male)	5	71.4%	2	28.6%	7	0
Comparison Group	5	71.4%	2	28.6%	7	0
Control (Remaining)	49	67.1%	24	32.9%	73	1
Non-Attend (Female)	6	40.0%	9	60.0%	15	6
Non-Attend (Male)	14	66.7%	7	33.3%	21	1
Totals	84	63.2%	49	36.8%	133	8

RISK ASSESSMENT

The Risk Assessment Score

The Probation Department completes a 12 item risk assessment survey concerning each probationer. The form has reportedly been validated and consists of a weighted checklist of facts regarding the subject. For example, a person gets a score of "0" for zero or one address change in the last twelve months; and a score of "2" for two address changes, and "3" for three or more address changes. For

"drug usage problems, the person gets a score of "0" for none, "2" for use in the past twelve months and no current use, and "5" for current use. Since the item rating scales are not interval scales, and not continuous, the use of the mean and median as measures of central tendency might be somewhat misleading; nevertheless they do give some indication of the comparability of the six experimental groups.

The means and the medians for the six research groups are quite similar. The Training Group (Male) and Comparison group means and medians are almost identical. Assuming these similarities would hold up for larger samples, it appears that samples drawn in the way done in this study produces research groups which are similar in their risks of re-offending.

Table 13. Risk Assessment Score

Research Groups	Mean	Median	Highest	Lowest	N	Missing
Training Group (Female)	20.0	22.5	38	1	10	0
Training Group (Male)	21.7	23.0	28	6	7	0
Comparison Group	21.0	24.0	28	4	7	0
Control (Remaining)	20.8	21.0	37	2	73	1
Non-Attend (Female)	21.4	20.0	33	9	15	6
Non-Attend (Male)	21.0	23.0	29	8	21	1
Totals	20.9	23.0	38	1	133	8

TRAINING VARIABLES

We collected two types of rating data from the training situation. The classroom teacher rated students regarding such factors as classroom behavior, attitude, and skills achievement. The student

rated the training in terms of its effectiveness and usefulness. Unfortunately, we were unable to collect much of this data. Therefore, we will not be reporting any results for these variables.

DEPENDENT VARIABLES

Institutional Adjustment

One hypothesis we had was that institutional adjustment would be better for those people who opted for Office Technology training versus no training. As shown in Table 14, about 70% of all the subjects in our sample received some kind of disciplinary action for misbehaving; and, in fact, the Training Groups received disciplinary actions at a lower rate than the "no training" subjects. Nevertheless, close to 60% of the Training Group males received discipline for misbehaving.

Table 14. Disciplinary Actions at RCCC

Research Groups	Yes	%	No	%	Total	Missing
Training Group (Female)	4	40.0%	6	60.0%	10	0
Training Group (Male)	4	57.1%	3	42.9%	7	0
Comparison Group	5	71.4%	2	28.6%	7	0
Control (Remaining)	51	69.9%	22	30.1%	73	1
Totals	64	69.9%	33	30.1%	97	1

Quality of Life

Research subjects were asked, six months after their release from RCCC, "Is your life better or worse than before your crime that resulted in probation?" Table 15 summarizes the results of the analysis

of the inmates' responses. A high percentage of subjects from all six research groups said that their life was better, and there appears to be little differences among the groups.

Table 15. Life Better Since Before Crime Resulting in Probation						
Research Groups	Yes	%	No	%	Total	Missing
Training Group (Female)	5	83.3%	1	16.7%	6	4
Training Group (Male)	5	83.3%	1	16.7%	6	1
Comparison Group	3	75.0%	1	25.0%	4	3
Control (Remaining)	45	84.9%	8	15.1%	53	20
Totals	58	84.9%	11	15.1%	69	28

Alcohol Abuse

The subjects were asked whether they have abused alcohol since their release from RCCC. The before RCCC percentage for the Training Group (male) was 71.4%. The percentages for the other groups are fairly similar to what they were prior to RCCC. The reliability of the Training Group (Male) results is very much in doubt because of the small sample size.

Table 16. Alcohol Abuse Since Release from RCCC						
Research Groups	Yes	%	No	%	Total	Missing
Training Group (Female)	5	55.6%	4	44.4%	9	1
Training Group (Male)	3	42.9%	4	57.1%	7	0
Comparison Group	3	60.0%	2	40.0%	5	2
Control (Remaining)	34	50.0%	34	50.0%	68	6
Totals	45	50.0%	44	50.0%	89	9

Drug Use

The subjects were also asked about their drug use after being released from RCCC. Table 17 contains these results. Once again, the Training Group (Male) percentage is substantially lower than the pre-RCCC percentage (57.1% versus 14.3%). For the other five groups, the pre and post-RCCC percentages are around 10 to 15 percentage points of one another.

Table 17. Drug Abuse Since Release from RCCC

Research Groups	Yes	%	No	%	Total	Missing
Training Group (Female)	6	60.0%	4	40.0%	10	0
Training Group (Male)	1	14.3%	6	85.7%	7	0
Comparison Group	5	83.3%	1	16.7%	6	1
Control (Remaining)	47	70.1%	20	29.9%	67	7
Totals	59	70.1%	31	29.9%	90	8

Community Legal Adjustment

"Since release from RCCC, was the offender arrested/convicted or in violation of probation?" Table 18 presents the results of this question. Almost half of the sample was either arrested, convicted or in violation of probation. The Comparison Group had the highest percentage (66.7%).

Table 18. Arrest, Conviction or Probation Violation since RCCC

Research Groups	Yes	%	No	%	Total	Missing
Training Group (Female)	4	40.0%	6	60.0%	10	0
Training Group (Male)	3	42.9%	4	57.1%	7	0
Comparison Group	4	66.7%	2	33.3%	6	1
Control (Remaining)	32	47.8%	35	52.2%	67	7
Totals	43	47.8%	47	52.2%	90	8

Employment After Release

One important dependent variable concerned whether or not the subject was employed at the six month date after being released from RCCC. Table 19 presents these results. As a result of the large amount of missing data, it is difficult to compare the before and after RCCC results. Probably most relevant is the fact that 6 of 17 training subjects were employed before RCCC and 5 after RCCC. Twenty nine control group subjects were employed before RCCC and 34 after RCCC.

Table 19. Employed Six Months after Release from RCCC

Research Groups	Yes	%	No	%	Total	Missing
Training Group (Female)	3	50.0%	3	50.0%	6	4
Training Group (Male)	2	28.6%	5	71.4%	7	0
Comparison Group	1	25.0%	3	75.0%	4	3
Control (Remaining)	33	61.1%	21	38.9%	54	20
Totals	39	61.1%	32	38.9%	71	27

Use of Computers on the Job

Did taking Office Technology have an effect on the number of subjects who use computers on the job. These data are particularly suspect because there are ten more subjects who provided a response than said that they had jobs six months after being released from RCCC. Nevertheless, the number of subjects who were both employed and using computers on the job was only two of the 17 who completed Office Technology training.

Table 20. Use Computers on the Job						
Research Groups	Yes	%	No	%	Total	Missing
Training Group (Female)	1	25.0%	3	75.0%	4	0
Training Group (Male)	1	33.3%	2	66.7%	3	0
Comparison Group	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	2	0
Control (Remaining)	5	12.5%	35	87.5%	40	0
Totals	7	12.5%	42	87.5%	49	0

CHAPTER 4

PROCESS EVALUATION

. Key factors in the research were:

- the research population consisted of inmates in county jails who typically serve sentences much less than 365 days; the short time span may make significant training interventions difficult;

- the specific type of training intervention, Office Technology, had not been formally studied;

- there were logistical challenges in that four different organizations needed to coordinate their efforts (the Board of Corrections, the Elk Grove Unified School District, the Sacramento County Sheriff's Department, and the Sacramento County Probation Department);

- the research required the tracking of research subjects over a long period of time (and the subjects come from population of people who are typically difficult to track after release);

- the study was conducted during a time of severe budgetary constraints in California; and, encouraging understaffed public agencies to add responsibilities (e.g., research tasks) to their normal full work loads represented a significant challenge.

Faced with these issues, we focused our process evaluation on a very basic question: ***"What does it take to do training-evaluation research in a jail setting?"*** As the research progressed, we identified a number of principles or criteria we think must be met in order to make such research feasible. In this chapter, we discuss each principle and assess the extent to which each was met in the current research.

We decided early on that this research would be as much a methodological study as an outcome study. For the benefit of future research, we wanted to determine the design and logistical problems that must be overcome to conduct useful training-evaluation research in the jail setting.

RESEARCH "READINESS" FACTORS

There were initially three jail training programs which were candidates for evaluation. In preparation for visiting each site prior to developing the research design, we formulated a number of questions which we planned to ask to assess whether research was possible at a given site. Upon review of the questions we had written, we realized that most, if not all, could be subsumed under the broad concept, *"To what extent are local personnel 'ready' to embark on a training-evaluation research project?"* Therefore, we have organized this chapter on "process evaluation" in terms of the factors related to the readiness of the training program at RCCC to conduct training evaluation. It is our

contention that unless a training site had adequately addressed each of these training-evaluation-readiness issues, evaluation research will be difficult if not impossible.

Some of the issues related to process evaluation depend on the analysis of the data that were collected and that will be presented in the next chapter. Therefore, some process-evaluation issues will be discussed in the next chapter also.

There are four readiness assessment factors areas that are critical to successful evaluation. They are:

1) ***Goals.*** The goals of the training, and the overall goals of the program, must be reasonable and clearly stated.

2) ***Target Groups.*** Acceptable criteria must be established for those who will participate in the research for both the treatment and control groups. In addition, a process must be established which reliably and accurately selects research subjects with the ability to learn or develop skills consistent with the requirements of the research design.

3) ***Training Content and Methods.*** The subject matter in the training and the method in which it is presented must be consistent with the program and training goals.

4) ***Record Keeping and Information Processing.*** Record keeping and research-subject tracking procedures must be in place to make a longitudinal study of the impact of training possible.

In the following section of the report, we will explain in greater detail the readiness factors, and then describe the strengths and weaknesses of the current study with regard to each factor. Our hope is that this analysis will guide future researchers in choosing research sites and conducting training-evaluation research.

READINESS DIMENSION #1: TRAINING GOALS

To make evaluation of a training program possible, the goals of the training and the overall goals of the program must be stated in unambiguous, detailed, and measurable terms. This principle becomes evident when one tries to measure whether a training program is successful. Without clear goals, how can one determine whether the training program is successful? How would one know?

The distinction between training and program goals is an important one. Training goals are the expectations regarding what students will achieve in the training. To determine this, one needs to ask, "What knowledge, skill or behavior must a student exhibit at the end of training in order to demonstrate mastery of the training material?" The method of measurement, and the standards that the student must achieve, must also be specified.

The goals of the program refers to the impact that one expects the training to have on the trainee's life after the trainee completes the training. It's one thing to know something; it's quite another to use the knowledge in some important way after completion of the training. The question with regard to jail training is: *"Does jail training produce a measurable difference in some aspect of post-release behavior of the former inmate?"*

In this research at RCCC, the goal of training was that a student successfully complete one or more module of the Office Technology instruction. The program goal was to increase trainees' marketable skills in the areas of office administration, secretarial duties, work processing, and desk-top publishing. All inmates who qualified for, and were interested, the training were admitted. The training was presented in a classroom where each student had access to his or her own computer work station. Students could have access to the computers and were able to work in the classroom for three hours per day. They could also study instructional material on their own time (away from the computers). Performance tests were administered regularly, and students were allowed to progress to the next lesson only after they had mastered the material they were working on. A final performance test had to be successfully completed for a person to receive credit for having completed a module. Each of the Office Technology modules took approximately 30 hours to complete. When released, those who successfully completed a module were expected to: a) have reduced recidivism, and b) have a job-placement rate of 60% of course graduates employed at $6.00 or more per hour.

Results

The goals of the Office Technology training were clearly stated and in measurable terms. The same instructor taught all of the modules. There was uniformity in the way the material was presented. Evaluations of performance were done according pre-established criteria. A uniform final exam was administered to the all the trainees in a particular module and the criteria of success were standardized.

To study a particular "treatment" such as a training program, one must satisfy the following competing demands: uniformity of treatment versus the need for an adequate sample size. For example, in this research we knew at the beginning that there was no specific training module at RCCC which would produce a sufficient sample size over the time span of the study (all the graduates over a twelve month period were included in the study). However, if we were willing to designate "the completion of any Office Technology module" as the treatment, we expected to generate a sufficient sample size of about 120 trainees in the treatment group.

By making this compromise, we thought we could avoid the problem of inadequate sample size. However, to do it, we had to decrease the uniformity of the treatment. There were a range of modules in the Office Technology curriculum from simply learning to operate the computer (including keyboard skills) to desk-top publishing. Someone who knows desk-top publishing probably has a better chance of being employed than someone who simply knows the operation of the computer without having a skill in a particular type of software. Nevertheless, trainees who

completed any one module of Office Technology training were expected to perform better on the dependent measures than the inmates at RCCC who did not receive training at all.

Conclusions Regarding Program Goals

The goals of the program were sufficiently well stated to serve as the basis for the development of measurable criteria of program success. The compromise in the uniformity of the program was necessary to make an adequate sample size possible, but also reduced the possibility of finding a significant treatment effect because some students would be less skilled than others at the end of the training.

READINESS DIMENSION #2: TARGET GROUPS

There are five criteria which can be used to establish the selection of the research subjects in a training evaluation study:

1) The potential subjects must have the basic knowledge, skills and abilities to be able to benefit from the training. For example, if it is necessary to have reading material in the training program that is written at the eighth grade level, then students who enter the program must be able to read at that level.

2) The potential subjects must be interested enough in the content of the training to put forth the effort required to master the material.

3) The potential subjects must have the opportunity to master the material. For example, they need enough time to study and practice the knowledge and skills being taught.

4) After the release back to the community, the potential subjects must have the opportunity to make use of the knowledge and skills which they obtain in training.

5) The control group must be selected so that the subjects are similar to the treatment group in important respects so that confounding factors which could confuse the results are minimized. For example, if the everyone in the training group were computer novices and everyone in the control group had work experience in the computer field, the control group would likely do better on the dependent variables than the treatment group. One might erroneously conclude that the training was ineffective, when in fact the problem was in the selection of the control group.

Results

To qualify for the Office Technology training, inmates took a preliminary measure called the "Locator." This test ultimately determined which level of the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE) that a person interested in taking training would take. A minimum score on the Locator was required for an inmate to take the follow-up exam.

Our intent was to first match the treatment and control groups in term of the Locator scores. While the Locator is not as precise a measurement as the full form TABE, it does provide some indication that the academic achievement of the treatment and control groups is sufficiently similar to eliminate academic achievement as a reason for group differences on the dependent variables. Based upon the Locator results, we concluded that those both the treatment and control groups possessed the basic skills needed to benefit from the training.

With regard to the second criterion, interest in the training, some difficulties surfaced. Our original intent was to select the training group from a larger list of those inmates qualified and interested in the training. Training staff at RCCC said that there were many more inmates interested in the training than there were training slots. However, that was not the situation during the research.

A second difficulty arose when we tried to match the treatment and control groups in terms of a measure of psychological adjustment. We considered administering the Beck Depression Inventory to treatment and control group members. The purpose was to match the treatment and control groups in terms of at least one measure of psychological adjustment. Our thinking was that if the treatment and control groups happened to possess a significantly different level of psychological adjustment, that alone might account for the results (for example, qualified inmates might be reluctant to sign up for training because they suffered from depression). The training administrators at RCCC judged that inmates would view psychological adjustment items negatively and would not give their cooperation. The administrators felt that this would negatively affect the inmate orientation meeting, during which the inventory would have to be given.

A third difficulty concerned the many kinds of training an inmate could receive at RCCC. In addition to Office Technology, there were courses regarding basic academic skills such as reading and writing, classes on parenting, domestic violence and other topics. We were interested in studying the effects of Office Technology and not a comparative study of one training compared with another. Therefore, we had to select a control group comprised on inmates who chose not to sign up for any training. While this allowed for a fairly unambiguous comparison, there was the danger that those uninterested in any training were different in other important ways related to the dependent variable (such as being also uninterested in post-release employment).

A fourth difficulty involved the fact that we had no control over the type of training treatment group subjects might take at RCCC in addition to Office Technology. For example, RCCC offered a course called "How to Get a Job." To further complicate the situation, those who attended this course were also eligible for job assistance which some inmates received and some did not. The best we could accomplish was to track the training (in addition to Office Technology) which inmates in the treatment group completed. In this way we hoped to be able to isolate whether Office Technology alone accounted for the results.

The third and fourth criteria related to the target group were satisfied, in our judgment, in that students in the class were given ample time and opportunity to master the content of the Office Technology module in which they enrolled. Also, in the opinion of the staff of a job placement service at RCCC, those who mastered the content of the Office Technology training would find a ready job market upon release from RCCC. Therefore, we believe the opportunity existed in the job market to translate skills acquired in the training into post-release employment.

Conclusions Regarding Target Groups

The treatment group satisfies the criteria previously stated. The control group is deficient in that members did not volunteer for training and the treatment group did. This difference could mean that there are fundamental differences between the treatment and control groups that could account for any dependent variable differences (in addition to, or instead of, any differences which were hypothesized to be the result of the Office Technology training). Despite confounding factors, we hoped that the many similarities between the treatment and control groups that did exist would help us to understand and explain the research results.

One recurring criticism by some researchers of jail education programs is the so-called "self-selection bias." This criticism relates to the fact that many, if not most, training programs rely on the voluntary participation of inmate-participants. The ideal research situation is where there are more inmates interested in the training than there are training opportunities, which permits the desirable strategy of randomly assigning people to treatment and control groups. On the other hand, it is never desirable to deny program participation to someone who would be helped by it simply to create a desirable research design.

In our situation, we had fewer people interested in the training than there were training slots. When this happens, staff cannot force inmates to participate in programs. Even when the court orders participation, a reluctant student might tend to be uncooperative, and therefore not benefit from the training. The fact remains that to prove that training works, the researcher must somehow show that

students who successfully completed the training, performed better on a relevant dependent variable, than did a comparable group of people who did not take the training.

When it is impossible to equate the treatment and control groups in terms of "interest in training," the researcher must create as much comparability between the two groups as possible, which is the strategy we used in this study.

READINESS DIMENSION #3. TRAINING METHODS AND ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS

For a training intervention to be effective, the training methods and training environment must be conducive to learning and consistent with the training content. The achievement standards must be relevant measures of student mastery of the material. Finally, the measurement of achievement must be an accurate assessment of the end-of-training skill and knowledge level of the students. If one or more of these ingredients is missing, research errors can easily occur. If inappropriate training methods are used, one could erroneously conclude that the students were not capable or that the training content was inappropriate. If achievement standards were not relevant or inaccurate, any conclusions about the effectiveness of the training would be invalid.

Results

The training methods and training environment for the Office Technology training at RCCC was excellent. Well lighted training rooms were equipped with approximately 15 individual computer

stations. The computer equipment was well maintained and up-to-date. Students received individualized and self-paced instruction from a full-time, credentialed, experienced teacher. Due to the small classes, students received almost immediate assistance when they needed it.

Achievement standards were defined in terms of work simulations or work samples. To progress through the course module, students took performance tests which required that they make use of the knowledge acquired. For example, a performance test in the word processing module might be the production of a business letter. The standard for acceptable performance was, stated generally: "the work must meet the criteria for acceptable work in typical employment after release from RCCC." Students were required to demonstrate in the classes the level of mastery of the material that would be required in future employment in order to progress to the class lesson.

Conclusions Regarding Training Methods and Achievement Standards

The training methods and environment were excellent. By using work samples and "on-the-job" criteria of good performance, the measurement of achievement was an accurate measure of achievement and relevant and to both the goals and content of the training.

READINESS DIMENSION #4: RECORD KEEPING AND INFORMATION SYSTEMS

It is impossible to conduct acceptable training evaluation research without being able to adequately track research subjects. For longitudinal research, such as in this study, accurate tracking is essential. The first difficulty which we encountered when we began the research is that the three jail/training

sites we considered for this study differed greatly in terms of the kinds of data gathered and maintained. In one site, we were told that there was no way to accurately ascertain the names of the inmates who show up for training (making tracking completely infeasible). At only the RCCC site did we have any possibility of gathering the kind of data needed for this type of research.

When we began this study, research subjects were estimated to be fairly easy to track. After all, the subjects were the wards of a legal system that depended on being able to keep track of people. The problem is that in this type of research one is dealing with four types of data: 1) data related to the inmate's pre-incarceration behavior (such as work history and legal history; 2) data related to a person's incarceration (such as booking date, disciplinary problems, release date); 3) training data (pre-test of knowledge/skills, training taken, achievement scores, documentation of completion); and, 4) data related to post-release behavior (employment, legal, adjustment). The four types of data are not maintained in the same system (i.e., in the same computer or manual data base). Getting the data from the different systems into the same research data base can easily require extensive resources beyond the scope of one legal authority or component of the criminal justice system.

Results: Pre-Incarceration and Post-Incarceration Behavior

These data were obtained from several sources. First, there is the national and state criminal justice computer data bases (e.g., regarding a person's legal history). Second, there is the county computer data base maintained by the sheriff's department (e.g., regarding a person's arrest and incarceration history). Third, there is data generated by the Probation Department as it processes people through the system (e.g., regarding a person's educational, work, family history and "risk assessment").

Fourth, there is post-release information that is only available through the probation department. The solution we arrived at for getting all these types of data consisted of enlisting the cooperation of the Sacramento County Probation Department, and also contracting with a department employee to gather the required data. A list of names of those inmates who were candidates for the treatment and control groups was forwarded to the probation department. The probation staff member under contract to the Board of Corrections accessed the data from the national, state and local computer data bases, and from probation officers' reports and data gathering forms. She forwarded the data to the Board of Corrections for entry into the research data base.

To get the required data for the study, this approach appeared to be the most feasible one. The returned data was, for the most part, complete and accurate. The one difficulty was getting the data sent to us in a timely fashion. The person supplying the data was gathering it on her own time, in addition to her regular duties. The shear volume of the data to be gathered by just one person created time delays.

The determination of the data which we intended to track from the probation reports was based upon the "typical" outline and content of such reports. For example, they typically included information about educational background and work history. Nevertheless, there was no way to guarantee that the data we needed would be present in each report; nor was there a way to retrieve data left off a report. Therefore, missing data was inevitable.

With regard to post-release behavior, we intended to include in the research only those inmates who would be released to formal supervision by the probation department (as opposed to those cases

which were "banked;" i.e., no direct, in person, contact by the probation department during the course of probation). We felt we needed this formal contact to adequately monitor the post-release behavior of the research subject. Two problems occurred with this approach. First, we found that using the direct-probation criterion that too many potential subjects were dropping out of the study. With reduced resources, the local probation department is banking an ever higher percentage of cases. We realized that our target sample size would never be reached with this criterion in place. Therefore, we modified the criterion to "placed on any type of probation with the Sacramento County Probation Department." The second problem encountered was that those inmates placed on direct supervision is that this type of supervision is being reserved for those convicted of fairly serious crimes (again the result of reduced resources). Restricting the study to serious offenders would create a treatment group composed of people especially difficult to employ.

Results: Incarceration Data

The most important data in this category included such variables as booking date, disciplinary record, and release date. We were able to get booking date from a training registration form collected by the training staff. Disciplinary record while incarcerated was gathered by the probation department staff member from the data base maintained by the sheriff's department. Release date, however, was most difficult to obtain. Inmate release dates often changed due to a number of reasons such early release due to "good time" credits and other reasons. However, there was no systematic way for the detention staff to communicate these changes to the training staff. As far as the training staff was concerned, some inmates would simply stop coming to training, and the training staff did not know why.

Results: Training Data

Giving the post-test (which was a re-administration of the Test of Adult Basic Education) was a hit-and-miss affair. So many people in the study were unable to take the test that it failed to serve as the post-test we had hoped to include in the study. While this was unfortunate, this test was probably not the best pre-post test in any event. One reason is that there was no opportunity to do a pre and post-test of the control group. The reason we included it was simply that it was the pre and post-test that was routinely given to all graduates of the Office Technology program. More relevant to this study than basic educational skills is: "What did students know about the content of the Office Technology module before and after the training?" To determine this, asked training subjects what, if anything, they knew about Office Technology skills prior to their taking the training at RCCC.

Conclusions Regarding Recordkeeping and Information Systems

We began this study hoping that one or more of the three sites considered for evaluation would have established the kinds of record keeping and information systems conducive to evaluation. The conclusions reached during this study about record keeping and information systems are as follows:

1) Unless educators are convinced of the importance of evaluation, and funding to support evaluation is available, the data gathering mechanisms will not be put in place to conduct adequate training evaluation research.

2) Unless educators are given some incentive to include evaluation in their programs, they will likely decide that expending resources on evaluation will detract from their ability to carry out their mission.

3) Unless the record keeping and information systems necessary for training evaluation are built into the training program, imposing evaluation on an existing training program will probably fail, or excessive resources will be required to conduct successful research. This is especially true if the other evaluation-readiness factors such as a proper training goal are absent also.

Process Evaluation Summary

By trying to conduct evaluation research in a setting where the readiness factors were not fully developed, we encountered many difficulties. The biggest problem was overestimating of the sample size we would get given the criteria for the research sample. Initially we were informed that we would get so many potential candidates for the research that paring the number down to manageable size would be a serious challenge. As it turned out, we were able to get 17 research subjects that completed the program and were released under the supervision of the probation department, rather than the anticipated 120 subjects.

Other unanticipated difficulties involved: a) assessing psychological functioning; b) obtaining a control group of those interested in Office Technology; c) being able to control the type of training

which inmates received in addition to Office Technology; d) getting adequate pre-post measurements on the treatment and control groups; e) getting release dates in a timely manner; and, f) the change of education program coordinator twice during the research study.

Our process results generally agree with Stern's baseline findings regarding education in California jails. Many programs need to improve their "readiness for evaluation" in order to support training evaluation research. Incentives in the form of additional funding may be necessary to encourage jail educators to include effective evaluation into their training programs.

Evaluation has not been a focus educators in correctional settings. The reasons include:

a) State funding for training is typically based upon "average daily attendance" type measures. Therefore, program viability necessarily depends upon building up class attendance. Diverting effort away from this goal to evaluation might actually be counter-productive from a program survival standpoint.

b) The long-term attendance (sufficient to complete a 30 day training program) of individuals in jail training is subject to many factors beyond the control of the training staff. For example: 1) candidates for training maybe given work assignments making class attendance impossible; 2) resources do not exist for counseling with inmates who's interest in the training wanes; 3) some inmates belong to groups where peer pressure militates against going to training (e.g., younger inmates, especially with gang affiliation); 4) jails by their very nature house people for relatively short

periods of time, making significant training interventions difficult; and, 5) the legal process takes precedence over the training process and therefore potential students can miss training because of many reasons related to their interaction with the legal system.

c) The inability of program staff to track people after their release from jail makes it impossible to assess what the effects of the training were the post-release setting.

d) We have a tradition of considering the value of education to be a truism, and the responsibility of educators is to supply the best education possible. To expend resources to "prove" what is already assumed to be true is not the focus of current training efforts. However, in this era of reduced resources, policy makers are now less willing than in the past to allocate resources based upon unproven assumptions.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

OUTCOME RESULTS CONCLUSIONS

The results of the outcome research, while not definitive, are interesting from a number of perspectives. Even with the small sample sizes, the data suggests certain conclusions. Regarding the inmates in the study:

- Most have an average education of less than 12 years.
- The majority were not employed at the time they committed the offenses which resulted in their incarceration.
- The majority have abused alcohol and most have abused drugs.
- Over 70% had been convicted of felonies prior to the offense resulting in their most recent incarceration.
- Almost all of the their most recent offenses were felonies.

- About 70% of them received some sort of disciplinary action for misbehaving while at RCCC.

- Half admitted to abusing alcohol and 60% admitted to using drugs within six months of leaving RCCC.

- Almost half were arrested, convicted or in violation of probation within six months of leaving RCCC.

With individuals having this kind of legal, education, employment, substance abuse and incarceration history, one wonders what kind of intervention at RCCC might have significantly altered their behavior for the better upon release? This is especially true when one considers:

- A student could complete a module of Office Technology training in only about 30 days.

- Only 12.5% of those inmates in the sample who were employed after leaving RCCC used computers on the job.

At the beginning of our research, we did not have the kind of data which would have allowed us to accurately assess the backgrounds of the inmates who would end up participating in the study. Had we known that they were such poor risks for future employment, we do not believe that we would

have hypothesized that as little as 30 days of Office Technology training would have a significant effect on their employability.

Our primary conclusion from these results is that it is risky to embark on research designed to measure the effect of an intervention if one is uncertain that the research subjects are prepared to benefit from the intervention. The dilemma with which we were faced was that these student "readiness" evaluations were simply not available. Until such data become routinely available, research regarding interventions designed to positively affect post-incarceration behavior will be risky ventures.

Although from a research perspective there were several obstacles and disappointments that occurred, this project has added to the body of literature documenting what needs to be improved at the local program level, and is consistent with similar findings by other researchers.

PROCESS RESULTS CONCLUSIONS

Researchers Should First Assess the Operational Adequacy of Programs and the Independent Variable. If Needed, Programs Should be Further Developed Before Conducting a Formal Evaluation.

Our experiences in reviewing the operations of three programs, coupled with the previously described findings of the recent update of the California baseline study (Stern, 1994), suggests that

there is great disparity in program quality and development among local school districts and county jail systems. Since approximately two-thirds of California counties/districts that operate jail education/vocation programs do not measure learning progress of program participants (Stern, 1994), many programs may be best served by undergoing a systematic operational analysis, and conducting further program development, before conducting a formal program evaluation.

Training/planning sessions, coupled with technical assistance, may be needed components and should focus an operational analysis on five major readiness areas of goals, target group, selection, methods/achievement standards, and recordkeeping/information systems. When programs are sufficiently developed in these areas, formal program evaluation should be considered.

Length of Stay and Expected Program Achievement Should be Carefully Considered When Identifying Dependent Variables.

A central question that we think should be carefully considered by program policymakers and evaluators is, *"What are realistic achievement expectations for short term intervention programs?"* Programs should specify in what ways they expect to have a measurable impact on participants.

Although there is a growing emphasis on identifying "public paybacks" of programs, and evaluators may wish to test many possible post-release dependent variables, it is important that programs do not overstate their expected impact on measures such as recidivism, employment, or institutional adjustment. Some program policymakers that we interviewed questioned if a few weeks of jail education programming is likely to have any significant impact in remediating inmates' behavioral

problems, propensity for criminality, or raising employment skills, unless programming is combined with some type of tailored post-release services. We agree.

Self Selection and Attendance Variability are Major Issues to Consider in Developing and/or Evaluating Jail Programs.

Inmates are confined against their will and many programs operate on a voluntary basis as a correctional or rehabilitative adjunct to a jail's custodial responsibility to incarcerate offenders for punishment and for the protection of public safety. Often in this environment, inmates may choose to enroll or not enroll in a program; not attend a program even if enrolled; or once enrolled, may be unable to attend due to disciplinary matters, court dates or attorney meetings, and other factors that are not issues in programs operated outside of a jail environment.

Each of the three jail programs we assessed had components of inmate self-selection, which is consistent with findings in the recent California baseline study (Stern, 1994). As previously indicated, we do not see self-selection (or volunteering to participate) as a program flaw provided that sufficient screening mechanisms are in place to ensure that volunteers meet target group criteria and have an ability to benefit from program participation. Programs with components of self selection may need to develop sufficient screening mechanisms to meet the readiness criteria for formal evaluation.

The jail environmental factors pose special challenges for program operations. In addition to sufficient screening mechanisms to ensure that voluntary participants meet target criteria and can

benefit, incentives for program participation that may reduce attendance variability should be considered. Closer integration of program selection criteria with inmate custody classification procedures may help programs in proactively identifying target group candidates in the inmate population, and reduce reliance on inmate self selection into the program candidate pool.

An Effective Working Relationship and Mutual Understanding of Needs Between Custody and Education Authorities is an Important Factor in Program Operations.

Custodial duties are primary responsibilities of jail facilities to enable secure detention and safe operations. The degree to which jails also operate as correctional facilities, and integrate various programs into operations, depends greatly on the philosophies and viewpoints of the county sheriff and jail administrators, and on the availability of necessary resources for correctional programming.

Programs that operate in a jail environment where there is a good working relationship and mutual understanding of needs between custody staff and educators reportedly have less problems in program operations. Custody division administrative and general line staff support appears essential if programs are to operate at maximum effectiveness. Many that we interviewed during our on-site program reviews cited examples of how problems in these relationships and understandings can negatively impact program operations. One example cited was that inmates in a program might be placed on conflicting work assignments without any knowledge or consideration of prior program assignment.

Comprehensive Program Evaluations Will Likely Require a Multi-Disciplinary Team Effort and May Require Supplemental Funding for Data Collection.

Major program evaluations that assess operations and community outcomes will likely require the close working involvement of policymakers and staff representing education, custody, and probation (or other community based) authorities. Areas of inquiry, and data sources, will likely cross lines of single authority.

Determining inmate behavior/adjustment in the community after release will likely require the involvement of probation authorities with the ability to verify measures in areas such as social adjustment, employment, and whether new arrests or convictions occur. It is important that evaluators not rely solely on inmate self-reporting, but also verify data on critical dependent variables that may be tested (e.g.,. employment, recidivism). Recidivism data should be gathered not only from local data bases, but also state and/or national data bases.

Since many probation departments currently lack sufficient staffing to supervise all probationers in the community, it may be necessary for evaluators to provide funding for community follow-up data collection. Likewise, it may be necessary for evaluators to provide funding for additional staff time of educators or custody staff that are involved in data collection.

Summary

We hope that this report of our experiences and viewpoints provides some useful information to those interested in developing or evaluating jail-based education/vocation programs.

It is clear from the literature findings and our program reviews that many programs could benefit first from a thorough and systematic operational analysis, and further program development, in five major readiness areas of goals, target group, selection, methods/achievement standards, and recordkeeping/information systems, before developing and conducting formal evaluation studies. Such an approach would likely involve training, planning and technical assistance components to aid program development.

Programs that are sufficiently developed in the five readiness areas should consider developing and conducting formal program evaluations that document results and impact on participants. We suggest that all training programs in jail settings develop the capacity evaluate effectiveness and impact on a regular basis. Formal program evaluations of outcomes should include experimental design features if possible. The ability to provide credible impact and outcome data will prove useful to programs in answering questions increasingly being posed by funding sources and legislators seeking to document "public paybacks" or results of jail education/vocation programs.

REFERENCES

Browing, Mary Lou. *"A Town Hall Summit on the Education of Jail Inmates."* February 1994.

Browing, Mary Lou. *"A Report on the Future of Educating Adults in California Jails."* June 1994.

Florida Department of Corrections. *"Job History Follow-up Study of Vocationally Certificated Inmates Released to Parole Mandatory Correctional Release During Fiscal Year 1977-1978."* 1979 Report.

Gleason, S. E. *"Inmate Attitudes Toward Vocational Training -- A Case Study of Vocational Training Students in the State Prison of Southern Michigan."* Journal of Offender Counseling, Services and Rehabilitation, Vol. 10, No. 4. Summer 1986.

Hackett, B. *"Correctional Education: A Way to Stay Out."* Illinois Council on Vocational Education, Springfield, IL. 1988.

Khatibi, M. *"Curriculum for Life Skills Training Programs in a Correctional Setting."* Journal of Correctional Education, Vol. 39, No. 3. September 1988.

Lattimore, P.K., et. al. *"Experimental Assessment of the Effect of Vocational Training on Youthful Property Offenders."* Evaluation Review, Vol. 4, No. 2. April 1990.

Markley, H., et. al. *"Offender Skills Training and Employment Success -- An Evaluation of Outcomes."* Corrective and Social Psychiatry and Journal of Behavior Technology Methods and Therapy, Vol. 29, No. 1. 1983.

Marshall, W.L. et. al. *"Evaluation of Life Skills Training for Penitentiary Inmates."* Canada Correctional Services, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada. 1989.

Mayre, L. *"New Orleans (LA) Criminal Sheriff's Cooking and Baking Program -- Evaluation Report."* Mayors Criminal Justice Coordinating Council. 1979.

Riechers, L. and Shreves, M. *"Evaluation of the Reading to Reduce Recidivism Program."* Texas Criminal Justice Policy Council. 1992.

Sayler, W.G. and Gaes, G.G. *"Post Release Employment Project: Prison Work has Measurable Effects on Post-Release Success."* Federal Prisons Journal, Vol. 2, No. 4. Winter 1992.

Stern, Barry. *"Baseline Study: Education in County Jails."* March 1990.

Stern, Barry. *"Baseline Study: Education in California Jails -- Update of 1990 Study."* June 1994.

Zumpetta, A.W. *"Full-Time Vocational Training in Corrections: Measuring Effectiveness Versus Appearance."* Journal of Correctional Education, Vol. 39, No. 3. September 1988.

ENDNOTES

1. The Chancellor's Office of the California community colleges is the State grant recipient of federal funds through the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Act. In FY 1992/93, they contracted the BOC to distribute $60,000 in Perkins Act funds to local programs, with mutual understandings that this would be a multi-year dissemination effort and the funding amounts to local programs would likely increase. The BOC developed a Request for Proposals process, solicited proposals from local programs, and disseminated $20,000 grants for program operations to three jail vocational education programs of local school districts in three California county jails operated by sheriffs' departments. In FY 1993/94, the Chancellor's Office notified the BOC that future funds to local programs would no longer be distributed through the BOC, but would instead be distributed through the California Department of Corrections (CDC). CDC operates the State prison and parole system in California.

2. NIJ assigned two consultants to work with and advise the BOC on the evaluation design and the overall project. The two NIJ consultants that worked with the BOC on this project are Dr. Ed McGarrell, University of Indiana, and Dr. Tim Bynum, Michigan State University.

Appendix A:
List of Variables

NIJ SYSFILE INFORMATION:

IDENTIFICATION
I001 BOC#
[redacted] Start date
[redacted] Treat/Cont
I004 Attending class

REGISTRATION FORM
R001 Date reg. form recd
R002 Name
R003 SS#
R004 X-REF #
R005 Gender
R006 Last grade
R007 Enroll date
R008 DOB
R009 Language
R010 Ethnicity
R011 Release
R011 Verified Release Date
RELM * No label *
RELDAY * No label *
RELYEAR* No label *
R012 Zip
R013 Jail work
R014 GED
R015 HS Diploma
R016 Dorm
R017 Birthplace
R018 Drug/alcoh
R019 Public Assist
R020 PA Type
R021 EMP/ARREST
R022 Occupation
R023 Yearly income
R024 Pre-TABE Read
R025 Pre-TABE Math
R026 Pre-TABE Lang
R027 Pre-TABE Level
R028 Post-TABE Read
R029 Post-TABE Math
R030 PostTABE Lang
R031 PostTABE Level
R032 Release proj
R033 Class
R034 Class 1
[redacted]5 Class 2
[redacted]6 Class 3
[redacted]037 Class 4
R038 Class 5

SUPPLEMENTAL FORM
RS001 Date supp rec
RS002 Emp/att confirm
RS003 Full/Part-Time
RS004 Wage/hr
RS005 Employ type
RS006 "Other" text
RS007 Back to job
RS008 "No label "
RS009 Locator 2nd

EVALUATION BY STUDENT
EOT001 Date eval rec
EOT002 Date filled out
EOT003 Computer b/4 RCCC
EOT004 WP skills b/4 RCCC
EOT005 Comp skills b/4 OT
EOT006 Comp skills aft OT
EOT007 Comp sftware b/4 OT
EOT008 Comp sftware aft OT
EOT009 Skills for comp job
EOT010 Skills to get WP job
EOT011 Overall eval
EOT012 Liked best
EOT013 Liked least
EOT014 OT w/o credits

EVALUATION OF STUDENT
EOS001 Date form recd
EOS002 OT subject
EOS003 Begin date
EOS004 Ending date
EOS005 Highest grade
EOS006 College degree
EOS007 Degree type
EOS008 Prior OT at RCCC
EOS009 Type of prior OT
EOS010 Prior OT elsewhere
EOS011 Prior type elsewhere
EOS012 Where elsewhere
[redacted]S013 Prior OT office exp
[redacted]S014 Type OT exp
EOS015 Type OT certs
EOS016 Behavior
EOS017 Attitude
EOS018 Skills
EOS019 Self-starter

PROBATION HISTORY REPORT: OVERALL
P000 Date form recd
P001 PO name(last, first)
P002 PO Ph#
P003 Date filled out
P004 CII #
P005 Probation #
P006 SS#
P007 Subject ph#
P008 Address
P009 Apt#
P010 City
P011 State
P012 Zip
P013 Date booked
P014 Have residence
P015 Reside with
P016 Employed at offense
P017 Full/Part-time
P018 If working, wage/hr
P019 Employ type
PR19A Employ other
P020 Returning to job
P021 Car for work
P022 Highest grade
P023 HS/GED
P024 Prior OT Trng
P025 College w/o degree
P026 College degree
P027 Military
P028 Marital status
P029 Alcohol abuse
P030 Alcohol treat
P031 Domestic vio
P032 Drug use
P033 Drug Treat
P034 Gang
P035 Inpatient/psych
P036 Outpatient/psych
P037 Child abuser
P038 Psych meds
P039 Child abuse victim
P040 Amphetamine
P041 Cocaine/crack
P042 Cocaine/powder
P043 Heroin
P044 Marijuana
P045 PCP
P046 Other

PROBATION REPORT: JUVENILE RECORD
PI047 Juv record
PI048 Date 1st juv adjud
PI049 # juv adjud
PI050 Armed robbery
PI051 Assault battery
PI052 Auto theft
PI053 Burglary
PI054 Drug use/poss
PI055 Drug sale
PI056 Alcohol offense/DUI
PI057 Escape
PI058 Forgery/NSF
PI059 Manslaughter/kidnap
PI060 Property theft
PI061 Robbery
PI062 Sex offense
PI063 Weapons offense
PI064 Other offense
PI065 Use amphetamine
PI066 Use cocaine/crack
PI067 Use cocaine/powder
PI068 Use heroin
PI069 Use marijuana
PI070 Use PCP
PI071 Use other
PI072 Sell amphetamine
PI073 Sell cocaine/crack
PI074 Sell cocaine/powder
PI075 Sell heroin
PI076 Sell marijuana
PI077 Sell PCP
PI078 Sell other
PI079 Gang related
PI080 Use force
PI081 Use weapon
PI082 Injure victim
PI083 Alcohol/drug inf
PI084 YA/State school
PI085 Ranch/camp
PI086 Ward w/juv hall
PI087 Ward w/o juv hall
PI088 Informal dispo
PI089 Prob violation

PROBATION REPORT: ADULT RECORD
PII090 Adult record
PII091 Arrest #
PII092 Felony conv #
PII093 Misd #
PII094 Gang related
PII095 Use force
PII096 Use weapon
PII097 Injure victim
PII098 Alcohol/drug inf
PII099 Armed robbery
PII100 Assault battery
PII101 Auto theft
PII102 Burglary
PII103 Drug use/poss
PII104 Drug sale
PII105 Alcohol offense/DUI
PII106 Escape
PII107 Forgery/NSF
PII108 Manslaughter/kidnap
PII109 Property theft
PII110 Robbery
PII111 Sex offense
PII112 Weapons offense
PII113 Other offense
PII114 Use amphetamine
PII115 Use cocaine/crack
PII116 Use cocaine/powder
PII117 Use heroin
PII118 Use marijuana
PII119 Use PCP
PII120 Use other
PII121 Sell amphetamine
PII122 Sell crack cocaine
PII123 Sell powder cocaine
PII124 Sell heroin
PII125 Sell marijuana
PII126 Sell PCP
PII127 Sell other
PII128 Probation vio
PII129 State prison
PII130 Prob w/ jail
PII131 Prob w/o jail
PII132 Summary prob
PII133 Jail
PII134 Fine
PII135 1st off code
PII136 1st off type
PII137 1st off M/F
PII138 1st off conv code
PII139 2nd off code
PII140 2nd off type
PII141 2nd off M/F
PII142 2nd off conv code
PII143 Use amphetamine
PII144 Use cocaine/crack
PII145 Use cocaine/powder
PII146 Use heroin
PII147 Use marijuana
PII148 Use PCP
PII149 Use other
PII150 Sell amphetamine
PII151 Sell cocaine/crack
PII152 Sell cocaine/powder
PII153 Sell heroin
PII154 Sell marijuana
PII155 Sell PCP
PII156 Sell other
PII157 Admits culpability
PII158 Gang related
PII159 Use force
PII160 Use weapon
PII161 Injure victim
PII162 Alcohol/drug inf
PII163 Monetary loss
PII164 Monetary loss $
PII165 Prob length; months
PII166 Jail sent; days
PII167 # misd conv
PII168 # felony conv

RISK ASSESSMENT FORM
RA001 Date form rec'd
RA002 Assessment date
RA003 Address change
RA004 School/employed
RA005 Alcohol problems
RA006 Drug problems
RA007 Attitude
RA008 1st convict age
RA009 # felony convict
RA010 # prob periods
RA011 # prob violations
RA012 Type of offenses
RA013 Drug sales
RA014 Institutionalized
RA015 Total
VAR00001 Report/File completed

FOLLOWUP FORM
F000 Date form rec'd
F001 Follow up date
F002 PO name
F003 PO phone #
F004 Date filled out
F005 Subject phone #
F006 Address
F007 Apt #
F008 City
F009 State
F010 Zip code
F011 RCCC entry date
F012 RCCC release date
F013 Disciplinary at RCCC
F014 # of minor disc
F015 # of major disc
F016 OT useful
F017 Why useful
F018 Why take OT
F019 Why not take OT
F020 Life better/worse
F021 Why better/worse
F022 $ for expenses
F023 How many children
F024 Child live w/subject
F025 Subject has home
F026 If yes, w/whom
F027 Subject homeless
F028 Public asst
F028A PA type
F029 Physical disab
F030 Alcohol abuse
F031 Alcohol treat
F032 Domestic vio
F033 Drug use
F034 Drug treat
F035 Gang
F036 Inpatient/psych
F037 Outpatient/psych
F038 Child abuser
F039 Psych meds
F040 Use amphetamine
F041 Use cocaine/crack
F042 Use cocaine/powder
F043 Use heroin
F044 Use marijuana
F045 Use PCP
F046 Use other
F047 Arrest/conv/vio
F048 Arrest dismissed
F049 New case misd
F050 New case felony
F051 Tech violation
F052 Conv/misd
F053 Conv/felony
F054 In jail since RCCC
F054A how many days
F055 Probation revoked
F056 Prison since RCCC
F057 If yes, months
F058 Jail for new vio
F059 If yes, months
F060 Sentence to prob
F061 If yes, months
F062 Gang related
F063 Case pending
F064 Conviction
F065 Use of force
F066 Case pending
F067 Conviction
F068 Use of weapon
F069 Case pending
F070 Conviction
F071 Injure victim
F072 Case pending
F073 Conviction
F074 Alcohol/drug inf
F075 Case pending
F076 Conviction
F077 Monetary loss
F078 Case pending
F079 Conviction
F080 Monetary loss $
F081 Job training
F082 Training type
F083 OT training
F084 Training type
F085 Formal educ
F086 Educ type
F087 Aft RCCC employ date
F088 Employed
F089 PT/FT
F090 Hourly wage
F091 Employ type
F093 Describe job
F094 Same job as b/4 RCCC
F095 Use OT on job
F096 Job satisfaction
F097 # of jobs since RCCC
F098 Employed since RCCC
F099 PT/FT
F100 Hourly wage
F101 Main emp
F101A * No label *
F102 Weeks employ
F103 Use comp on job
F104 Arrest #1 date
F105 Section code
F106 Code
F107 Arrest type
F108 Felony/Misd
F109 Conv
F110 Conv type
F111 Conv date
F112 Arrest #2 date
F113 Section code
F114 Code
F115 Arrest type
F116 Felony/Misd
F117 Conv
F118 Conv type
F119 Conv date
F120 Arrest #3 date
F121 Section code
F122 Code
F123 Arrest type
F124 Felony/Misd
F125 Conv
F126 Conv type
F127 Conv date
F128 Arrest #4 date
F129 Section code
F130 Code
F131 Arrest type
F132 Felony/Misd
F133 Conv
F134 Conv type
F135 Conv date
F136 Arrest #5 date
F137 Section code
F138 Code
F139 Arrest type
F140 Felony/Misd
F141 Conv
F142 Conv type
F143 Conv date
F144 more than 5 arrests
F145 If yes, #
F146 More than 5 conv
F147 If yes, #
VAR00002 Follow-up form completed
FOLLOWUP* No label *

FILE CHARACTERISTICS
- File c:\kohls\nij\dat\treatmnt.sav
- Created: 15 Nov 95 09:30:22 - 428 variables and 89 cases
- File Type: SPSS Data File
- N of Cases: 89
- Total # of Defined Variable Elements: 476
- Data Are Not Weighted
- Data Are Compressed
- File Contains Case Data

Appendix B:
Data Collection Forms

SACRAMENTO COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT
ADULT EDUCATION ENROLLMENT FORM

NAME_____ SOC SEC#_____
LAST FIRST
X-REF_____ SEX: M F LAST GRADE COMPLETED_____

ENTRY DATE_____ BIRTH DATE_____ LANGUAGE SPOKEN:_____
ETHNICITY: [ ]WHITE [ ]BLACK [ ]HISPANIC [ ]AM. INDIAN [ ]ASIAN/PAC ISL [ ]OTHER

RELEASE DATE_____ HOME ZIP CODE_____ JOB ASSIGNMENT_____
GED: Yes__ No__ HS DIPLOMA: Yes___ No___ DORM_____ BUNK____BIRTHPLACE_____

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:
IS YOUR ARREST DRUG OR ALCOHOL RELATED? [ ]YES [ ]NO
AT THE TIME OF YOUR ARREST WERE YOU RECEIVING PUBLIC ASSISTANCE [ ]YES [ ]NO
(CIRCLE ONE) AFDC, SS, GA, SSI, SDI, HANDICAPPED, EMPLOYED
AT THE TIME OF YOUR ARREST WERE YOU EMPLOYED? [ ]YES [ ]NO
IF SO, WHAT WAS YOU PRIMARY OCCUPATION?_____
YEARLY INCOME (CIRCLE ONE) A:$0-7,000 B:$7,501-10,000 - C:$10,001-15,000 D:$15,001-20,000 E:OVER

PRE TEST SCORES _____ _____ _____ LEVEL _____

POST TEST SCORES _____ _____ _____ LEVEL _____

GED TEST SCORES _____ _____ _____ _____ _____

PROJ. REL. DATE: _____199__ OFFICE TECH:_____ JOB SKILLS:_____

CLASSES: 1._____ 2._____ 3._____ 4._____ 5._____ LOCATOR SCORE_

EMPLOYMENT INFORMATION

CJIS X-REF#: _____

Case Name:

Last : _____
First : _____
Middle: : _____

DOB (*YY/MM/DD*): ____/____/____

Gender: ☐ Male
☐ Female

Was the inmate employed at the time of the current offense?

☐ No
☐ Yes

If "yes," answer the following:

☐ Full Time
☐ Part Time

Hourly Income: $ _____

Employment Type:

☐ Unskilled labor
☐ Non-Office Skilled Labor
☐ Office Work Related to Office Tech. Training
☐ Office Professional
☐ Office Other (e.g., mail room)
☐ Other (*specify*): _____

Is the inmate returning to this job upon release?

☐ No
☐ Yes

Upon release, will the inmate have the use of a car to go to work?

☐ No
☐ Yes

TRAINER EVALUATION

TRAINEE: _____ CJIS X-REF #: _____
(Last) (First) (MI)

TRAINING SUBJECT: _____ Begin Date: _____
End Date: _____

EDUCATION HISTORY:

Highest Grade Level Completed: _____

Does trainee have any college degrees? ☐ No ☐ Yes
Type: _____

Has trainee had any prior computer/office technology training at RCCC? ☐ No ☐ Yes
Type: _____

Has trainee had any prior computer/office technology training elsewhere? ☐ No ☐ Yes
Type: _____
Where: _____

Has trainee had any prior computer/office experience: ☐ No ☐ Yes
Type: _____

Other training certificates (while incarcerated): _____
_____
_____

PERSONAL EVALUATION:

After the trainee has achieved a completion certificate, please rate the trainee in the following areas according to the following scale:

5 = Very Good
4 = Good
3 = Average
2 = Below Average
1 = Poor

Topic	Rating
How would you rate the trainee's behavior in the classroom?	_____
How would you rate the trainee's attitude towards future work?	_____
How would you rate the trainee's skills in the subject area in which he/she achieved a certificate?	_____
How would you rate the trainee as a "self-starter"?	_____

OFFICE TECHNOLOGY
Student Evaluation

Name of Student:_____ XREF:_____

1. Date:__ __ / __ __ / __ __

2. Prior to coming to RCCC, I worked in a job which required the use of a computer. *Yes*_____ *No*_____

3. Prior to coming to RCCC, I worked in a job where I used word processing or desktop publishing computer software.

   *Yes*_____ *No*_____

4. Rate your computer skills before taking the Office Technology class. Use this 10-point scale. Circle one number.

   No skills 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 *Very highly skilled*

5. Rate your computer skills after taking the Office Technology class. Use this 10-point scale. Circle one number.

   No skills 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 *Very highly skilled*

6. Rate your skill in using office computer software (such as word processing) before taking the Office Technology training class. Circle one number.

   No skills 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 *Very highly skilled*

7. Rate your skill in using office computer software after taking the Office Technology training class. Circle one number.

   No skills 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 *Very highly skilled*

8. I now have the skill to get a job which involves using a computer. *Yes*_____ *No*_____

9. I now have the skill to get a job which requires word processing or desk top publishing. *Yes*_____ *No*_____

10. Overall, I think what I learned in this class will (check one):

    *Not be very useful*_____ *Be of limited use*_____ *Be useful*_____ *Be very useful*_____

11. This is what I liked best about the Office Technology class (write comment):

12. This is what I liked least about the Office Technology class (write comment):

13. Would you have chosen to participate in the Office Technology Program if you would not have earned education-time credits off your sentence in this program or any other RCCC education program? *Yes*_____ *No*_____

BOC ID#_____

CALIFORNIA BOARD OF CORRECTIONS PROBATION REPORT/FILE DATA COLLECTION FORM

IDENTIFICATION

CJIS X-REF #: _____
Case Name: _____
Last: _____
First: _____
Middle: _____
DOB (YY/MM/DD): _____
Gender: Male:☐ Female: ☐
Ethnicity:
☐ Asian/Pac. Islands
☐ African American
☐ Caucasian
☐ Hispanic
☐ Native American
Other: _____

1. Name of Probation Officer Coder:
   _____
2. P.O. Phone Number: (___)___-____
3. Date Form was filled out: (YY/MM/DD):
   _____
4. CII # _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _
5. Probation # _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _
6. SS # _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _
7. Probationer Phone Number:(___)___-____
8. Address: Number & Street
   _____
9. Apartment #:_____
10. City:_____
11. State:_____
12. Zip Code: _____

BACKGROUND

13. Date booked into RCCC: _ __/__/__
14. Upon release, will the inmate have a residence where he/she will reside? ☐ Yes ☐ No
15. If Yes, indicate the following:
    The inmate will live with: (*check one*)
    Alone ☐ Family/Spouse/Domestic Partner ☐ Friends ☐
16. Employed at time of current offense?
    ☐ Yes ☐ No
17. If Yes, answer the following:
    ☐ Full Time
    ☐ Part Time
18. If Yes, Hourly Income: $ ___ ___ ___ . ___ ___
19. Employment type: (*check one*)
    ☐ Unskilled Labor
    ☐ Non-Office Skilled Labor
    ☐ Office Work Related To Office Tech. Training
    ☐ Office Professional
    ☐ Office Other (e.g., mail room)
    ☐ Other (*specify*):_____
20. Is inmate returning to this job upon release?
    ☐ Yes ☐ No
21. Upon release, will the inmate have the use of a car for going to work? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown
22. Education:
    Last Grade Completed: _____
23. High School Grad. Or GED: ☐ Yes ☐ No
24. Prior Office Tech. Training: ☐ Yes ☐ No
25. Some College (no degree): ☐ Yes ☐ No
26. College Degree: ☐ AA ☐ BA ☐ BS ☐ MS
27. Military Service: ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown

BACKGROUND (CONT.)

8. Current Marital Status: *(check one)*

Single, never married	☐ Yes	☐ No
Divorced/Widowed	☐ Yes	☐ No
Common Law/ Domestic Partner	☐ Yes	☐ No
Married	☐ Yes	☐ No

SOCIAL HISTORY

Past History Of:	Yes	No	Unknown
29. Alcohol Abuse	☐	☐	☐
30. Alcohol Treatment	☐	☐	☐
31. Domestic Violence	☐	☐	☐
32. Drug Use: illicit *(note below)*	☐	☐	☐
33. Drug Treatment	☐	☐	☐
34. Gang Involvement	☐	☐	☐
35. Inpatient Psych Treatment	☐	☐	☐
36. Outpatient Professional Counseling	☐	☐	☐
37. Perpetrator of Child Abuse	☐	☐	☐
38. Was prescribed psych. meds	☐	☐	☐
39. Victim Of Child Abuse	☐	☐	☐

Type Drug Use: *(check all that apply)*

40. Amphetamine ☐
41. Cocaine (crack) ☐
42. Cocaine (powder) ☐
43. Heroin ☐
44. Marijuana ☐
45. PCP ☐
46. Other: _____ ☐

JUVENILE RECORD

47. Prior Juvenile Record of Adjudications?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If No, skip to number 90. If Yes, continue.

48. If Yes, Date of First Juvenile Adjudication:

__/__/__

49. Total Number Of Juvenile Adjudications:

_____

Indicate The Number Of Juvenile Offense Adjudications By Categories That Most Closely Applies:

50._____ Armed Robbery
51._____ Assault/Battery
52._____ Auto Theft
53._____ Burglary
54._____ Drug Use/Possession (*note below*)
55._____ Drug Sale *(note below)*
56._____ DUI Or Other Alcohol Offenses
57._____ Escape
58._____ Forgery Or NSF Checks
59._____ Manslaughter/Kidnap
60._____ Other Property Theft
61._____ Robbery
62._____ Sex Offense
63._____ Weapons Offense
64._____ Other:

Type Drug Use/Possession: *(check all that apply)*

65. Amphetamine ☐
66. Cocaine (crack) ☐
67. Cocaine (powder) ☐
68. Heroin ☐
69. Marijuana ☐
70. PCP ☐
71. Other: _____ ☐

Type Drug Sale: *(check all that apply)*

72. Amphetamine ☐
73. Cocaine (crack) ☐
74. Cocaine (powder) ☐
75. Heroin ☐
76. Marijuana ☐
77. PCP ☐
78. Other: _____ ☐

JUVENILE RECORD

Indicate If The Following Factors Were Present In Any Prior Juvenile Adjudication:

	Yes	No	Unknown
79. Gang Related	☐	☐	☐
80. Force or Threat of Force	☐	☐	☐
81. Use of a Weapon	☐	☐	☐
82. Victim Physical Injury	☐	☐	☐
83. Under Influence of Alcohol/Drugs	☐	☐	☐

Prior Juvenile Dispositions? *(check all that apply)*

84. Youth Authority/State Training School ☐
85. Ranch/Camp ☐
86. Ward On Probation With Juv. Hall Sentence ☐
87. Ward On ProbationWithout Juv.Hall Sentence ☐
88. Informal Dispositions/Other ☐

89. Violations Of Juvenile Probation/Parole?
☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not Applicable

ADULT PRIOR RECORD (Not Current Offense)

90. Prior Adult Record(s):
☐ Yes ☐ No
If No, skip to number 135.
If Yes, answer the following:

91. Number Of Prior Adult Arrests_____
92. Number Of Prior Felony Convictions____
93. Number Of Prior Misdemeanor Convictions_____

Indicate If The Following Factors Were Present In Any Prior Convicted Offense:

	Yes	No	Unknown
94. Gang Related	☐	☐	☐
95. Force or Threat of Force	☐	☐	☐
96. Use of a Weapon	☐	☐	☐
97. Victim Physical Injury	☐	☐	☐
98. Under Influence of Alcohol/Drugs	☐	☐	☐

IndicateThe Number Of Prior Adult Convicted Offense(s) By Categories That Most Closely Applies:

99. _____ Armed Robbery
100._____ Assault/Battery
101._____ Auto Theft
102._____ Burglary
103._____ Drug Use/Possession (*note below*)
104._____ Drug Sale (*note below*)
105._____ DUI Or Other Alcohol Offenses
106._____ Escape
107._____ Forgery Or NSF Checks
108._____ Manslaughter/Kidnap
109._____ Other Property Theft
110._____ Robbery
111._____ Sex Offense
112._____ Weapons offense
113._____ Other:

ADULT PRIOR RECORD (NOT CURRENT OFFENSE) CONT.

Type Drug Use/Possession: *(check all that apply)*

114. Amphetamine ☐
115. Cocaine (crack) ☐
116. Cocaine (powder) ☐
117. Heroin ☐
118. Marijuana ☐
119. PCP ☐
120. Other: _____ ☐

Type Drug Sale: *(check all that apply)*

121. Amphetamine ☐
122. Cocaine (crack) ☐
123. Cocaine (powder) ☐
124. Heroin ☐
125. Marijuana ☐
126. PCP ☐
127. Other: _____ ☐

128. Violations Of Adult Probation/Parole:
☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not Applicable

Prior Adult Sentence(s): *(check all that apply)*

129. State Prison ☐
130. Formal Probation With Jail ☐
131. Formal Probation Without Jail ☐
132. Summary Probation ☐
133. Jail ☐
134. Fine ☐

CURRENT OFFENSES

Please indicate the two most serious current convictions only.

	Offense Code	Type (PC,VC,HS)	Misdeamor or Felony (M/F)	Conviction Code that most closely applies
1st Offense	135.___ ___ ___ ___ ___	136.	137.	138.
2nd Offense	139.___ ___ ___ ___ ___	140.	141.	142.

CONVICTION CODES

1 = Armed Robbery
2 = Assault/Battery
3 = Auto Theft
4 = Burglary
5 = Drug Use/Possession (*note on #143-149*)
6 = Drug Sale *(note on #150-156)*
7 = DUI Or Other Alcohol Offenses
8 = Escape
9 = Forgery Or NSF Checks
10 = Manslaughter/Kidnap
11 = Other Property Theft
12 = Robbery
13 = Sex Offense
14 = Weapons offense

Type Drug Use/Possession in current offense(s) only: ***(check all that apply)***

143. Amphetamine ☐
144. Cocaine (crack) ☐
145. Cocaine (powder) ☐
146. Heroin ☐
147. Marijuana ☐
148. PCP ☐
149. Other: _____ ☐

Type Drug Sale in current offense(s) ***(check all that apply)***

150. Amphetamine ☐
151. Cocaine (crack) ☐
152. Cocaine (powder) ☐
153. Heroin ☐
154. Marijuana ☐
155. PCP ☐
156. Other: _____ ☐

CURRENT OFFENSES (CONT.)

Indicate if the following factors were present in the current offense(s):

	Yes	No	Unknown
157. Admits Culpability:	☐	☐	
158. Gang Related	☐	☐	☐
159. Force or Threat of Force	☐	☐	☐
160. Use of a Weapon	☐	☐	☐
161. Victim Physical Injury	☐	☐	☐
162. Under Influence of Alcohol/Drugs	☐	☐	☐
163. Monetary Loss	☐	☐	☐

164. Amount of Loss: $ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _

165. Length of Probation: *(months)*

_____

166. Length of Jail Sentence: *(days)*

_____

167. Total # current offense(s) misdemeanor convictions:

_____

168. Total # current offense(s) felony convictions:

_____

---

169. Attach copy of completed Probation Risk Assessment.

Return completed data form and copy of risk assessment to:

Board Of Corrections
600 Bercut Drive
Sacramento, Ca 95814

CJIS X-REF #: _____
Case Name: _____
Last: _____
First: _____
Middle: _____
DOB (YY/MM/DD): _____
Gender: Male: ☐ **Female:** ☐

16. Employed at time of current offense?
☐ Yes ☐ No

17. If Yes, answer the following:
☐ Full Time
☐ Part Time
18. If Yes, Hourly Income: $ ___ ___ ___ . ___ ___

19. Employment type: (*check one*)
☐ Unskilled Labor
☐ Non-Office Skilled Labor
☐ Office Work Related To Office Tech. Training
☐ Office Professional
☐ Office Other (e.g., mail room)
☐ Other (*specify*):_____

20. Is inmate returning to this job upon release?
☐ Yes ☐ No

21. Upon release, will the inmate have the use of a car for going to work? ☐ Yes ☐ No

RISK ASSESSMENT

Date Of Assessment: ___/___/___

1. Number Of Address Changing Last 12 Months

_____ 0 = None Or One
_____ 2 = Two
_____ 3 = Three Or More

2. Time Employed School In Last 12 Months

_____ 0 = N/A
_____ 0 = 7 Months Or More
_____ 1 = 5-6 Months
_____ 2 = Less Than 5 Months

3. Alcohol Usage Problems

_____ 0 = No Interference With Functioning
_____ 2 = Some Disruption Of Functioning
_____ 4 = Serious Disruption Of Functioning

4. Drug Usage/Problems

_____ 0 = None
_____ 2 = Past Use In 12 Months, No Longer Using
_____ 5 = Current Use

5. Attitude

_____ 0 = Motivated To Change
_____ 3 = Does Not Accept Responsibility For Action
_____ 5 = Negative, Not Motivated To Change

6. Age Of First Conviction Or Juvenile Adjudication

_____ 0 = 24 +
_____ 2 = 20-23
_____ 4 = 17-19
_____ 5 = 16 Or Younger

7. Number Of Prior Felony Convictions

_____ 0 = No Prior Convictions
_____ 2 = 1 Prior
_____ 4 = 2 or more Priors

Number Of Prior Periods Of Probation/Parole Supervision

____ 0 = None
____ 2 = Diversion
____ 4 = 1 Or More

9. Number of Prior Probation Violations Or Parole Revocation (Adult Or Juvenile)

____ 0 = None
____ 2 = 1 Violation
____ 4 = 2 Or More Violations

10. Convictions Or Juvenile Adjudications For Specific Offenses (Including Current Offense)

____ 0 = No Conviction For Burglary, Theft, Vehicle Theft, Robbery, Forgery Or NSF Checks
____ 2 = Convictions For Any Of The Following: Burglary, Theft, Vehicle Theft, Robbery
____ 3 = Convictions For Forgery Or NSF Checks

11. Convictions Or Juvenile Adjudications For Drug Sales

____ 0 = None
____ 4 = 1 Or More Sales

12. Prior Commitment To CO/ST/FED Adult Or Juvenile Institutions (See Instructions)

____ 0 = None
____ 4 = 1 Or More

_____ Treatment Group _____ Control Group BOC ID #_____

CALIFORNIA BOARD OF CORRECTIONS
POST-RELEASE DATA COLLECTION FOLLOW-UP

IDENTIFICATION

IDENTIFIERS:

Case Name:

Last: _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _

First: _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _

Middle Initial: ____

DOB: ___/___/___ (yy/mm/dd)

CJIS X-REF #:_____

CII #: _____

SS #: _____-____-_____

Probation #: _____

CODING INFORMATION:

1. Date of Follow-up: ___/___/___ *(yy/mm/dd)*
   (Must be 6 months after release)
2. Name of Probation Officer Coder:
   _____
3. P.O. Phone #: (___) _____-_____
4. Date Form Filled Out: ___/___/___ *(yy/mm/dd)*

PROBATIONER IDENTIFIERS:

5. Probationer Phone #: (___) ____-_____
6. Address: _____
7. Apartment #: _____
8. City: _____
9. State: _____
10. Zip Code: _____

BACKGROUND (RCCC):

11. Date of RCCC entry: ___/___/___ *(yy/mm/dd)*
12. Date of RCCC release: ___/___/___ *(yy/mm/dd)*
13. Did inmate have minor or major disciplinary actions between dates of RCCC entry and release:
    - ☐ No
    - ☐ Yes

    If "yes":
14. Number of minor disciplinaries: _____
15. Number of major disciplinaries: _____

PROBATIONER "SELF-REPORT"

16. Did you find the office technology training useful? (Treatment group only)
    - ☐ No
    - ☐ Yes
17. Why? _____
    _____
    _____
18. Why did you choose to participate in the Office Technology Program? (Treatment group only)
    _____
    _____
    _____
19. Why did you choose to not participate in any RCCC programs? (Control group only)
    _____
    _____
    _____
20. Is your life now better or worse than before your crime that resulted in probation?
    - ☐ Better
    - ☐ Worse
21. Why?: _____
    _____
    _____
22. If currently employed, are you earning sufficient money to meet basic expenses?
    - ☐ No
    - ☐ Yes
    - ☐ N/A - Unemployed

BACKGROUND (Personal)

23. Does probationer have any children?
    - ☐ No
    - ☐ Yes How many? _____

24. Do any children currently live with probationer?
    - ☐ No
    - ☐ Yes

25. Does probationer have a residence where he/she resides?
    - ☐ No
    - ☐ Yes

26. If "yes", indicate the following
    - Alone ☐
    - Family/Spouse/Domestic-Partner ☐
    - Friends ☐

27. Is the probationer homeless?
    - ☐ No
    - ☐ Yes

28. Is the probationer receiving any form of public assistance?
    - ☐ No
    - ☐ Yes

    Type: _____

29. Does probationer have a physical/mental condition that prevents employment?
    - ☐ No
    - ☐ Yes

BEHAVIOR

Since release from RCCC:	Yes	No	Unknown
30. Alcohol Abuse	☐	☐	☐
31. Alcohol Treatment	☐	☐	☐
32. Domestic Violence	☐	☐	☐
33. Drug Use--illicit *(note below)*	☐	☐	☐
34. Drug Treatment	☐	☐	☐
35. Gang Involvement	☐	☐	☐
36. Inpatient Psych. Treatment	☐	☐	☐
37. Outpatient Professional Counseling	☐	☐	☐
38. Perpetrator of Child Abuse	☐	☐	☐
39. Was prescribed psych. meds.	☐	☐	☐

Type Drug Use/Possession:

40. ☐ Amphetamine
41. ☐ Cocaine (crack)
42. ☐ Cocaine (powder)
43. ☐ Heroin
44. ☐ Marijuana
45. ☐ PCP
46. ☐ Other: _____

47. Since release from RCCC, was the offender arrested/convicted or in violation of probation?
    - ☐ No
    - ☐ Yes

    If "yes" to above question, indicate the following: ***(Check all that apply)***

48. ☐ Arrested, dismissed
49. ☐ New case pending - Misdemeanor
50. ☐ New case pending - Felony
51. ☐ Technical probation violation
52. ☐ Convicted - Misdemeanor
53. ☐ Convicted - Felony

54. Has probationer been incarcerated since release from RCCC?
    - ☐ No
    - ☐ Yes

    If "yes", how many days during the follow-up period? _____ days

55. Was probation revoked since release from RCCC?
    - ☐ No
    - ☐ Yes

BEHAVIOR

56. Was offender sentenced to **prison** for any new conviction/violation?
    - ☐ No
    - ☐ Yes
57. If "yes", length of sentence: _____ months
58. Was offender sentenced to **jail** for any new conviction/violation?
    - ☐ No
    - ☐ Yes
59. If "yes", length of sentence: _____ months
60. Was offender sentenced to **probation** for any new conviction/violation?
    - ☐ No
    - ☐ Yes
61. If "yes", length of sentence: _____ months

Did any new case pending or conviction involve the following? ***(Check all that apply)***

	No	Yes
62. *Gang Related*	☐	☐
63. If "yes", is case pending?	☐	☐
64. If "yes, was there a conviction?	☐	☐
65. *Force or Threat of Force*	☐	☐
66. If "yes", is case pending?	☐	☐
67. If "yes", was there a conviction?	☐	☐
68. *Use of a Weapon*	☐	☐
69. If "yes", is case pending?	☐	☐
70. If "yes", was there a conviction?	☐	☐
71. *Victim Physically Injured*	☐	☐
72. If "yes", is case pending?	☐	☐
73. If "yes", was there a conviction?	☐	☐
74. *Under Influence of Alcohol/Drugs*	☐	☐
75. If "yes", is case pending?	☐	☐
76. If "yes", was there a conviction?	☐	☐
77. *Monetary Loss*	☐	☐
78. If "yes", is case pending?	☐	☐
79. If "yes", was there a conviction?	☐	☐

80. Amount of monetary loss: $ _____

EDUCATION/TRAINING

81. Has probationer attended any type of job training or vocation training since release?
    - ☐ No
    - ☐ Yes
82. Type of training: _____
83. Has probationer attended any office technology training since release?
    - ☐ No
    - ☐ Yes
84. Type of training: _____
85. Has probationer attended formal education since release?
    - ☐ No
    - ☐ Yes
86. Type of education: _____

EMPLOYMENT

87. Date of first employment after RCCC release: ___/___/___ (yy/mm/dd)

88. Is the probationer currently employed:
- ☐ No *(Skip to Item 97)*
- ☐ Yes

89. If "yes", answer the following:
- ☐ Full Time
- ☐ Part Time

90. Hourly Wage: _____

91. Start Date: ___/___/___ (yy/mm/dd)

92. If the probationer is currently employed, what type of work is he/she employed in?
- ☐ Unskilled labor
- ☐ Non-office skilled labor
- ☐ Office work related to Office Tech. Training
- ☐ Office professional--salaried
- ☐ Office--other (e.g., mailroom)
- ☐ Other: *(Specify)*:_____

_____

93. Briefly describe your job.

_____

_____

_____

_____

94. Is your current job the same job you had before your incarceration?
- ☐ No
- ☐ Yes

95. In your work, do you make use of what you learned in the office technology training? (Treatment group only)
- ☐ No
- ☐ Yes

EMPLOYMENT

96. How do you feel about your job?
- ☐ Very satisfied
- ☐ Satisfied
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Dissatisfied
- ☐ Very dissatisfied

97. How many jobs have you had since your release?

_____

98. Has the probationer been employed at anytime since release from RCCC?
- ☐ No
- ☐ Yes

99. If "yes", answer the following:
- ☐ Mainly Full Time
- ☐ Mainly Part Time

100. Average Hourly Wage: _____

101. Main type of employment:
- ☐ Unskilled labor
- ☐ Non-office skilled labor
- ☐ Office work related to Office Tech. Training
- ☐ Office professional
- ☐ Office--other (e.g., mailroom)
- ☐ Other: *(Specify)*:_____

_____

102. Of the approximately 26 weeks since release, how many weeks was probationer employed?

_____weeks

103. Does probationer work with computers on the job?
- ☐ No
- ☐ Yes

POST-RELEASE ARRESTS AND CONVICTIONS

(New cases only since RCCC release)

ARREST DATE (yy/mm/dd)	SECTION CODE #	CODE (PC/VC/HS)	ARREST TYPE (See Below)	MISDEMEANOR OR FELONY (M/F)	CONVICTION YES/NO/OR Case Pending	CONVICTION TYPE (See Below)	CONVICTION DATE (yy/mm/dd)
104.	105.	106.	107.	108.	109.	110.	111.
112.	113.	114.	115.	116.	117.	118.	119.
120.	121.	122.	123.	124.	125.	126.	127.
128.	129.	130.	131.	132.	133.	134.	135.
136.	137.	138.	139.	140.	141.	142.	143.

144. Were there more than 5 arrests?
- ☐ No
- ☐ Yes

145. If "yes", how many? _____

146. Were there more than 5 convictions?
- ☐ No
- ☐ Yes

147. If "yes", how many? _____

ARREST AND CONVICTION TYPES

1	=	Armed Robbery
2	=	Assault/Battery
3	=	Auto Theft
4	=	Burglary
5	=	Drug Use/Possession
6	=	Drug Sale
7	=	DUI or Other Alcohol Offenses
8	=	Escape
9	=	Forgery or NSF Checks
10	=	Manslaughter/Kidnap
11	=	Other Property Theft
12	=	Robbery
13	=	Sex Offense
14	=	Weapons Offense
15	=	Probation Violation - Technical

Return completed data form to:

Board of Corrections
600 Bercut Drive
Sacramento, CA 95814
Attention: Carleen Okumura

STC PROGRAM
CORE COMPLETION MONITORING SUMMARY

Fiscal Year - 19__/19__

Date: _____

Field Representative: _____

Department	Total Projected	Actual						
		COS	CO	JC	PO	Supr STC	Supr POST	Total