DIVISION OF CORRECTION
STATUS REPORT

OFFENDER RECIDIVISM REPORT

STATE OF MARYLAND

William Donald Schaefer,
Governor

Bishop L. Robinson,
Secretary
Department of Public Safety
and Correctional Services

Arnold J. Hopkins,
Commissioner
Division of Correction

July 1, 1988

118281

WILLIAM DONALD SCHAEFER
GOVERNOR

MELVIN A. STEINBERG
LT. GOVERNOR

BISHOP L. ROBINSON
SECRETARY

STATE OF MARYLAND
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY AND CORRECTIONAL SERVICES
SUITE 310, PLAZA OFFICE CENTER
6776 REISTERSTOWN ROAD
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND 21215-2341
(301) 764-4000
TTY FOR THE DEAF: 486-0677

July 1, 1988

The Honorable Laurence Levitan
Chairman
House Appropriations Committee
100 Senate Office Building
Annapolis, Maryland 21401-1991

The Honorable Charles J. Ryan
Chairman
Senate Budget & Taxation Committee
131 Lowe House Office Building
Annapolis, Maryland 21401-19918

Dear Chairmen Levitan and Ryan:

I am pleased to submit this statistical report on recidivism within the Division of Correction, as requested by the 1988 General Assembly Joint Chairmen's Report (p. 218). This document was prepared by Arnold J. Hopkins, Commissioner of Correction.

A variety of alternative measures for evaluating program effectiveness are also discussed as part of this report. Future reports will include more detailed information.

We would be happy to address any additional concerns relating to these measures.

Sincerely,

Bishop L. Robinson
Secretary

BLR:cac
Enclosure

cc: Delegate Timothy F. Maloney
Senator Frank J. Komenda
Arnold J. Hopkins

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary

The Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services has developed a computerized statistical tool called Repeat Incarceration Supervision Cycle (RISC). This system provides data on the number of offenders who were supervised by one of the departments agencies and subsequently returned for additional supervision. A detailed review of RISC is given later in the report.

The limitations of this system include: that the recidivism measure provides only information on offenders supervised by an agency of the Department who subsequently are re-convicted or re-sentenced to an agency of the Department; those individuals who are returned as a technical parole violator and subsequently convicted of a new offense are not captured as a return; the current inability to use RISC to measure the return rates of inmates released from Patuxent; and lastly, problems which affect the replication of prior return tables.

Although RISC has these limitations, the effort has produced a system which is substantially more complete and more sophisticated than earlier methods. The Department continues to audit the production of RISC and attempts to make design refinements that will improve the validity of RISC.

The Division of Correction pointed out in the previous reports, that recidivism rates, as a sole approach to evaluating the effectiveness of Division of Correction programs, may be misleading. Although RISC provides data on recidivism rates a large number of factors affect these rates, many of which are beyond the control of the agency. The D.O.C. recommends alternative measures of effectiveness as shown in the October 1987 report. Some of these have been studied and are briefly listed below, with additional guides for measuring program effectiveness also listed.

<u>Education/Vocational Programs</u>

A. Repeat Incarceration Supervision Cycle (RISC) offers a three year follow-up on the number of offenders who were supervised under DPSCS and subsequently return for additional supervision. Fiscal year 1983 releases are shown in Table V of this report.

B. D.O.C. and Maryland State Department of Education propose to pilot three groups of program completers. The three groups will be: (1) high school equivalency graduates - GED's, (2) college graduates, and (3) vocational education. They will have completed these programs in FY 1985, therefore the November 1988 report will track them for the past two years.

C. Data on the effectiveness of the GED program will be provided in the November report and will include comparisons of student test performance with State wide results.

D. The Maryland State Department of Education will audit an institutional program using recently developed professional standards by the Correctional Education Association.

State Use Industries

A. SUI has implemented a system to track the post release employment experiences of their trainees.

B. SUI continues to improve its coordination efforts with other rehabilitative programs, such as MAP and academic education and vocational education programs.

Social Work Programs

A. Junction Bridge inmates have been tracked since 1982 and an analysis will be presented in the November report.

B. Data is currently being collected on inmates who complete a group with a social worker. The data will be collected over a 12 month period and will be available by September 1989.

Case Management

A. Data will be collected from three random sample groups of MAP, CMP and non-Case Management inmates. The number of classification team hearings will then be compared to see if MAP and CMP are more efficient.

B. The same sample group will be studied to see if a more complete assessment of the inmates needs are gathered, than those not in MAP or CMP.

C. It is anticipated that MAP and CMP inmates will be more inclined to complete programming assignment than inmates who do not have a continuous program. Three random sample groups will be studied to see if there is a difference in completion rates.

D. The impact of MAP and CMP on inmate institutional adjustment will be studied by collecting adjustment data.

The Division of Correction will offer that the measures listed above are better yardsticks for determining how well these correctional programs are carrying out their mission.

REPEAT INCARCERATION SUPERVISION CYCLE (RISC)

Overview

RISC represents an effort by the Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services to develop a computerized statistical tool which provides data on the number of offenders who were supervised by one of its correctional agencies and subsequently returned for additional supervision. The Office of Research and Statistics and the Data Services Division of the Department jointly performed a system analysis and design for this type of computerized statistical measurement tool as an outgrowth of similar capabilities which were previously developed by the Division of Correction and the Division of Parole and Probation individually.

This latest effort entails a redesign of the former independent systems to make them more complete and standardized. Although this effort has produced a system which is substantially more complete and more sophisticated, it still is not as exact and accurate as desired. A description of each of the RISC subsystems is provided in the following section of this report.

1. Division of Correction. RISC works with the Division of Correction data in the following manner. For each group of offenders released (including parole, mandatory release, expiration of sentence, commutation, and an option for court order) in a given month, a computerized follow-up is performed for multiple 12 consecutive month periods. The total of releases for each month is compared to subsequent monthly intake to the Division of Correction and probation case openings for the Division of Parole and Probation. A sequence of matching routines are used to check if the released individual has returned to either of these two agencies. See Table V on page 10.

2. Division of Parole and Probation. RISC works with the Division of Parole and Probation data in the following manner. For each group of offenders (including probation, probation before judgment, parole, mandatory and live-in) with a case opening in a given month, a computerized follow-up is performed for multiple 12 consecutive month periods. Again the total of releases for the given month is compared to subsequent monthly intake to the Division of Correction and probation case openings for the Division of Parole and Probation. The same matching routines mentioned above are used to check if the same individual for which there was a case opening has subsequently returned to either of these two agencies. Within the Division of Parole and Probation RISC segment, there are two follow-up options. The first allows following the case past the closing date (i.e. the day on which supervision was discontinued) and the second option

allows following the case up to the case closing date (i.e. only while the offender was being supervised).

Status

The RISC system design was developed and tested from September 1982 until May 1983. In June 1983, production runs to provide data were initiated. Since that time RISC outputs using the options described above have been produced for fiscal year 1986, 1985, 1984, 1983, 1982 and 1981 data. These outputs provide respectively one-year, two-year and three-year return rates. These outputs are continuously audited by this office for data reliability and consistency. Due to the operational conditions and data constraints discussed in the major limitations section below, the Office of Research and Statistics continues to audit the production of RISC and in conjunction with the Data Services Division in attempting to make design refinements that will improve the validity of RISC.

Major Limitations

The first limitation of RISC is that as a "recidivism" measure it provides only information on offenders supervised by an agency of the Department who subsequently are re-convicted or subjected to other judgment and re-sentenced to an agency of the Department. Thus, for those who seek a broader definition of "recidivism" such as re-arrest, re-conviction, local jail commitments, other state or federal commitments, fines, unsupervised probation to the court, violation of parole or mandatory release, etc., this system is not applicable. The answer to the question as to why these items were not included to broaden the definition is one of data availability and resources. The OBSCIS I correctional automated information system and the OBSCIS II Parole and Probation automated information system and their predecessors have the most readily available data for automated estimation of returns or "recidivism".

A second limitation of RISC relates to offenders who are initially returned as a technical parole violator and subsequently convicted of a new offense and sentenced to the Division of Correction since they are not captured as a return.

The third limitation relates to the current inability to use RISC to measure the return rates of inmates released from Patuxent. Due to OBSCIS I data problems relating to the release date of Patuxent Offenders, RISC cannot be accurately used for those individuals. Efforts to correct these problems are underway, but reliability to the extent that the process can be automated has not been achieved. Until these problems are resolved, the Office of Research and Statistics and Patuxent Institution will produce return rates for Patuxent parolees by manually duplicating the monthly follow-up and matching routines

of the RISC program. Comparison of Patuxent parolee return rates with other modes of release from the Division of Correction is discouraged due to the very small number of observations and the strict nature of Patuxent parole supervision that reduces its new offense return rates.

There is a fourth limitation that affects the replication of prior return tables. Replication of the initial result tables for the 1983 production, runs with a one-year and two-year extension of the follow-up period, reveals variation in aggregate returns established at that time. Variation in returns appear to be associated with cases where the potential for further processing exists; i.e., violation of probation or parole. Current audits indicate that the source of the aggregate return variation lies in routine transformations to records in the respective automated data bases of the Divisions. These transformations involve the Division's established automated record management procedures which include collapsing overlapping records, reactivating old records and expunging certain records. However, the resultant changes in the return rates is not viewed as invalidating conclusions drawn from comparison of these data for purposes of establishing a trend.

Initial Results

As previously mentioned, recidivism is defined for the purpose of this report as a new conviction resulting in a return to the Division of Correction or to probation supervision under the Division of Parole and Probation within three years of the intake (Parole and Probation data) or release date (Patuxent and Division of Correction data). Although this definition does not provide a comprehensive accounting of the offender's criminal activity due to restrictions on data collection, the following recidivism statistics provide a record of the offender's major re-convictions in Maryland.*

1. Division of Correction - Table I displays the return rates for the Division of Correction releases during Fiscal Years 1981, 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985 and 1986. Aggregate data is included on four release groups: Parolees, Mandatory Releases, Expirations and Commutations. It should be noted that the 1981 return rates may have been artificially low due to the inability in obtaining fingerprinted-based matches with the Division of Parole and Probation information system until after implementation of OBSCIS II.

*These restrictions exclude individuals who have been reconvicted in other states, fined or sentenced to local jails, and only returned for technical violations while on parole.

TABLE I

Fiscal Year of Release	Total Released	Cumulative Total & Cumulative Percentage of DOC Releases Returned Within:		
		1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year
1981	3,349	599 (17.9%)	1,092 (32.6%)	1,403 (41.9%)
1982	2,799	570 (20.4%)	1,041 (37.2%)	1,430 (51.1%)
1983	3,583	802 (22.4%)	1,357 (37.9%)	1,717 (47.9%)
1984	4,007	865 (21.6%)	1,536 (38.3%)	1,908 (47.6%)
1985	4,635	1,018 (22.0%)	1,778 (38.4%)	N/A
1986	4,811	949 (19.7%)	N/A	N/A

2. Division of Parole and Probation - Table II and Table III displays the return rates of the Division of Parole and Probation intakes during Fiscal Years 1981, 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985 and 1986. Aggregate data is included in both tables on four intake groups: Parolees, Probationers, Mandatory Releases, and Live-in/Work-out cases. Table II is limited to returns that have occurred prior to the case closing data or within the respective follow-up period from the case open date (whichever comes first). This table, therefore, only shows returns that occurred while the individual was under supervision. Table III displays the returns that have occurred during the follow-up period regardless of whether the case was still under the supervision of the Division.

TABLE II

Intake Fiscal Year	Total Intakes	Cumulative Total & Cumulative Percentages of P&P Intake Returned (While under supervision) within:		
		1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year
1981	32,216	4,021 (12.5%)	5,613 (17.4%)	6,047 (18.8%)
1982	34,460	4,392 (12.7%)	5,869 (17.0%)	6,263 (18.2%)
1983	44,089	5,456 (12.4%)	7,370 (16.7%)	8,106 (18.4%)
1984	42,866	5,177 (12.1%)	7,052 (16.5%)	7,774 (18.1%)
1985	43,349	5,608 (12.9%)	7,701 (17.8%)	N/A
1986	43,339	5,523	N/A	N/A

TABLE III

Intake Fiscal Year	Total Intakes	Cumulative Total & Cumulative Percentages of P&P Intakes Returned (While under or beyond supervision) Within:		
		1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year
1981	32,216	4,560 (14.2%)	7,717 (24.0%)	9,946 (30.9%)
1982	34,460	4,940 (14.3%)	8,243 (23.9%)	10,826 (31.4%)
1983	44,089	6,436 (14.6%)	10,440 (23.7%)	13,472 (30.6%)
1984	42,866	5,893 (13.8%)	9,827 (22.9%)	12,569 (29.3%)
1985	43,349	6,460 (14.9%)	10,475 (24.2%)	N/A
1986	43,339	6,306 (14.6%)	N/A	N/A

Table IV

FY 84 DOC RELEASES BY TYPE OF RELEASE AND TYPE OF RETURN

Release Type (total released)	Cumulative Total & Cumulative Percentage of DOC Releases Returned within:		
	1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year
Parole (1,426)			
Return to Probation	103 (7.2%)	238 (16.7%)	321 (22.5%)
Return to DOC	75 (5.3%)	126 (8.8%)	170 (11.9%)
Total Returned	178 (12.5%)	364 (25.5%)	491 (34.4%)
Mandatory (2,521)			
Return to Probation	356 (14.1%)	680 (27.0%)	840 (33.3%)
Return to DOC	315 (12.5%)	472 (18.7%)	551 (21.9%)
Total Returned	671 (26.6%)	1,152 (45.7%)	1,391 (55.2%)
Expiration (55)			
Return to Probation	8 (14.6%)	10 (18.2%)	15 (27.3%)
Return to DOC	8 (14.6%)	9 (16.4%)	10 (18.2%)
Total Returned	16 (29.2%)	19 (34.6%)	25 (45.5%)
Commutation (5)			
Return to Probation	0 (0.0%)	1 (20.0%)	1 (20.0%)
Return to DOC	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Total Returned	0 (0.0%)	1 (20.0%)	1 (20.0%)
Total (4,007)			
Return to Probation	467 (11.7%)	929 (23.2%)	1,177 (29.4%)
Return to DOC	398 (9.9%)	607 (15.2%)	731 (18.2%)
Total Returned	865 (21.6%)	1,536 (38.4%)	1,908 (47.6%)

PROGRAM EVALUATION FOR EDUCATION/VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Introduction

In its October 1, 1987, J.C.R., the Division of Correction cautioned against the use of recidivism data as a primary means of program evaluation. At the same time the Division recognized the need to develop and refine procedures to measure recidivism. Correctional programming, which addresses the needs of inmates in a variety of areas and which is organized in a treatment framework such as MAP or MDP should reduce recidivism for inmates when compared to other inmates with similar characteristics (such as age, race, criminal history, offense, or addictions).

Recidivism as a measure of program effectiveness is an imprecise measure of program effectiveness and is impacted by a number of intervening variables over which the MSDE has no control, including: labor market conditions, transitional services for releasees, community based addiction treatment programs and racial discrimination. A number of objective performance measures are available to evaluate the effectiveness of correctional Education Program.

In consultation with the State Department of Education, several program performance measures were suggested. These included: (1) student progress as measured by objective criteria such as standardized tests, (2) program audits and evaluations, (3) recently developed professional standards developed by the Correctional Education Association - an American Correctional Association affiliate, and (4) operational variables such as attendance and school closures.

Existing RISC Reporting

Currently one education/training program is evaluated using the RISC system. Repeat Incarceration Supervision Cycle or RISC represents an effort by the Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services to develop a computerized statistical tool which provides data on the number of offenders who were supervised by one of its correctional agencies and subsequently returned for additional supervision. Apprentices are both full time trainees (either of State Use Industries or of institutional food services department) and students (enrolled in related classroom instruction provided by local community colleges). The results of the three year follow up are provided in Table V.

TABLE V

FY 1984 Apprenticeship Program Releases by Type of Return

Total Released (47)	Cumulative Total & Cumulative Percentage of Apprenticeship Releases Returned within		
	1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year
Returned to Probation	2 (4.3%)	7 (14.9%)	10 (21.3%)
Returned to DOC	2 (4.3%)	2 (4.3%)	2 (4.3%)
Total Returned	4 (8.6%)	9 (19.2%)	12 (25.6%)

These rates compare very favorably to the agency wide return rate of 48% for both FY 1983 and FY 1984 releases.

However, it would be misleading to assume that apprenticeship is superior to other programs. Apprenticeship differs significantly from other training programs on a number of factors, including: (1) apprenticeships are 2 to 3 times as long as vocational training, (2) apprenticeships combine both hands on training and classroom instruction, (3) apprenticeships are frequently the result of a program sequence which includes academic and vocational education, and most importantly, (4) apprentices have the benefit of job placement assistance. Many inmates simply do not have sufficient time to participate in the apprenticeship program given their sentence length. Additionally, until the advent of Project Care in 1986 vocational education graduates received no systematic assistance in attempting to link their training to post release employment.

Proposed Additional Educational RISC Elements

At this point in time, educational program completions are reported by MSDE principals to classification departments for inclusion in inmates' records and to the Correctional education Program headquarters as one aspect of their accountability reporting. This program completion data is kept manually by the MSDE and, with varying degrees of consistancy entered in the OBSCIS system.

The Division of Correction, in consultation with the State Department of Education, proposes to pilot three groups of program completers using the RISC system. The three groups of program completers are: (1) high school equivalency graduates-GED's, (2) college graduates, and (3) vocational education completers. These three groups represent graduates of three major thrusts of the Correctional Education Program. Initially

the records of inmates who have completed in each program area will be obtained manually for analysis by the research department of the Office of the Secretary. For the report due November, 1988, RISC data on inmates' released in FY 1985 who completed one or more of these educational programs will be generated. A two year follow up will be available for the November JCR with the third year available by March of 1989.

The follow up will be a pilot and interim step until the MSDE automates their educational test and completion data in FY 1990. The Correctional Education Program is currently developing an automated record system using school based computers in each of the institutional schools. This automated system will allow for continuous record keeping as inmates are transferred from institution to institution and the recording of standardized achievement test data and program outcomes (completions). The automated record system is a major element in the agency performance plan for FY 1989 for the Correctional Education office of the MSDE. When the system is fully operational in FY 90 the collection and analysis of educational data will be greatly improved.

The Correctional Education program has agreed to expand program evaluation efforts through the use of graduate students working under the supervisor of academic or vocational program specialist. These graduate students or possibly interns will be involved in the collection and tabulation of program data. In addition to expanded evaluation efforts, the CE testing program (test instrument and procedures) will be reviewed in FY 1989. Finally, the Correctional Education Office will be receiving technical assistance in FY 1989 from the Education Testing Service (ETS), one of the most prestigious testing organizations in the nation. A written proposal has been received by MSDE to review the test instruments and procedures of the Correctional Education Office for their appropriateness and validity.

Proposed Measures of Program Effectiveness

The Division of Correction, in cooperation with the Correctional Education Office of the MSDE, proposes to pilot three measures of program effectiveness by November, 1988. Unlike recidivism data generated by the RISC study, these measures are directly and logically linked to program effectiveness. The measures of program effectiveness to be piloted by November, 1988, are: (1) student progress and achievement, (2) program quality as measured by professional standards developed by the Correctional Education Association, the primary professional organization of educators working with incarcerated persons, and (3) service levels - the degree to which the program reaches those with identified needs. The measures and the methods proposed to study their effectiveness as discussed in the following paragraphs.

As indicated in the October 1, 1988, JCR report on recidivism, the Division and MSDE suggest that program evaluation measures which are directly related to program objectives and operations are the best indication of program effectiveness. In that report, measures of student learning was suggested as the most direct and logical means of evaluating any educational program. As with other educational programs, correctional educational programs measure student progress on a regular basis and record the achievement of identified milestones such as the awarding of high school equivalencies, competency based vocational completions and the completion of degree granting post-secondary education programs.

The high school equivalency examination is a major focus of the correctional education program with approximately 700 GED's awarded annually. The high school equivalency provides the student with several important benefits including: (1) educational achievement level required by many employers as a minimum condition for employment, (2) access to a wide variety of post-secondary education opportunities both academic and vocational, and (3) access to higher level skill training opportunities provided by State Use Industries and the State Department of Education. For the November, 1988 JCR, a report on the effectiveness of the GED program will be available including comparisons of student test performance with State wide results and other comparison groups.

Staff from the Correctional Education Program of the MSDE were active participants in the development of professional standards for Correctional Education programs. The project was a joint effort of the Correctional Education Association of the Association of State Directors of Correctional Education. The standards have been extensively field tested in the Pennsylvania Correctional Education system in 1988. The Division of Correction and MSDE propose the auditing of one correctional education program by November 1988 and reporting those findings to the Joint Chairmen. These standards are the first professional standards for correctional education which are specific to the correctional education field.

One important measure of program effectiveness is the degree to which inmates who are committed to the Division with educational deficiencies have access to educational programming. The Correctional Education Program will conduct a study of not less than 100 FY 1987 releases. Using a randomly selected sample of FY 1987 releasees, files will be examined to determine: (1) educational needs at intake, (2) educational program participation during incarceration, (3) educational achievement, (4) barriers to educational participation - disciplinary problems, sentence length, program availability, removal from

school, etc. When the Correctional Education Office's automated record keeping system is fully operational in FY 1990, this type of program evaluation will be greatly simplified. The DOC and MSDE are in agreement that service delivery is a central factor in evaluating the effectiveness of the Correctional Education program.

Conclusion

The Division of Correction, in consultation with the MSDE proposes the inclusion to three groups of program completers in the RISC system. The results of the RISC study will be provided in the November, 1988 JCR report. Additionally, the Division and MSDE propose to supplement the findings with program effectiveness data which is closely linked to the cooperation and objectives of the educational programs. Data on the effectiveness of the GED program will be provided including comparisons with outside test groups. Finally, the MSDE will audit one institutional program using the recently developed professional standards developed by the Correctional Education Association - an ACA affiliate organization.

ALTERNATIVE MEASURE OF PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS STATE USE INDUSTRIES

Introduction

In the October 1, 1987, JCR on recidivism, four measures of program effectiveness were suggested for the prison industries program. The measures of program effectiveness were: (1) post release employment of SUI trainees, (2) inmate feedback, (3) improved coordination with other rehabilitative programs, and (4) the creation of new employment opportunities for inmates. Each of these recommended measures is briefly discussed below.

Post Release Employment

State Use Industries has successfully implemented a system to track the post release employment experience of their trainees. The system generates a listing of releasees who worked for SUI for a period of twelve months or more. A telephone survey is conducted with the releasees' Parole Agents to determine if the releasees have obtained employment, the nature of the employment and the stability of the employment. The results are tabulated and will be reported in the JCR on the Placement of Inmates with private employers.

Inmate Feedback

SUI has incorporated the systematic collection of inmate feedback as one aspect of their NIC funded program at the Maryland House of Correction. Inmates participant in the various elements of the program (in-service training, pre-service orientation, employment readiness training), complete detailed evaluations of the program, including rating the quality of training and program content.

Improved Coordination with Other Programs

State Use Industries has continued to improve its coordination with other rehabilitative programs, especially educational programs of the MSDE. SUI's upholstery and metal fabrication programs at Maryland Correctional Institution - Hagerstown have been closely linked with corresponding vocational education programs offered by MSDE at the same institution. Inmates are sequenced through the vocational education programs prior to SUI employment. Inmates enrolling in the registered apprenticeship in these two trades are given credit for their hours in vocational education as well as perference in hiring. Coordination with the educational programs continues during industries employment as the trainees attend related classroom instruction throughout their employment with SUI. During the interview process, inmates are encouraged to organize their

training program via MAP, thus further improving coordination.

At Maryland Correctional Institution - Jessup, SUI and vocational education programming provided by MSDE have been closely linked. MSDE and SUI cooperatively established a vocational education program in an adjacent facilities. Students use SUI equipment and work in the shop as part of their vocational training, thus being exposed to a production shop early in their training. MSDE has purchased equipment which will allow further collaboration with SUI in FY 1989.

State Use Industries is planning to coordinate these three programs at Eastern Correctional Institution with the MSDE's academic and skill training programs. Appreticeships will be developed and coordinated with vocational training programs. State Use Industries will be establishing minimum education achievement levels for employment as well as offering a structured incentive system to encourage completion of the high school equivalency for their employees. A number of the coordinative elements are currently being piloted at the Maryland House of Correction where SUI was awarded a National Institute of Correction's grant to pilot a comprehensive program to upgrade inmate training.

Creation of New Employment

State Use Industries has submitted a comprehensive plan to increase the number of inmate employees to 1,050 by June, 1989. This plan incorporates both new programs and expanded operations for existing programs. SUI currently operates 2 shifts in furniture manufacturing (MHC), printing (MCI-J), upholstery (MCI-H) and is actively considering the addition of a third shift in printing (MCI-J). The comprehensive plan has been submitted as SUI Plan for Reducing Inmate Idleness.

Conclusion

State Use Industries has moved from a money losing organization to a fiscally sound operation with FY 1987 sales in excess of $17,000,000.00. SUI has developed a plan for program expansion, increased sales and inmate employment based on professional marketing studies. They have embarked on a period of expansion unprecedented in SUI's history. Although the RISC data on SUI releasees compares quite favorably with the Division over all rate, there are four measures of program effectiveness for the industries programs which provide feedback directly related to program effectiveness. First, SUI has developed a system of follow up via Parole Agents to obtain information on the employment and earnings of releasees. Secondly, SUI has successfully implemented a NIC funded pilot project to serve as a model for a system wide upgrade of their inmate training programs. The NIC funded pilot includes inmates' feedback on

every element of the program - the first systematic inclusion of inmates in the program development process. Thirdly, SUI has moved to improve coordination of their programs with those provided by the Correctional Education office of the MSDE. Finally, SUI has submitted a master plan for the expansion of both industries and inmate employment opportunities.

PROGRAM EVALUATION FOR SOCIAL WORK

Introduction

As is established clearly in the executive summary of the October 1, 1987 report, direct accountability for the presence or absence of recidivism is not a measure of the effectiveness of a program effort, especially when there are no control groups and reasonable experimental design. Rather, gains in productive adjustment by inmates both during and following incarceration should be incremental overtime.

Institutional Rules & Infractions
Participation in Other Programs (Education, Vocational Training)
Completion Rate For All Programs

All of the above items should reflect some positive movement-away from destructive behavior - to a productive experience - but following completion of at least two group cycles, Stabilization/STOP and any one of several others following transfer to the institution in which the inmate will spend the bulk of his/her incarceration. The second group cycle accommodates the transfer from RCI to a maintaining institution; or from BBCF to one of the Pre-Release Units; and, offers a re-enforcement of responsible decision-making.

Adjustment to Parole
Adjustment to Employment
Accessing Treatment Resources

It is feasible to obtain this data only as long as the individual is on parole. The inmates who complete Junction Bridge are tracked both during incarceration (by DOC addictions staff) and following release while on parole. Inmates who complete social work groups will be identified with Junction Bridge completions as the two systems will be integrated as of July 1, 1988.

It should be noted that the vast majority of releases are by some mechanism other than parole. For the first nine months of this Fiscal Year (July-Mar.) the following releases were documented:

Parole - 1590, 38.0%
Mandatory - 2,183, 52.2%
Court - 412, 9.8%

Moreover, both Social Work and Junction Bridge resources are committed substantially to inmates in the major institutions.

Current Activities:

The Junction Bridge Program has tracked inmates completing their group cycles since 1982 with help from Addictions Specialists and following release with assistance from the Office of Research and Statistics in the Department of Public Saftey and Correctional Services, and from the Division of Parole and Probation.

The Social Work Program continues to track inmates who complete groups in segregation at RCI. There is continuity for each year through FY 1987 from inception of the program with the first seven groups. In FY 1989 inmates who completed groups during FY 1988 are being identified for study.

In addition, each Social Worker is tracking the adjustment of inmates who complete a group for which that staff person was the therapist. The data will be collected in standard format over 12 months in a codebook that identifies background, history of behavior and behavior at least three months following treatment. Assessments will be entered monthly. The data is to be analyzed by computer quarterly and culminated in a one year report no later than September, 1989.

Conclusion

The Social Work Program strives to offer change and monitor inmates in productive gains in their adjustment. These programs offer appropriate skills and behavior to address their needs and the problems they face. In tracking the inmates who complete Junction Bridge group cycles, it is hoped that more can be gained by offering appropriate programs to meet the needs of the inmate population.

PROGRAM EVALUATION FOR CASE MANAGEMENT

Introduction

The Division of Correction, in its October 1, 1987 J.C.R., cautioned that using recidivism data as a sole approach to evaluating the effectiveness of programs may be misleading. This is true for the Case Management processes of Mutual Agreement Programming (MAP) and the Case Management processes (CMP). In the stated goals for both MAP and CMP, reduction of recidivism was never mentioned. Both MAP and CMP were designed as processes for more comprehensively, effectively and efficiently evaluating the needs of the inmates and for successfully carrying-out those program plans. MAP was also designed to improve coordination between DOC programming efforts and parole decision making.
There are certain positive unique elements in MAP and CMP which need no evaluation to recognize their inherent value. MAP is the only process in which the DOC and the Parole Commission jointly decide on programming and release. This joint decision making process eliminates all of the "second guessing" that is normal between the two agencies for non-MAP cases. The DOC does not have to second guess what programming the Parole Commission believes is essential for parole and when the inmate should be sent to the pre-release security level. The Parole Commission staff are assured that the inmates will receive the programming that was included in the MAP agreement.

Secondly, both MAP and CMP are the only processes that require a comprehensive assessment of all of an inmate's programming needs and the development of a program for the inmate that schedules all activity for the inmate throughout the rest of his/her incarceration. This comprehensive approach to programming allows all parties to know exactly what is scheduled and when, eliminating all uncertainity.

Thirdly, the computerized reservation system that is used for MAP and CMP for scheduling activities for inmates needs no evaluation to determine that it is far superior to the traditional first-come-first-serve procedures of the manual waiting lists that have been used for determining when inmates can enter programs.

Nevertheless, evaluation of the effectiveness of MAP and CMP is needed to measure how well the processes are accomplishing the goals for which these programs were established. The studies that are proposed below would focus on specific goals of MAP and MDP and would provide a quantified analysis of the effectiveness of these processes in certain specified areas.

Existing RISC Reporting

The RISC report included a study of all MAP inmates released in FY 1984. The information in the table below, which was extracted from the RISC report, demonstrated that only 9% of all MAP inmates released from the DOC in FY 1984 were returned back to the DOC over the next three years. It also shows that 17.5% of the released MAP inmates received a new conviction that resulted in probation.

Table VI
FY 1984 MAP Releases by Type of Return

Total Released (212)	Cumulative Total & Cumulative Percentage of MAP Releases Returned Within		
	1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year
Returned to Probation	12 (5.7%)	29 (13.7%)	37 (17.5%)
Returned to DOC	3 (1.4%)	13 (6.1%)	19 (9.0%)
Total Returned	15 (7.1%)	42 (19.8)	56 (26.4%)

These rates compare very favorably to the overall return rates for all DOC releasees. Only 26.4% of all MAP inmates were returned for convictions of new offenses while the overall return rate for all DOC releasees was 47.6%. MAP return rates are also lower than the rates for all parolees released in FY 1984. The return rates for parolees was 34.4% (22.5% for probation and 11.9% back to the DOC.

It is, however, misleading to assume that MAP is a causitive factor for these lower rates. MAP carefully selects those inmates who are most motivated and who are the best candidates for parole. This selection bias must be considered when evaluating the effectiveness of MAP.

Proposed Studies to Evaluate the Effectiveness of MAP and CMP

1. In MAP and CMP a comprehensive plan is developed that schedules the inmate for programming throughout the rest of his/her incarceration. This program plan includes starting and ending dates for program participation, transfers to other institutions, reductions in security and custody, work release, etc. All decisions for these activities are made at one time and recorded on one document with MAP and CMP. Under the traditional classification process, each one of these activities would require a separate classification team action and a separate classification document. The MAP and CMP processes should result in a more efficient method of program and assignment decision making.

of classification decision making, data can be collected for three random sample groups of MAP, CMP and non-Case Management inmates. Data collection could be done for inmates who are on work release and are close to release. The number of classification team hearings held over a similar period of time for inmates in the three study groups would be counted and compared. It is anticipated that MAP and CMP inmates would have a significantly lower number of classification team hearings.

2. MAP and CMP require a full assessment of the inmate's needs and the development of a comprehensive program plan to address the inmate's needs. This method of case management should lead to a more complete assessment of the inmate's needs and a better system for ensuring that the inmate's needs are addressed with appropriate programming.

To measure the impact of MAP and CMP procedures on the assessment of inmates and the assignment of inmates to programs that meet their specific needs, data can be collected from the same three sample groups as (1) above. For each inmate in each group, an independent needs assessment can be completed. Then, it can be determined what programming each inmate received to address each identified need. It is anticipated that MAP and CMP inmates will have more complete assessment information available and will have had more of their needs addressed than non-case management inmates.

3. MAP and CMP inmates have comprehensive plans that include programming throughout the rest of their incarcerations. The inmate knows exactly what to expect and when he/she will achieve reductions in custody and security. Under the traditional methods of programming an inmate receives one or two program assignments at a time and never has a comprehensive plan or any sense of continuity to assignments. It is anticipated that MAP and CMP inmates will be more inclined to complete programming assignments than inmates who do not have a continuous program plan.

To measure the impact of MAP and CMP on inmate completion rates, three separate random samplings will have to be collected. These sample groups will be random selections of MAP, CMP and non-case management inmates who entered vocational shops and addictions treatment programs. The rates that the inmates complete these programs will be collected for each group. It is anticipated that MAP and CMP inmates will have better completion rates than non-case management inmates.

4. Because the inmates have continuous program plans that include reductions in security and (with MAP) anticipated release dates, inmates are expected to have better institutional adjustments. MAP and CMP inmates have a goal directed plan and have more to loose by violating institutional rules.

Institutional staff often report that MAP and CMP inmates have better institutional adjustments.

To measure the impact of MAP and CMP on inmate institutional adjustment, again, three samples will have to be collected for MAP, CMP and non-case management inmates. Adjustment data can be collected and compared for the three groups. It is anticipated that MAP and CMP inmates will have lower adjustment rates than non-case management inmates.

Conclusion

The recidivism rates for MAP compare very favorably with the overall rates for all releasees from the D.O.C. and 8% better than regular parolees released from the D.O.C.. While this data is encouraging, it alone does not provide a good evaluation of the Case Management process. The D.O.C. will initiate that in addition to the RISC studies for MAP inmates and CMP inmates, the four program evaluation studies should also be conducted in order to get a more comprehensive evaluation of the Case Management operations.