

148422



**Pre-Release
at**

**South Idaho Correctional
Institution:**

"Something Works"

148422

**U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice**

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

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

Idaho Department of Corrections

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

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

Principal Writers:

Gray, Doug (Education Program Manager)
Wren, Greg (Teacher)

Word Processing Operator:

Stingley, Tracy

Corrections Practitioners:

Allen, Vanna Kay (Secretary)
Anderson, Don (Social Worker)
Barrier, Gary (Parole Officer-Institution)
Carroll, Judy (Intern-BSU)
Cleland, Jennie (Social Worker)
Dutton, Linda (Teacher)
Holmes, Dennis (Teacher)
Johnson, Sondra (Administrative Assistant, Parole Commission)
Messley, Lowell (Deputy Warden)
Schweickart, Bert (Social Worker)
Tubbs, Steve (Substance Abuse Counselor)
Walker, Ken (Word Processing Supervisor)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction (Philosophy & History)	1
II.	Program Evaluation	3
	A. Methodology	3
	B. Data	
	1. Inmate Evaluation of Program	3
	2. Parole Officer Evaluation of Parolees	5
	3. Employment of Program Completers	8
	4. Recidivism Survey	10
	C. Analysis of Data: Summaries	11
III.	Conclusion	12
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	16

APPENDIX

Participant Evaluation Instrument	17
P.O. Telephone Survey Instrument	18
Employment Survey (Raw Data)	19-21
Recidivism Survey (Raw Data)	22-24

I. Introduction: Philosophy and History of Pre-Release Programming at SIC

In No Escape: The Future of American Corrections (1991), John J. Dilulio, Jr., proposes that: "The facile notion that 'nothing works' is ready for the garbage heap of correctional history" (p. 147). On the contrary, he maintains, *something* works. However, Dilulio cannot offer a specific program or formula that unflinchingly succeeds in the rehabilitation of offenders. Rather, he aligns himself with a growing number of corrections practitioners whose own common sense and experiences have led them to believe in the "something works" position. Dilulio cites evidence from the works of Paul Gendreau and Robert R. Ross which tends to support this stance when he asserts that "certain types of correctional programs may succeed in rehabilitating certain types of criminals" (p. 110).

The programs to which Dilulio refers vary widely in design but share common features:

1. Clear statements of the program rules and the consequences of breaking them.
2. Obvious concern by program staff about the welfare of participants.
3. Participant regard for staff members as persons worth imitating.
4. Preparation of participants for future problems, including family and job problems.
5. Utilization of community resources (p. 110).

Describing the methodologies employed in the delivery of these successful programs, Dilulio continues: "It may well be the case that the rehabilitative effects on inmates participating in these programs come not from the substance of the treatment but from the fact that the treatment causes them to engage others repeatedly in a more or less calm, civilized fashion, to be at a given place at a given time, and otherwise to behave in ways that are more reflective of straight middle-class society than of any criminal subculture" (p. 146).

The underlying philosophy and organization of the Pre-Release Program that has emerged at South Idaho Correctional Institution (SICI) since October, 1991, mirror Dilulio's comments. The Idaho corrections practitioners involved in the program share the belief that *something* works in correctional programming. None of us individually claims to have *the* answer to the multitude of problems ex-offenders face or to the social problem of recidivism, but we believe that our diverse backgrounds, correctional specialties, and experiences working with offenders compliment one another and that when combined in a coordinated, comprehensive program our shared knowledge and skills can best address the needs of both the individual offender and the society to which that offender will return as a parolee. Furthermore, data we have gathered since the inception of the SICI Pre-Release Program substantiates our initial hopes for the program.

The SICI Pre-Release Program is by design a loosely-coupled system involving practitioners from the corrections fields of psychology, social work, education, field and community services, and substance abuse counseling. The program runs for fifteen six-hour days (90 hours) and covers the areas of Personal Development, Social Development, Employability Skills Development, Substance Abuse Issues, and Prison-to-Parole Transition. The SICI Pre-Release Program is intended as the culmination of the programming that begins in Idaho's respective institutions and by design summarizes and focuses the ongoing programming in which the inmate has been (or should have been!) involved throughout his incarceration. This short-term "tune up" has run eight times since its inception, and the corrections practitioners involved in the delivery of the program have recently completed the self-evaluation of the program that follows.

Before proceeding with the description of the study and an analysis of its results, we wish to acknowledge the past efforts of the various Divisions and Bureaus of the Idaho Department of Correction in the area of "pre-release". We intend no slight in electing at this time not to describe in greater detail the Department's pre-release heritage. Neither do we pretend to be a grass-roots movement in the Department of Correction duty-bound to "do the right thing". Had not the Director ordered the formulation of a Pre-Release Task Force in July, 1991, we most likely would remain today semi-autonomous divisions obsessed by parochial concerns.

II. Program Evaluation: Methodology, Data, and Analysis

A. Methodology

Answering the fundamental question (Does the SICl Pre-Release Program work?) required the design of an evaluation plan. Factors to be considered included, first, whether the inmates who participated in the program themselves found the program to be relevant to their needs and, second, the post-program outcomes. Specifically, we wanted to know how the inmate participants felt about their experiences in the pre-release program, whether they found jobs, how their probation officers viewed their likelihood of succeeding on parole, and whether they returned to institutional custody either for technical violations of parole conditions or because of committing new crimes. Information gathered for this evaluation thus addresses program worth from three distinct perspectives: 1) the inmate participant; 2) the parole officer to whom the inmate was assigned upon release; and 3) society (in the sense that unemployment and recidivism are social ills that either lead to or result from crime).

B. Data: Responses to the Program from Participants and Parole Officers, Employment Outcomes, and Recidivism

1. Inmate Evaluation of the Program

At the outset of the program, the corrections practitioners involved in the day-to-day delivery of the program wanted to know how the inmate participants viewed the program. Consequently, at the conclusion of every fifteen-day session participants have completed a participant evaluation form on which they rated the relevance of each section of the program, identified the most and least useful aspects of the program to them personally, and suggested improvements in the course. A summary of the data received is shown below. See Tables Ia, Ib, and Ic. (A copy of the evaluation instrument is located in the Appendix.)

Table 1a (n = 70)

PARTICIPANT EVALUATION RELEVANCE RATINGS						
SECTION	1 (low)	2	3	4	5 (high)	MEAN SCORE
Personal Development	0	1	13	33	23	4.1
Social Development	1	2	18	29	20	3.9
Employability Development	5	9	15	23	18	3.5
Substance Abuse*	6	4	9	14	19	3.7
Transition	4	14	13	18	21	3.5

*Section not included in first program offering

Table 1b

Most Useful Things Covered (Listed randomly, duplicated answers eliminated)	
*Addictive behaviors	*Family Issues
*Relationships among thinking, behavior, consequences	*Rules of probation and parole
*Attitude's effects upon personal change	*Cooperation (not me against you)
*How to communicate with my P.O.	*Becoming in touch with myself
*Skills employers want in workers	*Goal-setting
*Dealing with problems and difficult situations	*How to achieve goals
*Career Information System (i.e. instructional materials)	*AIDS awareness
*Information concerning Vocational Rehabilitation services	*What a parole officer expects of me
*Financial aid information for Vo-Tech college	*How to overcome setbacks and obstacles
*Model: problem, objective, plan of action to solve P & P problems	*Contacts with AA and NA organizations throughout the state

Table 1c

Least Useful Things Covered	
*Over-reliance on videotaped materials	*Job interviewing techniques
*Substance abuse focus on alcohol and tending to overshadow other drugs	*Experience as a parolee doesn't match the instruction (contradiction between "fact" and "reality")
The reviewer's favorite direct quote:	
"Some things had no use, but I still learned about them anyway."	

2. Parole Officer Evaluation of Parolees Who Completed the Program

In order to determine whether the Parole Officers who "inherited" the program completers judged the completers prepared for and likely to succeed on parole, a standard instrument was designed. Between June 4 and 18, a college intern using this document conducted a telephone survey of the parole officers supervising program completers. The results of the survey are shown below. See Tables 11a, 11b, and 11c. (A copy of the survey instrument is located in the Appendix.)

Table IIa (n = 24)

PAROLE OFFICER SURVEY	
1. a. Know about existence of SICI's Pre-Release Program	23
b. Did not know about program	1
2. a. Knew that they had client(s) who had completed program	19
b. Did not know they had clients who completed program	5
3. a. Knew client before current supervision. If "yes", <u>how</u> is the parolee different from when the P.O. knew him previously: "He applies himself" "He's pleasant" "He's concerned about obeying rules" "He's more serious" "He listens" "He now maintains sobriety" "He's maturing" "He performs" "He accepts responsibility for his dependents" "There's no difference"	6
4. a. Thought program completer was more likely to succeed than others on caseload	12
b. Did not think program completer more likely to succeed	9
c. Would not express an opinion regarding likelihood of success	3

Table IIb

Why Client is More Likely to Succeed (Duplicated answers eliminated)	
Attitudes:	
Truthfulness	Motivation
Cooperativeness	Positive feelings about self
Positive attitude	Sincerity
Compliance	Honesty
Respect for freedom	Fear of going back to prison
Knowledge:	
Responsibility to others	Understands expectations
Has earned GED	Understands parole requirements
Understands his substance abuse problem	Understands the "system" and doesn't want to go back
Knows about Voc Rehab	
Behavior:	
Attends AA	Does what is expected
Follows his treatment plan	Cut himself off from past friends
Attends group sessions	Takes care of dependents
Avoids drug users	Asks questions
Works hard at his job	Clean UA's
Follows special conditions	Attended inpatient substance abuse treatment program

Table IIc

Unexpected Responses: <u>Why client is less likely to succeed on parole than others</u>	
Has disability	Feels victimized
Started strong; now going downhill	Harassing victim of original crime
Alcohol abuse/DUI	No job/unemployed
Not home when he's supposed to be	Will not commit to programming
Withdrawn/won't communicate	Lacks seriousness

3. Employment of Program Completers

Certain staff involved in the delivery of the program are funded by a grant through the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA). In order to participate in the entire program, inmates must meet JTPA eligibility requirements (all participants did) and be enrolled in the federal program. The provisions required by the grant include the tracking of participants for their first 90 days in the community or until the participant finds employment. This requirement provided an established means of determining the employment outcomes of the program.

A summary of the results of the JTPA-required employment follow-up survey is shown on the following page. See Table III. (The raw data from this survey can be found in the Appendix.)

Table III (n = 53)

EMPLOYMENT SURVEY		
Of the 70 Pre-Release completers, 53 had been released before 06-01-92. Of the 53 completers who were released:	#	%
Employed (within 90 days of release and prior to 06-01-92)	31	58%
Continuing JTPA training	2	4%
Attending substance abuse in-patient treatment	1	2%
Unemployed due to health-related problems	4	8%
Unemployed (after 90 days since release)	2	4%
Unknown (unable to track due to moving out of state/no parole officer assignment)	6	11%
JTPA Program completers Subtotal	46	
Placement (still within 90 days of release and seeking employment as of 06-01-92)	7	13%
Completers released prior to 06-01-92 TOTAL	53	
<p>Average beginning wage of SICI Pre-Release completers = \$5.78/hr</p> <p>Overall average beginning wage of all IDOC JTPA participants = \$5.44/hr</p> <p>Entered employment rate of SICI Pre-Release completers 67%</p> <p>Overall entered employment rate of IDOC JTPA Program 48%</p>		

4. Recidivism Survey

The Idaho Department of Correction Offender Inquiry Program enabled the corrections practitioners to identify whether each participant had not yet been released from SICI, was housed at another facility, was under supervision by Probation and Parole, was at large, or had been returned to institutional custody because of either a technical violation or new crime.

According to the Idaho Parole Commission, 323 inmates were paroled from Idaho institutions during the period of October, 1991, through the end of May, 1992. Of the 323 parolees released since October, 1991, 53 (16.5%) had already returned to prison prior to 06-01-92.

Of these 323 parolees, 270 (84%) did NOT complete the SICI Pre-Release Program. 52 of the 53 parolees who returned to prison came from this group.

Of the 70 Pre-Release completers, 53 had been released during this same period. Of the 53 completers who were released, ONLY one (2%) had returned to prison prior to 06-01-92. See Table IV. The raw data gathered during the survey of the 70 pre-release completers as of June 1, 1992, can be found in the Appendix.

Table IV (n = 53)

	Released on Parole	Returned to IDOC	8-Month Recidivism Rate
Total	323	53	16.5%
Those NOT Completing Pre-Release Program	270	52	19%
Pre-Release Completors	53	1	2%

C. Analysis of Data

We asked the inmate participants their assessment of the SICI Pre-Release Program, and they responded by providing us constructive criticism and consistent high marks for every section of the program. Although the program is mandatory for the inmates who meet selection criteria and offers few incentives to the participant (many participants in fact have had to leave paying jobs when assigned to the program), the mean and mode responses to the rating criteria – coupled with the positive specific identification of the personally most significant topics covered during the program – indicates that the participants have found the program to be both relevant and valuable.

In asking the parole officers to whom program completers were assigned whether they found their parolees who completed the program more likely to succeed on parole, we indirectly sought the officers' assessment of the program. The parole officers' responses were (perhaps appropriately) less optimistic than were those of the inmate-participants. However, the parole officers' overall evaluation suggested that they thought the program completers to be more likely to succeed than their non-completer clients. The six officers who knew the parolee prior to his completing the program provided the most encouraging responses in the survey. In five of these cases, the officer rated the client more likely to succeed and also identified positive behaviors and/or attitudes of the parolee that were missing in earlier associations. The parole officers we surveyed indicated that the program is providing a relevant and valuable service. (Incidentally, the five officers who did not know they had clients who had completed the program and the one officer who did not know SICI was delivering a pre-release program revealed the need to further publicize the program.)

Employment information gathered for the federal JTPA Program also indicates positive outcomes for completers of the SICI Pre-Release Program. Specifically, at 67%, the JTPA entered employment rate for Pre-Release completers is notably higher than the overall 48% rate of the IDOC program. Furthermore, this stringent JTPA statistic is lower than the desired 100% employment for parolees in part because of termination from JTPA upon the parolee's entering into post-release programming – particularly inpatient substance abuse programs – that may in fact benefit the parolee more than would the landing of a job immediately following his release from prison. Additionally, the average beginning wage is over 6% higher for Pre-Release completers (\$5.78/hr as compared to \$5.44/hr overall).

Data on recidivism gathered from the Idaho Parole Commission and the IDOC "Offender Inquiry" system also validates the SICI Pre-Release Program. By applying the 2% recidivism rate for program completers over the eight-month study to the 270 parolees NOT completing the Pre-Release Program over that same period, statistically only five (instead of 52) would have returned to prison.

By applying these figures to the average minimum cost to house an inmate in Idaho (\$30/day), we see that the Department could potentially have saved \$1,410 per day (47 x \$30) had the Pre-Release Program served all of these parolees prior to their release. Whether these savings would actually have been accomplished with a larger sample may be debatable. However, the evidence clearly suggests that the SICI Pre-Release Program is cost-effective.

In summation, the inmates who have participated in the program have rated it highly and the parole officers to whom program completers have been assigned have evaluated the program positively. The completers have found jobs and are following up the institutional program, with community-based service providers. So far (06-01-92), only one program completer has returned to prison. The evaluative data we have collected indicates a successful program that meets its objectives at the personal, institutional, and societal levels.

III. Conclusion

In many ways, the South Idaho Correctional Institution's Pre-Release Program has served as a pilot project to demonstrate that such programming provides a viable path for the Idaho Department of Correction to follow as it evolves in the 1990's. The program so far has cost the Department very little money. It has no dedicated budget, no buildings have been constructed or existing buildings retro-fitted to house the program, no vehicles have been purchased for relevant transportation needs, and no new staff has been hired to deliver the program. Despite its humble origins, the program has proven that indeed *something works* when corrections practitioners dedicate themselves to common sense, structured programming that reflects middle-class expectations rather than criminal or institutional subcultures.

The nature of pilot projects causes their usefulness to dwindle once they have proved – or disproved – the purpose(s) for which they were established. The agency which originated the project ultimately decides whether to continue the program, cease operation of the program, or expand the program. Should the Idaho Department of Correction decide either to keep the SICI Pre-Release Program or to expand it to touch those inmates released from institutions where similar programming is not available, the Department must address needs the practitioners involved in this evaluation have identified. These needs include facilities needs, inmate movement needs, and staffing needs.

The facilities at SICl in which the Pre-Release Program is delivered is minimally adequate. A dormitory day room has neither the floor space, the layout, nor the furnishings necessary for continued program delivery.

The hodgepodge of sofas, card tables, and a small-screen television inside a room without acoustical enhancements next door to living quarters in which non-program inmates reside (many of whom are "at home" while the program is being delivered) detracts from long-term program effectiveness and contributes to decline of practitioners morale. Also, the educational equipment (e.g. overhead projectors, video and audio tape players, monitors) have been scrounged or borrowed from various divisions at SICl and often times must be transported across the yard and down stairways. The program needs adequate facilities and equipment to continue effectively, and these items must be provided at other sites if the program expands beyond SICl.

Inmate movement practices have hurt the program. Some inmates have been transferred to other institutions or even paroled during the scheduled program delivery. Other inmates who would benefit from the program have not received transfers to SICl in time to begin the program when most appropriate; others have paroled directly from maximum, close, and medium security institutions without exposure to pre-release activities at all. See Table V. If the Department agrees that pre-release programming works, it must establish practices which demonstrate that belief. Otherwise, the program lacks the credibility necessary for its continuation or expansion.

Table V

Total # released on parole from 10-91 thru 05-92	323
Of the 323 released on parole:	
Total # that enrolled in the Pre-Release Program prior to release	67 (21%)
Total # that completed the Pre-Release Program prior to release	53 (16%)
Total # enrolled in SICI Pre-Release Program from 10-91 thru 05-92	87
Of the 87 enrolled in Pre-Release:	
Total # that completed the program	70 (80%)
Of those enrolled in but not completing the program	17 (20%)
Total # placed in detention prior to completion	1 (6%)
Total # put on medical lay-in prior to completion	2 (12%)
Total # released on parole prior to completion	6 (35%)
Total # transferred prior to completion	7 (44%)
# transferred to SAWC	4
# transferred to CWC-N	2
# transferred to ISCI	1

Some of the successes noted over the first eight months of the SICI Pre-Release Program are traceable to the enthusiasm that the practitioners brought to the formation and development of the program. The very newness of the program and the team-building involved in bringing together diverse staffs in a shared program caused the practitioners to perform above the levels one could reasonably expect them to continue over a longer period of time. All but one of the day-to-day practitioners had job descriptions that kept them fully occupied before they became involved in the Pre-Release Program, and they have continued these prior duties throughout their involvement in the new program. Over time, such practices extract energy and sap enthusiasm. Staff burnout and/or collapse from within are likely unless the Department takes steps to address the staffing needs for the continuance of the current program or its expansion.

Finally, the practitioners suggest to the Department of Correction administration the following solutions to the problems noted above:

1. Provide the program a budget that includes capital outlay (for essential curriculum and equipment), maintenance and operation, and personnel dedicated to the delivery of pre-release programming.

2. Adopt -- and follow! -- policy and procedure which supports the pre-release concept and programmatic movement of inmates.

(An inter-institutional/divisional task force comprised of Gary Barrier-Chair, Doug Gray, Lowell Messley, Bert Schweickart, Eric MacEachern, Glenn Johnson, Jon Lang, Mel Johnson, Alan Davis, Sondra Johnson, Joe Klauser, and Dave Paskett developed a draft of a pre-release policy in January 1992. Now, at the conclusion of this evaluation of the SICI Pre-Release Program, it seems especially timely to dust off this document.)

3. Develop an organizational structure for Departmental Pre-Release that clearly indicates administrative responsibilities and linkages.

(The Idaho Department of Correction needs to heed the warning Dilulio issues in No Escape: "A good program -- one that embodies the key strategic principles of effective treatment -- will fail if it is ill managed, undermanaged, or not managed at all (p. 112)." Also, the staff involved in the delivery of the program recognize that a large part of the successes it has achieved lies in the cooperation and the diversity each discipline contributes to the overall program.

However, the staff also recognize the need to clarify these linkages formally through an organizational chart which includes these lines of inter-divisional cooperation.)

The corrections practitioners who have completed this evaluation of the SICI Pre-Release Program are encouraged by the data they have gathered and are hopeful that Departmental administration will share their excitement regarding a program that appears to work. However, the continued success of the program requires more than excitement. Unless the Department addresses the needs identified in the conclusion of this study, the program is doomed to gradual degeneration and, ultimately, token adherence to a ritual in which no one truly believes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

Dilullo, John J., Jr., No Escape: The Future of American Corrections
(USA: Basic Books, 1991)

APPENDIX

PARTICIPANT EVALUATION

Pre-Release Course, SIC1

1. Please rate the relevance of the information presented in each of the sections of the Pre-Release Program.

SECTION	RELEVANCE				
	Low				High
Personal Development (Mon-Thurs, 8:00-9:30)	1	2	3	4	5
Social Development (Mon-Thurs, 9:30-11:00)	1	2	3	4	5
Employability Development (Mon-Thurs, 1:00-2:30)	1	2	3	4	5
Substance Abuse (Mon-Thurs, 2:30-4:00)	1	2	3	4	5
Prison to Parole Transition (Fridays)	1	2	3	4	5

2. Please list the things that were covered that you believe will be most useful to you.

a. _____
b. _____
c. _____

3. Please list the things that were covered that you believe will be of little or no use to you.

a. _____
b. _____

4. Please make suggestions for improving the course..

Pre-Release Telephone Survey
P & P Officers
FY92

Parolee: _____ Number: _____

Parole Officer: _____ District: _____

1. Are you aware of the Pre-Release Program that has operated at South Idaho Correctional Institution since October 1991?

Y N

2. Do you know that you have one or more clients on your caseload who have completed the SICI Pre-Release Program?

Y N

3. _____ (parolee's name) is one of the SICI Pre-Release completers. Did you know him before he was assigned to your caseload this time?

Y N

If yes, how is he different now?

4. Do you think this parolee is more likely to succeed than the other clients on your caseload?

Y N

If yes, what attitudes, knowledge, behaviors, or skills does he have that you think will help him succeed?

Attitudes:

Knowledge:

Behavior:

Skills:

**SICI PRE-RELEASE PROGRAM COMPLETERS
EMPLOYMENT SURVEY
(Arranged by "Release Date")**

Released	Job	Wage	Hr
11-19-91	Construction	\$5.00	40
11-21-91	Warehouse	\$4.75	40
12-03-91	Maintenance	\$6.00	40
12-04-91	Meatcutter	\$6.00	40
12-04-91	Unemployed		
12-11-91	Auto Body	\$5.00	40
12-17-91	Auto Body	\$4.75	40
12-17-91	Carpenter	\$5.00	40
12-19-91	Drywaller	\$5.25	40
12-23-91	Unknown		
01-02-92	Back Injury		
01-10-92	Car Lot	\$6.00	40
01-17-92	Farmhand	\$5.00	40
01-21-92	Construction	\$5.50	40
01-24-92	Unknown		
01-27-92	Cont. JTPA Training		
01-27-92	Sawyer	\$8.00	40
01-28-92	Construction	\$8.00	40
01-30-92	Unknown		
02-03-92	Logger	\$5.00	40
02-11-92	Unemployed		
02-19-92	Farmhand	\$4.25	40
02-27-92	Unknown		
03-03-92	Unknown		

Released	Job	Wage	Hr.
03-04-92	Salvation Army		
03-05-92	Disabled		
03-06-92	Forklift	\$6.25	40
03-10-92	Fiberglass	\$4.50	40
03-12-92	Tire Shop	\$5.00	40
03-12-92	Dairy	\$7.00	40
03-17-92	Cont. JTPA Training		
03-18-92	Painter	\$5.00	40
03-19-92	Lumber	\$7.00	20
03-19-92	Auto Body	\$5.40	40
04-02-92	Installer	\$6.50	40
04-07-92	Unknown		
04-08-92	Auto Mechanic	\$4.50	40
04-08-92	Placement (Job Seeking)		
04-16-92	Placement (Job Seeking)		
04-21-92	Truck Driver	\$8.50	40
04-21-92	Placement (Job Seeking)		
04-21-92	Leg Injury		
04-22-92	Lumber	\$5.10	40
04-23-92	Placement (Job Seeking)		
04-24-92	Construction	\$8.00	20
04-29-92	Placement (Job Seeking)		
04-30-92	Cheesemaker	\$4.50	40
04-30-92	Placement (Job Seeking)		
05-05-92	Brick Layer	\$8.00	40
05-06-92	Cabinet Maker	\$6.00	40

Released	Job	Wage	Hr
05-07-92	Potato Processor	\$4.43	40
05-20-92	Placement (Job Seeking)		
05-21-92	Surgery		

**SICI PRE-RELEASE PROGRAM COMPLETERS
 RECIDIVISM SURVEY
 (Arranged by 'Completion Date' / 'Release Date')**

Started	Completed	Released	Returned	Location
10-21-91	11-08-91	11-19-91		Nampa, ID
10-21-91	11-08-91	11-21-91		Rupert, ID
10-21-91	11-08-91	12-03-91	04-22-92	Incarcerated
10-21-91	11-08-91	12-04-91		Unknown
10-21-91	11-08-91	12-04-91		Nampa, ID
10-21-91	11-08-91	12-17-91		Boise, ID
10-21-91	11-08-91	12-23-91		Washington
10-21-91	11-08-91	04-24-92		Boise, ID
10-21-91	11-08-91	04-30-92		Nampa, ID
11-18-91	12-09-91	12-11-91		Boise, ID
11-18-91	12-09-91	12-17-91		Boise, ID
11-18-91	12-09-91	12-19-91		Meridian, ID
11-18-91	12-09-91	01-02-92		Idaho
11-18-91	12-09-91	01-10-92		Midvale, UT
11-18-91	12-09-91	01-17-92		Twin Falls, ID
11-18-91	12-09-91	01-21-92		Boise, ID
11-18-91	12-09-91	01-24-92		California
11-18-91	12-09-91	02-03-92		Orofino, ID
01-02-92	01-23-92	01-27-92		Bonnars Ferry, ID
01-02-92	01-23-92	01-27-92		Idaho
01-02-92	01-23-92	01-28-92		Payette, ID
01-02-92	01-23-92	01-30-92		Texas
01-02-92	01-23-92	02-11-92		Colorado
01-02-92	01-23-92	02-19-92		Rigby, ID

Started	Completed	Released	Returned	Location
01-02-92	01-23-92	02-27-92		Unknown
01-02-92	01-23-92	03-12-92		Twin Falls, ID
01-02-92	01-23-92	04-02-92		Boise, ID
01-02-92	01-23-92	04-07-92		Washington
01-02-92	01-23-92	04-30-92		Idaho
02-10-92	03-02-92	03-03-92		Unknown
02-10-92	03-02-92	03-04-92		Idaho
02-10-92	03-02-92	03-05-92		Idaho
02-10-92	03-02-92	03-06-92		Boise, ID
02-10-92	03-02-92	03-10-92		Boise, ID
02-10-92	03-02-92	03-12-92		Pocatello, ID
02-10-92	03-02-92	03-17-92		Idaho
02-10-92	03-02-92	03-18-92		Boise, ID
02-10-92	03-02-92	03-19-92		Bonnars Ferry, ID
02-10-92	03-02-92	03-19-92		Pocatello, ID
02-10-92	03-02-92	04-08-92		Boise, ID
02-10-92	03-02-92	04-16-92		Idaho
02-10-92	03-02-92	04-29-92		Idaho
03-09-92	03-27-92	04-08-92		Nevada
03-09-92	03-27-92	04-21-92		Santa Cruz, CA
03-09-92	03-27-92	04-21-92		Unknown
03-09-92	03-27-92	04-21-92		Idaho
03-09-92	03-27-92	04-22-92		Spokane, WA
03-09-92	03-27-92	04-23-92		Washington
04-13-92	05-01-92	05-05-92		Hailey, ID
04-13-92	05-01-92	05-06-92		Nampa, ID

2 4 2 92

Started	Completed	Released	Returned	Location
04-13-92	05-01-92	05-07-92		Blackfoot, ID
04-13-92	05-01-92	05-20-92		Unknown
04-13-92	05-01-92	05-21-92		Idaho