

AN INTRODUCTION TO EVALUATION RESEARCH  
FOR AGENCY ADMINISTRATORS

Wiley C. Smith  
Assistant Professor  
School of Public Administration  
San Diego State University

NCJRS

OCT 20 1976

ACQUISITIONS

Distributed through the International  
Halfway House Association

CT-523

\$2.85

37064

## ABSTRACT

While recognizing the breadth and complexity of the field of evaluation research, this paper is presented as a sensitizing introduction for Community Residential Treatment Center Administrators. The paper addresses the major concerns of the administrator in evaluation. It is intended to:

- A. Emphasize the growing demand for applied research and evaluation as necessary adjuncts to pure research and service delivery operations.
- B. Point out the key role of agency administrators in evaluation research and the possible dilemmas presented by evaluation.
- C. Discuss the practical expediency of integrating operational data recording with evaluational research and continuing policy/program feedback needs.
- D. Present the advantages and disadvantages of various resources available to agency administrators.
- E. Explicate the evaluation process as a series of inter-related strategical and tactical decisions aimed at increasing the validity of research.
- F. Provide an introduction to research designs, sampling techniques, and approaches to data storage, retrieval and compilation.
- G. Urge the use of cost-benefit analysis as a necessary component of evaluation.
- H. Cite further references for the use of agency administrators in acquiring a more complete knowledge of evaluation research problems, methods, and techniques.
- I. Recommend increased intra and inter agency evaluation efforts.

## Introduction

The purpose of this component of the Institute is three fold:

1. to place proper emphasis on the growing importance of evaluation in corrections.
2. to provide participants with an introduction to the basic concepts, methods, and utilization of evaluational research.
3. to suggest the integration of evaluation techniques with on-going agency record keeping as an administrative tool.

In the past decade research in Corrections has shifted from abstract theory testing by academicians on a sporadic basis to a focus on applied research assessing the change impact of particular programs.<sup>1</sup> The shift to applied research has been to a great extent due to the demand of funding sources. Persons responsible for resource allocations are expecting to see change as a result of expenditures. The catch word, either implicit or explicit, is "accountability." Accountability, not only for expenditure of funds for services agreed upon, but an accounting of whether these services made a significant difference in quantity of clients served and quality of outcomes or usually a combination of the two.

In the past the major concern has been to provide facilities and service delivery systems. An example of this was LEAA's disbursement of large sums of money to police departments for purchase of equipment and innovative programs. Now, LEAA is asking these same departments, "What good did it do?", "Where and by how much have you reduced crime?". Currently all facets of the field of Corrections are being asked similar questions. The questions are usually some variation of, "Did your program reduce the recidivism rate of your clients better than Program X?" Consequently the credibility of programs or treatment modalities are being questioned in terms of evaluated effectiveness. Increasingly these evaluations are based on demonstrable measures of change rather than philosophical polemics.

In addition to evaluation of existing programs, there is a rising demand that administrative policy and decisions be based upon, or at least guided by, solid data. Funding sources, boards of directors, and the public are effectively demanding a **demonstrable** rationale before supporting a proposed change or continuing support for an existing program or policy. This demand is further impetus for program administrators to seek adequate sources of information to justify their decisions or proposals.

It is apparent that not only in the interests of accumulating knowledge in the field of Corrections but from a practical necessity,

evaluation research is becoming an integral part of the Corrections scene with vast implications for community residential treatment centers as a growing alternative to traditional correctional processes.

### The Administrator's Dilemma<sup>2</sup>

In addition to being the principal recipient of pressures for evaluational research the program administrator is the crucial variable in evaluation policy and process within his/her agency. Whether or not evaluational research is conducted and whether such research is effectively utilized in agency management is highly dependent upon the administrator's attitude toward such efforts.

As in most pivotal roles this key position may present some very difficult dilemmas for the administrator. The major possibility for contradictory roles lies in the fact that as chief executive of his agency, responsibility for the success of its operations (including evaluation) rests upon him and that success is largely dependent upon his knowledge and involved encouragement. At the same time objective evaluational research may bring into question the credibility of administrative decisions, programs or policies, thereby reflecting upon the administrator's judgement. Some administrators may find themselves in a quandary with respect to the amount of support that should be given to a process that has the potential of undermining administrative decisions. This approach-avoidance conflict is especially acute when the data involves politically sensitive policies or practices.

The impact of research upon the administrator and the program depends upon the administrator's capability of handling the problems and opportunities presented by evaluation as a management tool. Some writers on the subject separate administrators into two general categories according to their mode of handling evaluative research.<sup>3</sup>

The administrator who is philosophically or politically committed to the appropriateness or inevitability of his program, and who will be in trouble emotionally and officially if an evaluation indicates a lack of program effectiveness, is in a real sense the "trapped" administrator. He may reject the evaluation as invalid, quietly shelve the research results, or try to influence the research process in order to dilute its objectivity and bias the results to suit his own value stance. Such reactions tend to impede the development of programs in the agency, invalidates research as a decision making tool, and creates real difficulties for those conducting the research efforts, especially in-house research efforts.

By contrast, the "experimental" administrator is not emotionally committed to a particular program or method but rather is committed to program and agency improvement. He views evaluation as an important input to the planning and decision making process.

The major objective is the analysis and solution of problems in a pragmatic way rather than attempting to justify or defend a particular solution to which he has committed himself. Naturally, finding a program to lack effectiveness is disappointing, but this knowledge is then used in the planning of new or modified programs in a continuing effort for improvement.

It is apparent that the administrator with an experimental stance toward evaluation is not trapped by evaluation but finds research to be an important instrument to be utilized in his necessary tasks of planning, policy and decision making. Not being trapped by staking his credibility on a particular program or treatment modality allows him the flexibility to engage in a continual process of agency and program improvement.

Adams has noted:<sup>4</sup>

There is need to define research requirements and establish research priorities that relate closely to constructive policy. There is need for continuing interaction with researchers, exchanging ideas, discussing new correctional concepts and emerging research findings, and learning how to penetrate the communication barriers that separate researchers from other agency staff.

There is need for the administrator to react appropriately to research results, to consider the best uses of positive findings, and to weigh fully the implications of negative findings. There is need to avoid over-reaction to either positive or negative findings, and at the same time to make suitable uses of both types of findings. There is need to involve researchers in decision making and in planning.

#### Integrating Evaluation Data and Operation's Records

The agency asked to evaluate a planned program or project or an agency wishing to use evaluative research as on-going feedback to assist in planning and decisions is immediately faced with the problem of minimizing disruption of operational activities by the evaluational process. The complaint is often heard that "My job is to operate an agency and deliver services to clients not to engage in research." However, that complaint is just as often countered by, "We realize that, but is your agency effective?" or "How do your services change your clients?"

The choice appears not to be whether or not to become involved in research but how to manage research efforts while operating an agency. There are several alternative or combinations of alternatives to solving the problem of research involvement.

One alternative is to contract with an outside agency to come

in on an "as needed basis" to evaluate the agency or particular programs. As in other alternatives, there are both advantages and disadvantages to utilizing an outside research team. The advantages include:

1. Contracting with an outside agency does not require the addition of new staff or completely removing existing staff from routine operating duties.
2. Existing staff may be lacking in research expertise that outside agencies may provide.
3. An "unbiased third party" evaluation may add credibility to an evaluation that would be difficult to acquire if conducted by staff involved in the project, especially if it is a politically sensitive issue.
4. Outside agencies often possess both hardware and software research capabilities not available from within the agency.

The disadvantages include:

1. Securing funds to pay the special research team.
2. The interruption of routine operations to assist researchers unfamiliar with agency records and operations.
3. Benefits of the special research effort may not extend beyond the immediate project in question. This may be due to lack of sustained interest of the outside researcher who feels responsibility only for the project at hand, or to agency funding capabilities.
4. Controlling the timeliness and distribution of research results, as well as the confidentiality of client records, may pose problems with outside researchers. These difficulties should be handled prior to the research effort through a carefully written service contract.
5. Some outside agencies are so specialized that they may tend to structure the research according to their pre-existing academic or intellectual bent rather than to the needs of the project. For example it has been noted that some academicians tend to turn every research project into a revision or extension of their Ph D dissertation. Private, for profit research firms are likely to try to use already developed techniques whether or not these instruments or methods are appropriate unless specifically paid to adapt to the needs of the specific project at hand.
6. Often the jargon and philosophy of outside researchers and agency staff are at variance and pose problems of effective communication concerning research efforts.

7. The time and knowledge needed in monitoring the work of an outside agency may require the assistance of yet another outside consultant if that expertise and time are not available in the agency. This problem may be greatest when working on a low budget contract with a private for profit firm. The temptation to cut costs (and corners) that reduce the quality of evaluation may pose problems.

Some of the best and some of the poorest research projects have been done by outside agencies. These research organizations are important resources to be explored along with other alternatives.

"Grow your own" is an alternative to funding outside firms to conduct research for your agency. Small agencies usually find prohibitive the cost of supporting staff positions not involved with service delivery operations. However, there are some distinct advantages to an in-house research capability. These advantages include:

1. The research team is familiar with the objectives, philosophy, and operating problems and procedures of the agency.
2. In addition to providing feedback on agency operations, the gear-up time for new projects is greatly reduced.
3. Communication with service delivery staff is facilitated and misunderstandings avoided.
4. Problems of confidentiality of records and appropriate distribution of research results are reduced.
5. Since research and planning are two sides of the same coin, utilization of research results is facilitated since those conducting the research are in a position to immediately apply feedback to the planning, development, and/or modification of programs.
6. The existence of in-house research capabilities enhances the possibilities of conducting limited in-house trials or pilot projects without the pressure of ensuring each one to be a resounding success and the possible backlash reaction that can result.<sup>5</sup>
7. A distinct advantage of sustained in-house research activities is the routinization of evaluation and feedback over long periods of time. Long-term follow up of programs has been a missing but glaring necessity in evaluating programs aimed at changing people or policies.<sup>6</sup>

Some of the difficulties associated with in-house research units include:

1. The expense of maintaining qualified research personnel is often prohibitive, especially in small or new agencies.

2. Research staff may become co-opted by the "trapped" administrator in such a way that valid research is impossible. Constant pressure to bias research to show favorable results becomes ethically untenable.
3. Research persons are often reduced to routine counting and operational record keeping rather than playing an active role in planning and evaluation. Such under utilization will usually discourage well-qualified researchers. The pressure is great to fully absorb research staff in operations record keeping or as a built-in apologist for the agency and thus subvert objective and useful feedback.<sup>7</sup>
4. Because research staff must also be used in other capacities in smaller agencies, staff retention is often tenuous due to the thwarting of their felt need to remain engaged in important or more exciting research projects and maintain a professional growth pattern.
5. Even if the agency can afford an in-house research capability, it is difficult to find and retain persons with flexible and adequate academic training who are also willing and capable of applied evaluational research. Frequent turn over in research personnel seriously hampers the effort to maintain continuous and cumulative evaluation results.

It is readily apparent that neither outside agency or totally in-house research resources may provide an adequate answer to the agencies' evaluational needs. In order to tailor a research program to suit the needs of a particular agency it may be necessary to devise an optimum research package. This package should be tailored so that it serves the particular needs of the agency and is flexible enough to be modified as the agency changes through time.

In the instance where the agency has adequate financial resources, a package consisting of a small in-house staff supplemented by an outside research team or consultants on a part-time basis may provide the necessary capabilities. Outside research resources are especially useful during the gearing up or planning phase. During periods of routine program operation, the in-house research staff carries on maintenance activities of the research project and calls in the original consultants at other peak research effort periods. The in-house staff may need assistance to handle particular phases such as research design and data analysis due to a lack of data manipulation capabilities or to ensure a research plan acceptable to the ultimate consumers of the results. This is also a method of minimizing the charges of bias in self evaluations since outside experts assisted in and monitored the planning of the research and appropriate analysis of the data.



Given a reduced agency budget an alternative package is to contract with outside resources for consultants to train certain staff whose duties would include research responsibilities as well as some program operations. Consultants then serve as periodic advisors to help solve particular problems and keep research activities on the right track. In-house staff are used to monitor, collect data, and compile results while checking with advisors concerning appropriateness.

In the situation where there are no funds to contract for outside assistance and little or no in-house research capabilities, it is time for "let's make a deal." Since universities and colleges are the source of most research education and training, it may prove fruitful to negotiate with appropriate departments or individual faculty for a mutual assistance deal.

Faculty members may be willing to lend their research expertise to the agency in return for use of the evaluation data or other data acquired in the evaluation process which is of interest to them. Many graduate departments now require internship service of its students. The students need an agency in order to gain experience and the agency may need the human resources and expertise they can provide. However, a strong caveat should be issued at this point.

Although the university or college may prove to be a very valuable resource, there are some subtle, and not so subtle, problems which should be considered. Some of these include the following:<sup>8</sup>

1. The academician tends to bring with him the frame of reference or outlook of his particular discipline. The agency must ascertain if this outlook is too narrow, whether the potential researcher is flexible enough to leave the world of "pure" research and engage in the inter-disciplinary activities of applied research, and particularly whether the outside source will remain with the project for an extended period of time.
2. The agency must be sure that its own evaluation needs will be satisfied as well as the research interest of the faculty member.
3. The agency should insist that a graduate internship arrangement should include:
  - a. a reliable faculty member who is ultimately responsible for adequate performance of interns.
  - b. The arrangement should be on a long-term basis with a smooth transition process from one wave of interns to the next.
  - c. Unless it is a specific short-term project, interns should be assigned in teams since they are required to serve only part time.

- d. The agency must see that interns have adequate research training to be of real assistance to the agency.
4. It is of major importance to select those university faculty who are willing to work with less than perfect research designs and data but at the same time are willing to work diligently to overcome these obstacles and produce an acceptable product. This often requires "the better-trained rather than less well-trained research workers, as is often assumed."<sup>9</sup>
5. It is essential that there be a joint and written understanding of the use, publication, and ownership of data and findings.

Despite the aforementioned cautions, the university is probably the most economical and most readily available research resource for agency evaluation needs. In addition the agency makes an important contribution through involving the academician in training for himself and his students in the frustrations of applied research. Many doctoral dissertations, masters theses, and professional publications have been obtained, and more should be, from significant research that helps agencies solve their problems. An important function of research through universities is the feedback to and linkages between the theoretical formulation efforts of the various disciplines and the application of theory in the field.

#### Integrating Operations Records with Evaluation Research Needs

Data for evaluation research must be drawn from agency records, special observation of client change, or indirect observations of change such as questionnaires or tests. Consequently the agency administrator can facilitate the research task, minimize the disruption of service delivery operations and provide more valid and reliable data by planning operations records to serve research purposes. Once this task is accomplished, both records needed for monitoring client treatment and effective evaluation will be easier.

Glaser has noted that "currently available records are grossly deficient for both operations and research. The analysis of these deficiencies will suggest that records can be improved if they are designed to serve both operations and research purposes simultaneously."<sup>10</sup> Glaser then continues to discuss this problem in the following quotation.<sup>11</sup>

- A. Operations records vary greatly in completeness. Some administrative or casework staff jot down detailed information on all items, but some make few or no entries on many items, even when standardized forms are used. Yet the compilation of statistics on an item requires an entry on that item in all cases.

- B. Operations records often vary in their terminology for describing the same item, in the aspects of the item which they emphasize, or in the dimensions they employ to indicate the item's magnitude or quality. Such variation, of course, impedes tabulation of statistics on an item. Records that consist of narrative accounts or comments usually contain all possible mixtures of terminology, as well as much variability in the thoroughness with which they describe their topics.
- C. Operations records are often bulky and inefficient when used for the retrieval of information. Administrative or case records frequently consist of long narrative reports with a large number of diverse documents overlapping in their information and jumbled in a thick file. Compilation of statistics on hundreds or thousands of cases from such files, therefore, requires a tedious and error-prone search that is extremely costly and inefficient.
- D. Operations records simply were not designed for research purposes, and therefore, many neglect to record the kinds of information researchers desire.

Glaser also points up the deficiencies of agency records even for operation purposes, especially narrative reports. Perhaps the following statement from Glaser may often be applied to agency records in general.<sup>12</sup>

Narrative statements are especially diverse in completeness and in the terminology they employ for describing a particular item. They are also most difficult to use when seeking specific items of information they are presumed to contain. The latter defect is an impediment for operations use as well as for research; if one desires a particular fact, such as the intelligence test score of a client, the personality assessment he received from the psychiatrist, or the names of the client's criminal associates, it is much easier to find those in standardized forms that have a space for these items than to dig through narrative accounts in search of them.

The remedy for these problems with narrative reports, of course, is to have precoded reports in standard categories which staff can simply check to indicate the information they wish to report.

The reader is urged to study the various methods of standardizing operations data as presented by Glaser. In addition, examples of integrated operations and research data forms are included in Appendix

While this presentation is not intended to be a thorough treatise on research evaluation methodology and techniques, and while it is recognized that all agency administrators need not be, nor even desire to be research experts, it is imperative that the administrator have some minimal grasp of the problems and processes of evaluation. Therefore, the remainder of the paper is intended to provide a cursory introduction to evaluational methods and techniques for the key person in both the production and consumption of evaluational feedback.

### Cost Benefit Analysis<sup>13</sup>

Cost benefit analysis is rapidly becoming an extremely important criterion in evaluating correctional programs. In addition to the demand to know which program is best for changing people, there is the demand to know which program gets the most "bang for the buck." Two programs may have very similar success rates but if one is less costly to operate, that fact becomes an important criterion for evaluation and funding.

Space does not permit a fuller discussion of cost benefit analysis, however, the reader is strongly urged to study carefully the section on cost benefit analysis found in Glaser's book, Routinization of Evaluation, pages twenty-six through forty-seven. Lack of treatment in this paper should in no way diminish the importance of this topic for the agency administrator.

### The Process of Evaluation

The term evaluation has been used to mean many different things, therefore, a clear definition of evaluation is in order. As used in this paper, evaluation means the use of scientific methods in applied research as a procedure to determine whether an event, process, or program is better when compared to some other event or program whose objectives are relatively similar. The key concepts in this definition are "scientific methods" and comparison. This evaluation is basically a procedure for scientific comparison; comparison with another program or with some previous existing or ideal situation.

The process of evaluation include the following steps:

1. stating the objectives of the program in clear, explicit terms.
2. identifying appropriate measurable criteria to be used in assessing these objectives.
3. gathering the data necessary to accurately reflect the selected criteria.
4. determining the differences between the observed data and the comparison criteria.

5. interpreting or explaining the observed differences in useful ways.
6. formulating recommendations based on the interpretations and other appropriate considerations.

The implicit but central issues in the evaluation process are the methods and techniques used in the various steps, i.e. choice of criteria appropriate to the objectives to be measured, the techniques of data gathering, the design of the process so as to maximize the validity of the comparison, techniques of data analysis appropriate to the data and the necessary comparisons. The more scientifically objective are the techniques and design the more credible the results will be to those who evaluate the evaluation.

The differences between evaluation and program monitoring should be noted. Program monitoring usually involves what may be thought of as contract compliance audits or program audits. A program audit or monitoring effort basically asks the question, "Is the agency providing the quality and quantity of service it is expected to provide?" While evaluation basically asks the questions, "What has changed as a result of contract compliance?" or "How successful is this arrangement as compared to some other situation?" One asks, "Did you do it?" and the other asks "What were the effects?" The two analyses may go hand in hand but the goals are distinct.

Planning the evaluation process may be thought of as making a series of functionally interdependent decisions on strategy and tactics. Strategy constitutes the overall research design and tactics are the techniques of implementing the strategy. As in military maneuvers, a change in strategy calls for a change in tactics and conversely. An example of a series of decisions follows:

#### Decision 1

First, the strategy calls for a decision about the specific objectives of the program or "what are the expected changes resulting from program activities." Specifying objectives is often a most difficult task because the objectives to be measured must be stated in terms of events or behaviors that are capable of empirical or "real world" observation.

For example, the objective may be to "rehabilitate" certain types of clients. The term "rehabilitate" is quite abstract and has a multiplicity of meanings. It is incumbent upon the administrator and researcher to arrive at exactly what behaviors involved in rehabilitation are measurable and relevant for the evaluation at hand. The meaning of the objective must be elaborated and made precise to the point where there is no ambiguity about what is being measured. Upon reflection it appears that most programs actually have several levels of objectives. The ultimate objective may be some ideal end state desired but in program operation,

there are various intermediate objectives that must be achieved before the ultimate ideal goal is gained. Failure to take into account a hierarchy or series of objectives may make a relatively effective program look like a dismal flop.

### Decision 2

The second decision then is whether these objectives are empirically observable. In this example, as in most cases, objectives are stated in abstract terms so the strategist must find the real world events that are acceptable equivalents of the abstraction.

### Decision 3

The third decision becomes "What observable phenomena should be used to mean or indicate 'rehabilitation' or whatever the objective?" The decision may be to use a number of indicators because no single indicator is strong enough to convey all that is meant by a complex concept or objective. In this instance, from one's own experience and through consultation with others knowledgeable in the field, the following indicators may be selected as appropriate referents of rehabilitation:

- a. Warrants issued against clients who participated in the program.
- b. Seriousness of charges against clients or time spent in confinement.
- c. Rate of employment.
- d. Increase in job skills.
- e. Changes in social behaviors displayed while in the program.
- f. Changes in attitudes while in the program.

Without discussing the merits of each indicator, it is apparent that the use of multiple indicators for a particular concept or objective will yield a more complete picture of what is meant by that concept. Using a single indicator, such as "recidivism" may ignore other important effects of a program.

One of the great fallacies of correctional research has been in using single indicators for very complex concepts such as "success" or "rehabilitation." Success or change most often occurs by increments or degrees, and in a hierarchial manner, not in an all or nothing fashion. It is indeed rare that separate programs (or persons) are so similar that a single measure would constitute an adequate comparison of their relative effectiveness.

#### Decision 4

The fourth decision involves selection of the appropriate techniques for actually counting or putting in operation the indicators previously chosen. The problem is actually two-fold. "What tactics should be used to count or observe these indicators?" and precisely "What is to be observed?" Concretely observable events are usually most acceptable. Examples are: use of police records to count the number of arrests, warrants issued, or days spent in confinement; days of employment as compared to possible working days; employment skills or social skill at time of release compared to intake; or agency records on behavior reports during treatment.

Other phenomena observed indirectly such as attitude test scores or other questionnaire-type measures may be weaker indicators of change. The discrepancies may be quite great between oral or written espousals and actual behaviors.

#### Decision 5

After operationalizing the indicators or specific variables to be measured, the next decision involves selecting a strategy for comparing the observations of the program or clients with some other appropriate comparison group or point in time. The problem is to select a research strategy or design that will maximize the validity of the conclusions to be drawn from the research observations.

If the research design is inadequate, consumers of the research report are able to challenge the results by hypothesizing alternative ways to arrive at the same conclusions. The critic may also hypothesize alternative conclusions based on the same observations described in the research.

The objective of this strategical and multifaceted decision is to rule out these competing hypotheses by the logic and operation of the strongest possible research design. However, the design must be selected according to the data and resources available to the researcher.

There may be several hypotheses competing with the evaluation hypothesis that, "the program produced the observed changes." Eight of the common competing hypotheses are presented here. If these competing explanations are not controlled by design of the evaluation, the critic will have good cause to question the research conclusions.

Using the operation of the program as the experimental variable, the effects of any of the following phenomena may be intertwined with the effects of program if not controlled by research design:<sup>14</sup>

1. History, the effects of events external to the program, may influence the observed results of the program. Examples are changes in the external environment eg. job market, revised legal codes, changes in agency policies or administration.

2. Maturation effects are natural process within clients that are a function of the passage of time eg. growing older (growing up), or other biological or psychological processes which systematically vary with passage of time, independent of the program.
3. Instrumentation changes, such as changes of observers, change in observers (observers get tired, sloppy, etc.), interviewers or testers become blasé.
4. Testing may in and of itself produce effects unrelated to the program operations in question. Subjects may become "test wise" or simply taking the test may have a sensitizing or learning result. This is especially problematic in a "test - retest" situation.
5. Regression toward the average is a common effect when observing groups who are extreme on some attribute. For example if one hundred clients were tested for achievement motivation and the ten clients with the highest scores were selected for retest at a later time, the statistical probabilities are that these ten persons, as a group, would achieve somewhat lower scores on the second test i.e. a movement toward the average. Because their scores were so extreme in the first instance, the probability is that their average score will be lower the second time. If the researcher is not aware of this artifact of statistical probability, and studies only an extreme group, it might appear the program actually caused them to regress. On the other hand, an extremely low scoring group will tend to score higher upon retest (move toward the average) even without experiencing the program, since they were selected for their extremely low scores to start with.<sup>15</sup>
6. Selection biases may be a serious threat to the validity of research results if questionable or different criteria or processes are used in the selection of program participants for example, using volunteers may bias results by selecting the most eager or the most manipulative from the pool of clients. Selection procedures, which produce characteristics unrepresentative of the group from which the selection was made by quality or quantity, seriously weaken the validity of research conclusions.
7. Attrition or "case mortality" is often overlooked in evaluational research. If a significant number of clients drop out or are removed from the program, and are unaccounted for in the research, the representativeness or validity of analyses of the remaining clients is questionable. Glaser reports the example of Dr. Ramirez who claimed a low 5.6 percent relapse rate in treatment of narcotic addicts. However, Ramirez failed to include the fact that his claim was based upon only 124 clients who completed the "re-entry" phase of his project. The 124



clients represent less than seven percent of those entering the program which had at least 1800 clients, and according to how they were counted could be up to 10,000.<sup>16</sup>

8. Reactive effects of special or particular program arrangements may raise serious doubts about concluding that the observed results could be obtained in other situations. If clients are told they are participating in an experimental or demonstration project, that knowledge alone may spur them to better (or worse) performance than if the program was in routine operation. The knowledge that it was an experiment may "cause" the result, not the program. A pitfall of many correctional research conclusion is that the observations (upon which the conclusions are based) were made in an artificial environment which was different in significant ways from the "real world" environment.

It is apparent that the very foundation of evaluational research (as compared to program monitoring) is the process of comparing one program or group of clients with some other standard or group, either real or ideal.

### Basic Research Designs

The following are some basic research designs illustrating the strengths and weaknesses of various research strategies in controlling for sources of invalidity. (The reader is urged to study carefully the book by Campbell and Stanley, Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research, Rand McNally, 1963.)

#### 1. One Shot Case Study

X O<sub>1</sub>

These symbols indicate one program (X) followed by a single observation or follow-up study.

#### 2. One Group Pretest - Posttest

O<sub>1</sub> X O<sub>2</sub>

In this instance research data is collected on the subjects before the program as well as a post program observation of the same type of data.

#### 3. Posttest Only with Comparison Group

X O<sub>1</sub> (Group A)

O<sub>2</sub> (Group B)

Design three indicates comparing by posttest only a group who did not experience the program with those whose did.

#### 4. Pretest - Posttest with Control Group

R O<sub>1</sub> X O<sub>2</sub> (Group A)

R O<sub>1</sub> O<sub>2</sub> (Group B)

An important feature of this design is the randomized selection of the two samples, (one group experienced the program and one did not. Both groups are pretested and posttested.) The purpose of randomized selection is to ensure that all clients with all combinations of characteristics have an equal chance of being included in the study when the entire client population is not used in the research.

A systematic randomization procedure avoids selection bias that could inflate or deflate true program results. Random selection may be achieved through such simple procedures as drawing numbers or names from a hat, use of a table of random numbers usually published in statistics texts, or a series of random numbers generated by a computer. After numbering the clients or cases sequentially, refer to a table or series of randomized numbers, starting with the first random number, draw the client or case with the same number until an adequate sample has been drawn.

As a consumer of research reports, the agency administrator should be particularly mindful of selection bias and this method of randomization to avoid it.

#### 5. Classic Four Group Design (often called the Solomon Four Group Design)

R O<sub>1</sub> X O<sub>2</sub> (Group A)

R O<sub>1</sub> O<sub>2</sub> (Group B)

R X O<sub>2</sub> (Group C)

R O<sub>2</sub> (Group D)

This classic design utilizes four groups, each sample acquired by randomized selection, two who experienced **the program** and **two who** do not, two who were pretested and two who were not. Each group is studied as a check on the validity of conclusions drawn from studying the others.

Keeping in mind the competing hypotheses previously discussed as alternative explanations of effects attributed to the operation of the programs, each design may be inspected to estimate its ability to handle or account for each alternative hypothesis.

In design (1), the one shot case study, none of the competing hypotheses can be refuted because there are no comparisons with other programs or previous points in time. If any other alternatives are available it is rarely defensible to use a one shot case study. As a pilot or trial study a one shot case study may prove helpful in providing hunches for further exploration or a simple description of what happened to the clients. If the results of such a study are compared implicitly or explicitly with some other known or commonly assumed data (e.g. heroin addicts have an 85 - 95% relapse rate), then it may be of some value. However, it then becomes, in effect, a posttest only with a comparison group.

Since the classic (Solomon) four group design incorporates the features of all other designs presented here (except the one shot case study), it will be used as an example of the effective research strategy.

The randomization process used to assign clients to the four comparison groups maximized the probability that (if all four groups originated from the same pool of possible participants) biasing or differentiating characteristics are evenly distributed. In other words, the proportion of short, tall, fat, skinny, eager, angry, or dumb people will be approximately the same in each group. The design may be inspected using the list of competing hypotheses as a measurement of strength.

For example, History is controlled in that the groups (A) and (B) are observed during the same time span therefore any effects of historical events would be the same in all groups and could not account for observed differences.

Maturation and Testing are controlled in that any effects of aging, tiredness, or learning from the pretest would show up equally in groups (A) and (B). Furthermore, since group (B) experienced the pretest but not the program, it is possible to separate the effects of the pretest from program effects; and a further separation is achieved by observing the results of group (C) who did not have the test but did experience the program; one final check is to observe the results of group (D) who neither had the pretest nor experienced the program.

The logic of comparing the results of each group with the results of every other group, plus the "equalizing" effects of randomized assignment holds true for each of the remaining competing hypotheses. The reader is invited to inspect the design carefully and to consult the aforementioned book by Campbell and Stanley (pp. 13-25) to more fully explore the merits of multiple comparison groups. The logic of comparison should be used to evaluate any proposed design.

It should be recognized that modifications of these designs are necessary to handle certain problems. For example a time series design such as  $O_1 \quad O_2 \quad X \quad O_3 \quad O_4 \quad O_5$  may be necessary to ascertain the long range or "sleeper" effects of some programs.

## Decision 6

This decision is whether to gather data on the entire population who experienced the program or to study a selected sample of that population. Time, money, and available manpower play a large role in choosing a sample size. It is usually best to study carefully a smaller truly representative sample than gather sloppy data on large numbers of cases. How large the sample must be to be a valid representation of the pool of cases under consideration is best answered by a trained statistician. Adequate sample size depends upon the nature of the population to be studied, the nature of the data to be gathered; and how the data is to be analyzed statistically.

The sampling strategy must also be taken into consideration. Some examples of general sampling strategies are:<sup>17</sup>

1. Simple random sample as described in the previous section on randomization.
2. Stratified sampling involves dividing the population to be sampled into homogeneous strata according to some appropriate criteria such as age, economic status, marital status, race, religion, extent of previous record, or type of offense. Then draw samples from within each strata. If some important group is under represented in the sample, it is appropriate to draw a disproportionate sample for that group to ensure there are enough of those important types of cases or people to be meaningful within the context of the research.
3. Cluster sampling is used to acquire cases from specific geographic areas of importance to the study; e.g. separate clients into different locations within a geographic or political region and draw samples from each general area or cluster of cases.
4. Judgemental or purposive sampling is justified (a) when some subgroup can be judged to be representative of the total pool, or (b) when the research calls for a sample to be selected because of its particular interest, e.g. first offenders or the most "hard core" clients. this approach should be used with caution unless persons well trained in research and who are familiar with the program and nature of the clients are consulted.

There are many variations on these general types of sampling and many techniques within each general type. Consultation with knowledgeable researchers would be wise before accepting or deciding on a sampling strategy or tactics.

## Decision 7

Techniques used in gathering data vary according to the type of questions asked of the research. Persons knowledgeable in

statistical analyses should be asked to advise on the form of the data as well as collection techniques.

Data may be collected by actual observation of behavior or observation of the artifacts of behavior, such as employment records. The form of the collected data will permit or exclude certain types of statistical analyses. If the data is collected in such a manner as to permit only an elementary level scale, sophisticated data analysis may be prohibited.

The administrator should be acutely aware of the extreme importance of using multivariate analysis (sometimes called elaboration, specification, or cross classification techniques) in evaluation. Rarely is a one variable analysis of a program adequate. Since several variables are important in influencing the outcome of a program, they must be utilized in the evaluation. Techniques for exploring the influence of the operation of several variables at the same time include: cross classification tables, partial correlation, factor analysis, and such sophisticated techniques as path analysis. The reader is urged to refer to a basis statistics or research methods text for further explanation. Before implementation of an evaluation program the researcher or consultant should be asked to explain what multivariate analysis he will perform and why this analysis is appropriate to the evaluation at hand.

The collected data will exhibit characteristics of one or a combination of the following scales arranged from the elementary to the more precise:

1. Nominal scales are simply the naming of categories to separate the data, with no indication of degrees or gradients. An example is employed and unemployed. Nominating categories to divide the data allows comparison by some characteristic but not by degrees of that characteristic.
2. Ordinal scales rank order the data from higher to lower. Employment of clients may then be compared by some rough measure of degree. An example might be employed full time, employed regularly part-time, intermittent employment, hard core unemployed.
3. Interval scales allow more precise measures of degree by indicating the exact degree of possession of that characteristic. In the case of employment the data might be arranged by the exact number of days worked in a given period of time. If client A worked fifty days out of a possible one hundred, and client B worked all one hundred days, it is possible to know precisely the difference between the two cases. Any measure that yields information about exact intervals between degrees of a characteristic has greater flexibility than a lower level scale. Interval scales allow subtraction and addition operations but lower level scales do not.

4. A ratio scale is an advanced form of interval scale, if the thing to be measured has an absolute zero ("0") point. In the above case of days of employment, the absolute zero would obviously be no days of employment. But intelligence or authoritarianism have no zero point, (although in the case of intelligence, one might sometimes wonder.) Because there is the "0" comparison point, ratio scales permit statistical operations such as calculating percentages, exact rates or ratios, and higher level statistical manipulations that are not possible with lower level scales.

Further explanations of levels of measurement and their appropriate use may be found in most elementary statistics texts. It should be noted that lower level scales may be entirely appropriate depending upon the research answers needed.

### Decision 8

Decision 8 involves how to compile data retrieved from research efforts. Small amounts of non-complex data may be hand tabulated with pencil, paper, and perhaps a hand calculator using the original data collection forms spread out on the dining room table. However, each time the researcher wishes to tabulate the data in a different way, it is usually necessary to return to the original lengthy forms and the dining room table.

A somewhat unsatisfactory, but sometimes adequate, alternative is to record the data using a system like the Royal Mc Bee system used in some agencies and schools who do not have computer access. A Mc Bee type system consists of punching holes or slots in cards according to possession or non-possession of the characteristic in question. For example, the cards are printed with small squares just inside the edges. Each square represents some characteristic such as married or unmarried. Those cases who are married are punched with a hole in the center of the square, those not married are punched with a slot extending through the edge of the card. In order to choose all the married clients, simply push a long thin rod (provided in the kit) through the proper square and lift. All those not married will be left in the upright holder because they have been punched with an open slot. Those having or having a certain attribute are easily separated. This method, although elementary, permits permanent and easily accessible storage of data. Obviously large numbers of cases and complex data would at some point preclude the use of this system. However, it is quite effective for smaller, low-budget operations.

Computerization of data for analysis, storage, and access purposes is the most satisfactory method of research and record keeping. If agency or grant funds are not available, business firms or local universities may be willing to assist. In situations where agencies are interrelated with city, county, or state computer systems, it may be possible to make arrangements of mutual benefit.

The value to routinizing the evaluation process cannot be stressed too strongly. The long term track record for particular agencies as well as the entire field of corrections is coming under increasingly greater pressures to show evidence of their effectiveness. It is the rare administrator who will escape these pressures for accountability.

The last two, but possibly most important, of evaluation decisions have been saved for this concluding comment.

#### Decisions 9 and 10

The two most important decisions in conducting evaluations with greatest effectiveness are: (A) the decision should be made to plan the evaluation process from the very start to finish before beginning any actual research. The entire plan, including the rationale for the evaluation should be in written form and given to appropriate staff members and other persons knowledgeable in research methods for their input, suggestions, and modification. Groups and clients to be compared should be decided upon, separated, or randomly assigned before starting the program. Post Hoc evaluations are more difficult and in most cases more suspect. A complete plan and constructive criticism may be the most money and time-saving input the administrator can make.

(B) The decision to integrate operational records and research data needs, by the use of standard data forms, both within and between agencies, would constitute an advancement of real significance in the field of corrections. It is significant that the International Halfway House Association is working to increase and improve this practice. The reader is again referred to Appendix and urged to contact the International Halfway House Association for advice in moving toward this goal.

## FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup>Stuart Adams, Evaluative Research in Corrections: A Practical Guide (Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, Washington, D.C., 1975), pp. 3 - 4.

Joseph S. Wholey et al., Federal Evaluation Policy (Washington D.C.: The Urban Institute, 1970), pp. 11 - 12 and pp. 19 - 23.

<sup>2</sup>Much of the following material is drawn from: Stuart Adams, Evaluative Research in Corrections: A Practical Guide (Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, Washington, D.C., 1975), pp. 19 - 27.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 119, Item 6.

Donald T. Campbell, "Reforms as Experiments," Quasi-Experimental Approaches: Testing Theory and Evaluating Policy, Ed. James A. Caporaso and Leslie L. Roos, Jr., (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1973), p. 224.

<sup>4</sup>Stuart Adams, Evaluative Research in Corrections: A Practical Guide (Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, Washington, D.C., 1975), p. 20.

<sup>5</sup>Daniel Glaser, Routinizing Evaluation: Getting Feedback on Effectiveness of Crime and Delinquency Programs (monograph HSM 42-72-119, National Institute of Mental Health, Washington, D.C., 1973), pp. 158 - 160.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., pp. 176 - 182.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 156.

Stuart Adams, Evaluative Research in Corrections: A Practical Guide, (Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, Washington, D.C., 1975), p. 20.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., pp. 30 - 31.

<sup>9</sup>Edward A. Suchman, Evaluative Research Principles and Practice in Public Service and Social Action Programs (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1967), p. 153.

<sup>10</sup>Daniel Glaser, Routinizing Evaluation: Getting Feedback on Effectiveness of Crime and Delinquency Programs (monograph HSM 42-72-119, National Institute of Mental Health, Washington, D.C., 1973), p. 103.



<sup>11</sup>Ibid., pp. 103 - 105.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., p. 111.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., pp. 26 - 47.

<sup>14</sup>The following as adapted from:

Donald T. Campbell and Julian C. Stanley, Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research (Chicago: Rand Mc Nally & Company, 1966), pp. 5 - 6.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., pp. 10 - 12.

<sup>16</sup>Daniel Glaser, Routinizing Evaluation: Getting Feedback on Effectiveness of Crime and Delinquency Programs (monograph HSM 42-72-119, National Institute of Mental Health, Washington, D.C., 1973), p. 162.

<sup>17</sup>Delbert C. Miller, Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1970), pp. 55 - 58.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, Stuart. Evaluative Research in Corrections: A Practical Guide. Washington, D.C., 1975.
- Anderson, Theodore R. and Morris Zelditch, Jr. A Basic Course in Statistics with Sociological Applications. New York, 1968.
- Campbell, Donald T. "Reforms as Experiments," Quasi-Experimental Approaches: Testing Theory and Evaluating Policy, Ed. James A. Caporaso and Leslie L. Roos, Jr., Evanston, 1973.
- Campbell, Donald T. and Julian C. Stanley. Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research. Chicago, 1966.
- Glaser, Daniel. Routinizing Evaluation: Getting Feedback on Effectiveness of Crime and Delinquency Programs. (monograph HSM 42-72-119, National Institute of Mental Health, Washington, D.C., 1975).
- Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundation of Behavioral Research Educational and Psychological Inquiry. New York, 1964.
- Miller, Delbert C. Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement. New York, 1970.
- Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York, 1956.
- Simon, Julian L. Basic Research Methods in Social Science The Art of Empirical Investigation. New York, 1969.
- Suchman, Edward A. Evaluative Research Principles and Practice in Public Service and Social Action Programs. New York, 1967.
- Wholey, Joseph S. et al. Federal Evaluation Policy. Washington, D.C., 1970.

APPENDIX A

SAMPLE INTAKE FORM  
(Magdala Foundation)

# MAGDALA FOUNDATION INTAKE

IE: \_\_\_\_\_ S.S.# \_\_\_\_\_  
 ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_ P.O. \_\_\_\_\_  
 PHONE NO.: \_\_\_\_\_ P.O. PHONE: \_\_\_\_\_

1. MAGDALA NUMBER <div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 100%;"></div>		2. SEX (1) MALE (2) FEMALE <input type="checkbox"/> (9) NO INFO <input type="checkbox"/>		3. RACE (1) WHITE (2) BLACK (3) OTHER <input type="checkbox"/> (9) NO INFO <input type="checkbox"/>		4. DATE OF BIRTH (MONTH & YEAR) (9999) NO INFO <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 20px;"></div> <div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 20px;"></div> <div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 20px;"></div> <div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 20px;"></div> </div>			
5. ADMISSION (1) FIRST (2) SECOND (8) EIGHT OR MORE (9) NO INFO <input type="checkbox"/>		6. *MARITAL STATUS (1) SINGLE (2) MARRIED (3) DIVORCED (4) SEPARATED (5) WIDOW(ER) (9) NO INFO <input type="checkbox"/>		7. *NO. CHILDREN (0) NONE (1) ONE (8) EIGHT OR MORE (9) NO INFO <input type="checkbox"/>					
8. NO. SIBS (0) NONE (1) ONE (8) EIGHT OR MORE (9) NO INFO <input type="checkbox"/>		9. *LIVING WITH OR INTENDS LIVING WITH: (0) PARENT(S) (1) SPOUSE (2) ALONE (3) NON-CLIENT FRIEND (4) RELATIVE (5) ANOTHER CLIENT (9) NO INFO <input type="checkbox"/>							
10. *RECORD AGE FIRST ARREST (0) NO ARRESTS (1) UNDER 10 (2) 10-13 (3) 14-16 (4) 17-18 (5) 19-21 (6) 22-26 (7) 27 OR OLDER (9) NO INFO <input type="checkbox"/>		AGE FIRST CONVICTION (0) NONE (1) JUVENILE (2) CERTIFIED (3) 17-18 (4) 19-21 (5) 22-26 (6) 27 OR OLDER (9) NO INFO <input type="checkbox"/>		NATURE FIRST CONVICTION [SEE OFFENSE SHEET] <div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 40px;"></div>		*NO. JUVENILE OFFENSES (0) NONE (8) EIGHT OR MORE (9) NO INFO <input type="checkbox"/>		MOST FREQUENT TYPE JUVENILE OFFENSES [SEE OFFENSE SHEET] <div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 40px;"></div>	
*NO. ADULT CONVICTIONS (00) NONE (99) NO INFO <input type="checkbox"/>		MOST FREQUENT TYPE ADULT CONVICTION [SEE OFFENSE SHEET] <div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 40px;"></div>		TYPE OF LAST CONVICTION: [SEE OFFENSE SHEET] PLEA: _____ DATE: _____ <div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 40px;"></div>					
11. *FAMILY WITH CONVICTIONS (0) NONE (1) FATHER OR STEP- (2) MOTHER OR STEP- (3) BOTH PARENTS (4) SPOUSE (5) OLDER SIB(S) (6) YOUNGER SIB(S) (7) 5 + 6 (8) PARENTS + SIB(S) (9) NO INFO <input type="checkbox"/>		12. EDUCATION NAME OF SCHOOLS <div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 100%;"></div> <div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 100%;"></div> <div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 100%;"></div> <div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 100%;"></div>		HIGHEST GRADE COMPLETED: (99) NO INFO <div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 40px;"></div>		SOURCE OF EDUCATION: (1) PUBLIC SCHOOL (2) PRIVATE SCHOOL (3) 1+2 ABOVE (4) PUBLIC AND PRISON G.E.D. (5) PRIVATE AND PRISON G.E.D. (6) PUBLIC AND OTHER G.E.D. (7) PRIVATE AND OTHER G.E.D. (8) OTHER (9) NO INFO <input type="checkbox"/>			
13. *EMPLOYMENT NO. JOBS HELD IN LAST 5 YEARS [EXCLUDE PRISON AND MILITARY] (0) NONE (8) EIGHT OR MORE (9) NO INFO <input type="checkbox"/>		LONGEST STAY ON JOB: (00) NONE (01) 1 DAY-1 MONTH (02) 1-2 MONTHS (24) 23-24 MONTHS (99) NO INFO <input type="checkbox"/>		TYPE JOB HELD LONGEST: (0) NONE (1) PROFESSIONAL (2) CLERICAL (3) SALES (4) SERVICE (5) SKILLED (6) SEMI-SKILLED (7) UNSKILLED (8) OTHER (9) NO INFO <input type="checkbox"/>		AVERAGE PAY/HOUR ON LONGEST JOB: (000) NONE (120) \$1.20/HR. (999) NO INFO <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 20px;"></div> <div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 20px;"></div> <div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 20px;"></div> </div>			

13. EMPLOYMENT [CONTINUED]		PRIOR VOCATIONAL TRAINING [SEE VOCATIONAL TRAINING SHEETS]		42 43	
14. MILITARY SERVICE		NO. MONTHS IN SERVICE 700) NONE [ ] NO INFO		TYPE DISCHARGE (0) NONE (1) HONORABLE (2) GENERAL (3) DISHONORABLE (4) MEDICAL (5) UNDESIRABLE (9) NO INFO	
15. SPECIAL PROBLEMS		*DRUG HISTORY (9) NO INFO (1) NARCOTICS (COCAINE, HEROIN, MORPHINE) (2) BARBITURATES (3) HALLUCINOGENS (LSD, ETC) (4) TOXIC CHEMICALS (GLUE, GASOLINE) (5) MARIJUANA (6) STIMULANTS (7) COCAINE (8) COMBINATION OF ABOVE [CHECK DRUGS USED]			
		DRUG TREATMENT (9) NO INFO (1) METHADONE (2) HALWAY (3) OUTPATIENT (4) HOSPITAL (5) PRIVATE (6) NO TREAT AND OTHER (7) OTHER (8) COMBINATION OF ABOVE [CHECK SOURCE]			
		ALCOHOL HISTORY (9) NO INFO (1) DRINKS (2) GOES TO BAR (3) RECEIVED TREATMENT (4) RECEIVED PRIVATE TREATMENT (5) HOSPITALIZED FOR ALCOHOL ABUSE (6) IN HALFWAY HOUSE FOR ALCOHOLICS (7) ADMITTED ALCOHOLIC (8) MEMBER OF AA [LOCATION]			
		PSYCHIATRIC HISTORY (9) NO INFO (1) PRIOR EVACUATION (2) OUTPATIENT TREATMENT (3) MINOR TRANQUILIZER PRESCRIBED (4) ANTIDEPRESSANT PRESCRIBED (5) MAJOR TRANQUILIZER (6) HOSPITALIZED (7) EST (8) OTHER SUICIDAL HISTORY: (0) NONE (1) ONE ATTEMPT (9) NO INFO			
16. PLACE OF RESIDENCE (0) COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AREA (1) ST. LOUIS CITY (2) ST. LOUIS COUNTY (3) REGION 5 (4) STATE OF MISSOURI (5) OUT OF STATE (8) OTHER (9) NO INFO		17. REFERRAL SOURCES (01) FED. BUREAU OF PRISONS (02) MO. PROBATION OFFICE (03) MO. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS (04) MO. BOARD OF PROBATION AND PAROLE (05) JAIL-GUMBO (06) JAIL-CLAYTON (07) COUNTY PROBATION OFFICE (08) CITY JAIL (09) MED. SECURITY INST. (10) CCC PROBATION OFFICE (11) CITY COURT PROBATION OFFICE (12) SELF-REFERRAL (13) OTHER (99) NO INFO			
18. CLASSIFICATION (0) DIVERSION (1) OBSERVATION + STUDY (2) PRE-RELEASE (3) SPLIT SENTENCE (4) PROBATION (5) PAROLE (6) BOND (7) MANDATORY RELEASE (8) OTHER (9) NO INFO		19. REASON FOR REFERRAL (0) EMERGENCY LODGING (1) PSYCH. SERVICE ONLY (2) VOC. SERVICE ONLY (3) RESIDENCY-STIPULATED (4) RESIDENCY-NOT STIPULATED (5) OUTCLIENT-STIPULATED (6) OUTCLIENT-NOT STIPULATED (8) OTHER (9) NO INFO			
20. STATUS DECISION (1) ACCEPT (2) REJECT (9) NO INFO		*REASON FOR REJECTION: (0) TOO YOUNG (1) TOO OLD (2) ON DRUGS (3) IS TOO LOW (4) ACUTELY PSYCHOTIC (5) TOO AGGRESSIVE (6) REFUSED PROGRAM (7) NO LEGAL STATUS (8) OTHER (9) NO INFO			
21. RELEASE OF INFORMATION SIGNED [CHECK ONE] YES NO					
22. DATE INTERVIEWED: [CODE MONTH, DAY AND YEAR]					

END OF CARD NO. 1

Magdala Foundation  
May, 1973

Form - M35h

# MAGDALA FOUNDATION: INTAKE SUPPLEMENT

## 8. MARITAL STATUS - PRESENT AND PAST, INCLUDE ADULTERY

NAME OF SPOUSE

NAME CHILDREN

OUTCOME AND REASON

CHILDREN'S NAMES

LIVING WITH OR IN HANDS OF

AGE

OCCUPATION

PLACE

TYPE OF RELATIONSHIP

9. NAMES OF PEOPLE

RELATIONSHIP

OCCUPATION

ADDRESS

AGE

## 10. PRIOR RECORD - LIST BELOW ALL OTHER ARRESTS WHETHER CONVICTED OR NOT [INCLUDE JUVENILE COURT AND MILITARY]

DATE

COURT

LOCAL  
ARREST  
NUMBER

OFFENSE

DISPOSITION

## 11. FAMILY WITH CONVICTIONS

FAMILY MEMBER

OFFENSE

DATE

DISPOSITION

APPENDIX B

SAMPLE VOCATIONAL RECORD  
(Magdala Foundation)

# MAGDALA FOUNDATION

AT ONA CTION

MAGDALA NUMBER

2. CARD NO.

3. PROGRAM ENTERED.

- (1) RESIDENCY  
(2) OUTCLIENT  
(3)  
(4) OTHER  
(9) NO INFO

VOCATIONAL EVALUATION

I.Q.  
(999) NO INFO

[CHECK SOURCE]

8	9	10

	WAIS		BETA		OTHER
--	------	--	------	--	-------

WRAT OR EQUIVALENT [CODE GRADE LEVEL]

9.1=

0	9	1
---	---	---

SPELLING

11	12	13

ARITHMETIC

14	15	16

READING

17	18	19

EPPS [CODE RAW SCORES]

ACH

20	21

DEF

22	23

ORD

24	25

EXH

26	27

AUT

28	29

AFF

30	31

INT

32	33

SUC

34	35

DOM

36	37

ABA

38	39

NUR

40	41

CHG

42	43

END

44	45

HET

46	47

AGG

48	49

STRONG VOCATIONAL INTEREST [CODE STANDARD SCORES]

AACH

50	51

AR

52	53

DIV

54	55

MF11

56	57

MO

58	59

OIE

60	61

OL

62	63

STRONGEST VOCATIONAL INTEREST FROM TEST DATA:

- (00) OUTDOOR
- (01) MECHANICAL
- (02) COMPUTATIONAL
- (03) SCIENTIFIC
- (04) LITERARY
- (05) CLERICAL
- (06) SOCIAL SCIENCE
- (07) PHYSICAL SCIENCE
- (08) BIOLOGICAL SCIENCE
- (09) BUSINESS
- (10) EXECUTIVE
- (11) PERSUASIVE
- (12) LINGUISTIC

- (13) HUMANITARIAN
- (14) ARTISTIC
- (15) MUSICAL
- (16) HEALTH SERVICE
- (17) OFFICE WORK
- (18) ELECTRONICS
- (19) FOOD SERVICE
- (20) CARPENTRY
- (21) SALES-OFFICE
- (22) "CLEAN-HANDS"
- (23) INVALID RESULTS
- (24) OTHER

64	65

CHECK TEST ADMINISTERED

☐ KUDER

☐ THURSTONE

☐ MVII

BENNETT MECHANICAL TEST  
[CODE RAW SCORES]

66	67

OTHER VOCATIONAL TESTS ADMINISTERED

1. \_\_\_\_\_
2. \_\_\_\_\_
3. \_\_\_\_\_

MENTS ON VOCATIONAL TEST BEHAVIOR AND/OR RESULTS



# 5. VOCATIONAL SERVICES

## NO. JOB REFERRALS [EXCLUDING TEMPORARY LABOR]

- (0) NONE
- (1) ONE
- (8) EIGHT OR MORE
- (9) NO INFO

68

## NO. JOBS OBTAINED [EXCLUDING TEMPORARY LABOR]

- (0) NONE
- (1) ONE
- (8) EIGHT OR MORE
- (9) NO INFO

69

## MOST FREQUENT REASON FOR LEAVING JOB:

[DO NOT CODE IF NEVER EMPLOYED OR ONE JOB KEPT]

- (0) FIRED-TARDINESS OR ABSENCES
- (1) FIRED-INSUFFICIENT WORK OUTPUT
- (2) FIRED-CONFLICT WITH BOSS OR EMPLOYEES
- (3) FIRED-CRIMINAL RECORD
- (4) FIRED-DRUG OR ALCOHOL PROBLEM
- (5) LEFT-DIDN'T LIKE JOB
- (6) LEFT-PROBLEM WITH BOSS OR EMPLOYEE
- (7) LEFT-PERSONAL PROBLEM
- (8) OTHER
- (9) NO INFO

70

## VOCATIONAL TRAINING RECEIVED:

[SEE CODE SHEET]

- (29) OTHER

71 72

## INDIVIDUAL SESSIONS: [CODE MOST INTENSE]

- (0) NONE
- (1) CRISES INTERVENTION
- (2) AD HOC SESSIONS
- (3) WEEKLY FOR <1 MNTH.
- (4) WEEKLY FOR >1 MNTH.
- (5) TWICE WEEKLY FOR <1 MNTH.
- (6) TWICE WEEKLY FOR >1 MNTH.
- (7) >TWICE WEEKLY FOR <1 MNTH.
- (8) >TWICE WEEKLY FOR >1 MNTH.
- (9) NO INFO

73

## GROUP TRAINING

- (0) NONE
- (1) INTENSIVE VOCATIONAL GROUP
- (2) WEEKLY GROUP
- (3) INTENSIVE AND WEEKLY GROUP
- (4) SPECIAL GROUP TRAINING

- (5) OTHER
- (6) MORE THAN ONE [CHECK TYPES]
- (9) NO INFO

74

## CONSULTATION SERVICES: [EXCLUDE STANDARD SERVICE]

- (00) NONE
- (01) V.R. COUNSELOR
- (02) PROB. OR PAROLE OFFICER
- (03) EMPLOYERS
- (04) MO. STATE EMPLOYMENT OFFICE
- (05) TRAINING SITES
- (06) TEMPORARY LABOR
- (07) PARENTS
- (08) SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCY
- (10) OTHER
- (11) MORE THAN ONE [CHECK SOURCES]
- (99) NO INFO

75 76

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: [JUDGEMENT OF EMPLOYABILITY, TYPE OF JOB REFERRALS, NUMBER CONSULTATIONS TO AGENCIES OR PERSONS].

END OF CARD NO. 2

APPENDIX C

SAMPLE PSYCHOLOGICAL RECORD  
(Magdala Foundation)



# MAGDALA FOUNDATION

M

1. MAGDALA NO.

1	2	3	4	5

2. CARD NO.

3
6

## PSYCHOLOGICAL EVALUATION

MMPI [CODE RAW SCORES WITH K]

L 7 8	F 9 10	K 11 12	Hs 13 14	D 15 16	Hy 17 18	Pd 19 20
Mf 21 22	Pa 23 24	Pt 25 26	Sc 27 28	Ma 29 30	S1 31 32	

16PF [CODE STANDARD SCORES]

A 33 34	B 35 36	C 37 38	E 39 40	F 41 42	G 43 44	H 45 46	I 47 48
L 49 50	M 51 52	N 53 54	O 55 56	Q1 57 58	Q2 59 60	Q3 61 62	Q4 63 64

[CHECK SOURCE(S)]

FORM A	<input type="checkbox"/>	FORM B	<input type="checkbox"/>	FORM C	<input type="checkbox"/>	FORM D	<input type="checkbox"/>
FORM E	<input type="checkbox"/>	FORM F	<input type="checkbox"/>	NORM: _____			

EYSENCK PERSONALITY INVENTORY [CODE RAW SCORES]

[CHECK SOURCE(S)]

E 65 66	N 67 68	L 69 70	FORM A	<input type="checkbox"/>	FORM B	<input type="checkbox"/>
			NORM: _____			

OTHER PSYCHOLOGICAL TESTS ADMINISTERED:

1. _____	4. _____
2. _____	5. _____
3. _____	6. _____

TA ON TEST RESULTS:

4. PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES

INDIVIDUAL TREATMENT [CODE MOST INTENSE]

- |                          |  |                          |
|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|
| (0) NONE                 | (4) LESS THAN 6 WEEKLY SESSIONS                | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (1) DIAGNOSTIC INTERVIEW | (5) SIX OR MORE WEEKLY SESSIONS                |                          |
| (2) CRISES INTERVENTION  | (6) SIX WEEKS OR MORE OF TWICE WEEKLY SESSIONS | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (3) AD HOC SESSION(S)    | (7) OTHER _____                                |                          |
|                          | (9) NO INFO                                    | 71                       |

SPECIAL TREATMENT [EXCLUDE STANDARD SERVICE]

- |           |                |                 |                          |
|-----------|----------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| (0) NONE  | (2) FAMILY     | (4) OTHER _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (1) GROUP | (3) PEER GROUP | (9) NO INFO     |                          |

GOAL(S) OF TREATMENT: \_\_\_\_\_

TYPE OF TREATMENT(S): \_\_\_\_\_

CONSULTATION SERVICES: [EXCLUDE STANDARD SERVICE]

- |                              |                      |                          |                          |
|------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| (00) NONE                    | (07) TRAINING SITES  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (01) MAG. VOC. COUNSELOR     | (08) TEMPORARY LABOR |                          |                          |
| (02) O.C. COUNSELOR          | (10) EMPLOYERS       | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (03) VOLUNTEER               | (11) OTHER _____     |                          |                          |
| (04) V.R. COUNSELOR          | (12) MORE THAN ONE   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (05) PROB. OR PAROLE OFFICER | [CHECK SERVICES]     |                          |                          |
| (06) FAMILY                  | (09) NO INFO         | 73                       | 74                       |

REFERRAL SERVICES

- |                                  |                   |                          |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|
| (0) NONE                         | (5) DRUG PROGRAM  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (1) COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AGENCY | (6) OTHER _____   |                          |
| (2) PRIVATE MENTAL HEALTH AGENCY |                   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (3) STATE MENTAL HEALTH AGENCY   | (8) MORE THAN ONE |                          |
| (4) ALCOHOL PROGRAM              | [CHECK SERVICES]  | 75                       |
|                                  | (9) NO INFO       |                          |

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

END OF CARD NO. 3

APPENDIX D

SAMPLE CLIENT SOCIAL EVALUATION  
(Magdala Foundation)

PROGRAM DATA. Cards 4, 5 & 6

1. MAGDALA NUMBER

2. CARD NO.

3. DATE ENTERED PROGRAM

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

6
---

7	8	9	10	11	12
---	---	---	----	----	----

4. SOCIAL EVALUATION To be completed at third staff meeting following entrance into program.

A. RELATIONSHIP WITH FAMILY

- |  |                                       |  |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| (0) HAS NO FAMILY  | (4) UNSATISFACTORY: MINOR PROBLEMS    | <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 20px; text-align: center; line-height: 20px;">13</div> |
| (1) RELATIONSHIP DISINTEGRATED.<br>NO CONTACT MAINTAINED | (5) SATISFACTORY. NO PROBLEMS         |  |
| (2) VERY POOR  | (6) FAIRLY GOOD                       |  |
| (3) STRAINED   | (7) EXCELLENT: MUTUAL SUPPORT EVIDENT |  |

B. SOCIAL SKILLS:

a. LEVEL OF AWARENESS

- (1) VERY CONFUSED & IMPERCEPTIVE  
(2) SOMEWHAT OBLIVIOUS TO SOCIAL SITUATION  
(3) AVERAGE LEVEL OF ALERTNESS  
(4) GOOD DEGREE OF AWARENESS  
(5) VERY ALERT & PERCEPTIVE

14

j. INITIATIVE

- (1) NEEDS MUCH PRODDING  
(2) SOMEWHAT SLUGGISH  
(3) AVERAGE DEGREE OF INITIATIVE  
(4) ABLE TO BEGIN PROJECTS WITH  
LITTLE SUPPORT  
(5) SELF-STARTER

23

b. JUDGMENT

- (1) JUDGMENT CANNOT BE TRUSTED  
(2) OCCASIONAL POOR JUDGMENT  
(3) AVERAGE JUDGMENT  
(4) GOOD COMMON SENSE  
(5) MAKES EXCELLENT DECISIONS

15

k. POISE

- (1) VERY TENSE  
(2) SOMEWHAT UNCOMFORTABLE  
(3) AVERAGE DEGREE OF COMFORT  
(4) RELATIVELY AT EASE  
(5) VERY COMFORTABLE

24

c. AFFABILITY

- (1) DISTINCTLY UNPOPULAR  
(2) NOT PARTICULARLY LIKEABLE  
(3) AVERAGE IN POPULARITY  
(4) FAIRLY POPULAR  
(5) EXTREMELY LIKEABLE

16

l. VOICE QUALITY

- (1) VERY GRATING  
(2) POOR  
(3) AVERAGE  
(4) PLEASING  
(5) VERY ATTRACTIVE

25

d. EMOTIONAL TONE

- (1) USUALLY SAD AND DEPRESSED  
(2) RATHER APATHETIC  
(3) AVERAGE TONE  
(4) MOSTLY HAPPY  
(5) VERY HAPPY & CAREFREE

17

m. VERBAL SKILLS

- (1) VERY POOR: DOES NOT LISTEN  
(2) LISTENS WHEN FORCED TO  
(3) AVERAGE: LISTENS OCCASIONALLY  
(4) USUALLY LISTENS BEFORE RESPONDING  
(5) COMMUNICATES EXCEPTIONALLY WELL

26

e. EMOTIONAL RESPONSIVENESS

- (1) DULL, VERY LITTLE VARIATION IN FEELINGS  
(2) BLUNTED, SOME VARIATION IN FEELINGS  
(3) EMOTIONS VARY APPROPRIATELY WITH  
SITUATION  
(4) SOMEWHAT EXAGGERATED  
(5) VERY STRONG & FAST: HOT HEADED

18

n. CANDOR

- (1) POSITIVE EFFORTS TO DECEIVE  
(2) ATTEMPTS TO SHADE TRUTH  
(3) AVERAGE LEVEL OF HONESTY  
(4) WILLING TO REVEAL TRUTH  
(5) FORTHRIGHT AND OPEN

27

f. INTEREST

- (1) SEEMS VERY BORED  
(2) SOMEWHAT UNINTERESTED  
(3) MODERATELY INTERESTED  
(4) SOMEWHAT ENTHUSIASTIC  
(5) VERY ENTHUSIASTIC

19

o. SELF-CONFIDENCE

- (1) VERY POOR SELF-CONCEPT  
(2) SOME FEELINGS OF INADEQUACY  
(3) AVERAGE SELF-CONCEPT  
(4) SELLS SELF FAIRLY WELL  
(5) CONVINCED OF OWN ABILITY

28

g. AMBITION

- (1) NO APPARENT AMBITION  
(2) LITTLE AMBITION  
(3) AVERAGE LEVEL OF AMBITION  
(4) SOMEWHAT GOAL ORIENTED  
(5) VERY HIGH LEVEL OF ASPIRATION

20

p. COOPERATIVENESS

- (1) REFUSES TO WORK CONSTRUCTIVELY  
(2) PROCRASTINATES BEFORE WORKING  
(3) AVERAGE COOPERATION  
(4) GOOD COOPERATION  
(5) VERY READY TO WORK CONSTRUCTIVELY

29

h. PLANNING ABILITY

- (1) GOALS UNREALISTIC  
(2) GOALS REALISTIC: MAGIC,  
IMMEDIATE ACHIEVEMENT  
(3) GOALS REALISTIC: DOESN'T KNOW  
HOW TO BEGIN  
(4) GOALS REALISTIC: SOME NOTION OF  
MEDIATING STEPS  
(5) GOALS REALISTIC: SUBGOALS PLANNED OUT

21

q. RESPONSIBILITY

- (1) DOESN'T CARE ABOUT WORK QUALITY  
(2) LITTLE RESPONSE TO WORK QUALITY  
(3) AVERAGE RESPONSE TO WORK QUALITY  
(4) RATHER CONCERNED ABOUT WORK QUALITY  
(5) VERY CONCERNED WITH WORK QUALITY

30

i. ENDURANCE

- (1) UNABLE TO STICK WITH A TASK  
(2) FLIGHTY & HAS PROBLEMS STAYING INVOLVED  
(3) AVERAGE ENDURANCE  
(4) GOOD STAYING POWER  
(5) CAN STICK WITH ALMOST ANYTHING

22

r. EMOTIONAL STABILITY

- (1) BEHAVIOR BIZARRE  
(2) BEHAVIOR UNPREDICTABLE  
(3) AVERAGE STABILITY  
(4) RATHER STABLE AND ORGANIZED  
(5) VERY TOGETHER & WELL ORGANIZED

31

## PROGRAM DATA

## 4. SOCIAL EVALUATION: (cont'd)

## a. MATURITY

- (1) IMPULSIVE - VERY IMMATURE & EGOCENTRIC  
 (2) BEHAVES RATHER IMMATURE  
 (3) BEHAVES AS PERSON OWN AGE  
 (4) SOMEWHAT MORE MATURE THAN OWN AGE   
 (5) VERY MATURE: ACTS OLDER THAN AGE 32

## b. RATING OF ABILITY TO MAINTAIN PROSOCIAL LIFE

- (1) EXTREMELY POOR  
 (2) POOR  
 (3) AVERAGE  
 (4) GOOD  
 (5) EXCELLENT

33

## c. DEBTS OWED (CODE TO NEAREST DOLLAR)

<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
34	35	36	37

## 5. NEED &amp; CONTRACTUAL SERVICE AGREEMENT

## A. CONTRACT NEGOTIATED: (1) YES (2) NO

If No, Leave Remainder of 5 Blank

38

## B. DATE OF FIRST SERVICE CONTRACT:

## C. FOR EACH SERVICE, CODE NEED LEVEL &amp; CONTRACTUAL AGREEMENT

- |                                   |                               |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| (0) NOT NEEDED                    | (4) LOW NEED-IN CONTRACT      |
| (1) LOW NEED-NOT IN CONTRACT      | (5) MODERATE NEED-IN CONTRACT |
| (2) MODERATE NEED-NOT IN CONTRACT | (6) HIGH NEED-IN CONTRACT     |
| (3) HIGH NEED-NOT IN CONTRACT     | (9) NO INFO                   |

## SERVICES:

- |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| (1) VOCATIONAL TRAINING <input type="text"/>  | (6) DRUG SURVEILLANCE PROGRAM <input type="text"/>                         | (11) DENTAL SERVICES <input type="text"/>                       |
| 39  | 44   | 49  |
| (2) EMPLOYMENT SERVICES <input type="text"/>  | (7) ALCOHOL DEKXIFICATION <input type="text"/>                             | (12) LEGAL SERVICES <input type="text"/>                        |
| 40  | 45   | 50  |
| (3) EDUCATIONAL SERVICES <input type="text"/> | (8) ALCOHOL PROGRAM <input type="text"/>                                   | (13) WELFARE SERVICES <input type="text"/>                      |
| 41  | 46   | 51  |
| (4) BUDGETING & SAVINGS <input type="text"/>  | (9) COLLATERAL PSYCHIATRIC/<br>PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES <input type="text"/> | (14) FAMILY COUNSELING <input type="text"/>                     |
| 42  | 47   | 52  |
| (5) DRUG DETOXIFICATION <input type="text"/>  | (10) MEDICAL SERVICES <input type="text"/>                                 | (15) SIGNIFICANT OTHER<br>GROUP COUNSELING <input type="text"/> |
| 43  | 48   | 53  |
|   |  | (16) INDIVIDUAL COUNSELING <input type="text"/>                 |
|   |  | 54  |

## 6. SERVICE DELIVERY

VOCATIONAL  
TRAINING

## A. SERVICE UTILIZED (1) YES (2) NO

If No, Leave Remainder of Section Blank

55

## B. ELIGIBILITY

- |                                  |                                 |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| (1) PARTIAL COMPLETION ONLY      | (4) COMPLETED: REFUSED TRAINING |
| (2) COMPLETED: NOT ELIGIBLE      | (9) NO INFO                     |
| (3) COMPLETED: ACCEPTED TRAINING |                                 |

56

## C. SOURCE OF TUITION

- |                               |              |
|-------------------------------|--------------|
| (1) RESIDENT/FAMILY           | (5) INDUSTRY |
| (2) VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION | (6) OTHER    |
| (3) C.E.P.                    |              |
| (4) C.E.T.A.                  | (9) NO INFO  |

57

EMPLOYMENT  
SERVICES

## A. SERVICE UTILIZED (1) YES (2) NO

If No, Leave Remainder of Section Blank

58

B. NO. DAYS TO SECURE FIRST JOB OTHER THAN TEMPORARY  
LABOR FROM DAY CONSTRUCTIVE CONTRACT REQUIRES

- |                             |                               |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| (00) NEVER SECURED JOB      | (98) ENTERED PROGRAM WITH JOB |
| (01) DAY AFTER CONTRACT     | (99) NO INFO                  |
| (10) 10 DAYS AFTER CONTRACT |                               |

59 60



## PROGRAM DATA

EDUCATIONAL  
SERVICESA. SERVICE UTILIZED: (1) YES (2) NO

If No, Leave Remainder of Section Blank

61

B. TYPE OF SERVICE

(1) REMEDIAL

(4) COLLEGE DEGREE

(2) ADULT BASIC EDUCATION

(5) OTHER

(3) HIGH SCHOOL DEGREE

(9) NO INFO

62

DRUG  
SERVICESA. SERVICE UTILIZED (Exclude Standard Screening)

(1) YES (2) NO

If No, Leave Remainder of Section Blank

63

B. DETOXIFICATION

(0) NONE

(4) IN HOUSE

(1) CITY HOSPITAL

(5) OTHER

(2) STATE HOSPITAL

(6) MORE THAN ONE (Check Sites)

(3) PRIVATE HOSPITAL

(9) NO INFO

64

C. DRUG PROGRAM/SURVEILLANCE

(1) MAGDALA PROGRAM: (1) YES (2) NO

65

(2) NASCO GROUP (1) YES (2) NO

66

(3) NARA GROUP/SURVEILLANCE (1) YES (2) NO

67

(4) COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AGENCY PROGRAM (1) YES (2) NO

68

(5) CITY OR STATE HOSPITAL OUTPATIENT TREATMENT (1) YES (2) NO

69

(6) TASC (1) YES (2) NO

70

(7) METHADONE MAINTENANCE (1) YES (2) NO

71

END OF CARD NO. 4

CARD NO. 5 (PROGRAM DATA CONTINUED)

MAGDALA NUMBER

1	2	3	4	5

CARD NO.

5
6

ALCOHOL  
SERVICESA. SERVICE UTILIZED: (1) YES (2) NO

If No, Leave Remainder of Section Blank

7

B. DETOXIFICATION

(0) NONE

(4) IN HOUSE

(1) CITY HOSPITAL

(5) OTHER

(2) STATE HOSPITAL

(6) MORE THAN ONE (Check Sites)

(3) PRIVATE HOSPITAL

(9) NO INFO

8

C. ALCOHOL PROGRAM

(1) ANTABUSE PROGRAM

(1) YES (2) NO

9

(2) A.A.

(1) YES (2) NO

10

(3) COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

(1) YES (2) NO

11

## CARD NO. 5 (PROGRAM DATA CONTINUED)

ALCOHOL  
SERVICES  
(Cont'd)C. ALCOHOL PROGRAM (cont'd)

- (4) CITY OR STATE HOSPITAL OUTPATIENT (1) YES (2) NO ☐ 12
- (5) PRIVATE HOSPITAL OUTPATIENT (1) YES (2) NO ☐ 13
- (6) MAGDALA PROGRAM (1) YES (2) NO ☐ 14
- (7) OTHER (1) YES (2) NO ☐ 15

COLLATERAL  
PSYCHIATRIC/  
PSYCHOLOGICAL  
SERVICESA. SERVICE UTILIZED (1) YES (2) NO ☐ 16

If No, Leave Remainder of Section Blank

B. IN-PATIENT SERVICE

- (0) NONE (3) PRIVATE HOSPITAL ☐ 17
- (1) CITY HOSPITAL (4) OTHER
- (2) STATE HOSPITAL (5) MORE THAN ONE (Check Sites)
- (9) NO INFO

C. OUTPATIENT SERVICE

- (0) NONE (3) PRIVATE HOSPITAL ☐ 18
- (1) CITY HOSPITAL (4) OTHER
- (2) STATE HOSPITAL (5) MORE THAN ONE (Check Sites)
- (9) NO INFO

MEDICAL  
SERVICESA. SERVICE UTILIZED (Includes Physical Exam) ☐ 19

- (1) YES (2) NO
- If No, Leave Remainder of Section Blank.

B. SERVICE PROVIDER

- (1) PRIVATE PRACTITIONER (5) COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AGENCY ☐ 20
- (2) CITY HOSPITAL (6) OTHER
- (3) STATE HOSPITAL (7) MORE THAN ONE (Check Sites)
- (4) PRIVATE HOSPITAL (9) NO INFO

C. TYPE SERVICES

- (1) IN-PATIENT (2) OUTPATIENT ☐ 21
- (3) BOTH

OTHER  
SERVICESA. DENTAL SERVICE UTILIZED ☐ 22

- (1) YES (2) NO

B. LEGAL SERVICE UTILIZED ☐ 23

- (1) YES (2) NO

C. WELFARE SERVICE UTILIZED (ADC, etc.) ☐ 24

- (1) YES (2) NO

FAMILY  
COUNSELINGA. SERVICE UTILIZED (1) YES (2) NO ☐ 25

If No, Leave Remainder of Section Blank.

B. SERVICE DELIVERED BY EXTERNAL AGENCY ☐ 26

- (1) YES (2) NO

C. SERVICE DELIVERED BY MAGDALA STAFF ☐ 27

(Exclude Level I/Phase I Requirement) (1) YES (2) NO

SIGNIFICANT  
OTHER GROUP  
COUNSELINGA. SERVICE UTILIZED IN HOUSE PROGRAM (Exclude Standard House Group) ☐ 28

- (1) YES (2) NO

INDIVIDUAL  
COUNSELING BY  
STAFF/VOLUNTEERSA. SERVICE UTILIZED (Exclude Routine Program Feedback) ☐ 29

- (1) YES (2) NO
- If No, Skip B and Proceed to C.

## C. NO. 5 (PROGRAM DATA CONTINUED)

INDIVIDUAL  
COUNSELING BY  
STAFF/VOLUNTEERS  
(Cont'd)

## B. GOALS OF COUNSELING: TO IMPROVE

- |                                   |  |    |    |
|-----------------------------------|--|----|----|
| (00) INSIGHT                      | (07) SELF-CONTROL                      |    |    |
| (01) INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS  | (08) TEMPER CONTROL                    |    |    |
| (02) COPING WITH TENSION          | (09) DELAY OF GRATIFICATION (Patience) |    |    |
| (03) PEER CHOICES                 | (10) CONTACT WITH REALITY              |    |    |
| (04) RELATIONSHIPS WITH AUTHORITY | (11) OTHER                             |    |    |
| (05) COMMUNICATION SKILLS         | (12) MORE THAN ONE (Check Goals)       | 30 | 31 |
| (06) SELF-CONCEPT                 | (99) NO INFO                           |    |    |

## C. PSYCHOLOGICAL SCREENING FOLLOW-UP

- (1) YES (2) NO
- 32

PROGRAM  
DATAA. NO. OF DAYS IN PROGRAM TO NEGOTIATE FIRST SERVICE CONTRACT  
(No. days to Reach Level III/Phase II)

33	34

B. NO. OF DAYS FROM CONTRACT TO ESTABLISH FIRST CONSTRUCTIVE DAY  
(No. Days on Level III/Phase II)

35	36

## 7. POST SOCIAL SKILLS EVALUATION: To Be Completed At Staffing One Week Prior to Outdate.

## A. RELATIONSHIP WITH FAMILY

- |  |                                       |    |
|--|---------------------------------------|----|
| (0) HAS NO FAMILY  | (4) UNSATISFACTORY: MINOR PROBLEMS    |    |
| (1) RELATIONSHIP DISINTEGRATED:<br>NO CONTACT MAINTAINED | (5) SATISFACTORY: NO PROBLEMS         |    |
| (2) VERY POOR  | (6) FAIRLY GOOD                       | 37 |
| (3) STRAINED   | (7) EXCELLENT: MUTUAL SUPPORT EVIDENT |    |

## B. SOCIAL SKILLS:

## a. LEVEL OF AWARENESS

- |  |    |
|--|----|
| (1) VERY CONFUSED & IMPERCEPTIVE           |    |
| (2) SOMEWHAT OBLIVIOUS TO SOCIAL SITUATION |    |
| (3) AVERAGE LEVEL OF ALERTNESS             | 38 |
| (4) GOOD DEGREE OF AWARENESS               |    |
| (5) VERY ALERT & PERCEPTIVE                |    |

## f. INTEREST

- |                           |    |
|---------------------------|----|
| (1) SEEMS VERY BORED      |    |
| (2) SOMEWHAT INTERESTED   |    |
| (3) MODERATELY INTERESTED | 43 |
| (4) SOMEWHAT ENTHUSIASTIC |    |
| (5) VERY ENTHUSIASTIC     |    |

## b. JUDGMENT

- |                                |    |
|--------------------------------|----|
| (1) JUDGMENT CANNOT BE TRUSTED |    |
| (2) OCCASIONAL POOR JUDGMENT   |    |
| (3) AVERAGE JUDGMENT           | 39 |
| (4) GOOD COMMON SENSE          |    |
| (5) MAKES EXCELLENT DECISIONS  |    |

## g. AMBITION

- |                                   |    |
|-----------------------------------|----|
| (1) NO APPARENT AMBITION          |    |
| (2) LITTLE AMBITION               |    |
| (3) AVERAGE LEVEL OF AMBITION     | 44 |
| (4) SOMEWHAT GOAL ORIENTED        |    |
| (5) VERY HIGH LEVEL OF ASPIRATION |    |

## c. AFFABILITY

- |                               |    |
|-------------------------------|----|
| (1) DISTINCTLY UNPOPULAR      |    |
| (2) NOT PARTICULARLY LIKEABLE |    |
| (3) AVERAGE IN POPULARITY     | 40 |
| (4) FAIRLY POPULAR            |    |
| (5) EXTREMELY LIKABLE         |    |

## h. PLANNING ABILITY

- |  |    |
|--|----|
| (1) GOALS UNREALISTIC                                  |    |
| (2) GOALS REALISTIC: MAGIC,<br>IMMEDIATE ACHIEVEMENT   | 45 |
| (3) GOALS REALISTIC: DOESN'T KNOW<br>HOW TO BEGIN      |    |
| (4) GOALS REALISTIC: SOME NOTION OF<br>MEDIATING STEPS |    |
| (5) GOALS REALISTIC: SUBGOALS PLANNED OUT              |    |

## d. EMOTIONAL TONE

- |                               |    |
|-------------------------------|----|
| (1) USUALLY SAD AND DEPRESSED |    |
| (2) RATHER APATHETIC          |    |
| (3) AVERAGE TONE              | 41 |
| (4) MOSTLY HAPPY              |    |
| (5) VERY HAPPY & CAREFREE     |    |

## i. ENDURANCE

- |   |    |
|---|----|
| (1) UNABLE TO STICK WITH A TASK             |    |
| (2) FLIGHTY & HAS PROBLEMS STAYING INVOLVED |    |
| (3) AVERAGE ENDURANCE                       | 46 |
| (4) GOOD STAYING POWER                      |    |
| (5) CAN STICK WITH ALMOST ANYTHING          |    |

## e. EMOTIONAL RESPONSIVENESS

- |   |    |
|---|----|
| (1) DULL, VERY LITTLE VARIATION IN FEELINGS       |    |
| (2) BLUNTED, SOME VARIATION IN FEELINGS           |    |
| (3) EMOTIONS VARY APPROPRIATELY WITH<br>SITUATION | 42 |
| (4) SOMEWHAT EXAGGERATED                          |    |
| (5) VERY STRONG & FAST: HOT HEADED                |    |

## j. INITIATIVE

- |   |    |
|---|----|
| (1) NEEDS MUCH PRODDING                           |    |
| (2) SOMEWHAT SLUGGISH                             |    |
| (3) AVERAGE DEGREE OF INITIATIVE                  | 47 |
| (4) ABLE TO BEGIN PROJECTS WITH LITTLE<br>SUPPORT |    |
| (5) SELF-STARTER                                  |    |

## CARD NO. 5 (POST SOCIAL SKILLS EVALUATION CONTINUED)

## k. POISE

- (1) VERY TENSE  
 (2) SOMEWHAT UNCOMFORTABLE  
 (3) AVERAGE DEGREE OF COMFORT  
 (4) RELATIVELY AT EASE  
 (5) VERY COMFORTABLE

  
 48

## p. COOPERATIVENESS

- (1) REFUSES TO WORK CONSTRUCTIVELY  
 (2) PROCRASTINATES BEFORE WORKING  
 (3) AVERAGE COOPERATION  
 (4) GOOD COOPERATION  
 (5) VERY READY TO WORK CONSTRUCTIVELY

  
 53

## l. VOICE QUALITY

- (1) VERY GRATING  
 (2) POOR  
 (3) AVERAGE  
 (4) PLEASING  
 (5) VERY ATTRACTIVE

  
 49

## q. RESPONSIBILITY

- (1) DOESN'T CARE ABOUT WORK QUALITY  
 (2) LITTLE RESPONSE TO WORK QUALITY  
 (3) AVERAGE RESPONSE TO WORK QUALITY  
 (4) RATHER CONCERNED ABOUT WORK QUALITY  
 (5) VERY CONCERNED WITH WORK QUALITY

  
 54

## m. VERBAL SKILLS

- (1) VERY POOR: DOES NOT LISTEN  
 (2) LISTENS WHEN FORCED TO  
 (3) AVERAGE: LISTENS OCCASIONALLY  
 (4) USUALLY LISTENS BEFORE RESPONDING  
 (5) COMMUNICATES EXCEPTIONALLY WELL

  
 50

## r. EMOTIONAL STABILITY

- (1) BEHAVIOR BIZARRE  
 (2) BEHAVIOR UNPREDICTABLE  
 (3) AVERAGE STABILITY  
 (4) RATHER STABLE AND ORGANIZED  
 (5) VERY TOGETHER & WELL ORGANIZED

  
 55

## n. CANDOR

- (1) POSITIVE EFFORTS TO DECEIVE  
 (2) ATTEMPTS TO SHADE TRUTH  
 (3) AVERAGE LEVEL OF HONESTY  
 (4) WILLING TO REVEAL TRUTH  
 (5) FORTHRIGHT AND OPEN

  
 51

## s. MATURITY

- (1) IMPULSIVE - VERY IMMATURE & EGOCENTRIC  
 (2) BEHAVES RATHER IMMATURE  
 (3) BEHAVES AS PERSON OWN AGE  
 (4) SOMEWHAT MORE MATURE THAN OWN AGE  
 (5) VERY MATURE: ACTS OLDER THAN AGE

  
 56

## o. SELF-CONFIDENCE

- (1) VERY POOR SELF-CONCEPT  
 (2) SOME FEELINGS OF INADEQUACY  
 (3) AVERAGE SELF-CONCEPT  
 (4) SELLS SELF FAIRLY WELL  
 (5) CONVINCED OF OWN ABILITY

  
 52

## t. RATING OF ABILITY TO MAINTAIN PROSOCIAL LIFE

- (1) EXTREMELY POOR  
 (2) POOR  
 (3) AVERAGE  
 (4) GOOD  
 (5) EXCELLENT

  
 57

## B. RELEASE DATA: Coded On Day of Release.

VOCATIONAL  
TRAINING

Code Only If Training Attended in Program.

## A. TOTAL NUMBER OF WEEKS TRAINING ATTENDED

- (012) ONE WEEK + 2 DAYS  
 (064) SIX WEEKS + 4 DAYS

 58  59  60

## B. STATUS OF TRAINING ON DAY OF RELEASE

- (1) TRAINING COMPLETED  
 (2) DROPPED BY SCHOOL  
 (3) DROPPED VOLUNTARILY  
 (4) STILL IN TRAINING  
 (5) TRAINING TO BEGIN AFTER RELEASE  
 (6) OTHER  
 (7) NO INFO

  
 61
C. CODE SCHOOL'S FEEDBACK ON THE FOLLOWING VARIABLE USING THE FIVE POINT SCALE  
AT COMPLETION OF TRAINING/  
RESIDENCE

## AFTER SECOND WEEK

PROMPTNESS

  
 62

  
 67

ATTENDANCE

  
 63

  
 68

APPEARANCE

  
 64

  
 69

COOPERATIVENESS

  
 65

  
 70

PROGRESS

  
 66

  
 71

POOR      BELOW AVERAGE      AVERAGE      ABOVE AVERAGE      SUPERIOR  
 1                      2                      3                      4                      5

EMPLOYMENT  
SERVICES

Code Only If Employed In Program Other Than Temporary Labor

## A. LONGEST NUMBER OF WEEKS CONSECUTIVELY EMPLOYED WITHOUT ONE DAY LOST DUE TO JOB CHANGE

- (003) ZERO WEEKS + 3 DAYS    (140) FOURTEEN WEEKS

 72  73  74

## CARD NO. 5 (RELEASE DATA CONTINUED)

- B. STATUS OF EMPLOYMENT ON DAY OF RELEASE  
 (0) UNEMPLOYED (2) FULL-TIME JOB  
 (1) PART-TIME JOB(S) (3) OTHER  
 (9) NO INFO

75

- C. IF EMPLOYED ON RELEASE DAY: PAY/HR.  
 (100) \$1.00/HOUR

76 77 78

END OF CARD NO. 5

## CARD NO. 6 (RELEASE DATA CONTINUED)

## MAGDALA NUMBER

## CARD NO.

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

6	7
---	---

## EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

Code Only If Service Utilized in Program

- A. NUMBER OF HOURS OF IN-PROGRAM TUTORING  
 (01) ONE HOUR (13) THIRTEEN HOURS

7	8
---	---

- B. TOTAL NUMBER OF A.B.E. CLASSES ATTENDED  
 (02) TWO (41) FORTY-ONE

9	10
---	----

- C. FOR A.B.E. ONLY, G.E.D. TEST  
 (1) NOT NEEDED (3) TAKEN - PASSED  
 (2) NOT TAKEN (4) TAKEN - FAILED  
 (9) NO INFO

11

- D. FOR A.B.E., CODE SCHOOL'S FEEDBACK ON FOLLOWING VARIABLES USING THE 5 POINT SCALE  
 AT COMPLETION OF TRAINING/  
 AFTER SECOND WEEK RESIDENCE

PROMPTNESS

12
----

17
----

ATTENDANCE

13
----

18
----

APPEARANCE

14
----

19
----

COOPERATIVENESS

15
----

20
----

PROGRESS

16
----

21
----

BELOW ABOVE  
 POOR AVERAGE AVERAGE SUPERIOR  
 1 2 3 4 5

- E. STATUS OF A.B.E. ON DAY OF RELEASE

- (1) DROPPED BY SCHOOL (3) STILL IN CLASS  
 (2) DROPPED VOLUNTARILY (4) OTHER

22

- F. TOTAL NUMBER OF WEEKS IN HIGH SCHOOL/COLLEGE

- (010) ONE WEEK (011) ONE WEEK + ONE DAY

23	24	25
----	----	----

- G. STATUS OF HIGH SCHOOL/COLLEGE ON DAY OF RELEASE

- (1) DROPPED BY SCHOOL (3) STILL IN SCHOOL  
 (2) DROPPED VOLUNTARILY (4) OTHER  
 (9) NO INFO

26

## DRUG SERVICE

Code Only If Service Utilized in Program

- A. LONGEST NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE WEEKS WITH CLEAN URINES  
 (06) SIX

27	28
----	----

- B. IS CLIENT DRUG FREE?

- (1) YES (2) NO

29

- C. RATE ABILITY TO MAINTAIN DRUG FREE LIFE

BELOW ABOVE  
 POOR AVERAGE AVERAGE SUPERIOR  
 1 2 3 4 5

30

## CARD NO. 6 (PROGRAM DATE CONTINUED)

**ALCOHOL  
SERVICE**

Code Only If Service Utilized in Program

A. IS CLIENT FREE OF ALCOHOL DEPENDENCE?  
(1) YES (2) NO ☐ 31

B. RATE ABILITY OF CLIENT TO REMAIN FREE OF ALCOHOL DEPENDENCE

POOR	BELOW AVERAGE	AVERAGE	ABOVE AVERAGE	SUPERIOR
1	2	3	4	5

☐ 32
**OUTCOME &  
CONSTRUCTIVE  
DAY SUMMARY**A. TOTAL NUMBER DAYS AS RESIDENT  
(Not to Exceed 3 Days After Day of Unauthorized Leave) ☐ 33 ☐ 34 ☐ 35B. FINAL NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE WEEKS OF CONSTRUCTIVE DAYS  
(01) ONE WEEK + 4 DAYS (070) SEVEN WEEKS ☐ 36 ☐ 37 ☐ 38C. FINAL CONSTRUCTIVE DAY TO CONTINUE ON DAY AFTER RELEASE  
(1) YES (2) NO ☐ 39D. TOTAL AMOUNT SAVED ☐ 40 ☐ 41 ☐ 42 ☐ 43

E. PRIMARY &amp; SECONDARY COMPONENTS OF RELEASE CONSTRUCTIVE DAY (CODE EACH SERVICE AS):

- (0) NOT IN CONSTRUCTIVE DAY  
(1) PRIMARY COMPONENT  
(2) SECONDARY COMPONENT

## SERVICES

VOCATIONAL TRAINING ☐ 44ALCOHOL PROGRAM ☐ 52FULL TIME JOB ☐ 45PSYCHIATRIC/PSYCHOLOGICAL  
SERVICE ☐ 53PART TIME JOB ☐ 46MEDICAL SERVICE ☐ 54A.B.E. CLASSES ☐ 47DENTAL SERVICE ☐ 55HIGH SCHOOL ☐ 48LEGAL SERVICE ☐ 56COLLEGE ☐ 49WELFARE SERVICE ☐ 57DRUG SURVEILLANCE ☐ 50FAMILY COUNSELING ☐ 58DRUG PROGRAM ☐ 51SIGNIFICANT OTHER  
GROUP COUNSELING ☐ 59INDIVIDUAL COUNSELING ☐ 60

## F. TYPE OF RELEASE

- (01) PROGRAM COMPLETED  
(02) PROGRAM PARTIALLY COMPLETED - RETURN TO COMMUNITY - NOT RUNAWAY OR TERMINATED  
(03) LEGAL STATUS DISCONTINUED  
(04) TRANSFERRED TO ANOTHER COMMUNITY CORRECTIONAL AGENCY  
(05) TRANSFERRED TO A NON-CORRECTIONAL AGENCY  
(06) RUNAWAY - WARRANT ISSUED  
(07) RUNAWAY - WARRANT NOT ISSUED  
(08) ESCAPE  
(09) INCARCERATED FOR A NEW OFFENSE  
(10) SENTENCED FOR A PRIOR OFFENSE  
(11) TERMINATED - WARRANT ISSUED  
(12) TERMINATED - NO WARRANT ISSUED  
(13) VOLUNATARY CLIENT - DIDN'T LIKE PROGRAM  
(14) DEATH  
(15) OTHER

☐ 61 ☐ 62

CARD NO. 6 (PROGRAM DATA CONTINUED)

G. CLIENT TO ENTER AFTERCARE  
(1) YES (2) NO

83

**EARNINGS SUMMARY**

1. TOTAL EARNINGS IN PROGRAM (TO NEAREST DOLLAR)

84	85	86	87

2. TOTAL FEDERAL TAX DEDUCTIONS (TO NEAREST DOLLAR, INCLUDING F.I.C.A.)

88	89	90	91

3. TOTAL STATE TAX DEDUCTIONS (TO NEAREST DOLLAR)

92	93	94	95

4. TOTAL LOCAL TAX DEDUCTIONS (TO NEAREST DOLLAR)

96	97	98	99

THIS FORM IS DUE AT THE STAFF MEETING FOLLOWING THE CLIENT'S RELEASE

COUNSELOR'S SIGNATURE \_\_\_\_\_

DIRECTOR'S SIGNATURE VERIFYING THOROUGHNESS AND ACCURACY \_\_\_\_\_

END OF CARD NO. 6

This project was supported by Contract Number LEAA-73-ED-0017 awarded by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice, under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the author (s) and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.



**END**

7 10/10/11