THE TRANSITION FROM PRISON TO EMPLOYMENT:— AN ASSESSMENT OF COMMUNITY-BASED ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

-ISSUES REVIEW-

Supported Under Grant No. 76NI-99-0083

National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration
U.S. Department of Justice

June 1976

THE LAZAR INSTITUTE
WASHINGTON, D.C.

THE TRANSITION FROM PRISON TO EMPLOYMENT: AN ASSESSMENT OF COMMUNITY-BASED ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

-ISSUES REVIEW-

Supported Under Grant No. 76NI-99-0083

National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration
U.S. Department of Justice

DRAFT

Principal Investigator: Mary A. Toborg
Senior Associate: Lawrence J. Center
Co-Investigator: Raymond H. Milkman

June 1976

The Lazar Institute
1700 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 785-4320

TABLE OF CONTENTS

HIGHLIGHTS

Introduction

This report summarizes major findings from the existing literature concerning community-based programs providing employment services for prison releasees. The paper discusses the present state of knowledge about such programs, including:

- the ways in which they operate;
- the outcomes of clients who participate in them;
- the outlook for evaluating the programs' impact;
- an analysis of the assumptions which underlie the programs' operations; and
- consideration of important issues which will affect future evaluations of the programs.

One problem which arose during the literature review is that few studies have focused specifically on analysis of community-based programs which help prison releasees become employed. However, many studies have addressed related topics, such as ways to help ex-offenders or other disadvantaged groups obtain jobs or the effectiveness of prison-based training programs. Consequently, relevant material from these studies has been incorporated into the state of knowledge review. Major findings from this review follow.

Program Operations

- Community-based employment services programs can offer prison releasees a wide range of services. These include:

  --intake;
  --orientation;
  --assessment of vocational needs;
  --skills training;
  --educational services;
  --counseling;
  --subsidized employment or supported work;
  --job development;
  --job placement;
  --job retention assistance; and
  --supportive services (e.g., housing aid, emergency cash, health care).

- Very little information is available concerning the organization of community-based employment programs for ex-offenders. Because the organization and range of services provided can vary so greatly, there is no "standard" staffing pattern. One staffing issue that

is receiving increasing attention, and which will be reviewed carefully in this Phase I study, is the most appropriate use of ex-offenders on the staff.

- Because an individual program may be unable to provide all the employment-related services needed by a releasee, referral linkages with other programs are often essential. However, experience has shown that programs frequently have poor information about the services available at other community-based organizations, and that there is often little interprogram coordination.

Client Outcomes

- There is a general lack of studies of client outcomes across programs. This is largely due to the many variables making program comparisons difficult, if not impossible.

- Recidivism has often been overemphasized as a measure of program or participant success. Past studies indicate that employment-related programs can have varying effects on the recidivism of releasees. Unless recidivism is consistently defined and the many variables affecting it considered, it will not be possible to determine whether differing outcomes result from different methods of measuring recidivism or actual program differences.

- The use of "employment" as an outcome measure also poses serious problems. Usually, follow-up of program graduates is done for only a short period of time (e.g., less than one year), if at all. Job quality is often overlooked. Moreover, a variety of definitions and measures are associated with the term "successful employment".

- There have been few quantitative or systematic studies correlating client characteristics with "success" or "nonsuccess" in a program, although a few researchers have made generalizations concerning the socio-demographic traits of more successful participants (e.g., they seem to be older, married, better educated individuals with a more stable employment history).

Outlook for Evaluation

- Most evaluation studies have been outcome- rather than process-oriented. There has been very little analysis of programs' delivery systems or of the impact of specific employment services upon clients.

- Most outcome studies have focused on employment and recidivism rates, often measured in analytically limited ways which differ from project to project.

- Few comparative studies have been done of community-based employment programs serving ex-offenders. In part, this is due to the many variances in program operations and objectives, which make cross-program comparisons difficult.

- Long-term follow-up analyses of participants in community-based programs have not been conducted.

- Future evaluation efforts may be hindered by the poor quality of the data presently available for analysis. Most of the information needed for impact- or process-oriented evaluation is available, if at all, only at the individual project level, and these data are rarely comparable across projects.

Assumptions Underlying Community-Based Employment Services Programs

- There are a number of assumptions, based on past studies and public attitudes, underlying community-based employment services programs for ex-offenders. The primary assumptions are:

  --Offenders desire a work role in the legitimate economy of society.

  --An ex-offender given the alternative and opportunity for a work role will accept it.

  --An ex-offender who accepts a work role will desist from criminal activity.

  --Improvements in the external environment, such as removing legal barriers to ex-offender employment or improving employers' attitudes toward hiring ex-offenders, will heighten prison releasees' chances for legitimate employment.

  --For persons released from prison back to the community, employment-related services may often be necessary.

- These assumptions are generally oversimplified, and past studies have cast some doubt on their validity. Although more research is needed to test these assumptions, the following statements can be made:

  --Not all offenders (especially those who lack middle-class goals, aspirations, and values) want to work. Some are incapable of functioning effectively in a legitimate work role.

  --Releasees often must accept work as a condition precedent to parole. Thus; acceptance of a job does not imply actual employment satisfaction. Experience has shown that long-term readjustment generally associated with successful employment will most often occur when the releasee is working at a satisfying job. More research should be conducted to adequately determine why releasees accept some jobs and stay only a short time, accept others and remain considerably longer, or do not accept some jobs at all.

--Many past studies have shown that recidivism rates decrease when persons are employed. Although it cannot be definitely concluded that employment "causes" decreases in criminal activity, there often seems to be a close link between increased employment and reduced criminality.

--Efforts to improve the external environment are new and unevaluated. However, these efforts have increased opportunities for ex-offenders, both in terms of the number of occupations in which jobs are available and the number of employers who will be willing to hire former offenders.

--Prison releasees are often in critical need of employment services. Community-based programs can lead to increased employment and, more important, address the releasee's total readjustment needs. However, the extent of these programs' contributions will only be accurately assessed when the currently poor state of knowledge is improved.

- The state of existing data necessary to assess the validity of these assumptions is poor. Currently, there is no adequate common data base to allow valid comparisons of programs, development of broad-based statistics with a common meaning, and development of criteria and standards to guide future projects.

Evaluation Issues for Employment Programs Serving Prison Releasees

- Many issues confront those persons concerned with evaluation of community-based employment programs serving prison releasees. Issues thus far identified include:

  --To what extent have employment services programs increased employability?

  --To what extent have employment services programs helped reduce recidivism?

  --What are appropriate measures of "success" for employment services programs and for individual program participants?

  --What factors contribute to program success and individual participant success?

  --What are the overall cost-benefit effects of community-based employment services programs serving prison releasees?

- Many problems exist in addressing these issues. One important problem is the poor state of existing knowledge: little is presently known about the "best" ways to structure such programs or about the most appropriate methods for evaluating them.

- These issues will receive additional consideration as this Phase I study continues. The list of relevant issues itself will probably change to add new areas of concern or modify existing issues. The Phase I findings will not enable the issues to be completely solved in most cases. However, the study should permit specification of methods for conducting more comprehensive analyses of the issues, estimation of the expected costs of doing so and an assessment of whether it would be worthwhile to implement the analytical approaches.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background

As part of its National Evaluation Program, the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice has commissioned a series of Phase I evaluation studies. These studies assess current knowledge about a project type, additional information which could be provided through further evaluation and the cost and value of obtaining such additional information. In some cases Phase I assessments will be followed by Phase II evaluation studies to collect the additional information considered warranted.

Phase I assessments have six parts:

- review of issues, existing literature and work in progress;
- descriptions of actual project operations;
- development of analytical frameworks for understanding major project types;
- determination of whether additional evaluation is needed;
- design of an evaluation for the overall program (if necessary); and
- design of an evaluation for an individual project (if necessary).

This report presents the results of the first stage (review of issues, existing literature and work in progress) of a Phase I study of programs providing employment services for prison releasees. The concept of providing these services to persons being released from prison has been a natural outgrowth of the increasing concern given to the rehabilitative aspects of incarceration and the need for post-incarceration assistance to insure a successful readjustment for the person making the transition from prison back to the community.

B. The Need To Study Employment Services for Prison Releasees

The provision of employment services to prison releasees has become an important part of the criminal justice system's efforts to assist the ex-offender to readjust successfully after release from prison. Studies have shown that the person being released from prison faces numerous barriers to obtaining satisfying employment and often needs help in surmounting these barriers.

Barriers take many forms. They relate to the releasee's personal characteristics and prison record and to the attitude of people in the community to which the releasee is returning. These barriers include:

- Lack of Education and Skills--The skills factor often appears to be the foremost barrier to employment for prison releasees.
- Public Attitudes--In spite of increased public relations activities and lobbying undertaken by persons representing the interests of releasees, they are still often viewed in negative, stereotyped ways. Employers frequently use arrest and conviction records as reasons for not considering people for employment. Bonding requirements, fear of employee repercussions, fear of customer reaction, and fear of theft all combine to give employers a negative perspective of prison releasees.
- Limited Knowledge of Job Acquisition Techniques--Persons being released from prison often are not familiar with the various factors besides skill level that play a role in the acquisition of a job. These include appearance, attitude, how to fill out a work application and how to act during a job interview.
- Limited Orientation to the "World of Work"--In addition to limited knowledge of how to get a job, releasees often possess limited awareness of how to successfully keep a job. They are unfamiliar with employers' expectations regarding promptness, dress, and personnel policy and with the skills necessary to function successfully in the social work atmosphere.
- Statutory Restrictions--There are a number of statutes and government regulations which restrict the employment opportunities of prison releasees and all ex-offenders. Occupations which require licensing often are closed to released prisoners by the qualifying requirements imposed by each State.1/
- Union Discrimination--The lack of acceptance of releasees into various craft unions also has traditionally closed off employment opportunities. At the local level, unions often have an autonomy which allows them to operate somewhat differently than national union policy may dictate.

The plight of the releasee seeking employment has been concisely summarized in one study of manpower projects in the correctional field:

> The criminal offender is perhaps the most disadvantaged of the 'disadvantaged.' . . . (H)e has all of the deficits of the economically and culturally disadvantaged non-offenders, accentuated by (1) increased self-doubt; (2) formal and informal employment restrictions; (3) experience in a non-rehabilitative prison environment: and (4) an almost irreversible label of "criminal" and the accompanying stigma.2/

A review of the various barriers faced by the prison releasee seeking employment suggests that the employment status of releasees may be extremely poor. Past studies have concluded that this is indeed the case. It has been estimated that of ex-offenders in the labor pool, 20% are working only part-time and 17% are unemployed.[3] The 1969 study that produced these data analyzed the employment problems of released Federal prisoners, although it was concluded that these statements would usually apply to persons being released from local and State institutions as well. Additionally, the study showed that most releasees worked on unskilled, service and operative jobs. It also found that:

- the majority of people leaving prison did not have pre-arranged jobs;
- released prisoners found unstable employment;
- over half of the ex-offenders had one or more periods of unemployment; and
- inadequate supervision by the corrections systems contributed to failure by releasees to find and obtain jobs.

These conclusions indicate an urgent need for improved employment services for prison releasees. The transition from prison to the community is a very difficult one, and often obtaining a successful job can be the key to a productive readjustment. Employment can provide the releasee with income to offset financial pressures which might stimulate criminal activity, while serving as an activity to deter idleness and an opportunity for the releasee to achieve personal success and restore lost dignity.

Employment services programs can help the releasee overcome the many employment-related barriers encountered on returning to the community. It is often very difficult for releasees to surmount these barriers unaided; the assistance of trained program staff providing services like vocational assessment, counseling, prevocational training, and education can contribute significantly toward employment success. This support also assists the releasee in gradually readjusting to a community environment after a long period of separation. Employment services may be available to the prison releasee through a special community program for ex-offenders, through an existing Comprehensive Employment and Training Program, or through local technical or trade schools. Whatever the source, employment services can be a significant factor in the personal development of the prison releasee. In addition, most past studies have shown that increased employment by releasees has generally been strongly related to a decrease in crime by that population.

One of the first follow-up studies, published in 1930, found the "association between post-parole success or failure and success or failure with respect to industry was very high."[4] More recent studies supported this, one concluding that "criminal behavior will be a negative function of the individual's success in the labor market."[5] Another major study of the employment status and recidivism rates of prison releasees concluded that "variations in economic opportunity have a major influence on the rate at which adult males commit crimes".[6] Pownall's comprehensive study found that crime by releasees varied directly with their unemployment and that a positive relationship existed between arrest rates and unemployment rates for all age groups.[7] This relationship between employment and recidivism may rest on the reasons for recidivist activity. One authority has stated that criminal activity which results in

reimprisonment is primarily undertaken as an alternative to legitimate employment. This conclusion was partly based on the fact that over 90% of all felonies involve the taking of money, with even a higher percentage for felonies committed by recidivists.[8]

The mere retention of a job by releasees has not been the primary deterrent to crime. More recent studies have concluded that the quality and steadiness of employment are directly related to lower recidivism. Jobs with skills may be viewed by releasees as more worthwhile and challenging. One problem has often been that most jobs available to the relatively unskilled and traditionally unmotivated releasee have been low status, low income and generally unattractive ones. With such low-paying jobs often the only choice, releasees are understandably tempted to return to a criminal lifestyle that may promise much more money.

In recent years, the issue has been raised whether the true relationship is between recidivism and employment or between recidivism and income, since it can be argued that the temptation to engage in crime stems mainly from a lack of income. One author has hypothesized that if property crimes are really redistributions of income through means deemed socially unacceptable, then guaranteed incomes might do more than employment services to reduce criminality.[9] One recently completed project has in fact drawn conclusions that support this hypothesis. The study, Project Life, was designed to test whether financial aid or job services, given immediately at the time of release from State prison, is able to reduce recidivism within the first year after release. A four-group randomized design was used: the first group received money and job services, the second group received money only, the third group received only the job services, and the fourth group--the control group--received neither service. Preliminary results

showed that financial aid does indeed reduce recidivism, but the job services provided had no effect on recidivism. However, these findings do not necessarily imply that employment does not reduce recidivism. The researchers stated, "we were never able to raise the employment rate among the men who received our job service, even though our service was an intensive, individualized effort . . . The men who were hired through our efforts quit or were fired soon after. (Because) our job service was not able to raise the employment rate, . . . we were not truly able to test whether employment reduces re-arrest."[10]

Much additional research is needed in this area before any definitive conclusions can be drawn. The Department of Labor is currently funding a two-state (Georgia and Texas) demonstration program to test the efficacy of providing releasees with financial aid and/or job services as they return to the community. Both projects will be followed by Lazar so that important findings can be reflected later in this Phase I study.

Based on existing literature, it can be concluded that there is indeed a positive relationship between increased employment and decreased recidivism. Naturally, there are many variables affecting both sides of this relationship. However, there are a number of important societal benefits that result from an increase in "legitimate employment" by prison releasees and a decrease in recidivism. Society gains added production from a previously unemployed person. Resource waste that occurs through the costs of maintaining an overcrowded court and prison system and of the damage done through criminal activity itself is reduced, and the costs of a disorderly society where there is higher risk are also reduced.

Employment services and increased employment are not the answer to all the problems affecting recidivism. For certain parts of the criminal population, employment services are unlikely to be effective unless society does more to make crime less attractive to those who view it as a relatively safe way to earn a great deal of money. Still, research seems to support the following conclusions:

- Success in the labor market is associated with prison releasees' adjustment success, including reduced recidivism.
- Employment services can increase the possibilities of job success, if they are provided along with appropriate supportive services.
- Thus, employment services may lead to lower recidivism.

The rationale for providing employment services to releasees can be viewed in terms of two types of benefits: benefits to the releasee making the readjustment to community life and benefits to society as a result of the releasee's successful readjustment. Because of the importance of both these types of benefits, increasing attention is being paid to this area of the corrections process. However, little is definitively known at present about the best ways to provide employment services to releasees or about which types of releasees benefit most from certain types of employment services. The conclusion reached in the 1969 study, "Employment Problems of Released Prisoners," is still valid today to a great degree: "While theories and assumptions about the job problems of released prisoners have been plentiful, facts are in short supply."[11] This Phase I study is designed to identify both existing "facts" and knowledge gaps, so that those interested in the successful community readjustment of the prison releasee can have better knowledge of what has been and what still needs to be done.

C. Study Scope

This Phase I study focuses on the transition from prison to employment. To as great an extent as possible, it examines the employment problems of those people who have been incarcerated six months or longer and thus have been removed from the community for a significant period of time. Since people held in jails are often there for less than six months, the study deals primarily with prison, rather than jail, releasees.

The study assesses the problems of persons being released on parole or at the end of sentences. Since the focus is on people who have been removed from the community, the problems of probationers will not be analyzed.

The Phase I study also concentrates on the problems of adult releasees. Juvenile releasees often do not have the same employment needs; they may, for example, return to school or be supported by parents. Since they often experience different problems, they need different services than adult releasees.

Additionally, this study focuses on community-based employment services available to prison releasees. Prison services will be assessed only as they affect community activities. For example, the link between prison staff and community programs will be analyzed to see whether releasees are informed sufficiently about the range of community-based services available to them. The study also focuses on those community-based services provided to releasees no longer confined in incarceration-like settings. Thus, work-release programs, which permit inmates to participate in community programs during the day before returning to prison at night, will not be assessed. Similarly, community-based correctional centers will not be examined. Although they may offer various employment services, they are viewed as a form of incarceration.

The many halfway houses, some of which serve as alternatives to prison, will not constitute a major study focus, but will be included if they have a heavy emphasis on employment services.

Although the focus of the study can be precisely defined, most of the existing literature and operating programs have a somewhat different focus. For example, much of the literature deals with the needs of the ex-offender without differentiating among the probationer, parolee, or person who has served out a sentence. Programs typically serve "ex-offenders", whether State or Federal releasees, from jails or prisons. Additionally, a great deal of research has been performed on prison-based projects and very little on community-based employment programs for releasees. Because of these characteristics of the existing state of the art, this issues paper will consider related materials, even though they technically fall outside the project boundaries previously drawn.

Selected literature dealing with probationers and in some cases people released to pretrial intervention programs will be considered, because the problems faced by these program participants correspond to some extent with those encountered by prison releasees. Such problems include a lack of work experience, inadequate education, poor knowledge about how to get and keep a job, and often the disadvantages associated with a minority background or an illegitimate-economy subculture. Selected research related to in-prison training programs will also be considered. Although the later aspects of this Phase I study will not assess prison-based training, consideration of the literature on this subject will provide a better assessment of the problems faced by the person being released from prison. Very often these problems are associated with inadequacies in the prison-based programs. Knowledge of such inadequacies will enable Lazar to gain a better understanding of those services the releasee needs when returning to the community.

Of course, the most practical reason necessitating a literature review and issues synthesis broader than the precise study boundaries is the state of knowledge itself. Although there is much literature related to the employment problems of ex-offenders, very little focuses on prison releasees. The great majority of the literature, especially the evaluation literature, deals with research and demonstration programs for prison inmates. Other literature discusses the employment problems of persons considered to be socio-economically disadvantaged. This literature will be considered in the context of the insight it provides about the employment problems of persons who have engaged in criminal activity and the general problems these persons face upon being released from prison and returning to the community.

D. Issues Review

The purpose of this paper is to review relevant findings from analyses concerning the employment-related needs of prison releasees. This review will increase the likelihood that any additional analysis recommended in later stages of the Phase I study would fill gaps in existing knowledge, not simply repeat work already conducted.

The issues review includes consideration of existing evaluations of employment services programs and manpower research and demonstration projects, related material on employment services program operations, studies which address the validity of major assumptions underlying the provision of employment services to prison releasees, and possible data sources for analysis of these programs. In addition to reviewing these materials and presenting major findings, this paper suggests several issues vital to employment services program evaluation and summarizes the state of knowledge concerning them.

Studies included in the review were identified through the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS) and discussions with people

knowledgeable about employment services programs for ex-offenders or related criminal justice and manpower activities. To the extent possible, work in progress has been included as well as completed studies.

E. Organization of Report

Three chapters of this report follow. Chapter II reviews past studies of employment services for releasees. Included are analyses of different kinds of projects, their operational components, client outcomes, key relationships with the rest of the community, and selected legal issues. In addition, the chapter discusses past evaluation studies of employment services programs and the conceptual problems encountered.

Chapter III reviews the assumptions which underlie most employment services programs for releasees and the literature which bears upon each of them. These assumptions concern the releasee's desire for a work role in the legitimate economy of society, the releasee's acceptance or non-acceptance of such a work role, the relationship between releasee employment and criminal activity, the relationship between improvements in the external environment and increased employment, and the extent of need for community-based employment services programs for releasees. The general problems inherent in evaluating the validity of these assumptions are also discussed. In addition, the chapter considers the data problems which affect research attempting to assess the validity of the underlying assumptions. The variety of potential data sources and possible future improvements in the quality and scope of data available are also reviewed.

Chapter IV presents several evaluation issues affecting analysis of employment services programs for releasees, summarizes relevant findings concerning them, and indicates major considerations which must be addressed to resolve them. The issues concern employment services programs' impact on increased employability and reduced criminality as well as determination of

appropriate "success" measures, factors influencing success, and overall cost-benefit effects. As Phase I continues, these issues may be modified and the discussions of them amplified to reflect additional findings and insights.

II. PAST STUDIES OF EMPLOYMENT SERVICES PROGRAMS FOR PRISON RELEASEES

A. Introduction

This chapter presents major findings from past studies of employment services programs for prison releasees, with emphasis on items of relevance for evaluation. The history of employment services for ex-offenders is briefly reviewed, followed by a discussion of the major types of studies of these programs and then by important findings concerning specific aspects of project operations, such as:

- services;
- staff;
- information linkages;
- program costs;
- outcomes;
- relationship with the community; and
- selected legal issues.

The chapter concludes with a discussion of the outlook for evaluation of employment services programs for prison releasees.

B. Employment Services for Offenders: A Brief History

Initially, the prison system in the United States was viewed as a means of punishing those convicted of crimes and deterring them from future criminality. However, in the nineteenth century the rehabilitation concept was introduced as a third goal of the prisons. With this philosophical change came changes in correctional institutions, one of which was the introduction of vocational training. Over the years the extent of vocational training programs in prisons has greatly increased, as have the problems associated with them. Criticism of institutional vocational training has been continual. One study concluded, "In isolated settings, divorced from

labor markets, working with second-rate materials and a highly disadvantaged clientele, vocational training alone seems to have minimal impact."[12] Other studies of vocational training projects have reached varied conclusions concerning the impact of training on inmate rehaiblitation. However, several studies have stated that these programs often use outdated equipment, offer courses geared to the institutions' needs rather than the participants' needs, provide inadequate aid in preparing inmates for the social-occupational environment of the "world of work", and offer training only for low-status, entry-level jobs.

The decade of the 1960's brought many changes to correctional manpower. More comprehensive employment-directed training and services were introduced through the Manpower Development and Training Act. In 1964-65, the first experimental and demonstration Manpower Development and Training (MDT) projects were undertaken at three sites to test the feasibility of MDT employment services in prisons and measure their effect on the lives of ex-offenders. Once these studies demonstrated the feasibility of broad-scale inmate training programs, projects expanded and diversified to provide remedial and basic education, vocational and personal-adjustment counseling, job development, job placement and follow-up services.

The Pretrial Intervention Program began in 1967 and provided manpower services to accused offenders, enabling many to be released to employment or training without adjudication. The Employment Service Model Program was developed in five States in 1970 to offer job development and placement services specifically to fit the needs of ex-offenders. This program provided each State's Employment Service with staff to link inmates and ex-inmates to existing manpower resources. This additional staff was located in several places and provided continuity in services to ex-offenders

during the transition from prison to the community. The efforts were coordinated by a corrections unit in the central State Employment Service office in each State. Employment Service staff were stationed in correctional institutions to work with inmates in counseling, job development and placement prior to release. This staff was linked to local Employment Service offices where full-time staff were specially assigned to assist ex-offenders when they returned to their communities. Additionally, a manpower service center was created in the largest metropolitan area of each participating State to provide a concentration of manpower staff specializing in the servicing of ex-offenders. The State Comprehensive Correctional Models, the next step in Manpower development and training for offenders, provided States with funds to develop proposals to meet the manpower needs of offenders in all stages of the criminal justice system.[13]

Corresponding to the growth of correctional manpower services has been a trend toward prerelease employment services. Prerelease centers in large urban areas have been established to provide intermediate support between imprisonment and complete parole or discharge. They are also being used as an alternative to prison or probation. Additionally, an increasing number of States are allowing inmates furlough time prior to release to obtain satisfactory employment.

At present the emphasis has shifted to community-based programs for prison releasees. This corresponds to the increasing use of probation, parole, and pretrial intervention. The majority of all adult offenders in the correctional system are now under community supervision. Since many additional persons are outright releasees and not under parole supervision, the appropriateness and importance of postrelease rehabilitative services becomes clear.

One survey of community-based programs conducted in 1975 concluded that in spite of the urgent need for such programs, there are relatively few to serve the specific needs of prison releasees that do not also serve as alternatives to incarceration.[14] However, another survey concluded that "post-incarceration programs such as halfway houses, volunteer assistance by ex-offender and other groups, and intensive job counseling and education programs directed toward increasing hiring of former offenders exhibit great diversity at the moment."[15] A universe identification effort currently being conducted as part of this Phase I project seems to support that finding. A great number of community-based programs providing employment services to prison releasees have been identified. Preliminary analysis shows that these programs are funded and/or administered by a variety of organizations: private foundations like The Seventh Step Foundation; adjuncts of local probation and parole departments; prime sponsors operating under the 1973 Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA); and individual programs receiving grants from Federal agencies such as the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration or the Employment and Training Administration (formerly the Manpower Administration).

As the number of programs providing employment services to ex-offenders and prison releasees has increased, the development of innovative approaches in the provision of such services has continued. One example is a Department of Labor-funded experimental project called Mutual Agreement Programming (MAP), a project directed by the American Correctional Association. This program began in response to problems encountered by releasees in their transition to the community. Planners felt that, ideally, the completion of training should be coordinated with release and job placement so that newly acquired skills could be put to best use. "In practice, prisoners often had to wait an indefinite period before release, and could not plan effectively for outside

employment as long as their release date was unknown."[16] The basis for MAP is a contract among inmate, institution, and parole board that includes a definite parole date contingent upon the completion of mutually agreed upon rehabilitation goals, almost always including vocational training or other employment-directed services.

Another trend in employment services for offenders and ex-offenders is the increasing attention being paid to specific client groups within the total ex-offender population. For example, the Department of Labor has funded several recent projects specifically to serve ex-offenders who are also ex-drug addicts. One project entitled Manpower Assistance for Rehabilitated Drug Abusers (MARDA), established community-based manpower programs for drug-involved ex-offenders in Des Moines, Iowa, and Baltimore, Maryland. Another provided funds to establish a manpower component within a large treatment program in Atlantic City, New Jersey.

Several community programs have been established to serve the special problems of female ex-offenders. For example, the Female Offenders Program of Western Pennsylvania provides female releasees with comprehensive employment services, both directly and by referral to other agencies. One America, Inc. operates a women's program in Houston, serving female probationers and parolees. The Maryland Department of Corrections is implementing Mutual Agreement Programming for women, and Massachusetts is establishing a similar voucher program for 50 to 79 female releasees.

Certain projects primarily serve ex-offenders with specific minority backgrounds. For example, Development Assistance for Rehabilitation, Inc. (D.A.R.) of Austin, Texas, serves mainly Chicano ex-offenders, while Operation DARE in Chicago provides services mostly to black ex-offenders.

One important change in service delivery which affects the employment-related needs of all types of releasees is the return to decentralized

manpower programs by the Department of Labor. Under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) of 1973, local categorical manpower programs have been subsumed and/or replaced by comprehensive programs administered by prime sponsors, often cities or other local communities. In areas where no special programs for ex-offenders exist, the releasee will often rely on these Comprehensive Employment and Training Programs for employment-related services. Their major purpose is to provide the economically disadvantaged, the unemployed, and the underemployed with the assistance they need to compete for, secure, and hold satisfying jobs. Generally, CETA programs provide all the usual employment-directed services. Title I of CETA allows prime sponsors to establish programs offering comprehensive manpower services. Title II provides for transitional public employment programs, while Title III specifically provides for Federally supervised manpower programs for special target groups in particular need of services, including offenders. This Title also authorizes Federally supervised research, experimental, demonstration, and pilot programs.

The Department of Labor is currently using Title III money to implement programs for ex-offenders. These Model Ex-Offender Programs (MEP's), an outgrowth of the earlier Employment Service Model Program, are currently being implemented in ten States. They are being funded with Title III monies and States' discretionary CETA funds under Title I. The MEP's in each State are to be composed of:

- a central staff at the State level to provide overall direction and to monitor and evaluate project operations;
- an institution-based counseling unit or units to provide employment services to inmates prior to their release back to their communities; and
- community-based ex-offender employability development teams to provide employment and training services to releasees. These teams will be located within CETA prime sponsor program structures.

One goal of the program is to establish the coordination necessary to link institution and community-based programs, so that a continuity of services can be provided to all inmate-releasees on a Statewide basis.

Another possible resource for releasees in communities without special ex-offender programs is the State Department of Vocational Rehabilitation. However, recent changes in the Vocational Rehabilitation approach have made it more difficult for releasees to be served. Vocational rehabilitation programs were originally instituted to serve physically disabled clients, but in the last decade there had been a shift toward including mentally or emotionally disturbed clients as target populations. One indication of this approach was the inclusion of "behavior disorder" as a qualifying disability category.[17]

Currently, the emphasis is shifting back toward the physically handicapped. The 1973 Vocational Rehabilitation Act specifies that "the severely handicapped" must be served first. Although the American Bar Association, the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, and the American Correctional Association lobbied for the offender population to be included among vocational rehabilitation eligibles, a heavy lobbying effort by the physically handicapped led Congress to remove "behavior disorder" as a qualifying disability.

Because of this shift in emphasis, most State Vocational Rehabilitation Agencies have discontinued working with prison releasees unless they are indeed physically handicapped. This avenue of employment services, once very valuable to releasees, is thus being gradually eliminated. One exception is the District of Columbia Bureau of Rehabilitation Services, which still maintains a special offenders unit. Most States, however, have virtually stopped serving offenders.

Thus, most prison releasees returning to communities and needing employment-related services will likely take advantage of special programs for ex-offenders or Comprehensive Employment and Training Programs (CETP's). The CETP's vary greatly in terms of administrative structure and service delivery. This diversity also appears in community-based programs specifically designed for ex-offenders.

Great variation exists in terms of eligibility criteria, interactions with the criminal justice system, the emphasis placed on different employment services, and so on. These are relatively new programs, and the concept of organized community-based employment services for releasees is to some extent still evolving. However, all programs have one primary goal: to provide the releasees with effective employment services and necessary supportive assistance in order to prepare them for the world of work, place them in jobs, and help them achieve employment stability and satisfaction, so that they can readjust successfully to life in the communities to which they have returned.

C. Types of Studies

The types of programs that have been and are being utilized to provide employment services to releasees and their degrees of success are reflected in the past studies which have been conducted. Four types of studies have been identified and reviewed:

- analyses of individual projects;
- comparative studies of projects;
- methodological discussions; and
- miscellaneous studies on related topics.

1. Analyses of Individual Projects

Many of the existing studies which have evaluative implications have analyzed project operations in a single place. Some of these analyses were

performed by the projects themselves, although certain evaluations stemmed from the interests of Federal or State agencies which funded the projects. There is an overall lack of evaluation studies of community-based employment services programs specifically for prison releasees. Most evaluation studies are of community programs that generally serve "the ex-offender". The great majority of evaluation studies in the area of employment-related programs concern those based in prison or incarceration-like settings. Those community-based programs that have conducted evaluation studies have produced limited results, focusing mainly on employment or recidivism rates. For example, one program with a first-year objective of 350 job placements of ex-offenders reported that it made 506 placements and that during a several-month follow-up period, only 26 were returned to prison or had further problems with the law.[18] Another program evaluation concluded that there was little difference in the rearrest rates of project clientele in terms of whether they obtained employment through the program. However, program clients had "rearrest rates for any offense 17% below baseline rates and rearrest rates for Impact Offenses 20% below the baseline data."[19]

Most of the studies focusing on one project have not included a comprehensive evaluation, often due to limitations in data availability. Typical are the problems encountered during the evaluation of the Singer/Graflex Monroe County (New York) Pilot Probationer Project.[20] Although this project served probationers rather than releasees, it presents problems relevant for analysis of employment services programs for people released from prison. A before/after research design was used comparing probationers referred to the program and accepted, those referred and not accepted, and a group of adequately employed probationers. The project was evaluated in terms of program efficiency; client characteristics; academic achievement; follow-up concerning employment rates; time needed to obtain a job; job stability;

employee ratings; job satisfaction; probation performance; and recidivism. Although the evaluation revealed that job placement efficiency was high and that the program probably paid for itself, several problems occurred which hampered effective evaluation. There was an inadequate number of referrals from the probation department, so the control group had to be terminated early. Probation personnel continually failed to turn in completed, up-to-date forms. A six-month follow-up was not sufficient for definite measurement of program impact, so many findings had to be viewed as indicators rather than conclusions. No cost-benefit analysis could be conducted because there were no accurate records of county per-person costs for welfare, police services, courts, probation department, jail and prison. Though recidivism rates for project participants seemed to indicate positive results, the evaluators questioned whether recidivism was being reduced by means of employment upgrading. They asserted that unemployment was not a major cause of recidivism and that the project achieved its crime reductions through overall "human upgrading", e.g., the provision of educational services, guidance counseling, supportive services, etc. These assertions were made based on certain project findings: the group of adequately employed probationers had a much lower unemployment rate, yet its recidivism rate did not differ significantly from any other groups; also, the employment rate of those who completed the program was not significantly lower than that of all inadequately employed probationers referred to the program. However, its recidivism rate was much lower than the rate of those who were not exposed to the program. Thus, the program's success in reducing criminal behavior may not have been due to its ability to place probationers in jobs. Evaluators asserted that if this were indeed true, then two questions remained: (1) What is the relationship between employment and recidivism? (2) Why was the program successful in reducing criminal behavior?

This discussion points out the many problems affecting the state of the evaluation art concerning employment service programs for releasees and ex-offenders. Evaluation components are often inadequate, necessary data is often unavailable, the reasons for program success or failure are often unclear, and too often the conclusion is that more evaluation needs to be conducted.[21]

Most evaluation literature that does exist focuses on client outcomes, as reflected in the previous discussion. There is a limited set of client outcome measures, and most evaluations have relied upon the traditional measures of program effectiveness: employment rates and recidivism rates. There has been very little analysis of programs' service delivery systems or the impact of specific employment services on clients. Although in some instances specific components of ex-offender programs have been evaluated, it has generally been in terms of client outcomes. Evaluators often find it very difficult to relate outcome data to program characteristics because so little program operation data is available.

2. Comparative Studies of Projects

Comparative studies of employment services programs for ex-offenders, including prison releasees, have rarely been performed, due to a series of constraints. Projects differ widely in terms of clients served, program operations, success measures, and funding sources. Some may serve all ex-offenders and others only parolees. Program operations may vary so widely that effective comparison becomes impossible; this variation stems from the potential variety of services that can be offered by a program: assessment, orientation, counseling, work-adjustment training, job development, job placement, etc. The variance in program operations can also be reflected in the extent to which programs rely upon outside agencies for supportive services. Success measures can vary depending upon the programs' objectives or even a

program director's own concept of "success". One program may define success as job placement and job retention for six months; another may only follow up clients for three months. An alternative criterion for success may be time on a job for a certain percentage of the post-program year. Some programs may define success in terms of recidivism rates; others, employment rates; and still others with a combination of the two measures. This variation in success measures makes only very general comparisons possible.[22] Moreover, the difference in funding sources makes comparisons difficult, because projects may be required to collect differing data by their funding agents. A Department of Labor-sponsored program may collect data impossible to compare with that collected by a Law Enforcement Assistance Administration grantee.

A very common problem is the lack of clear standards of performance. Often objectives are stated in terms of broad goals. For example, one job placement program's goals were to develop capabilities of probation-parole and correctional officers to aid offenders in finding and keeping jobs upon release; to enlist the support of employers in hiring ex-offenders; to build an effective working relationship with trade and civic organizations; to integrate the overall ex-offender training and employment program with the Labor Department Jobs Program; and to develop an effective delivery system of ex-offenders to job placements.[23]

Another problem concerns the lack of adequate project evaluation components. A 1969 study recommended an increase in evaluation activities and decried the lack of consistent recordkeeping and reliable follow-up data.[24] Three years later, another review of employment services programs for ex-offenders led to a similar recommendation for greater monitoring and evaluation of existing programs.[25] A review of ten years of correctional

manpower projects concluded that "a lack of concern with the interface between theory and program implementation has hampered projects in their attempt to create a cumulative picture of 'what works' and 'why'".[26] Another review of the state of knowledge concerning evaluation of projects concluded that "with the exception of work release, most of the non-traditional manpower programs are experimental" and that "most lack validating research as to their results . . ."[27] In many cases, the lack of an adequate project evaluation component is due to an unawareness on the part of project administrators as to the importance of evaluation. In other cases, however, it may reflect a conscious decision to sacrifice data collection and analysis to utilize staff resources in direct delivery of services to clients.[28]

The few comparative studies that have been performed have not dealt with employment services programs for prison releasees. However, because these studies have assessed programs serving clients possessing many of the same "disadvantaged" characteristics of prison releasees and delivering many of the same types of services, an examination of their conclusions and problems is relevant.

One study compared Pretrial Intervention Projects funded by the Department of Labor in terms of employment and income effects and recidivism rates. Evaluators concluded that, looking across projects, defendants are responsive to employment services delivered by intervention programs, that they generally enter the programs unemployed with bad work histories and leave having experienced one or more successful job placements with increased chances for employment, at least over the short term.[29] However, it was found that the type of placement offered defendants was not generally very desirable; wage rates were not substantially improved by participation in the program; confluence between career aspiration and placements was

not high; and there was a systematic tendency for placement in jobs of lower status and salary than those in which participants expressed interest. Although project comparison produced the conclusions that "program services can be a significant factor in improving the employment status of groups traditionally at a labor market disadvantage" and that there is "a weaker but positive effect of employment services on recidivism among these groups," there were, in actuality, no very impressive correlations between employment status and program participation.[30][31]

Another study compared the results of correctional research and demonstration projects funded by the Department of Labor between 1963 and 1973. Although it was impossible to draw scientific comparisons, the author was able to look at the results of many programs and draw general conclusions. Although concluding that evidence shows projects were successful in achieving employment goals, she also emphasizes the fact that large gaps exist in the state of knowledge concerning both the delivery of employment services to offenders and the evaluation of the efficiency and effectiveness of those services.[32]

Another comparative study of manpower projects, again primarily prison-based, produced both positive and disappointing results. The study analyzed the post-release performance of trainees of an inmate vocational training program in terms of recidivism and employment status. Data was collected for six months following the release of trainees from 25 projects. Findings indicated that trainees had significantly lower recidivism rates than control group members. However, evaluators concluded that employment impact data was biased, because of inconsistencies in data collection methods. Since it was not possible to correct for this bias, trainees did not appear to enjoy greater employment success than the controls, when measured in terms of employment status, hourly wage rates, cumulative earnings or percent of

time employed since release.[33] This is another example of the data problems hindering evaluation efforts.

3. Methodological Discussions

Because the concept of community-based employment services programs is relatively new, the evaluation literature concerning such programs is relatively limited. As seen from the previous discussion, many of the evaluation studies performed have been of prison-based or pretrial intervention programs. However, the concept of evaluation has certainly not been ignored when community-based programs are discussed.

One recent manual prepared for use by people interested in establishing community-based employment services programs for ex-offenders discusses the need for and role of evaluation.[34] However, sources cited are general in nature,[35] and the authors themselves admit the poor state of the evaluative art:

> Critics have charged that there has been very little proper evaluation, no establishment of standards or criteria by which to measure degree of success or failure, and no way of knowing whether offender rehabilitation programs are working and are worth the investment.
>
> In many projects the evaluation techniques or findings have been found faulty when subjected to rigorous examination, in others the evaluation results could not be generalized to make them universally applicable because the persons, conditions, and circumstances were unique to those programs at a particular time. In most, the evaluation has consisted of a presentation of operational statistics such as number entered, number trained, numbers placed, number employed, and number recidivating. In some cases, outside evaluators have been hired to evaluate projects after the fact, with the evaluation design being dependent upon the limited project data available or reconstructed data.36/

The Department of Labor has funded some studies aimed at developing tools for assessing the potential of offenders and ex-offenders for making a successful transition back to the community. These projects were undertaken at the Experimental Manpower Laboratory for Corrections (EMLC) in Alabama. The evaluative tools produced were not, however, designed to assist in analyzing the performance of an overall employment services program.

Aside from mention of evaluation in individual studies, little else has been done. On the State level, the methodological literature is sparse. One State, however, has devoted some efforts to the task of upgrading the state of evaluative techniques for offender and ex-offender employment services programs. The Dade County, Florida Criminal Justice Planning Unit developed a "Methodology for the Evaluation of Ex-Offender Projects." The methodology covers model objectives, site visit reports, suggested data items, suggested data collection forms, suggested client interview forms, and model program standards and goals. More specific material is presented for a residential project, a volunteer service project, and a coordinating project. Although the report is general in its approach, it does reflect the fact that planners are increasingly recognizing the role of evaluation in the development of employment services programs for ex-offenders.

4. Other Studies

Although the amount of literature concerning evaluation of community-based employment services programs for prison releasees is samll, there is no shortage of literature dealing with the need for employment services for ex-offenders. This includes: the proceedings of conferences convened to deal with the employment problems of ex-offenders;[37] government-published brochures on employment opportunities for ex-offenders;[38] nationwide studies of the statutory barriers to ex-offenders' obtaining employment;[39] and guidelines for manpower staff in dealing with ex-offenders.[40]

D. Services Offered By Community-Based Employment Services Programs

Information about components of and services performed by community-based employment services programs for releasees appears in individual project reports and in the few comparative studies that have been conducted. Additionally, much literature focuses on the needs of persons being released from prison in terms of employment-directed services. The following discussion

focuses on the typical program components, suggests the range of variations in operational arrangements, and summarizes the evaluation literature relevant to the various program services.

1. Selection of Clients for the Program

The criteria for selection of program participants vary according to the purposes and design of the program. Sometimes external restrictions imposed by organizations funding the program may limit the client population to be served. For example, community-based programs connected with local or State Parole bodies may only serve persons released from institutions in one State or from institutions in a defined geographical area within the State. Programs funded with money under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) can only serve persons who are certified as CETA-eligible under Department of Labor guidelines. Restrictions on clients served may also be informal. They may exist based on the beliefs of the program director or the program staff. Some programs may be designed specifically to serve a certain type of releasee. In other instances, staff's subjective estimates of the releasee's "success potential" may limit the people a program accepts.

Some programs may establish specific eligibility criteria. These may relate to sex, age, place of residence, type of crime, major physical or mental handicaps, unemployment or underemployment. For example, persons over a certain age might not be served because they present particularly difficult placement problems. Alcoholics or persons using drugs might not be served simply because a program is not equipped to handle the special problems they present or believes that they cannot benefit from the types of services offered. Members of a particular minority group may be the primary participants because the program's administrators believe the needs of that group are of greatest significance in the community. Less restrictive selection

criteria often result from experience; eligibility criteria can be enlarged if, for example, a program has encountered success and met with favorable community reactions.

A major issue facing community-based programs is "who to serve". This issue is often discussed in terms of "creaming". Should a program provide services to a carefully circumscribed group of releasees who have a high potential for success, or should it offer services to all releasees, regardless of their potential for success? This issue has long been debated by researchers, program planners, and program operators in the context of many rehabilitation programs. Unfortunately, polarization of opinion has often been the result.[41] Neither one of these approaches can be judged as correct or incorrect. However, it must be recognized that community-based programs designed to aid the low-risk releasee may hinder the development of comprehensive services in ways similar to those that prison-based programs for low-risk inmates hindered program development: capabilities to discover and plan for the needs of the higher risk or most disadvantaged groups will be limited, as will planners' abilities to discover whether the differences between the high-risk and low-risk releasee groups (judged in terms of potential for successful employment and readjustment to "straight" community life) are more important to project planning than are their similarities. Although prison-based projects and community projects tied to prison systems have traditionally favored serving "low-risk" offenders,[42] the community-based employment services programs serving releasees may not wish to "cream" simply because they cannot "select" their participants as easily as prison-based projects. In other cases, community-based programs serving general populations in which releasees can be included may not be permitted to "cream", since they have very broad eligibility criteria.[43]

There, of course, is no universal answer to the "creaming" question. The issue cannot be considered apart from the individual program situation and the resources or services available to participants. However, a program which selects participants who will be the most difficult to help should also recognize that they may be the most likely to fail. Thus, those community-based programs designed to serve the higher-risk releasee may need extra program features built in to overcome the serious problems faced by the clients.

Persons selected for community-based employment services programs vary in terms of a number of socio-economic and demographic characteristics. The objectives and functions of the program will reflect the kinds of clients it serves. No studies have been done of clients from programs serving only releasees. However, it is likely they reflect the same characteristics as participants of prison-based and community-based programs for ex-offenders. Such program participants possess low educational achievements and are often high school dropouts, even though they have an intelligence level generally corresponding to the non-offender population.[44] Participants generally have poor employment histories, characterized by much mobility and often unrealistic expectations. They also have usually experienced low wages, low work status and have often been on welfare. Most releasees are males: men comprise 95% of the prison population. At the time of release from prison, a third of releasees are married, half are single, and the remainder are divorced or widowed. Releasees from prisons also exhibit psychological characteristics typical of disadvantaged people who have experienced difficulty in adjusting to life in the "straight" world. The following characteristics were repeatedly found by prison-based projects which used psychological tests: inability to plan or work towards long-range goals; low frustration tolerance or

tolerance for normal stress; low or unrealistic aspiration level; inability to tolerate delay of rewards; impulsiveness; self-centeredness; broad mood changes in response to events; and negative self-concept, self-image, self-confidence.[45] Many releasees are members of minority groups, and they are generally younger, with a weaker educational background and poorer employment history, which all combine to place them in an even more difficult position concerning potential employment success.

In addition to these disadvantages associated with client characteristics, most releasees will face the various disadvantages associated with their status as ex-offenders. These include all the barriers discussed in Chapter I, such as statutory restrictions, prejudicial public attitudes, and union discrimination. Thus, community-based employment programs serving prison releasees must realize that no matter whom they select, they will have to deal with both the personal disadvantages the releasee brings to the program and the many external barriers to releasee employment.

2. Orientation

Orientation services are designed to provide a participant with information about the program, to offer guidance on personal and family problems, and to prepare the participant for the tasks necessary in seeking and maintaining employment. At a minimum, all participants generally receive a brief introduction to the employment services program as a whole, including the services it offers and the rights and responsibilities of participants. Beyond this, orientation content is usually governed by the needs of program participants. It may be part of intake activities or continue to occur throughout program participation. For example, information on needed daily skills--landlord-tenant relations, availability of social services in the community, consumer affairs--can be appropriate at the beginning of or

throughout a releasee's participation in a program. Data on the labor market will have the greatest impact if presented shortly before job search is begun. In fact, this form of orientation, called pre-vocational training, is often segregated as a separate program component.

3. Assessment

Assessment services are designed to determine a participant's employability, attitudes, abilities and interests. Only with this knowledge can program staff and participant develop a plan to achieve the participant's employment and associated goals. Fundamental to assessment in all employment services programs, not merely those for ex-offenders, is the assumption that a successful training, adjustment, or employment outcome depends upon an accurate understanding of the participant's abilities, needs, and interests. Programs have learned that these characteristics can change as a result of the participant's program experiences; therefore, assessment must be an ongoing process.

Usually, the result of initial assessment is an individualized plan for achieving the releasee's training-related goals. This is often termed an "employability plan". It can specify goals related to eventual jobs, skills training, counseling, education, and other supportive services to be provided for the participant. The plan also can define the steps that must be taken by the participant to ensure completion of the plan and satisfactory employment. Assessment is usually accomplished in a three-stage process of interviewing, testing and counseling. Testing is often formal and comprehensive, but it may be informal and minimal. The utilization of formal testing demands that the program employ trained staff who understand exactly what the tests are measuring, as well as their limitations. Testing results are usually weighed against information and insights obtained as the result of interviewing and counseling sessions.

Much research in the correctional manpower field has focused on the development of effective assessment tools. The Experimental Manpower Laboratory for Corrections (EMLC) developed two instruments for this purpose: the Environmental Deprivation Scale (EDS) and Maladaptive Behavior Record (MBR). These two tools can be used to help predict releasee success in the community and to determine which community supportive services are most needed by ex-offenders.[46] The EDS is a 16-item checklist of environmental influences on the individual; it provides an overall index of potential adjustment in the community and identifies problem areas, so that necessary support can be planned. The MBR is a checklist of an individual's responses to the environment in areas such as work, relationships with co-workers, fighting, and money management. A longitudinal follow-up study of releasee behavior concluded that the EDS and MBR predicted illegal behavior with significant accuracy.[47]

Another study which was not directed at assessment procedures for ex-offenders or releasees, but rather for Manpower Development and Training trainees, may be of value for staff of employment services programs serving ex-offenders. This study tested the effectiveness of an instrument called the Vocational Opinion Index (VOI) in measuring the "Job Readiness Posture" of train[illegible].[48] The study concluded that the index has significant ability to reliably differentiate the "work status" of individuals. Use of the VOI would enable staff to isolate "nonworkers" or "problem participants" early in the program, and then provide supplementary services to help develop job readiness postures.

There are a number of other assessment tools used by staff in employment services programs. Such standardized tests include the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI), General Abilities Test Battery (GATB),

and Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE). An assessment technique increasingly being used is that of work-sampling, in which program participants test their aptitudes and skills by completing programmed work assignments at a series of "work stations".

As previously discussed, a trend toward client self-assessment and goal-setting has reached the implementation stage in the form of the Mutual Agreement Program, which is based on a contract between inmate, institution and parole board that includes a definite parole date contingent upon the completion of rehabilitation goals.

4. Prevocational or Work-Adjustment Training

One of the most important facets of employment services for prison releasees is prevocational or work-adjustment training. This involves making clients aware of the various social skills associated with the straight work world. Releasees may be able to perform work at a required skill level, but they may not be ready to adjust to a normal work environment and to exhibit the qualities employers and supervisors expect of most workers. Thus, any employment program must make sure a releasee understands the need for punctuality and regular working hours, exhibits necessary skills for maintaining social relationships with co-workers, can work under pressure, and realizes the importance of adhering to personnel policy regulations.

In the past, projects which have developed this training, either in prison or in the community, have disagreed about its nature and scope, although all have agreed that it is critical. In most Manpower Development and Training projects, it was usually a minor part of the project and offered informally by regular counselors without any set structure. "In one project it took the form of a course in tool technology; in another, a role playing group focusing on worker-supervisor relationships. In one project it was

called prevocational training; in another, work adjustment training. Whatever the name, the common bond was the emphasis on social, psychological, education, and other skills which enable a participant to obtain and maintain employment."[49]

Some projects have emphasized the provision of this form of training to releasees. One program, Exploy-Ex in Denver, holds an employment preparation workshop three times each week for all job applicants. This includes mock applications and videotape interviews. Another, the Parole Rehabilitation and Employment Program (PREP), operating in nine Ohio cities, is a five-week training program with two weeks spent in a classroom and three weeks in locating and securing a job. Training focuses on personal adjustment, problem-solving and job seeking skills, with emphasis on the recent releasee and those "least employable". Skills training is not a program component.

An assessment of PREP, conducted for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, found that of all clients graduated from the program over a five-year period, 68% had achieved "successful" employment, securing and holding a job for 60 days after graduation from the program. The overall recidivism rate of PREP clients was estimated to be 11%. This effort to assess the PREP program encountered several of the same problems expressed by authors of other studies throughout the literature on employment services program evaluation. PREP had conducted a one-year follow-up study on clients, but sufficient data was not available to make accurate and reliable comparisons with the parolee population at large or any segment comparable to PREP clients.[50]

5. Skills Training

Very little has been written concerning community skills training programs for prison releasees. Very often community-based employment services

programs cannot afford to operate their own skills training components. They do not often possess the necessary money for equipment and trained instructors or the necessary staff. Therefore, most community programs for ex-offenders must rely on other resources for the provision of skills training to program participants.

Although little literature exists concerning community skills training programs specifically for prison releasees, much has been written about two other relevant subjects:

- prison-based training programs whose operations and problems affect the skills training needs of prison releasees returning to the community; and
- community-based skills training for other disadvantaged persons, who often possess many of the same socio-economic and demographic characteristics as prison releasees.

Skills training is probably the employment service most often provided to inmates of correctional institutions. Inmate training programs and work release programs have been operating for many years. And from the inception, in-prison vocational training has been beset by problems.

Although this Phase I study focuses on community-based employment programs for releasees, the problems inherent in prison-based training programs cannot be ignored. Community-based programs must serve the releasees as they find them; the problems encountered by prison-based training will inevitably influence the employment status or extent of job-readiness exhibited by releasees returning to the community. Only by possessing some awareness of the problems of prison-based vocational training can one gain a full understanding of the training- and skill-related needs of the prison releasee.

Training has often been associated with low-level jobs. Too often occupational areas are selected for training which bear little if any relationships to the labor market situation in the community to which the releasee

will be returning. Because of convenience or expedience, the desires and interests of participants are often ignored in favor of the needs of the institution. Generally, in-prison training has not had the desired effect on the employability of participants.

The literature emphasizes these conclusions repeatedly. Pownall found that the best predictor of releasee employment status was prior work experience, and that the type of institutional work assignment was not significantly related to employment status. He concluded that institutional training and work experience had very little influence on post-release employment status and that the majority of releasees worked at unskilled, service and operative jobs. Pownall's study found that most prison vocational training programs were associated with institutional maintenance. The negligible difference in employment rates between those who did and those who did not have vocational training indicated that these programs were of little benefit to releasees. Pownall also found that those trained in professional or technical skills were most likely to have successful post-release full-time employment, but that only a very small percentage of inmates qualified for and received this type of training. Additionally, less than one-third of those who received training used it in their first post-release job, and more than half of those releasees who received vocational training were employed in unskilled or semi-skilled jobs after release.

The raw data for Pownall's study is approximately 10 years old, and improvements have been attempted by those responsible for vocational training in prisons. However, more recent studies have found many of the same problems. Rovner-Pieczenik's review of correctional manpower projects through 1973 found that in general the projects did not consider the seasonality of employment, wage levels, occupational status or the needs of the community to which the offender would probably be returning after release.[51] Although

most projects surveyed prisoner interest prior to project selection and training and placement, their interests did not play a significant role in the selection of training areas. Rather, the training areas selected reflected middle-class biases concerning the kind of work offenders would be able to or "should" do; most training offered was in blue-collar and service occupations. Little training has thus far been done in human service occupations, such as work with other disadvantaged populations.

Unfortunately, a very recent study reached many of the same conclusions as Pownall and Rovner-Pieczenik. This study, conducted on behalf of the U.S. Department of Labor, of 560 prisons, was released in March 1976. Some of its major observations included:

- More than half of all inmates want types of training that are unavailable in their institutions.
- There is an apparent lack of relationship of job training to individual and local job market needs.
- Only half the directors of vocational training programs regard as important the development of job skills to enable an inmate to obtain employment.
- Less than half the inmates who participated in training said the job waiting for them was related to training they received in prison.52/

Short-term, entry-level training has usually been offered the offender. One exception was Project Fresh Start, which established a program of job orientation, counseling, job placement, and follow-up support for women incarcerated at and released from the Detroit House of Corrections. Job orientation was provided in the areas of typing, keypunch, food service, and nurse's aide. However, projects like this, that have tried to bring trainees to a level of skill where they could perform on the job at realistic levels of production, have been rare. Although training for the entry level may be somewhat understandable,[53] it places the releasee in direct

competition with the many noncriminal disadvantaged for jobs where turnover is high and the chances of career mobility are low. Therefore, it is not surprising that jobs obtained by releasees are usually not training-related and that turnover occurs within a few months of initial hiring. With a specific commitment from an employer as in the early Manpower Development and Training Rikers Island project,[54] entry-level training in prison may be sufficient when followed by on-the-job training at the work site with other employees. However, this has not been a typical vocational training project arrangement.

Many recommendations have been made to improve skills training for offenders. These include:

- The selection of training areas should take into account not only institutional realities and work demands but also the interests of the offender.
- Innovative training programs in white-collar occupations should be developed with the assistance of potential employers. Course offerings in blue-collar occupations should be increased.
- Training should be individualized through an open-entry/exit structure which allows trainees to progress at their own speed.
- Training programs should work toward specific commitments between those who do the training and those who control job entry to (1) assure a training program and level of skill which takes employer's needs into account and (2) provide a direct link between training and potential employment.55/

These types of recommendations may be acted upon. However, the foregoing discussion reveals that most prison releasees re-entering the community after an extended period of incarceration have serious training needs, regardless of whether they have participated in any prison-based vocational training program.

It is likely that skills training programs available to the prison releasee in the community will be connected with a Comprehensive Employment and Training Program (CETP). The form of this connection will vary:

- Some communities may be operating Model Ex-Offender Programs (MEP's) funded by both Federal and State CETA monies in ten States.
- Other community CETA prime sponsors may operate special programs for ex-offenders as part of their regular CETP.
- An existing community-based program for ex-offenders may subcontract with the local CETP for skills training services.
- In many communities the prison releasee will probably have to compete for regular CETP services with other disadvantaged persons.

CETA prime sponsors generally develop skills training classes for groups of participants or refer participants to existing training resources on an individual basis. Community employment program experience has shown that individual referral minimizes administrative costs, permits training in more occupations by utilizing the entire range of training services available, and allows more flexibility in timing with regard to when a participant can begin training. Community-based programs for ex-offenders themselves may attempt to develop individualized referral commitments with local training resources if sufficient money is available.

Prime sponsors that develop their own training classes utilize a single or multi-occupational approach. Single-occupation provides training in one occupation over a certain length of time and for a defined skill level. Such classes operate on specified schedules or an open entry, open exit basis. Releasees with prior experience in an occupation and/or very specific vocational interests will probably benefit most from this approach. Multi-occupation provides training in a number of occupational areas, e.g., automotive cluster, health cluster, clerical cluster. Participants advance according to their ability and can transfer within and among clusters according to their needs. This type of training may be very beneficial to prison releasees who have only a general idea of the type of work they desire.

For those communities without specific CETA components for offenders, releasees will necessarily have to compete with all the other disadvantaged for services. Although CETA programs generally provide a wider range of vocational training than is offered in prisons, much of it is blue-collar and entry-level. However, a releasee who has the additional support of a community-based ex-offender program for counseling, prevocational training, etc., and must rely on CETA only for actual skills training will probably be able to benefit most from the services available.

6. Educational Services

The low educational achievement of prison inmates has already been discussed. The severity of this problem mandates that community-based programs provide releasees with some form of educational services. The type of educational training can vary. Academic instruction can lead to some prescribed certification (diploma or degree) and/or can be designed to prepare the releasee for further training, future employment, or advancement in current employment. Academic training can be utilized where it is necessary for a person to have a high school diploma, a General Education Development (GED) certificate, or college courses in order to obtain certain employment or increase mobility in a specific occupation. It can also be used to provide an ex-offender with remedial or basic education or communication skills (e.g., English-as-a-second-language-ESL-training).

The approach community-based programs may take can also vary. Some programs may be large enough to make arrangements with public school systems to furnish teachers to work with program participants who desire to obtain a GED certificate, the equivalent of a high school diploma. Other programs may take advantage of adult basic education programs in the schools. Others can use volunteer tutors, alone or in combination with the schools.

No evaluation has been conducted of educational services provided by community-based employment programs for releasees. However, because the educational disabilities and attitudes of prison releasees inevitably parallel those of prison inmates, conclusions based on studies of educational services provided in prisons are relevant. An assessment of such projects produced these findings:

- Remedial education is most effective when offered concurrently with vocational (or pre-vocational) training.
- A nontraditional teaching design (e.g., team teaching, individual tutors, tutors combining with educational machines) should be employed.
- Nontraditional teaching methods and materials (e.g., individualized teaching materials and machines, the use of role playing) are more effective than traditional ones.
- Nontraditional teachers (e.g., formerly trained project participants, college volunteers, community workers) can direct the use of educational materials without academic training or certification in the field of education.56/

These points suggest that although a community-based program for releasees could take advantage of the public schools or adult education courses, it might be better advised to provide educational services to program clients either in-house or in a non-school setting. Part of the success of nontraditional techniques inevitably occurs because of the offender's association of all past traditional education with failure or hostility. Nontraditional methods can increase the motivation to learn by lessening these negative associations.

The Experimental Manpower Laboratory for Corrections (EMLC) has developed individualized experimental educational materials for use with offenders and ex-offenders. EMLC refined the use of individually programmed instruction and developed materials for dissemination to correctional officials. The experimental research produced these conclusions:

- Materials and procedures must be concrete, varied, and short.
- Teaching machines inherently motivate interest, but personal attention and varied activities are a necessary supplement to their use.
- Learning contingencies (e.g., rewards) can be manipulated to encourage maximum performance.
- The use of individually programmed instruction reduced preparatory and training time when compared with traditional methods.57/

7. Counseling

Counseling is an important part of any community-based employment program for prison releasees. "Counseling" can be defined as the process of assisting participants in realistically assessing their needs, abilities, and potential; of providing guidance in the development of employment goals and the means to achieve them; and of helping with the solution of a variety of problems occuring during participation in the program. The scope and purposes of counseling vary from program to program and even within a program, depending upon the program's design and the releasee's needs and status at the time the counseling is provided.

Regardless of definition, however, counseling is an ongoing process that usually runs throughout the releasee's participation in a program. Counseling is often structured around the development and implementation of an ex-offender's "employability plan". The development of such a plan can give concrete purpose to counseling sessions. The counselor can assist the releasee in the development of an employability plan, coordinate program inputs necessary for the plan to be effected, and provide continuous support in the ongoing development and modification of the plan.

Releasees attempting to readjust to the community may need more than one type of counseling. Programs generally offer these kinds of counseling assistance:

- Individual Counseling--This type of counseling is usually concerned with basic problems relating to immediate environment and behavior and not with psychological scars or emotional relationships. It is often provided to releasees by their parole officers and is most common in manpower programs like CETA or State Vocational Rehabilitation Agencies.

- Group Counseling--This form of counseling is concerned with improving the releasee's ability to readjust socially and form relationships with others. It uses guided group interaction as a treatment method but requires trained counselors. Many community-based programs for ex-offenders have group counseling as a regular part of the program regimen.

- Individual Treatement Counseling--This assistance is concerned with severe emotional or personality problems requiring professional attention. Community-based programs obtain these services from local mental health agencies, social service agencies, or private therapists.

- Vocational Counseling--Vocational counseling is a specialized form of individual counseling. Although individual counseling may cover the development of an employability plan and the related needs of the releasee, some comprehensive community programs may have special vocational counselors who serve as supplements to general counselors. In such cases the vocational counselors will be solely concerned with the participant's employment needs. Such specialists often have the time and experience to establish valuable relationships with other community employment-related agencies and develop formal linkages for assuring better client referral.

Literature on past project experiences emphasizes the importance of counseling quality. The type of counseling may be less important than the existence of a trusting, continuous relationship between client and counselor. The benefits of quality counseling have been enumerated,[58] as have the advantages of "reality-oriented" counseling, in which behavioral change is the goal.[59]

One recurring issue in the existing literature is the role of the ex-offender counselor. Ex-offender counselors often succeed with ex-offender clients because they have special insights into the client's problems that the average counselor lacks. The client, knowing this, may consciously pay heed to or develop more trust in the counselor. Ex-offender counselors often can use this added credibility in combination with nonmoralizing and

judgmental manners and nontraditional methods to achieve results that a counselor with a middle-class background might find difficult. Several offender projects, though not serving releasees, did find the use of ex-offender counselors to be very effective,[60] and some community-based programs operated and staffed completely by ex-offenders have also been effective. However, problems can develop if ex-offender counselors are used, and these must be considered. One problem which may occur "from selecting an insufficiently mature ex-offender of the same background as the client is that the two may become stuck on the point of their fight against the 'establishment', (which) becomes the scapegoat; no behavior change is demanded, and no responsibility is accepted, though the staff member may teach the participant how to beat the system."[61]

Part of the problem of assessing the value of ex-offender counselors, of other types of counselors, or of the various kinds of counseling, stems from the scarcity of research on this important program component. The experience with counseling in the years of Manpower Development and Training projects has been characterized as typified by "unfortunate misuse of terminology, obscure goals, unexplored assumptions, haphazard techniques and disagreement about what to do to whom and under what circumstances."[62] This general lack of ability to measure the impact of counseling makes it difficult to independently assess counseling "success". Only by distinguishing the counseling component and its corresponding objectives and techniques from other program components will programs be able to evaluate its relative importance in the ex-offender's success.

8. Subsidized Employment or Supported Work

The concept of subsidized employment or supported work derives from the belief that some ex-offenders need a supportive employment experience to bridge the gap between prevocational and vocational training to a full-

time position in the legitimate economy. There are a number of variations to this aoproach, but all attempt to provide participants with support in a temporary work environment. The goal is termination from the program and entrance into a satisfactory job in the labor market.

Subsidsized employment is employment created in the public sector and in private nonprofit agencies which is paid for by the client's program. Tnis type of service is often available to eligible unemployed persons through local CETA programs. Essentially, it includes two types of activity which are different in nature and have distinct purposes: transitional public service employment and work experience.

The purpose of transitional public service employment is to provide participants with newly created jobs in the public sector which will provide needed public services. These jobs are meant to be temporary until participants can be moved onto the employer's regular payroll or certain other suitable public or private employment.

Work experience can occur in the public sector or in private nonprofit agencies. The work situations are temporary and are not necessarily expected to result in unsubsidized employment for the participants. The purpose is to provide the person with experience on a job, to develop occupational skills and good work habits, or to provide exposure to various occupational opportunities.

Several projects specifically for ex-offenders have utilized one or more of these approahces with varied results. For example, the Pennsylvania Governor's Justice Commission sponsored a work experience program through Goodwill Industries that attempted to offer clients an opportunity to establish a work record so that Goodwill could provide job recommendations to prospective employers. Approximately 30 clients at a time spent ten weeks in a program of work, counseling and placement assistance. Each

client started at a fixed hourly rate and could be granted an increase of ten cents an hour at the end of each of the first four weeks. The program goal was that each client be referred for placement or training between the fourth and sixth week. An evaluation of the program pointed out several problems. Poor risk clients admitted into the program did not fare well, clients seemed to lack motivation, and the ex-offender participants still had a generally difficult time in the job market.[63]

Another program that has received widespread attention is the Pioneer Messenger Service operated in New York City by the Vera Institute of Justice. The project offers steady work to "unemployable" ex-drug addicts and ex-offenders, who participate at all levels, from top management of the service to delivering packages. Early evaluation showed that participant success and capacity to handle more responsible work bore little relation to attendance at therapy sessions or participation in them, so the project now does not require therapy. Instead, it operates on the belief that work success alone may provide the stability necessary for an individual to successfully adjust to life in the community. Vera also operates other supported-work projects through its Wildcat Corporation. Work performed by program participants includes the cleaning of public buildings and maintenance in public parks.

A national supported-work program based on the Vera approach is currently being implemented at approximately thirteen sites around the country. This national demonstration project is being funded by six federal agencies and the Ford Foundation. Work experience is being provided to several disadvantaged groups, in normal work environments with necessary support. Ex-offenders comprise 25%-35% of the persons served, but including drug-addicted ex-offenders, they may comprise up to 50% of the clients. The objectives are to provide approximately 15,000-18,000 participants a year

with the opportunities to learn work habits and develop employment histories. The goal of the three-year project is to determine which groups are most responsive to assistance.

One problem with the supported-work concept is that participants tend to become dependent upon these jobs and derive security from them. As a result, they are inclined to stay with the project rather than to seek permanent, full-time employment. This is one problem that has plagued Vera Institute projects, which have otherwise proved successful. The national demonstration project, aware of this problem, does have mandatory graduation requirements. Clients will remain 12 or 18 months at a maximum.

9. Job Development

Job development is often a difficult and time-consuming process for staff of community-based employment programs serving ex-offenders. It is an ongoing process that may begin as soon as a releasee has been accepted by the program. The goal is to coordinate job development with all other activities and services to ensure timely placement for the participant in the desired vocation. Job development can include many phases or processes.

Job solicitation consists of efforts to identify all available and projected jobs through contact with employers and community representatives. The objective is to secure, store and classify "job orders" in preparation for eventual job placement activities. Solicitation efforts can include an analysis of the local labor market, publicity campaigns to engender employer interest and job order collection. Often automated services can be purchased through a computer hook-up or obtained by the employment services program from offices of the State Employment Service.

Job creation, contrastingly, attempts to open up to program participants jobs which were never before available to them. One strategy is to convince employers to change hiring policies that exclude program participants

and limit the effective use of the program's resources. Often, this requires changes in attitudes rather than large-scale rearrangement of institutional rules and regulations.

A key to successful job development for releasee or ex-offender employment programs is the maintaining of a pool of employers who are aware of the program and have indicated a receptivity to employing ex-offenders for positions they will have available. Ex-offenders can thereafter be referred to those employers most likely to have jobs appropriate for the person's own needs. Such referrals can be made with some measure of assurance that the ex-offender, whether hired or not, will be treated with some sensitivity.

A great variation exists in the manner of delivering job development services. They can be provided:

- in-house with little or much contact with other community employment-related agencies;
- by an agency that is delegated to handle it that has been created by a group of ex-offender programs;
- by the local office of the State Employment Service; or
- through contracting out to a public or private agency or group.

The advantages and disadvantages of these approaches have been debated frequently by program planners and administrators. One of the main advantages of a centralized job development (and placement) service is that it avoids duplication of work by staff of several ex-offender programs and alleviates the annoyance of businesses at repetitive calls and other solicitations of openings. However, most programs have found that job development provided by an outside agency often does not produce satisfactory results. For example, the traditional staff and techniques used by the Employment Service have not been notably successful with ex-offenders. Often counselors with middle-class backgrounds find it difficult to relate to ex-offenders who may exhibit no middle-class values.

One program operating in the centralized model is the Lousiville, Kentucky, Clearinghouse for Ex-Offenders, which provides employment services to offenders from the prerelease stage through parole or full separation from the criminal justice system. Job search is handled in two ways: through use of the Clearinghouse's on-site scanners of open positions in the Kentucky Employment Service's job bank, and through its own in-house job development efforts. Job development includes regular meetings with and mailings to officers or key hiring officials of separate clusters of companies.

Previous projects funded by the Department of Labor tend to show that job development is most effective when done by ex-offender programs themselves, through either the centralized approach used in Louisville or on a program-by-program basis. Points gleaned from a comparison of these projects include:

- Personal visits to employers are preferable to telephone contacts.
- It is important to appeal to the civic responsibility of a potential employer.
- Close time connection is preferable between job development and participant placement.
- The participant's record should not be hidden from the prospective employer or abilities overestimated.
- Development activities should feed information back to a project, so that employer concerns are taken into account.
- Coordination with other community employment services (e.g., job banks) is important but should not substitute for a program's own job development acitivities.
- Employers should be made aware of and assisted with on-the-job supports needed by the ex-offender.64/

When community-based programs do their own job development, it is sometimes helpful to concentrate on one or several large employers who have proven receptive. Sometimes special programs for ex-offenders can be

established. One such program is "Impact", Chase Manhattan Bank's Ex-Inmate Program. In-prison training and, if necessary, training after release, prepare offenders for jobs that will be available with Chase Manhattan. A screening committee includes business personnel, but co-workers and supervisors are unaware of the ex-offender's status. This avoids any possible stereotyping. Other organizations with similar programs for releasees include Con Edison, the Chemical Bank of New York, the New York Telephone Company, and the Equitable Life Insurance Company.

There is no perfect job development process. Assessments of past projects show that when traditional agencies are relied upon, results may be disappointing, but that when programs engage in job development themselves, duplication may produce animosity on the part of the very employers to whom the programs are trying to appeal. Perhaps the best appraoch is the combined use of outside resources and in-house staff efforts.

10. Job Placement

Job placement activities can only occur when the releasee is considered "job-ready". If the releasee is at this stage, program staff may:

- counsel the participant on job-seeking procedures (if not already done);
- assess the releasee's needs, skills and potential for employment (if not already done);
- match the client to existing job opportunities;
- refer the person to the job; and
- verify the results of the referral.

There are a variety of factors which influence job placement services for prison releasees and other ex-offenders. Past and current analyses have studied these factors and generally made recommendations concerning "how not to" proceed rather than providing answers on the best way to proceed.

One of the primary problems facing those responsible for placement of releasees is the various barriers, both official and informal, to the hiring of ex-offenders. Employer fears and prejudices have previously been discussed in this report, as have the various statutory restrictions hampering the job opportunities of ex-offenders. Unless job placement staff work with employers and supervisors, the informal barriers will continue to exist.

Another problem evident with most programs is that job placement per se is a deceptive and overemphasized criterion of a releasee's success. Pownall found that most prison releasees who had pre-arranged jobs had positions of a semi-skilled or unskilled nature, indicating that although they were "successfully" job-placed, the institutions had not successfully arranged skilled positions for releasees.

Conclusions from past studies emphasize the fact that job placement alone is not necessarily a significant measure of success. One job is often inconclusive. A releasee often needs time to adjust to community life and develop employment goals while actually working. A releasee should perhaps be expected to change jobs frequently. Thus, employment rates at a specified time after program termination or the percentage of clients successfully placed are misleading measures of an employment program's "success". Only long-range follow-up can adequately measure the placement "success" a program has had with its participants.

A factor contributing to the deceptiveness of job placement as a success measure is the role of job quality in a releasee's readjustment to community life. Several studies of parolee and releasee job placements have concluded that too often work does not have "meaning".[65] A comparative study of pre-trial intervention programs[66] revealed the same problem. Since participants

had not been incarcerated or even convicted, one would expect that their chances for quality employment would be greater than those for prison releasees. Pretrial participants do not have to make the difficult adjustment from prison to the community environment, and thus may be better able to secure good jobs. Yet evaluators found that the type of placement offered defendants was generally "not very attractive" and that there was a systematic tendency for placement in jobs of lower status and salary than those in which participants expressed interest. The conclusion was reached that increased employment benefits come at least partly at the expense of job quality and that long-term effectiveness may be mitigated by this factor. One of this evaluation's major recommendations was that the quality of job placements must be emphasized much more. This problem for pretrial intervention program participants serves to illustrate the severity of the job quality problem for releasees, who face more numerous and difficult barriers in their searches.

The general lack of job quality is especially evident in the records of parolees, who usually must have a "guaranteed" job in order to be paroled. Often such jobs are solicited as a means to an end, merely to ensure the person's release on parole. Too often the jobs are of an unskilled or entry-level status--the easiest type for releasees to obtain--simply so the releasee can be released from the institution.

Another factor influencing job placement as a success measure and the task facing staff of community-based employment programs is the degree of competition among programs for job placements. This was cited as one of the major problems facing ex-offender programs at an offender employment seminar in Washington, D.C. Representatives of programs and agencies agreed that an attitude of competition existed among staff trying to reach quotas

of referrals and placements. This competition often came at the expense of "employer overload"; employers annoyed by repetitive placement efforts could be turned against the entire idea of special consideration for ex-offenders. Even where only one special ex-offender employment program exists in a community, it may have to compete with several other employment programs serving the economically disadvantaged. Although the number of such categorical programs has been reduced as the result of the 1973 Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, the resulting local CETA programs still are attempting to place a great many people with many of the same characteristics possessed by prison releasees. The only major difference is that most CETA participants do not have criminal records.

One partial solution to this competition problem is centralization and/or coordination of community employment services for the ex-offender. This approach has met with a degree of success in several locations. The Louisville Clearinghouse, previously mentioned, and an Ex-Offender Skills Bank in Oakland, California, attempt to find jobs for releasees from a wide geographic area and a number of correctional institutions and community programs. The approach in Louisville was deemed so successful that a similar operation has begun in Lexington.

Another job placement factor often insufficiently considered by program staff is job mobility-stability. As previously mentioned in this report, studies have found that employment "success" for releasees often occurs in a series of jobs. Pownall's study, for example, concluded that nearly 60 percent of releasees with pre-arranged jobs remained for less than six months, and the median length of the first job for releasees was four months. A recent survey concluded that "successful employment frequently takes place in a series of jobs rather than in one; the ex-offender . . . with little employment history may try a number of jobs before he stabilizes.

What appears to be a lost employee may, in fact, be a successful rehabilitation experience."[67] Some community job placement programs build in mobility when placing ex-offenders, thus taking this problem into account. Such a program places an individual in a low-skilled, moderate-paying job for a few months to give the person necessary income and simultaneously develop successful employment experience. During this period the staff member responsible for job placement attempts to find a job that more closely matches the skills and vocational interests of the ex-offender and offers an opportunity for upward mobility. This technique has been used with good results by parole officers working with parolees from Maryland penal institutions. These officers start by placing a parolee in a low-paying, entry-level job and end by locating a job with potential for upward mobility, for example, in a large business firm.

Little data exists on employment stability. The few studies of offender employment programs which gathered such information show that offenders who participated in projects with employment services spent a greater percentage of their post-project year working (than their pre-project year) and received higher wages and more highly skilled positions. One reason for the lack of data on participants from community-based employment programs is the insufficient number of longitudinal follow-up studies yet performed that monitor post-program employment histories with specific attention to correlates of job mobility and employment stability. Most programs have not had the resources to conduct long-term follow-up studies.

11. Job Retention

One of the most important and yet most neglected aspects of a continuum of employment-related services is activities directed at job retention. This includes services provided to both the employee and the employer after job placement. Often the first week is crucial to the employee's eventual

success on the job; program staff need to be available to provide necessary supportive services during this period. The employer who has made the commitment to hire the prison releasee should also be assured that program staff will do whatever is necessary to help the employee with successful adjustment.

Previous studies revealed that, while it is very difficult, it is possible to work with, and not in spite of, "the establishment". Rovner-Pieczenik notes that "the conclusion of Operation Pathfinder[68] is persuasive; the key to job retention is supervision, regardless of whether employees are disadvantaged or 'normal'."[69] Thus, the amount of risk and inconvenience an employer is willing to accept and tolerate may well depend upon how much assistance and cooperation can be expected from the community-based program's staff. Too often "follow-up" has consisted merely of collecting data for program recordkeeping purposes rather than providing assistance to the employer or employee. This may be partly due to the fact that employers may resent intrusion by program staff. According to Rovner-Pieczenik, supervisors in general have been unable or unwilling to cope with on-the-job behavior of ex-offenders that is incompatible with the effective operation of the firm. Operation Pathfinder, one of the few offender research and demonstration projects that worked with the employer, encountered resistance when employers were asked to change work practices; employers did not want outside training for their supervisors; they did not want "research" done with them; they did not want to become involved in a government program.

In recent years, some community-based employment programs for ex-offenders have paid more attention to working with employers. Some programs arrange to telephone every week for approximately a month after new ex-offender

employees are placed. Others send staff to visit the work site periodically and check on new employees' progress.

12. Supportive Services

Supportive services are a necessary adjunct to any manpower services delivered to prison releasees. They can be provided by program staff or by other resources within the community, but for a person returning to the community after a period of incarceration, they are almost always essential. Experience has shown that "marital, financial, housing and legal problems can be traumatic for the released offender. Project Fresh Start (a Labor ORD project) referred to this transition period as 'postrelease shock'."[70] Usually supportive services should be made available throughout participation in the program. These services can include:

- health care services;
- child care;
- legal assistance;
- transportation, and;
- residential support.

Many problems may arise as community-based programs attempt to see that these services are provided. Projects have concluded that existing community services are often unknown or underutilized by prison releasees. Community agencies which pledged cooperation to community-based ex-offender programs have been hesitant or reluctant to provide necessary services to the ex-offender population. To some extent, this is due to the reality of large caseloads, long waiting lists and insufficient budgets. However, it is partly due to the traditional "creaming" done by community agencies. Often success is judged in terms of placements alone, and counselors whose performance is judged on this basis are thus hesitant to serve high-risk clients.

Another problem is the failure of community-based ex-offender programs and community service agencies to establish efficient referral procedures. One person has said "the key problem in the development of community-based programs for ex-offenders is the failure of community agencies to coordinate efforts and the absence of a continuum of supportive services to releasees."[71] Reflecting this problem, a comparative study of nine offender projects found that most projects did not seek to maximize linkages with outside agencies to expedite the referral processes, and that generally there were no formal arrangements or definite procedures for providing services to project participants. This is somewhat understandable; staff of ex-offender programs are often hesitant to play "the agency game", referring releasees from one agency to another for supportive services. Experience has shown that traditional agencies often do not prove beneficial to such clients.

Several community-based programs serving ex-offenders have begun to provide their own supportive services to clients. For example, the SAFER Foundation in Chicago, which funds Operation DARE, now administers a revolving tool fund for parolees and soon-to-be released offenders. All applicants must have a verifiable job, and if approved, are supplied tools relating to their employment, e.g., mechanical tools, carpenter tools and plumbing tools.

13. Other Program Activities

Community-based employment programs for prison releasees and other ex-offenders are engaging in activities in addition to those connected with the direct provision of services to clients. Many of these deal with efforts to remove barriers to ex-offenders' employment. These barriers, previously referred to in this report, include irrelevant and unrealistic hiring qualifications and stereotyped attitudes of employers and supervisors.

Increasing attention is being paid to this aspect of ex-offenders' employment problems; some people feel that unless arbitrary and discriminatory hiring barriers are erased, all of the manpower services will produce minimal impact. A large part is being played by the American Bar Association Clearinghouse on Offender Employment Restrictions. It has published a pamphlet, "Removing Offender Employment Restrictions", which proposes remedial legislation to eliminate unreasonable restrictions encountered by ex-offenders. The National Alliance of Businessmen (NAB) has also done much on a national basis to work with employers. NAB has its own offender employment project which works with community NAB groups to sponsor seminars and conferences and to develop linkages between the employer community and ex-offender programs.

E. Program Staff

Very little information is available concerning the organization of the staff for community-based employment programs for ex-offenders. Because the organization and range of services provided can vary so greatly, there is no "normal" staffing pattern.

However, one of two staffing approaches is usually utilized to deliver services to program participants:

- The One Person Approach--This approach involves an individual who works with the participant to develop an "employability plan" and guides the participant through the program. A one-to-one approach of this type generally works well in small programs where activities and services are few and follow-up is easier. In large programs, the participant's options may be so varied that coordination may be too difficult for one staff member to manage.

- The Team Approach--The purpose of this approach is to provide each individual with a single staff group responsible for participant progress. Overall responsibilities of this team are to develop and implement a plan which is consistent with the ex-offender's capabilities and interests. The team also provides support and advice to the participant both while in the program and after placement on a job. While there seems to be no ideal composition, such teams can include a counselor, work training specialists, and a job development and placement specialist.

Although no comprehensive studies have been done of staff organizations of ex-offender employment programs, one survey of program directors revealed the following general points:

- The most frequently cited qualities for a staff member who will be working with ex-offenders are competence, dedication, maturity and demonstrated responsibility, character, empathy and flexibility.
- Additional qualities often include the ability to operate in bilingual and bicultural situations, since in many areas ex-offenders do not speak, read or write English and are products of diverse cultural backgrounds.
- Staff training is essential before and during a program, especially concerning the problems of the ex-offender, community services, and the characteristics and background of the population to be served.
- Positive relationships with staff of other agencies, and with business, labor and community groups are crucial to program success. Failure to establish such relationships can produce serious conflicts and misunderstandings detrimental to the program.72/

Rovner-Pieczenik's review of ten years of Manpower Development and Training projects also included conclusions concerning program staffing:

- While the most desirable mixture of professional and paraprofessional staff is unknown, most programs agree that it is important to maintain such a mix.
- Important job conditions for project participants are not usually considered for project staff. Career ladder mobility, frequent "feedback" raises, and internal promotions are not generally structured for the paraprofessional. Projects often expect paraprofessional staff members to show middle-class work behavior and simultaneously establish rapport with lower-class program participants.
- Since the paraprofessional is often hired for similarity with the ex-offender, training for personal and job competence is mandatory.
- Both professional and paraprofessional staff need training but often for different reasons: to introduce the professional to a new setting, new client and set of techniques; to structure the work behavior of the paraprofessional to meet program goals.
- A lack of project cross-fertilization concerning staff training and organization is evident; most projects developed training programs in isolation of available material developed by others.73/

One of the main issues confronting program directors is that concerning the use of ex-offenders on the staff. This decision has already been discussed, but some of the main points are worth reviewing:

- Hiring ex-offenders for program staff is generally highly recommended, if qualified persons can be found or can be qualified during an available training period.
- A competent ex-offender on the staff can often find other valuable ex-offender staff for the program.
- Ex-offenders selected should come from the same socioeconomic background as the ex-offender program clients.
- The pressures on ex-offenders working as part of the establishment can be extremely high, including role conflicts and inconsistencies in attitude.

One staffing issue that is receiving increasing attention in this era of dwindling resources for community-based human services programs is the use of volunteer staff. Lazar's survey of existing community-based programs serving prison releasees has revealed that many programs are operated solely by volunteers, while many others utilize volunteers in conjunction with professionals and paraprofessionals. One program has published a guidebook specifically for volunteers working with ex-offenders.[74] It includes a description of ex-offender problems, advice to volunteers, resources in the community, description of successful techniques and of potential problems, and examples of how volunteer programs may operate. The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration has also published a basic reference on organizing and managing volunteer programs.[75] It, too, includes a comprehensive list of resources and training aids.

The role played by volunteer staff varies. Some programs use volunteers with professional experience as regular counselors. Other programs only use volunteers in support positions. Some programs use an individual volunteer in the community to which the releasee has returned to develop a one-to-one trust and support relationship with the releasee in order to ease the difficulty of the readjustment process. Sometimes these volunteers are the ones responsible for referring the releasee to the appropriate community agency for assistance with employment-related problems. Whatever

the role played by volunteers, it can be valuable to community-based programs faced by problems of decreased resources.

It is clear that more research is needed in the area of staffing community-based employment programs for ex-offenders. This research must include specifics about ideal staffing patterns for programs serving different types of ex-offenders. For example, a program serving only prison releasees who have been incarcerated for over a year may have different staffing considerations than a program serving only probationers or only persons incarcerated six months or less. For example, because long-incarcerated prison releasees are facing the most difficult of adjustments back to community life, it may be advisable to have a greater number of ex-offenders who have experienced the same readjustment problem on the staff. Persons who have been incarcerated long periods of time may also need a trust relationship with one individual, something they may not have had for many years. In that case, a one-to-one approach may be preferable to the team approach.

F. Information Linkages

An efficient communications system among program staff and between the ex-offender employment services program and other community agencies is imperative if the releasee is to receive the optimum mix of appropriate employment-directed services. Experience has shown, however, that interprogram communications are often characterized by knowledge gaps and inefficiency.

One survey of services for the ex-offender in a large metropolitan location questioned 22 community agencies about their range of services, eligibility requirements, whether they provided services for ex-offenders, and whether families of ex-offenders were eligible for aid. Agencies surveyed included probation, parole, law enforcement, general welfare, family and child welfare, low-rent housing, vocational training, employment

and rehabilitation. One point emphasized in the findings was that only four agencies knew whether they served ex-offenders. The researchers concluded that many more community resources are available than are known to ex-offenders and suggested that a brochure be prepared describing the services available, the eligibility requirements, and the manner to proceed in obtaining services.[76]

This result is typical of the situation confronting ex-offenders in many communities. Returning to a new environment, they cannot be expected to know about all the services available. Therefore, it is mandatory that community-based programs designed to serve the ex-offender possess complete and thorough knowledge of available community services. However, too often communication between the ex-offender program and others is strained or non-existent. Program staff become easily frustrated at the bureaucratic problems associated with traditional community agencies. Staff at those agencies conversely sometimes become hesitant to serve ex-offenders because of the risk factor involved or because the ex-offender program may have referred one or more inappropriate clients. Often the quality of communications can be influenced by personal relationships. One staff member at an ex-offender program may utilize another community agency because of a good working relationship with a staff member at that agency. Another person at the same ex-offender program may not use that agency simply because of previous bad experiences with a staff member there. The ex-offender's opportunities are hampered by such inconsistent communication patterns among programs.

The community-based employment program can operate most officiently with certain information flows. On one level such flows may represent work performed by a program's participant selection or intake component: a program must usually collect types of information pertinent to the

selection of participants, helpful in referrals to other community programs and related to participants' performance in those programs. On another level flows of information promote coordination, cooperation and understanding. Such information flows can include:

- from parole officers or prison staff to the community-based program regarding a parolee or releasee's background and characteristics;
- from ex-offender program staff monitoring participant progress to vocational programs serving program participants regarding ex-offender program data collection requirements and procedures;
- from the community vocational programs to the ex-offender program regarding participant progress, e.g., level of performance, attendance, personal problems, etc.;
- from the ex-offender program to a parole officer concerning the participant's progress in the program and overall adjustment;
- from the ex-offender program to employers or supervisors of the program participant who has obtained a job concerning the program data needs; and
- from the employer or supervisor to the program concerning the program participant's performance on the job, e.g., relationship with other employees, work performance, punctuality, attendance, etc.

Little has been written about the adequacy of these specific information flows. The exchange of accurate, up-to-date information among these resources would not only decrease chances of releasees dropping out of programs but would also ensure the availability of data useful in program evaluations.

G. Program Costs

A discussion of program operations would not be complete without mention of costs. Many problems arise in determining the costs of program operations which makes such a task extremely difficult. Start-up costs will necessarily be high. Also, the vocational programs serving participants of the ex-offender program may be paid for their services according to different methods or not at all. For example, community programs may be paid according to contractual agreements between them and the ex-offender

program. Payments may be made on a fee-for-service basis. Another complication concerns the fact that ancillary services, such as transportation, provided by one community-based program may differ from those available in another community. These differences may make appropriate cost comparisons across programs impossible.

Additionally, programs are frequently not interested in conducting cost studies. Often operating on a small-scale or experimental basis, they are naturally extremely concerned with the delivery of services to participants. As a result, cost considerations may play a secondary role.

H. Outcomes

Client outcomes are major products of ex-offender employment services program operations. Data are available on many individual programs to measure client outcomes with respect especially to recidivism and employment status. Some evaluations have attempted to provide a frame of reference for outcome measures by presenting a program participant/non-participant comparison. No comparisons of several community-based programs for releasees have been done, however. Examples of the different approaches to measuring outcomes are presented below.

Comparison groups have been used to measure both employment and recidivism. However, most studies utilizing comparison groups have evaluated prison-based training programs. The evaluations compared the success of trainees in getting jobs and engaging in non-violative behavior to ex-offenders who had not received any vocational training. One effort which did use comparison groups to assess the success of a community-based program assessed Project Develop in New York City. Project Develop (Developing Education-Vocational Experiences for Long-Term Occupational Adjustment of Parolees) was designed as a comprehensive approach to the employment problems of undereducated and undertrained young male offenders on parole in the New York City area. The project established an employment evaluation

and diagnostic center to help parolees prepare for, plan for, and attain appropriate educational and employment objectives. Participants were provided with training costs, support allowances, intensive counseling, vocational assessment and job placement services during project participation and after completion. The evaluation study compared parole delinquency and recidivism rates of a group of project parolees to those of a control group of regular parolees. It was found that the experimental group had a parole delinquency rate of 15 percent and the control group a rate of 23 percent. The recidivism rate for project parolees was 6 percent as compared to the 12 percent recidivism rate for the control group parolees.[77]

This study and often other evaluations fail to recognize that recidivism can be an unreliable measure; thus, it can be overemphasized as a measure of program participant outcomes. Recidivism can be defined differently by people within the criminal justice system and by evaluators. The type of crime committed by the person--e.g., a felony or a misdemeanor--is rarely taken into account. Some program participants who engage in criminal activity repeatedly may never be apprehended. Conversely, arrest rates, often used as recidivism measures, do not accurately reflect conviction rates. Another complicating factor is plea bargaining; often an arrestee may plead guilty to a lesser offense for fear of being convicted of a more serious crime. Too often pre-program or pre-incarceration arrest rates and arrests during program participation are not compared, and rearrest is assumed to be equivalent to proof of continued criminal behavior. Moreover, rearrest rates, when applied only to program participants (control groups rarely being used), lack a frame of reference, since there is no information on outcomes of similar groups who did not participate in the program.

The importance of employing good techniques and utilizing common measures of recidivism is even more significant in light of the varying results of recidivism outcome studies already conducted. These studies indicate that employment-related programs can have good, bad, or minimal effects on the recidivism of releasees. Unless recidivism is consistently defined and the many variables affecting it considered, it will not be possible to determine whether differing outcomes result from different methods of measuring recidivism or actual program differences.

Thus, one of the reasons so many evaluations utilize recidivism as an outcome measure is the relative ease with which data can be collected. One author, decrying the state of evaluation, said, "Because the criterion of recidivism is always available, tables can be set up to compare any crudely differential groups. Under such circumstances the lack of statistical significance is not surprising."[78] Another researcher concluded that it is "useless" to urge that correctional officials distinguish the various meanings of "recidivism".[79] And it has also been noted, "If kinds of recidivism are not made clear, we would be failing to carefully conceptualize the dependent variable by lumping all types of recidivism together . . . If we fail to clearly define dependent variables, we will fail to obtain clear-cut results."[80] Rovner-Pieczenik has also acknowledged the overemphasis on recidivism as an outcome measure on the part of most Manpower Development and Training projects, and even though her conclusion is a reflection primarily on prison-based programs, it holds true for many program people in this field intent on showing the success of their program. While the desirability of reducing recidivism cannot be questioned, an overemphasis on the importance of reducing recidivism can be harmful to a project's other goals.[81] She notes that recidivism statistics, as they now exist, might best be used as a means to refine a program's design or services by distinguishing between those participants who are "successful" and those

who are not. "It becomes incumbent upon a project to utilize the statistic to refine the project so that a continually increasing proportion of participants are successful, rather than to tout the statistic and use it for comparative purposes with other dissimilar projects (as often done)."[82]

The second outcome measure used most often by ex-offender employment services programs is "employment". Usually this refers to the acquisition of a full-time job and retention on that job for a certain period of time. However, many problems affect the use of employment rates as an outcome measure of a program's effectiveness. Because of these problems, it becomes difficult to compare programs in terms of the employment outcomes of their participants.

Such comparisons would be very helpful, since outcomes in terms of employment have varied dramatically among both prison-based and community-based employment services programs. However, the problems involved in the use of employment as an outcome measure make comparisons almost impossible across projects. Usually, follow-up of program graduates is not sufficiently long, especially in view of the great job mobility often experienced by prison releasees on their re-entrance to the world of work. Many evaluations of prison- and community-based programs have freely admitted that their follow-up was not sufficient for definitive measure of program impact. Not surprisingly, this is not a new problem. One early (1930) study concluded, "Most research designs are generally based on the careers of ex-prisoners during too brief a period to afford a reliable basis of conclusion as to the genuineness and permanence of the 'reformation'."[83] Forty-three years later a parallel recommendation was made, "Longitudinal studies should be undertaken which monitor post-program employment histories with specific attention to correlates of job mobility and employment stability."[84]

Another serious problem in relying on employment placements as a criterion of program success is neglect of the critical job quality variable. Almost

all large-scale studies done of the employment status of parolees or releasees have found that the great majority find low-paying, dead-end jobs that do not correspond with releasee's interests or goals. It may be argued that any job is better than unemployment, and that if these are indeed the kinds of jobs prison releasees usually get, then trying to place them in higher-status, better-paying jobs will only lead to greater frustration and fewer placements. However, even if it is not realistic to expect any significant change in the type of jobs obtained by releasees, more detailed evaluations need to be performed to accurately differentiate degrees of "placement success". Rather than just measuring placement or retention on the job, programs must also analyze starting salaries, compatibility with occupational interest, use of training skills on the job and other more qualitative variables.

Another factor which clouds the use of placements as an indicator of program success is participant demographic characteristics. Often a person's non-success in the labor market may be wholly or largely unrelated to the services received in a community-based employment services program. Non-success may be due to sexism or racism on the part of an employer or discrimination against older job applicants. A sharp downturn in the economy of a community may severely hamper the employment chances of a program's graduates. The program naturally has no control over such economic conditions, which may drastically influence job placement rates.

Non-success in the job market may be unrelated to program impact in another way. Rather than being related to factors over which the program has no control, it may be related to factors over which the program chooses not to exercise control. Many community programs for releasees are small in scale and cannot afford to provide comprehensive services of both a personal and manpower nature to participants. They may be compelled to refer a person to another community agency for services like family

counseling, health care assistance, transportation aid or housing assistance. The program, by choosing (or being forced due to lack of resources) to refer clients for these services, thus places the client's eventual success partially in the hands of these other agencies. If the person's eventual nonsuccess in the job market is due to an unresolved family problem or transportation problem, it is not the responsibility of the ex-offender program itself. Yet an outcome of "unemployed" will likely be considered a program "failure".

Perhaps the most common problem affecting the use of "employment" as an outcome measure is the variety of definitions and measures associated with the term "successful employment". Success may mean such outcomes as:

- referral to a job and positive hiring decision;
- successfully employed for a fixed period of time (e.g., one month, 90 days), which may vary from program to program;
- placement in a job with a specified minimum wage level; or
- placement in a job corresponding to the person's occupational interests.

With so many definitions, it becomes impossible to compare employment results across projects. And yet if projects cannot be compared, then no conclusions can be reached about the best ways to secure jobs for program participants.

Other means exist to measure program impact on participants. Several outcome studies of employment services programs for releasees or ex-offenders have attempted to analyze "who" the successful participant is. One synthesis of the results of a number of projects concluded that participants who are relatively "more successful" (in terms of a combination of manpower and recidivism criteria, combining short- and long-term measures) are those with a history of greater personal success. Successful participants were:

- older;
- more educated;

- employed upon arrest or had a relatively good employment history prior to entering prison or a community-based program;
- married; and
- able to sustain supportive interpersonal relationships in the community.85/

The least likely to succeed in adjusting to a law-abiding life in the community were the young, single, narcotics addicts with poor education and no significant work experience.

A comparison of the characteristics of the more successful participants in prison- and community-based programs with characteristics of the releasee reveals why most releasees have great difficulty in readjusting to community life:

- Most releasees have completed less than nine grades of school.
- At the time of release from prison, only a third of releasees are married, half are single and the remainder are divorced or widowed.
- Very few releasees have had a regular employment history. Work histories are usually characterized by high unemployment, low wages, intermittent and low status work patterns, and welfare.

In spite of the generalizations about which ex-offenders prove more successful in employment services programs, there is still no clear answer as to which participants (aside from those with certain demographic characteristics) do best in such programs. This is due to a number of reasons, all of which serve to underline the evaluation problems confronting researchers in this area:

- Although projects vary in terms of clients served, they differ so much in terms of objectives and service delivery that it is impossible to compare "successes" by client type.
- Comparisons with control groups have been performed too rarely.
- Often individual programs have served such a homogenous population that internal group comparisons are not possible.
- Few programs have correlated participant characteristics with "success" criteria.

Thus, the question, "Which types of releasees are successful in which types of programs and why?" remains largely unanswered.

The foregoing discussion makes it clear that there are a number of problems affecting the outcome studies which have been conducted. There have been no long-range follow-up studies of releasees served by community-based employment services programs. This can be partly explained by the relative newness of these programs. Additionally, few programs have the resources or staff to plan a truly scientific long-term follow-up study. Yet such studies can tell much about the real impact of a program. For example, a three-year follow-up of participants in Experimental Manpower Laboratory for Corrections programs studied 106 offenders given institutional, educational and vocational training and 67 applicants who were not given such training. A prerelease interview was conducted as well as a series of postrelease interviews at intervals of 3, 6, 12 and 18-24 months. Additionally, law enforcement records were checked at regular intervals on a statewide basis and final review of these records was conducted 36 months after the initiation of the project. Findings indicated only a small-scale impact of manpower services in early postrelease behavior, especially in the employment area where trainees spent 13 percent more time working and made 3 percent more money than did the non-trainees during the first 18 months after release. The recidivism rates were about the same for both groups, 30 percent for major crimes and 50 percent for all law violations.

Although the objectives of a community-based program may differ greatly from those of a prison-based program and the range of services available may be much broader, the results of this study still point out the value of a longitudinal follow up of program participants. It can provide a more long-range measure of a program's impact, and long-range progress in

the releasee's employment and personal life is what community-based programs attempt to produce.

There has been little emphasis on studies of job mobility and stability. The few prison-based projects which did gather data on job stability showed offenders who had participated spent the greater percentage of their post-project year working, received higher wages, and held more highly skilled positions. However, no such studies have yet been done comparing releasee participants of community-based programs. Job mobility has been studied primarily in a descriptive manner (e.g., the Pownall study found a four-month median length for post-release job retention) and not as an outcome dependent on or varying with participation in programs.

There is a general lack of outcome studies across projects. Again, this is largely due to the many variables making program comparisons difficult, if not impossible. It is hoped that the analytical frameworks and evaluative designs Lazar develops in the course of this Phase I study will help lead to an alleviation of this particular problem in the state of knowledge.

I. Relationship with the Community

The concept of assisting the prison releasee to readjust successfully to community life puts great demands on a program. The releasee's needs are so varied that project implementation and program operations depend greatly on working relationships with other community agencies and groups. The following factors can be important:

- support of political leadership;
- media support;
- relationships with the community corrections department;
- support and cooperation of other community social service agencies;

- support of area employers; and
- support of the general public.

The support of political leadership is often critical in a program's planning stages. They must be convinced that a program for ex-offenders can have real value and merits their support. The continuance of an ex-offender program, funded initially by Federal money, often hinges on its being taken over by local or State agencies and funded by local or State funds. Such a takeover is currently being planned by the Labor Department regarding its Model Ex-Offender Programs; it is hoped that eventually Title III Federal CETA funds will be replaced totally by prime sponsor Title I money. This kind of takeover depends on the public in general and local officials (such as the mayor and city council) in particular realizing the value of the program and working for its support.

Media support can do much to engender public awareness of a program. Citizens often harbor the same stereotyped opinions and fears that are exhibited by employers wary of hiring ex-offenders. Media influence can be utilized to break down stereotypes and publicize the positive aspects of employing ex-offenders. The National Alliance of Businessmen, for example, has effectively used television and radio spots to gain public support.

The relationship of the program with community corrections officials is important, because it is those officials who will refer parolees and releasees to the program. Parole officers may not cooperate unless they can be assured they will be kept up-to-date on parolee progress in the program. Some community ex-offender employment services programs are associated with the probation or parole departments; in these programs particularly cooperative relations between corrections officials and program staff are essential.

The need for cooperation between staff of the ex-offender program and other community agencies has previously been discussed in this report. Community employment services programs can rarely provide all the manpower related services needed by prison releasees. They must rely to some extent on other programs. Although traditional agencies such as the Employment Service have experienced problems in serving the ex-offender, often a program with minimal financial resources cannot be very selective.

The support of area employers is, of course, vital to the eventual success of any employment services program for releasees. The program and the employer have a mutual interest in the quality of performance of the releasees. Each has a need for them to succeed on the job and each needs the other's support in order for their objectives to be fulfilled. However, the employer is in the advantageous position since the program is basically soliciting for available jobs. Therefore, the burden is on the program to establish and maintain supportive relationships with employers. Many programs are attempting to work more closely with employers by providing extensive support to releasees after they are placed on a job. For example, Operation SARE in Chicago provides social services support to program graduates who are working; follows up each job placement at five-, thirty-, and ninety-day intervals; encourages all employees to contact program staff immediately regarding any supportive help needed by the employer or employee; and works continually with the National Alliance of Businessmen to increase employer awareness of and cooperation with the program.

The support of the general public is essential if a program wishes to maintain an identity in the community. It may be most important during the planning stages when administrators are seeking to implement a program for

ex-offenders. A great deal of public fear and hostility may have to be overcome. Although the program can garner public support through the media, a more effective approach may be going directly to the public, holding conferences to explain the program's objectives and value. For example, H.I.R.E. (Helping Industry Recruit Ex-Offenders), a job and vocational training program in Minneapolis, holds seminars on ex-offender employment problems and needs and publishes a quarterly publication for dissemination to the public.

More and more, community-based programs for the prison releasee and other ex-offenders are realizing the importance of establishing good community relationships.

J. Selected Legal Issues

There are two legal issues which affect the program operations of community projects for ex-offenders. One involves releasee opportunities to secure jobs, and the other concerns official barriers to their obtaining jobs.

1. Parolee Job Requirements

The legal issues surrounding parole vary from State to State. Statutory criteria for parole selection are very broad, usually requiring employment and the fact that the parolee will not be a detriment to himself or society. Statutes in most States allow the Parole Board to adopt its own rules and regulations, as long as there is no conflict with the statutes. However, all States do not have written criteria for parole selection, and some have written criteria which are broad and vague.

As stated, most parole board policies require a parolee to have employment before being released. A 1975 survey of parole boards found that 38 require an inmate to have employment before release, while 12 do

not require employment. In cases where employment is required, the person may be granted parole, but cannot be released until employment has been located and verified.[86] If employment is considered a criterion for "success" on parole, then parole boards will be more reluctant to release an inmate without that employment. Some States, however, are now selectively releasing inmates on furloughs, so that they can have better opportunities to find employment.

The trend to furloughs is an outgrowth of problems with the traditional system. Inmates cannot be expected to find good jobs while in prison. Pownall's study found that the median length of releasee's first job is four months. Often the jobs parolees obtain are not viewed in terms of any long-range potential, but only as a means of being granted parole. The corrections system generally does not spend nearly as much money or time in helping releasees find jobs as it does in training them while in prison. The situation was summarized by Pownall, who stated that correctional institutions and probation offices provide minimal assistance; after spending much time and a great deal of money to train inmates, the investment made is lost at the time people are released, because they are left to find their own jobs.

Parolee employment histories might be more stable if parolees could be referred to community-based programs or if parole officers, prior to release, would work with community-based programs to arrange for manpower services and or a job. Pownall's study found that most releasees obtain jobs through family, friends or former employers. In cases where inmates do not have a job and do not have access to personal resources, the parole officer is usually designated to help locate a job for the person. Traditionally, parole departments have been weak in this area. Rather than require the

parole officer to find a job for the soon-to-be released inmate, parole boards could contact community-based projects in the community to which the releasee will be returning, forward all available data on the person and permit that project to develop or locate a job for the releasee.

Community programs will tend to do a better job of following up on releasee's job performance than parole agents. Traditionally, overloaded parole staff do not conduct adequate follow-up. Of the fifty parole boards surveyed in 1975, three do not require any employer contact by the parole agent, six do require employer contact, and the remaining forty-one stated that whether or not the employer is contacted is left to the discretion of the parole agent and individual case requirements.[87] Follow-up during the critical post-release period of up to six months should not be discretionary but mandatory, and community-based programs are in a much better position to do it than parole agents.

2. Statutes Restricting Employment Opportunities of Prison Releasees

The problem surrounding laws such as those regulating trade and occupational licensing, which arbitrarily restrict employment opportunities, is a continuing one for prison releasees. The problem has already been discussed in this report in the context of both barriers to ex-offender employment and activities of community-based programs, but it is essentially a legal problem.

A statutory search conducted in 1973 disclosed 1,948 separate statutory provisions that affect the licensing of persons with an arrest or conviction record.[88] Overall, the search found a total of approximately 350 different licensed occupations affected by restrictive statutory provisions.[89] Sparse data led researchers to conclude that millions of persons, both males and females, are at least potentially affected by these laws.

There are a variety of methods to remove these legal barriers, and community-based program officials have been lobbying at the State and local levels using these methods. Some progress has been made in recent years. Florida, for example, enacted a general law in 1971 which provides that a crime shall not be a bar to a license unless it directly relates to the occupation sought. Illinois adopted a discretionary standard in 1971 by removing outright statutory prohibitions on the licensing of ex-felons. In 1972, California enacted legislation establishing standards for licensing boards to follow in determining the "good moral character" of license applicants.

Altogether, measures affecting the occupational licensing or public employment of ex-offenders have passed in fifteen States since 1971, with at least twelve more States currently considering such action. The most significant action has been the enactment of an amendment to Hawaii's Fair Employment and Practice Law prohibiting discrimination against ex-offenders in private employment.

An opinion by the State Attorney General can also have an impact on the removal of formal ex-offender employment restrictions. This approach was started in 1972 by the Attorney General of Maryland. Recognizing the discretion of some licensing agencies to refuse a license to an ex-offender, the Attorney General issued an opinion presenting certain considerations that must be taken into account before denial of a license. These include "the amount of time which may have elapsed since the conviction; the nature of the crime and whether it bears a significant relation to the type of license being issued and whether is has a rational connection with the applicant's fitness to perform the occupation".[90]

The Governor of any State can also officially advocate policies to improve the employment opportunities for ex-offenders. For example, in 1972 the Governor of Maine issued an Executive Order which makes it official State policy that ex-offenders (and ex-patients of State institutions) be given the chance to compete for State jobs on an equal basis with all other candidates.

Community-based programs for ex-offenders should not be satisfied with the direct delivery of services to participants. They can continue to work for changes in the legal employment status of ex-offenders. Until that status is free of barriers, many manpower services may be wasted.

K. Outlook for Evaluation

A review of past studies of both prison- and community-based employment services programs for offenders and ex-offenders suggests several comments about the outlook for program evaluation.

1. Summary of Program Evaluation Studies

The existing literature of community-based program evaluation studies is limited. It does not accurately reflect the number of programs currently in existence.

A review of the various employment projects for the offender, sponsored by the Department of Labor, and existing reports on individual community-based programs reveals many problems in the present state of knowledge. As a result, there is general agreement that the state of knowledge is extremely poor.

Most evaluation studies have focused on outcomes. No study has combined evaluative information on program operations, outcomes and community factors with cost data to develop estimates of program cost-benefit effects. Most studies have concentrated on client "successes" or "failures" measured in terms of placement and recidivism rates.

Evidence is mixed, but there is reason to believe that participation in community-based employment services programs does lead to increased chances for employment success and to lower recidivism. As one survey found, "While most (community programs) lack validating research as to their result, they represent a considerable advance over a decade ago. There are sufficient indications of their utility not only in terms of reducing costs but also in reducing the isolating effects of institutions and focusing on the reintegration of offenders into their communities."[91]

2. Program Operations

Very little literature exists evaluating community-based program operations. Programs have generally been so outcome-oriented that process assessments have been largely ignored. Almost all existing evaluations have been of individual programs. One of the few which considered program operations was the evaluation of the Singer/Graflex project in Monroe County, New York. However, that program served probationers, not releasees.

Rovner-Pieczenik's review of manpower projects confirmed that program efficiency has rarely been studied. In fact, her synthesis of ten years of correctional manpower projects and the guidebook, Job Training and Placement for Offenders, prepared as a Prescriptive Package for LEAA, are the only two large-scale efforts which attempt to draw conclusions about the best ways to structure program operations. These conclusions are based not on scientific evaluations of programs, but rather on overviews of overall program experiences. Thus, they represent educated recommendations.

The Prescriptive Package presents many recommendations and various approaches concerning job placement and training, planning and administration, and evaluation. The lack of available hard data led the authors to phrase their recommendations for elements of a model program in general terms. For example:

- A program should analyze characteristics of its clients to determine their specific needs, as well as their aptitudes and abilities.
- Clients should make their own assessments and develop their own goals, based upon objective measurement and their own motivations and with any expert assistance that they need.
- A program should emphasize that obtaining and retaining a job requires learning job-related personnel policies and social skills.
- The extent to which a project should develop its own services or should rely on community services depends upon the situation.
- A gradual phasing out of assistance to an individual works better than an abrupt termination.
- Particularly for young offenders, peak effectiveness is reached at about six months, and after that there will be a plateau or even retrogression.
- Programs should make extensive use of and create linkages with economic, social and financial resources available through community agencies.92/

Other studies of program operations have been undertaken by outside evaluators. For example, Abt Associates conducted a brief evaluation of the PREP program in Ohio to prepare an LEAA Exemplary Project Screening and Validation Report, and Urban and Rural Systems conducted a similar evaluation of the Clearinghouse for Ex-Offenders of Louisville, Kentucky. In a few instances, programs have evaluated themselves, focusing partly on program operations. For example, the Maryland Division of Corrections evaluated its job placement program in 1973 and conducted some cost/benefit analysis of program operations.

3. Outcomes

Outcome measures reported in the literature are almost solely related to employment and recidivism, although in a few cases other measures are considered. Some outcome analyses used non-program participants to attempt to estimate the impact of the programs on the behavior of "graduates." There have been few quantitative or systematic studies correlating client characteristics with "success" or "nonsuccess" in a program, although a few

researchers have made generalizations concerning the demographic traits of more successful participants.

The foregoing discussion reveals that many of the conceptual problems of defining outcomes which are both meaningful and measurable remain unresolved. As discussed earlier in this chapter, this observation is generally true of the rearrest rate used in an attempt to assess the impact of program participation on criminal behavior and the job placement rate as an indicator of program impact on participants' eventual community readjustment. Therefore, it is impossible to attribute existing wide variations in outcome results to analysis methods or program characteristics.

4. Community Analysis

Although the importance of interaction with corrections officials and other community agencies is emphasized in the literature, no systematic assessments of community factors have been conducted. Anecdotal information on the implementation stages and gradual growth of individual programs, contained in program summary reports, constitute the bulk of this data. The most frequently mentioned variable in the community which influences the ease with which participants receive services is the support of and cooperation given by acting community service programs, such as the welfare department, CETA program, and local office of the State Employment Service.

5. Proposals for Evaluation of a Community-Based Program

Few comprehensive evaluations of community-based programs have been conducted, and few studies suggest approaches which might be used for such evaluations.

The LEAA Prescriptive Package includes a chapter on evaluation which includes recommendations concerning:

- levels of evaluation;
- steps in evaluation;
- data systems;
- integration of evaluation into planning and operation;
- standards and criteria;
- sources of data, and;
- cost/benefit approach to evaluation.

However, most of the recommendations are general ones, drawn from general evaluation literature,[93] not past evaluation studies.

Rovner-Pieczenik's review of manpower projects emphasizes the need for further evaluation. A section on "Program Assessment and Development" in her report highlights past failings of projects concerning evaluation and makes recommendations to erase past shortcomings. These recommendations include:

- An assessment component should be an integral part of planning from a program's inception. During their initial orientation, staff should be introduced to its rationale, proposed techniques, and the part they will play.
- Periodic program reassessment should be undertaken so that appropriate findings can be converted into program improvement.
- Program administrators should demonstrate a knowledge of basic designs and techniques that are appropriate and available for program assessment.
- Program administrators should understand the theories of behavior and behavioral change which establish the rationale for their program and exhibit a broad knowledge of programs and findings related to their present undertaking.
- The importance of both qualitative and quantitative information in program assessment should be recognized and provisions made in the assessment strategy to gather and utilize both types of information.
- Large-scale programming should be based upon a sound demonstration of success in either a pilot or comparable program.[94]

Other proposals for evaluation of community-based programs are contained in the general literature which deplores the lack of adequate evaluation. These proposals, however, tend to be couched in negative terms, and recommendations are general in nature. For example, one author examining the state of evaluation knowledge commented,

> More observation is needed, . . . comparisons are inconclusive . . . Connections between events and consequences are left to speculation; events themselves are neither accounted for nor related to events they produce. Indeed, they are not even described for what they are. Without the causal link between (specific services) and their impact on offenders, we cannot construct hypotheses about the expected effects of any assumptions about it . . . Because we have conducted so few observations, few researchers know how to conduct them. It's much easier to classify input and output, make comparisons, and draw conclusions.95/

5. Outlook for Evaluation

Given that the program evaluations which have been conducted were quite limited in scope, that no real methodological approaches for more comprehensive evaluation have been developed, and that the typical evaluative measures utilized involve many conceptual problems, what does the outlook for evaluation appear to be? The dearth of evaluative data indicates that a great number of useful studies need to be performed. However, it is very likely that future evaluators will have to develop most of the methods for them and assess the costs of implementing them.

Several serious limitations in the scope of past studies indicate the need for further evaluation. The scope itself is a problem; very few evaluations of strictly community-based employment services programs for releasees or ex-offenders have been conducted. Another associated problem is the absence of long-term follow-up analyses of participants who have left community-based programs.

An additional, severe problem which future evaluators will face is the poor quality of data available for analysis. Many of the past studies have found a serious lack of evaluation data. This point was made by Pownall in 1969 and by Rovner-Pieczenik in 1973. Because of the lack of adequate data, many writers in the field are still relying on the Pownall data which was collected approximately ten years ago.

The general lack of data is illustrated, for example, in the assessment conducted by Urban and Rural Systems of the Louisville, Kentucky, Ex-Offender Clearinghouse. This project was, at the time of the assessment, nominated for LEAA exemplary project status. Yet the evaluators found the same lack of adequate evaluation data mentioned often in the literature.

Evaluators found that, although the Clearinghouse seemed to have met its two major goals associated with the provision of job development, placements, and supportive services to ex-offenders, it had not explicitly defined any goals or objectives related to expected impacts or effects of its services. Goal assessment was thus difficult. Additionally, much data was qualitative and judgmental in nature. In other cases, data needed to make valid assessments was either totally unavailable or was not in a readily retrievable form or condition. It was difficult to assess the effectiveness of program services because the program did not differentiate among various groups of clients concerning the kinds of services provided, (e.g., number of counseling sessions, frequency and characteristic of contacts with probation officers, support given in making a job referral, or in follow-up activities). The program staff performed follow-up for only three months, and this was done by telephone and mail rather than through personal visits.

CONTINUED

1 OF 2

Four common measures were suggested by the evaluators to determine whether the program achieved its desired impact on ex-offenders: unemployment rates, duration of placements, recidivism rates, and job upgrading. However, no data was available on recidivism, data on job retentions and upgrading would have to be developed by analysis of all program files and calls to employers; and data on unemployment rates for ex-offenders was unavailable.

Conclusions about the potential evaluation of the program were largely negative. Some necessary data was not collected; some was collected but aggregated in inappropriate categories; the records did not adequately distinguish between or relate data on individuals served and events (e.g., number of referrals, number of follow-ups, etc.); data was not adequately correlated (evaluators could not tell how many received a particular mix of services, whether those who did shared any common characteristics, and whether any common effects ensued); data categories and recording practices were not standardized among counselors; ex-offenders card files were sometimes incomplete; and some data that was collected was very difficult to retrieve (e.g., job types, salaries). It was found that most program reports provided information on operational capacities and service statistics such as number of people served, kinds of services provided, and public relations contacts. No data related to program impact on target population behaviors, attitudes, or conditions (e.g., recidivism, job retention and satisfaction, unemployment, etc.) was reported on a regular basis.

In spite of all these problems with the evaluation of the Clearinghouse, Urban and Rural Systems concluded that it was basically a good program worthy of replication elsewhere if certain problems could be resolved. The program consciously concentrated on service delivery rather than

evaluation. However, the discussion of the many evaluation problems--those of a good program--serve as an example of the myriad problems confronting researchers who have attempted to evaluate community-based (and prison-based) employment services programs for ex-offenders.

III. ASSUMPTIONS UNDERLYING COMMUNITY-BASED EMPLOYMENT SERVICES PROGRAMS FOR EX-OFFENDERS

Community-based employment programs for ex-offenders are based on certain assumptions about (1) the role of work in society, (2) the relationship between employment or unemployment and crime and (3) the probable effects of manpower services upon the releasee's readjustment to community life. These assumptions are based on findings from numerous studies of the histories of offenders, the effectiveness of manpower services, and the impact of community-based services on employment and recidivism outcomes.

For several key assumptions underlying community-based employment services programs for ex-offenders, this chapter provides a brief review of the reasoning behind them, including the major studies which bear upon the validity of those assumptions. The chapter also includes a discussion of data problems affecting the evaluation of the assumptions' validity.

The primary assumptions behind the programs are as follows:

- Offenders desire a work role in the legitimate economy of society.
- An ex-offender given the alternative of and opportunity for a work role will accept it.
- An ex-offender who accepts this work role will desist from criminal activity.
- Improvements in the external environment will heighten the ex-offender's chances for successful employment.
- For persons released from prison back to the community, employment-related services may often be necessary.

Each assumption will be discussed individually. Since there is a great deal of literature relating to these assumptions, and much of it has been considered earlier in this paper, the review which follows has been designed to indicate the nature and extent of analysis of the assumptions.

A. Offenders Desire a Work Role in the Legitimate Economy of Society

This assumption is based on the fact that in our society regular employment is the accepted way of assuming responsibility for one's self and that the assumption of such responsibilities is a goal of an ex-offender returning to community society after a period of incarceration.

Early studies reflect the fact that most persons released from prison desired a stable job above almost all else; such a job would provide them with personal dignity and the financial resources to refrain from criminal behavior. Glaser has said that those who revert to crime apparently do so largely because they have difficulty in securing adequate noncriminal employment, because they have inadequate financial resources at the time of release, and because they continue personal contacts with other persons of criminal backgrounds. Additionally, releasees may possess limited confidence in their ability to achieve their economic goals legitimately. This lack of confidence is due to past failures and ongoing problems, which reflect their lack of the skills and experience necessary to legitimately attain the jobs and financial status to which they aspire.[96]

Although there are many problems facing the releasee, it has yet to be proven that all offenders want to work in legitimate society. This is an untested assumption based primarily on societal values. However, as Rovner-Pieczenik concluded, the offender "lacks 'middle-class' goals, aspirations, and values."[97] Some have been part of the criminal environment for so long a period that they do not view a role in the legitimate economy as a realistic option. As one evaluator has commented, "We must face the fact that for certain parts of the recidivist population, (employment services) are unlikely to be effective unless society simultaneously either reduces the income possible through illegitimate activities or alternatively increases the risk."[98]

Part of the rationale for the assumption that offenders desire a work role in the legitimate economy is that offenders desire the financial stability that comes from work. However, in recent years that rationale has come under challenge by those who believe that releasees do not desire legitimate work, but merely income, and that releasees with income will adjust just as successfully as those with income derived from a job. Project LIFE (Living Insurance for Ex-Prisoners), a study conducted by the Bureau of Social Science Research, was designed to test whether financial aid of job services, given immediately at the time of release from a State prison, can reduce recidivism within the first year after release. It was confined to men only who were released from a state prison and returned to Baltimore, Maryland. The project found that releasees who were given financial aid did experience lower recidivist rates than those who did not. However, releasees who received job services did not experience reduced recidivism, and in fact did not tend to remain on their jobs for any appreciable length of time.

Another weakness with this overall assumption is the implied belief that all offenders are capable of functioning in the legitimate work environment; this is not the case. There are some who are simply incapable of functioning effectively in a legitimate work role. These are the people whose anti-work attitudes or habits are too ingrained to be easily changed. Programs have rarely addressed the issue of what to do about these hard-core unemployed or chronically disadvantaged releasees. Often such individuals are screened out of community-based programs because staff believe the program will not have an impact on them. However, being turned away from a program designed specifically for ex-offenders can easily help convince such a person to return to criminal behavior. Alternatives need to be developed for those people deemed incapable of functioning in the legitimate work world.

In summary, absolute statements that offenders desire a work role in the legitimate economy of society are not supported by any comprehensive studies.

However, the fact that many offenders questioned in the course of studies have expressed a strong desire to find legitimate employment lends credence to an assumption that most offenders desire a steady income, which can be obtained through a steady job. Any estimates of the percentage of offenders who desire such a work role in the legitimate economy of society cannot be made.

B. An Offender Given the Alternative of and Opportunity for a Work Role Will Accept It

This assumption, which follows from the previous one, has been proven too simple and naive by past studies. It has been shown that the post-release employment histories of ex-offenders are very erratic. Merely because people given the alternative of and opportunity for work accept the positions does not mean they will stay in those positions for any meaningful length of time.

As Rovner-Pieczenik reported in the survey of correctional manpower programs:

- Pownall's study found that the median length of releasees' first job was four months and of their longest job eight months. 99/
- Project Crossroads, a Manpower Development and Training program, found that almost all former participants were working in non-Crossroads jobs within four months after project termination. 100/
- Statistics from the Federal Bonding Assistance Demonstration Project Programs showed that young ex-offenders left bonded jobs within three months. 101/
- Experimental Manpower Laboratory for Corrections data revealed a mean of approximately five weeks on a first job for prison releasees, with a range of 0 to 12 weeks. 102/

These findings reflect the fact that researchers must stop assuming that ex-offenders given the chance to work will do so. Rather, more research should be conducted to adequately determine why releasees accept some jobs and stay only a short time, accept others and remain considerably longer, or do not accept some jobs at all.

Past studies have found that too little emphasis has been placed on the quality of jobs for releasees. The assumption that ex-offenders given the alternative of and opportunity for work will accept it ignores the quality factor altogether. Experience has shown that the long-term readjustment generally associated with successful employment will most often occur when the releasee is working at a satisfying job. Unfortunately, studies have revealed that usually releasees' jobs are entry-level, low-paying, and without meaningful career potential. Part of this is due to middle-class biases on the part of correctional staff or professional placement counselors who assume that releasees can only perform in blue-collar, low-level jobs. Studies have proven the contrary. For example, the Pownall study suggested that releasees who had been trained in professional, technical, and managerial work performed better in their jobs than those trained in blue-collar occupations.

Part of this assumption rests on data about the "choices" made by many releasees. As discussed earlier, 38 out of the 50 parole boards still require that parolees have a job in order to be granted paroles. Faced with the choice or remaining in prison or accepting "any job", parolees naturally, "given the alternative of and opportunity for a work role," accept it. However, to call that a real alternative is to ignore the reality of the situation. Parole officials generally admit that many parolees' jobs are used as tools to gain parole and that parolees are often unemployed soon after release on parole. More research needs to be conducted on the kind of work that releasees will most readily accept and perform well. Professionals in the vocational field have often found that clients with disadvantaged backgrounds and anti-social behavioral histories do best at nontraditional forms of work, work that does not require a nine-to-five schedule or constant desk tasks. People who are used to a very mobile lifestyle often find it difficult to adjust to a sedentary,

routine existence. Until more research is conducted into the types of work that releasees most readily accept--taking into account their skill levels and experience--this second assumption must stand as one that is oversimplified.

C. An Offender Who Accepts a Work Role Will Desist From Criminal Activity

This is perhaps the most researched assumption underlying community manpower programs for ex-offenders. It is based upon the belief that employment has a positive effect upon releasees and tends to produce reduced criminal behavior.

The relationship between employment and crime was discussed in the first chapter of this report. Several of the major studies reviewed there are summarized below:

- Glaser and Rice found, by analyzing officially reported cases, that crime rates vary directly with unemployment. 103/
- Belton Fleisher, re-analyzing some of the national data used by Glaser and Rice but utilizing mathematical procedures to make corrections for long-term trends in the variables studied, also found a positive relationship between arrest rates and unemployment. 104/
- Both Pownall and Evans emphasized the inverse relationship between employment and crime and the importance of regular employment in lowering recidivism. 105/
- Glaser proposed an employment-crime causal relationship, because he found that unemployment may be among the principal factors involved in recidivism of adult male offenders. 106/
- Welford argued that recidivism and employment are probably highly correlated because of their relationship to other truly explanatory variables, that they do not cause each other, but simply covary: "Since the skill level of a man coming out of prison has not usually improved, his job opportunity is basically unchanged from before when he 'decided' to commit a crime rather than take a menial straight job. His decision to go straight and become employed must be based not on his desire for and ability to find unskilled employment, but on other factors that have moved him away from crime as a way of accomplishing certain goals. Whether this be maturation, the proverbial 'getting tired of hustling', or the influence of family, it affects both employment and criminal behavior. The decision causes the correlation." 107/

Whether one believes that employment itself causes a decrease in criminal behavior or that success in reducing recidivism is based on understanding the releasee's decision to "go straight" and become employed, it seems that unemployment and recidivism are strongly linked. Most studies performed support both conclusions: that reduced recidivism comes from increased employment and that reduced recidivism comes from an overall "human upgrading".

However, there are some factors which weaken the assumption that employed releasees will desist from criminal behavior and that tend to support the latter hypothesis. The antisocial behavior of some releasees may simply be unalterable. For these ex-offenders, work will not be any key to reduced recidivism. They need a comprehensive change in attitude, personality, behavior, values, etc. Often this can only come through long-term therapy, such as psychoanalysis or behavior modification.

Associated with this problem is the problem of the criminal subculture. For many releasees, who generally have a low self-concept and low self-confidence, peer group pressure may offset the positive factors associated with work. Thus, many programs have begun family counseling components, attempting to get the releasees' families to provide necessary positive support to counteract the negative influence of friends or environment. Another approach tried has been to release several persons to the same community at one time so that they can provide each other with positive reinforcement. Still, the effect of a releasee's subculture upon eventual readjustment is not well understood, and more research needs to be conducted.

The assumption that a releasee who accepts a work role will desist from criminal behavior also ignores other employment-related variables, such as salary level. For example, a 12-year study of parolee earnings found that the

rate of parolee violation was inversely related to monthly earnings.[108] If, as Project Life concluded, the need may be for income as much as for employment, then a releasee with insufficient income from a legitimate job may return to criminal behavior.

A serious difficulty in attempting to verify the assumption that employment leads to lessened criminal activity is the difficulty in determining levels of criminality, as discussed earlier. Many studies use arrest records as a proxy for crime, even though people may be arrested for crimes which they did not commit or may escape arrest for crimes they did commit. Moreover, police records may be incomplete or inaccurate. One way to avoid these problems is by relying on self-reported criminal data obtained through personal interviews. Such data could include arrests, convictions and illegal activities, whether or not they resulted in arrest. However, these data can also be inaccurate. People may remember past events incorrectly and may also either overstate or understate their criminality in response to their perceived impressions of what the interviewer would like to hear. If data on the types of charges are also collected through self-reports, an additional problem may arise from the fact that the person may never have known the precise charges, particularly if there were several. Moreover, in jurisdictions where plea bargaining is common, an individual may not know the charge for which a conviction occurred, especially if the resulting sentence was light or suspended.

As a result of these and other problems, it is difficult to obtain reliable information on the criminality of community-based program participants. It is also hard to obtain adequate information on the criminality of other groups, so that appropriate comparisons of changes in criminality can be made.

The problem with using arrest or conviction rates as measures of recidivist behavior is also reflected in the inherent weakness of reported crime

rates. These rates do not account for what is known as the "hidden universe" of criminal activity which, for a variety of reasons, never comes to the attention of the police. Thus, reported crime rates for an area usually understate actual levels of criminal activity. This is demonstrated by victimization surveys, which repeatedly find that much more crime has occurred than has been reported.

These limitations of existing criminality data and measures must be borne in mind when findings of specific studies are reviewed. These difficulties have limited the comprehensiveness of most past studies: for example, few have examined the seriousness or type of crime or the frequency of rearrest.

A review of past experiences shows that recidivism rates do decrease when persons are employed. However, some studies have found that recidivism rates are the same for persons who receive employment services as for those who do not. Other studies have found only a weak positive effect of employment services on recidivism. Many studies done of the impact of employment upon criminal activity suffer from methodological problems and poor data. Moreover, most studies have focused on a single community and often on only one program. This makes it more difficult to make valid generalizations based on existing studies.

In summary, there appears to be no persuasive argument against the belief that employment contributes to a reduction in recidivism to some undetermined extent. A more definitive statement cannot be fully supported, given the studies concluding that significant declines in recidivism rates are caused by employment and the other studies criticizing such conclusions. On balance, it seems reasonable to conclude that the strongest proponents of the "employment reduces crime" theory have probably overstated their case somewhat about

the causal relationship but that critics of the contention have not presented arguments damaging enough to refute the theory completely.

D. Improvements in the External Environment Will Heighten the Ex-Offender's Chances for Successful Employment

In recent years, more and more attention has been paid to the barriers maintained by societal institutions against the ex-offender entering the legitimate economy. Many people have commented that a reduction of these non-job-related barriers is as important as the delivery of actual services to ex-offenders, that only through an improvement in the external barriers can long-term success be achieved regarding employment for ex-offenders. The increasing concern being paid to this area is reflected in the establishment of the National Clearinghouse on Offender Employment Restrictions, part of the American Bar Association's National Offender Services Coordination Program. The Clearinghouse has published many documents identifying, and presenting methods for removing, formal barriers to ex-offender employment.

It is too early to determine the validity of the assumption that reduction of these barriers definitely leads to increased employment. Although efforts have been undertaken to change official policies and regulations barring ex-offenders from certain occupations, no studies have been conducted of the effects of these changes on actual ex-offender employment. The most that can be said is that such efforts have increased the opportunities of ex-offenders for employment.

One of the most imposing external barriers present in the external environment has always been the attitudes and policies of employers toward ex-offenders. Realizing this, community-based programs have been attempting to involve the employer community in the operation of their programs. There have been no formal

studies of the effects of these efforts. However, individual programs have reported in anecdotal form that their efforts to involve employers do often lead to improved job opportunities for program participants.

This is a relatively new assumption underlying most programs, so there is understandably a lack of information available on effects of these activities. At this time, it seems reasonable to conclude that improvements in the external environment can create increased opportunities for ex-offenders, both in terms of the number of occupations in which jobs are available and the number of employers who will be willing to hire them. Of course, no activities to reduce barriers can help the ex-offender once on the job and working. At that juncture, the person's own skills and aptitudes are the determining factors. Improvements in the external environment serve primarily to help open the door.

E. For Persons Released From Prison Back to the Community, Employment-Related Services May Often Be Necessary

This final assumption is a logical outgrowth of the other assumptions and of past studies of prison-based employment services programs. Releasees returning to the community after a period of incarceration generally experience a very difficult readjustment process. Studies have repeatedly found that the first six months after release are the most critical to eventual adjustment success. Because few other alternatives exist for legitimate income and because steady employment often seems to stabilize people's lives, there is definitely a need for employment for prison releasees.

Why is there a necessary need for community-based programs? Past studies have documented the many problems associated with prison-based

projects. Although it has been concluded that prison-based programs were often successful in achieving employment goals,[109] it has also been found that:

- "Vocational training (in prison) alone seems to have minimal impact". 110/
- Most prison occupation training programs have been ineffective in terms of preparation for specific post-release employment.111/
- Unless it has roots in the community with job placement capability, an inmate training program cannot be a useful rehabilitative tool. 112/
- Less than one-third of releasees who receive training use it in their first post-release job. 113/

The criticisms of prison programs have been harsh and numerous. However, one general conclusion has been that one of the most common problems with offender employment efforts has been the failure to provide comprehensive job-related services. In-prison programs cannot provide these; the environment is poor and the resources are limited. The trend has thus been to establish training and placement programs for prison releasees in the community.

The assumption that community-based programs are needed is borne out by the few assessments that have been done. These have usually revealed that such programs do contribute to increased employment for releasees. More importantly, community-based programs are able to address the total readjustment needs of the ex-offender. Many of these needs are indeed job-related, e.g., education, skills training, social skills training, etc. However, many needs are related to the overall readjustment process -- e.g., transportation, health, family, residential, etc. -- and must be met before a releasee can even attempt to find a job. A community-based program, even though it may provide only manpower services, can deal with these related needs. Additionally, it

can provide the individualized attention the releasee may need over an extended period of time.

The releasee's need for comprehensive community services has been documented in many studies. One community-based program, a Community Resource Development Project of the Indiana Department of Corrections, found that the need for such services was more important than specific job placement activities. In requesting funds from the Indiana Office of Manpower Development for expanded services, project administrators said:

> When this project was originally designed, it was believed that if an ex-offender is placed in a job situation, then most of the problems of reintegration into society would be solved. In retrospect, this appears to have been a very much oversimplified assumption . . . Other major problems to the reintegration process exist for the ex-offender . . . (M)any ex-offenders are neither ready, willing, nor able to seek, obtain or keep jobs due to a variety of needs, both materially and psycho-socially. 114/

The state of evaluation knowledge concerning the effectiveness and efficiency of community-based employment services programs for ex-offenders is poor, due partly to the relative youth of many of these programs. Often they operate in isolation, unaware of what other programs are doing in the same area. Program operations vary dramatically. Although these programs seem to be necessary for many ex-offenders, it is not yet known what kinds of programs work best, which types of releasees profit most, what approaches work best with employers, which releasees are likely to fail to readjust successfully despite program efforts or which would probably find employment and readjust without the need for manpower services. These unanswered questions are only representative of the many knowledge deficiencies now confronting planners and evaluators of community-based programs. Although it can be said that there are many indications of the utility of these community-based programs in

contributing to the reintegration of offenders into their communities, the extent of their contribution will only be accurately assessed when more information is available.

F. Data Problems Affecting Evaluation of Assumptions' Validity

The information needed to accurately test the validity of the foregoing assumptions is not now available. However, no evaluation efforts should be undertaken without a knowledge of what data is available. Therefore, this section reviews the state of existing data.

Currently, there is no adequate common data base to allow valid comparisons of programs, development of broad-based statistics with a common meaning, and development of criteria and standards to guide future projects. The primary governmental funding sources of community-based programs are the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration and the Department of Labor. Neither agency has a large-scale data base on its projects. Data is generally gathered on an individual program basis in the form of progress reports, annual reports, financial statements, etc.

The Department of Labor's data insufficiencies are due largely to the relative newness of Comprehensive Employment and Training Programs. Federal officials do not yet have a working knowledge of individual prime sponsors' activities for ex-offenders. Management information reports are submitted monthly. However, these reports only contain information on gross client population. According to CETA guidelines, a participant must be under the hold of the criminal justice system in order to be listed as an "offender". Some prime sponsors do not even request this information, since they believe they must serve anyone who is CETA-eligible and status as an ex-offender is

irrelevant to that determination. The definition of "offender" is currently in the process of being expanded to include those people who have recently been released from a criminal justice system hold.

The National Offender Services Coordination Program's Information Exchange is currently operating a project to document CETA prime sponsors' activities for ex-offenders. Although this project is still in its early stages, researchers are encountering serious difficulties in locating information. They have had to contact regional manpower offices and State manpower service councils as the first step in what they anticipate to be a very long process.

The Model Ex-Offender Programs funded by the Department of Labor with CETA Title III monies and by the participating States with some Title I funds are still in the planning and early implementation stages. No valid data will be available from them for an extended period of time.

Another potential source of data would have been the comprehensive survey of ex-offenders in the unemployed population mandated by the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, which states:

> The Secretary, through the Bureau of Labor Statistics, shall annually compile and maintain information on the incidence of unemployment among offenders and shall publish the results of the information obtained pursuant to this subsection in the report required under subsection (a) of this section. 115/

However, after researching this task, the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) concluded that comprehensive data on the employment status of ex-offenders is currently unavailable and that it would be extremely difficult to collect such data. Therefore, the BLS decided to continue researching the many problems associated with this required effort.

One valuable source of employment data on releasees may be the State parole boards. However, a 1975 survey revealed that only one jurisdiction (North Carolina) has any type of information about the wages and salaries of parolees, due to the fact that their monthly reports from parole agents are computerized. Almost every jurisdiction has a reporting system by the parole agent, but nothing is done with the data on these reports. Additionally, not a single jurisdiction keeps information on job stability or evaluates the reasons which a parolee may give for leaving a job. This information, frequently available on periodic individual parole report sheets, may be known to the parole agent, but this data is not collected or evaluated by the agency.[116] Thus, the use of parole boards' records would require a timely search of individual State's files and the compilation of relevant data. On a national basis, such a task would be extremely costly.

There is some data available from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, but it is not comparable across communities. The LEAA does not require the many community-based programs it funds to submit standardized data concerning program performance. Moreover, few generally applicable performance standards have been established and local situations vary so much that it is difficult to develop such standards. For example, in most community-based employment services programs for ex-offenders, an obvious standard is percent successful placements, but there are so many factors influencing placement rate (e.g., the local rate of unemployment) that no one standard can apply everywhere at all times.

Even if several projects used the "same" success measures, caution would be necessary in making comparisons. Data from different sources or

times may have the same name, phrase, or measure title defined differently. Sometimes, even though defined in the same way, they may be computed differently. In these cases, data will not be compatible, though on the surface they appear the same. Recidivism rate is a prime example, since it can be computed in many different ways and under various rules. Placement rate is another example of a term that can signify different things in different places; in one program it may be the percentage of total participants placed and working successfully for a defined time period, while in another it may refer to the percentage of participants who complete the program and are placed in a job. The former procedure usually would give a lower figure than the latter, and comparisons of the two would not be valid. Therefore, analysis of individual project reports would demand review of the details of computation and construction of common definitions so that the data could be compared.

Another source of data relevant to analysis of community-based employment services programs for ex-offenders is United States Employment Service statistics on the unemployment rate. The state of the local economy is one of the major variables affecting the placement rates of all employment services programs and may be especially significant for the employment prospects of ex-offenders. When the local economy is poor and many people are out of work, employers may be unlikely to hire releasees. In such circumstances, they are inclined to hire a non-disadvantaged person with a stable background and good work history. In such situations, employers can afford to be very selective. During such periods, community-based programs must adjust their placement expectations. Evaluators can also utilize official employment rate data in assessing programs' effectiveness; the unemployment rate may be taken into account in assessing the placement rate of program participants.

This brief review reveals lack of data available for use in analysis of community-based programs. Although several States have established clearinghouses on ex-offenders, most do not have standardized offender program data. At this time, any comprehensive evaluation would require visits to individual programs, data collection, data analysis, and finally a very difficult multiple-program analysis.

G. Conclusion

The assumptions underlying employment services programs for ex-offenders are either oversimplified or relatively untested. Past program experience has pointed out the weaknesses in several of these assumptions, especially those concerning the releasee's desire and ability to maintain a work role in the legitimate economy. The assumption that employment services programs will help reduce the criminal behavior of participants has been researched often for the last several decades, but no definitive answers have emerged. One of the newer assumptions underlying community-based programs, that improvements in the external environment will increase ex-offenders' chances for employment, has not yet been tested through any systematic evaluation studies. The final assumption, that community employment services programs may often be necessary for prison releasees, seems appropriate based on past studies of both prison-based programs and releasee needs. However, more data are needed to document the true contributions of these programs.

Unfortunately, the state of existing data is poor. There seem to be no efforts planned to collect any comprehensive information. However, the Department of Labor is funding a project that will document CETA prime sponsors' efforts for ex-offenders and is also preparing to evaluate the Model Ex-Offender Programs.

The field work to be conducted later in this Phase I study should provide a clearer picture of the kinds of data available from individual programs, and thus give a better understanding of the potential for evaluation of these programs.

IV. EVALUATION ISSUES FOR EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS SERVING PRISON RELEASEES

Throughout this Phase I assessment of community-based employment services programs serving prison releasees, Lazar will work toward identifying and analyzing major issues of concern for evaluating these programs. This chapter discusses five such issues identified during the course of this initial review. all of which have been referred to in the course of this report:

- To what extent have employment services programs increased employability?
- To what extent have employment services programs helped reduce crime?
- What are appropriate measures of "success" for employment services programs and for individual program participants?
- What factors contribute to program success and individual participant success?
- What are the overall cost-benefit effects of community-based employment services program serving prison releasees?

It is anticipated that this list of issues will be modified and probably expanded as the Phase I study progresses. New issues may be added and others rephrased to articulate a major concern more precisely. Moreover, by the conclusion of Phase I, the discussions of the issues can be considerably expanded as a result of the remaining analytical work to be accomplished. Although the Phase I findings may not enable the issues to be definitively answered, they should permit specification of methods for determining such answers, the expected costs of doing so, and an assessment of whether it would be worthwhile to implement the analytical approaches.

The comments on specific issues in this chapter should be considered preliminary indications of important analytical concerns which must be addressed and considerations of the present availability of data needed for such analyses. Some of the points raised in this chapter have already been briefly discussed in earlier sections of this report dealing with specific subjects. However, the following presents them all in the context of future potential evaluation efforts.

A. To What Extent Have Employment Services Programs Increased Employability?

Community-based employment services programs are premised partially on the belief that they will increase the employment of program participants. This would occur as a result of providing various manpower services to people who would otherwise remain unemployable or unemployed. Whether they have increased employment can be addressed in one primary way, an analysis of program participants' employment histories. Such analysis requires decisions on which variables to consider, determination of participants' employment over time, and development of similar data for appropriate comparison groups, to assess the probable outcomes had the community-based program not provided services to the participant.

Given that employment data could be collected either from program records or interviews with participants, the issue becomes which analyses should be made. Several possible comparisons have been conducted for prison-based programs and suggested for community-based programs. One type of analysis compares clients' employment before incarceration and after participation in the program. However, this could inflate a program's real effect. A releasee who participated in vocational training or other manpower programs while in prison might have enjoyed increased employment post-release in any event.

Several studies have analyzed employment of participants of prison-based employment programs in terms of:

- time employed pre-incarceration year and post-program participation year; and
- wage levels pre-incarceration and post-program participation.

The results of these studies were generally mixed. Some found a very positive change in releasees' employment and income, others found only an insignificant positive change, while still others found that there had been no measurable changes at all. Few, if any, similar studies have yet been conducted on releasees who have participated solely in community-based programs. Such outcome studies for the period after completing program participation are essential to assess the long-run effects of the program or changed employment status. This may require follow-up interviews with former program clients, although some useful data might be obtainable from staff of programs that conduct long-range follow-up activities.

In addition to analyses of program participants' employment over time, a similar type of comparison could assess the employment outcomes of participants who complete the program as compared with those who drop out. However, such data by themselves are difficult to interpret. For example, if dropouts do as well as those who complete the program, that may mean that the program failed, since completing the program was not associated with more successful employment outcomes, or it may mean that the program affected the behavior of the dropouts in positive ways also. The latter may very well be the case, since a participant may drop out of a program after receiving some services but before receiving all the services the program staff deems necessary to be considered fully job-ready. To assess what was likely to have happened without

any program participation requires comparison with a group of similar people who did not participate in the program.

Very few studies have been completed of employment statuses of ex-offender participants of community-based programs. "In recent years, control group samples have increasingly been included in assessment designs, anticipating important comparative questions to be addressed throughout project and program operation." [117] Most of these studies have been of pretrial intervention programs, programs for probationers, [118] and prison-based vocational training programs. [119] However, it should be possible to identify appropriate comparison groups. Examples might include:

- releasees who returned to the community and were eligible for the program but did not participate;
- releasees who returned to the community during the period immediately prior to the start of program operations and would probably have utilized the program had it existed; and
- releasees who entered other programs in the community, although this may be difficult, since ex-offender programs may often rely on other community manpower programs for services.

Consideration of the feasibility and analytical usefulness of structuring such comparison groups will be an important part of the remaining Phase I work. A number of problems will need to be resolved in addition to identifying possible comparison groups. In particular, the interpretation of results must be carefully considered, since it will always be difficult to try to separate the effects of an employment services program from other influences on people's behavior, no matter how carefully the comparison groups are developed.

B. To What Extent Have Employment Services Programs Helped Reduce Criminal Behavior?

The community-based programs serving releasees are also based on the

assumption that they can reduce the criminal behavior of participants. This assumption is in turn based on the close relationship between employment and crime, whether that be a causal relationship or merely a close co-varying relationship. The program impact on participants' criminal behavior can be assessed in ways similar to those previously discussed concerning employment status.

The criminal histories of program participants can be analyzed to determine program effects on their criminality. This again requires definitions of "criminal behavior" (e.g., arrest, conviction, felony arrest, felony conviction), determination of participants' criminality over time, and development of similar data for appropriate comparison groups.

Definitions of recidivism vary among programs and researchers. Even if there is agreement about whether arrest rates or conviction rates should be utilized, there might be differences about whether all crimes or only "serious" crimes be included. Unfortunately, most past studies of recidivism rates have not differentiated types of crimes or frequency of violative behavior. This tends to blur important distinctions. Greater sensitivity to the extent of participant "success" or "failure" can be obtained using continuous measures such as subsequent confinement time rather than dichotomous measures such as reincarcerated/not reincarcerated. Glaser maintains,

> Probably the most sensitive criterion of the effectiveness of correctional endeavors with any group of offenders is the time they are confined during a follow-up period . . . By reflecting the severity as well as number of penalties, the total amount of confinement time provides a crude index of societal outrage at the conduct of various groups of released offenders. 120/

Glaser admits that there are many problems in using data from the law enforcement side of the criminal justice system, as discussed earlier in this report. In addition to all the variables affecting arrests and convictions, some people may get light sentences and others heavy sentences, although their

previous record and current crime may be the same. However, while noting that such variabilities warrant caution, Glaser states that the inconsistencies of the criminal justice system can be presumed to be randomly distributed and that, if large groups of similar releasees from different programs are compared in a follow-up period, the differences in their average period of subsequent confinement should reflect differences in the programs.[121]

Assuming that a common recidivism measure could be defined and appropriate data collected, one obvious analysis would compare clients' criminality before incarceration and after participation in the program. However, this may be somewhat inflated. The incarceration itself may have served as an effective deterrent to future criminal behavior, or any rehabilitation that occurred during a releasee's incarceration may have served to reduce criminal tendencies. Additionally, this comparison might inflate the real reduction in criminality if the period immediately preceding incarceration was a time of unusually high criminal activity.

Many studies have analyzed criminal activities for prison releasees who have participated in prison-based training programs, and the results have varied. However, very few analyses have been made of releasees in community-based programs. Most recidivism analyses have been not of releasees' criminal activity pre-incarceration and post-program, but of post-program recidivism compared to that of other groups. Some of the reasons for the lack of such studies are the numerous variables affecting a releasee's post-incarceration behavior that make comparisons with behavior prior to incarceration very difficult.

Another comparison could assess the outcomes of "successful" participants as compared with dropouts. Again, these data by themselves are difficult to

interpret, since dropouts may benefit from program services and as a partial result engage in reduced criminal behavior.

The use of comparison groups can be an effective way to assess what changes, if any, would have occurred in releasees' criminal behavior without participation in the program. Such an analysis can better account for the positive changes resulting from incarceration or in-prison rehabilitation.

The same comparison groups utilized for measuring employability can be effective in assessing criminality:

- releasees who returned to the community and were eligible for the program but did not participate;
- releasees who returned to the community during the period immediately prior to the start of program operations and who would probably have utilized the program had it existed; and
- releasees who entered other community employment programs.

Throughout the remainder of this Phase I project, Lazar will consider the feasibility and value of structuring these or other comparison groups. Particular care must be taken in interpreting results of such analyses. For example, releasees who decide to participate in other community manpower programs may experience the same reductions in criminal behavior as participants of the community-based program for releasees being evaluated. However, it may be the case that without the evaluated program these releasees would never have received employment-related services. A major difficulty will, of course, be to try to separate the effects of the community-based program from the many other influences on releasees' behavior.

C. What Are Appropriate Measures of "Success" for Employment Services Programs and for Individual Participants?

Development of "success" measures is a difficult undertaking, which requires both conceptualization of appropriate criteria and consideration of whether data

could be collected to construct the measures. Various types of success indicators could be used to evaluate community-based employment services programs serving prison releasees, including measures of:

- program operation, workload and other process-oriented considerations;
- the program's effect in achieving changes in the external environment (e.g., attitudes of employers regarding hiring of ex-offenders);
- client outcomes, both during and after participation in the program; and
- cost-benefit effects of the program.

This section discusses the range of measures which either have been or could be used to assess program operations, community relationships and client outcomes. Cost-benefit effects are discussed as a separate issue.

One measure of a program's success is whether it serves the releasees it was set up to serve, providing the services it hoped to provide. For example, has the program successfully reached the releasee population residing in or returning to the community? Has it provided the anticipated range of services to the expected number of releasees? Has it followed-up on clients and worked with employers to minimize employee failures? These questions could be addressed through such measures as the number of persons released to the community from State or Federal prisons compared with the number contacted by the program, the number who are assessed to be in need of certain services compared to the number who actually receive those services, and the number of placements made compared to the number of placements for which follow-up activities were conducted.

Another possible success measure is whether the program accomplished its goals efficiently, e.g., at reasonable costs. Such measures as cost per placement, or cost per successful placement could be used to make this determination.

Cost rates could also be used at the service or activity level to measure successful service outcomes such as completion of the service or activity (e.g., a work orientation course, an educational course, a skills training program, etc.). There are serious problems, however, in using costs aggregated at the services or activity level. There may be specific services that are particularly important, or there may be substantial variations within services. Quantitative comparisons will be appropriate only when two services being compared are roughly similar in terms of objectives and of groups being served.

Another important set of questions concerns the quality of the relationships the program has built with other groups in the community. For example, has it developed good liaison with the parole department from which releasees may be referred, so that the parole agents understand and cooperate with the program? Has the program developed support for itself within the community's political structure? Has it tried to improve the relationships with various groups whose support it requires, such as other community agencies or employer groups, or has it largely accepted existing relationships as they are?

Specific indicators of program relationships with and impact on area employers might include:

- degree of awareness and approval of the program by employers;
- changes in employer personnel policies to remove artificial barriers to releasees' employment; and
- quality of work performance of those participants placed in employment, compared to other employees, as rated by employers.

These types of community relationship questions often require subjective measures, assessing both the information the program provides to other groups and the perceptions those groups have of the program's activities and importance.

In addition to measures of program operations and community relationships, measures of client outcome are essential. These must consider clients' experiences after leaving the program as well as those during participation, and, if possible, prior to incarceration. Measures used can be changes in criminality, employment, and other indicators of social readjustment.

The problems in measuring criminality or recidivism outcomes have already been discussed in this chapter. Very few such studies have been performed of community-based programs.

Employment outcome success of program participants may be measured in a variety of ways:

- Placements Ratios - the percentage of participants who obtained employment;
- Job Entry Completion Ratio - the percentage of participants who retained employment for a given period of time;
- Training-Related Employment Ratio - the extent to which participants completing training in the program are placed on jobs relating to that training.

Other outcomes that may be of interest include:

- the percentage of participants who enjoy an increase in educational or occupational skill level as measured by a test or scale;
- the percentage of participants who found the program useful, regardless of employment outcome, as measured in a survey;
- the percentage of participants who exhibit changes in work attitudes as measured by observation, case file, or record; and
- the percentage of participants who exhibit changes in motivation, level of aspiration, or self-esteem, as measured by a test or scale.

Consideration of appropriate measures for community-based programs and for individual participants will continue to be an important topic of the Phase I study. To be useful for evaluation, such measures must be unambiguously defined, and data to calculate them must be either available or able to be collected at feasible costs.

D. What Factors Contribute to Program Success and Individual Participant Success?

The many factors which may influence program and participant success can be grouped into three major categories: program characteristics, participant factors and community variables.

A variety of program factors may contribute to success. One important variable will be the skill of the program director. A good director can often find ways to resolve problems before they have damaged the program. The quality of the rest of the staff will also affect program success. If all program components are staffed by well-qualified, highly-motivated people, be they paid professionals or volunteers, the community-based program should be better able to meet the demands placed upon it effectively.

Success may also be affected by the types of services offered. The contributions of individual program components to participant success could perhaps be measured by comparing success in individual components with eventual success in employment. Eligibility criteria can also play an important role, since more selective programs may achieve high success levels by focusing on a smaller number of prison releasees. The restrictiveness of the eligibility criteria may be partly a function of age, since programs often soften their admission requirements as they gain experience. Program age will also have other effects on success, since new community-based programs often face a variety of start-up difficulties which older programs have resolved.

Another important factor which may affect success is the program's operational status, e.g., independent, part of probation department, allied with National Alliance of Businessmen (NAB), etc. This may influence the degree of support received from local community agencies or major area employers.

A related consideration which may affect support received is the specific activities pursued by the program. For example, a program which performs regular follow-up for several months on participants placed in jobs, providing necessary support to alleviate personal difficulties, may be viewed more favorably by employers than if such services were not performed.

Client characteristics affecting success include age, marital status, employment history, and race. There is evidence in the literature that older releasees might be expected to achieve greater levels of successful readjustment and employability. Persons who are married, have had relatively good employment histories and are more educated also seem to enjoy greater success. Persons with supportive interpersonal relationships in the community also seem to be more successful. Race, as a variable, has been viewed as significant only as it is linked to other more discriminating variables, such as age and employment.

Another important participant factor is the extent of attachment to the subculture of which the releasee was a member prior to incarceration. Often an attachment to a criminal subculture can help override positive program effects.

A number of important community factors will affect program and participant success. One such factor is changes in local response to crime, since increased police activities may increase the pressure for participants to refrain from recidivist behavior. The local economy is also important. If jobs are easier to get, it will affect program placements positively. If jobs are difficult to obtain, releasees may be the last disadvantaged group to be considered by employers. Indeed, one program switched its entire focus away

from job placement because of the poor state of the local economy. The Tacoma, Washington NAB program experienced little success in job development efforts because the area unemployment rate was so high (12% in May 1976). As a result, its priority shifted to conducting job finding technique workshops and utilizing films on work orientation.

Other relevant community factors are the support of important local groups, especially members of the business community and the vocational program community. The support of the local parole office is also important, since it may be a source of many participant referrals. The community also needs to have relatively good vocational resources, spanning a range of services, since community-based ex-offender programs cannot do everything themselves.

In summary, many program, participant and community factors may affect successful program outcomes. It will be important as Phase I progresses to try to identify the most salient of the possible factors which may influence success and to consider whether data are available for adequate analysis of their impact.

E. What Are the Overall Cost-Benefit Effects of an Employment Services Program Serving Prison Releasees?

Although no comprehensive cost-benefit evaluation of community-based employment services programs serving prison releasees has been conducted, several individual programs have conducted cost/benefit analyses of their operations, and one study proposed general approaches which might be used in such work. However, the program analyses done have been relatively simple and the proposals made did not deal effectively with all the conceptual problems affecting such analyses. Consequently, consideration of the cost-

benefit effects of community-based employment services programs for releasees cannot be based upon existing literature alone.

A time stream of benefits from program services delivered to releasees could theoretically be estimated and compared with the costs of a program. However, this would require determination of items which would be considered benefits and those which reflect true program costs. Benefits might include increases in productivity of releasees who join the work force or obtain better jobs and cost savings associated with reductions in criminality. Such savings might include taxes lost to the State and welfare benefits paid when a person is confined, police work savings, court and parole savings, corrections savings and the reduced cost of offenses (damages and losses). Benefits should be estimated in comparison with likely outcomes in the absence of the program.

Costs and benefits could also be analyzed by type of service or by participant sub-group. These analyses would provide an indication of which program services were most efficiently provided and which types of clients were benefitting most from the program.

Many problems other than identification of appropriate benefits and costs would be posed by such an analysis. For example, over what time period should costs and related benefits be measured? How could the benefits attributable to the program be separated from those due to other factors?

Different problems are posed depending on whether such analysis would focus on one program or attempt to obtain comparable data for a group of programs. Community-based programs operate in many different ways, in communities which vary widely in terms of support given to the programs and

with participants whose backgrounds differ from program to program. Therefore, it would be extremely difficult to obtain cost-benefit data which could be compared across programs without being misleading.

Collection of data to implement any cost-benefit study of community-based programs would probably be hard and expensive, given the past studies which indicated that much of the data needed even for relatively simple analyses was not available. Data problems, coupled with the conceptual ones, help explain the absence of existing cost-benefit studies of community-based employment services programs serving prison releasees. These problems also suggest areas which should receive additional attention during the later stages of the Phase I study.

F. Conclusion

Many problems exist in addressing the major evaluation issues involving community-based employment programs serving prison releasees. One important problem is the poor state of existing knowledge: little is presently known about the "best" ways to structure such programs or about the most appropriate methods for evaluating them.

Few studies have been performed which describe these community programs. Until more is known about the various types of programs and their corresponding objectives, it will be difficult to adequately address the evaluation issues. As this Phase I project continues, more information will be collected about the range of existing programs -- from centralized, comprehensive manpower programs to specialized programs concentrating on one aspect of job-readiness or the readjustment process.

Until gaps in the state of knowledge are removed many community-based programs will probably continue to operate in isolation utilizing different service delivery methods and criteria for success. Comparisons across programs will be impossible.

If the approaches or techniques which seem to work best could be documented, many programs could benefit. This cannot be done, however, until more is known about program activities and about the best methods for evaluating those activities. These topics will be addressed in later stages of the Phase I study of community-based programs serving prison releasees.

FOOTNOTES

1. The severity of the problem of offender licensing restrictions was emphasized in a study done by the American Bar Association, which said: "The existence of arbitrary restrictions on an offender's job opportunities suggests a basic ambivalence by society towards the rehabilitation of the offender . . . (S)uch restrictions are self-defeating. They neither contribute to the offender's rehabilitation, nor serve the best interests of society. They close off many legitimate avenues for meaningful and gainful employment that would aid the individual's reintegration into the community as a law-abiding, self-supporting citizen and give society some assurance that he will not return to crime." James E. Bowers, James W. Hunt and Neal Miller, Laws, Licenses, and the Offender's Right to Work, (Washington, D.C.: National Clearinghouse on Offender Employment Restrictions, 1974), p. 17.

2. Roberta Rovner-Pieczenik, A Review of Manpower R and D Projects in the Correctional Field, 1963-1973, (Washington, D.C.: Manpower Research Monograph No. 28, U.S. Department of Labor, 1973), p. 21.

3. George A. Pownall, Employment Problems of Released Prisoners, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, 1969), p. 8.

4. Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, 500 Criminal Careers, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1930), p. 217.

5. Robert Evans, Jr., "The Labor Market and Parole Success", Journal of Human Resources, (Spring, 1968), p. 203.

6. Daniel Glaser, The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System, (New York: Bobbs Merrill Co., Inc., 1964), p. 9.

7. Pownall, Employment Problems of Released Prisoners, p. 2.

8. Ibid, p. 488.

9. J.B. Hudson, Evaluation of MDTA Training in Correctional Institutions: Vol. I Perspectives on Offender Rehabilitation, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, 1971), p. 39.

10. Kenneth J. Lenihan, "Theft Among Prisoners: Is it Economically Motivated? An Experimental Study of Financial Aid and Job Placement for Ex-Prisoners, paper presented at the Eastern Sociological Society Meeting, (Washington, D.C., April 1974), pp. 7-8.

11. George A. Pownall, "Employment Problems of Released Prisoners", Manpower, Vol. III, No. 1, (January, 1971), p. 26.

12. Robert Taggart III, The Prison of Unemployment, Manpower Programs for Offenders, (Baltimore, Md.: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972), p. 49.

13. In this program, the Department of Labor, through a contract with the Governor, provides a State with limited staff to: assess its needs in corrections at all stages of the criminal justice process; designate the best methods of delivering services; secure the assistance of all potential public and private resources within the State; and work out the interagency agreements necessary to accomplish the optimal plan. The results of this planning stage are then submitted in proposal form to the Department of Labor for funding consideration.

14. Abt Associates, Inc., Exemplary Project Validation Report: Parole Rehabilitation and Employment Program (PREP), (Cambridge, Mass.: Abt Associates, Inc., 1975), p. 22.

15. John M. McCreary and Phyllis Groom McCreary, Job Training and Placement for Offenders and Ex-Offenders, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, 1975), p. 15.

16. Anne M. Rosenfeld, An Evaluative Summary of Research: MAP Program Outcomes in the Initial Demonstration States, (College Park, Md.: American Correctional Association, 1975), p. 3.

17. Under this disability category, vocational rehabilitation services could be provided if it was determined that "an individual's behavior significantly deviates from what is considered normal, or that his ability to carry on normal relationships with family and community is significantly impaired . . . Eligible for vocational rehabilitation services under such a definition may include the public offender . . . and the socially and culturally deprived, provided these people are truly 'handicapped' in finding and holding suitable employment." Federal Vocational Rehabilitation Manual, Chapter 16-I, (Washington, D.C.: Rehabilitation Services Administration DHEW, July 26, 1967).

18. Palmer-Paulson Associates, Inc., EXCEL in Indiana, Final Report, Aug. 1, 1971-Aug. 1, 1972, (Chicago, Ill.: Palmer-Paulson Associates, Inc., 1972).

19. Employ-Ex, Inc., Employ-Ex-Annual Report, April 1, 1974, (Denver, Col.: Employ-Ex, Inc., 1974)

20. William A. McConnell and Peter S. Venezia, Effect of Vocational Upgrading Upon Probationer Recidivism--A One-Year Evaluation of the Singer/Graflex Monroe County Pilot Probationer Project, (Davis, Cal.: Research Center of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, 1972).

21. Evaluators of the Singer/Graflex project concluded that a large enough sample of probationers should be used to allow a statistical determination of the programs differential success with various client "types", that correctional and multivariate analyses should develop separate profiles of probationers who succeeded and those who failed, and that additional evaluation techniques were required, such as: on-site observations through time of each program component, in-depth interviews of staff, clients, non-clients, employers, and probation officers. Ibid.

22. Although it primarily assessed prison-based training programs, a recent study drew conclusions reflective of the variance in success measures utilized by ex-offender employment services programs. The author found: "Some projects claimed success because they demonstrated project feasibility. Others used arrest and/or conviction records and demonstrated decreased recidivism. Still others based success on one or more aspects of an offender's job performance during project participation and after termination: stability on a job, skill performance, salary, occupational mobility. The refinement of training and educational technology were indicants of success for others. Project performance (i.e., the number of participants served, referrals made, and/or placements in a job) was highlighted by still others. In short, an assessment of success was distinct to the design and purposes of each project and attainable on a number of levels simultaneously (e.g., administrative, programmatic, individual)." Rovner-Pieczenik, A Review of Manpower R and D Projects in the Correctional Field, p. 15.

23. Palmer-Paulson Associates, Inc., EXCEL in Indiana, Final Report, August 1, 1971-August 1, 1972, Chicago, Ill.: Palmer-Paulson Associates, Inc., 1972).

24. See Pownall Employment Problems of Released Prisoners.

25. See Robert Taggart, III, Prison of Unemployment--Manpower Programs for Offenders, (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972).

26. Rovner-Pieczenik, A Review of Manpower R and D Projects in the Correctional Field, p. 74.

27. McCreary and McCreary, Job Training and Placement for Offenders and Ex-Offenders, p. 16.

28. See Urban and Rural Systems Associates, Inc., Exemplary Project Validation Report--Clearinghouse for Ex-Offenders of Louisville, Kentucky (San Francisco, Cal.: Urban and Rural Systems, Associates, Inc., 1974).

29. Abt Associates, Inc., Pre-Trial Intervention: A Program Evaluation of Nine PTI Projects, (Cambridge, Mass.: Abt Associates, Inc., 1974), p. 28.

30. Ibid., p. 159.

31. Evaluators concluded that a .172 correlation between employment services and post-program employment was encouraging because it showed "some impact", even though the correlation decreased in later follow-up periods. Ibid., p. 146.

32. See Rovner-Pieczenik, A Review of Manpower R and D Projects in the Correctional Field.

33. See Abt Associates, Inc., An Evaluation of MDTA Training in Correctional Institutions Vol. II--Impact of the MDTA Training Program on Trainees, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, 1971).

34. McCreary and McCreary, Job Training and Placement for Offenders and Ex-Offenders, pp. 55-60.

35. Sources cited include: Peter H. Rossi and Walter Williams, eds., Evaluating Social Research, (New York: Seminar Press, 1972); Edward Suchman, Evaluation Research, (New York: Russel Sage Foundation, 1967); Carol H. Weiss, Evaluation Research, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972); and Daniel Glaser, Routinizing Evaluation, (Rockville, Maryland: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1973).

36. McCreary and McCreary, Job Training and Placement for Offenders and Ex-Offenders, p. 54.

37. For example, the National Offender Services Coordination Program has been conducting a series of regional conferences to acquaint CETA prime sponsors with techniques for providing employment services to the ex-offender.

38. Brochures published include: Chamber of Commerce of the United States; Marshaling Citizen Power to Modernize Corrections, (Washington, D.C.: American Correctional Association, 1972); The Man Who Lived Again: Understanding and Helping the Released Prisoner, (Washington, D.C.: AFL-CIO Community Service Activities in cooperation with the American Correctional Association); and Employment of the Rehabilitated Offender in the Federal Service, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Civil Service Commission, 1973).

39. Reports published concerning statutory barriers to ex-offender employment opportunities include the following: James E. Bowers and James W. Hunt, A Guide to Legislative Action, (Washington, D.C.: National Clearinghouse on Offender Employment Restrictions); James E. Bowers and James W. Hunt, Removing Offender Employment Restrictions, (Washington, D.C.: National Clearinghouse on Offender Employment Restrictions, 1972); James E. Bowers, James W. Hunt and Neal Miller, Laws, Licenses, and the Offender's Right to Work, (Washington, D.C.: National Clearinghouse on Offender Employment Restrictions, 1974); and, Robert Plotkin, Constitutional Challenges to Employment Disability Statutes, (Washington, D.C.: National Clearinghouse on Offender Employment Restrictions).

40. One example is a training system publication of the Rehabilitation Research Foundation, Guide for Employment Service Counselors in Correctional MDTA Programs, published in 1972.

41. Projects which "cream" are viewed as wanting to "look good" and their directors as "bad guys". Project directors who serve "high-risk" persons are viewed as "good guys". "This polarization completely ignores the facts that: (1) all project directors want a successful project and (2) not all projects are appropriate for all offenders." Rovner-Pieczenik, A Review of Manpower R and D Projects in the Correctional Field, p. 26.

42. "Experiences with community- and prison-based projects reveal that they are implemented . . . under the auspices of personnel who favor the participation of the "low-risk" offender (i.e., the offender with the shorter arrest, conviction and prison record, more stable employment history, higher educational background, and devoid of psycho-mental problems such as addiction or mental retardation)." Ibid., p. 27.

43. For example, Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Programs must serve all persons who meet basic quidelines relating to previous income, employment status, and residency. Programs associated with the United States Employment Service must serve all persons who are "unemployed".

44. "Projects have concluded that this low educational achievement level is not attributable to either low intelligence or lack of desire to achieve". Rovner-Pieczenik, p. 23. A Department of Labor survey also concluded that the intelligence of offenders is the same as the national average, although their educational achievement is very much below the national average (See chart below).

Educational Levels of Offenders Compared to the National Average

Educational Level	Offenders Percent	General Population Percent
College		
4 years or more	1.1	8.4
1-3 years	4.2	9.4
High School		
4 years	12.4	27.5
1-3 years	27.6	20.7
Elementary		
5-8 years	40.3	28.0
0-4 years	14.4	.0

From Correctional Manpower Program, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, 1973), p. 30.

45. Rovner-Pieczenik, A Review of Manpower R and D Projects in the Correctional Field, p. 24.

46. See W.O. Jenkins and W. Lee Sanford, A Manual for the Use of the Environmental Deprivation Scale (EDS) in Corrections: The Prediction of Criminal Behavior, (Elmore, Ala.: Rehabilitation Research Foundation, 1972), and, M.C. Barton and W.O. Jenkins, The Maladaptive Behavior Record (MBR): A Scale for the Analysis and Prediction of Community Adjustment and Recidivism of Offenders, Elmore, Ala.: Rehabilitation Research Foundation, 1973).

47. See M.C. Barton and W.O. Jenkins, A Longitudinal Follow-up Investigation of the Post-Release Behavior of Paroled or Released Offenders, (Elmore, Ala.: Rehabilitation Research Foundation, 1973).

48. Variables investigated in the development of VOI scales were classified as practical and psychological. Practical variables included: free time for personal needs; purchasing power; physical hardships; benefits to family; social value; personal problems; medical problems; child care problems; transportation problems; difficulty of obtaining job; job-ability match; and job expectancy match. Psychological variables included: social relations; general competency; personal independence; maturity; security; personal mobility; responsibility; mental health; fear of failure; job stability; social pressure against working; perceived acceptance by peers at work; fear of strangeness; rejection of authority; and probability of obtaining any job. Associates for Research in Behavior, Inc., Transition to Work: Contribution of the Job Readiness Posture, (Phila., Pa.: Associates for Research in Behavior, Inc., 1974), p. 4.

49. Rovner-Pieczenik, A Review of Manpower R and D Projects in the Correctional Field, p. 39.

50. See Abt Associates, Inc., Exemplary Project Validation Report: Parole Rehabilitation and Employment Program (PREP), (Cambridge, Mass.: Abt Associates, Inc., 1975).

51. Rovner-Pieczenik, p. 36.

52. Vocational Preparation in U.S. Correctional Institutions, (Columbus, Ohio: Battelle-Columbus Laboratories, 1975), quoted in "Need for Better Education for Convicts is Cited", Chicago Tribune, May 9, 1976.

53. Reasons for the use of entry-level training include: (1) employers often prefer to hire at the lowest entry level and do their own skill training; (2) prison and other training programs do not possess the equipment, space, or machinery needed for advanced training; (3) projects are geared to "produce" the largest number of trainees in the shortest amount of time; and (4) trainees with less than a sixth grade educational achievement level cannot train above entry level in a standard six months training cycle. Rovner-Pieczenik, A Review of Manpower R and D Projects in the Correctional Field, p. 38.

54. Employers committed themselves to hiring men who passed basic skills examinations and provided training on I.B.M. punched-card data processing machines and necessary remedial help. See Clyde E. Sullivan and Mandell Wallace, Restoration of Youth Through Training, (Staten Island, N.Y.: Wakoff Research Center, 1967).

55. Rovner-Pieczenik, A Review of Manpower R and D Projects in the Correctional Field, pp. 38-39.

56. Ibid., p. 43.

57. See, John M. McKee and others. The Draper Project: Final Report, Vol. III. How to With P.T.I. (Elmore, Ala.: Rehabilitation Research Foundation, 1968), and An Introduction to Programmed Instruction, (Elmore, Ala.: Rehabilitation Research Foundation, 1969).

58. Counseling can provide "a willing ear, a source of advice and personal empathy for the ex-offender. . . Counseling provides a buffer against many of the pressures facing ex-offenders. In particular, counselors can counteract some of tne negative ghetto influences. . . and can explain an employer's perspective on certain issues. . .

    Fry Consulting Group, "The Employment Problems of Ex-Offenders--A Presentation," sponsored by Sen. Jacob K. Javits, The Alliance for a Safer New York, and the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation, (New York, New York: 1972), p. 18.

59. See Rovner-Pieczenik, A Review of Manpower R and D Projects in the Correctional Field, p. 46.

60. See Vera Institute of Justice, The Manhattan Court Employment Project Final Report. (New York: Vera Institute of Justice, 1972) and Leon Leiberg, Project Challenge Final Report (Washington, D.C.: National Committee for Children and Youth, January 1968).

61. Selection and Training of Advocates and Screeners for a Pre-Trial Diversion Program, (Boston, Mass.: Boston Court Resource Project), p. 41, quoted in McCreary and McCreary, Job Training and Placement of Offenders and Ex-Offenders, p. 50.

62. Rovner-Pieczenik, A Review of Manpower R and D Projects in the Correctional Field, p. 44.

63. See M. Baum, L. Hudzinski; and R. Kleff, Evaluation Research on the Public Offender Program at Goodwill Industries, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania - Final Report, (Harrisburg, Pa.: Pennsylvania Department of Justice, 1974).

64. Rovner-Pieczenik, p. 60.

65. See Clyde E. Sullivan, "Changes in Corrections: Show on Substance?" Manpower, Vol. 3, No. 1, (January, 1971).

66. Abt Associates, Inc., Pre-Trial Intervention: A Program Evaluation of Nine PTI Projects, (Cambridge, Mass.: Abt Associates, Inc., 1974).

67. McCreary and McCreary, Job Training and Placement for Offenders and Ex-Offenders, p. 34.

68. Operation Pathfinder was designed to assess the utility and feasibility of using behavior modification techniques for juvenile parolees and other hardcore disadvantaged on the job. Industrial supervisors were trained to use these techniques, especially social reinforcement, in shaping work habits and social behavior of their employees.

69. Rovner-Pieczenik, p. 66.

70. Ibid., p. 69.

71. James Hunt, "The Bottom Line: Jobs: A Guide for Program Planners on Developing Community-Based Offender Job Development Systems", unpublished paper prepared within the American Bar Association, National Clearinghouse on Offender Employment Restrictions, Washington, D. C.: (1976)

72. McCreary and McCreary, Job Training and Placement of Offenders and Ex-Offenders, pp. 47-50.

73. Rovner-Pieczenik, pp. 52-53.

74. Worrall, Jay, OAR Volunteer Handbook,(Charlottesville, Va.: Offender Aid and Restoration Program, 1974).

75. U.S. Department of Justice, Guidelines and Standards for the Use of Volunteers in Correctional Programs, (Washington, D. C.: LEAA Technical Assistance Division, 1972).

76. R.R. Smith, Montgomery, Alabama--Survey of Community Services for the Ex-Offender, (Elmore, Ala.; Rehabilitation Research Foundation, 1970).

77. L. R. Witt, Project Develop--Developing Educational--Vocational Experiences for Long-Term Occupational Adjustment of Parolees: Summary Report, (Albany, New York: New York Division of Parole, 1968).

78. J. B. Hudson, Evaluation of MDTA Training in Correctional Institutions, Vol. I--Perspectives on Offender Rehabilitation, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, 1976) p. 7.

79. Conrad, John P., Crime and Its Correction, (Boulder, Colo.: U. of Colo. Press, 1965), p. 300.

80. J. B. Hudson, Evaluation of MDTA Training in Correctional Institutions, Vol. I--Perspectives on Offender Rehabilitation, (Washington, D. C.: U.S. Department of Labor, 1971), p. 7.

81. "For example, the reliance on a rearrest and/or conviction rate may limit the exploration of other variables in determining success (e.g., life-style, environmental supports). It may also detract from the importance of finding answers to distinctly manpower questions." Rovner-Pieczenik, p. 18.

82. Ibid.

83. Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, 500 Criminal Careers, (New York, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1930), p. 7.

84. Rovner-Pieczenik, p. 64.

85. Ibid, p. 25.

86. "A Survey of Parole Board Policy: Employment Requirements Before Parole Release", contained in, William C. Parker, Parole (Origins, Development, Current Practices and Statutes), (College Park, Md.: American Correctional Association, 1975), p. 216.

87. Ibid.

88. Laws, Licenses, and the Offender's Right to Work, James E. Bowers, James W. Hunt and Neal Miller, (Washington, D.C.: National Clearinghouse on Offender Employment Restrictions, 1973), p.8.

89. Ibid., p. 11.

90. Opinion of Frances B. Burch, Maryland Attorney General, July 20, 1972, quoted in James E. Bowers and James W. Hunt, Removing Offender Employment Restrictions, (Washington, D. C.: National Clearinghouse on Offender Employment Restrictions, 1973), p. 11.

91. McCreary and McCreary, Job Training and Placement of Offenders and Ex-Offenders, p. 16.

92. Ibid, pp. 64-66.

93. See Carol H. Weiss, Evaluation Research, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972); Edward Suchman, Evaluation Research, (New York; Russell Sage Foundation, 1967); Peter H. Rossi and Walter Williams, eds., Evaluating Social Research, (New York: Seminar Press, 1972); Daniel Glaser, Routinizing Evaluation, (Washington, D. C.: Center for Studies of Crime and Delinquency, National Institute of Mental Health, 1973).

94. Rovner-Pieczenik, pp. 73-74.

95. J.B. Hudson, Evaluation of MDTA Training in Correctional Institutions, Vol. I.--Perspectives on Offender Rehabilitation, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, 1971), p. 7.

96. Daniel Glaser, The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System, (New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1964), p. 490.

97. Rovner-Pieczenik, p. 22.

98. J.B. Hudson, Evaluation of MDTA Training in Correctional Institutions, Vol. I--Perspectives on Offender Rehabilitation, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, 1971). p. 40.

99. See George A. Pownall, Employment Problems of Released Prisoners, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, 1969).

100. See Project Crossroads. Phase I. (Washington, D.C.: National Commission on Children and Youth, 1969).

101. See Bonding Assistance Demonstration Project. Summary Report. (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, 1968).

102. See M.C. Barton and W.O. Jenkins, A Longitudinal Follow-Up Investigation of the Post-Release Behavior of Paroled or Released Offenders, (Elmore, Ala.: Rehabilitation Research Foundation, 1973).

103. Daniel Glaser and Kent Rice, "Crime, Age and Unemployment", American Sociological Review, Vol. 24, (October, 1959), pp. 679-686.

104. Belton M. Fleisher, "The Effect of Unemployment on Delinquent Behavior", Journal of Political Economics, Vol. 71, (1963) pp. 543-555.

105. Pownall, Employment Problems of Released Prisoners and Robert Evans, Jr., "The Labor Market and Parole Success", Journal of Human Resources, (Spring, 1968), p. 203.

106. Daniel Glaser, The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System, (New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc.), p. 1964.

107. Charles Welford, "Manpower and Recidivism", Proceedings: The National Workshop on Corrections and Parole Administration, (New Orleans, La.: American Correctional Association, 1972), pp. 113-120 quoted in McCreary and McCreary, Job Training and Placement of Offenders and Ex-Offenders, p. 6.

108. Virginia Bureau of Public Administration, The Virginia Parole System--An Appraisal of Its First 12 Years, (Charlottesville, Va.: Virginia Bureau of Public Administration, 1955), p. 106.

109. See Rovner-Pieczenik, p. 16.

110. Robert Taggart III, The Prison of Unemployment, Manpower Programs for Offenders, (Baltimore, Md.: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972), p. 49

111. See Sylvia G. McCollum, The Potential of New Educational Delivery Systems for Correctional Treatment, A Correctional Education Handbook, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Bureau of Prisons, 1973), p. 8.

112. McCreary and McCreary, Job Training and Placement for Offenders and Ex-Offenders, p. 11.

113. See Pownall, Employment Problems of Released Prisoners, P. 138.

114. Indiana Department of Corrections--Community Resource Development, Modification of a Request for Proposal (1975), p. 1.

115. Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, P.L. No. 93-203, Section 7051 (d).

116. "A Survey of Parole Board Policy: Employment Requirements Before Parole Release", contained in William C. Parker, Parole, (Origins, Development, Current Practice, and Statutes) (College Park, Md.: American Correctional Association, 1975), p. 218.

117. Rovner-Pieczenik, p. 73.

118. See William A. McConnell and Peter S. Venezia, Effect of Vocational Upgrading Upon Probationers Recidivism--A One-Year Evaluation of the Singer/Graflex Monroe County Pilot Probation Project, (Davis, Cal.: Research Center of National Council on Crime and Delinquency, 1972).

119. For example, an evaluation of a vocational training program in the California Institution for Women followed up 225 women released to California parole who received vocational training and a comparison group of 154 released during the same year who had not received training but whose institutional work assignments had been related to areas where training was offered. The purpose was to determine whether women found jobs for fields in which they had been trained. See C. Spencer, California Instiutiton for Women--Vocational Training--An Evaluation, (Sacramento, Cal.: California Department of Corrections, 1971).

120. Daniel Glaser, Routinizing Evaluation, (Rockville, Md.: National Institute of Mental Health, Center for Studies of Crime and Delinquency, 1973), p. 23.

121. Ibid.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Program Studies and Project Reports

Abram, Robert A., LaDow, Diane, and Levy, Girard W. Vocational Preparation in U.S. Correctional Institutions: A 1974 Survey. Columbus, Ohio: Battelle - Columbus Laboratories, (1976).

Abt Associates, Inc. An Evaluation of MDTA Training in Correctional Institutions. Vol. II - Impact of the MDTA Training Program on Trainees. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Department of Labor, (1971).

_____. Exemplary Project Validation Report: Parole Rehabilitation and Employment Program (PREP). Cambridge, Mass.: Abt Associates, Inc., (1974).

_____. Pre-Trial Intervention: A Program Evaluation of Nine Pre-Trial Intervention Projects. Cambridge, Mass.: Abt Associates, Inc., (1974).

Associates for Research in Behavior, Inc. Transition to Work: Contribution of the Job Readiness Posture. Philadelphia, Pa.: Associates for Research in Behavior, Inc., (1974).

Barton, M.C., and Jenkins, W.O. Longitudinal Follow-up Investigation of the Postrelease Behavior of Paroled or Released Offenders. Elmore, Ala.: Rehabilitation Research Foundation, (1973).

_____. The Maladaptive Behavior Record (MBR): A Scale for the Analysis and Prediction of Community Adjustment and Recidivism of Offenders. Elmore, Ala.: Rehabilitation Research Foundation (1973).

Baum, M., Hudzinski, L., and Kleff, R. Evaluation Research on the Public Offender Program at Goodwill Industries--Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania--Final Report. Harrisburg, Pa.: Pa. Department of Justice, (1974).

Berecochea, J.E., and Spencer, C. California Institution for Women--Vocational Training--An Evaluation. Sacramento, Cal.: California Department of Corrections, (1971).

Bonding Assistance Demonstration Project--Final Report. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, (1968).

Cambell, W. and Saxton, S. Employ-Ex Annual Report, April 1, 1974. Denver, Col.: Employ-Ex, Inc., (1974).

Holt, N. California's Prerelease Furlough Program for State Prisoners--An Evaluation. Sacramento, Cal.: California Department of Corrections, (1969).

Jenkins, W.O., and Sanford, W. Lee. A Manual for the Use of the Environmental Deprivation Scale (EDS) in Corrections: The Prediction of Criminal Behavior, Elmore, Ala.: Rehabilitation Research Foundation, (1972).

Jenkins, W.O., and Witherspoon, A.D. Post-Prison Analysis of Criminal Behavior and Longitudinal Follow-up Evaluation of Institutional Treatment. Elmore, Ala.: Rehabilitation Research Foundation, (1974).

Leiberg, Leon G. Project Challenge. Washington, D.C.: National Committee for Children and Youth, (1968).

Maryland Division of Correction. Maryland Job Placement Program--Final Report. Pikesville, Md.: Maryland Division of Correction, (1973).

McConnell, William A., and Venezia, Peter S. Effect of Vocational Upgrading Upon Probationers Recidivism--A One-Year Evaluation of the Singer/Graflex Monroe County Pilot Probation Project. Davis, Cal.: Research Center of National Council on Crime and Delinquency, (1972).

McCreary, John M., and McCreary, Phyllis Groom. Job Training and Placement for Offenders and Ex-Offenders. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, (1975).

McKee, John M., and others. Draper E and D Project Final Report, Vols. I and II. Elmore, Ala.: Rehabilitation Research Foundation, (1968).

_____. How to With PTI. Elmore, Ala.: Rehabilitation Research Foundation, (1968).

_____. An Introduction to Programmed Instruction. Elmore, Ala.: Rehabilitation Research Foundation, (1969).

Palmer-Paulson Associates, Inc. EXCEL in Indiana, Final Report, Aug. 1, 1971-Aug. 1, 1972. Chicago, Ill.: Palmer-Paulson Associates, Inc., (1972).

Pownall, George A. Employment Problems of Released Prisoners. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, (1969).

Project Crossroads - Phase I, Washington, D.C.: National Commission on Children and Youth, (1969).

Rovner-Pieczenik, Roberta. A Review of Manpower R and D Projects in the Correctional Field, 1963-1973. Washington, D. C.: Manpower Research Monograph No. 28, U.S. Department of Labor, (1973).

Rosenfeld, Anne M. An Evaluative Summary of Research: MAP Program Outcomes in the Initial Demonstration States. College Park, Md.: American Correctional Association, (1975).

Smith, R.R. Montgomery, Alabama--Survey of Community Services for the Ex-Offender. Elmore, Ala.: Rehabilitation Research Foundation, (1970).

Sullivan, Clyde E., and Wallace, Mandell. Restoration of Youth Through Training. Staten Island, New York: Wakoff Research Center, (1967).

Taggart, III, Robert. The Prison of Unemployment, Manpower Programs for Offenders. Baltimore, Md.: The Johns Hopkins University Press, (1972).

Urban and Rural Systems Associates, Inc. Exemplary Project Validation Report--Clearinghouse for Ex-Offenders of Louisville, Kentucky. San Francisco, Cal.: Urban and Rural Systems, Inc., (1974).

Vera Institute of Justice. Manhattan Court Employment Project: Final Report. New York, N.Y.: Vera Institute of Justice, (1972).

Virginia Bureau of Public Administration, The Virginia Parole System--An Appraisal of its First Twelve Years. Charlottesville, Va.: Virginia Bureau of Public Administration, (1955).

Witt, L.R. Project Develop--Developing Educational-Vocational Experiences for Long-Term Occupational Adjustment of Parolees, Summary Report. Albany, N.Y. New York Division of Parole, (1968).

Books and Journal Articles

Conrad, John P. Crime and Its Correction. Boulder, Col.: University of Colorado Press, (1965).

Evans, Jr., Robert. "The Labor Market and Parole Success". Journal of Human Resources (Spring, 1968): 203-211.

Fleisher, Belton M. "The Effect of Unemployment on Delinquent Behavior," Journal of Political Economics LXXI (1963), 543-555.

Glaser, Daniel. Routinizing Evaluation. Rockville, Md.: National Institute for Mental Health, Center for Studies of Crime and Delinquency, (1973).

_____. The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System. N.Y.: Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., (1964).

_____, with Rice, Kent. "Crime, Age, and Unemployment," American Sociological Review XXIV (October, 1959), 679-686.

Glueck, Eleanor and Glueck, Sheldon. 500 Criminal Careers; N.Y., N.Y.: Alfred A. Knopf, (1930).

Pownall, George A. "Employment Problems of Released Prisoners". Manpower, Vol. III, No.1, (January, 1971), 26-31.

Sullivan, Clyde E. "Changes in Corrections; Show or Substance?" Manpower, Vol. III, No. 1, (January, 1971), 2-7.

Welford, Charles. "Manpower and Recidivism," Proceedings: The National Workshop of Corrections and Parole Administration. New Orleans, La.: (1972), 113-120.

Worrall, Jay. OAR Volunteer Book. Charlottesville, Va.: Offender Aid and and Restoration Program, (1974).

Other Materials

Bowers, James E., and Hunt, James W. Guide to Legislative Action. Washington, D.C.: National Clearinghouse on Offender Employment Restrictions, n.d.

_____, Removing Offender Employment Restrictions. Washington, D. C.: National Clearinghouse on Offender Employment Restrictions, (1972).

_____, and Miller, Neal. Laws, Licenses and the Offender's Right to Work; Washington, D.C.: National Clearinghouse for Offender Employment Restrictions, (1974).

Chamber of Commerce of the United States. Marshaling Citizen Power to Modernize Corrections. Washington, D. C.: American Correctional Association, (1972).

Correctional Manpower Programs. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, (1973).

Employment of the Rehabilitated Offender in the Federal Service. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Civil Service Commission, (1973).

Fry Consulting Group,"Employment Problems of Ex-Offenders--A Presentation". New York, N.Y.: Alliance for a Safer New York, (1972).

Hunt, James M. "The Bottom Line: Jobs: A Guide for Program Planners on Developing Community-Based Offender Job Development Systems," unpublished paper prepared within American Bar Association National Clearinghouse on Offender Employment Restrictions, Washington, D.C., (1976).

Indiana Department of Corrections, "A Modification of a Request for Proposal," (1975).

Keating, M., Pedrajo, M., and Weber, S. Methodology for the Evaluation of Ex-Offender Projects. Miami, Fla.: Dade County Criminal Justice Planning Unit, (1974).

McCollum, Sylvia G. The Potential of New Educational Delivery Systems for Correctional Treatment: A Correctional Education Handbook. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Bureau of Prisons, (1973).

Parker, William C. Parole (Origins, Development, Current Practices and Statutes). College Park, Md.: American Correctional Association, (1975).

Plotkin, Robert. Constitutional Challenges to Employment Disability Statutes. Washington, D. C.: National Clearinghouse on Offender Employment Restrictions, n.d.

Rehabilitation Research Foundation. Guide for Employment Service Counselors in Correctional MDTA Programs. Elmore, Ala.: Rehabilitation Research Foundation, (1972).

The Man Who Lived Again: Understanding and Helping the Released Prisoner. Washington, D. C.: AFL-CIO Community Service Activities in cooperation with the American Correctional Association, n.d.

U.S. Department of Justice. Guidelines and Standards for the Use of Volunteers in Correctional Programs. Washington, D. C. Law Enforcement Assistance Administration Technical Assistance Division, (1972).

END