

**The author(s) shown below used Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice and prepared the following final report:**

**Document Title: Impact Assessment of the Pre-Release Employment Program, Graduates of the Herman Toulson Boot Camp Versus Nonparticipants, Graduates of the Herman Toulson Boot Camp**

**Author(s): Sherrise Y. Truesdale**

**Document No.: 190227**

**Date Received: September 17, 2001**

**Award Number: 97-IJ-CX-0037**

**This report has not been published by the U.S. Department of Justice. To provide better customer service, NCJRS has made this Federally-funded grant final report available electronically in addition to traditional paper copies.**

**Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.**

**COPPIN STATE  
COLLEGE**

190227

---

**GRANT # 97-IJ-CX-0037**

---

**“AN IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF THE  
PRE RELEASE EMPLOYMENT  
PROGRAM, GRADUATES OF THE  
HERMAN TOULSON BOOT CAMP  
VERSUS  
NONPARTICIPANTS,  
GRADUATES OF THE HERMAN  
TOULSON BOOT CAMP”**

**FINAL REPORT**

Approved By: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

PROPERTY OF  
National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS)  
Box 6000  
Rockville, MD 20849-6000

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. Title Page**
- II. Abstract**
- III. Introduction**
  - A. Hypothesis**
  - B. Importance of the study from the view of the researcher**
  - C. Importance of the study from the view of other scholars**
  - D. Why choose the Herman Toulson Boot Camp graduates**
- IV. Literature Review**
- V. Methods**
- VI. Results**
- VII. Research Analysis**
- VIII. References**
- IX. Tables**
  - A. Case Summary of Participants and Nonparticipants**
  - B. Table of Statistical Findings**
    - 1. Standard Deviation**
    - 2. Mean**
    - 3. Standard Error of the Mean**
    - 4. T-Test**
- X. "A National Survey of Aftercare Provisions for Boot Camp Graduates"**
- XI. Final Progress Report**

**Running Head: AN IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF THE PRE RELEASE  
EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM, GRADUATES OF THE HERMAN TOULSON  
BOOT CAMP**

**AN IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF THE PRE RELEASE  
EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM, GRADUATES OF THE HERMAN  
TOULSON BOOT CAMP  
VS.  
NONPARTICIPANTS  
GRADUATES OF THE HERMAN TOULSON BOOT CAMP**

**Sherrise Y. Truesdale  
Coppin State College  
Re: Grant #97-IJ-CX-0037**

**ABSTRACT**

The employment rates of the Pre Release Employment Program were investigated. Thirty participants (exoffenders) on probation and parole of the Pre Release Employment Program were selected to be the experimental group. They were demographically matched to nonparticipants (exoffenders) on probation and parole that represented the control group; these individuals were not participants of the Pre Release Employment Program. Although the assertion was that the participants of the Pre Release Employment Program would have a higher rate than those that did not participate, it was found that there was no significant difference between the participants of the program and nonparticipants of the program.

## INTRODUCTION

This study will analyze employment rates of graduates of the Herman Toulson Boot Camp Pre Release Employment Program compared to Herman Toulson Boot Camp graduates who were nonparticipants of the Pre Release Employment Program. Essentially, the applicant proposes to conduct an impact assessment of the Pre Release Employment Program (Rossi and Freeman, 1993). The goal of this assessment is to determine what, if any, employment success was achieved by ex-offenders who participated in the Pre Release Employment Program compared with nonparticipants.

### Hypothesis

After careful review, the researcher selected to investigate the employment rates for those who participated in the Herman Toulson Boot Camp Pre Release Employment Program. The study was guided by the following research question and hypothesis: Is there a significant difference in the employment rates between those graduates of the Herman Toulson Boot Camp who participated in the Pre Release Employment Program than those graduates who did not participate? The assertion is that the employment rates of those who are participants will be higher than those of nonparticipants.

**Importance of the Study from the view of the researcher**

The Pre Release Employment Program is five years old. Since its inception, there has not been any research specifically targeted toward the employment of the aftercare program. Maryland, specifically, has a need to reduce recidivism and help exoffenders become better acclimated into society. In order to accomplish this goal, aspects of the aftercare program must be evaluated.

**Importance of the study from the view of other scholars**

Since the 1980's the boot camp programs have been interesting to many researchers. However, there has been very little research conducted on aftercare programs. Blair B. Bourque, Me Han, and Sarah M. Hill, researchers of "A National Survey of Aftercare Provisions for Boot Camp Graduates", found that few boot camp programs have developed structures for monitoring and evaluating their graduates in aftercare. Furthermore, studies must be conducted to get a better understanding of recidivism and its relationship to the aftercare programs.

Roberta C. Cronin and Me Han, researchers of "Boot Camps for Adult and Juvenile Offenders: Overview and Update", recommended from findings that there should be an investment in the aftercare programs to capitalize

and preserve any gains made in boot camp. If a specialized aftercare program is not feasible, then they suggest that a strong relationship with aftercare services should be built. This will ensure that graduates who leave boot camps will have an individualized plan to follow up to see whether the plan is effective. Blair B. Bourque, Roberta C. Cronin Frank R. Pearson, Daniel B. Jelker, Mei Han, and Sarah M. Hill of the "Boot Camps for Juvenile Offenders: An Implementation Evaluation of Three Demonstration Programs", found that progress is possible, but these aftercare programs were affected by unexpected cuts in federal support, especially in Denver, Colorado and Mobile, Alabama. The programs were concerned with adjustments and improvements, which came to a close when the cuts were implemented.

#### **Why Choose the Herman Toulson Boot Camp Graduates?**

The Herman Toulson Boot Camp graduates were chosen because they represent a clear aftercare path. Logically, the boot camp graduates of the Pre Release Employment Program can be expected to have higher rates of employment because of the program.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

After Care programs, as it pertains to boot camps, can be defined as the services that are given to graduates after they have been released. These services may include supervision, counseling, education, training and/or any service that is considered to assist the released prisoner in his/her transition into the community. These graduates are typically nonviolent, young adult offenders (usually car thieves and drug dealers) serving their first sentence. Recently, Criminal Justice professionals have become interested in the role aftercare plays in offender success. Although there have been extensive studies on boot camps, there have been some effort to study the aftercare programs, but none have specifically concentrated on employment as it relates to training, recidivism, drug use, race, or curriculum.

There are many variables that affect the effectiveness of aftercare and the success of the graduates.

### Supervision

Most researchers have elevated their concentration on supervision. Cronin and Han (1993) reported to the National Institute of Justice that

California and New York are prime examples of this participation. In California, it was reported that graduates move to a sixty-day placement in a work furlough facility, which is followed by another 120 days of intensive parole supervision. Finally, a GAO report in 1993 indicated that Georgia boot camp participants are now assigned to intensive supervision for a minimum of three months, before receiving regular supervision. The New York program, which is referred to as shock parole, offers a two person parole officer team supervision for a caseload of thirty-eight parolees for six months. When this has been completed, they return to regular supervision. Their graduates also receive temporary residential placement for ninety days, educational/vocational training, employment assistance, relapse prevention, and peer group counseling are arranged through contracts with community agencies.

### Recidivism

Studies indicate that there is no compelling evidence that boot camp participants recidivate less than the groups with which evaluators have compared them (Mackenzie and Souryal, 1994) However, this may be the result of shortcomings in aftercare programs. For example, in Georgia, findings indicated that recidivism rates for boot camp graduates were significantly lower than offenders placed in prison or on intensive supervision. However, boot camp graduates did about the same as

offenders placed in diversion centers and much worse than those on regular probation (Cronin and Han, 1994). In Florida, findings indicated that 25.3 percent of the first 281 graduates of boot camp were returned to prison versus 27.8 percent of those in the comparison group. Rates of return for felonies were virtually identical, while boot camp graduates had a higher rate of return for misdemeanors and a lower rate of return for probation violations. (Cronin and Han, 1994). In Louisiana, findings indicated that 31 percent of boot camp graduates were no more likely to succeed on community supervision than a comparison group of parolees (percentage for comparison group were not given in the text). Approximately thirty eight percent were arrested at least once.

### Race

Race is another variable that may effect the success of the graduate in the aftercare program. Race is considered a subgroup of offenders. Cronin and Han (1994) asserted that subgroup information might assist program managers to develop better classification/eligibility criteria and refine policies. In addition, some researchers have compared recidivist and nonrecidivist among boot camp graduates. For example, South Carolina evaluators asserted that boot campers were more likely to be nonwhite (72 percent of graduates versus 63 percent of failures), and were less likely to

be drug offenders (32 percent graduates versus 18 percent of the failures).

In Florida; however, evaluators indicated that certain subgroups of boot camp inmates appeared to have recidivated less than others. These included those ages 16-17 at admission, those with sentences in the 2 to 3 year range, and whites. (Florida Department of Corrections, 1990).

Therefore, the lack of positive boot camp aftercare is related significantly to recidivism. As a result, many researchers suggest that supervision of boot camp aftercare should be enhanced.

Each state may apply a different aftercare philosophy to their program. "A National Survey of Aftercare Provisions for Boot Camp Graduates", a study conducted by Bourque, Han, and Hill (1996) researched thirteen specialized programs. Table 3 gives a breakdown of the characteristic of state aftercare programs. This study concluded that in order to adequately reinforce and monitor skills built during incarceration, intensive services should be employed, as well as intensive supervision.

#### The commission on African American Males

In Maryland, the Commission on African American males, in 1990, addressed problem areas of education, health care, employment, and criminal justice. Among the factors that rendered a challenge to the

commission was how racism effected these problem areas in the community. They concluded that in order to bring about a positive change in the current condition of African American males, there must be concentration effort to depart from "business as usual". While all of these problem areas may affect the aftercare of released prisoners of the Herman Toulson Boot Camp, the employment variable, as it relates to race, concluded that "independence through gainful employment is one of the most decisive factors in the capability of an individual and his family to live a peaceful and healthy life in our society. The ability to function in the workforce and in the labor market has an impact on families. Through their research, they found that many studies and reports revealed that racism does exist. It starts with the systematic neglect of African American children in our school systems; the lack of access to economic gains through employment and entrepreneurial opportunities; and the number of African American males who are seen in the criminal justice system. The results have led to family disintegration, illiteracy, negative media attention and economic inequalities. The commission found that African American males, particularly between the ages of 16-24, are now a higher risk of being employed than any other segment of American society. The National unemployment rate for all African American males indicated 13.7 percent

for January, 1992. Maryland, the unemployment rate of African American males indicated 9.6 percent.

The commission asserts that there is discrimination at all levels of employment. In 1991, the Urban Institute conducted an experiment to determine the level of discrimination in job hiring procedures. Their methodology included pairs of young African American and Caucasian males with similar backgrounds and qualifications to apply for 476 entry level jobs in Chicago and Washington, D.C. Their findings indicated that the white males were three times more likely to be employed before black males with a criminal record and found that an additional barrier was posed for gainful employment.

After carefully reviewing the problem, the United States General Accounting Office (GAO) reported that three important disparities affected the African American males as it pertained to employment. However, only two of those disparities pertained to the race variable. First, white participants received more classroom and on the job training than African Americans. Although African Americans were primarily given job search assistance, they also had the lowest average wage upon placement. Second, when both whites and blacks received classroom

training, African Americans were trained in occupations with lower median placement wages. As a result, the commission made the following recommendations:

Recommendation 1

“Develop new and extend current educational program that will prepare African Americans for employment and increase entrepreneurial awareness through public school curriculums from kindergarten through grade 12.”

Recommendation 2

“Develop new and increase current resources for African American business expansion in effected areas and increase the opportunities for new African American owned business.”

Recommendation 3

“Develop new and increase current resources and practices that would allow for the training and employment of more African American males in the private and public sectors.”

**Pre Release Employment Program  
(evaluation criteria)**

The Pre Release Employment Program recognizes that there are problems that create unemployment, such as lack of employment skills, limited education, and low self esteem. These barriers have been found to encourage criminal activity; but on the other hand, the criminal record creates an overwhelming barrier that prevents employment. As a result, the

government agencies combined resources to combat employment problems.

The Pre Release Employment Program, an entity of the aftercare program, is developed to desolve barriers that create employment.

The program is oriented by goals, objectives, and strategies, which are the following:

Goals

To pursue the development of expanded service delivery options exclusively, but not limited to a target group of exoffenders, disadvantaged black youth and "at risk" youth.

- Offer prevention barrier for persons who may have an inclination to pursue a path of criminal behavior, but have not reached that point.
- Development of an Employment Resource Center for individuals with multi barriers to employment opportunities.

Objectives

- Provide staffing, space requirements and equipment to house a staff of employees capable of performing educational assessments, employability profiles, and support services referrals to our target group.
- Develop a procedure for a support service referral network, which can link with other state agencies and services.
- Develop training initiatives that meet the capability our clients to the extent that they can be effectively trained in occupations, which can lead to career paths and economic self sufficiency.
- Institute an entrepreneurial training workshop component for those

- individuals who have expressed a desire to enter into a small business of their own.
- Develop a relationship with the Baltimore public school administrations and determine who are their "at risk" population.

Strategy

- To perform employment readiness training, a classroom must be available with sufficient room to house approximately 15-20 registrants at a time. Out side of the classroom there must be tables and phone banks available, modular work stations for staff and client for confidentiality, an area for self registration, an area must be set aside for resource materials with book shelves for magazines, periodicals, and videos.
- Assessment performed by the staff in an one on one encounter through the use of an approved questionnaire. Through the Mutual Agreement Program, PREP has provided the graduates the opportunity to remove tremendous barriers to gainful employment. It has been agreed that individuals who graduate from the boot camp program between the ages 17 and 21 without a high school diploma or GED must enroll in the Harbor City Learning Center. Once they have been accepted, they qualify to receive \$200.00 monthly.
- Staff must aggressively investigate and seek out training initiatives for our clients so that permanent linkages can be developed.

## METHODS

Since random assignment was not an option, the design selected to conduct this research is a quasi-experiment (Cook and Campbell, 1979). In the applicant's design, the experimental group consists of graduates of the Pre Release Employment Program and the control group consists of subjects who did not participate in the Pre Release Employment Program. The outcomes observed in both the experimental and control groups. Thus, the critical issue concerning this evaluation is whether or not the program produces desired levels of effect above what would have occurred either without the intervention or with an alternative intervention.

As part of the methodology, thirty participants were randomly selected from a sampling frame of graduates of the Pre Release Employment Program. These graduates were matched by relevant demographic characteristics to a control group consisting of offenders who completed the boot camp but did not participate in the Pre Release Employment Program. This helped to control for extraneous variables. The dependent variable of concern for this research is employment. Employment was operationalized as the acquisition of a job that pays wages. Additional dimensions of the dependent variable that were collected and measured for length of time employed, type of employment, whether the individual is employed full or part-time, and the length of time between

release and employment. A composite score for comparative and evaluative purposes will be derived from an index based on these dimensions. The independent variable for this assessment is participation in the Herman Toulson Boot Camp Pre Release Employment Program. It was anticipated that participation in the Pre Release Employment Program (independent variable) would influence employment rates and patterns (dependent variables).

The data for this study was obtained through a systematic analysis of the Herman Toulson Boot Camp records. The Maryland Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation (the agency heading the Pre Release Employment Program) and the Maryland Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services, Division of Parole and Probation gave the researcher approval to access the records required to conduct this evaluation. Data analyses included comparisons based on tabular presentations consisting of rates and percentages. In addition, appropriate inferential statistics, such as tests of significance were applied.

For this study, the researcher has attempted to meet the "Good Enough Rule" standard, which says that the best possible design from a methodological standpoint has been chosen taking into account the importance of the program, the feasibility of the design, and the probability

that the design will produce useful and credible results (Rossi and  
Freeman, 1993:220)

## RESULTS

The anticipation that the participants of the Pre Release Employment Program will influence employment rates and patterns was found to be inaccurate. According to the statistical analysis, findings indicated that there was no significant difference of rates of employment between those that participated in the Pre Release Employment Program and those that did not. **Table 1** provides a case summary of the participants of the Pre Release Employment Program and nonparticipants. **Table 2** provides the statistical analysis associated with the findings.

## RESEARCH ANALYSIS

The general framework of Parole and Probation has been structured to require the exoffender to report to the agent on a time specific bases.

The purpose is to maintain accurate records and to ensure that the stipulations in the exoffenders' parole/probationary period are being met.

This approach emphasizes supervision and in specifically, treatment (i.e. drug counseling, job counseling [Pre Release Employment Program], psychological counseling, and educational counseling). As a result of this program structure, data required to operationalize the study was obtained, but the hypothesized rationale to this study was found to be only affected by the length of employment among participants and nonparticipants.

Length of employment was found to be the most qualified indicator of whether the participant and nonparticipant obtained employment, in addition to providing months of job retention. The only requirement this study was suppose to meet was whether the subjects were employed or not. The weakness to include the type of employment was that it did not

matter what type of job the subject obtained, just so long as the subject was employed. Whether the subject was part time or full time did not have a barring because clearly if the research indicated such data, the subject was employed. Lastly, the length of time between release time and employment truly has no barring because there is no correlation between the employment and release time because an exoffender can be employed while he is incarcerated through the work release program.

Although this study was successful in determining the employment rates of participants and nonparticipants of the Pre Release Employment Program, It is asserted that this study can be perfected through further research by addressing factors, such as motivational issues (i.e. the desire to work, self esteem, and job incentives). The fact that the graduate has completed the job counseling program does not mean that he is motivated to work. Another means to perfect this study is through an analysis of the skills training programs that may be offered within the boot camps, and special programs, such as Youth Build and Home Builders Institutes' Project CRAFT. The industry, according to the Home Builders Institute, has indicated that there is a labor shortage in the building industry. As a result, efforts have been made to job place nontraditional employees, such as "at risk" populations, exoffenders, and women. In terms of the aftercare components, the subsequent study should seek to determine

whether there is a correlation among recidivism, employment, wages, and job retention. The assertion is that as wages and job retention increase the less likely recidivism will occur. This impact assessment, as pertains to the Pre Release Employment Program, recognized that there should have been some evidence that the graduates were in occupations that lead to career paths and economic sufficiency. During the data collection, findings indicated that the average wage was \$5.96. Clearly, this is an indication that the objectives in this perspective are not being met.

REFERENCES

- Cook, T.D. and Campbell, D.T. (1979) Quasi-Experimentation: Design and Analysis Issues for Field Settings. Skokie, IL: Rand McNally.
- Rossi, P.H. and Freeman, H.E. (1993) Evaluation: A Systematic Approach (5th Ed.) . Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Roberta C. Cronin and Mei Han, Boot Camps for Adult and Juvenile Offenders: Overview and Update. Rockville, Maryland: National Institute of Justice, 1994.
- Blair B. Bourque and others, eds., Boot Camps for Juvenile Offenders: An Implementation Evaluation of Three Demonstration Programs. Rockville, Maryland: National Institute of Justice, 1996.
- Blair B. Bourque, Mei Han, and Sarah M. Hill, A National Survey of Aftercare Provisions for Boot Camp Graduates. Rockville, Maryland: National Institute of Justice, 1996.
- Report of the Governor's Commission on Black Males, June, 1993.
- Styles, Gregory t., Pre Release Employment Program. Baltimore, Maryland , 1991.

(Table 1)

<b>Case Summary of Participants</b>		<b>Case Summary of Nonparticipants</b>	
<u>Case Number</u>	<u>Length of Employment</u>	<u>Case Number</u>	<u>Length of</u>
	<u>Employment</u>		
1	6.00	1	0
2	0	2	0
3	8.00	3	5.00
4	39.00	4	0
5	12.00	5	0
6	0	6	5.00
7	2.00	7	10.00
8	18.00	8	2.00
9	0	9	3.00
10	41.00	10	0
11	72.00	11	4.00
12	12.00	12	36.00
13	36.00	13	3.00
14	2.00	14	12.00
15	30.00	15	6.00
16	60.00	16	1.00
17	24.00	17	15.00
18	72.00	18	0
19	48.00	19	0
20	0	20	5.00
21	12.00	21	24.00
22	0	22	1.00
23	0	23	0
24	12.00	24	0
25	0	25	4.00
26	18.00	26	0
27	24.00	27	0
28	0	28	27.00
29	5.00	29	1.00
<u>30</u>	<u>1.00</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>0</u>
<b>Total = N</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>Total = N</b>	<b>17</b>

Note: Length of employment indicates the number of months employed. 0 indicates that the subject was not employed.

(Table 2)

	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Error of the Mean
Participants	21.5634	18.4667	4.0042
Nonparticipants	8.8345	5.4667	1.6405

## T-Test

Value of the T-Test	Standard Error of Difference
-3.004	4.3273

Note: The probability value is less than .05 showing that there is no significant difference between the participants and nonparticipants.

(Table 3)

**"A NATIONAL SURVEY OF AFTER CARE  
PROVISIONS FOR BOOT CAMP GRADUATES"**

<b>STATE</b>	<b>SUPERVISION</b>	<b>SELF DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>NO. OF PAROLE OFFICERS</b>
<b>New York</b>	random urinalysis curfew checks employment home visits	job placement, employment counsel vocational testing on the job training	<b>2 person parole officers</b>
<b>Minnesota</b>	direct supervision random contact random phone calls random drug test	employment referral job training program therapy/training acupuncture, cognitive, chemical	<b>14 person parole officers</b>
<b>Maryland</b>	handled by parole and probation	employment training employment assist support groups community service drug abuse training counseling sessions mentoring program	<b>2 person parole officers</b>
<b>Arizona</b>	intensive probation 90 house arrest report twice a week required to work 40 hours of community service	educational classes family counseling recreational activities physical training	<b>unknown</b>
<b>Michigan</b>	intensive/regular	work detail community service physical training educational/drug abuse/vocational programs	<b>unknown</b>
<b>Ohio</b>	intermediate transitional detention	drug abuse counseling educational testing employment service life of skills program	<b>unknown</b>
<b>New Hampshire</b>	90 intensive supervision standard supervision	substance abuse counseling	<b>unknown</b>
<b>Texas</b>			
Travis County	routine supervision	work release	<b>unknown</b>
Hidalgo County	unknown	counseling/vocation/ mentoring	<b>unknown</b>
Harris County	unknown	counseling	<b>unknown</b>

# **FINAL PROGRESS REPORT**

---

RE: GRANT # 97-IJ-CX-0037  
“ AN IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF THE  
PRE RELEASE EMPLOYMENT  
PROGRAM, GRADUATES OF THE  
HERMAN TOULSON BOOT CAMP  
VERSUS  
NONPARTICIPANTS,  
GRADUATES OF THE HERMAN  
TOULSON BOOT CAMP”

**FINAL  
PROGRESS REPORT**

**June 1, 1998 – June 31, 1998**

**Director/Investigator:** Sherrise Y. Truesdale

**College:** Coppin State College, 2500 W. North Ave., Baltimore, MD 21216

Contact person: Sherrise Y. Truesdale

Phone (410) 235-7341 Fax (410) 383-2918

**Re:** Grant #97-IJ-CX-0037 "Analysis of Post Prison Employment of the Herman Toulson Boot Camp Graduates, Participants of the Pre Release Employment Program vs. Nonparticipants.

---

The impact assessment of the Pre Release Employment Program, graduates of the Herman Toulson Boot Camp versus nonparticipants, graduates of the Herman Toulson Boot Camp has been completed and final goals have been accomplished.

The purpose of the research is to conduct a pseudo-experimental study of the Herman Toulson Boot Camp graduates. The study seeks to evaluate the effectiveness of the Pre Release Employment Program by calculating the employment rates of participants to nonparticipants. The control group and the experimental group have been successfully matched demographically to control for extraneous variables.

The following subsections give a narrative of the schedule grant activities, the anticipated changes, the problem areas, the identification of data source, the schedule of major meetings, and the financial report.

**Schedule of Grant Activities**

**June through July**

During the month of June and July, data from the Pre Release Employment Program was collected and statistically analyzed for final drafting of the grant. The data was input into the SPSS system to calculate required statistics (T-Test, standard deviation, mean, and standard error of the mean). Final draft has been completed. Included are one original and two copies binded for NIJ; and the high density 3.5 disk loaded with the grant draft and statistics (table 1, table 2 are applicable to the statistical analysis). Funds for the grant

were not depleted; \$506.00 remains in the budget and is being returned to NIJ. The anticipated cost for the computers was slightly over estimated; the school was able to get a reduced price on the computer that saved the grant operating expense. The school is required to get the best computer at the most reasonable cost. In addition, the insurance amount was less than needed because the amount was calculated on a yearly bases for running the grant. Since the grant ended before December, the amount needed was less than what was allocated.

#### **Anticipated Change**

There have been no changes to the project objectives, staffing, budget, nor location.

#### **Resolution of the Problem Areas**

All the required data to operationalize the study was successfully obtained from the Pre Release Employment Program files, Parole and Probation, and the Maryland Department of Labor.

#### **Data Source Identification**

- Maryland Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services, Division of Parole and Probation, 2100 Guildford Ave., Baltimore, MD 21218
- Pre Release Employment Program, 2100 Guildford Ave., Baltimore, MD 21218
- Maryland Department of Labor, 1100 N. Eutaw Street, Baltimore, MD 21201

#### **Schedule of Major Meetings**

For the month of August, a final copy of the study will be distributed to the Maryland Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services, Parole and Probation as required under contract. If a meeting is required to discuss any findings, I will be notified when receipt of the copy has been made.

#### **Financial Report** (See Attachment)

Coppin State College  
2500 W. North Ave.  
Baltimore, Maryland 21216  
Grant # 97-IJ-CX-0037

---

**FINAL  
FINANCIAL REPORT  
6/01/98 – 7/31/98**

<b>Category</b>	<b>Budget Amount</b>	<b>Monthly Expenses</b>	<b>Balance Forward</b>
Income	10,000.00	10,000.00	
Insurance	1,332.00	<u>880.00</u>	
<b>Technical and Special Fees</b>		<b>10,880.00</b>	<b>452.00</b>
Contractual Service	1,352.00	1,352.00	
Supplies/Material	167.00	167.00	
Equipment	<u>2,149.00</u>	<u>2,095.00</u>	
<b>Operating Expenses</b>		<b><u>3,614.00</u></b>	<b>54.00</b>
<b>Total Project Year (quarterly budget)</b>	<b><u>15,000.00</u></b>	<b><u>14,494.00</u></b>	<b><u>506.00</u></b>

PROPERTY OF  
National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS)  
Box 6000  
Rockville, MD 20849-6000