

National Evaluation Program Phase 1

RESIDENTIAL INMATE AFTER-CARE THE STATE OF THE ART

SINGLE HALFWAY HOUSE EVALUATION MODEL

MARCH 1976

PROGRAM OF THE STUDY OF CARE AND DELINQUENCY

COLLEGE OF ADMINISTRATIVE SCIENCE
SCHOOL OF U.S. LIFE ADAPTATION



RETURN TO:
NCIRS
P.O. BOX 24036 S.W. POST OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024

LOAN DOCUMENT

36382 C.5

PROGRAM FOR THE STUDY OF CRIME AND DELINQUENCY
The Ohio State University
1314 Kinnear Road
Columbus, Ohio 43212

Harry E. Allen, Ph.D.
Director

* *

Principal Authors

Richard P. Seiter, Ph.D., Project Director

Eric W. Carlson, M.S.

Helen H. Bowman, M.A.

James J. Grandfield, ACSW

Nancy J. Beran, Ph.D.

PROGRAM FOR THE STUDY OF CRIME AND DELINQUENCY
The Ohio State University
1314 Kinnear Road
Columbus, Ohio 43212

Harry E. Allen, Ph.D.
Director

* * * * *

Principal Authors

Richard P. Seiter, Ph.D., Project Director

Eric W. Carlson, M.S.

Helen H. Bowman, M.A.

James J. Grandfield, ACSW

Nancy J. Beran, Ph.D.

NC

SEP 9 1976

ACSW

This study was supported by grant #76NI-99-0015 from the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, United States Department of Justice. Such support does not necessarily indicate concurrence with the contents of this report.

NATIONAL EVALUATION PROGRAM

PHASE I

SINGLE HALFWAY HOUSE EVALUATION MODEL

March 1976

NATIONAL EVALUATION PROGRAM

PHASE I

RESIDENTIAL INMATE AFTERCARE:
THE STATE OF THE ART

Project Staff

Christopher Auth

George Kaitza

Israel Barak

Susan Lowe

Linda Bennett

Franklin Marshall

Martha Brediger

Evalyn Parks

Maurice Breslin

Candace Peters

Josephine Ann Colli

Doretta Petree

William Cooper

Norma Price

Brenda Davidson

Rose Ann Stern

Jeannette Edgington

Geri Trecker

Bonnie Hope

Gennaro Vito

William Ivoska

SINGLE HALFWAY HOUSE EVALUATION MODEL

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Needs Assessment	4
Program Completion	6
Correlational Analysis	7
Programatic Activity Evaluation	8
Cost Effectiveness	12
Follow-up Assessment	13
Outcome Comparison	15
Resident Evaluation	16
Outside Consultant	17
Evaluation Materials	17
Conclusion	18
 Appendices	
A. Resident Needs Assessment	20
B. Subjective Assessment of Resident Progress	22
C. Resident Background Variables	24
D. A Measure of Relative Adjustment	28
 Footnotes	 33

SINGLE HALFWAY HOUSE EVALUATION MODEL

This section presents evaluation procedures which can be utilized by individual halfway houses. Procedures have been designed to provide relevant data to program managers, and still be readily implemented by the halfway house staff.

Evaluation procedures referred to in this model are generally those which measure the effectiveness of a program in terms of the stated goals of the halfway house. The results of these evaluation procedures should then be used to make policy decisions and to improve or modify the existing program.¹ The criteria used to judge the effectiveness of the program will vary depending upon the focus of the evaluation. Procedures can focus upon overall goals, sub-goals, intermediate objectives or programmatic activities, as well as the assumptions linking activities and objectives. These are elaborated upon in detail in the "analytical framework" in Volume I of the Phase I National Evaluation Project entitled, Residential Inmate Aftercare: The State of the Art. This framework delineates and assesses the linking of goals, sub-goals, objectives and activities with the appropriate assumptions. Figure 1 illustrates the hierarchy of the aforementioned framework as well as the specific programmatic objectives of halfway houses.

Halfway houses should be evaluating the effectiveness of their programs and using the results of such evaluative efforts to modify and improve their program and policies. State Planning Agencies (SPA) should encourage and facilitate evaluation efforts by local halfway houses. The SPA's should

Needs Assessment

A needs assessment for each resident should be conducted prior to, or immediately upon, entrance into the halfway house. The framework for evaluation indicates some of the programmatic activities of halfway houses which closely correspond to the needs of residents. Consequently, needs can be identified according to the following sample categories.

1. Employment
2. Education
3. Financial self-reliance
4. Family relationships
5. Interpersonal relationships
6. Self-image
7. Drug or alcohol dependence
8. Leisure time activities
9. Physical disabilities
10. Security

A more detailed breakdown of each of these needs assessment categories can be found in Appendix A. The basic needs of clothing, transportation, housing and meals are assumed to be provided uniformly for all residents and, thus, are not essential to an individual needs assessment. Halfway house staff should develop its own needs assessment form, similar to that of Appendix A, to be administered to the resident. The degree of each need should be quantified; for example, one could indicate the extent of each need by using the following scale:

0	1, 2, 3	4, 5, 6	7, 8, 9
No need	Minimum Need	Moderate Need	Maximum Need

Also, the extent of and circumstances surrounding the need should be descriptively enumerated. Following the needs assessment, specific goals can be developed for each resident within the halfway house program. Generally, these goals should be formulated from the needs identified by the needs assessment and include general program goals. A statement of these goals should be developed by staff and resident and agreed upon by the resident. A contract between the staff and resident should be developed which specifies the goals toward which the resident will be striving. Many goals can be operationalized and quantified to enable measurement of progress towards attainment of the goals. Community mental health centers are using a method called Goal Attainment Scaling² which is used to define and measure goals in behavioral terms within a given time period. It is recommended that a similar method be used in the halfway houses. In its simplest form, the problems or needs should be defined, followed by a statement of a goal to be working toward for a given period of time. The goal should be behaviorally defined to enable measurement. An example is listed below.

<u>Need</u>	<u>Long Range Goal</u>	<u>Intermediate Goal (time frame: two weeks)</u>
Job Placement	Secure permanent job	Visit employment office. Go for three interviews.

It is valuable to develop several objectives for each need; including, as appropriate, an overall goal, immediate behavioral objective(s), and attitudinal objective(s). At this point, it has been found that the development of a contract between the resident and staff can be useful in facilitating a specific commitment on the part of the resident and staff.

Progress toward these objectives and reassessment of needs should be reviewed and the objectives modified at specific intervals. Subjective assessments by staff and residents (some programs involve the other residents) can be conducted periodically to measure individual progress, especially non-quantifiable progress, e.g., attitudinal objectives. One example of a subjective assessment can be found in Appendix B.

Prior to the resident's exit from the program, a final assessment of needs, progress toward the achievement of individual goals and the identification of post release goals should be undertaken. A comparison of the needs assessment ratings at the entrance and exit of the resident should be conducted as a measure of the ability of the house to meet the resident's needs. A quantifiable measure of the resident's progress toward his goals is available through the goal attainment scaling procedure. Additionally, the subjective assessments offer a means of assessing the resident's progress and success within the program.

Program Completion

Generally, the data should be collected by halfway houses to determine the percentages of program completers and non-completers for specific time periods. The criteria for program completion should be identified and made explicit. For example, program completion may involve the resident's satisfactorily meeting all the goals defined for him within the specified time and being released into the community. Non-completion reasons (generally defined as failure) commonly include: (1) arrest; (2) non-adjustment to program; (3) escape or abscond; and (4) neutral or medical.

Correlational Analyses

Background variables should be collected for all residents. This information can be used to statistically determine correlations between these variables and program completion or non-completion, as well as reintegration into the community. Moreover, the differential information resulting from correlational analyses can be used to modify and improve the program. It may be possible to identify types of residents which respond well to a halfway house program. For instance, previous research suggests that significant relationships exist between program completion (or success) as well as successful reintegration and such variables as education, intelligence, marriage, sex, age, employment skills, history of drug or alcohol problems, community ties, length of time at the halfway house, history of psychiatric treatment, age at beginning of criminal career, number of prior incarcerations and type and length of criminal record.³

Some categories of background variables include (1) commitment variables, (2) release variables, (3) personal background variables, (4) criminal history variables and (5) halfway house variables.⁴ An operationalization of each of these categories of variables can be found in Appendix C. This operationalization is considerably involved and can be condensed.

Program staff can determine background variables which will be collected based upon available resources for collecting and analyzing the data as well as utilizing the results. However, the importance of certain variables, as noted above, warrants the necessity for their inclusion in the data collection and analysis. Multivariate analyses

can be used to determine correlations between program completion, reintegration and the aforementioned variables. The discovery of positive correlations between specific variables and program completion or successful reintegration may result in modification or change in programmatic or policy activities to best utilize such information. For example, it may be determined that those who are employed while in the program are more likely to successfully complete the program, and more likely to remain employed and successfully adjust to the community upon release from the program. Such information would then spur the halfway house to increase employment-related activities.

Programmatic Activity Evaluation

Evaluation of each of the intermediate objectives (which includes treatment activities) as denoted in Figure 1 involves measurement of activities which can then be compared to the objective linked to each of those activities. Some measurements were suggested in Volume I, Chapter 3 of the National Evaluation Project entitled Residential Inmate Aftercare: The State of the Art. Because so little has been done to measure the accomplishment of intermediate objectives of halfway houses, the development of indicators for measurement has been based upon the knowledge and experience gained through this study. Survey data collected from a large sample of halfway houses, along with consultation experiences, and volumes of theoretical as well as evaluative information on halfway houses, have served as guides to the development of multiple indicators for the intermediate objectives of halfway houses.

Employment of the offender is the first identified intermediate objective. Aside from interpersonal counseling, more effort has been spent on employment-related activities than any other activity, and staff define

employment as a top priority. Quantifiably, the percentage of residents employed or enrolled in vocational training serves as one indicator. Also, the number of job assists or interviews secured by the staff for residents can be used as a measure. In terms of quality, it is important to determine if the resident enjoys and is satisfied with his job, if he can support himself and family with the job and what prospects for promotion or permanency exist. Outcome measures for this activity include assessments of job satisfaction, length of employment, number of jobs held since release, income and changes in income. Outcome measures should be compiled for a similar group not experiencing the halfway house program in order to determine the effectiveness of house programmatic activities upon the adjustment of former residents in the community.

Educational activities are generally measured in terms of an increase in the educational level of the resident. Of consequence are the secondary effects of education upon the resident's ability to secure employment, improve his attitude and increase his self confidence.

Financial self-reliance is another activity frequently considered important for residents. Measurement of this activity can include determination of the level of savings and incomes. Budgeting and consumer skills should also be assessed. Loan repayment records can serve as a measure for those residents with debts. It was stated in the framework that financial self-reliance outside of the house should be defined as the former resident's ability to support himself and his dependents without resorting to criminal behavior, charity, welfare or excessive indebtedness. This ability is dependent upon legitimate steady employment and adequate income. Legitimate steady employment is defined as a

permanent full-time job extending at least three years into the future.

Adequate income can be defined as that which can support a minimum standard of living as defined by the Bureau of Labor statistics.

Measurement of activities involving the resident's relationship with his family are difficult to develop. Family relationships can vary tremendously for each individual and require a diversity of activities. Thus, this variable can best be measured in terms of the individual. The needs of the individual resident should be assessed and goals determined. The effectiveness of programmatic activities will largely be measured in terms of the resident's progress toward his goals. The number of counseling sessions attended or interactions with family can be quantifiable measures of the resident's family relationship.

The same measurement problem exists with assessing improvement of the resident's interpersonal relationships. Essentially, the best measurement process concerns the achievement of individualized short-term objectives. Also, measurement of counseling sessions, crisis interventions, request for assistance and critical incidents can supply information upon which to assess activities related to improving the resident's interpersonal relationships.

Measurement of the activities designed to improve the resident's self-concept include the number of counseling sessions, rating of physical appearance, number of reward situations and participation within the house milieu. Also, pre- and post-treatment self-concept measures abound and can be used.

Reduction of the resident's dependence on drugs and alcohol is generally measured by determining the number of incidents of drug or alcohol abuse while at the house and, ideally, during a long-term follow-up.

Leisure time activities constitute an area which halfway houses have been relatively vague in stating their objectives, which has resulted in a lack of measurement. Recreation counseling sessions can be measured, as well as the utilization of in-house recreational facilities and participation in outside recreational activities.

The suitability of community placement would generally depend upon the particular resident and his specific needs. An assessment of the suitability can be made soon after the resident has moved to the residence.

Physical disability services also depend upon the needs of the resident. An assessment of satisfaction of the needs is the best measure for this variable. Obtaining glasses for a resident with poor eyesight would be an example of a measure of the effectiveness of activities supplying the needs of residents.

In-house security can be measured in terms of the number and seriousness of behavior incidents within the house, as well as the number of residents dropped from the program for breaking security rules. These can be compared with the house goals for security, or with general increases or decreases in security over time.

Community security is measured in terms of incidents committed by residents in the community. Such incidents may be reported by others or by the residents themselves. The number of residents dropped from the program because of misbehavior in the community is perhaps the most often used.

The suitability of program physical facility must be measured in terms of the requirements of the program. It should be determined if the house is large enough for programmatic activities, is accessible to jobs and services, and provides a satisfactory living environment. Generally

accepted standards and guidelines regarding the physical facility are also in existence.⁵

The preceding section focused upon multiple indicators to be used in measuring some of the intermediate objectives of a halfway house program. Focus has been on the program objectives, directly affecting resident behavior. In general, many of the indicators can be quantified in terms of frequencies of occurrence. However, some indicators involve subjective assessments, necessitating the development of survey or rating instruments. These measurement guidelines should provide useful information to the practitioner for gathering data and implementing evaluative procedures for the assessment of the intermediate objectives of a halfway house.

Cost Effectiveness

The comparative cost of social programs is an issue of considerable importance. Halfway houses should determine the money spent on each programmatic activity, and compare these data to the evaluation of those activities to determine if any reallocation of monies would have any relative effect on the program success. Also the cost per man per day and occupancy rates should be calculated periodically to analyze patterns and to enable comparisons with alternative programs. If possible, cost-benefit analyses should be conducted.

Defining the benefits of a halfway house in monetary terms is quite difficult. It is generally agreed that the house is more humane when compared to institutionalizations, but quantifiable benefits are usually desired by funding sources and policymakers. Examples of benefits which can be quantified are as follows:

1. Money earned by resident

2. Financial support of family (eliminating the need for welfare dependence)
3. Taxes paid by the resident
4. Room and board paid by the resident
5. Savings accumulated by resident
6. Restitution or payment of fines.

These benefits can be combined with the cost of operating the halfway house and compared to the cost-benefit of institutions and other alternatives.

Follow-Up Assessment

Post-program performance of former residents should be assessed periodically to determine the effects of programmatic activities upon the resident's adjustment in the community. Follow-up measures should correspond to the needs assessments and activities provided while the resident was at the house. The employment adjustment of residents could be measured in terms of the percent of time employed during the follow-up period, quality of the job, satisfaction of the individual with the job, income, income change and performance on the job. Education could be measured in terms of enrollment in or graduation from educational or vocational courses as well as an assessment of the retention or improvement of educational skills.

Financial self-reliance could be measured in terms of employment, income, savings, budgeting and consumer skills retention and utilization, loan repayment, and consistency in supporting self and family at a minimum standard of living. Stable family relationships would have to be subjectively assessed through the former resident and his family. Stable and socially acceptable patterns of interpersonal relationships would also require subjective assessment by talking to the former resident and his employer, parole or probation officer, and friends. Positive self

image can be measured again by attitudinal survey if this measure was used at the house. Self-image could also be subjectively assessed by family friends, employer and parole or probation officer. A decrease or total lack of dependence on drugs or alcohol could be indicated through crime tests or by reports from family or parole and probation officers. Socially acceptable leisure time activities can be determined through discussion with the former resident and associates as well as with local recreational programs, if applicable. These general adjustment indicators can be collected by parole or probation officers or by personal follow-up inquiries at the house. Mailed self-reporting questionnaires may also be useful.

The absences of criminal behavior would be measured by the number of criminal behavior incidences exhibited by the former resident. This can be determined through the parole or probation officer, criminal justice system records, the individual and his associates. Both the severity and frequency of such incidences should be tabulated.

It is recommended that a follow-up study of former residents involve the collection of specific data for the individual (1) while at the halfway house, (2) six months after release from the house, (3) twelve months after release and (4) twenty-four months after release. It is informative to determine the relatively immediate effect (or non-effect) of the program upon the individuals' adjustment to the community (thus, the use of a six-month time period). Research results have varied concerning the longitudinal effects of correctional programs, indicating a need for subsequent period of assessment following the six-month period (thus, the twelve and twenty-four month follow-up periods).

Follow-up data on former residents can be compared across time periods to determine patterns of adjustment or compared to pre-determined expectations (or goals) of how the former residents will adjust. For example, based upon the halfway house program, it may be expected that 75 percent of the former residents of the house will have maintained their original job at the end of the six-month period. Thus the actual percentage maintaining their job can be compared with the above goal and a conclusion drawn concerning the results. These goals should be set down and quantified prior to the follow-up. The basis for the development of these goals is dependent upon the program and the prognosis determined by the house.

Outcome Comparison

It is important to gather evaluative data to draw valid and reliable conclusions regarding the impact of residential inmate after-care programs upon an individual's reintegration into the community. Thus, experimental data should be collected which will measure the outcome of the program and services in relation to stated goals and objectives. The overall goal of halfway houses as defined by this study is

To assist in the reintegration of ex-offenders by increasing their ability to function in a socially acceptable manner and reducing their reliance on criminal behavior.

The measurement of the attainment of this goal is generally undertaken by an assessment of socially acceptable behaviors exhibited by former residents and by a reduction in criminal behavior. Confidence in the results of such measurements is increased through the use of a comparison group.

The kind of data to be collected is delineated quite explicitly in a study of Ohio halfway houses.⁶ This study utilized an outcome measure termed "Relative Adjustment." This measure (see Appendix D) is based upon a criminal behavior index (a frequency and severity scale) and an acceptable behavior index (emphasizing employment and education status, financial stability, participation in self-improvement programs and satisfactory movement through parole or probation supervision). These two indices together assess the reintegration goal of halfway houses. Collection of the data required by these indices will involve contact with the former resident, parole or probation officers, employers, family, friends, community agencies, and criminal justice system agencies. Here again, it is recommended that the data be collected at six, twelve and twenty-four month intervals for both groups.

The selection of a non-randomized comparison group involves the determination of a group of individuals comparable to the halfway house group but not receiving the halfway house experience. Commonly, a group of parolees is selected who were paroled from the institution during the same period as the residents were released from the halfway house. The relative adjustment data should be collected for the comparison group and statistically compared to data collected from the halfway house group. The results indicate if there is a statistically significant difference in the relative adjustment of halfway house residents compared to a comparison group of individuals.

Resident Evaluation

Several programs find that some of their most beneficial feedback is from a resident evaluation of the program. Simple open-ended questions

such as "What are the best and worst things about the program?" and "What would you do to improve the program?" can be asked in an exit survey. These subjective assessments by residents identify problems that are often quite simple to resolve, but may have an important effect on house operations.

Outside Consultant

At times, it may be beneficial for an outside consultant to conduct a subjective and descriptive assessment of the halfway house program and operation. Someone with an administrative or treatment background in corrections with direct knowledge about residential inmate aftercare programs should be utilized. The assessment could involve review of relevant records and documents; interviews with staff, residents, and former residents, associated community agency personnel, relevant criminal justice personnel, board members and community residents; on-site observation of programmatic activities and procedures; and discussion with staff concerning questions which arise. The objectivity of an outside evaluator is important for uncovering patterns and problems nearly impossible to discover when the evaluator is a member of the staff. The outside consultant should provide a written report which appraises the various programmatic activities, policies, relationships with community agencies and the criminal justice system, and operation of the halfway houses (both positive and negative observation are important here). Then, recommendations should be suggested for changes or modifications.

Evaluation Materials

There are presently several publications regarding evaluation in general and specifically, evaluation of social programs. Some of those

which have been found to be informative and relevant are listed below:

1. Weiss, Carol H. Evaluative Research: Methods of Assessing Program Effectiveness. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1972.
2. Suchman, Edward A., Evaluative Research: Principles and Practice in Public Service and Social Action Program, New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1968.
3. Glaser, Daniel. Routinizing Evaluation: Getting Feedback on Effectiveness of Crime and Delinquency Programs. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1973.
4. Seiter, Richard P. Evaluation Research as a Feedback Mechanism for Criminal Justice Policy Making. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1975.
5. Evaluation: A Forum for Human Service Decision-Makers (magazine), 501 South Park Avenue, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55415.
6. Handbook of Evaluation Research. Elmer Streuning and Marcia Guttentag (eds.) Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1975.
7. Kirby, Bernard C. Crofton House Final Report, San Diego State College, San Diego, California, June 1970.
8. Vasoli, Robert H. and Faney, Frank J., "Halfway House for Reformatory Releasees." Crime and Delinquency, Vol. 16 (July 1970) pp. 292-304.
9. Warren, Marguerite Q. Community Corrections: For Whom, When, and Under What Circumstances? School of Criminal Justice, State University of New York at Albany, 1973.
10. Wilkins, Leslie T., "A Survey of the Field from the Standpoint of Facts and Figures," in Effectiveness of Punishment and Other Measures of Treatment. Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 1967.
11. Savitz, Leonard D. A Critique of Research Reports Relevant to Failure on Release. Department of Sociology, Temple University.
12. Thalheimer, Donald J. Cost Analysis of Correctional Standards: Halfway Houses. Standards and Goals Project, Correctional Economics Center of the American Bar Association, Washington, D.C., 1975.
13. Adams, Stuart. Evaluative Research in Corrections: A Practical Guide. U.S. Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, March 1975.

Conclusion

This report is designed to provide staff or residential inmate aftercare programs with evaluative strategies and procedures for assessing the efforts, effect and efficiency of their programs. Strategies have focused upon overall goals, sub-goals and intermediate objectives of halfway house programs as well as the assumptions linking the framework together. An effort was made to simplify the methodologies and procedures to facilitate relatively easy application and use of evaluation in halfway house programs. It is emphasized that the results of evaluation efforts are only valuable when they are utilized in making decisions about the future program or policy of the halfway house.

APPENDIX A
RESIDENT NEEDS ASSESSMENT

1. Employment
 - a. Is vocational testing needed?
 - b. Is vocational counseling needed?
 - c. Is vocational training needed?
 - d. Is job counseling needed?
 - e. Are job hunting and interview skills needed?
 - f. Is job placement assistance needed?
2. Education
 - a. Is educational testing needed?
 - b. Is educational training needed?
 - c. Is educational placement assistance needed?
3. Financial self-reliance
 - a. Is a mandatory savings account needed?
 - b. Is control of the resident's expenditures required?
 - c. Are budgeting skills needed?
 - d. Is consumer education needed?
 - e. Are a loan and information about getting a loan needed?
 - f. Are work-related activities at the house needed?
4. Family relationships
 - a. Is family counseling needed?
 - b. Are parent role skills needed?
 - c. Is individual counseling needed?
 - d. Is group counseling needed?

5. Interpersonal relationships
 - a. Is individual counseling needed?
 - b. Is group counseling needed?
 - c. Is crisis intervention counseling needed?
6. Self-image
 - a. Is individual counseling needed?
 - b. Is group counseling needed?
 - c. Are clothing and grooming skills needed?
 - d. Are community mental health services needed?
7. Drug or alcohol dependence
 - a. Is individual counseling needed?
 - b. Is group counseling needed?
 - c. Is community drug treatment needed?
 - d. Is community alcohol treatment needed?
8. Leisure time activities
 - a. Is individual counseling needed?
 - b. Is group counseling needed?
 - c. Are recreational skills needed?
 - d. Are organized recreational activities needed?
9. Physical disabilities
 - a. Is medical care needed?
 - b. Is dental care needed?
 - c. Is physical rehabilitation needed?
 - d. Is counseling needed?
10. Security
 - a. Are special security measures or restrictions needed?
 - b. Is counseling needed?

APPENDIX B*

SUBJECTIVE ASSESSMENT OF RESIDENT PROGRESS

Resident _____

The purpose of this evaluation is to evaluate the individual resident's progress in certain areas. These evaluations are conducted each week by staff and resident.

EXPLANATION OF TERMS:

Self-esteem: The individual's feelings of self-worth and value.

Perception of Reality: The individual's ability to determine the appropriateness of his behavior in any given situation, irrespective of conscience.

Interpersonal Relationships with Residents and Staff: The level at which the individual relates to people involved with the halfway house on a day-to-day basis.

Interpersonal Relationships with Non-Residents: The level at which the individual functions in relationships with people not involved with the halfway house on a day-to-day basis.

Interpersonal Heterosexual Relationships: The ability of the individual to function in all levels of interpersonal relationships with members of the opposite sex. The relationship may be casual, friendship, romantic, marriage or otherwise. In most cases we consider this an extremely important aspect of rehabilitation.

Conscience: Effectiveness of the mechanism by which an individual experiences appropriate feelings of guilt coincident with inappropriate behavior.

Group Involvement - Working on Self: Individual's receptiveness in group counseling when working on his own behavior.

Group Involvement - Working on Others: Individual's involvement in group counseling when working on the behavior of others.

Response to One-to-One Counseling: Individual's response and cooperative effort in one-and-one counseling with staff members.

Honesty: The degree or extent to which the individual has acquired an honest foundation. This is an important aspect of counseling.

Reliability: The degree to which the individual can be depended on to fulfill basic expected responsibilities.

Overall Progress in Program: Extent to which the individual seems to be progressing in the program.

*This form was adopted from one used by Alpha House, Inc., 2712 Fremont Avenue South, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55807.

SELF-ESTEEM		PROGRESS TOWARD QUANTIFIABLE GOALS	
PERCEPTION OF REALITY		<p>Scale</p> <p>1 - poor</p> <p>2 - fair</p> <p>3 - poor or fair but showing good progress</p> <p>4 - acceptable</p> <p>5 - good</p> <p>6 - excellent</p> <p>NA: does not apply to individual at this time</p>	<p>NOTE*</p> <p>An individual may experience fluctuations in progress; consequently, an occasional setback may be expected to occur from time to time.</p>
INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH RESIDENTS			
INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH NON-RESIDENTS			
INTERPERSONAL HETEROSEXUAL RELATIONSHIPS			
CONSCIENCE			
GROUP INVOLVEMENT WORKING ON SELF			
GROUP INVOLVEMENT WORKING ON SELF			
GROUP INVOLVEMENT WORKING ON OTHERS			
RESPONSE TO ONE-TO-ONE COUNSELING			
HONESTY			
RELIABILITY		<p>Length of time at house</p> <p>_____</p>	
OVERALL PROGRESS IN THE PROGRAM			

Comments: _____

Name: _____ Date: _____

APPENDIX C
RESIDENT BACKGROUND VARIABLES

1. Commitment Variables

- a. Type of institution of original commitment
- b. Age at commitment
- c. Present Offense (most serious charge)
 - (1) Offenses against the person
 - (2) Sex offenses
 - (3) Crimes against property
 - (4) Other
- d. Number of charges involved in present offense.
 - (1) The total number of charges involved in the present commitment. For example, if an individual is committed for burglary, arson and assault, three charges are recorded. Charges should not be confused with counts. An individual may be committed on 16 counts for the single charge of burglary.
- e. Type of sentence
 - (1) Simple - one sentence is being served.
 - (2) Concurrent - more than one sentence is being served (all served coterminous)
 - (3) Aggregate - more than one sentence is being served but the sentences are added together and not served coterminous.
 - (4) Forthwith - a sentence which supercedes an existing sentence.
 - (5) From and After - a sentence which began after an individual had been released from an existing sentence.

2. Personal background variables.

- a. Race
- b. Marital status

c. Military service

- (1) None
- (2) Honorable discharge
- (3) Dishonorable discharge
- (4) Bad conduct discharge, other than honorable, general, undesirable
- (5) Medical
- (6) In Armed Service, but the type of discharge is not listed on the booking sheet

d. Occupational field

- (1) Professional - (e.g., lawyers, doctors, engineers, clergy)
- (2) Business/Managerial - ownership of management of a business valued at \$10,000 or more.
- (3) Clerical/Sales - (e.g., sales managers, life insurance sales, bookkeeper, clerks).
- (4) Skilled Manual - (e.g., master tradesman, machinist, factory foreman)
- (5) Semi-Skilled Manual - (e.g., apprentice craftsman, automobile mechanic, assembly line)
- (6) Unskilled Manual - labor tasks requiring little training or skill.
- (7) Service - (e.g., bartender, waiter, taxi driver, janitor)

e. Length of employment at most skilled position

f. Longest time employed at any one job

g. Last grade completed

h. History of drug use

- (1) No mention of drug use
- (2) Drug user (no specific drug mentioned)
- (3) Drug user (mention of heroin use)
- (4) Drug user (mention of the use of any drug other than heroin or marijuana--the exclusive use of marijuana)
- (5) Drug user (marijuana only drug mentioned)

3. Criminal History Variables

- a. Age at first arrest
- b. Age at first drunk arrest
- c. Age at first drug arrest
- d. Total number of court appearances
- e. Number of court appearances for person offenses
- f. Number of court appearances for property offenses
- g. Number of court appearances for sex offenses
- h. number of court appearances for narcotic offenses
- i. Number of court appearances for drunkenness offenses
- j. Number of court appearances for escape offenses
- k. Number of juvenile commitments
- l. Number of house of correction commitments
- m. Number of prior state or federal commitments
- n. Number of any incarcerations
- o. Number of juvenile paroles
- p. Number of adult paroles
- q. Number of any paroles
- r. Number of juvenile parole violations
- s. Number of adult parole violations
- t. Number of any parole violations

4. Release Variables

- a. Age at release
- b. Length of time served on present incarceration
- c. Type of release

5. Halfway House Variables

- a. Length of stay
- b. Employed while at house
- c. Special Counseling
 - (1) Type
- d. Vocational training/educational enrollment
- e. Incidents at house
- f. Status of program completion

APPENDIX D

A MEASURE OF RELATIVE ADJUSTMENT

To determine the effectiveness of halfway houses in assisting in the reintegration of offenders, a new outcome measure entitled relative adjustment was developed. Relative adjustment (RA) is founded on the premise that the correctional philosophy of reintegration emphasizes the development of acceptable living patterns to replace the offender's prior reliance on deviant behavior.

If one were to accept the reintegrative model, the successful adjustment of an offender should not be judged on his criminal behavior alone. What should be considered in his prior history of behavior, the present criminal involvement, and also his positive or acceptable behavior patterns. In this sense, the total exorcism of all criminal tendencies will not occur immediately, but reliance on criminal behavior will slowly be replaced as acceptable behavior is practiced and reinforced.

Therefore, a single measure of recidivism or return to crime is not seen as a valid measure of the effectiveness of a reintegrative program and should not be used. In place of the traditional measure of recidivism, a continuous scale of criminal behavior (according to the frequency and severity of offenses) will be combined with a quantitative measure of acceptable behavior patterns. These two scores, in combination with the utilization of analysis of covariance to control for the relative difference in the comparison and experimental groups, make up the "relative adjustment" outcome criteria.

Criminal Behavior Outcome Criteria

To replace the dichotomous measure of recidivism where an offender is either classified a "success" or "failure," a continuous scale of criminal behavior has been used. The continuous scale is based on the severity of the offense as prescribed in the Ohio Criminal Code. The Code was developed after consultation with criminal justice experts and was passed by the Ohio Legislature. The offense severity assignments are therefore accepted as valid.

To assure the reliability of the scale, only the offender's behavior (the actual offense) is considered. Usually, recidivism measures are based on the disposition of the offense; however, dispositions could vary from court to court. In utilizing the continuous criminal behavior criteria, the offender is assigned a score based on the offense of which he has been found guilty or has confessed to committing. Although charges are often reduced from the actual offense, this is assumed to occur equally between the groups and therefore has no biased effect on the outcome scores.

Since multiple offenses can occur during the twelve-month outcome analysis, the severity score for each offense is added. It is then theoretically possible for the offender to exceed the highest score on the scale. Also added to the scale are severity scores for technical parole or probation violations and absconding or being declared a violator at large. Table 1 illustrates the severity categories to which offenses are assigned.

Adjustment Criteria Index

The second element in the development of this total outcome criterion is the construction of a scale of "acceptable living patterns." Since the reintegration model is not perceived as a sudden change in behavior, but

TABLE D-1. Criminal Behavior Severity Index

Degree of Offense	Assigned Score
Aggravated murder	11
Murder	10
Felony 1st	9
Felony 2nd	8
Felony 3rd	7
Felony 4th	6
Misdemeanor 1st	5
Misdemeanor 2nd	4
Misdemeanor 3rd	3
Misdemeanor 4th	2
Minor Misdemeanor	1
Violator at Large	1
Technical Violation	0.5

movement toward acceptable societal norms, an adjustment scale should be included as well as a criminal behavior scale. Several items generally considered to demonstrate "acceptable societal behavior" are presented in Table D-2. These are not ascribed as total indicators of success, but merely as an index of adjustment within the community.

The major emphasis of the adjustment scale is on work or educational stability, although also included are self-improvement qualities, financial responsibility, parole or probation progress, and absence of critical incidents or illegal activities. Although these items are somewhat discretionary and do not include all the qualities which could be defined as adjustment, each does suggest stability, responsibility, maturity, and a general order in life style that is correlated with socially accepted patterns of behavior.

The construction of this adjustment scale was subjected to tests for validity and reliability. To validate the scale, various parole and

TABLE D-2. Adjustment Criteria Index

Assigned Score	Adjustment Criterion
+1	Employed, enrolled in school, or participating in a training program for more than 50 percent of the follow-up period
+1	Held any one job (or continued in educational or vocational program) for more than a six-month period during the follow-up.
+1	Attained vertical mobility in employment, educational, or vocational program. This could be a raise in pay, promotion of status, movement to a better job, or continuous progression through educational or vocational program.
+1	For the last half of follow-up period, individual was self-supporting and supported any immediate family.
+1	Individual shows stability in residency. Either lived in the same residence for more than 6 months or moved at suggestion or with the agreement of supervising officer.
+1	Individual has avoided any critical incidents that show instability, immaturity, or inability to solve problems acceptably.
+1	Attainment of financial stability. This is indicated by the individual living within his means, opening bank accounts, or meeting debt payments.
+1	Participation in self-improvement programs. These could be vocational, educational, group counseling, alcohol or drug maintenance programs.
+1	Individual making satisfactory progress through probation or parole periods. This could be moving downward in levels of supervision or obtaining final release within period.
+1	No illegal activities on any available records during the follow-up period.

probation officers, research associates, members of the Ohio Citizens' Task Force on Corrections, and other professionals in the field were consulted to determine items generally considered as acceptable adjustment. To test the reliability of the scale, scoring of the adjustment criterion was initially done by several individuals. This resulted in the formulation of certain standards for scoring, which led to consistent scoring of

the outcome index. Because of the large numbers, all of these scoring standards are not indicated in Table D-2. Many of these are standards which prevent the individual from losing points because he is making changes which should be considered beneficial to his adjustment.

Each adjustment criterion is weighted equally. Individuals receive a +1 score for each criterion for which they qualify according to scoring standards. The adjustment score is therefore the total number of criterion for which the individual has qualified, and can range from zero to plus ten.

The overall RA outcome criteria is then obtained by combining criminal and acceptable behavior index scores. With the now established RA scale, an ex-offender may counter minor delinquent behavior with adjustment factors. Also, the ex-offender who stays out of trouble, but does nothing that qualifies as adjustment, is not seen as a total success as in recidivism measures. It is our assumption that this combined score will provide a more realistic behavior criterion than had been available previously.

SINGLE HALFWAY HOUSE EVALUATION MODEL

FOOTNOTES

- ¹Weiss, Carol H. Evaluative Research: Methods of Assessing Program Effectiveness. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1972.
- ²Kiresuk, T.J. and Sherman, R.E., "Goal Attainment Scaling: A General Method for Evaluating Comprehensive Community Mental Health Programs," Community Mental Health Journal, Vol. 4, No. 6 (1968) pp. 443-453.
- ³See Volume I, Chapter III of this study for more information.
- ⁴These characteristics were adapted from a study done by Daniel LeClair, entitled A Profile of Characteristics Distinguishing Between Program Completers and Program Non-Completers in Massachusetts' Pre-Release Centers, Massachusetts Department of Corrections, November 1975.
- ⁵McCartt, John M. and Mangogna, Thomas J., Guidelines and Standards for Halfway Houses and Community Treatment Centers, United States Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, Technical Assistance Division, 1973.
- ⁶Seiter, Richard P., Evaluation Research as a Feedback Mechanism for Criminal Justice Policy Making. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1975.