

LEAA

DS-74-C-F3-9-553
Gaudenzia Project
Pa. Bureau of Corrections
By: FREDERICK J. BROWN
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

IT IS QUITE APPARENT TO EVERYONE INVOLVED IN THIS PROJECT THAT THE CHALLENGE OF DEALING EFFECTIVELY WITH DRUG ABUSERS, DRUG USERS AND DRUG EXPERIMENTERS IS A DIFFICULT ONE AT BEST, AN EVEN MORE CHALLENGING ASPECT RELATES TO THAT OF VALIDLY DETERMINING THE SUCCESS OR OVERALL IMPACT OF SUCH A PROJECT ESPECIALLY WITH RESPECT TO THE ASPECT OF DOCUMENTING INDIVIDUAL GROWTH. THIS EVALUATOR PERCEIVES HIS ROLE IN SUCH A SITUATION AS ONE IN WHICH HE CAN AT BEST DOCUMENT THE FACT THAT GAUDENZIA STAFF PERSONNEL PURSUED THE OBJECTIVES IDENTIFIED IN THE INITIAL AND INTERIM REPORTS IN A HIGHLY PROFESSIONAL MANNER AND THAT INSTITUTIONAL STAFF CONTRIBUTED TO THE ACCOMPLISHMENT OF THESE OBJECTIVES.

PERSONNEL INVOLVED IN PROJECTS OF THIS NATURE MUST BE EQUIPPED TO DEAL WITH MANY TYPES OF NEUROTIC AND PSYCHOPATHIC TYPES OF BEHAVIOR. IN THE VERY LEAST ONE COULD READILY CONCLUDE THAT THEY MUST STRIVE TO DEAL EFFECTIVELY WITH MANY RESIDENTS WHO POSSESS SEVERE CHARACTEROLOGICAL DISORDERS. SOON ONE REALIZES THAT SOME OF THESE INDIVIDUALS POSSESS A POOR SELF-IMAGE, NEGATIVE ATTITUDES TOWARD SOCIETY, AUTHORITY AND OTHERS, AND THAT SOME ARE POORLY MOTIVATED TOWARD POSITIVE CHANGE AND THUS UNPREPARED TO FACE REALITY. FURTHERMORE, SOME DO NOT POSSESS THE EMOTIONAL STRENGTH REQUIRED TO TAKE A HARD CRITICAL LOOK AT THEMSELVES. IT

NCJRS

OCT 6 1978

ACQUISITIONS

52177
C1

BECOMES APPARENT THEN THAT IT WOULD BE IMPRACTICAL TO EXPECT "SIGNIFICANT" RESULTS FROM A PROJECT THAT AT BEST ENCOMPASSES SEVERAL MONTHS OF "LIMITED" INVOLVEMENT WITH A DEDICATED TRAINER/COUNSELOR. IT IS UNREALISTIC TO EXPECT SUCH AN INDIVIDUAL TO TURN THINGS AROUND IN SUCH A BRIEF PERIOD OF TIME. FOR THIS REASON AND OTHERS PREVIOUSLY DOCUMENTED IN THE INTERIM REPORT AND ELSEWHERE IN THIS REPORT, THIS EVALUATOR DOES NOT FEEL THAT THE OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE WORTH OF THIS AND SIMILAR PROJECTS WOULD SUFFER BECAUSE OF ONE'S INABILITY TO EFFECTIVELY DOCUMENT "INDIVIDUAL GROWTH" OVER A SHORT PERIOD OF TIME.

THE GAUDENZIA PRISONER HUMANIZATION PROJECT WHICH INVOLVED THE COMBINED EFFORTS OF THE GAUDENZIA AND INSTITUTIONAL STAFFS MUST BE TERMED A SUCCESSFUL ENDEAVOR. BOTH PARTIES PURSUED THEIR RESPONSIBILITIES DILIGENTLY AND ATTAINED THE EXPECTATIONS THAT WERE INITIALLY ESTABLISHED. HOPEFULLY, EVALUATIONS OF THIS NATURE WILL HELP TO ESTABLISH THE WORTHINESS AND VALUE OF THIS PROJECT AND FUTURE PROJECTS OF A SIMILAR NATURE.

THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS/CONCLUSIONS ARE HEREBY OFFERED:

I. GAUDENZIA PRISONER HUMANIZATION PROJECTS SHOULD BE FUNDED IN OTHER STATE AND/OR COUNTY INSTITUTIONS WITHIN THIS COMMONWEALTH. THERE APPEARS TO BE LITTLE DOUBT THAT PROJECTS OF THIS TYPE WOULD REPRESENT A MUCH NEEDED SERVICE IN ANY INSTITUTION AND IN FACT WOULD IN ALL PROBABILITY REPRESENT THE

ONLY ON-GOING PROGRAM OF THIS TYPE IN MOST INSTITUTIONS (INCLUDING SOME STATE INSTITUTIONS) AND IN THE VERY LEAST REPRESENT AN ADDITION TO CURRENT OPERATING TREATMENT PROGRAMS.

2. THE GAUDENZIA STAFF SHOULD NOT BE THE SOLE DETERMINANT OF WHAT TYPE OF CONFRONTATION METHODS SHOULD BE EMPLOYED. INSTITUTIONAL STAFF SHOULD NOT ONLY BE GIVEN AN OPPORTUNITY TO HAVE INPUT REGARDING INITIAL SELECTION CRITERIA BUT ALSO THE OVERALL METHODOLOGY INVOLVED IN GROUP ENCOUNTERS. THE UNIQUE EXPERTISE AND EXPERIENCE OF INSTITUTIONAL PERSONNEL SHOULD BE MORE FULLY UTILIZED. THIS WOULD UNDOUBTEDLY LEND ITSELF TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF WHAT WOULD CONCEPTIONALLY BE THE MOST EFFECTIVE FORMAT TO FOLLOW IN FUTURE PROJECTS OF THIS NATURE.

3. GAUDENZIA AND SIMILAR TYPES OF OUTSIDE STAFF PERSONNEL SHOULD BE ACCORDED HIGH PREFERENCE/PRIORITY WITH REGARD TO THE USE OF INSTITUTIONAL FACILITIES. IT SHOULD BE UNDERSTOOD FROM THE ONSET OF FUTURE PROJECTS THAT INVOLVED INSTITUTIONAL PERSONNEL SHOULD ADJUST THEIR SCHEDULES AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE SO AS TO MAXIMIZE THE EFFORTS OF FUNDED OUTSIDE PERSONNEL WHO REPRESENT A SERVICE WHICH CONSTITUTES (IN SOME CASES) THE BULK (IF NOT ONLY) DRUG THERAPY CONDUCTED WITHIN THAT INSTITUTION.

4. IDEALISTICALLY, CONSIDERATION SHOULD BE GIVEN IN FUTURE PROJECTS TO THE ESTABLISHMENT, WHERE POSSIBLE, OF DIFFERENTIAL LEVELS OF CONFRONTATION. IN THIS PROJECT, IT APPEARED TO BE SOMEWHAT IMPRACTICAL BECAUSE OF THE DIVERSE RANGE OF CAPABILITIES AND PERSONALITIES THAT EXIST AMONG MEDIUM/MAXIMUM SECURITY

PRISONERS. ALSO IN THE CURRENT PROJECT, IT WAS DECIDED THE BEST APPROACH WOULD BE TO ATTEMPT TO REACH THE GREATEST NUMBER OF RESIDENTS RATHER THAN TO BE SO SELECTIVE THAT ONLY A FEW WOULD BE INVOLVED. FUTURE FUNDINGS SHOULD INCORPORATE BOTH TYPES OF APPROACHES HOWEVER SO THAT PERTINENT OBSERVATIONS COULD BE DRAWN FROM EACH APPROACH.

5. A HIGH LEVEL OF DIALOGUE SHOULD BE ASSURED IN FUTURE PROJECTS BETWEEN INVOLVED INSTITUTIONAL STAFF (COUNSELORS/SUPERVISORS) AND OUTSIDE TRAINERS. THIS DIALOGUE HAS EVIDENTLY SUFFERED IN SOME INSTANCES IN THIS PROJECT APPARENTLY BECAUSE SOME INSTITUTIONAL STAFF WERE CONTENT TO LET GAUDENZIA PERSONNEL "DO THEIR THING". IN FUTURE FUNDINGS, HOWEVER, THIS ASPECT SHOULD BE GIVEN THE HIGHEST OF PRIORITIES IN ORDER TO ASSURE THE HIGHEST DEGREE OF EFFECTIVENESS.

6. SIGNIFICANT FOLLOW-UP SHOULD BE PROVIDED FOR IN FUTURE FUNDINGS. THE PARENT (RECEIVING) INSTITUTION SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR COORDINATING THIS IN MOST INSTANCES. WITHOUT SUCH FOLLOW-UP THERE WILL BE LITTLE OPPORTUNITY TO VALIDLY ASSESS ANY LONG TERM EFFECTIVENESS OF SIMILAR PROJECTS. IT IS RECOGNIZED THAT THIS PARTICULAR ASPECT REPRESENTS A CHALLENGE TO ALL INVOLVED AGENCIES, HOWEVER, THE MACHINERY FOR CONDUCTING SUCH FOLLOW-UP MUST BE IDENTIFIED AND ASSEMBLED GRADUALLY SO THAT EVENTUALLY A VALID APPRAISAL OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SIMILAR PROJECTS CAN BE ASCERTAINED.

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
OF
THE GAUDENZIA PRISONER HUMANIZATION PROJECT
PENNSYLVANIA BUREAU OF CORRECTION
DS-74-C-F3-9-553

BY
FREDERICK J. BROWN
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR
INDIANA UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA
INDIANA, PENNSYLVANIA 15701

IN COOPERATION WITH THE
GOVERNORS JUSTICE COMMISSION
HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA

INTRODUCTION

THIS FINAL EVALUATION REPORT OF THE GAUDENZIA PRISONER HUMANIZATION PROJECT WHICH WAS DEVELOPED IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE PENNSYLVANIA BUREAU OF CORRECTION ENCOMPASSES A NINE (9) MONTH PERIOD BETWEEN FEBRUARY 1, 1975 AND OCTOBER 31, 1975. MATERIAL FOR AND IN THIS REPORT WAS SECURED AND DEVELOPED WITH THE ASSISTANCE AND COOPERATION OF THE GAUDENZIA RESEARCH DEPARTMENT AND TO A MUCH LESSER DEGREE PENNSYLVANIA BUREAU OF CORRECTION PERSONNEL IN THE INVOLVED CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS WHO SUPPLIED RECORDS AND RELATED INFORMATION TO THIS EVALUATOR.

THIS EVALUATION INVOLVED A SERIES OF ON-SITE VISITATIONS TO THE STATE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS AT GRATERFORD, MUNCY, AND HUNTINGDON, PENNSYLVANIA. THE VISITATIONS WERE CONDUCTED DURING THE MONTHS OF APRIL, MAY AND OCTOBER, 1975. ALSO INVOLVED WERE PERSONAL CONFERENCES AND RELEVANT DISCUSSIONS WITH THE GAUDENZIA AREA DIRECTOR, ALL THE GAUDENZIA TRAINERS (5) INVOLVED IN THE PROJECT WITHIN THE AFOREMENTIONED INSTITUTIONS, DISCUSSIONS WITH THE DIRECTORS OF TREATMENT AT THE MUNCY AND HUNTINGDON INSTITUTIONS, FEED BACK FROM INSTITUTIONAL PERSONNEL INVOLVED IN OR FAMILIAR WITH THE PROJECT, A VISIT TO THE GAUDENZIA RESIDENTIAL CENTER AND EXECUTIVE OFFICE IN PHILADELPHIA WHERE CONSIDERABLE STATISTICAL DATA WAS SECURED WITH THE ABLE ASSISTANCE OF THE GAUDENZIA DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH

AND FINALLY A THOROUGH EVALUATION OF ALL THE INFORMATION AND
DATA THAT THIS EVALUATOR CONSIDERED RELEVANT TO THIS EVALUATION.

SECTION I - PROJECT OBJECTIVES

THE PROGRAMMATIC OBJECTIVES INITIALLY IDENTIFIED AND SET FORTH IN THE SUB-GRANT PROPOSAL RELATED TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF DRUG TREATMENT AND COUNSELING GROUPS WITHIN THE INSTITUTIONAL SETTINGS WHICH WERE DESIGNED PRIMARILY TO PRODUCE ATTITUDINAL CHANGES WITHIN THE PARTICIPANTS WHICH WOULD NOT ONLY ENABLE THEM TO ADJUST BETTER WITHIN THE INSTITUTIONAL SETTING BUT ALSO SIGNIFICANTLY CONTRIBUTE TO A MODIFICATION OF THE BEHAVIORAL PATTERNS AND ATTITUDES WHICH CONTRIBUTED GREATLY TO THEIR DRUG ABUSE PROBLEMS. ESSENTIALLY, THE PROGRAMMATIC OBJECTIVES ALSO INCLUDE THAT OF MOTIVATING THE PARTICIPANTS TO STRIVE FOR CONTINUED SELF-IMPROVEMENT AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF SIGNIFICANT INSIGHT INTO THEIR PAST BEHAVIOR AS WELL AS THE DEVELOPMENT OF VIABLE ALTERNATIVES TO ANY FUTURE EXPOSURE TO DEVIANT BEHAVIOR. THIS, OF COURSE, NOT ONLY INVOLVES A CHANGE IN SPECIFIC AND GENERAL ATTITUDES BUT ALSO AN IMPROVED SELF-IMAGE AS WELL AS THE IDENTIFICATION OF A MORE CONFORMING AND REALISTIC ROLE EACH MUST PLAY IN THE FUTURE FOLLOWING HIS RELEASE AND PROBABLE RETURN TO THE SAME ENVIRONMENT WHICH SPAWNED HIS PREVIOUS DIFFICULTIES WITH DRUGS AND THE LAW.

THE AFOREMENTIONED OBJECTIVES AND OTHERS IDENTIFIED IN THIS REPORT AND THE INTERIM REPORT WERE PURSUED BY GAUDENZIA STAFF PERSONNEL WORKING IN CONJUNCTION WITH INSTITUTIONAL STAFF PRIMARILY THE INSTITUTIONAL COUNSELORS WHOSE EFFORTS WERE

COORDINATED BY THE DIRECTOR OF TREATMENT. INSTITUTIONAL COUNSELORS WERE PRIMARILY INTERESTED IN HELPING TO INCREASE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROJECT TRAINERS THROUGH FOLLOW-UP DOCUMENTATION OF INDIVIDUAL PARTICIPANT INVOLVEMENT IN OTHER THERAPY OR SELF-HELP GROUPS, MODIFICATION, IF ANY, (AND HOPEFULLY POSITIVE) IN THE PARTICIPANT'S INSTITUTIONAL ADJUSTMENT AND ATTITUDE, INVOLVEMENT OF THE PARTICIPANTS IN ANY GROWTH ACTIVITIES ESPECIALLY THOSE RELATED TO THE SIGNIFICANT IMPROVEMENT OF THEIR EDUCATIONAL STANDARDS AND OCCUPATIONAL CAPABILITIES AND FINALLY AN ASSESSMENT AS FAR AS PRACTICAL, OF THE OVERALL CHANGE ELICITED OR REFLECTED BY THOSE WHO PARTICIPATED IN THE GROUP EXPERIENCE.

A. MAJOR FINDINGS

THIS PROJECT ESSENTIALLY PROVIDED THAT TRAINERS FROM GAUDENZIA WOULD REGULARLY VISIT EACH OF THE INVOLVED INSTITUTIONS ACCORDING TO AN AGREED UPON SCHEDULE (SEE TABLE I) AS PART OF AN ON-GOING PROJECT AND WOULD INTERVIEW, ORIENT, MOTIVATE AND/OR SCREEN AND ENLIST PARTICIPANTS WHO REFLECTED AN INTEREST IN THE REGULARLY SCHEDULED GROUP SESSIONS. THIS PHASE OF THE PROJECT WAS SUCCESSFULLY PURSUED AND ACCOMPLISHED IN ALL OF THE INVOLVED INSTITUTIONS WITH VARYING DEGREES OF COOPERATION AND INVOLVEMENT BY INSTITUTIONAL PERSONNEL. A SIGNIFICANT NUMBER OF RESIDENTS WERE SELECTED AND BECAME INVOLVED IN THE PROJECT DURING THIS PERIOD OF FUNDING WHICH ENCOMPASSES A NINE (9) MONTH PERIOD OF

TIME (SEE TABLE III). IT BECAME QUITE CLEAR AFTER SEVERAL MONTHS OF THIS PROJECT, HOWEVER, THAT SOME OF THE OBJECTIVES INITIALLY IDENTIFIED AND DILIGENTLY PURSUED BY THE JOINT PARTIES INVOLVED (PROJECT AND INSTITUTIONAL STAFF) WOULD BE IMPOSSIBLE OF FULL ATTAINMENT. THESE OBJECTIVES RELATED TO THAT OF SUCCESSFULLY DEVELOPING AND IMPLEMENTING A SYSTEM WHEREBY RELEVANT FEEDBACK REGARDING INDIVIDUAL RESIDENT GROWTH AND/OR CHANGE FROM THE COUNSELOR TO THE TRAINER COULD BE ACCOMPLISHED. IN ALL ACTUALITY IT SOON BECAME QUITE APPARENT TO BOTH OF THE PRINCIPAL PARTIES INVOLVED THAT THE INSTITUTIONAL COUNSELOR WOULD NOT BE ABLE TO MAKE THESE ASSESSMENTS ON A REGULAR BASIS BECAUSE OF THE VOLUME OF OTHER DUTIES. CONCEIVABLY, THE INSTITUTIONAL COUNSELOR GAVE THIS DUTY/RESPONSIBILITY A LOW PRIORITY BUT IN ALL FAIRNESS IT SHOULD BE POINTED OUT THAT CONCEPTUALLY IT WAS A GOOD IDEA BUT PRACTICALLY IT JUST DIDN'T WORK AND WON'T WORK EFFECTIVELY UNDER EXISTING CIRCUMSTANCES AND CONDITIONS. IT SHOULD ALSO BE POINTED OUT THAT THE TERMINATION OF THE ATTEMPT TO CHART AND DOCUMENT INDIVIDUAL RESIDENT/PARTICIPANT PROGRESS WAS AGREED UPON MUTUALLY BY BOTH PARTIES. THIS EVALUATOR FOUND THIS TO BE A PRACTICAL SOLUTION TO THE PROBLEM IN VIEW OF ALL FACTS FOUND TO BE PRESENT.

THIS EVALUATION, THEREFORE, WILL ADDRESS ITSELF TO THE DETERMINATION OF WHETHER OR NOT AND TO WHAT DEGREE EACH PARTY FULFILLED ITS OBLIGATION AND TO IDENTIFY AND/OR DOCUMENT RELEVANT OBSERVATIONS THAT CAN BE DRAWN FROM THIS TYPE OF PROGRAMMATIC INVOLVEMENT WITHIN

AN INSTITUTIONAL SETTING. AS PREVIOUSLY INDICATED ON PAGE 6 OF THE INTERIM REPORT, THIS EVALUATOR DID NOT DEEM IT NECESSARY TO PERSONALLY OBSERVE THE GROUPS IN ACTION INASMUCH AS LITTLE VALID INFORMATION COULD BE ELICITED IN THAT MANNER. FURTHERMORE, THERE DOES NOT APPEAR TO BE ANY QUESTION REGARDING THE CAPABILITY OF THE GAUDENZIA TRAINERS TO CONDUCT GROUPS IN A COMPETENT AND PROFESSIONAL MANNER SIMILAR TO THAT FOUND TO BE EFFECTIVE WITH SIMILAR PARTICIPANTS IN OTHER GAUDENZIA PROJECTS.

SECTION II - PROJECT ACTIVITIES

ONE READILY BECOMES AWARE THAT THERE HAS AND CONTINUES TO EXIST WITHIN ANY INSTITUTIONAL SETTING A NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD TREATMENT ACTIVITIES (INCLUDING PROJECTS LIKE THE GAUDENZIA PRISONER HUMANIZATION PROJECT) ON THE PART OF MANY RESIDENTS CONFINED THEREIN AND ALSO SOME EMPLOYEES. THERE REMAINS UNDOUBTEDLY "A LONG ROW TO HOE" BEFORE SUCH NEGATIVE ATTITUDES CAN BE EFFECTIVELY NULLIFIED WITH RESPECT TO INHIBITING THE TOTAL EFFECTIVENESS OF SUCH PROJECTS. SOME OF THESE INFLUENCES INCLUDE WITHDRAWAL OF PAY OF THOSE WHO ATTEND SESSIONS, AND NUMEROUS REASONS (INDIVIDUAL AND INSTITUTIONAL AS WELL) WHY VARIOUS RESIDENTS CANNOT ATTEND SPECIFIC SESSIONS. SUFFICE IT TO OBSERVE THAT THE OVERALL EFFECTIVENESS OF PROJECTS SUCH AS THE GAUDENZIA PROJECT AND SIMILAR TREATMENT ENDEAVORS SUFFER GREATLY BECAUSE OF THE MANY RELATED INFLUENCES GENERATED WITHIN THE INSTITUTIONS. ON THE OTHER HAND, IT SHOULD BE RECOGNIZED THAT THE VERY NATURE OF CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS IS UNIQUE AND THE PROBLEMS THAT INSTITUTIONAL PERSONNEL MUST DEAL WITH ON A DAILY BASIS JUSTIFY SOME OF THE POLICIES/PROCEDURES THAT INHIBIT PROGRAMS OF THIS NATURE.

THE GAUDENZIA TRAINERS SAW AS THEIR PRIMARY GOALS IN THE PROJECT THE NEED TO ESTABLISH FUNDAMENTAL POSITIVE RAPPORT WITH THE PARTICIPANTS. THEY ALSO SAW A NEED TO CONVEY THROUGH THE GROUP PROCESS THE USELESSNESS OF THE "NEGATIVE" LIFESTYLES MOST

PRISONERS WERE ENGAGED IN. BY NEGATIVE, THE TRAINERS WERE DESCRIBING A LIFESTYLE IN WHICH INDIVIDUALS WERE GIVEN TO IRRESPONSIBLE BEHAVIOR TOWARD SELF AND OTHERS, DESPAIR AND ACTING OUT OF THEIR EMOTIONS WITHOUT RATIONAL CONSIDERATIONS. THE TRAINERS THUS ATTEMPTED TO INDUCE THE PARTICIPANT TO "OWN UP" TO THE FACT THAT HIS LIFESTYLE HAS NOT BEEN POSITIVE AND TO ACCEPT THE FACT THAT REALISTIC, ACCEPTABLE AND VIABLE ALTERNATIVES WERE AVAILABLE TO HIM. ANOTHER GOAL WAS ALSO TO MAKE PARTICIPANTS AWARE OF THEIR EMOTIONS AND THE PART THEY PLAY IN THEIR ULTIMATE BEHAVIOR. AS A COROLLARY TO THIS, IT WAS HOPED THAT SOME OF THE RESIDENTS NEGATIVE ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIOR WITHIN THE INSTITUTIONAL SETTING COULD ALSO BE INFLUENCED THROUGH A NEW AWARENESS.

THE TRAINERS THUS VIEWED THE GROUP AMONG OTHER THINGS AS A DUMPING GROUND FOR PEOPLES FEELINGS AND FRUSTRATIONS. THEY ATTEMPTED TO SUPPORT THE INDIVIDUAL AND TO CONVEY THE FACT THAT ONE CAN DEVELOP A GOOD IMAGE OF HIMSELF IN SPITE OF THE MANY ADVERSITIES HE FACES AND THAT PART OF THIS FEELING IS TO LEARN TO TRUST OTHERS THROUGH A SHARING OF ONES FEELINGS. GROUP LEADERS HOPED THAT PARTICIPANTS WOULD IDENTIFY WITH THEM AND THAT THEY AS LEADERS COULD ACT AS ROLE MODELS FOR THE SUCCESSFUL TRANSFORMATION FROM A NEGATIVE LIFESTYLE TO A MORE ACCEPTABLE ONE. IN THIS ENDEAVOR, THE TRAINERS WERE UNDOUBTEDLY AIDED BY THE FACT THAT SOME OF THEM KNEW SOME OF THE PARTICIPANTS

PERSONALLY FROM EITHER THE STREET OR FROM PRIOR COMMITMENTS, THUS PARTICIPANTS COULD REALISTICALLY ATTEST TO THE CHANGE THAT OCCURRED IN THE TRAINERS AND HOPEFULLY DEVELOP THE SAME POTENTIAL FOR CHANGE IN THEMSELVES.

WHEN THE PRISON GROUPS INITIALLY BEGAN, THE GAUDENZIA STAFF EXPECTED THAT THEY COULD CHANGE THE PRISONERS A GREAT DEAL, THAT RESULTS WOULD BE IMMEDIATE AND CONSIDERABLE. BUT IT BECAME APPARENT THAT WITHIN THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF PRISON, THIS WAS NOT FEASIBLE. RATHER, GAUDENZIA ACCEPTED THE FACT THAT IF ONE COULD HELP A PERSON TO COME TO GRIPS WITH THEIR LIFE AND TO SEE HOW THEY HAVE BEEN RESPONDING TO IT, THEN THE SOLUTION WOULD THEN LIE WITHIN THE INDIVIDUAL TO CHANGE IT, IF NOT NOW, THEN PERHAPS EVENTUALLY. TO SHOW SOMEONE THAT THERE ARE INDIVIDUALS WHO CARE, WHO HE/SHE CAN TRUST, TO TEACH COMMUNICATION AND TO REATTACH EMOTION TO THINKING, THIS PLANTED THE SEED OF A NEW REALITY. THE GROUP LEADERS FELT VERY STRONGLY THAT WHAT INMATES ACHIEVED IN GROUPS WOULD HAVE SOME EFFECT, IF NOT IMMEDIATELY, THEN LATER. GROUPS WERE "A POSITIVE STIMULUS IN A SEA OF NEGATIVE STIMULI THAT WERE REINFORCING THE PRISONERS' ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIORS". GROUPS DID MAKE SOME CHANGES IN THE PARTICIPANTS WHO WENT CONSISTENTLY; MEN WHO WERE ALWAYS IN THE "HOLE" STOPPED GOING, MEN WHO HAD MACHO IMAGES BROKE DOWN AND CRIED IN GROUPS - BUT GROUP LEADERS FELT THAT THE REAL TEST OF GROUPS WOULD COME IN THE SUBTLE AND LONG TERM PROCESS OF THE INDIVIDUAL'S REEVALUATION OF HIMSELF WITH SOME OF THE TOOLS HE HAD GAINED IN GROUPS.

SECTION III - EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

THIS EVALUATOR VISITED THE STATE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS AT MUNCY AND GRATERFORD IN APRIL AND MAY, 1975 AND THE STATE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION AT HUNTINGDON IN APRIL, MAY AND OCTOBER, 1975. IN ADDITION, HE VISITED THE GAUDENZIA RESIDENTIAL LIVING CENTER AND EXECUTIVE OFFICE IN PHILADELPHIA IN OCTOBER, 1975. DURING ALL OF THESE VISITATIONS, CONFERENCES WERE CONDUCTED WITH VARIOUS GAUDENZIA AND INSTITUTIONAL PERSONNEL INCLUDING DIRECTORS OF TREATMENT, INSTITUTIONAL COUNSELORS AND DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT FOR TREATMENT. IN ADDITION, A RANDOM SAMPLING OF RESIDENT PARTICIPANTS WERE INTERVIEWED AND RELEVANT FEEDBACK DOCUMENTED. THIS EVALUATOR DID NOT FEEL IT NECESSARY TO INTERVIEW LARGE BLOCKS OF RESIDENT PARTICIPANTS IN VIEW OF THE FACT THAT GAUDENZIA AND INSTITUTIONAL PERSONNEL RECEIVED RELEVANT FEEDBACK AND EACH RESIDENT COMPLETED TERMINATION QUESTIONNAIRES REFLECTING THEIR IMPRESSIONS. LIMITED STATISTICAL AND OTHER MATERIALS WERE SECURED FROM THE HUNTINGDON AND MUNCY DIRECTORS OF TREATMENT; HOWEVER, GREATER ATTENTION AND EVALUATION WAS DEVOTED TO THE EVALUATIVE INFORMATION SUPPLIED BY THE GAUDENZIA RESEARCH DIRECTOR, PRIMARILY BECAUSE THIS WAS THE AGREED UPON FORMAT FROM THE VERY BEGINNING OF THIS EVALUATION EFFORT. MORE IMPORTANTLY, IT BECAME READILY APPARENT THAT THE GAUDENZIA INFORMATION WAS MORE COMPREHENSIVE AND MEANINGFUL THAN ANY MAINTAINED BY THE INSTITUTIONS.

A. TYPE AND SCOPE OF DATA FORMS UTILIZED

THE GAUDENZIA STAFF APPROACHED EACH CLIENT IN A VERY THOROUGH MANNER AS REFLECTED BELOW:

1. A CLIENT ADMISSIONS FORM (APPENDIX 8) WAS ADMINISTERED TO EVERY CANDIDATE LISTING ALL TYPES OF SIGNIFICANT DATA WHICH IS UTILIZED PRIMARILY IN SCREENING ALL POTENTIAL CLIENTS.
2. DEMOGRAPHIC RECORDS WERE RELIGIOUSLY MAINTAINED BY GAUDENZIA PERSONNEL AT EACH INSTITUTION.
3. DAILY WORK SHEETS ARE MAINTAINED BY GAUDENZIA STAFF AT EACH INSTITUTION AND THESE IN TURN ARE EVALUATED AND REDUCED TO A STATISTICAL ANALYSIS BY THE GAUDENZIA RESEARCH DIRECTOR.
4. INDIVIDUAL DROP OUT QUESTIONNAIRES WERE COMPLETED BY DROP-OUTS IDENTIFYING THE REASONS FOR WITHDRAWAL (APPENDIX #4).
5. WORK PERFORMANCE RATINGS WERE MAINTAINED TO A LIMITED DEGREE BY WORK SUPERVISORS (APPENDIX #5).
6. BLOCK REPORTS WERE MAINTAINED TO A LIMITED DEGREE BY BLOCK OFFICERS (APPENDIX #6).
7. TWO MONTH PROGRESS FORMS WERE COMPLETED BY EACH PARTICIPANT SO THAT GAUDENZIA COULD ASSESS HOW

THE INDIVIDUAL FELT THE GROUP WAS HELPING HIM (APPENDIX #7).

8. A JOINT REPORT WAS COMPLETED BY THE INSTITUTIONAL COUNSELOR AND GAUDENZIA TRAINER IN AN ENDEAVOR TO DOCUMENT THE EXTENT OF ONE GROUP PARTICIPATION AND OVERALL PROGRESS WITHIN THE GROUP AND INSTITUTIONAL SETTINGS.

B. STATISTICAL DATA UTILIZED

APPRAISAL OF AVAILABLE STATISTICAL DATA REVEALS THAT THE FOLLOWING TYPES OF DATA WERE FELT TO BE SIGNIFICANT AND RELEVANT FOR THIS EVALUATION.

TABLE I	STAFF CHARACTERISTICS
TABLE II	AGGREGATE ATTENDANCE CHARTS
TABLE III	CLIENT FLOW BY MONTH (GRATERFORD) CLIENT FLOW BY MONTH (HUNTINGDON) CLIENT FLOW BY MONTH (MUNY)
TABLE IV	TOTAL STAFF HOURS
TABLE V	DROP OUTS - REASONS, NUMBER AND PERCENTAGES. TOTAL ATTENDANCE - ALL SESSIONS

SECTION IV - PROJECT ANALYSIS

A. STAFFING PATTERN

THIS PROJECT ESSENTIALLY INVOLVED THE SERVICES OF A GAUDENZIA SECRETARY, SIX (6) STAFF TRAINERS FROM GAUDENZIA WHO WERE ASSIGNED TO SPECIFIC INSTITUTIONAL GROUPS ON A REGULAR VISITATION SCHEDULE AND THE GAUDENZIA AREA DIRECTOR WHO HELPS COORDINATE THE ENTIRE PROJECT WITH THE INSTITUTIONAL DIRECTORS OF TREATMENT AND VARIOUS OTHER INSTITUTIONAL PERSONNEL. IN ADDITION, IT INVOLVED THE GAUDENZIA RESEARCH DIRECTOR WHO COMPILED AND DOCUMENTED THE MAJORITY OF THE RELEVANT DATA CITED IN THIS EVALUATION.

B. STAFF CHARACTERISTICS

TABLE I (BELOW) REFLECTS THE FACT THAT STAFF PERSONNEL WERE ASSIGNED TO INSTITUTIONS WHERE IT WAS FELT THEY WOULD BE MOST EFFECTIVE. FEMALES CONDUCTED THE SESSIONS AT MUNCY WHILE MALES CONDUCTED ALL OTHER SESSIONS. THREE GROUPS OF CONFRONTATION LEVELS WERE MAINTAINED NAMELY ON THE ORIENTATION, INTERMEDIATE AND ADVANCED LEVELS. PROGRESSIVE ADVANCEMENT FROM ONE LEVEL TO THE OTHER WAS DETERMINED IN MOST CASES UNILATERALLY BY THE GAUDENZIA TRAINER INVOLVED IN THAT INSTITUTION. NEW RESIDENTS WERE CONTINUOUSLY ENROLLED AS NEW GROUPS WERE FORMED. GAUDENZIA THUS SENT THREE (3) MALE TRAINERS TO GRATERFORD ON MONDAY, TUESDAY AND WEDNESDAY, THREE (3) TRAINERS TO HUNTINGDON ON THURSDAYS, AND ONE (1) ON FRIDAYS, AND TWO (2) FEMALE TRAINERS TO MUNCY ON THURSDAYS.

INSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITIES REPORTED THAT GAUDENZIA STAFF REGULARLY APPEARED ON TIME FOR THEIR MEETINGS AND THAT THEY MADE A DETERMINED EFFORT TO CONDUCT EVERY SESSION WHEN NOT PRECLUDED FROM DOING SO FOR REASONS BEYOND THEIR CONTROL.

TABLE I - STAFF CHARACTERISTICS/SCHEDULE

GROUP LEADERS	RACE	SEX	DAYS WORKED WITH GROUP	MON. & WED. (G)	THURS. (M)	TUES. (G)	THURS. (H)	MON. & TUES. (H)
1	B	M	4	X		X	X	
2	B	M	4	X		X	X	
3	B	M	4	X		X	X	
4	B	F	1		X			
5	B	F	1		X			
6	W	M	3				X	X
TOTALS			17	3	2	3	4	1

C. AGGREGATE ATTENDANCE

TABLE II (BELOW) PRESENTS A STATISTICAL PICTURE OF THE NUMBER OF SESSIONS OFFERED IN EACH INSTITUTION, THE TOTAL ATTENDANCE OF RESIDENTS IN EACH INSTITUTION, THE MEAN ATTENDANCE AT EACH GROUP SESSION IN EACH RESPECTIVE INSTITUTION, THE TOTAL RESIDENTS INVOLVED IN THESE SESSIONS, THE TOTAL HOURS OF GROUP INVOLVEMENT AND THE TOTAL HOURS OF STAFF INVOLVEMENT.

ONE CAN READILY OBSERVE THAT THE OVERALL EFFORT AND INVOLVEMENT OF STAFF AND RESIDENTS REFLECTED BY THIS DATA IS

SIGNIFICANT. ANY ATTEMPT TO MAKE A DEFINITIVE ANALYSIS OF THIS DATA WOULD BE OF LITTLE VALUE

TABLE II - AGGREGATE ATTENDANCE CHART

INSTITUTION	SESSIONS OFFERED	TOTAL ATTENDANCE	MEAN ATTENDANCE SESSION	TOTAL RESIDENTS REACHED	TOTAL HOURS	STAFF HOURS IN GROUP
MUNCY	19	87	4.7	11	37	68
HUNTINGDON	112	903	8.1	69	225.5	312
GRATERFORD	146	1072	7.3	134	292	578
TOTALS	277	2062	7.4	214	554.5	958

C. CLIENT FLOW BY MONTH

TABLE III (BELOW) REFLECTS THE FACT THAT THE AVERAGE ATTENDANCE IN GROUPS REMAINED FAIRLY CONSTANT IN ALL INSTITUTIONS. THE HUNTINGDON INSTITUTION REFLECTS THE BEST OVERALL ATTENDANCE AND SUCCESS RATIO RELATED TO ATTENDEES AND SESSIONS CONDUCTED. THE HUNTINGDON PROGRAM REFLECTED THE BEST OVERALL MANAGEMENT AND INPUT BY THE DIRECTOR OF TREATMENT ACCORDING TO GAUDENZIA PERSONNEL AND THE EVALUATORS APPRAISAL. CLIENTS AT THE HUNTINGDON INSTITUTION REFLECTED A HIGHER DEGREE OF INTEREST AND MOTIVATION IN GROUP SESSIONS. THIS ASPECT, HOWEVER, MAY BE INFLUENCED BY MANY FACTORS, SUCH AS INSTITUTIONAL MORALE, ETC. THIS EVALUATOR DOES NOT FEEL IT TO BE APPROPRIATE TO MAKE ANY OBSERVATIONS BEYOND THIS POINT REGARDING THIS PARTICULAR ASPECT OF THE PROJECT.

TABLE III - CLIENT FLOW BY MONTH

<u>GRATERFORD</u>	<u>TOTAL ATTENDANCE</u>	<u>NUMBER OF SESSIONS HELD</u>	<u>AVERAGE ATTENDANCE PER SESSION</u>
JANUARY	84	9	9.3
FEBRUARY	128	15	8.5
MARCH	183	22	8.3
APRIL	150	21	7.1
MAY	119	17	7.0
JUNE	83	15	5.5
JUNE	120	16	7.5
AUGUST	111	17	6.5
SEPTEMBER	94	14	6.7
TOTALS	1072	146	7.3
<u>HUNTINGDON:</u>			
JANUARY	70	9	7.8
FEBRUARY	100	12	8.3
MARCH	130	17	7.6
APRIL	116	14	8.3
MAY	105	15	7.0
JUNE	107	13	8.2
JULY	92	11	8.4
AUGUST	101	12	8.4
SEPTEMBER	82	9	9.1
TOTALS	903	112	8.1
<u>MUNCY:</u>			
APRIL	13	3	4.3
MAY	30	4	7.5
JUNE	20	4	5.0
JULY	10	3	3.3
AUGUST	9	3	3.0
SEPTEMBER	5	2	2.5
TOTALS	87	19	4.7
TOTALS (FOR 3 INSTITUTIONS)	2062	277	7.4

D. STAFF HOURS

TABLE IV REFLECTS THE FACT THAT THE GAUDENZIA STAFF INITIALLY ESTABLISHED AND CONSTANTLY MAINTAINED A HIGH LEVEL OF STAFF INVOLVEMENT IN EACH INSTITUTION. FEEDBACK FROM THE INSTITUTIONAL PERSONNEL RESPONSIBLE FOR COORDINATING GAUDENZIA EFFORTS WITHIN THE INSTITUTIONAL SETTING REVEAL THAT ALL THE DIRECTORS OF TREATMENT WERE GENERALLY SATISFIED THAT GAUDENZIA PERSONNEL PURSUED THE ESTABLISHED SCHEDULE WITH A HIGH DEGREE OF DETERMINATION IN SPITE OF OCCASIONAL INTERRUPTIONS THAT DISRUPTED THE TEMPO OF ACTIVITIES. GAUDENZIA PERSONNEL WERE OF THE FEELING THAT INSTITUTIONAL OFFICIALS COOPERATED WELL WITH THEM.

TABLE IV - STAFF HOURS

	<u>GRATERFORD</u>	<u>HUNTINGDON</u>	<u>MUNCY</u>	<u>TOTALS</u>
JANUARY	50	26	--	76
FEBRUARY	60	32	--	92
MARCH	83	52	--	140
APRIL	30	40	9	129
MAY	70	36	14	120
JUNE	64	36	16	116
JULY	62	30	13	105
AUGUST	62	34	12	108
SEPTEMBER	<u>42</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>72</u>
TOTALS	578	312	68	958

E. DROP OUT REASONS, TOTALS, PERCENTAGES

TABLE V (BELOW) REFLECTS DROP-OUT REASONS, TOTAL AND PERCENTAGES OF THOSE WHO WITHDREW FROM THE PROGRAM FOR ONE REASON OR ANOTHER. THE HUNTINGDON PROGRAM REFLECTED THE HIGHEST PERCENTAGE OF PROGRAM COMPLETIONS; HOWEVER, IT IS

EXTREMELY DIFFICULT TO FAIRLY DRAW ANY DEFINITIVE CONCLUSIONS FROM THIS DATA INASMUCH AS WITHDRAWALS ARE OBVIOUSLY AFFECTED SIGNIFICANTLY BY SUCH FACTORS AS OVERALL INSTITUTIONAL CONDITIONS AND MORALE, THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN TRAINERS AND THE STRATEGIES THEY EMPLOYED AND THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE TYPE AND CHARACTER OF RESIDENTS HOUSED IN EACH INSTITUTION. TWO OUT OF FIVE (2-5) DROP-OUTS RESULTED FROM ATTENDANCE PROBLEMS HOWEVER, ONE COULD NEVER REALISTICALLY DETERMINE WHETHER THE WITHDRAWALS RESULTED FROM THE FACT THAT THE CONFRONTATION LEVEL WAS BECOMING TOO INTENSE AND IN FACT BEGINNING TO HURT AS ONE BEGAN TO FACE HIS REAL PROBLEMS OR THE WITHDRAWAL WAS MADE FOR SOME OTHER REASON. SOME OF THE MOST FREQUENTLY GIVEN REASONS ELICITED FROM A SAMPLING OF RESIDENTS AT THE GRATER-FORD INSTITUTION RANGE FROM SUCH RATIONALES AS PERSONAL PROBLEMS, ATTENDANCE NOT MANDATORY ANYMORE, POOR ATTENDANCE, ANTICIPATED RELEASE, NOT INTERESTED ANYMORE, DIDN'T LIKE TALKING TO PEOPLE, WAS OVER QUESTIONED, PROGRAM DOESN'T GET TO THE ROOT OF MY INDIVIDUAL PROBLEM, TO THAT OF RECEIVING NO ANSWERS AT ALL. THE APPARENT RANGE OF SUCH RATIONALES IS SO DIVERSE THAT IT WOULD BE IMPOSSIBLE TO ACTUALLY DETERMINE WHAT ACTUALLY MOTIVATES PEOPLE TO DROP FROM A PROGRAM.

TABLE V - DROP-OUT REASONS, TOTALS, PERCENTAGES

REASON	HUNTINGDON	MUNCY	GRATERFORD	TOTAL - ALL INSTITUTIONS
1. ATTENDANCE	21.2% (14)	27.3% (3)	48.5% (65)	38.9% (82)
2. TRANSFER TO ANOTHER INSTITUTION	1.5% (1)		6.7% (9)	4.7% (10)
3. PAROLE	3.0% (2)	18.2% (2)	7.5% (10)	7.1% (15)
4. TRANSFER TO ANOTHER PROGRAM (OUTSIDE PRISON)	1.5% (1)		1.0% (1)	1.0% (2)
5. TRANSFER TO GAUDENZIA	9.1 (6)		3.7% (5)	5.2% (11)
6. MAXIMUM EXPIRES				(0)
7. WORK RELEASE, SCHOOL, ETC.			1.5% (2)	1.0% (2)
8. UNKNOWN		9.0% (1)		.5% (1)
9. GROUP ENDED	<u>63.6%</u> (42)	<u>45.4%</u> (5)	<u>31.3%</u> (42)*	<u>42.2%</u> (89)
	99.9% (66)	99.9% (11)	100.2% (134)	100.6% (211)

* STILL IN GROUPS

F. CLIENT FLOW BY MONTH

APPENDIX I - 2 - 3 PRESENTS A STATISTICAL PICTURE OF CLIENT FLOW BY MONTH. AT GRATERFORD, THE NUMBER OF CLIENTS INVOLVED DECREASED AS THE PROJECT PROGRESSED WITH APPROXIMATELY HALF AS MANY INVOLVED IN SEPTEMBER AS IN JANUARY. NO SPECIFIC REASON COULD BE IDENTIFIED FOR THIS OCCURRENCE. IN THE GRATERFORD AND HUNTINGDON INSTITUTIONS, MEN OFTEN ATTENDED BECAUSE DEMANDS WERE PLACED UPON THEM TO DO SO OR

OFTEN BECAUSE THEY FELT IT PRUDENT TO DO SO FOR PAROLE CONSIDERATION. AT MUNCY, THERE WAS A HIGHER DEGREE OF NEGATIVISM EVIDENCED AMONG THE GENERAL POPULATION AND CONSEQUENTLY THE PROJECT NEVER SEEMED TO EXPAND BEYOND A GIVEN POINT.

G. OTHER SOURCES OF INFORMATION.

APPENDIX 4 - SAMPLE DROP-OUT FORM

APPENDIX 5 - SAMPLE WORK SUPERVISION REPORT FORM

APPENDIX 6 - SAMPLE BLOCK OFFICER REPORT FORM

APPENDIX 7 - TWO MONTH PROGRAM EVALUATION

APPENDIX 7 - CLIENT ADMISSION FORM

V - FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

THE INITIAL OBJECTIVE OF THE PROJECT WAS TO FACILITATE POSITIVE CHANGE IN BEHAVIOR THROUGH THE UTILIZATION OF VARIOUS TREATMENT STRATEGIES EMPLOYED IN THE GROUP COUNSELING PROCESS. THIS PROCESS WAS ONE DESIGNED TO CHANGE NEGATIVE ATTITUDES ABOUT SELF AND ONE'S LIFESTYLE INTO POSITIVE AND MORE REALISTIC ATTITUDES AND LIFESTYLES DESIGNED TO PREPARE CLIENTS TO BETTER COPE WITH THEIR PROBLEMS FOLLOWING RELEASE. THE PROJECT WAS CONCEPTUALIZED AND DESIGNED SO THAT THE GAUDENZIA STAFF WOULD CAREFULLY SCREEN AND SELECT ALL PROSPECTIVE CLIENTS AND CONDUCT THE SESSIONS WITH LITTLE, IF ANY, INVOLVEMENT OF INSTITUTIONAL STAFF. IT IS THIS EVALUATOR'S FINDING THAT THIS PROJECT HAS ACCOMPLISHED ALL OF THE OBJECTIVES IDENTIFIED IN THIS SUBGRANT PROPOSAL WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE OBJECTIVE RELATED TO THE DETERMINATION OF INDIVIDUAL CLIENTS GROWTH AS A RESULT OF THEIR GROUP EXPERIENCE.

THE GAUDENZIA PRISONER HUMANIZATION PROJECT WHICH INVOLVED THE COMBINED EFFORTS OF THE GAUDENZIA AND INSTITUTIONAL STAFFS MUST BE TERMED A SUCCESSFUL ENDEAVOR. BOTH PARTIES PURSUED THEIR RESPONSIBILITIES DILIGENTLY AND ATTAINED THE EXPECTATIONS THAT WERE ESTABLISHED.

THE FOLLOWING OBSERVATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS/CONCLUSIONS ARE HEREBY OFFERED:

1. GAUDENZIA PRISONER HUMANIZATION PROJECTS SHOULD BE FUNDED IN OTHER STATE AND/OR COUNTY INSTITUTIONS WITHIN THIS COMMONWEALTH. THERE APPEARS TO BE LITTLE DOUBT THAT PROJECTS OF THIS TYPE WOULD REPRESENT A MUCH NEEDED SERVICE IN ANY INSTITUTIONS AND, IN FACT, WOULD IN ALL PROBABILITY REPRESENT THE ONLY ON-GOING PROGRAM OF THIS TYPE IN MOST INSTITUTIONS (INCLUDING SOME STATE INSTITUTIONS) AND IN THE VERY LEAST REPRESENT AN ADDITION TO CURRENT OPERATING TREATMENT PROGRAMS.

2. THE GAUDENZIA STAFF SHOULD NOT BE THE SOLE DETERMINANT OF WHAT TYPE OF CONFRONTATION METHODS SHOULD BE EMPLOYED. INSTITUTIONAL STAFF SHOULD NOT ONLY BE GIVEN AN OPPORTUNITY TO HAVE INPUT REGARDING INITIAL SELECTION CRITERIA BUT ALSO THE OVERALL METHODOLOGY INVOLVED IN GROUP ENCOUNTERS. THE UNIQUE EXPERTISE AND EXPERIENCE OF INSTITUTIONAL PERSONNEL SHOULD BE MORE FULLY UTILIZED. THIS WOULD UNDOUBTEDLY LEND ITSELF TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF WHAT WOULD CONCEPTIONALLY BE THE MOST EFFECTIVE FORMAT TO FOLLOW IN FUTURE PROJECTS OF THIS NATURE.

3. GAUDENZIA AND SIMILAR TYPES OF OUTSIDE STAFF PERSONNEL SHOULD BE ACCORDED HIGH PREFERENCE/PRIORITY WITH REGARD TO THE USE OF INSTITUTIONAL FACILITIES. IT SHOULD BE UNDERSTOOD FROM THE ONSET OF FUTURE PROJECTS THAT INVOLVED INSTITUTIONAL PERSONNEL SHOULD ADJUST THEIR SCHEDULES AS MUCH AS PRACTICAL SO AS TO MAXIMIZE THE EFFORTS OF FUNDED OUTSIDE PERSONNEL WHO REPRESENT A

SERVICE WHICH CONSTITUTES (IN SOME CASES) THE BULK (IF NOT ONLY) DRUG THERAPY CONDUCTED WITHIN THAT INSTITUTION.

4. IDEALISTICALLY, CONSIDERATION SHOULD BE GIVEN IN FUTURE PROJECTS TO THE ESTABLISHMENT, WHERE POSSIBLE, OF DIFFERENTIAL LEVELS OF CONFRONTATION. IN THIS PROJECT, IT APPEARED TO BE SOMEWHAT IMPRACTICAL BECAUSE OF THE DIVERSE RANGE OF CAPABILITIES AND PERSONALITIES THAT EXIST AMONG MEDIUM/MAXIMUM SECURITY PRISONERS. ALSO IN THE CURRENT PROJECT, IT WAS DECIDED THE BEST APPROACH WOULD BE TO ATTEMPT TO REACH THE GREATEST NUMBER OF RESIDENTS RATHER THAN TO BE SO SELECTIVE THAT ONLY A FEW WOULD BE INVOLVED. FUTURE FUNDINGS SHOULD INCORPORATE BOTH TYPES OF APPROACHES HOWEVER SO THAT PERTINENT OBSERVATIONS COULD BE DRAWN FROM EACH APPROACH.

5. A HIGH LEVEL OF DIALOGUE SHOULD BE ASSURED IN FUTURE PROJECTS BETWEEN INVOLVED INSTITUTIONAL STAFF (COUNSELORS/SUPERVISORS) AND OUTSIDE TRAINERS. THIS DIALOGUE HAS EVIDENTLY SUFFERED IN SOME INSTANCES IN THIS PROJECT APPARENTLY BECAUSE SOME INSTITUTIONAL STAFF WERE CONTENT TO LET GAUDENZIA PERSONNEL "DO THEIR THING". IN FUTURE FINDINGS, HOWEVER, THIS ASPECT SHOULD BE GIVEN THE HIGHEST OF PRIORITIES IN ORDER TO ASSURE THE HIGHEST DEGREE OF EFFECTIVENESS.

6. SIGNIFICANT FOLLOW-UP SHOULD BE PROVIDED FOR IN FUTURE FUNDINGS. THE PARENT (RECEIVING) INSTITUTION SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR COORDINATING THIS IN MOST INSTANCES. WITHOUT SUCH FOLLOW-UP, THERE WILL BE LITTLE OPPORTUNITY TO VALIDLY ASSESS ANY LONG TERM EFFECTIVENESS OF SIMILAR PROJECTS. IT IS RECOGNIZED THAT THIS PARTICULAR ASPECT REPRESENTS A CHALLENGE TO ALL INVOLVED AGENCIES; HOWEVER, THE MACHINERY FOR CONDUCTING SUCH FOLLOW-UP MUST BE IDENTIFIED AND ASSEMBLED GRADUALLY SO THAT EVENTUALLY A VALID APPRAISAL OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SIMILAR PROJECTS CAN BE ASCERTAINED.

Appendix I

CLIENT FLOW BY MONTH
GRATERFORD 1975

MONTH	TOTAL AT BEG.	FIRST ADDS	RE-ADS.	TOTAL DIO.	Vol.	ADJUD.	TOTAL AT END	TOTAL INDIVIDUALS TREATED FOR MC.
JAN	83	10	1	33	26	7	61	94
FEB	61	4	0	2	0	2	63	65
MARCH	63	9	2	29	22	7	45	74
APRIL	45	0	2	5	0	5	42	47
MAY	42	5	1	1	1	0	47	48
JUNE	47	0	0	18	15	3	29	47
JULY	29	14	1	3	1	2	41	44
AUG.	41	2	0	0	0	0	43	43
SEPT.	43	0	0	1	0	1	42	43
TOTAL		47	7	92	65	27		
DIO-40 Vol & NONVOL.				100%	70.7%	29.3%*		

-25-

PRISON GROUPS
 1975- SEPT 1975
 GAUCHER, INC.

Appendix 2

CLIENT FLOW BY MONTH

HUNTINGDON 1975

MONTH	TOTAL AT BEG.	FIRST ADS.	RE-ADS.	TOTAL LO/O	VOL.	NONVOL.	TOTAL AT END	TOTAL NUMBER TREATED FOR M.O.
JAN.	32	3	1	7	7	0	29	36
FEB.	29	1	0	1	1	0	29	30
MAR.	29	4	0	4	3	1	29	33
APR.	29	4	1	1	0	1	33	34
MAY	33	0	2	1	0	1	34	35
JUN.	34	7	0	1	0	1	40	41
JUL.	40	0	0	2	1	1	38	40
AUG.	38	7	0	3	1	2	42	45
SEPT	42	4	0	* (46)	* (1)	* (45)	0	46
TOTAL		30	4	20	13	7		
Vol - % Vol. AND NONVOL.				100%	65%	35%		

*groups ended.

PRISON GROUPS
JAN 1975 - SEPT 1975
GAUDENCIA, INC.

Appendix 3

CLIENT FLOW BY MONTH
MARCH 1975

MONTH	TOTAL AT BEG.	FIRST ADS.	RE-ADS.	TOTAL D/O	VOL.	NONVOL.	TOTAL AT END	TOTAL NO. D. FILED FOR 2nd
APR	9	0	0	2	1	1	7	9
MAY	7	2	0	1	1	0	8	9
JUN	8	0	0	1	1	0	7	8
JUL	7	0	0	1	0	1	6	7
AUG	6	0	0	1	1	0	5	6
SEPT	5	0	0	* (5)	* (0)	* (5)	0	5
TOTAL		2	0	6	4	2		
D/O - % VOL + NONVOL				100%	66%	33%		

* groups ended

Lefebvre
at

GAUDENZIA, INC.
Prisoner Humanization Project
Drop-Out Form

Why did you drop-out of groups?

NOT MANDATORY ANY MORE

What didn't you like about groups?

Nothing

What did you like about the group process?

OPEN MIND GROUP SESSION

Would you consider rejoining the groups in the future? ☒ yes ☐ no
Why?

It deals with Reality

Do you have any other comments?

WORK

Appendix 5

Resident _____

Date 3-18-75 (2)

Work Assignment C.I. Clothing Plant Supervisor Mr. TreffingerThis resident is being considered for Gaudenzia House Progress Report

Due to various considerations, Support Teams of caseworkers, block officer, and work supervisor are not routinely assembled to make these decisions, and this report serves to present your viewpoint without such a meeting. However, if you have questions concerning this decision to be made, or if you feel that it would be more appropriate to have a Support Team meeting in this case, contact the Director of Treatment. If you do complete this form return it to Daniel T. Sims

I. BEHAVIORAL OBSERVATIONS ON THE JOB

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| (3) (✓) Works effectively | (13) (✓) Learns job quickly |
| (4) () Works ineffectively | (14) () Finds job difficult |
| (5) () Seeks advice | (15) (✓) Appears to want to work |
| (6) (✓) Responds to advice | (16) () Doesn't want to work |
| (7) () Rejects advice | |
| (8) () Seeks work to do | (17) () Needs constant supervision |
| (9) (✓) Accepts assigned work | (18) (✓) Needs little supervision |
| (10) () Avoids work | (19) () Needs no supervision |
| (11) (✓) Shows interest in self-improvement | (20) (✓) Completes work assigned |
| (12) () NO particular interest in self improvement | (21) () Requires prodding |

II. PERSONAL HABITS

- Personal cleanliness/ Safety (22) (✓) Satisfactory (23) () Unsatisfactory
- Work area Cleanliness/Safety (24) (✓) Satisfactory (25) () Unsatisfactory
- Personal/ Work habits are (26) () Improving (27) (✓) Stable (28) () Worsening

III. INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH OTHER RESIDENTS

(29) () Usually alone (31) () Is active, assertive
 (30) (X) Usually with a group (32) () Is passive, withdrawn

IV. EMOTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS -- Check where appropriate

(33) Angry	_____	(37) Acts impulsively	(75) _____	Aggressive	_____
(34) Cheerful	✓	(40) Calm and Relaxed	(46) ✓	Explosive	_____
(35) Irritable	_____	(41) Nervous, jumpy	(47) _____	Dominates	_____
(36) Fearful	_____	(42) Easily threatened	(48) _____	Is dominated	_____
(77) Depressed	_____	(43) Acts confused	(49) _____	Exploitive	_____
(38) Mood swings	_____	(44) Mature, steady	(50) _____	Cooperative	✓

V. WORK PERFORMANCE

Length of time on this job assignment SEPTEMBER 9, 1975 (51)

Special skills or qualities resident is learning on this work assignment John is learning cutting, this consist of making material for clothing - spreading the material and the cutting of the material

Is absenteeism a problem? No. (52)

Based on your contacts with this resident on the job, do you think that he should be approved for the program noted above? (53)

Please explain your answer Yes, Heatherdorn faithfully, does his job well and tries to do his best. He is in the top 25% of the inmates in the shop

Signed David Buffington Date 3/26/75
Foreman cloth shop

BLOCK REPORT

STATE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION
GRATERFORD, PENNSYLVANIA

PLEASE RETURN TO THE DIRECTOR OF TREATMENT BY:

DATE: ~~3-28-75~~ 3-25-75

BLOCK C DATE _____

1. Please check those personal and conduct characteristics below which most clearly describe how the man is behaving on your block at the present time. CHECK ENOUGH CHARACTERISTICS TO GIVE A CLEAR PICTURE OF THE MAN'S PRESENT BEHAVIOR ON YOUR BLOCK.

CONDUCT CHARACTERISTICS

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Seldom causes trouble | <input type="checkbox"/> Tries to leave block often | <input type="checkbox"/> Tries to take liberties with the officers |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Invites sex attraction | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Respectful | <input type="checkbox"/> Tries to loiter on block |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aggressive homosexual | <input type="checkbox"/> Requires frequent conduct warnings | <input type="checkbox"/> Insolent in manner |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Quarrelsome | <input type="checkbox"/> Refrains from fighting | <input type="checkbox"/> Slow in carrying out orders |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Polite | <input type="checkbox"/> Aggressor | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Seldom requires a conduct warning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Picks on weaker inmates | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Runs his own business | <input type="checkbox"/> Takes orders willingly |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Tries to dominate others (a bully) | <input type="checkbox"/> Gambles heavily | <input type="checkbox"/> Brags alot |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recently prefers to associate w/troublemakers | <input type="checkbox"/> Gambles moderately | <input type="checkbox"/> Acts hastily and thoughtlessly |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recently associates with the better element | <input type="checkbox"/> Argumentative | <input type="checkbox"/> "Con artist" |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Keeps to himself | | |

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resents criticism | <input type="checkbox"/> Needs protection | <input type="checkbox"/> Keeps an untidy cell |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Easily confused | <input type="checkbox"/> Tries to be a big shot | <input type="checkbox"/> A peddler (merchant) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Usually sour in attitude | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Can hold his own OK | <input type="checkbox"/> Nervous |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gets along well w/inmates | <input type="checkbox"/> Seems too bold in manner | <input type="checkbox"/> Complains too much |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gets along well w/officers | <input type="checkbox"/> Easily irritated | <input type="checkbox"/> Keeps to himself too much |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Does not get along well with the inmates | <input type="checkbox"/> Seldom complains | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Friendly and cooperative |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Does not get along well with the officers | <input type="checkbox"/> Easily talked into things by others | <input type="checkbox"/> Bull-headed and stubborn |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Feelings easily hurt | <input type="checkbox"/> Mature and steady | <input type="checkbox"/> Even-tempered |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resents authority | <input type="checkbox"/> Seems to get sick often | <input type="checkbox"/> Depressed and unhappy most of the time |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clean and neat person | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Keeps a clean, neat cell | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepts criticism favorably |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Dirty and untidy person | <input type="checkbox"/> Usually cheerful | <input type="checkbox"/> Childish and flighty |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Chronic liar | | <input type="checkbox"/> Carries a chip on his shoulder |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Seems seriously disturbed | | <input type="checkbox"/> A "jailhouse" lawyer |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Loses temper quickly | | |

2. Does inmate need special placement on the block? Yes () No ☒ 67

If so, please explain _____

3. If his associates on the block are known to you please list several by number and name _____

4. Please use the following space for more detailed discussion of any of the above items, or for discussion of anything not covered in the items:

5. Overall comparison with the rest of the men on the block: 66

☐ Upper 25%. One of the best on the block. ☒ Middle 50%. Average on the block. ☐ Lower 25%. One of the worst on the block.

Lt. Howard
Signature of the Block Sergeant

GAUDENZIA, INC.

Appendix 7

Prisoner Humanization Project
Counsellor/Trainer Report

Do you see any improvement over the last two months for the resident in the following areas? -

1. On the block:

2. In vocational training:

3. In education:

4. In group participation: King's attendance has been Excellent. at this point he is quite able to get involved in verbalizing some difficult things about himself. He has begun to look at his negative behavior and grow to the point of taking the responsibility to change some of it.

3-27-75
date

Don J. Quinn
counsellor

Mag. J. Coffey
trainer

UNIFORM DATA COLLECTION SYSTEM CLIENT MANAGEMENT

CA 1

Appendix 8

CLIENT ADMISSION

GOVERNOR'S COUNCIL ON DRUG
AND ALCOHOL ABUSE

A. IDENTIFICATION

FACILITY NO. 1 CLIENT NO. 1 STAFF I.D. 3 MOST RECENT ADMIT 2 4
MO. DAY YR.

IF TRANSFERRED/REFERRED FROM ANOTHER FACILITY

OLD FACILITY NUMBER 5 OLD CLIENT NUMBER 6

CLIENT REFERRED BY 7
01 - SELF 06 - EMPLOYER 10 - PUBLIC INEBRIATE PROGRAM
02 - RELATIVE 07 - FACILITY 11 - PROBATION AND PAROLE
03 - FRIEND 08 - AA 12 - OTHER CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM
04 - PHYSICIAN 09 - BSU 99 - OTHER

IF CMI, DATE OF INTERVIEW 8
MO. DAY YR.

OUT OF STATE RESIDENT 9 1 - YES 2 - NO CURRENT COUNTY OF RESIDENCE 10 ADMISSION TYPE 11
1 - FIRST ADMISSION ANY FACILITY WITHIN PROJECT
2 - READMISSION ANY FACILITY WITHIN PROJECT
3 - TRANSFER FROM ANY FACILITY WITHIN PROJECT

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE 12 13 14
PUBLIC ASSIST. CODES
1 - NONE
2 - GENERAL
3 - MEDICAL
4 - AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN
5 - SSI AID TO DISABLED

B. DEMOGRAPHY

SEX 15 1 - M 2 - F YEAR OF BIRTH 16 RACE/ETHNIC 17
01 - WHITE 04 - JAPANESE 08 - MEXICAN AMERICAN
02 - BLACK 05 - CHINESE 09 - CUBAN
03 - AMERICAN INDIAN 06 - OTHER ASIAN 99 - OTHER

CURRENT MARITAL STATUS 18 1 - NEVER MARRIED 5 - DIVORCED
2 - MARRIED 6 - WIDOWED
3 - LIVING TOGETHER 7 - UNKNOWN RELIGION 19 1 - PRACTICING 2 - NOT PRACTICING
CREED 20 1 - CATHOLIC 4 - PROTESTANT
2 - ISLAMIC 5 - OTHER
3 - JEWISH 9 - NONE

LEGAL PRESSURE TO ENTER 21 1 - YES 2 - NO IF YES, CODE FOR LEGAL PRESSURE 22 OTHER LEGAL STATUS 23 24 25 *always the same.*

LEGAL CODES 26 01 - NONE 05 - FEDERAL PAROLE 23 - HELD FOR TRIAL 26 - WORK RELEASE 31 - COUNTY PROBATION
02 - NARA I 06 - FEDERAL TASC 24 - CIVIL COMMITMENT 27 - JUVENILE COURT 32 - COUNTY PAROLE
03 - NARA III 20 - STATE PROBATION 25 - SENTENCED TO COMMITMENT IN LIEU OF PROSECUTION 28 - OTHER PRISON PROGRAMS 99 - OTHER
04 - FEDERAL PROBATION 21 - STATE PAROLE 30 - A.R.D. PROGRAM

HIGHEST GRADE COMPLETED 27 STUDENT IN EDUC. PROGRAM 28 1 - YES 2 - NO STUDENT IN TRAINING PROGRAM 29 1 - YES 2 - NO TRAINING SCHOOLS ATTENDED 30 31 1 - NONE 4 - TECH.
2 - VOC. 9 - OTHER
3 - BUS.

EMPLOYMENT STATUS 32 *always same* USUAL OCCUPATION WHEN EMPLOYED 33 NUMBER OF MONTHS EMPLOYED IN LAST TWO YEARS 34 CURRENT GROSS WEEKLY LEGAL INCOME 35 0

OCCUPATION CODES
1 - FULL TIME (30 OR MORE HOURS PER WK)
2 - PART TIME (LESS THAN 30 HRS PER WK)
3 - RETIRED
4 - UNEMPLOYED
5 - LEAVE OF ABSENCE
01 - PROFESSIONAL, TECHNICAL, MANAGERIAL
02 - OFFICE, CLERICAL, SALES
03 - CRAFTSMAN
04 - ENTERTAINER, MUSICIAN
05 - OPERATIVE, TRANSPORTATION
06 - OPERATIVE, OTHER
07 - SERVICE WORKERS, DOMESTIC
08 - SERVICE WORKERS, NON-DOMESTIC
09 - LABORER, FARM
10 - LABORER, MINE
11 - LABORER, OTHER
12 - HOMEMAKER
13 - STUDENT
99 - OTHER

AGE AT FIRST ARREST 36 ARRESTS FOR DRIVING WHILE INTOXICATED 37 NUMBER OF FELONY ARRESTS IN LAST TWO YEARS 38 DRUG SALES 39 DRUG POSSESSION 40 OTHER ARRESTS 41 TOTAL CONVICTIONS 42

C. CLIENT W/O D/A PROBLEM

CLIENT IS IN FACILITY FOR CLIENT'S OWN DRUG OR ALCOHOL PROBLEM 43 1 - YES 2 - NO
IF NO -- WHAT IS THE RELATION TO PERSON WITH DRUG OR ALCOHOL PROBLEM OR
1 - SPOUSE 2 - PARENT 3 - SIBLING 4 - CHILD 5 - FRIEND 9 - OTHER
IS CLIENT IN TREATMENT FOR OTHER REASONS? 44 1 - YES 2 - NO
IF YES, SPECIFY: 45

IF CLIENT DOES NOT HAVE DRUG OR ALCOHOL PROBLEM SKIP TO SECTION G.

D. TREATMENT HISTORY - MOST RECENT FIRST

ENTER 1 - DRUG 2 - ALCOHOL 46 TYPE 47 NO. OF MOS. FOR LEAVING 48 REASON FOR LEAVING 49

TOTAL NUMBER OF PRIOR TREATMENT EXPERIENCES: 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65

DRUG 66 ALCOHOL 67

NUMBER OF MONTHS SINCE LAST TREATMENT EXPERIENCE: 68 69

DRUG 70 ALCOHOL 71

TYPE OF TREATMENT CODES
01 - THIS PROJECT
02 - OTHER PROJECT
03 - PRIVATE M.D.
04 - HOSPITAL
05 - MH/MR
06 - SOC/COMM SERV.
07 - CLERGYMAN
08 - NARCOTICS ANONYMOUS
09 - AA
99 - OTHER

REASON FOR LEAVING CODES
1 - COMPLETED TREATMENT - GOALS FULLY ACHIEVED
2 - COMPLETED TREATMENT - GOALS PARTIALLY ACHIEVED
3 - LEFT WITH FACILITY ADVICE
4 - LEFT AGAINST FACILITY ADVICE
5 - NON-COMPLIANCE WITH FACILITY RULES
6 - JAILED
7 - TRANSFERRED
8 - REFERRED
9 - OTHER

END