

67588

✓
✓
EVALUATION
✓
LORTON ART PROGRAM INC.

Prepared by:

The Office of Resource Management
✓ D.C. Department of Corrections
Delbert C. Jackson, Director

January 1980

Mary H. Oakey
Program Analyst

67588

ACA, Evaluation

FEB 15 1980

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report represents the initial evaluation of the Lorton Art Program. The Lorton Art Program began in 1973 and is currently in operation at Youth Centers I and II and the Maximum Security Facility. It has a staff of one.

The population for this study included 372 participants from the initial classes at Minimum Security Facility and Youth Centers I and II. 252 of the 372 participants have been released to the community. 102 were released through Community Correctional Centers and 150 were released directly to parole supervision. On the cut-off date for the study (8-15-79), 201 (79.8%) of the 252 participants were still in the community. Performance by manner of release indicated that 76.4% of those who were released through CCC were still in the community on the cut-off date compared to 80% of those who were released directly to parole supervision.

The art director used several measures to evaluate the performance of the 372 participants. The only measure for which a correlation could be established with performance on parole was "student's reaction to the program." Degree of involvement, prior training, interest level, progress achieved, and talent were not related to release performance.

Since 203 of the 252 participants who were released to the community were from Youth Centers I and II, their post release performance was compared with that of nonparticipating youths from

the same institutions. Differences in the time periods of release, difference in the definition of escapes, and lack of data regarding inmate characteristics of nonparticipating youths made it impossible to do a definitive comparison. However, very little difference was found in the projected percentage of parole at one year out for the two groups. (9.03% for the nonparticipating group compared to 9.6% for the participants.)

A comparison between the participants who were released to the community through CCC and the CCC Performance Analysis system showed a substantially lower projected percentage of failure at four months out (the average length of stay in a CCC) for the art program participants (30% compared to 41% for the nonparticipants). Because the groups were not necessarily matched, it cannot be stated with assurance that participation in the art program alone accounted for the lower projected percentage of failures for the participants. However, it can be assumed that it has some impact.

A survey of treatment and administrative staff reactions to the program was very favorable. An anonymous survey of participant attitudes showed less commitment but was also generally favorable.

It can be concluded from the findings of this study that the program has thus far achieved its objectives. The positive evaluation by the educational and psychological service staffs indicate that the program has rendered a valuable service to the institutions in which it has been conducted.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction	1
Brief History of Lorton Art Program	5
Procedure	7
Discussion of Findings	8
- Characteristics of Participants	8
- Evaluation of Students' Performance by Art Director	13
- Revocation by Six Measures of Art Director's Evaluation	15
- Comparison of Parole Performance of Youths of the Program with Adult Males of the Program.	19
- Comparison of Youth Participants with Youths from Parole Performance Monitoring System	20
- Comparison of Youth Participants with Youths from CCC Performance Analysis System	22
Staff Evaluation of Lorton Art Program	24
Evaluation of Lorton Art Program by Participants	27
Conclusions and Recommendations	29
Bibliography	31

INTRODUCTION

Although art has been present in prison for a long time, it has played a minor role in the program structure of the institution. Traditionally, art has been viewed as a recreational or leisure time activity, and consequently its existence as a program has been very limited with little thought having been given to funding and staffing by prison administration. In some instances art in prison has survived through private sources and the efforts of professional artists from the community who have donated their time and talents. In still other cases the inmates themselves have continued to produce art on their own time and with whatever material they could manage to find.

A review of the literature reveals that until recently very little information was available regarding art programs in prison. However, a 1975 study conducted by Margo Koines included a survey of 126 correctional facilities throughout the United States. Her inquiries received 79 responses. Of those 79, 59 institutions had art programs in one form or another. Within the group with no art programs, 7 were planning to implement one, and 13 had no intention of doing so.¹ Since the Koines study was conducted, more

¹ Margo Koines, "Art Therapy in Correctional Institutions," unpublished paper, 1975 Part II, p.3

attention has been focused on art in prison. One of the reasons for this recent interest is Project CULTURE (Creative Use of Leisure Time Under Restricted Environment).

In January 1977, the Law Enforcement Assistance Agency (LEAA) awarded the American Correctional Association initial funds of \$1.1 million to conduct an 18 month arts project. This was the first Federally funded art program of its kind in the country. Designed to promote greater cooperation among state and local correctional arts organizations and institutions, the project initially awarded 21 contracts in 16 states; making a total of 54 adult correctional institutions with a combined average daily inmate population of 19,000 participating. The project's activities included various forms of art including drama, music, dance, creative writing, and visual arts. The project has been extended until 1980. However, after that time no further funding will be made.²

Project CULTURE has provided an opportunity for some correctional institutions to initiate programs in the arts which otherwise would not have had the funding to do so. Further, through its exhibit of inmate art in Washington, D. C. in July and August 1978, Project CULTURE demonstrated to the public that there exists a great deal of talent within the nation's prisons.

² American Correctional Association, Arts In Corrections, (A Summary of Project CULTURE and a Handbook for Program Implementation), Collins Lithographing and Printing Company, 1978, p.4.

Most important, it has helped to make more correctional officials aware that prison art programs may have potential benefits beyond providing recreational and leisure time activities.

While "art therapy" can be used as a treatment technique in correctional institutions, it is different from the more general "therapeutic" value of art programs. Art therapy is a formalized structured program directed by a therapist who has been trained in art as well as in techniques that can detect the therapeutic needs of the participant. The therapeutic benefits of art programs are generally by-products rather than the main or desired ends. Some of the benefits that may be derived from prison art programs are: reduction of tension, self-satisfaction, success achievement, self-expression and understanding.³

The combined therapeutic and recreational benefits of prison art programs contribute to the rehabilitation process by providing constructive use of leisure time, increasing understanding and exercise of self-control and feeling capable of accomplishment and creativity.⁴

Drawing, painting and crafts have proven useful in developing and improving hand-eye coordination and concentration, the lack of which often give rise to severe difficulty in learning. The value of art in preparing the learning disabled child for

³ American Correctional Association, Arts in Corrections, (A Summary of Project CULTURE and a Handbook for Program Implementation), Collins Lithographing and Printing Company, 1978, p.3.

⁴ Ibid., p.4.

academic learning has been demonstrated by the Lab School of the Kingsbury Center, Washington, D.C.

. . .The arts lend themselves to the imaginative use of concrete materials and experiences to teach abstract ideas. Neural immaturity makes it very hard for the learning disabled child to grasp abstractions. He has to be introduced to them through his body, through objects and pictures, and then through symbols. The arts offer opportunities to strengthen visual, auditory, tactile, and motor areas.

* * *

Artists, art teachers, and art therapists can work on the same basic skills as a classroom teacher but in different and captivating ways. The same training in discrimination that is required for reading in the classroom is provided by discriminating one shape, sound, color or direction from another in the arts. The skills for academic readiness are inherent in the arts: organizing and remembering sequences; relationships of size, shape, color, or volume; using and recognizing a symbol in varying contexts; and many more. With a prescription of precise objectives, the artist concentrates on the learning process while the child, doing what he enjoys, concentrates on the product he is creating.⁵

It should be noted that although the short term benefits of arts to the institution are discernible, the long term benefits, that is, its effects on the offender's community adjustment, are yet unknown.

. . .There is no hard evidence showing a correlation between a decrease in recidivism and involvement with an arts program . . .There has been an attempt, though to show a correlation between involvement in an arts program and a decrease in incidence of violence inside the prison. In the first annual report of Project CULTURE, officials claim that there was a 54 to 100 percent drop in incidents among those who participated in the program. The report

5

Sally L. Smith, No Easy Answer, Winthrop Publisher, 1979, p.137.

continues: 'Offering creative outlets for pent-up energies has eased conflicts and reduced tensions among the inmates as well as between inmates and guards.'⁶

The report further states that the Assistant Director of Project CULTURE admitted that the above cited data is a limited evaluation.

The Lorton Art Program:

The following report is the initial attempt to evaluate the Lorton Art Program. One of the major reasons for conducting the study was to determine its impact on recidivism. Other important information the study hoped to find included: some of the characteristics of the participants, an evaluation of their performance, in the program, the reaction of institutional staff to the program, and finally an evaluation of the program by the participants.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE LORTON ART PROGRAM, INC.

The Lorton Art Program, Inc. is a comprehensive fine arts program which links the offender, the criminal justice system and the private sector in an effort to provide, through art education and individual skills development, a means for rehabilitation, education and community understanding.

The Lorton Art Program began in 1973, when its present Director, Miss Mia Choumenkovitch, began teaching Saturday morning art classes as a volunteer at the D. C. Department of Corrections' Minimum Security Facility, Lorton, Virginia.

6

Philip B. Taft, Jr., "The Alchemy of Prison Art," Corrections Magazine, Vol. V, No. 3, September, 1979, p. 19.

Recognizing the need for such a program within the Department, Miss Choumenkovitch began raising funds on a small scale to obtain the necessary art supplies. The program continued to operate on small private donations and her volunteer efforts until the summer of 1975. At that time she received reliable funding which enabled her to expand the program. It continues to be supported primarily by money from the National Endowment for the Arts and private foundations and corporations. Administration of the program, fund raising and classroom teaching are done by the art director, with assistance from volunteer teachers. The bookkeeping is done by a contractual accountant.

While the program is no longer in operation at the Minimum Security Facility, classes are currently being held at Youth Center I for the general population, as well as for those in the protective custody unit of that institution, and at Youth Center II. Early in 1979 classes were begun at the Maximum Security Facility for adult male offenders. Classes are held for a minimum of two-and-one half hours per session and are conducted four days a week at the different facilities. Participants are able to attend classes twice a week. The average number of students per class is 15, and the average length of participation in the program is six months to one year for most student inmates.

Miss Choumenkovitch defines the objectives of the program as follows:

- Offer and expand art and crafts education to youth and

adult males of the Department's institutions who are interested in developing skills in visual and plastic arts.

- Help prison residents to develop both the initiative and learning techniques that they can apply to other occupations and learning situations. (vocational training, etc.)
- Give offenders with learning disabilities special training designed to help correct these impairments.
- Provide offenders with a constructive outlet of tensions, frustrations, anger and boredom that might otherwise encourage anti-social behavior.
- Provide offenders with situations where decision-making and other forms of choice and self-expression are required.
- Offer offenders, through drawing, painting and crafts, evidence of their own accomplishments to raise their self-esteem and guide them to more constructive pursuits.
- Provide the more gifted offenders with special training in art and craft techniques to enable them to take part in city and community projects upon their release from prison.

PROCEDURE

The data for this study were collected from four sources. The first source of data was supplied by the art director and included a roster of the participants, as well as her evaluation of their performance in the program. Information regarding characteristics of the participants of the program such as age, I.Q., grade level, charge, release date, method of release (i.e. through a community correctional center, by parole plan, or other), violation of parole, and new convictions was collected from the records of the D.C. Department of Corrections. The third source was an evaluation by the institutional staff, and the fourth source was a questionnaire completed by the participants. Each of the four sources of data will be presented separately in this

report.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The roster indicated that 396 inmate students had participated or were currently participating in the Lorton Art Program as of May 1, 1979. This included students in Youth Centers I and II and those who had participated in the initial program at the Minimum Security Facility (1973-75). The newly formed classes at the Maximum Security Facility were not included since they had not been in progress long enough to make a valid evaluation.

It was necessary to exclude 23 names from the roster because, in some instances, positive identification could not be made with Department records. This was due to the fact that the art director's records contained names but no DCDC numbers. In attempting to identify the participant through Department records, it was found that several former inmates would have the same name. In other cases, the inmate had participated for a short period of time; two weeks to two months while awaiting transfer to a federal institution, and an evaluation would have been difficult to make. The study, therefore, includes 372 students who participated in the program for a minimum of three months and for whom positive identification could be made.

Characteristics of the Participants:

While the ages of 14 of the 372 students included in the study were unknown, the largest number 251 or (67%) were between the ages of 21 and 25 years; 27 (7%) were between the ages of

19 and 20, and 3 (1%) were between the ages of 46-50 and were the oldest students to participate. Table I below shows the age range of the students.

Table I Age Range of Students

Age Group	Frequency	Percent
Unknown	14	4%
19-20	27	7%
21-25	251	67%
26-30	43	12%
31-35	22	6%
36-40	8	2%
41-45	4	1%
46-50	<u>3</u>	<u>1%</u>
Total	372	100%

I.Q. scores and grade levels were not available for the adult male students who participated in the 1973-75 art classes at the Minimum Security Facility. However, Revised Beta I.Q. test scores, as well as Stanford Achievement Test results were available at the Department's Diagnostic Center for 256 of the students from Youth Centers I and II.

In the average intelligence range (90-109) there were 141 scores (55%), and in the bright normal range (110-119) there were 11 (4.5%). 104 participants scored in the below average intelligence range, with 19 (7.3%) scoring between 50-69; 28 (10.5%) between 70-79, and 57 (22%) scored between 80-89. Table II shows the range of scores.

Table II Revised Beta I.Q. Test Scores

Range	Frequency	Percent
Mentally Deficient 50-69	19	7.3%
Borderline 70-79	28	10.9%
Dull Normal 80-89	57	22.0%
Average 90-109	141	55.0%
Bright Normal 110-119	<u>11</u>	<u>4.3%</u>
Total	256	100%

Stanford Achievement Test scores for the 256 Youth Centers I & II participants indicate that 117 (45%) were functioning at grade levels of 1 through 3, 126 (49.2%) were in grade levels 4 through 6, and 14 (5.5%) were in grade levels 7 through 9.

The original charges indicated that crime against the person accounted for 55.1% of all the convictions. Of the 372 subjects in the study, 155 (42%) were convicted for robbery, 14 (4%) for murder, 2 (.1%) for kidnapping, 6 (2%) for rape, and 28 (8%) for assault. Property crime accounted for 34.2% of the convictions, with 60 (16%) for burglary, 41 (11%) for larceny, 3 (.8%) receiving stolen property, 22 (6%) unauthorized use of vehicle, and 1 (.3%) for arson. Dangerous drugs accounted for 10 (3%), 2 (.1%) commercial sex offenses, and 28 (8%) less serious offenses (other). Table III lists the convictions with frequencies and percentages.

Table III Original Charges

Charge	Frequency	Percent.
Murder	14	4.0%
Kidnapping	2	0.1%
Rape	6	2.0%
Assault	28	8.0%
Robbery	155	41.0%
Arson	1	0.3%
Burglary	60	16.1%
Larceny	41	11.0%
Receiving Stolen Property	3	0.8%
Unauthorized Use Vehicle	22	6.0%
Dangerous Drugs	10	3.0%
Sex Off. (Commercial)	2	0.1%
Other	<u>28</u>	<u>8.0%</u>
	372	100%

Of the 372 participants in the study, 293 (78%) had been released from the institutions as of August 15, 1979, the cut-off date for the study, and 79 (21.3%) remained in the institutions. Of those released 102 (34%) were paroled through one of the Department's Community Correctional Centers (CCC); 150 (51.1%) were released directly to parole supervision; and 41 (13.9%) were administratively released to other jurisdictions to serve sentence, to St. Elizabeth's Hospital for treatment of mental illness, or to another of the Department's institutions to continue serving sentence.

The 41 who were administratively released or transferred were removed from the 293 who had been released from the institutions for the purpose of computing parole performance, since no attempt was made to follow-up on them once they were transferred. This left a total of 252 participants who had been released to parole supervision since the program began in 1973, and it is the number on which the percentage of recidivism is based.

On the cut-off date for the study, 201 (79.8%) of the 252 participants who had been released on parole were still in the community; parole of 2 (.8%) was terminated by death, 46 (18%) had been returned to custody for violation of parole, and 3 (2%) cases were pending in the courts. Of the 46 parole violations, 19 (40.3%) were for technical violation of parole conditions, and 27 (57.6%) were for new convictions.

Performance by manner of release of the 252 participants indicated that 80 (76.4%) of the 102 who were released through CCC were still in the community on the cut-off date for the study, compared to 121 (80.6%) of the 150 who were released directly to parole plan. Table IV shows performance by manner of release.

Performance	Through CCC		Direct to Community	
Successes	80	78.4%	121	80.6%
Parole Term. by Death	0	0	2	0.8%
Violation Conditions	10	9.8%	9	6.0%
New Convictions	10	9.8%	17	11.2%
Pending Cases	<u>2</u>	<u>1.0%</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0.7%</u>
	102	100%	150	100%

Table V reflects the cumulative length of time in the community for the 252 participants who were released to the community. (See page 14)

EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE OF
STUDENTS BY THE ART DIRECTOR

The art director used six measures to evaluate the performance of the 372 students. These included: 1) whether the student was involved in art prior to entering the program, 2) extent of formal training before entering the program; 3) the student's personal interest in the program, 4) the student's progress; 5) the student's reaction to the work he produced, and 6) the extent of talent displayed by the student. The first measure was evaluated by "yes" or "no" and measures two through six were evaluated on a scale of one to three or one to four, with one being the lowest point on the scale.

With regard to measure number one; whether the student was involved in art prior to entering the program, 45 (12%) of the 372 participants had been involved in art prior to entering the program. 340 (91%) of the 372 students had received no formal training in the arts prior to participating in the program; 31 (8.7%) had received some fromal training, and only 1 (.3%) had received extensive training before entering the program. 77 (21%) showed little interested in the program; 180 (48%) were somewhat interested, and 115 (31%) were found to be very interested. The evaluation showed that 46 (12%) of the 372 students made no progress in the program; 241 (65%) made some progress, and 85 (23%) made marked progress. 40 (11%) of the

Cumulative Length of Time in Community &
Failures and Percentages for Participants
of the Lorton Art Program

Table V

Days, Months, Years	Days, Months, Years	Cumulative Percentage	Persons	Failures	Percent
0 days	to 6 mo. 3 days	10%	27	3	11.5%
6 mo 3 days	to 9 mo. 7 days	20%	25	3	11.5%
9 mo. 7 days	to 1 yr. 18 days	30%	25	1	4.0%
1 yr. 18 days	to 1 yr. 3 mo. 11 days	40%	26	3	11.5%
1 yr. 3 mo. 11 days	to 1 yr. 8 mo. 5 days	50%	24	4	16.7%
1 yr. 8 mo. 5 days	to 2 yr. 2 mo. 26 days	60%	24	6	33.0%
2 yr. 2 mo. 25 days	to 2 yr. 9 mo. 18 days	70%	26	7	30.7%
2 yr. 9 mo. 18 days	to 3 yr. 5 mo.	80%	25	5	20.0%
3 yr. 5 mo.	to 4 yr. 3 mo. 8 days	90%	25	5	19.0%
4 yr. 3 mo. 8 days	to 6 yr. 3 mo. 6 days	100%	25	12	48.0%

372 students usually expressed no feelings regarding their work; 312 (84%) were usually pleased with the work they produced; and 20 (5%) were usually self-critical of their work. 44 (12%) of the 372 students displayed no talent at all, while 235 (63%) were somewhat talented, 72 (19%) were very talented, and 21 (6%) were exceptionally talented.

The study attempted to determine if a correlation could be established between performance on parole and the six measures by which the participants were evaluated. The results of the comparison are shown in the following six tables.

Measure one, prior involvement in art: 80.8% of the participants with no prior involvement in art upon entering the program were still in the community on the cut-off date of the study, compared to 78.8% of those who had been involved in art before entering the program. With regard to recidivism, there was virtually no difference associated with prior involvement.

Type of Revocation	Yes		No	
Successes	26	78.8%	177	80.8%
Vio. of Parole Conditions	3	9.0%	16	7.3%
New Convictions	4	12.1%	23	10.5%
Pending Cases (in court)	0	0	3	1.4%
Total	33	100%	219	100%

Measure two, extent of formal training in art: 82.7% of those parolees who had received no prior training upon entering the program were still in the community on the cut-off date, compared to 76.1% of those who had received some prior training. The one person who had received extensive training before entering the program failed on a technical violation. The percentage of recidivism was also lower for those with no prior formal training, a total of 18% compared to 24% for those with some prior training and 100% for the one with extensive training. See table VII.

Table VII Type of Rev.	Revocation by Prior Formal Training					
	No Prior Training		Some Prior Training		Extensive Prior Training	
Successes	187	81.3%	16	76.1%	0	0
Vio. Parole Cond.	16	6.9%	2	9.5%	1	100%
New Convictions	24	10.4%	3	14.2	0	0
Cases Pending	3	1.3%	0	0	0	0
Total	230	100%	21	100%	1	100%

Measure three, personal interest in the program: The ones who were "somewhat interested" in the program performed slightly better in the community than those with "little interest" or "very interested." 83.6% of the "somewhat interested" parolees were still in the community on the cut-off date for the study, while 79.3% of those with "little interest" and 76.3% of those who were "very interested" were also in the community. The "somewhat interested" also had a smaller percentage of revocations, showing a total of 16.3%, compared to 19% for the "little interest" and 23.6% for the "very interested." Again, however, no strong association is found.

See table VIII.

Table VII Type of Revocation	Revocation by Personal Interest in Program					
	Little Interest		Somewhat Interested		Very Interested	
Successes	46	79.3%	102	83.6%	55	76.3%
Vio. Par. Cond.	4	6.9%	6	4.9%	9	12.5%
New Convictions	7	12.0%	12	9.8%	8	11.1%
Pending Cases	1	1.7%	2	1.6%	0	0
Total	58	100%	122	100%	72	100%

Measure four, student's progress: 83.6% of the parolees who made "some progress" were still in the community at the cut-off date, while 79.4% of those who made "no progress" and 72.8% of those who made "marked progress" also remained in the community. The percentage of revocation of parole is slightly smaller for the parolees who made "some progress," indicating 16.9% compared to 20.5% for those who made "no progress" in the program, and 27.2% for those who made "marked progress. See Table IX below.

Table IX Type of Rev.	Revocation by Student's Progress in the Program					
	No Progress		Some Progress		Marked Progress	
Successes	27	79.4%	133	83.6%	43	72.8%
Vio. Parole Cond.	3	8.8%	8	5.0%	8	13.6%
New Convictions	3	8.8%	16	10.6%	8	13.6%
Pending Cases	1	2.9%	2	1.3%	0	0
Total	34	100%	159	100%	59	100%

Measure five, student's reaction to the program: 100% of those who were "usually self-critical of the work they produced" were in the community on the cut-off date for the study. This reflects a substantial difference between those who were "usually pleased with their work" which showed 79.9% in the community, and those showing "no expression of feelings." 77.4%. See Table X below.

Table X	Revocation by Student's Reaction to the Program					
	No Expression of Feelings		Usually Pleased With Work		Self-critical of his work	
Type of Rev.						
Successes	24	77.4%	167	79.9%	12	100%
Vio. Cond. Par.	3	9.7%	16	7.7%	0	0
New Convictions	3	9.7%	24	10.5%	0	0
Cases Pending	1	3.2%	2	1.0%	0	0
Total	31	100%	209	100%	12	100%

Measure Six, talent: The "very talented" participants had the highest percentage of parolees in the community on the cut-off date, with 82.6%, while the "no talent" parolees showed 81.3%, the "somewhat talented" showed 80.8%, and the "exceptionally talented" showed the lowest percentage, 70.6%. See Table XI below.

Table XI	Revocation by Talent							
	No Talent		Somewhat Talented		Very Talented		Exceptionally Talented	
Type of Revocation								
Successes	26	81.3%	127	80.8%	38	82.6%	12	70.6%
Vio. Par. Cond.	3	9.4%	8	5.1%	5	10.9%	3	17.6%
New Conv.	3	9.4%	19	12.1%	3	6.5%	2	11.8%
Cases Pending	0	0	3	1.9%	0	0	0	0
Total	32	100%	157	100%	46	100%	17	100%

The only measure used by the art director to evaluate performance which appeared to be related to outcome after release was "student's reaction to the program."

Comparison of Participants from Youth Centers I & II with Adult Males from the Minimum Security Facility:

A considerable difference was found in the ages of the two groups. 88% of the participants from the Youth Centers were between the ages of 19 and 25, while 75% of the adult males from the Minimum Security Facility were between the ages of 31 and 50 years.

Charges for crime against the person were higher for the adult male participants; 73.4% compared to 46.3% for those from Youth Centers I & II. However, 37.4% of the youths had charges of property crime while 18.3% of the adult males had received that type of charge.

The study found that 167 (82.3%) of the 203 youth participants who were paroled were still in the community on the cut-off date compared to 36 (73.4%) of the 49 adult male parolees. In addition, the percentage of failures was 17.7% for the youths and 26% for the adult males. Table XII shows the post release performance of the two groups.

Comparison of Post Release Performance
of Program Participants from Youth
Centers I & II with those from the
Minimum Security Facility

Table XII

Performance	Participants from YC I & II		Participants from Min. Sec. Fac.	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Successes	167	82.3%	36	73.4%
Failures	36	17.7%	13	26.7%
Total	203	100%	49	100%

Comparison of Participant and Nonparticipant
Post Release Performance:

Since 203 of the 252 participants who were released to the community were from Youth Centers I and II, an attempt was made to compare the post release performance of those youths with nonparticipating youths from the same institutions. The only sources with data that could be used for comparison were the Department's Parole Performance Monitoring System and the Community Correctional Centers Performance Analysis System. However, differences in the time periods of release, difference in the definition of escapes, and lack of data regarding inmate characteristics of the nonparticipating groups made it impossible to do a definitive comparison. Nevertheless, it did provide some information regarding recidivism by the participants in comparison with youths from the same institutions who did not have the benefit of the art program.

Comparison with Youths from Parole
Monitoring Group:

Comparison with youths from the Parole Performance Monitoring System was limited to age, current charge and post release performance.

A sample of 175 youths from the Parole Performance Monitoring System was compared with the total number of youths in the art study (323). As shown by Table XIII, the ages of the two groups are quite similar.

Comparison of Age Range of
Lorton Art Program Youths
with Parole Performance
Monitoring Group

Table XIII

Age Range	Lorton Art Program		Parole Monitoring Group	
	Frequency	Percent.	Frequency	Percent.
18-22	77	24.6%	42	24.0%
23-27	206	66.0%	116	66.3%
28-32	<u>29</u>	<u>9.3%</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>9.7%</u>
Total	312*	100%	175	100%

*Birthdates of 11 participants unknown

Current charges for the two groups followed a similar trend. 52.4% of the youths from the art program and 60% of the Parole Performance Monitoring group were charged with some type of crime against the person, while 36.2% of the art program youths and 32% of the Parole Performance Monitoring group were charged with property crimes. There was less than one percent difference in the dangerous drug charges for the two groups; 3.1% of the art program youths had drug charges, compared to 4% of the other group. Table XIV compares the current charges of the two groups.

Comparison of Charges of Youths of
Lorton Art Program with Youths from
Parole Performance Monitoring System

Table XIV

Charge	Art Program Youths		Parole Monitoring Youths	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Crime Against Person (Murder, Rape, Asslt. Rob. Kidnapping)	169	52.3%	105	60%
Property Crime (Arson, Burg, Larc. UUV, Rec. Stolen Prop.)	118	36.5%	56	32%
Dangerous Drugs	10	3.1%	7	4%
Other	<u>26</u>	<u>8.0%</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>4%</u>
Total	323	100%	175	100%

Based on the limited data available for testing compatibility of the two groups, the participants and sample from the Parole Monitoring System appeared to be similar enough to justify comparison of post release performance. When making the comparison of the two groups, failures were defined as technical violations and new sentences only. Escapes were not included, due to the difference in the definition by the study and the Parole Performance Monitoring System. See Table XV.

Table XV. Comparison of Post Release Performance by Art Program Group with Youths from Parole Monitoring Group

	Failure Rates	Projected % Failure at One Year Out
Parole Monitoring Youths July 1978-Sept. 1979	.02581%	9.03%
Art Study Participants Mar. 1975-Aug.15, 1979	.02722%	9.6%

As indicated by Table XV, there was very little difference in the projected percentage of failure at one year out for the two groups.

Comparison with CCC Performance Analysis System:

The CCC Performance Analysis is a system that monitors, on a quarterly basis, the performance of releaseses from Youth Centers I and II who enter the community through a community correctional center rather than by direct parole. A comparison was made between this group and the art program participants who were released to the community through a CCC to determine if the performance of one group was better than the other. The comparison shows a substantially lower projected percentage of failure at four months (average

length of stay in a CCC) for the art program participants; 30% compared to 41% for the CCC Performance Analysis youths. Since the comparison was made on just one variable (performance in CCC), we cannot state with assurance that participation in the art program alone accounted for the lower projected percentage of failures for the participants. However, it can be assumed that it had some impact. See table XVI.

Table XVI
Comparison of CCC Performance
by Art Program Participants
with Youths from CCC Perform-
ance Analysis System

	Failure Rates	Projected % Failure at Four Months Out
CCC Performance Analysis Youths July 1978 - Nov. 1979	.3336%	41.0%
Art Program Participants Mar. 1975 - Aug. 15, 1979	.2443%	30.0%

Staff Evaluation of the Lorton Art Program:

Questionnaires were distributed to 14 members of the teaching and psychological services staffs at Youth Centers I and II and the Minimum Security Facility. 13 questionnaires were completed and returned. One was not completed because the staff member to whom it was directed had left the employ of the Department. Below are the responses to the four questions contained in the questionnaire. (Respondents selected more than one answer in questions 1,2 and 3.)

1. Do/did you find the participants of the Lorton Art Program a bit different from the remainder of the institution population?

more withdrawn	1
less verbal	5
aggressive	2
brighter	3
duller	0
troubled	4
no different	2
more introverted	1
occasionally more motivated	1

2. Do/Did you detect any indication of personal improvement in the participants of the Lorton Art Program such as?

self-esteem	8
more confidence	7
more relaxed	6
more cooperative	6

3. What do you feel is the role of the Lorton Art Program?

a leisure-time activity	9
a rehabilitative technique	10
contribution to institution control	7
educational program	10

4. How effective has it been in fulfilling its role?

"Very. I have noticed a definite improvement in my students after having been in this program. They have a better sense of self-worth and accomplishment. They are able to express themselves easier."

"Not only has the art program been effective in providing the items listed in question number 3, it has also given the residents a new kind of exposure and a means of expression. The learning disabilities specialist recognized an improvement in the visual perception of men who participated in the art program."

"The program is fulfilling its role very well as I understand it. With reference to question number 3, I feel that while institutional control is not a goal of the program, it is an outgrowth of it which is very positive. Based on the control factor and personal improvement the participants receive, I feel the program is worthwhile and should be expanded."

"The program is certainly seen as worthwhile, especially since it allows the resident an alternative avenue for self-expression and allows him to develop his artistic talents. The resultive factors, however, are difficult to determine. I find it hard to group those particular residents involved in the art program. Further, it is difficult to distinguish the degree to which the art program affects the behavior or growth in relationship to other factors in the institutional setting."

"Residents involved in the art program have an opportunity to learn whether they have skills of merit in art. Thus as an educational program it fulfills its role. It provides an outlet to occupy time and to gain self-expression. Furthermore, because of its structure, the program contributes to institutional control. This program should be an ongoing activity."

"Very effective. I feel it has given the men who do not otherwise have adequate means to express themselves, a channel through which they may do so. I find that many of the men reflect warm feelings toward the art instructor, because they appreciate the respect and caring she shows toward them. I feel that they experience an especially important interpersonal relationship in the art class as well as learning how to channel energy, express themselves in non-verbal ways, remedy perceptual motor problems, etc."

"In the YC I setting it has been less effective than it might have been because it has been minimally integrated with other rehabilitative programs. In the sense, however, that it appears to have increased the self-esteem of the participants, it has most certainly demonstrated its potential for contributing to emotional growth; low self-esteem is clearly a significant factor in the psychological makeup of those who break the law and who are substance abusers."

"As I see its role presently, it is just another activity to broaden free time resident choices. I feel it has fulfilled its role. However, it seems imperative to me that the role

needs to be intensified toward the rehabilitative goal. Structure will have to be provided by the institution to move the present program toward becoming a rehabilitative technique. This will assure that communication in both directions is working. Hopefully this could include the art therapist as a regular member of the treatment team."

"Extremely effective. Provides leisure time activity, improves dexterity and skill with the hands, as well as enriching the lives of the men who participate."

"It is difficult to measure the art program's impact. Many values reinforced are not always visible. Men appear to enjoy the classes, look forward to Ms. Mia's arrival, and actively participate in the various art forms."

"Difficult to really say. My personal experience with clients involved in both therapy and the art program is limited. However, in those cases the art program has proven to be a valuable resource."

One respondent stated only "O.K."

Evaluation by Participants of the Program:

Questionnaires were distributed to 311 of the 372 participants included in the study. The 41 who were administratively released, and 20 who were off time from parole supervision, and could not be contacted, were not included.

The questionnaires were distributed through the parole officers of those participants who were under parole supervision and through classification and parole officers of those who were still in the Department's institutions. 126 completed questionnaires were returned, representing 40% of the 311 that were distributed.

Although a 40% response is not sufficient to derive any concrete conclusions, the results do indicate a positive evaluation of the program by the men who completed the questionnaires. Of particular interest is the fact that 115 of the 126 respondents viewed the program as a learning experience, 121 said it was worth the effort, and 109 would participate again if the opportunity arose. In addition, a substantial majority of the respondents said the program helped them to become more aware of art in the community, it helped improve their self-image, to express themselves, to become more aware, and that it helped them improve their learning ability.

Overall, while the program was a positive experience there was a much weaker inclination to continue the pursuit of art activities after release. The responses are recorded on table XVII.

Table XVII Student's Evaluation of Lorton Art Program
(Responses to Questionnaire)

Question	Responses		
	Yes	No	No Response
What was your reason for participating in the art program?			
Leisure-time activity	57	22	47
Learning experience	115	19	2
Was it worth your effort?	121	4	1
Would you participate in an art program if offered at another time?	109	4	13
Have you continued using your art training?	79	38	9
Are you attending classes?	45	26	55
Do you sketch?	50	17	59
Are you more aware of art in the community in which you live? (art galleries, architecture, etc.)	87	32	7
Did the art classes help you to:			
Improve your self-image	89	24	13
Express yourself	90	8	28
Become more aware	105	17	4
Improve your learning ability	107	12	7
Other Program Involvement:			
Vocational	54		
Academic	60		
Individual therapy	30		
Group therapy	39		

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The concept of using art for its therapeutic and rehabilitative value is new to corrections, and it is evident that more research and evaluation must be conducted before its full potential is known. However, from the information at hand it is apparent that art can be used as a treatment technique, as well as a leisure-time activity in the correctional setting.

Although this study found no conclusive evidence that participation in the Lorton Art Program resulted in a lower percentage of recidivism, it did find that the participants performed as well as the nonparticipants while on parole. Further, the participants performed well above the nonparticipants in the CCC comparison. It is still possible that variables other than participation in the art program contributed to the lower projected percentage of failure in CCC performance for the art program youths. Further study using more closely matched comparison groups would seem to be warranted.

It can be concluded from the findings of this study that the Lorton Art Program has thus far achieved its objectives. The positive evaluation by the education and psychological services staffs indicated that the program has rendered a valuable service to the institutions in which it has been conducted. For this reason it is recommended that consideration be given to the possibility of making art a part of the Department's treatment program. As a part of the treatment program, one of the major contributions art could make would be the identification of learning disabled residents. Many times learning disabilities

go undetected. This would enable the teaching staff to provide specialized training for those persons.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Correctional Association, Arts in Corrections, (A Summary of Project CULTURE and a Handbook for Program Implementation, Collins Lithographing and Printing Co., 1978.

Koines, Margo, "Art Therapy in Correctional Institutions," unpublished paper, 1975.

Smith, Sally L, No Easy Answer, Winthrop Publisher, 1979.

Taft, Philip B., Jr. "The Alchemy of Prison Art," Corrections Magazine, Vol. V, No. 3, Sept. 1979.

END