

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

**Document Title: Faith-Based Corrections and Reentry Programs:
Advancing a Conceptual Framework for
Research and Evaluation**

**Author: Janeen Buck Willison, Diana Brazzell, KiDeuk
Kim**

Document No.: 234058

Date Received: March 2011

Award Number: 2007-IJ-CX-0019

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

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

 **THE URBAN INSTITUTE** 2100 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20037

Don Spencer
Senior Contract Administrator
Office of Grants, Contracts and Pricing

Direct Dial: 202.261.5396
Facsimile: 202.728.0231
e-mail: dspencer@urban.org

January 15, 2010

Marilyn Moses
National Institute of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
810 Seventh Street, NW
Washington, DC 20531

**RE: Draft Final Report – Grant # 2007-IJ-CX-0019
(Urban Institute Project Number 08169-000-00)**

Dear Ms. Moses:

The Urban Institute is pleased to submit its draft final report for grant number 2007-IJ-CX-0019, entitled “Faith-Based Corrections and Reentry Programs: Advancing a Conceptual Framework for Research and Evaluation.”

This draft supersedes the previous draft, provided to the National Institute of Justice on January 7.

Should you have questions of a technical nature, please direct them to Janeen Buck-Willison at (202) 261-5746. Questions of a contractual nature should be forwarded to the undersigned at (202) 261-5396.

Sincerely,


Don Spencer

Faith-Based Corrections and Reentry Programs: Advancing a Conceptual Framework for Research and Evaluation

Janeen Buck Willison

Diana Brazzell

KiDeuk Kim





URBAN INSTITUTE
Justice Policy Center

2100 M Street NW
Washington, DC 20037
www.urban.org

© 2010 Urban Institute

This report was prepared under Grant 2007-IJ-CX-0019 from the National Institute of Justice.

The nonpartisan Urban Institute publishes studies, reports, and books on timely topics worthy of public consideration. The views expressed are those of the authors and should not be attributed to the Urban Institute, its trustees, or its funders.

Abstract

Nearly 700,000 offenders are released each year from prisons (Sabol et al. 2009). Resource-strapped policymakers and criminal justice practitioners are increasingly turning to the faith community to help meet the multiple needs of returning prisoners. Although faith-based organizations have long served disadvantaged individuals, including prisoners, few studies have examined the effectiveness of faith-based efforts to improve prisoner reentry and reduce recidivism or identified the distinguishing characteristics of “faith-related” programming. None has focused on faith-based programs in corrections. As a result, basic questions about the nature of faith-based programs and how they may improve offender outcomes, including recidivism and other reentry outcomes, remain largely unanswered (Mears et al. 2006; Noyes 2009; Winship and Reynolds, no date). This gap makes evaluation haphazard and inhibits meaningful policy debate.

Researchers at the Urban Institute (UI) worked to address these critical gaps in knowledge with funding from the National Institute of Justice (# 2007-IJ-CX-0019). Under the *Faith-Based Corrections and Reentry Programs: Advancing a Conceptual Framework for Research and Evaluation (FBCRP)* study, UI researchers surveyed faith-based in-prison and reentry programs across the country to identify key program characteristics and explore the extent and manner in which faith or spirituality infuses program content and activities. The primary objective of the survey was to formulate answers to two critical questions: (1) What is a faith-based program, and (2) How does faith “work” in faith-based programs. Concerted effort was made to identify and include programs operating from a mix of faith traditions. The overarching objective of the research was to provide policymakers, program developers, practitioners and evaluators with a practical tool for classifying faith-based corrections programs and advance a platform for future research on the effectiveness of faith-based reentry and corrections programs. The study, like the survey, was entirely exploratory in nature.

Findings from the survey indicate meaningful variation in the characteristics of faith-based programs, even among programs identifying with the same faith tradition (Christian). Among the 48 programs represented in the survey, 85 percent identified as “faith-based.” Those operating outside the three Abrahamic faith-traditions (Christian, Jewish, and Islamic religions) were less inclined to do so, preferring the mantle “spiritually-based.” Analysis, though limited, confirms that faith-based programs are differentiated by the manner and degree to which faith and spirituality intersects around four dimensions: program identity; religious activities; staff and volunteers; and key outcomes. These distinctions provide direction for future research by identifying constructs and measures for further investigation and exploration. Practitioners in the field, such as parole or probation officers, also stand to benefit from this analysis: these distinctions suggest not all faith-based programs are alike and that a range of faith-based options are available to corrections practitioners and their clients. The extent to which the current findings would differ for a more diverse sample is unknown and a noteworthy consideration for future research efforts.

Acknowledgements

This study would not have been possible without the support of those practitioners who enthusiastically responded to our survey, generously agreed to telephone interviews and readily shared materials describing their respective programs and accomplishments. The assistance of practitioners from all reaches of the faith community as well as members of the criminal justice system greatly benefited the project.

We reserve special thanks for the National Institute of Justice, whose funding made this project possible, particularly Laurie Bright, Senior Social Science Analyst, and Marilyn Moses, Social Science Analyst, the project's grant monitors, for their support and interest throughout the study.

Several current and former employees of the Urban Institute also played critical roles. Dr. Caterina Roman and the late Dr. Laura Winterfield provided valuable feedback on the survey instrument as it was being developed. Colleen Owens and Elizabeth Davis played other key roles. Alexandra Faye provided support to the project.

Although we appreciate the contribution of those noted above, and any others inadvertently omitted, the authors acknowledge their responsibility for any errors contained in this report.

Table of Contents

Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Table of Contents	v
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
Key Findings	2
Survey of Faith-Based Programs	2
Program Typology	6
Implications for Program Development and Research	7
1. INTRODUCTION	9
Policy Context	9
Corrections and the Faith Community	11
Review of the Extant Research	13
Unpacking ‘faith’ in faith-based efforts	14
Complexity of Categorization of Faith-based Programming	15
The Faith Factor: Existing Frameworks and Typologies.....	15
2. RESEARCH DESIGN AND EVALUATION METHODS	17
Sample Construction	17
Data Collection	19
Document Review	19
Semi-Structured Phone Interviews.....	19
Faith-Based Program Survey.....	20
3. SURVEY FINDINGS	21
Description of the Sample	21
Respondent Background.....	21
Program Background	21
Program Operations	22
Target Population	22
Caseload Characteristics	23

Eligibility Criteria.....	23
Referral sources.....	24
Services	24
Operational Capacity: Staffing and funding.....	25
Faith and Spirituality in Programming and Activities	26
Program Activities	26
Program identify, Mission and Operations	27
Outcomes	29
Collaboration and Coordination	29
Support and Challenges for Faith-Based Programs.....	30
External Support.....	30
Challenges	31
4. TYPOLOGY DEVELOPMENT.....	31
Scale Construction	32
Cluster Analysis.....	33
Limitations.....	35
5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH.....	35
6. REFERENCES	38
Appendix A: Faith-Based Program Phone Interview Guide.....	A-1
Appendix B: FBCRP Survey Instrument.....	A-2
Appendix C: Tables	A-3
Table 1. Descriptive Statistics: Respondents.....	A-4
Table 2. Descriptive Statistics: Program Background.....	A-5
Table 3. Services.....	A-6
Table 4. Program Characteristics.....	A-7
Table 5. Program Operations.....	A-8
Table 6. Program Outcomes	A-9
Table 7. Faith and Spirituality in Programming: Activities.....	A-10
Table 8. Faith and Spirituality in Program Operations and Mission.....	A-11
Table 8. Faith and Spirituality in Program Operations and Mission- con't.....	A-12
Table 9. Challenges During the Past Year.....	A-13
Table 10. External Support	A-14
Table 11. Coordination and Collaboration	A-15

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Resource-strapped policymakers and criminal justice practitioners are increasingly turning to the faith community to help meet the multiple needs of the roughly 700,000 individuals released annually from the nation's prisons. Although faith-based organizations have long served disadvantaged individuals, including prisoners (O'Connor 2004; Roman et al. 2004), only a handful of studies have examined the effectiveness of faith-based efforts to improve prisoner reentry and reduce recidivism (Mears et al. 2006; Leventhal and Mears 2002; Johnson and Larsen 2003). Even fewer studies have attempted to identify the distinguishing characteristics of "faith-related" programs (Harden 2006; Sider and Unruh 2004). None has focused on faith-based programs in corrections.

Basic but critical questions about the nature of faith-based programs and how they may improve offender outcomes, including recidivism and other reentry outcomes, remain largely unanswered (Mears et al. 2006; Noyes 2009; Winship and Reynolds not dated). For example, what constitutes a faith-based program? How do faith-based programs differ from their secular counterparts? How is faith, religion or spirituality incorporated into faith-based programs, and in what manner? Are faith-based programs better positioned to serve disadvantaged populations, including offenders, and are they more effective in doing so, as proponents contend? Until answered, these gaps in knowledge not only inhibit meaningful policy debate but hinder meaningful evaluation.

Researchers at the Urban Institute (UI) worked to address these critical gaps in knowledge with funding from the National Institute of Justice (# 2007-IJ-CX-0019). Under the *Faith-Based Corrections and Reentry Programs: Advancing a Conceptual Framework for Research and Evaluation (FBCRP)* project, UI researchers surveyed faith-based corrections and reentry programs across the country to identify key program characteristics, particularly the manner in which faith, spirituality, and religion infuse program activities and services, if at all, and the extent to which these concepts influence program operations and objectives. Information about the program's identity and mission, services and outcomes, administrative practices and governance structure, as well as factors affecting operations were also collected.

Unlocking the elements or factors that set faith-based programs apart from their secular counterparts is both key to understanding how faith-based programs may achieve desired outcomes and is critical for replication efforts. Policymakers and program developers are interested in replicating what works, but to do so, researchers first must identify, with some level of specificity, those critical elements contributing to successful program outcomes in order to know what to replicate. Through the FBCRP survey, researchers sought to answer two pressing questions facing policymakers, practitioners and program developers: (1) What is a faith-based program, and (2) How do faith-based programs "work." **Demonstrating the effectiveness of faith-based programs or isolating program impacts was beyond the scope of this purely exploratory work.** The overarching objective of the project was to provide policymakers, program developers, practitioners and evaluators with a practical tool for classifying faith-based corrections programs, and advance a platform for future research on the effectiveness of faith-based reentry and corrections programs.

With respect to gaining a clear understanding of what makes a faith-based program faith-based, the survey data offer several clues. Program identity, staffing (including leadership and management positions), and mission and vision appear to intersect most with faith. Affiliation with a spiritual or religious community, mandatory spiritual activities and religious transformation appear to be less definitive elements of the faith-based programs surveyed for this study. Researchers should focus on further exploration of the more heavily faith-infused elements to gain a clearer sense of how these elements “work” in these programs and are theoretically linked to program outcomes, if at all. Cluster analyses, though limited, support these general observations. In short, preliminary cluster analyses indicate faith-based programs vary in meaningful ways on a number of measures of how faith or spirituality intersects with key program characteristics. These distinctions offer researchers direction for additional examination and may help practitioners, such as parole or probation officers, make more informed decisions when making client referrals (i.e., the analysis indicates a number of factors that appear to distinguish faith-based programs, as well as between faith-based and secular programs; these factors may assist practitioners in linking a highly spiritual client to the appropriate faith-based program, etc).

Key Findings

This report summarizes survey findings from a small, exploratory study of faith-based corrections and reentry programs across the nation, and lays the foundation for development of a pragmatic typology for classifying faith-based programs according to the manner and degree to which faith, spirituality or religion infuses these programs on a number of operational and philosophical dimensions. The findings and recommendations discussed throughout this report are designed to advance research and inform the broader policy debate about the considerations associated with faith-based programs, in general, and those serving incarcerated individuals and those returning to the community from the criminal justice system.

Survey of Faith-Based Programs

Executive directors and program coordinators representing roughly 96 programs across six faith traditions were invited to participate in the faith-based survey. Half (N=48) responded. The traditional (mail) self-administered survey questionnaire consisted of six major sections: demographics, program operations, services, target population, faith and spirituality in programming and activities, and collaboration and community support including obstacles and challenges. The survey was developed in consultation with practitioners, but incorporated slightly modified measures and scales from the Faith Integration Survey (Smith et al. 2008) and an instrument used to measure religiosity in social services coalitions (Ebaugh et al. 2006). Participation was voluntary and confidential. The survey was designed to be completed in less than 20 minutes and featured just one open-ended item (i.e., “What spiritual or religious principles are most critical to your program model?”)

Several themes emerged from analysis of the survey data including key characteristics of these programs, insights about how faith and spirituality manifest, and the operational challenges these programs face. Themes and findings are summarized below.

Leadership. Ninety-four percent of respondents identified themselves as the Executive Director for their program. On average, respondents had been in their current position 7.8 years; twenty percent had occupied the current position for at least ten years suggesting respondents were knowledgeable about their programs and well-positioned to report on the multiple dimensions of program operations. In turn, slightly more than half (52 percent) also identified themselves as a spiritual leader, such as a clergyperson, cleric, priest, imam, rabbi, or nun. When asked which best described their personal religious faith, 82 percent identified Christianity. The remainder of respondents identified as Buddhist, Jewish, Muslim, or spiritual. Just one respondent selected no religious faith. Three respondents chose not to answer the question.

Program Identity. Among the 48 programs represented in the survey, 85 percent self-identified as “faith-based.” Of those programs identifying as faith-based, sixty-two percent reported the program’s faith affiliation as Christian. Programs operating outside the three Abrahamic faith-traditions (Christian, Jewish, Islamic religions) were less likely to identify as faith-based, preferring instead the mantle “spiritually-based.” Likewise, non-Christian programs were less likely to respond to the survey, also bristling at the categorization of their programs as faith-based. It is interesting to note that roughly 70 percent of the programs that did not identify as faith-based still reported a faith affiliation; the affiliation of these programs ranged from Buddhist (1) to Christian (3) and inter/multi-faith (1).

Just as the majority of the sample self-identified as faith-based, roughly 86.8 percent reported that clients also considered the program faith-based and 88.2 agreed or strongly agreed that their program had a clearly religious identity.

Connection to Religious Communities. Despite the number of programs that identified as faith-based, less than half reported an association with a religious community like a church, mosque or temple, or other congregation. The number of programs operating independent of a religious community or congregation suggests other factors such as spiritual leadership may be a more cogent characteristic of faith-based programs than affiliation with a faith-community.

Mission and Vision. Respondents largely agreed with statements regarding the degree to which the program’s mission and vision are based on faith or spiritual principles. Almost three-quarters (73.4 percent) of the sample agreed or strongly agreed with the characterization that program commitment to clients is based on religious beliefs or conviction. A similar percentage (73.2 percent) reported that spiritual principles or religious beliefs formed the basis for the program’s model.

Program Activities. While the majority of respondents readily identified faith as intersecting with program identity and mission and vision, spiritual activities such as group prayer, the study of religious texts or materials, and participation in religious services or rituals were not viewed as vital to these programs. Instead, respondents were more likely to identify secular activities such as helping clients gain skills or training, build or repair their support networks, and build supportive relationships between staff, volunteers, and clients as central. Upwards of 80 percent of the sample rated these activities as very important to their respective programs.

Program capacity and target population. Survey data lend credence to the assertion that faith-based programs provide vital support to the incarcerated and formerly incarcerated. Every program reported serving offenders on their caseload; 70 percent reported serving criminal justice individuals exclusively. Half the sample reported serving more than 100 criminal justice-involved individuals annually; the annual average was 440 individuals. Median service duration was six months. Many programs relied on nominal paid staff and a solid volunteer base to provide services. Thirty-one percent of programs operated with 3 or fewer paid staff.

Eligibility criteria. The eligibility requirements of most programs were relatively inclusive with respect to criminal justice criteria and faith preference. Only twenty percent unilaterally excluded such typically hard-to-place offenders as those convicted of arson, violent, or sex crimes. Many reported accepting such offenders on a case-by-case basis. Among those individuals most likely to be excluded by programs were those with severe mental health issues (48 percent of programs had excluding criteria); sex offenders (40 percent of programs had excluding criteria); and individuals with severe physical disabilities (30 percent of programs had excluding criteria). For most programs, a client's faith affiliation or spiritual orientation carried little weight. Nearly 60 percent (58.3) do not take the client's religious affiliation into account while 30 percent gave preference to individuals with some religious or spiritual orientation regardless of the nature of that orientation. In short, religious affiliation or orientation was not used to exclude individuals from service or to give preference to others.

Services and Outcomes. Consistent with findings from other evaluations, the programs in this faith-based sample engaged offenders in a broad array of services ranging from ministry and spiritual development to parenting education and substance abuse treatment and counseling. The average program offered eight of the thirteen services listed in the survey; roughly 79 percent offered six or more services. The five most prevalent services provided include ministry/spiritual development (85 percent); life skills training (83 percent); mentoring (81 percent); aftercare/reentry services (79 percent); and employment services (73 percent). Medical care, mental health services and therapy were among the least prevalent services.

Deepening personal spiritual commitment (44.4 percent), reduced offending (37.7 percent) and reduced use of drugs and alcohol (11.1 percent) topped the list of program outcomes ranked by respondents as most relevant (i.e., ranked #1). Stable housing and educational attainment were not selected by any sample respondent as the most relevant outcome for their program, although these were identified as one of three outcomes programs hoped to achieve. Educational attainment (4.4 percent), stable housing (10.4 percent) and steady employment (24.4 percent) were least likely to make the list of relevant program outcomes.

Services and programming occurred in a range of settings. Roughly half (53 percent) reportedly bridge the facility and the community; that is, they operate both in the correctional facility as well as with offenders in the community. Twenty-seven percent identified as reentry programs that worked exclusively with offenders in the community. Among the remaining programs, 10 percent reported operations focused exclusively on in-prison spiritual development, and roughly the same number identified as faith/character-based residential units. Lastly, not all lead agencies responding to the survey were community-based agencies; roughly 10 percent of survey completers worked for state departments of corrections.

Staffing and Volunteers. As alluded to earlier, programs in the sample relied heavily on volunteers. Most operated with fairly limited paid staff members.

Collaboration, Coordination and Support. Programs tapped diverse funding streams to create a balanced portfolio of resources, enjoyed broad support across constituency groups and coordinated with a variety of community- and faith-based entities and criminal justice officials around funding, programming and volunteers.

Although 83 percent of the sample received funding from religious institutions, this source constituted roughly 30 percent of program funds. Seventy percent reported leveraging foundation funding, of which this funding source provided a quarter of program funding. Forty-two percent accessed government funding streams, but this funding source constituted less than one-quarter of any program's budget. This diversity likely provides a measure of stability conducive to the type of long-term operations characterizing the programs in this sample (on average, programs in the sample had been in operation close to thirteen years). While 42 percent of respondents indicated the faith-based nature of their program occasionally or frequently limited the sources of funding sought, close to sixty percent typically did not encounter any obstacles due to program status.

Overall, the programs in the sample were most likely to coordinate with community-based organizations and the faith community, including faith-based non-profits and religious communities such as churches, mosques and temples on matters of funding, programming and volunteers, and were least likely to collaborate with federal, state or local governments on any of these issues. Religious communities and faith-based non-profit agencies were among the top three entities with which programs in the sample reported coordinating on funding (66.7 percent and 37.5 percent), programming (50 percent and 54.2 percent) and volunteers (75 percent and 50 percent) during the past year. The business community (54 percent) rounded out the top three entities with which programs in the sample coordinated for funding. Community-based and civic organizations were among the top three entities with which programs in the sample coordinated on programming (45.8 percent) and volunteers (41.7 percent).

Finally, survey analyses suggest the programs in this sample enjoyed broad support from a variety of constituencies. Churches and religious organizations (60.4 percent), jail and prison officials (50 percent) and community groups (35.4 percent) were most likely to be rated as very supportive of the programs in the sample. Close to fifteen percent rated the business community as not at all supportive.

Obstacles and Challenges. Despite leveraging diverse funding streams, funding uncertainties (52.1 percent) topped the list of serious challenges encountered in the past year. It was followed by too many cases/ referrals (22.9 percent) and political pressures surrounding prisoner issues (22.9 percent). Programs reported facing minor challenges due to a lack of volunteers (56.3 percent) and difficulties coordinating with local and state agencies (50 percent and 45.8 percent).

These observations can be summed into the following themes.

- **Faith manifests in a variety of dimensions.** Analysis of survey data suggests faith or spirituality intersects with a number of key characteristics and to varying degrees. Consistent

with the suppositions of other researchers (Noyes 2009), these programs do exist on a continuum. Programs in the sample were more likely to report that faith and spirituality manifested in abstract elements such as staff and volunteer commitment to clients, program principles, and the program model than concrete program activities. Further, although the majority of programs identified as faith-based, many did not identify spiritual transformation as relevant to program success although deepening personal spiritual development was among the top three outcomes programs hope to achieve. This suggests the manifestation and influence of religious principles or spirituality is subtle and the relationship between program participation and outcomes requires additional examination.

- **Broad set of services offered, inclusive criteria for clientele.** The faith-based programs in this survey sample are characterized by a broad, inclusive mandate. Most provide a wide array of services, and the majority of programs do not give much consideration to the religious orientation of a client. The diversity in funding streams leveraged by these programs suggests this inclusive position is not tied to an external policy requirement but rather reflects the true orientation and nature of these programs.
- **Relatively high capacity given operational resources.** In turn, these data suggest these programs have relatively high service capacity relative to operational resources, serving literally hundreds of clients annually with nominal numbers of paid staff members.
- **Common obstacles and challenges.** Our analysis suggests the faith-based programs in this sample face the same obstacles encountered by many community-based programs: uncertain funding and political pressures associated with serving disenfranchised populations. What is interesting to note is the lack of challenges associated with the faith-based nature of these programs; although roughly 40 percent reported occasional limitations due to their faith-based status, 60 percent perceived these challenges were rare.

Program Typology

Cluster analysis is a way to analytically develop a typology of particular items, in this case programs, by grouping them based on similarities along particular dimensions of interest and by creating such groupings so that they are distinct from one another.

Here, we included five measures (mission and vision; program identity; faith and spiritually-based activities; staff and volunteers; and key outcomes) in a cluster analysis to explore profiles of faith-based programs. Three clusters emerged based on patterns of responses to these five constructs. Cluster 1 comprises roughly 27 percent of programs in the sample; these 13 programs have little manifestation of faith or spirituality across all five constructs, particularly staffing. Group 2 comprises almost 65 percent of the sample (N=31) and is highly faith-infused on all five constructs; this cluster consists predominantly, but not exclusively, of programs operating from a Christian faith tradition. Multi-faith programs as well as programs operating from Muslim and Buddhist orientations are also represented among Cluster 2. Cluster 3 is the smallest and strongly secular in orientation; only one of the programs in this cluster self-identified as faith-based.

Figure 2 shows the means and standard deviations of the five key constructs by cluster. Cluster 2 is distinctive from the other two clusters in that the mean scores of the key constructs are all positive (i.e., suggesting these programs scored high across the five constructs) whereas the other two clusters have negative mean scores, suggesting weak or limited manifestation of faith as measured by the five constructs. Clusters 1 and 3 are in the same direction with respect to our key constructs, but Cluster 3 shows greater negative mean scores on all five key constructs suggesting it is the least faith-infused or conversely, the most secular.

Figure 2. Means and Standard Deviations for 3-Cluster Solution

Faith Constructs	Cluster 1 Mean (SD)	Cluster 2 Mean (SD)	Cluster 3 Mean (SD)
Mission and Vision (f_vision)	-.81 (.78)	.45 (.31)	-1.13 (1.16)
Program Identity (f_iden)	-.35* (.46)	.36* (.35)	-1.67* (.96)
Religious Activities (f_relig)	-.78* (.45)	.52* (.41)	-1.54* (.26)
Staff and Volunteers (f_staff)	-.35* (.63)	.32* (.46)	-1.30* (.93)
Key Outcomes (f_outcm)	-.63* (.48)	.47* (.37)	-1.57* (.46)
N	13	31	4

* The mean value is significantly different from those of other two clusters at .05 level

This initial analysis suggests four of the five measures – program identity, religious activities, staff and volunteers, and key outcomes – distinguish these clusters in a meaningful way. Specifically, it indicates that for one type of program (Cluster 2), it did not matter what they reported as their mission and vision; they conducted activities, maintained identities, and hired staff or engaged volunteers that all reflected strong faith or spiritual orientations.

Implications for Program Development and Research

With respect to gaining a clear understanding of what makes a faith-based program faith-based, the survey data offer several clues. Program identity, staffing including leadership and management positions, and mission and vision appear to intersect most with faith. Affiliation with a spiritual or religious community, mandatory spiritual activities, and religious transformation appear to be less definitive elements of faith-based programs surveyed for this study, although relevant for highly faith-infused programs as the above cluster analysis indicates. Researchers, therefore, should focus future evaluation on the more heavily faith-infused elements to gain a clearer sense of how these elements “work” in these programs, in what combination, and how they are theoretically linked to program outcomes, if at all.

In turn, practitioners in the field, such as parole or probation officers, also stand to benefit from these findings. First, the distinctions identified by the analysis offer practitioners evidence that all faith-based programs are not the same. Second, survey findings suggest the programs in this sample are highly structured, formalized, and inclusive; further, they tend to view distinctly spiritual or religious activities as optional (i.e., these activities are not mandatory and do not

appear to be overtly coercive as some opponents fear) and not necessarily central to their mission or program objectives. Rather, faith or spiritual principles appear to infuse more abstract dimensions such as staff philosophy and motivation or program identify; how faith transfers to affect program operations and outcomes is less clear. Third, these programs appear open to serving many hard-to-place offenders. Taken together, these observations offer practitioners some concrete criteria for consideration when choosing which program to refer a client. A client with a strong spiritual orientation may be best suited to a faith-based program where spiritual activities are emphasized as opposed to a faith-based program in which staff are deeply spiritual but programming is largely secular and deepening spiritual commitment, while encouraged, is not facilitated directly by the program.

As is often the case with exploratory research, this study raises more questions than it answers. While it identifies characteristics of faith-based programs and provides clues about how faith and spirituality intersect with these programs, it does not address how these elements affect program operations or outcomes, or whether these elements make faith-based programs more effective than secular programs. It does, however, provide insight about the manner in which faith and spirituality intersect with practical program operations and characteristics. In this respect, the study's primary objective was achieved.

1. INTRODUCTION

More than 700,000 offenders are released each year from prisons and jails (Sabol et al. 2009), and resource-strapped policymakers and criminal justice practitioners are increasingly turning to the faith community to help meet the multiple needs of returning prisoners. Although empirical evidence suggests religious programming reduces recidivism (Clear 2002; Johnson et al. 1997), few studies have examined the effectiveness of faith-based efforts to improve prisoner reentry and reduce recidivism or identified the distinguishing characteristics of “faith-related” programming. None has focused on faith-based programs in corrections. Additionally, no systematic method exists for classifying faith-based corrections programs or for distinguishing the characteristics of “faith” in faith-related programming and services for offenders. As a result, basic questions about the nature of faith-based programs and how they improve offender outcomes, including recidivism and other reentry outcomes, remain largely unanswered.

The Faith-Based Corrections and Reentry Programs: Developing a Conceptual Framework for Research and Evaluation (FBCRP) project, funded by the National Institute of Justice (#2007-IJ-CX-0019), addressed these critical gaps by taking stock of current practice and surveying faith-based corrections and reentry programs across the nation using an opportunistic sample generated from prior work. The program survey measured the manner in and extent to which faith or spirituality infuses key operational dimensions of faith-based programs including program mission, services, staffing, and administration. Using that information, researchers employed cluster analysis to develop a practical program typology that could inform future research and assist policymakers and practitioners.

This report presents the findings from the FBCRP project. First we discuss the context that inspired the study, focusing on three issues – (1) recent policy developments in support of faith-based initiatives, (2) the intersection of faith-based programs and the corrections system today with a brief discussion of the history preceding it, and (3) the limitations of extant research on faith-based programs, including the critical research and policy questions that remain. We then review the study’s exploratory evaluation approach, methods and data collection (Section 2). The remainder of the report summarizes findings from the program survey (Section 3) and discusses the development of a practical program typology (Section 4) based on those data. We conclude by considering the implications of the study for practitioners and for future research (Section 5).

Policy Context

Over the past decade, interest in the role of faith-based organizations (FBOs) in addressing social problems has grown dramatically. Though the engagement of FBOs in social issues is by no means a new phenomenon, academic and media attention have increased as new political initiatives, particularly those led by former President George W. Bush, have expanded the role for FBOs in social service delivery. Despite this recent attention, a great deal still remains to be learned about FBOs, particularly faith-based programs, and their effectiveness.

Religious institutions and independent faith-based groups have been providing human services and supporting communities throughout America's history, beginning with the country's earliest charities and its first prisons (O'Connor 2004). As the social service sector and government institutions such as prisons and schools professionalized in the 20th century, they often distanced themselves from their religious roots and adopted a more professional, scientific approach to service delivery (O'Connor 2004; Walton 2007). Yet even as criminal justice, social work, and other disciplines moved away from religious approaches, faith-based organizations continued to engage on a range of social issues and to work with government and secular organizations, albeit in a more peripheral role. Today, faith-based organizations provide diverse services, including emergency assistance and shelter, food and clothing, substance abuse treatment, and referrals for treatment and employment (Kramer et al. 2002). Within the criminal justice arena, faith-based community organizations often take the lead to provide in-prison, pre-release, and reentry programs that promote community restoration and successful prisoner integration (Rossman et al. 1999).

The past several years have seen faith-based groups thrust back into the spotlight as political and non-profit leaders have sought a new and expanded role for FBOs in addressing social problems. Arguably, the biggest force in this movement was President George W. Bush, who began his presidency in January 2001 with the creation of the White House Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives (OFBCI). The Office supported the work of faith-based and community organizations (FBCOs) by:

- Implementing regulatory and policy changes that make it easier for FBCOs to compete for funding with secular and/or larger organizations;
- Providing new sources of funding for FBCOs through mini-grant programs like the Compassion Capital Fund and targeted initiatives like the Prisoner Reentry Initiative (PRI);
- Offering training and technical assistance to build organizational and fundraising capacity; and
- Conducting public education and outreach to promote the role of FBCOs in addressing social problems (White House 2008).

Federal legislation and the formation of Faith-Based and Community Initiative offices in states and localities around the nation supplemented the work of the White House in these areas (White House 2008). President Obama extended the OFBCI, renaming it the White House Office of Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships. The wide reach of the initiative under President Bush and its continuation under President Obama suggest that federal engagement on this issue is likely to continue for the foreseeable future.

Research suggests public support for these efforts has been and continues to be widespread. A 2008 Pew survey found that two-thirds of Americans (67 percent) favor allowing churches and other houses of worship to apply, along with other organizations, for government funding to provide social services (Pew 2008). This figure has remained fairly steady over the past eight years, peaking at 75 percent in 2001. When asked who can do the best job providing services for the needy, individuals are split between religious organizations (31 percent), non-religious organizations (29 percent) and government agencies (31 percent) (Pew 2008). Yet public support of government funding for FBOs has some limits: two-thirds (61 percent) of people oppose

allowing groups that encourage religious conversion to apply for government funding to provide social services, and three-quarters (73 percent) say that groups receiving government funding should not be permitted to hire only people who share their religious beliefs (Pew 2008).

The impetus behind the public support and political efforts described above is the idea that FBOs (as well as community-based organizations) have a unique role to play in addressing social ills and, in some cases, may be more effective at doing so than secular non-profits or government agencies. For some individuals, religion can be a key transformative or rehabilitative force, and FBOs may be better suited to serve and support the religious activities of these individuals. FBOs may also be more likely to have certain organizational or programmatic characteristics – such as committed, compassionate staff or strong community ties – that enable them to better serve all clients, regardless of religious background (Roundtable 2008). In addition, FBOs have a great deal of resources to offer in the form of money, space, material resources, and volunteer time, as well as intangibles like community connections and social capital (Walton 2007). A 2005 Gallup survey found that, of the 111 million Americans who engage in community service for an hour or more each month, 92 million (83 percent) volunteer through their church or other religious institution (Baylor Institute 2008).

Despite the potential value of FBO involvement in addressing social problems and the support of political leaders and the public for such efforts, we know relatively little about FBOs and their engagement in social services. What is unique about FBOs and how do they differ from secular government or non-profit agencies? What types of faith-based programs work and for whom? In addition, the answer to an even more basic question is still unclear: What, exactly, does “faith-based” mean? As discussion of FBOs has expanded over the past decade, a wide range of groups have taken up the label of “faith-based,” while others have avoided it. Who calls themselves “faith-based” and why? Are there different types of faith-based organizations? These and other questions drove the current study, which looks at the role of FBOs in serving criminal-justice involved individuals, and the role that faith and religious activities play in their work.

Corrections and the Faith Community

Since the origins of penitentiaries in Europe and America in the 1700s, individuals affiliated with religious institutions and volunteer community groups have been providing care and support for incarcerated individuals and released prisoners. Today, thousands of faith-based organizations (FBOs) provide a wide range of services to individuals in prison and those returning to their communities from prisons and jails. Services include emergency and long-term shelter, job training, mentoring of young adults and children of prisoners, and treatment for addiction (Wilcox 1998).

The past decade witnessed an expansion of diverse faith-based services to offenders, particularly those in prison (Corrections Compendium 2003). In a 2003 survey of the nation’s 51 correctional systems, just eight of the 44 states (18 percent) participating in the survey reported operating separate faith-based residential units; five other states had plans underway for similar programs (Corrections Compendium 2003: 13). Two years later, roughly 41 percent of the nation’s 51 correctional systems reported either having at least one faith-based residential unit or

plans in place for such units (National Institute of Corrections 2005). Many of these residential units operate in conjunction with faith-based programs or rely heavily on members of local congregations to provide programming support and services. Prison Fellowship's InnerChange Freedom Initiative and Kairos Prison Ministry's Horizon program are two of the most widely known initiatives; Florida's Faith-and Character-Based correctional facilities in Hillsborough County has also gained national prominence.

The increased popularity of character-and faith-based units is just one example of the expansion in faith-based programming and services for individuals in prison. According to the Corrections Compendium (2003), all U.S. prison systems offer faith-based worship services and religious programs; 93 percent also offer prayer groups. Faith communities surrounding these institutions often play a vital role in the provision of spiritual and faith-based services to inmates: personal development and parenting classes sponsored by faith-based programs are offered in more than 70 percent of the systems reporting to the Compendium, and 68 percent provide meditation groups and marriage classes. About 77 percent of the systems responding to the 2003 Corrections Compendium survey (34 of the 44 responding) relied on volunteers from the faith community to provide this wide-range of programming. Volunteers from various faith traditions reportedly served as mentors, assisted with the delivery of educational programming and job readiness services, engaged with inmates in personal ministry and activities that encouraged spiritual development, and offered a variety of release support services.

Although many of the faith-based services noted in the 2003 Corrections Compendium survey operated from the Christian faith tradition, other faiths actively conduct in-reach and provide services to incarcerated individuals. The Gateless Gate Zen Center, Zen Mountain Monastery, and Assisting Incarcerated Muslims are examples of discrete programs that serve Buddhist and Muslim inmates. National organizations such as the Aleph Institute and Muslim Alliance of North America also conduct in-reach for Jewish and Muslim offenders, and in some instances operate specific reentry programs. Most often in-reach and programming occur through local congregations, regardless of faith orientation. For this reason, it can be difficult to gauge the true extent of in-reach and services provided to offenders from any faith-community.

The dual emphasis on prisoner reentry and faith-based initiatives under the previous presidential administration undoubtedly increased the presence and role of various faith communities in recent reentry efforts. Obtaining an accurate measure of the scope and breadth of faith-based reentry programming is more challenging than tracking the explosion of faith-based in-prison initiatives over the last decade. Notably, there is no master list of faith-based reentry programs and no single agent responsible for tracking faith-based reentry efforts at either the federal level or across the 50 states. Numerous federal-level reentry initiatives for adult and youth offenders, however, emphasized partnerships with the faith-community in the last decade. Examples include President Bush's Prisoner Reentry Initiative (PRI), the Serious and Violent Offender Reentry Initiative (SVORI), Ready4Work, and the Department of Justice's Anti-Gang Initiative. These initiatives provide clues about the scale and scope of the faith-based reentry efforts. Evaluations of these initiatives indicate that faith-based partners engaged adult and juvenile offenders in a multitude of programs and services. SVORI provides an apt example: more than half (53.3 percent) of SVORI grantees relied on faith-based partners for post-release mentoring services; 45 percent for emergency assistance; 42 percent for post-release housing services; 40 percent for twelve step programming (AA/NA) and 37 percent for parenting skills programming

post-release (Lindquist and Brumbaugh 2005). Clearly, as proponents assert, the faith community offers a wide range of services to a diverse population of criminal justice-involved individuals.

Despite the growing popularity and prevalence of faith-based programming for offenders, relatively little is known about the operations and effectiveness of these programs (Mears et al. 2006). Whether these programs work, and more importantly how these programs work remains largely unanswered. Ambiguity regarding what exactly constitutes a faith-based program continues to hamper evaluation. Until greater clarity is achieved, the small body of promising evaluation results of faith-based programs remains of limited utility to policymakers, practitioners, and program developers. In the next section, we take a closer look at the extant research on faith-based programs, and briefly review the critical research questions that have yet to be resolved.

Review of the Extant Research

Although practitioners and policymakers acknowledge that faith-based services provide vital support for incarcerated individuals and those formerly incarcerated, only a handful of rigorous research studies have assessed the effectiveness of faith-based programs and very few have attempted to isolate the characteristics of the services that embody effective programming. Stated more succinctly, much of the extant research examines the deterrent effect of religion on recidivism, not the effectiveness of faith-based programs.

Criminological research provides some evidence about the links between religiosity, faith, and spirituality, on the one hand, and crime on the other (e.g., Evans et al. 1995); yet, little of it involves program or policy evaluation. This previous research has helped in the development of theoretical rationales for how faith-based efforts might be effective in reducing recidivism among released prisoners, but it provides relatively little assistance in determining if existing faith-based corrections programs are effective. Nonetheless, there is some research that indicates that religious programs reduce recidivism (Clear 2002). Johnson et al. (1997), for example, examined whether inmates who participated in programs sponsored by Prison Fellowship (PF) in New York prisons fared better than a matched group of inmates who did not participate in PF programs, and found that the PF participants had significantly lower re-arrest rates. Such findings are provocative primarily because, as Johnson et al. (1997) emphasize, religious programs are highly prevalent in U.S. prisons.

Unfortunately, such studies are rare and typically do not use rigorous designs to eliminate issues surrounding selection bias, including the possibility that inmates less prone to recidivate may be more likely to participate in religious programs (Johnson and Larson 2003). These studies also frequently do not specify the components that matter. For example, they do not differentiate between whether faith-based programs are effective because of the faith activities or because of the faith-based organization that runs them. There is, therefore, a need for rigorous research to establish whether faith-based programs are effective in reducing recidivism, what it is about the programs that make them effective, and whether they can be implemented in diverse settings (Clear 2002).

The literature on religious programming offers only a handful of studies on the effectiveness of religious programming specifically within criminal justice practice. Our search of the extant literature revealed a few studies examining the impact of faith-based correctional programming. However, the few empirical evaluations that exist of faith based programming in corrections provide mixed support for the role that religion plays on prison inmates. A study conducted by Johnson (1984) found that religious inmates were no more likely to receive disciplinary confinement than non-religious inmates. In contrast, Clear (1992) found that an inmate's religious participation had a significant and positive impact with respect to prison adjustment (Sumter and Clear 2002).

More recent research offers slightly more promising findings. A 2003 evaluation (Johnson and Larson) of the InnerChange Freedom Initiative (IFI), a Christian-focused pre-release program operated by Prison Fellowship Ministries, found inmates who completed all phases of the program were 50 percent less likely to be rearrested within two years of release compared to a matched comparison group. Caliber Associates' 2004 evaluation of the Kairos Horizon program in Tomoka, Florida, a faith-based in-prison residential program which uses a restorative justice framework to equip prisoners with the skills necessary to live responsibly with others and facilitate inner transformation and civic engagement, found Horizon program participants had significantly lower rates of discipline reports and segregation stays than a matched comparison group and those on a waiting list. The evaluation also examined the program's impact on recidivism; analyses suggested that although participants and comparison group cases were re-arrested at equal rates, Horizon program participants were on the street for longer periods of time before re-arrest. Likewise, a 2007 study by La Vigne et al. of Florida's Faith-and Character-based Institutions (FCBI) found FCBI inmates had lower re-incarceration rates six months after release than a matched group of inmates drawn from the general population. Preliminary findings from the evaluation of the spiritually-based Ridge House residential program for parolees found that members of the treatment who had a spiritual conversion were less likely to recidivate; this promising finding, however, did not hold in later analyses (Buck Willison 2010 forthcoming). The reasons for this have yet to be fully explored.

Although many programs have not employed rigorous designs, the studies do report some limited outcomes. Further, there is no common set of outcomes that are agreed upon. For instance, Damascus Way in Minnesota reports that 85 percent of their participants in a prison program have not recidivated and have stayed substance abuse free. Similarly, Christian Prison Ministries contend that only 20 percent of "Bridge" program participants have recidivated, as compared to a 74 percent national average. While these statistics seem promising, the constructs (staying out of trouble, not recidivating) are not clearly defined in the literature; therefore, it is difficult to determine how effective these programs really are.

Unpacking 'faith' in faith-based efforts

As we just discussed, although rigorous evaluations of faith-based programming in criminal justice are scarce (Canada 2003; Mears 2006; Noyes 2009), recent research offers promising findings. Findings from recent studies suggest faith or spirituality – or rather programs that attend to and cultivate this dimension of the individual – have a positive effect on recidivism and reintegration. Understanding that linkage and how to produce it in a program or specific

intervention is key for purposes of program design and replication. This growing body of empirical evidence, though small, underscores the importance of “unpacking” the faith factor in faith-based programming (Noyes 2009). Here we examine the challenges associated with “unpacking” the faith factor and identify tangible next steps for evaluation.

Complexity of Categorization of Faith-based Programming

The kinds of programs and interventions that have been termed “faith-based” in criminal justice are complex and diverse. Rigorous evaluation has been difficult to do because of the lack of common elements or definitions, or specification of how program components are to fit together. In addition, the relationship between religion and crime is multi-faceted, and it is not easy to measure all necessary variables. Furthermore, the measurement of the construct of religion itself is limited.

The first factor that complicates the categorization of faith-based programs is the lack of definition regarding the term “faith-based.” Second, as Mears et al. (2006) point out, the link between faith-based programming and improved outcomes is ambiguous at best; typically the logic linking activities to outcomes is not articulated and therefore, program effects are hard to isolate. Third, some contend that evaluation is hampered by the lack of faith-based programs providing long-term or sustained services that could be easily be defined as a “program.” According to Chaves (1999), the majority of faith-based interventions focus on short-term, immediate needs. Whether designed to meet short-term or longer-term needs, the critical factor to consider for evaluation is whether expected outcomes appropriately reflect program objectives and services provided. Lastly, faith-based organizations frequently collaborate with other organizations (Chaves 2001), making it difficult to parse out what is faith-based programming or if it even exists within the collaborative.

Lastly, it is not always apparent which organizations are actually engaging in religious work or are delivering programming that has a specific religious or spiritual message (i.e., faith organizations that provide services versus programs that provide faith-infused services). For example, while some faith-based initiatives use religious teachings to instill a new set of beliefs and morals in individuals to prevent criminal activity or to change the behavior of those who have already been involved with the justice system, other faith-based organizations mobilize their members to participate in social services, similar to those services provided by secular organizations, without an element of religion in direct programming. In evaluating religious programs, Vidal (2001) questioned how researchers should distinguish organizations that claim religious teachings into the program structure from interventions that demonstrate a religious component. This is an issue that has not been resolved, and continues to plague evaluation.

The Faith Factor: Existing Frameworks and Typologies

Efforts to develop a definition of faith-based programs have typically focused on identifying the characteristics of faith-based organizations or the organizational characteristics of specific religious social services coalitions, including salient religious or spiritual attributes at the organizational level (Ebaugh et al. 2006; Sider and Unruh 2004; Smith and Sosin 2001).

These conceptual frameworks vary greatly as researchers grapple with how to operationalize the spiritual or religious characteristics of faith as it pertains to faith-based social service organizations, agencies, and coalitions. Smith and Sosin (2001), for example, operationalized the faith dynamic of agencies in their sample with respect to how closely linked or “coupled” faith or religion was to an agency’s culture, resources, and structure of authority (bureaucracy). Sider and Unruh (2004) developed a six-fold typology for classifying the faith characteristics of organizations based on case studies of fifteen congregations and the program services they provided. This typology included more organizational dimensions and contextual elements in which faith might be observed, such as the religious characteristics of the organization’s environment, than Smith and Sosin’s schema. Operating more as a continuum, Sider and Unruh’s typology places organizations in one of six categories ranging from “faith permeated” – indicating that faith or religion infuses all aspects of operations and organizational characteristics – to “secular” – indicating that operations and organizational characteristics do not incorporate any elements of faith or religion.

Using a slightly different approach, Ebaugh et al. (2006) conducted a national survey to measure the organizational religiosity of social service coalitions. Survey items focused on the extent to which these coalitions engaged in distinctly religious practices such as prayer during staff meetings, leading clients in prayer, and distributing spiritual materials to clients. This survey also captured the extent to which religious beliefs and principles were expressed at the organizational level with respect to staffing, leadership, and the organization’s mission. Harden (2006) perhaps comes closest to advancing a theoretical framework for shaping general evaluation efforts of faith-based programs. He proffers four faith-based program theories (FBPT) based on the “transformational purposes” of a program’s spiritual or religious activities and the intended spiritual or social change these activities are designed to produce (outcomes). Identifying the transformation purposes of a faith-based program is central to Harden’s framework in that it is directly related to articulating the underlying logic that links spiritual activities to expected outcomes.

Lastly, Roman et al. (2004) constructed a conceptual framework specific to faith-based criminal justice interventions rooted in key sociological theories (social bonding, deterrence, desistance, and restorative justice). This framework ties the link between religion and religious programming to individual outcomes, and seeks to identify these influences in the religious/spiritual components of faith-based criminal justice programs and interventions. While providing a much needed theoretical foundation, this framework has not yet been applied to actual programs.

Application of these frameworks to classify functioning programs has been limited. Most focused on categorizing faith-based organizations or social service coalitions involving the faith community, not discrete programs. Thus, it is clear that the wide range of operationalizations of religion and faith-based programming has made it virtually impossible to compare evaluations done to date across faith-based programs in order to detect similarities and differences or to compare outcomes.

Building on recently completed work for NIJ, in which roughly 110 faith-based organizations and programs delivering in-prison programming or community-base reentry services were

identified¹, the FBCRP project worked to address these gaps in the research by surveying these discrete programs to better understand how faith, spirituality and religious principles infuse services, activities and operations. Specifically, this study sought to explore and identify how faith and spirituality intersect with programming, services, and program operations. It was our hope to advance both using a practical paradigm that takes into account the many ways in which faith and spirituality may infuse programs across a variety of operational dimensions. In doing so, this paradigm would identify potential elements that could be tested to determine if faith-based programs are, as some posit, more effective than their secular counterparts in delivering services to disenfranchised populations and producing desired results.

2. RESEARCH DESIGN AND EVALUATION METHODS

The FBCRP study employed both qualitative and quantitative methods and relied on multiple data sources to achieve its exploratory research objectives. The goal of the study was to answer two fundamental questions about faith-based programs – what constitutes a “faith-based” program and how do faith-based programs “work” – by examining the manner and extent to which faith or spirituality manifests in various dimensions of program operations². Research activities focused primarily on identifying the characteristics of faith-based programs, particularly the different dimensions in which faith or spirituality infuses program operations and structure, content and services, mission and identity, outcomes, and policies and practices. Data collection consisted of document review, semi-structured phone interviews with key program staff, and a survey of faith-based corrections and reentry programs operating from various spiritual and religious orientations. Descriptive analysis, as well as factor and cluster analyses, informed the conceptual framework and development of a basic but pragmatic program typology. Program theory grounded the technical approach.

Sample Construction

A list of roughly 110 faith-based organizations and programs compiled by the Urban Institute, as part of a recently completed evaluability assessment task order funded by NIJ, formed the basis for the present study. Project researchers reviewed this list to identify the subset of discrete programs serving adult offenders³. This review provided a base sample of 50 programs, of which roughly two-thirds were associated with the Christian faith tradition; the remaining third

¹ The list of program and organizations compiled under this initial work, NIJ task order, Evaluability Assessment of Faith-Based Programs in Corrections (TO-12// NIJ#ASP BPA 2004BF022), included a wide-range of programs and organization serving both juvenile and adult offenders, and their families. Many programs fell outside the scope of the present study.

² Related and equally important questions regarding how faith-based programs work, how faith or spirituality is specifically linked to outcomes, and whether faith-based programs are effective (the all important question “do they work”) fell outside the scope and resources of the present study. A secondary goal was to develop a practical, functioning typology of faith-based programs, the presumption being that programs identified as faith-based may vary in a number of important ways. Discourse to-date largely ignores this issue; arguably, the silence implies all faith-based programs are uniform in their guiding philosophy, mission and approach to service delivery. Stated more succinctly, the absence of investigation into the defining characteristics of faith-based programs seemingly presumes an understanding about what a faith-based program is and an assumption that all faith-based programs are alike.

³ Although work under the previous task order focused on identifying promising faith-based programs, the list included numerous faith-based umbrella organizations (e.g., Catholic Charities and Lutheran Family and Children Services) operating multiple programs targeting a variety of populations including juvenile justice-involved youth. For a variety of reasons, the current study limited the sample to discrete programs serving adult offender populations but sought to include programs operating from a mix of faith traditions and offering a range of services.

consisted of a mix of multi-faith or spiritually-based programs. Just three of the programs in the base sample identified with a specific non-Christian tradition such as Islam or Judaism.

Working from this base of roughly 50 programs, researchers used a variety of methods including snowball sampling techniques, online searches of reentry and departments of corrections' websites, and document review to further build the study sample. A first step was to re-initiate contact with the program directors of the 50 "base" programs, confirm the scope of present operations and solicit recommendations for other faith-based in-prison or reentry programs for inclusion in the study sample. New program nominations were then logged into a detailed program matrix. Next, the research team scanned online informational clearinghouses, reentry and faith-based policy websites like the Roundtable on Religion and Social Welfare Policy (www.religionandsocialpolicy.org) for reports and materials about these programs to determine the scope of services provided. As discussed in subsequent sections, brief phone interviews were then scheduled with the Executive Director or program coordinator of the newly nominated program to learn more about the program's services, target population, and mission and vision. An additional 70 programs were identified using these methods.

It is important to note that a handful of programs comprising the initial base sample were no longer operational or reachable when the study re-initiated contact.

Additionally, project researchers made significant effort to diversify the study sample and ensure a mix of faith traditions were represented. As mentioned earlier, much of the extant research on faith-based programs focuses on in-prison programs operating from the Christian faith tradition. Evaluations of Prison Fellowship's InnerChange Freedom Initiative and the Kairos Prison Ministry's Horizon program in Florida's Tomoka Correctional Institution are ready examples. Data on inmate religious preference collected for the 2003 Corrections Compendium survey indicate that upwards of 60 percent of prison populations in most states identify with the Christian faith tradition. Roughly 20 percent were Muslim, 5 percent Native American, and roughly 2 percent Buddhist and also 2 percent Jewish.

As discussed below, project researchers contacted and interviewed staff at major national religious service organizations to identify programs focused on prisoners or reentry services. This proved to be a fruitful approach.

Lastly, it is important to briefly discuss the challenges of constructing the study sample. Recognizing that many in-prison programs have a community-based reentry component, and that many community-based reentry programs conduct in-reach to prisons and jails to connect with clients prior to release, the present study sought to reflect the wide array of prison-based programs including residential programs, character-based units, and personal ministries, as well as reentry programs. Identifying the range of faith-based in-prison programs was a relatively straight-forward task; many, if not most, state DOCs provide an accounting of faith-based programs and services on their websites. Identifying the full range of faith-based reentry programs proved more challenging. Absent a central list of reentry programs, project researchers consulted the large government-sponsored reentry efforts like SVORI and Ready4Work to identify faith-based reentry programs. We also enlisted the aid of the states' faith-based and community liaisons to identify promising faith-based reentry programs.

These efforts culminated in a sample of roughly 120 discrete faith-based programs representing six different faith traditions including those self-identifying as multi-faith and spiritually-based. Viable, confirmable contact information was obtained for 96 of the 120 programs; these 96 programs comprised the study sample. Buddhist, Christian, Hindu, Jewish, Native American, and Muslim faith traditions were represented among the 96 programs in the sample; non-Christian faith traditions comprised one quarter of the sample.

Data Collection

Three data collection tasks informed the project. The nature and objective of each data collection task is briefly described in the sections below.

Document Review

Document review encompassed two tasks: review of the extant research literature (see previous section for summary) and compilation of program materials describing key aspects of service delivery and operations. Review of the extant literature focused specifically on (1) the role and effect of faith-based programs in social service provision; (2) program theory and typology development; and (3) key policy issues associated with faith-based service provision and programming, and which shape the policy landscape for these initiatives. Project researchers gathered descriptive materials from the programs in the sample to develop brief summaries of each program; these materials also informed the content and structure of the survey instrument.

Semi-Structured Phone Interviews

Project staff conducted brief, semi-structured interviews with selected staff members (typically Executive Directors or Program Coordinators) of the programs identified for the sample to gather detailed information about operations, services, mission, and the program's guiding philosophy. The role of faith or spirituality in programming, services, and program operations was also discussed. Lead letters introducing the project and the purpose of the phone interview were mailed and faxed to targeted participants along with a brief project description. Follow-up calls, to schedule interviews and answer any questions about the project or the interview request, were made within a week of the initial mailing. Project staff also supplied participants with a copy of the semi-structured interview guide in advance of the interview to ensure a productive conversation. A copy of the interview guide is provided in Appendix A.

Information from these interviews populated a detailed matrix developed by project researchers to catalogue key characteristics of the programs identified for the study sample; the matrix served as tool by which to assess, on an on-going basis, the mix of programs identified for the sample and determine where gaps in the composition of the sample existed with respect to core reentry service domains (e.g., education, employment, housing, mental health/health, and substance abuse), program setting (in-prison, community-based) and faith orientation.

In turn, semi-structured interviews were also conducted with key staff of national religious service organizations to learn more about how that sector of the faith community intersected with criminal justice-involved individuals or the issues related to prisoner reentry. Among the

organizations targeted for additional outreach were the Aleph Institute, the Islamic Society of North America, Jewish Prisoner Services International, Jewish Community Centers of North American, Muslim Alliance of North America, Zen Mountain Monastery Prison Programs and the Engaged Zen Foundation. Given the project's limited resources, researchers did not prioritize re-connecting with umbrella organizations such as Prison Fellowship Ministries that were targeted under prior recent work.

Faith-Based Program Survey

During a six-week period spanning mid-August to late September 2008, the FBCRP project surveyed the program directors of 96 faith-based corrections and reentry programs across the nation. Representatives from 48 discrete programs completed the survey, resulting in a 50 percent response rate. Roughly five percent of respondents declined to participate citing their programs were not faith-based.

The FBCRP survey is a traditional self-administered instrument consisting of six major sections. Survey items measured key program characteristics, as well as the manner in which faith, spirituality, and religion infused program activities and services, if at all, and the extent to which these concepts influenced program's operations and objectives. Although developed in consultation with practitioners, the survey instrument also incorporated slightly modified measures and scales from the Faith Integration Survey (Smith et al. 2008) and the Survey of Faith-Based Social Service Coalitions (Ebaugh et al. 2006). A draft version of the instrument was pre-tested in early August and revised in accordance with the feedback received. In its final form, the survey consisted of 37 items supporting five program constructs (mission and vision; program identity; religious activities; staffing; outcomes) in which faith or spirituality could manifest. Response formats were almost exclusively three- and five-point Likert-type scales; the survey featured just one open-ended item (i.e., "What spiritual or religious principles are most critical to your program model?"). A copy of the survey instrument is provided in Appendix B.

Data collection began in mid-August and spanned roughly six weeks. An aggressive follow-up schedule consisting of "lead letters," phone calls to verify names and addresses, repeat mailings to all non-respondents, and follow-up phone calls was implemented to achieve data collection goals. Project researchers mailed lead letters to all potential respondents once the respondent's contact information had been verified. Lead letters introducing the FBCRP survey, inviting the individual's participation, and informing the respondent to look for the survey to arrive soon, were sent a week in advance of the survey launch. The week after the survey launch, project staff contacted each potential participant to confirm receipt of the survey, extend a personal invitation to complete it, and address any questions or concerns about the study or the survey. Additional follow up calls targeted non-responders and the small number (approximately 5 respondents) of individuals who contacted UI to actively decline. Calls to "active refusers" explored the reasons for the declination; these calls, however, were well-received and often lead to informative discussions about the program's identity, services and programmatic approach. "Not a faith-based program" was the consistent reason cited by those individuals who declined to participate in the survey. Likewise, these individuals did not believe the survey items applied to their respective programs.

3. SURVEY FINDINGS

This section of the report presents findings from the FBCRP survey. Discussion is structured into six issue areas mirroring the structure of the survey instrument. All referenced tables are located in Appendix C.

Description of the Sample

Individuals from 96 programs, operating from six faith orientations, were invited to participate in the survey. Half (N=48) responded. Respondents, like the programs they represent, embodied a mix of faith orientations. The programs themselves were diverse, varying in size, length of operation, services offered, populations targeted, models employed, and challenges encountered.

Respondent Background

When asked about their current professional position, the vast majority (94 percent) reported holding the top spot: most selected “Executive Director” but several clarified their position as president or CEO of the program. One respondent identified his/her current position as “volunteer” and another as support staff. Respondents had been in their current position an average of 7.8 years. Twenty percent had occupied the current position for at least ten years.

Slightly more than half (52 percent) of respondents identified themselves as a spiritual leader, such as a clergyperson, cleric, priest, imam, rabbi, or nun. When asked which best described their personal religious faith, 82 percent identified Christianity. The remainder of respondents identified as Buddhist, Jewish, Muslim, or spiritual. Just one respondent selected no religious faith. Three respondents chose not to answer the question.

Taken together, these figures suggest the survey sample consisted of individuals who worked in their current position many years, held leadership positions with their agencies and were well positioned to report on the multiple dimensions of program operations. In addition, many respondents also identified as spiritual leaders suggesting the programs in this sample are largely lead by individuals with clear faith-related ties, as opposed to secular leaders. The faith affiliation of the respondent closely mirrored the religious or spiritual identity of the program, as might be expected.

Program Background

Five items measured program background characteristics: number of years in operation; whether the program operated under an umbrella organization; faith-based identify (self-reported); religious affiliation; and program setting.

Table 1 provides selected descriptive statistics for the programs represented in the survey. On average, the programs represented in the sample had been in operation 12.59 years. A little more than two-thirds (66 percent) had been in operation 10 years or less. Twenty percent had been established in the last five years.

Eighty-five percent of the programs in the sample identified as faith-based, with 62 percent identifying their faith affiliation as Christian. Fifteen percent selected “non-denominational/spiritually-based” while another 8 percent reported a multi-faith focus. Less than half of the programs (42 percent), however, reported an association with a religious community like a church, mosque or temple. Roughly the same percent reported operating under an umbrella organization.

Among the 48 programs represented in the survey data, roughly half (53 percent) bridge the facility and the community; that is, they reported operating both in the correctional facility as well as with offenders in the community. Twenty-seven percent identified as reentry programs that worked exclusively with offenders in the community. Among the remaining programs, ten percent reported operations focused exclusively on in-prison spiritual development, and roughly the same number identified as faith/character-based residential units. Lastly, not all lead agencies responding to the survey were community-based agencies; roughly 10 percent of survey completers worked for state departments of corrections.

Further, it is interesting to note that while the majority of programs identified as faith-based, many operate independent of a religious community or organization. This calls into question whether spiritual leadership may be a more cogent characteristic of faith-based programs than affiliation with the faith community.

The average length of years in operation (roughly 13 years) suggests these programs are relatively stable and well-established in their communities. The extent to which these figures indicate the faith-based programs in this sample are more or less stable than their secular community-based counterparts is unclear. This, however, would be an interesting question for future research (i.e. the question being, are faith-based program more durable than secular programs, and if so, why?).

Program Operations

Program operations were conceived of as having three dimensions: structural, functional, and conceptual characteristics. The survey relied on multiple measures to capture potential variation in program operations across these three dimensions and to answer fundamental questions about the “Who, What, When, Why, How and How Much” regarding reentry and correctional programs identified as faith-based.

Project researchers conceived of structural characteristics as the degree to which curricula, eligibility criteria, and service provision, as well as policies and procedures, were formalized. Functional measures (functional characteristics) focused on the range of services provided, program capacity, referral sources, eligibility criteria, staffing (size, composition, qualifications), funding, and collaboration. A program’s articulated mission and vision, and desired outcomes were thought to offer clues about the conceptual characteristics of the program.

Target Population

Seven items asked about the characteristics of the intended target population, eligibility criteria, and common referral sources.

Caseload Characteristics

Almost 70 percent (33 of 48, or 68.7 percent of the sample) of the programs represented by survey respondents served criminal justice-involved individuals exclusively. Among the remaining 30 percent of the programs represented in the survey sample, criminal justice-involved individuals still comprised a portion of the client caseload:

- **Adult male offenders:** roughly 86 percent served adult male offenders; male offenders comprised an estimated 5 to 80 percent of the caseload for these programs; the average was 48.9 percent.
- **Adult female offenders:** adult female offenders comprised some portion of the caseload for about 79 percent of the programs that did not serve criminal justice individuals exclusively; adult female offenders again represented anywhere from 5 to 80 percent of the caseload for these programs; the average was 33 percent.
- **Children or family-members of prisoners or former prisoners:** about 57 percent of the programs serving mixed caseloads identified the children or family members of prisoners or former prisoners as among their program's target population. On average, children and family members of offenders or former offenders constituted about 25 percent of the caseload of these programs (range was 2 percent to 80 percent).
- **Juvenile justice involved youth:** 35 percent of the programs serving mixed caseloads reported serving juvenile justice-involved youth; on average, such cases were estimated at comprising about ten percent of the program's overall caseload.

Eligibility Criteria

Two survey items asked about program eligibility. One item focused on criminal justice criteria, the other on faith preference. Both focused on potential reasons for exclusion from the program.

Individuals convicted of violent crimes, sex offenses or arson are often excluded from community-based programs, making them a particularly difficult population to serve post-release. When asked about categories of individuals that were excluded from participating in their respective program, respondents reported the following:

- 48 percent excluded individuals with serve mental health issues
- 40 percent excluded sex offenders
- 30 percent excluded individuals with serve physical disabilities

Just twenty percent of programs in the sample unilaterally excluded arsonists and violent offenders. Most augmented their survey response with a note qualifying that arson, sex and violent offenders may be admitted on a case-by-case basis. One program reported serving women only (men were excluded). Another noted that it did not exclude any type of offender.

Survey respondents were also asked about the role a potential client's religion plays, if any, in determining whether the client is accepted into the program. Most respondents indicated that a client's affiliation or spiritual orientation carried little influence. Nearly 60 percent (58.3) do not

take the client's religious affiliation or spiritual orientation into account while the 30 percent of programs that gave preference to individuals with a religious or spiritual orientation did so without regard to the nature of that orientation. Only ten percent of the programs represented in this sample gave preference to individuals that adhered to a particular religious or spiritual orientation, the assumption being the client's religious preference mirrored the faith orientation of the program.

Referral sources

Although only 20 percent of the programs in the sample operated exclusively in correctional facilities, nearly 90 percent reported typically receiving referrals from prison chaplains. Other top referral sources include prison and jail officials (83 percent), faith-based in-prison programs (73 percent), probation and parole officers (73 percent), and family members (73 percent). Table 5 provides a complete list of potential referrals sources and figures for those sources.

Services

Table 3 lists the array of services regularly provided by the programs represented in the survey sample. As the table indicates, the programs in this sample offer a broad array of services ranging from ministry and spiritual development to parenting education and substance abuse treatment and counseling. The average program offers eight of the thirteen services listed in Table 3, with roughly 79 percent offering six or more services. The five most prevalent services offered include ministry/spiritual development (85 percent); life skills training (83 percent); mentoring (81 percent); aftercare/reentry services (79 percent); and employment services (73 percent). Medical care, mental health services and therapy were among the least prevalent services.

In addition to offering a diverse array of services, the survey also suggests the capacity of faith-based programs (those comprising this sample) is relatively high given operational resources such as staffing. Half the programs reported serving more than 100 offenders annually; the annual average across programs was 507 criminal justice-involved clients.

Programs received an average of 440 referrals annually. The median duration of services was six months. Almost half (48 percent) the programs represented in the sample reported operating with a waiting list. As discussed in the next section, most programs operate with nominal paid staff and rely heavily on volunteers to function.

Lastly, programs comprising the survey sample were characterized as highly structured and formalized. Forty-eight percent of respondents described their programs as highly structured with formalized policies and procedures to which the program strictly adheres (e.g., follows the designated curriculum, client eligibility criteria, adhere to the designated suite of services for a designated period of time). Only ten percent described their program as loosely structured; these programs do not follow a designated curriculum, have only general guidelines about eligibility, and offer services as needed.

Operational Capacity: Staffing and funding

Most programs in the sample operate with a relatively small number of paid staff and rely on a strong volunteer base. About a third of the programs in the sample had three or fewer paid (full or part-time); fifteen percent (7 of 48) reported operating without any paid full-time staff, which suggests these programs were staffed largely by volunteers and paid part-time staff. Among programs with paid full time staff, the number of paid full-time positions ranged from one to 60; two was the median number of paid full time positions. In contrast, the median number of paid staff, either full time or part time, was slightly larger at five positions.

With respect to program volunteers, forty-four percent of the programs in the sample reported an average annual volunteer base of more than 50 individuals. In contrast, 20 percent of the sample reported fewer than 10 volunteers. Equal percentages of the sample reported an average volunteer base of between 10 and 25 workers annually, and 26 to 50 annually.

While the programs in the sample operated with limited paid staff and relied heavily on a broad volunteer base, they leveraged a relatively balanced mix of funding sources. Analysis suggests that faith-based programs do not depend on one source such as charitable contributions from congregations. Programs in the survey sample provided rough estimates regarding the percentage of funding obtained from each of the following sources.

- **Government funding.** Roughly 42 percent of programs in the sample received funding from government agencies, whether federal, state or local; this source composed 23 percent of total program funding. It is interesting to note that close to two-thirds did not report leveraging government funding streams.
- **Religious communities (churches, mosques, synagogues).** Approximately 83 percent of the sample received financial support from religious institutions such as a mosque, synagogue, temple or church, with contributions from these sources comprising about 30 percent of program funding.
- **Community-based funding sources.** Civic organizations such as the United Way provided funding to just over 40 percent of the sample; about 6 percent of program funding was derived from this source.
- **Foundations or philanthropic organizations.** Seventy percent of the sample received philanthropic funding from sources other than religious congregations. Programs in the sample estimated that about a quarter of program funding came from foundations or other philanthropic organizations.
- **Individuals.** About 30 percent of the sample received contributions from individuals; this funding source represented about 18 percent of overall program funding. This may be an underestimate as the initial survey round inadvertently omitted the option to report funding received from individual contributors. Many respondents wrote in the information. These responses were entered and included in the analysis.

In sum, the faith-based programs comprising the survey sample tapped diverse funding streams to create a balanced portfolio of resources. This diversity likely provides a measure of stability conducive to the type of long-term operations characterizing the programs in this sample (on average, programs in the sample had been in operation close to thirteen years).

Faith and Spirituality in Programming and Activities

Measuring how faith or spirituality manifests in faith-based reentry and corrections programs was one of the study's key objectives. The faith-based program survey included thirty-two items to measure the manner in which faith and spirituality could intersect with programming and activities across eight distinct domains:

- **Mission and Vision:** the degree to which each program's mission and vision were based on spiritual principles or religious beliefs; four items
- **Key Outcomes:** the importance of spiritual development or religious transformation to the program model and outcomes; two items
- **Program Identity:** the extent to which the program had a clear, explicit faith identity; four items
- **Religious Activities:** the importance of religious activities to the program model; seven items
- **Secular Activities:** the importance of secular activities to the program model; three items
- **Client Characteristics:** the importance of clients' religious backgrounds and beliefs; two items
- **Staffing:** the role of staff and volunteers' religious background or beliefs; seven items
- **Connection to Religious Communities:** level of connectedness between formal religious communities and the program; three items

Two domains, program identity and connection of surveyed programs to religious or faith communities, were reported on earlier in this section, therefore, they are not revisited here. Instead, we now focus on those items that asked about the nature of key outcomes, the importance of religious and secular program activities, and staff and volunteers' religious or spiritual beliefs.

Program Activities

Respondents answered ten questions about the importance of specific religious and secular activities to their respective programs⁴. Response options ranged from very important, somewhat

⁴The survey instrument also incorporated slightly modified measures and scales from the Faith Integration Survey (Smith et al. 2008) and the Survey of Faith-Based Social Service Coalitions (Ebaugh et al. 2006); UI obtained permission to use these items.

important, not important, not allowed/policy prohibits, and not applicable. None of the respondents indicated that an activity was prohibited. Not applicable was reserved for instances in which an activity was not part of the program. A percentage (ranging from 4 to 30 percent) of respondents selected *Not Applicable* for eight of the ten items; this option was frequently selected by those programs that did not self-identify as faith-based and in response to items about religious activities.

Table 7 presents the distribution of responses. As inspection of Table 7 clearly indicates, respondents were more likely to rate secular activities as central to their respective program than spiritual or religious activities such as group prayer, client participation in religious services or rituals or the study of sacred texts. The top three activities identified as very important to respondents' programs were (1) building supportive relationships between staff, volunteers and clients (89.6 percent very important); helping clients build or repair their support networks (85.1 percent very important); and helping clients gain skills or training (80.8 percent very important). It is interesting to note these activities were ranked as very important by both programs that identified as faith-based as well as those that did not. Only 2.1 percent of the sample responded that building supportive relationships between staff and clients was not important. Client spiritual development (77.1 percent very important) and individual prayer (56.3 very important) rounded out the top five activities viewed by respondents as very important to their programs.

Activities most likely to be deemed not important were all spiritual in nature. These included (1) client participation in group prayer (22.9 percent not important); (2) clients joining a religious institution such as a church, mosque, synagogue or spiritual group (16.7 percent not important); and (3) client study of religious texts or materials (10.6 percent not important) followed by (4) client participation in religious services or rituals (10.4 percent not important). Between a quarter and a third of respondents reported the study of religious texts and client affiliation with a spiritual group or congregation were not applicable to their programs; both those identified as faith-based programs and those that did not self-identify as faith-based selected this option.

Taken as a whole, these figures suggest faith-based programs are less inclined to identify formal activities with a religious or spiritual overtone as important to their programs; key activities of central importance are largely secular. If analysis is expanded to combine very important and somewhat important – any reporting of importance to the program – there is a clear sense that programs have a religious identity but that spiritual activities within programs are not viewed as essential elements or ingredients. This suggests that faith manifests in some other way that programs view as more critical to their operations than the traditional or apparent activities identified by the survey items. Staffing and the infusion of spiritual beliefs and religious principles in programming appear to be more central and relevant to how faith intersects with these programs. How this manifestation influences program operations and ultimately outcomes should be examined as a next step.

Program identify, Mission and Operations

The survey included 20 statements about the extent to which faith and spirituality intersect with program operations including administrative decisions, staffing, and program mission and identity. Respondents indicated whether they strongly agreed, agreed, disagreed, or strongly

disagreed with the statement that a particular policy or practice accurately described their program. Table 8 provides the sample's responses to these twenty items.

Overall, these figures suggest respondents are mixed about how to best describe and characterize their programs; identifying the manifestation of faith and spirituality in programming may require a more subtle analytical approach than these descriptive statistics can offer. For example, although roughly 85 percent of the sample self-identified as faith-based in an earlier survey item, only two-thirds strongly agreed with the statement that program participants consider the program faith based, and just 53.4 percent strongly agreed with the statement that their program had a clearly religious identity. The statement that the program focuses on the participants as whole persons through a commitment to their physical, emotional and spiritual well-being drew the most support with 80.4 percent of the sample selecting strongly agree. Combining strongly agree and agree boosted the percentage of the sample identifying with this statement to 99.9 percent.

Respondents were more likely, however, to consistently identify with statements about the manner in which faith or spirituality intersected with program values, mission and operations. Roughly 58 percent of the sample strongly agreed their program draws on religious values and beliefs in training and motivating staff and volunteers, while 52.1 percent strongly agreed that religious values strongly influence administrative decisions about the program. Nearly half the sample strongly agreed that program staff and volunteers perform their work as an expression of their religious values or spiritual beliefs. This is consistent with later reporting that all levels of staff from executive leaders to administrative support staff generally share the beliefs and convictions of the program; between half and two-thirds of the sample strongly agreed with statements to this effect.

It is interesting to note that respondents were more likely to strongly agree that executive-level and program staff shared the beliefs and convictions of the program than support staff. Although early responses indicated that programs in the sample did not give preference in hiring to individuals with a specific religious or spiritual orientation, this would suggest otherwise at least at the upper management levels.

It is also interesting to note that 56.4 percent disagreed that program partners shared the religious beliefs and convictions of the program.

More than 40 percent strongly agreed the program model was based on spiritual principles or religious beliefs; this number increases to 73.2 percent when strongly agree and agree are combined. This suggests that most programs would describe their model as based on spiritual principles and religious beliefs.

The following statements garnered the most disagreement. Twenty percent strongly disagreed that the faith or spiritual element in the program was mandatory; this figure rose to 51.1 percent when strongly disagree and disagree were combined. Likewise, 14 percent (13.6) strongly disagreed with the statement that participants must undergo a religious or spiritual transformation for the program to be effective; this number increased to 49.9 percent or roughly half the sample when strongly disagree and disagree were combined. This suggests some ambivalence about the role of spiritual and religious transformation in program effectiveness and a lack of agreement

about the centrality or relevance of spiritual transformation, which is interesting given the outcomes identified in the next section.

Another interesting item to note: roughly even percentages of the sample agreed and disagreed with the statement that program participants typically have the same religious beliefs and convictions as the program. When responses were collapsed into two dichotomous variables of agree and disagree, only slightly more agreed (55.8 percent) than disagreed (44.1 percent) with the statement. This suggests no clear pattern.

Outcomes

Lastly, survey respondents were asked to identify the top three outcomes⁵ their programs hope to achieve, and to then rank the relevance from most (1) to least relevant (3) on a scale ranging from 1 to 3. Table 6 lists the survey responses for the sample.

Deepening personal spiritual commitment (44.4 percent), reduced offending (37.7 percent) and reduced use of drugs and alcohol (11.1 percent) topped the list of outcomes ranked most relevant (i.e., ranked #1) by respondents. Interestingly enough, the fifteen percent of the sample (N=7) that did not self-identify as faith-based identified a similar set of top outcomes although the ordering differed slightly: reduced offending topped the list of most relevant program outcomes for those programs that did not identify as faith-based, followed by deepening personal spiritual commitment, and pro-social behavior and attitudes.

In contrast, reduced offending (68.8 percent), deepening personal spiritual commitment (64.4 percent) and pro-social behavior and attitudes (48.8 percent) were consistently selected by respondents as among the top three outcomes their respective programs hoped to achieve.

Stable housing and educational attainment were not selected by any sample respondent as the most relevant outcome for their program, although these were identified as one of three outcomes programs hoped to achieve. Educational attainment (4.4 percent), stable housing (10.4 percent) and steady employment (24.4 percent) were least likely to make the list of relevant program outcomes.

Collaboration and Coordination

The ability to form and sustain productive collaborative relationships and to coordinate with key partners is critical for the survival of many community-based programs including those operating within the faith community. The survey measured coordination and collaboration among faith-based programs by asking respondents to report on coordination between their respective program and eight entities around the issues of funding, programming and volunteers; the referent period was the past year. Table 11 provides the sample's responses to these questions. Overall, the programs in the sample were most likely to coordinate with community-based organizations and the faith community, including faith-based non-profits and religious communities such as churches, mosques and temples on matters of funding, programming and volunteers, and were least likely to collaborate with federal, state or local governments on any of

⁵Respondents selected and ranked outcomes from a list of nine common outcomes identified from earlier semi-structured interviews with selected faith-based programs, as discussed in previous sections of this report.

these issues. Religious communities and faith-based non-profit agencies were among the top three entities with which programs in the sample reported coordinating on funding (66.7 percent and 37.5 percent), programming (50 percent and 54.2 percent) and volunteers (75 percent and 50 percent) during the past year. The business community rounded out the top three entities with which programs in the sample coordinated for funding: roughly 54 percent of programs in the sample reported coordinating with the business community for financial support in the previous year. Community-based and civic organizations were among the top three entities with which programs in the sample coordinated on programming (45.8 percent) and volunteers (41.7 percent).

Although it is not surprising that relatively few programs reported coordinating with federal, state or local government on programming and volunteers, it is interesting to note that less than a third of the sample reported coordinating with federal agencies for funding given the emphasis of the prior presidential administration on increasing the ability of faith-based agencies to do so. Why few programs coordinated with federal partners for funding is unclear. Among the government entities (federal, state, local) with which respondents could report coordinating, state government agencies were most likely to be tapped for funding (31.3 percent) and programming (33.3 percent), and local government agencies for volunteers (20.8 percent). Programs in the sample were more likely to collaborate or coordinate with state government agencies over federal agencies on all three issues. It is beyond the scope of the present study to remark on why this is the case but this raises an interesting question worthy of additional research and investigation.

Support and Challenges for Faith-Based Programs

The survey measured support for faith-based programs among a broad set of community and civic constituencies and asked respondents about challenges facing their programs, as discussed below.

External Support

External support for faith-based reentry and corrections programs was measured by asking respondents to rate how supportive nine different constituency groups were of their respective program. Response options ranged from not at all supportive, mildly supportive, moderately supportive, and very supportive. Respondents could select “not applicable” if the constituency did not apply to the program or community.

As Table 10 suggests, the programs in this sample reported broad support across diverse constituency groups. Religious communities like churches, mosques and congregations (60.4 percent), jail and prison officials (50 percent) and community groups (35.4 percent) topped the list of constituencies perceived as very supportive. Combining moderately supportive and mildly supportive yields a slightly different picture that suggests faith-based programs have broader support among a more diverse community base. When these two response categories are combined, roughly 70 percent of the sample identified the business community as supportive, while two-thirds rated local media, community groups and community-based social service programs as supportive. With the exception of the business community (14.1 percent), less than ten percent of the sample identified any of the constituency groups as not at all supportive. Such

broad support is critical to sustained program operations and may be a key factor in the relatively large percentage of established programs comprising this sample.

Challenges

Challenges facing faith-based programs were measured by asking respondents about the extent to which 14 issues posed challenges for their programs in the past year. Respondents could select one of three options to describe the level of challenge posed by the issue: serious challenge, minor challenge, or not a challenge. Table 9 presents statistics summarizing the sample's responses to these questions.

Uncertainties about future funding (52.1 percent), too many clients (22.9 percent), political pressure surrounding the issue of prisoner reentry (22.9), not enough volunteers (20.8 percent) and difficulties coordinating with state agencies (16.7) composed the top five serious challenges faced by faith-based programs in the past year. Combining the response categories serious challenge and minor challenge and focusing on the top three challenges yields a slightly different perspective. Although funding uncertainty still tops the list with a combined 89.6 percent of the sample identifying it as a challenge, lack of volunteers (77.1 percent) and too many clients (68.7 percent) fall into second and third place.

As might be expected, “too few clients” was not a challenge for the majority of the sample; just 15 percent reported it being a minor challenge. Neither was a lack of clarity about program goals (79.2 percent not a challenge) or difficulty coordinating with faith-based organizations or congregations (52.1 percent not a challenge).

Respondents were evenly divided when it came to issues involving federal, state and local government and lack of community support. A quarter of the sample reported minor challenges in coordinating with federal agencies over the past year, while a quarter said it wasn't a challenge at all; however, about 38 percent chose not to answer the question. While half the sample reported minor challenges in coordinating with local agencies, almost a third (29.2 percent) reported none. Over forty percent of the sample reported minor challenges coordinating with criminal justice agencies.

4. TYPOLOGY DEVELOPMENT

Researchers across disciplines acknowledge that faith-based programs likely exist on a continuum with respect to the extent to which faith or spirituality is implicitly or explicitly expressed in the delivery of services (Mears et al. 2006; Noyes 2009:2). Developing a functional, pragmatic conceptual framework for classifying faith-based programs is a necessary next step to advance more rigorous evaluation around the effectiveness of faith-based programs. The current study used factor analysis to characterize dimensions of faith-based programs and cluster analysis to construct a basic program typology; categorization of programs was based on the degree to which faith or spirituality infused five operational dimensions. Here, we review our analytic approach and key findings.

Figure 1. Scale Construction	
Scale	Description
<p>Mission and Vision (f_vision) – alpha = .85</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • program commitment to clients is based on religious beliefs or convictions • program model is based on spiritual principles or religious beliefs • program’s guiding principles have an explicit religious or spiritual orientation • mission statement has an explicit religious or spiritual orientation 	<p>The degree to which the program’s mission and vision are based on faith and/or spiritual principles (4 items)</p>
<p>Program Identity (f_iden) – alpha = .78</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • program has a clearly religious identity • faith or spiritual elements incorporated into this program are made explicit to participants • program participants consider this a faith-based program • program is defined as faith-based 	<p>The degree to which the program has a clear, explicit faith-based identity (4 items)</p>
<p>Religious Activities (f_relig) – alpha = .93</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • clients pray individually • clients pray in groups • clients study religious texts or materials • clients participate in religious services or rituals • participation in the faith or spiritual element of this program is mandatory • staff and volunteers use religious beliefs or principles as to instruct or encourage clients • clients are encouraged to make personal changes in attitudes or behaviors that are based <u>directly</u> on religious or spiritual principles 	<p>The importance of religious activities and engagement to the program model (7 items)</p>
<p>Staff and Volunteers (f_staff) – alpha = .83</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • program draws on religious values and beliefs in training staff and volunteers • staff and volunteers perform their work as an expression of their religious or spiritual beliefs • volunteers recruited from congregations or religious organizations • preference given to candidate’s religious or spiritual orientation in hiring decision • executive staff (e.g., executive director, program director, etc) share the religious beliefs and convictions of the program • program staff (e.g., counselors, case managers, therapists, etc) share the religious beliefs and convictions of the program 	<p>The role of staff and volunteer’s religious backgrounds (6 items)</p>
<p>Key Outcomes (f_outcm) – alpha = .71</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • deepening client’s personal spiritual commitment • clients develop spiritually • participants must undergo a religious or spiritual transformation for program to be effective 	<p>The extent to which the program acknowledges the importance of spiritual development (3 items)</p>

Scale Construction

As discussed in the previous section, the project surveyed a sample of faith-based reentry programs across the country to identify the distinguishing characteristics of such programs and to explore the extent and manner in which faith or spirituality infuses program operations. The objective of the survey was to derive answers to the much contemplated question: What is a faith-based program? In doing so, however, project researchers also sought to move beyond simple description to examine how key factors or characteristics, taken together, may

differentiate these programs – specifically, how do various factors, and in what combination, distinguish seemingly similar programs from one another?

Descriptive analysis of the survey data suggested that faith or spirituality intersects with service provision in a number of ways ranging from the intervention itself (individual and group prayer, attendance at services) to program staff and location (services delivered in a temple or mosque). With this in mind, project researchers compiled individual survey items into multi-question indexes or scales reflecting single concepts for each. For example, the survey measured the degree to which the program's mission and vision were based on faith or spiritual principles by asking respondents about four separate statements. The extent to which the program had a clear and explicit faith-based identity was measured with five different items. A respondent's score on a particular scale was calculated as the average of that individual's answers to all of the questions making up that scale.

Initially, survey items were conceptualized into nine scales. Only five scales, however, were found to be distinct and reliable. Factor analysis validated the extent to which these scales each represented distinct constructs; and the measures of internal consistency among items, or alpha, were .70 or greater for all scales. The mean and standard deviation values were similar to one another (SD ranged from .73 to .86; the mean from -.02 to 0), indicating no single scale would cause distortion in overall findings. Figure 1 lists key elements of these scales.

Cluster Analysis

Cluster analysis is a way to analytically develop a typology of particular items, in this case programs, by grouping them based on similarities along particular dimensions of interest and by creating such groupings so that they are distinct from one another.

Here, we included five measures (mission and vision; program identity; faith and spiritually-based activities; staff and volunteers; and key outcomes) in a cluster analysis to explore profiles of faith-based programs. Three clusters emerged based on patterns of responses to these five constructs. Cluster 1 comprises roughly 27 percent of programs in the sample; these 13 programs have little manifestation of faith or spirituality across all five constructs, particularly staffing. Group 2 comprises almost 65 percent of the sample (N=31) and is highly faith-infused on all five constructs; this cluster consists predominantly, but not exclusively, of programs operating from a Christian faith tradition. Multi-faith programs as well as programs operating from Muslim and Buddhist orientations are also represented among Cluster 2. Cluster 3 is the smallest and strongly secular in orientation; only one of the programs in this cluster self-identified as faith-based.

Figure 2 shows the means and standard deviations of the five key constructs by cluster. Cluster 2 is distinctive from the other two clusters in that the mean of the key constructs is all positive (i.e., suggesting these program scored high across the five constructs) whereas the other two clusters have a negative mean score suggesting a weak or limited manifestation of faith as measured by the five constructs. Clusters 1 and 3 are in the same direction with respect to our key constructs, but Cluster 3 shows a greater negative mean score on all five key constructs suggesting it is the least faith-infused or conversely, the most secular.

Figure 2. Means and Standard Deviations for 3-Cluster Solution

Faith Constructs	Cluster 1 Mean (SD)	Cluster 2 Mean (SD)	Cluster 3 Mean (SD)
Mission and Vision (f_vision)	-.81 (.78)	.45 (.31)	-1.13 (1.16)
Program Identity (f_iden)	-.35* (.46)	.36* (.35)	-1.67* (.96)
Religious Activities (f_relig)	-.78* (.45)	.52* (.41)	-1.54* (.26)
Staff and Volunteers (f_staff)	-.35* (.63)	.32* (.46)	-1.30* (.93)
Key Outcomes (f_outcm)	-.63* (.48)	.47* (.37)	-1.57* (.46)
N	13	31	4

* The mean value is significantly different from those of other two clusters at .05 level

For further examination, post hoc multiple comparisons were performed using the Tukey test. We tested if those clusters are statistically different from one another⁶. All three clusters were statistically different from one another on those constructs at the .05 level, except for Mission and Vision. No significant difference was found on the construct, Mission and Vision, between any pair of the three clusters.

This initial analysis suggests four of the five measures or constructs – program identity, religious activities, staff and volunteers, and key outcomes – distinguish these clusters in a meaningful way. Cluster analyses, though limited, support these general observations. Specifically, it indicates that for one type of program (Cluster 2), it did not matter what these programs reported as their mission and vision; they conducted activities, maintained identities, and hired staff members or engaged volunteers that all reflected strong faith or spiritual orientations. These findings provide researchers with clear next steps about what to investigate. In short, researchers should next examine how these heavily faith-infused elements “work” in these programs practically, how they are linked to program outcomes, if at all, and which elements are more relevant than others in producing desired outcomes – is a single factor key, some combination of these four elements, or must all four elements function together to achieve desired program outcomes? Understanding how clients experience these programs and these elements would also be an important next step.

⁶ Based on the post hoc Tukey test, we conducted a series of pair-wise mean comparisons for the clusters. The comparisons were conducted with and without an assumption of equal variance. The Tukey test relied on the Welch standard error and Satterthwaite's degrees of freedom when unequal variance was assumed. Overall, findings suggest that the clusters were distinctive from one another on the key constructs, except for Mission and Vision. The mean difference was not statically distinguishable between any pair of the three clusters on the Mission and Vision scale.

Limitations

Like any study, the findings of this study are a function of the questions asked and the data collected. The project's survey of faith-based reentry and corrections programs sought to identify key characteristics of these programs and to detect the manner and extent to which faith or spirituality manifested; it did not measure the effectiveness of these programs or attempt to isolate program impacts. The premise of our approach was to address a critical gap in the research: what distinguishes faith-based programs from secular programs? As discussed in earlier sections of this report, questions about the efficacy and effectiveness of faith-based programs cannot be answered until researchers derive clear and compelling answers to the former.

Although the survey data successfully identify a number of key characteristics, the sample size is small and oriented predominately toward one faith tradition (Christian). As has been noted by the broader research community, "different faiths have different world views and thus vary in their moral logic and cannot be classified as similar in their approach to service provision" (Noyes 2009:3). The extent to which current findings would differ for a more diverse sample is unclear but a noteworthy consideration for future research efforts. As such, the reader should be cautious in making any generalizations about faith-based programs based on these data.

Attempts to develop a pragmatic typology of faith-based programs also fell short. Although an appropriate technique for this task, the potential of cluster analysis could not be fully realized in this study. Preliminary cluster analysis suggests programs in this sample differed in the level and manner in which faith and spirituality infused various operational dimensions such as staffing, programming activities, program identity and key outcomes. The largest grouping of programs was the most highly faith-infused. The two smaller clusters, though less faith-infused, were also distinct, suggesting one was essentially secular in its approach and the other nominally faith-infused. Despite the stated limitations, this analysis offers credible direction for future research on faith-based programs as discussed in the previous section. Identifying key characteristics in which faith manifests and the measures of those characteristics provides researchers with a suggested short list of elements that warrant closer inspection in any study of effectiveness.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The primary objective of this small, entirely exploratory study was to advance answers to two questions: how does faith or spirituality infuse faith-based programs and how do faith-based programs work. As is often the case with exploratory research, study findings raise more questions than answers. Regardless, this report concludes with a summary of key findings about the characteristics of faith-based programs in the sample and then offers recommendations for future research.

Key findings and themes include:

- **Not all faith-based programs are alike.** The present analysis, though limited confirms that faith-based programs which appear to be largely similar are differentiated by the manner and degree to which faith and spirituality intersect around four dimensions: program identity; religious activities; staff and volunteers; and key outcomes. These distinctions provide direction for future research efforts by identifying constructs and measures that likely differentiate faith-based programs from secular programs.
- **Faith manifests in a variety of dimensions.** Analysis of survey data suggests faith or spirituality manifests in a number of key characteristics and to varying degrees. Consistent with the suppositions of other researchers, these programs do exist on a continuum. Programs in the sample were more likely to report that faith and spirituality manifested in abstract elements such as staff and volunteer commitment to clients and program principles, and the program model than concrete program activities. Further, although the majority of programs identified as faith-based, many did not identify spiritual transformation as relevant to program success although deepening personal spiritual development was among the top three outcomes programs hope to achieve. This suggests the manifestation and influence of religious principles or spirituality is subtle and the relationship between program participation and outcomes requires additional examination.
- **Broad set of services offered, inclusive criteria for clientele.** The faith-based programs in this survey sample are characterized by a broad, inclusive mandate. Most provide a wide array of services, and the majority of programs do not give the religious orientation of a client much consideration. The diverse funding streams leveraged by these programs suggest this inclusive position is not tied to an external policy requirement but rather reflects the true orientation and nature of these programs.
- **Relatively high capacity given operational resources.** Analysis suggests the service capacity of these programs is high relative to operational resources; they serve literally hundreds of clients annually with nominal numbers of paid staff members.
- **Common obstacles and challenges.** Survey findings suggest the faith-based programs in this sample face the same obstacles encountered by many community-based programs: uncertain funding and political pressures associated with serving disenfranchised populations. What is interesting to note is the lack of challenges associated with the faith-based nature of these programs; although roughly 40 percent reported occasional limitations due to their faith-based status, sixty percent reported these challenges were rare.

With respect to gaining a clear understanding of what makes a faith-based program faith-based the survey data offer several clues. Program identity, staffing including leadership and management positions, and mission and vision appear to intersect most with faith. Affiliation with a spiritual or religious community, mandatory spiritual activities and religious transformation appear to be less definitive elements of faith-based programs surveyed for this study. Researchers, therefore, should focus on further exploration of the more heavily faith-infused elements to gain a clearer sense of how these elements “work” in these programs, in what combination, and the extent to which they influence program outcomes, if at all.

In turn, practitioners in the field, such as parole or probation officers, also stand to benefit from this analysis. First, the distinctions identified by the analysis offer practitioners evidence that all faith-based programs are not the same. Second, survey findings suggest the programs in this sample are highly structured and formalized and inclusive; further, they tend to view distinctly spiritual or religious activities as optional (i.e., these activities are not mandatory and faith-based programs do not appear to be overtly coercive as some opponents fear) and not necessarily central to their mission or program objectives. Rather, faith or spiritual principles appear to infuse more abstract dimensions such as staff philosophy and motivation or program identify; how faith transfers to affect program operations and outcomes is less clear. Third, these programs appear open to serving many hard-to-place offenders. Taken together, these observations offer practitioners concrete criteria for consideration when choosing which program to refer a client. A client with a strong spiritual orientation may be best suited to a faith-based program where spiritual activities are emphasized as opposed to a faith-based program in which staff are deeply spiritual but programming is largely secular and deepening spiritual commitment, while encouraged, is not facilitated directly by the program.

In conclusion, this small exploratory study identified characteristics of faith-based programs and provides clues about how faith and spirituality intersect with these programs. Although it does not address how these elements affect program operations or outcomes, or whether these elements make faith-based programs more effective than secular programs, it does provide insight about the manner in which faith and spirituality intersect with practical program operations and characteristics. These insights offer researchers clear next steps for investigation and provide practitioners with more information about the range of faith-based programs in operation. In this respect, the study's primary objective was achieved.

6. REFERENCES

- Aldenderfer, M. and Blashfield, R.K. 1984. Cluster Analysis. Newbury Park, CA: Sage University Paper Series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, No. 07-044
- Ammerman, N. 1997. Congregation and Community. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Baylor Institute for Studies of Religion. 2008. Not by Faith or Government Alone: Rethinking the Role of Faith-based Organizations. Waco, TX: Baylor University.
- Canada, B. (Analyst in American National Government, Government and Finance Division). 2003, January 23. "Faith-Based Organization and Their Relationship with State and Local Governments: Analysis of Recent Initiatives." In Report for Congress.
- Chaves, M. 1999. "Congregations' Social Service Activities." In Charting Civil Society Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.
- Chaves, M., and Tsitsos, W. 2001. "Congregations and Social Services: What they Do, How they Do it, and With Whom?" NonProfit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly 30: 660-683.
- Clear, T. R. 2002. "Does 'Getting Religion' Rehabilitate Offenders?" NIJ Perspectives Lecture Series.
- Clear, T. R., and Stout, B. D. 1992. "Does Involvement in Religion Help Prisoners Adjust to Prison?" The National Council on Crime and Delinquency.
- Ebaugh, H.R., Chafetz, J.S., and Pipes, P.F. 2006. "Where's the Faith in Faith-based Organizations? Measures and Correlates of Religiosity in Faith-Based Social Service Coalitions." Social Forces 84(4): 2259-2272.
- Evans, T. D., Cullen, F.T., Dunaway, R.G., and Burton, V.S., Jr. 1995. "Religion and Crime Reexamined: The Impact of Religion, Secular Controls, and Social Ecology on Adult Criminality." Criminology 21:505-527.
- "Faith-Based Programming." 2003. Anonymous. Corrections Compendium. 28(8):8-20.
- Harden, M. G. 2006. "Towards a Faith-Based Program Theory: A Reconceptualization of Program Theory." Evaluation Review 30(4): 481-504.

- Johnson, B. and Larson, D. 2003. Center for Research on Religion and Urban Civil Society. Report The InnerChange Freedom Initiative. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania..
- Johnson, B. R., Larson, D.B., and Pitts, T. C. 1997. "Religious Programs, Institutional Adjustment, and Recidivism among Former Inmates in Prison Fellowship Programs." Justice Quarterly 14:145-166.
- Jones, Jeffrey. 2001. "Public Favors Bush's Faith-Based Charities Initiative." Gallup News Service: July 31. Available online at <http://www.gallup.com/poll/4750/Public-Favors-Bushs-FaithBased-Charities-Initiative.aspx?version=print>.
- Kramer, F.D., Smith Nightingale, D., Trutko, J., Spaulding, S., and Barnow, B.S. 2002. Faith-Based Organizations Providing Employment and Training Services. Final Report. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.
- Leventhal, E.L., and Mears, D.P. 2002. "Will Churches Respond to the Call? Religion, Civic Responsibility, and Social Service." Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare 29:53-76.
- Lindquist, C. and Brumbaugh, S. 2005. Faith-Based Involvement: Findings from the SVORI Multi-site Evaluation. Research Triangle Park, NC: RTI, International.
- McCarthy, J., & Castelli, J. 1999. Religion-Sponsored Social Services. In Working Paper for the Aspen Institute (pp. 53-54).
- McGarrell, E., The Hudson Institute (Welfare Policy Center). 1999. Wisconsin State Legislative Study Committee on Faith-Based Approaches to Crime Prevention and Justice in The Role of Faith-Based Organizations in Crime Prevention and Justice. The Hudson Institute (24 pages).
- Mears, D.P., Roman, C.G., Wolff, A., and Buck, J. 2006. "Faith-Based Efforts to Improve Prisoner Reentry: Assessing the Logic and the Evidence." Journal of Criminal Justice 34: 351-367.
- Noyes, J. 2009. "Measuring the "Faith Factor" in Social Service Program Outcomes." Fast Focus. 3-2009: 1-4.
- O'Connor, T.P. 2004. "What Works, Religion as a Correctional Intervention." Community Corrections (14):11-12, 27. .
- Pattillo-McCoy, M. 1998. "Church Culture as a Strategy of Action in the Black Community." American Sociological Review 63:767-784.

Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life, and The Pew Research Center for the People and the Press. 2008. *Some Social Conservative Disillusionment: More Americans Question Religion's Role in Politics: Results from the 2008 Annual Religion and Public Life Survey.*

Roundtable on Religion and Social Welfare Policy. 2008. "Understanding the Comparative Effectiveness of Faith-based and Secular Social Service Organizations: A Summary." Albany, NY: Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government. Available online at http://www.rockinst.org/pdf/faith-based_social_services/2008-06-27-comparative_effectiveness_study_update.pdf.

Roman, C.G., Whitby, A., Zweig, J. and Rico, G. 2004. *Religion, Crime, and Delinquent Behavior: A Synthesis of the Empirical Research on Theory and Practice.* Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute Report to the National Institute of Justice.

Rossman, S., Sridharan, S., Gouvis, C, Buck, J. and Morley, E. 1999. *The Impact of the Opportunity to Succeed for Substance-Abusing Felons: Comprehensive Final Report.* Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.

Sabol, W.J., West, H., and Cooper, M. 2009. *Prisoners in 2008: Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin.* Bureau of Justice Statistics: Washington, DC.

Sider, R.J. and Unruh, H. R. 2004. "Typology of Religious Characteristics of Social Service and Educational Organizations and Programs." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly.* 33(1): 109-134.

Smith, S.R. and Sosin, M.R. 2001. "The Varieties of Faith-Related Agencies." *Public Administration Review.* 61(6): 651-670.

Walton, Elaine. 2007. "Evaluating Faith-Based Programs: An Introduction From the Guest Editor." *Research on Social Work Practice.* 17(2): 171-173.

The White House. 2008. *The Quiet Revolution: The President's Faith-Based and Community Initiative, A Seven-Year Progress Report.* Washington, DC: The White House.

Wilcox, S. 1998. "Release is Just the Beginning: Aftercare Programs." *Christian Social Action,* pp. 27-29.

Winship, C and Reynolds, A. Undated. *Faith, Practice and Transformation: A Theory-Based Evaluation of a Faith-Based Teen Program.*

Appendix A: Faith-Based Program Phone Interview Guide

FBSP Phone Interview Guide - project #08169 DRAFT

Program Name: _____

Date of Interview: _____

Name of Executive Director/Program Director/Clinical Director: _____

Start time: _____ End Time: _____ UI Staff: _____

INTRODUCTION

Hi, my name is _____, I'm calling from the Urban Institute to talk with you about the faith-based corrections or prisoner re-entry program you (or your organization) operate(s). As you may know, the Department of Justice is very interested in learning about promising faith-based programs – particularly those geared toward in-prison or reentry services for adults. With funding from the National Institute of Justice, the Urban Institute is working to identify and describe the range of faith-based corrections and reentry programs in operation around the country.

We would like to take about 20 minutes of your time to talk about the _____ program and the services it provides. We won't actually be evaluating your program we just want to learn more about it for future reference.

Information from this brief conversation will be used to write a summary description of your program and the services provided; this description may then be included in a report that UI is creating for people – program professionals, communities, policymakers and even other evaluators – who are interested in learning more about the kinds of services faith-based programs provide to prisoners and individuals returning to the community from prison. Programs selected for the report will be contacted a few months from now and asked to review UI's description of that program and to notify UI of any errors or concerns regarding the program summary.

Is this a good time to talk?

___ [YES] Great. Thank you...

___ [NO] Is there another time I can reach you or some one else I could talk to?

Program Overview

- Briefly, please tell us about the program's history and mission...when was the program established?
- When and how did the program start (where did the idea come from? Did a specific event generate momentum leading to the program's start?)
- What are the program/initiative's mission/goals/objectives?
- What services does the program provide? How often are services provided? For how long?
- Does the program follow a specific model or structure? If so, please tell me about the program model ... for example, what are the key components of the program?

(If no model exists, what components constitute the core of your program? In other words, if you had to describe your program in one sentence, how would you describe it?)

- What outcomes does the program hope to affect/influence?
- In your words, how do program activities or services lead to these outcomes (i.e., logic model by which you can trace activities to outcomes)
- Caseload
 - Who is the target population?
 - Are there any eligibility criteria? [offense type, age, place of residence, etc]
 - Can you estimate the total number of people served since the project began?
 - What is the annual caseload?
 - *Do you have to limit the number of clients you serve, either because of space or resource constraints?*
 - *Do you have a waiting list? If so, how many are on it? [If no waiting list], roughly how many clients do you intake each month?*
- Faith/Spiritual Element
 - How would you describe your program with regard to faith, religion or spirituality? In other words, does your program have a "faith-based" or spiritual element or feature? (or, "How does faith or spiritual beliefs influence/define/ program and the way services are delivered?")
 - Are there overt faith/spiritual activities like prayer or meditation?
 - Are there more subtle spiritual activities?
 - Is client participation in these activities mandatory or voluntary?
 - With what faith tradition is the program affiliated, if any?

Operations and Management

- How many staff does the program employ? Who is considered core staff?
- How many staff are full time? Part time?
- How heavily does the program depend on volunteers? How many volunteers does the program have? Are any full time?

Coordination

- Basic Partnerships
 - Is the agency or program affiliated with a prison ministry? (Or, if the program is a prison ministry, is it connected to agencies in the community? How many? Which and why, etc)
 - What agencies or organizations do you partner with (churches, prison ministries, secular programs, corrections agencies, law enforcement, the courts, probation or parole, state DOC etc)?
 - How does your program interact with these partner agencies?

Program Data and Data Management Systems

- Do you keep track of your program's performance in any way, like keeping statistics on those who complete the program, or any statistics related to success in the community?
- What types of information are you collecting? For instance do you keep records on program clients? or other information on your caseload?
- Does the program keep electronic records or paper files or both? Does the program have a computerized system?
- If electronic records, Can you tell me a bit about the program's information management system? How far back do program records go (What cases are included and how far back do you keep them)? Are there any plans to expand the system?
- Are there any materials that you might be able to send to us on the program model, services or your organization?

Evaluation (optional)

- Is the program currently being evaluated or has it ever been evaluated? If so, by whom?
- Are you using a comparison group in your evaluation? Are the results available?

Final Questions:

- Are there other faith-based reentry programs or prison-based programs we should talk to? Who should we contact there (get name and number):
- As part of this project, we are also trying to better understand what being a "faith-based organization" means and are conducting a short survey about how faith or spirituality infuses programming and services, if at all. **May we send you a copy of this survey?** *Participation is totally voluntary*; your decision to participate in the survey will in no way affect the Urban Institute's decision about which programs to highlight in its report.

Thank you for your time!

If you have any questions about this study or this phone call, please contact Janeen Buck Willison at (202) 261-5746, by email at jbuck@ui.urban.org

Appendix B: FBCRP Survey Instrument



URBAN INSTITUTE
**Survey of Faith-Based
Reentry and In-Prison Programs**

Questions/Comments: contact Janeen Buck Willison, (202)
261-5746; jrbuck@ui.urban.org

2100 M STREET NW
WASHINGTON DC 20037

Subject ID: **MERGE FIELD 1**

ID:	Today's Date: _____
Name	If any of the information to the left is incorrect, please cross it out and provide the correct information below.
Program Name: AUTOFILL <MAIL MERGE?>	
Street Address	
City, ST ZIP	

INSTRUCTIONS

The Urban Institute (UI), a non-profit research organization based in Washington, DC, is conducting a survey of faith-based programs that serve incarcerated individuals, or individuals recently released to the community from prison or jail. This survey is part of a larger study sponsored by the National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice, that is designed to identify faith-based reentry and in-prison programs across the nation and examine how these programs work and the services they provide. We are particularly interested in the role faith, spirituality and religion play, if any, in the services and activities provided by programs identified as "faith-based."

The <<Program Name.>> was identified by the Urban Institute during a search for faith-based corrections and reentry programs. As a key contact for the program, we would like to invite you complete the attached survey. If you believe another member of your program's staff is better suited to complete this survey, please forward the survey to that individual.

Your participation in this survey is completely voluntary—you do not have to participate. Your responses to the survey are confidential. Your name will not be used in any report about this survey. Nobody outside the research team will know how you answered a particular question. Findings from the study will combine all survey responses; individual responses will never be reported or linked to you or your specific program.

The survey should take about 15 minutes to complete. Please answer every question as best you can. If you're uncertain about an answer, select the one that comes closest to your views. Once you have completed the survey please return it to the Urban Institute using the enclosed self-addressed postage-paid envelope. For your convenience, you are also welcome to complete the survey over the phone by calling Janeen Buck Willison at (202) 261-5746.

When the study is completed at the end of 2008, we will present the combined survey results in a report available on the Urban Institute website at www.urban.org. We will email survey participants when the report is online.

The Urban Institute and the National Institute of Justice thank you for participating in this important survey.



URBAN INSTITUTE
**Survey of Faith-Based
Reentry and In-Prison Programs**

Questions/Comments: contact Janeen Buck Willison, (202)
261-5746; jrbuck@ui.urban.org

2100 M STREET NW
WASHINGTON DC 20037

Subject ID: **MERGE FIELD 1**

INTRODUCTION

This survey examines the role faith, spirituality and/or religion play, if any, in faith-based programs serving incarcerated individuals, or individuals recently released from prison or jail. For this survey, “program” is defined as a distinct set of activities and services provided to a specific client population with the aim of producing particular outcomes. We are specifically interested in the [Program Name]. Whenever this survey asks about “your program”, it is referring to the [Program Name].

Note: some questions refer to an organization that may oversee the program. For some programs, this is a separate organization; for others, the program and governing organization are one and the same.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- **Which position best describes your current position in the [Program Name]?**
 - Executive director, program coordinator, clinical director, staff supervisor
 - Therapist, counselor, case manager, program staff
 - Support/administrative staff
 - Volunteer
 - Other: _____
- **How many years have you been in your current position? _____ years**
- **In what year did you begin working for this program? _____ (1980, 1995, etc.)**

PROGRAM INFORMATION

1. **In what year was the [Program Name] founded? _____ (1980, 1995, etc.)**
2. **Is there an “umbrella” organization that operates and oversees the [Program Name]?**
 Yes No (skip to Q3)
 - 2a. If YES, what is the name of that organization? _____
 - 2b. Including your program, how many programs does the organization operate? _____
If the organization only oversees this program, use “1”
3. **Which category best describes the focus and setting in which your program operates? Please choose one only.**
 - In-prison program focused on inmates’ spiritual needs and development
 - In-prison program focused on preparing inmates for release
 - Faith/character-based residential unit in a prison or jail
 - Community-based reentry program (for former prisoners only)
 - Community-based social service program that focuses primarily on one specific service area such as substance abuse treatment, job training, or housing,
 - Other (please specify) _____



URBAN INSTITUTE
Survey of Faith-Based
Reentry and In-Prison Programs

Questions/Comments: contact Janeen Buck Willison, (202) 261-5746; jrbuck@ui.urban.org

2100 M STREET NW
WASHINGTON DC 20037

Subject ID: MERGE FIELD 1

4. Programs often provide multiple services to clients. During the last calendar year, which of the following services did your program or organization regularly provide to clients? Please select all responses that apply.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aftercare/ reentry services | <input type="checkbox"/> Employment training/job readiness |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ministry/spiritual development | <input type="checkbox"/> Housing (transitional, permanent, emergency shelter) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Health services/medical care | <input type="checkbox"/> Mental health treatment/counseling |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Life skills training | <input type="checkbox"/> Parenting education/ family reunification |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mentoring | <input type="checkbox"/> Therapy (individual, group, family) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Educational services/GED assistance/ literacy training | <input type="checkbox"/> Immediate emergency assistance with financial needs (rent, utilities, food, etc) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Substance abuse treatment/counseling (residential, outpatient, etc) | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (<i>please specify</i>): _____ |

5. Which statement best describes the structure and organization of your program?

- Highly structured – this program strictly adheres to a curriculum, follows specific client eligibility criteria, and provides similar services to every client for the same set period of time.
- Moderately structured – this program loosely follows a curriculum, observes some client eligibility criteria and tailors services and length of service provision based on a client’s needs.
- Loosely structured – this program does not follow a curriculum, adheres only to general guidelines about client eligibility and provides services as needed (i.e., for as short or as long a period of time as deemed appropriate based on client needs).

6. Do the services or activities offered by your program take place in a facility that is typically used for religious services, such as a sanctuary, church, temple, or mosque?

- Yes No

PROGRAM CLIENTS

For the next few questions, “*criminal justice-involved individuals*” includes people in prison or jail, former prisoners, and people on probation or parole supervision.

7. Does your program exclusively serve criminal justice-involved individuals?

- Yes (skip to Q8) No

7a. If you answered “No” to the question above, and your program serves individuals other than criminal justice-involved individuals, what percentage of your clients are ...

- | | |
|--|---------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adult male prisoners or former prisoners /offenders | _____ % |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adult female prisoners or former prisoners/offenders | _____ % |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Children or family members of prisoners or former prisoners | _____ % |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Juvenile-justice involved youth | _____ % |
| | 100 % |



URBAN INSTITUTE
**Survey of Faith-Based
Reentry and In-Prison Programs**

Questions/Comments: contact Janeen Buck Willison, (202)
261-5746; jrbuck@ui.urban.org

2100 M STREET NW
WASHINGTON DC 20037

Subject ID: **MERGE FIELD 1**

8. Does your program exclude any of the following individuals from participating? Check all that apply.

- Arsonists
- Violent offenders
- Sex offenders
- Individuals with severe mental health issues
- Individuals with severe physical disabilities
- Youth aged 18 or younger
- Other individuals (please specify): _____

9. On average, in a 12-month period, how many criminal justice-involved individuals are ...

- a. Referred to your program _____ (a rough estimate of the total number of unduplicated cases is fine)
- b. Served by your program _____ (a rough estimate of the total number of unduplicated clients is fine)

10. What agencies and/or individuals typically refer clients to your organization? Please check all that apply.

- Prison chaplains
- Prison/jail officials
- Faith-based in-prison programs
- Secular in-prison programs
- Probation or parole officers
- Local law enforcement
- Local faith-based program
- Local social service programs
- Family members
- Other (please specify): _____

11. How long do most clients typically spend in you program? _____ days weeks months years
(choose one)

12. Does your program typically have a waiting list for services? Yes No

13. What role does an individual's religion play, if any, in determining whether he or she is taken on as a client? Please check one only.

- Preference is given to individuals who adheres to a particular religious or spiritual orientation
- Preference is given to individuals with a religious or spiritual orientation, regardless of orientation
- Religious affiliation or spiritual orientation is not taken into account
- Preference is given to individuals who are not religious



URBAN INSTITUTE
**Survey of Faith-Based
 Reentry and In-Prison Programs**

Questions/Comments: contact Janeen Buck Willison, (202) 261-5746; jrbuck@ui.urban.org

2100 M STREET NW
 WASHINGTON DC 20037

Subject ID: **MERGE FIELD 1**

FAITH AND SPIRITUALITY

The next set of questions focus on the manner in which faith/spirituality/religion may be expressed in this program.

14. Please indicate the importance of the following activities to your program: very important, somewhat important, not too important, not important, or not allowed/ policy prohibits the activity. If an activity is not part of your program, use "Not Applicable."

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Not allowed/ policy prohibits	Not Applicable
a. Clients pray individually	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Clients pray in groups	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Clients study religious texts or materials	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Clients participate in religious services or rituals	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Clients join a church, mosque, synagogue, or spiritual group	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Clients obtain support for material needs (food, clothing, shelter)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Clients gain skills or training	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Clients build or repair support networks with family and friends	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Clients develop spiritually	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Staff/volunteers build supportive relationships with clients	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

15. Please think about your program when considering each statement below. Indicate whether you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with each statement.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
a. The program has a clearly religious identity.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
b. The program focuses on participants as whole persons through a commitment to their physical, emotional, and spiritual well-being.	<input type="checkbox"/>				



URBAN INSTITUTE
**Survey of Faith-Based
 Reentry and In-Prison Programs**

Questions/Comments: contact Janeen Buck Willison, (202) 261-5746; jrbuck@ui.urban.org

2100 M STREET NW
 WASHINGTON DC 20037

Subject ID: **MERGE FIELD 1**

15. continued	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
c. The program's commitment to our clients is based on religious beliefs or convictions.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
d. Religious values strongly influence administrative decisions about the program.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
e. The program draws on religious values and beliefs in training and motivating staff and volunteers.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
f. For this program to be effective, participants must undergo a religious or spiritual transformation.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
g. The faith or spiritual elements incorporated into this program are made explicit to participants.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
h. Participation in the faith or spiritual elements of this program is mandatory.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
i. Program participants consider this program faith-based.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
j. Program staff and volunteers perform their work as an expression of their religious values or spiritual beliefs.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
k. Staff and volunteers use religious beliefs or principles to instruct or encourage clients.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
l. Program participants are encouraged to make personal changes in attitudes or behaviors that are based <i>directly</i> on religious or spiritual principles.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
n. Program participants are encouraged to make personal changes in attitudes or behaviors <i>regardless</i> of religious or spiritual principles (?).	<input type="checkbox"/>				
o. Program participants typically have the same religious beliefs or convictions as the program.	<input type="checkbox"/>				



URBAN INSTITUTE
**Survey of Faith-Based
Reentry and In-Prison Programs**

Questions/Comments: contact Janeen Buck Willison, (202)
261-5746; jrbuck@ui.urban.org

2100 M STREET NW
WASHINGTON DC 20037

Subject ID: **MERGE FIELD 1**

16. Do you define your program as “faith-based”?

- Yes No

17. What faith tradition, if any, is your organization affiliated with? Select one only.

- Buddhism
- Christian (Catholic, Baptist, Lutheran, etc): _____ please specify denomination
- Hinduism
- Islam
- Judaism
- Native American spiritual traditions
- Wicca
- Non-denominational/ Spiritual
- Interfaith/ Multi-faith
- None
- Other (please specify): _____

18. Is your program associated with a religious community like a church, mosque, or temple?

- Yes No

Program Operations

Items in this section focus on program operations, including staffing, funding, outcome and mission.

19. How many paid full-time staff does your program have? _____

20. How many paid part-time staff does your program have? _____

21. How many volunteers, on average, work for your program in any given year?

- Less than 10
- 10 to 25
- 26 to 50
- 50 or more _____ (please indicate rough estimate)

22. What percent of your program’s volunteers are recruited from congregations or religious organizations?

_____ %

23. Regarding a hiring decision between two candidates with equal qualifications, your organization would typically (check one only) ...

- Favor a candidate who adheres to a particular religious or spiritual orientation
- Favor a candidate with a religious or spiritual orientation, regardless of which orientation
- Disregard religious affiliation or spiritual orientation in the hiring decision
- Favor a candidate who is not religious



URBAN INSTITUTE
**Survey of Faith-Based
 Reentry and In-Prison Programs**

Questions/Comments: contact Janeen Buck Willison, (202) 261-5746; jrbuck@ui.urban.org

2100 M STREET NW
 WASHINGTON DC 20037

Subject ID: **MERGE FIELD 1**

24. Please indicate whether you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with the following statements. Use "Not Applicable" if the question doesn't apply to your program.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
a. <u>Executive staff</u> generally share the religious beliefs and convictions of the program. (By <u>executive staff</u> , we mean program directors, staff supervisors, executive directors and others who make decisions about the direction of the program.)	<input type="checkbox"/>				
b. <u>Program staff</u> generally share the religious beliefs and convictions of the program. (By <u>program staff</u> , we mean counselors, case managers, therapists, trainers, or those who have direct contact with clients.)	<input type="checkbox"/>				
c. <u>Support staff</u> generally share the religious beliefs and convictions of the program. (By <u>support staff</u> , we mean administrative, clerical, or secretarial staff in charge of administrative operations.)	<input type="checkbox"/>				
d. Members of the program's board or governing body typically share the religious beliefs and convictions of the program.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
e. The agencies the program partners with typically share its religious beliefs and convictions.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
f. The program model (i.e., the structure for delivering services to clients) is based on spiritual principles or religious beliefs.	<input type="checkbox"/>				

25. What percentage of your program's funding comes from ...

- Government agencies (federal, state, and/or local) _____ %
 - Churches, mosques, synagogues, or other religious communities _____ %
 - Community-based funding sources (e.g., United Way, civic clubs) _____ %
 - Foundations or philanthropic organizations _____ %
- 100 %

26. In the past 12 months, how often has the faith-based nature of your program limited the sources of funding you applied for?

- Never
- Rarely
- Occasionally
- Frequently
- Always



URBAN INSTITUTE
**Survey of Faith-Based
 Reentry and In-Prison Programs**

Questions/Comments: contact Janeen Buck Willison, (202) 261-5746; jrbuck@ui.urban.org

2100 M STREET NW
 WASHINGTON DC 20037

Subject ID: **MERGE FIELD 1**

27. Does your program collect data on client participation in program activities and services?

Yes No

28. Does your program collect data on client outcomes?

Yes No

29. Which of the following client outcomes does this program hope to achieve? Please select the three most relevant to your program and rank their relevance by listing a “1”, “2”, or “3” in the box next to the outcome with a “1” being most relevant.

- Deepening personal spiritual commitment
- Reduced offending among program participants
- Pro-social behavior and attitudes
- Steady employment
- Reduced use of drugs and alcohol
- Educational attainment (GED, for example)
- Stable housing
- Improved life skills
- Family reunification
- Other (please specify): _____

30. Do your program’s guiding principles have an explicit religious or spiritual orientation?

Yes No

31. Does the mission statement of the “umbrella” organization that oversees your program have an explicit religious or spiritual orientation? If your program does not operate under an “umbrella” organization use “Not Applicable.”

Yes No Not Applicable

32. Please list the religious or spiritual principles that are most critical to your program model, if applicable.

- a. _____
- b. _____
- c. _____

Collaboration

Items in this final section focus on your program’s relationships with members of the community.

33. To what extent have the following factors posed challenges for your program during the last calendar year, if at all? Use “Not Applicable” if the factor listed doesn’t apply to your program.

	Not a Challenge	Minor Challenge	Serious Challenge	Not Applicable
a. Uncertainties about future funding	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Not enough cases/referrals/clients	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



URBAN INSTITUTE
**Survey of Faith-Based
 Reentry and In-Prison Programs**

Questions/Comments: contact Janeen Buck Willison, (202) 261-5746; jrbuck@ui.urban.org

2100 M STREET NW
 WASHINGTON DC 20037

Subject ID: **MERGE FIELD 1**

33. continued	Not a Challenge	Minor Challenge	Serious Challenge	Not Applicable
c. Too many cases/referrals/clients	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Not enough volunteers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Lack of community support	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Political pressures surrounding faith-based programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Political pressures surrounding prisoner issues	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Lack of clarity about program goals	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Difficulties coordinating with criminal justice agencies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Difficulties coordinating with other faith-based organizations or congregations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. Difficulties coordinating with other social service programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l. Difficulties coordinating with local government agencies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
m. Difficulties coordinating with state agencies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
n. Difficulties coordinating with federal agencies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**34. In your opinion, how supportive of your program are the following groups in your community?
 Use "Not Applicable" if the item listed doesn't apply to your program or community.**

	Very Supportive	Moderately Supportive	Mildly Supportive	Not At All Supportive	Not Applicable/ Not Aware of Program
a. Jail/prison officials	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Law enforcement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Elected officials	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Local media (TV, newspapers)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Community groups	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Churches, congregations, and other religious organizations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Business community	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Local residents	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Community-based social services programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Other (please specify): _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



URBAN INSTITUTE
Survey of Faith-Based Reentry and In-Prison Programs

Questions/Comments: contact Janeen Buck Willison, (202) 261-5746; jbuck@ui.urban.org

2100 M STREET NW
 WASHINGTON DC 20037

Subject ID: **MERGE FIELD 1**

35. During the past year, which of the following entities did your organization/program coordinate with on funding, programming and volunteers? Check all that apply.

	Funding	Programming	Volunteers
a. Federal government agencies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. State government agencies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Local government agencies (county or city)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Community-based or civic organizations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Faith-based non-profit agencies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Churches, mosques, synagogues or other religious communities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Business community	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Other (please specify): _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

36. Which best describes your personal religious faith? (optional)

- Buddhism
- Christian (Catholic, Baptist, Lutheran, etc): _____ please specify denomination
- Hinduism
- Islam
- Judaism
- Native American spiritual traditions
- Wicca
- Non-denominational/ Spiritual
- Interfaith/ Multi-faith
- None
- Other (please specify): _____

37. Are you a spiritual leader equivalent to a clergyperson, cleric, imam, nun, priest, rabbi? (optional)

- Yes No

Thank you very much for completing this survey!

Please return it in the postage paid envelope provided. If you have any questions, please call Janeen Buck Willison at (202) 261-5746 or email her at jbuck@ui.urban.org

If you have a **program brochure or other materials** you would like to send us, please include them, along with your completed survey, in the envelope provided.

Appendix C: Tables

- Table 1. Descriptive Statistics: Respondents
- Table 2. Descriptive Statistics: Program Background
- Table 3. Services
- Table 4. Program Characteristics
- Table 5. Program Operations
- Table 6. Program Outcomes
- Table 7. Faith and Spirituality in Programming: Activities
- Table 8. Faith and Spirituality in Program Operations and Mission
- Table 9. Challenges During the Past Year
- Table 10. External Support
- Table 11. Coordination and Collaboration

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics: Respondents

	Mean	N
Number of years in current position	7.8	48
Current professional position		
Executive Director or program coordinator	93.7%	45
Therapist, counselor, case manager, program staff	–	–
Support/administrative staff	2.1%	1
Volunteer	2.1%	1
Other	2.1%	1
Spiritual leader equivalent to a clergy person, cleric, priest, iman, or nun*	52.1%	24
Respondents <u>personal</u> religious faith**		
Buddhist	2.2%	1
Christian (Catholic, protestant or non-sectarian)	82.2%	37
Hindu	–	–
Islam	2.2%	1
Judaism	4.4%	2
Native American spiritual traditions	–	–
Wicca	–	–
Non-denominational/ Spiritual	8.8%	4
None	2.2%	1
* two respondents did not answer the question; valid N=46		
** three respondents did not answer the question; valid N=45		

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics: Program Background

	Mean	N
Number of years program in operation	12.59	47
Programs overseen by umbrella organization	42%	20
Faith-based (self-identified)	85%	41
Faith affiliation of <u>program</u>, if any		
Buddhism	2%	1
Christian	62.5%	30
Hinduism	—	—
Islam	2.1%	1
Judaism	2.1%	1
Native American spiritual traditions	—	—
Wicca	—	—
Non-denominational/ Spiritual	14.5%	7
Multi-faith	10.4%	5
None	6.2%	3
Reentry Program Setting		
In-prison (exclusively)	35.4%	17
In the community (exclusively)	50.0%	24
Both in the prison and the community	14.5%	7

Table 3. Services

	Pct.	N
Aftercare/ reentry services	79.1%	38
Educational services/ GED assistance/literacy	58.3%	28
Employment training/ job readiness	72.9%	35
Health services/medical care	20.8%	10
Housing (transitional, permanent, emergency shelter)	56.2%	27
Immediate emergency assistance with financial needs (rent, utilities, food)	43.7%	21
Life skills training	83.3%	40
Mental health treatment/counseling	29.1%	14
Mentoring	81.2%	39
Parenting education/ family reunification	60.4%	29
Ministry/ spiritual development	85.4%	41
Substance abuse treatment/ counseling (residential, outpatient, etc)	54.1%	26
Therapy (individual, group, family)	37.5%	18

Note: The item asked respondents to identify those services regularly provided by their program during the last calendar year; respondents were instructed to check all that applied.

Table 4. Program Characteristics

	Pct.	N
Program Structure		
<u>Highly structured</u> : program strictly adheres to a curriculum, follows specific client eligibility criteria, and provides similar services to every client for a set period of time.	47.9	23
<u>Moderately structured</u> : program loosely follows a curriculum, observes some client eligibility criteria, and tailors services and length of service provision to client needs.	41.7	20
<u>Loosely structured</u> : program does not follow a curriculum, adheres only to general guidelines about client eligibility, and provides services as needed.	10.4	5
Staffing		
	Median	
Number of paid staff (full- and part-time combined)	5	
Number of paid full-time staff	2	
Share of programs with 3 or fewer paid staff	31.0%	
Volunteers		
Less than 10 volunteers	18.8%	9
10-25	18.8%	9
26-50	18.8%	9
50+ volunteers	43.8%	21
Funding (average percentage received)		
Government agencies	23%	20
Religious institutions (churches, mosques, temples)	28%	40
Community-based funding sources	6%	19
Foundations/ philanthropic organizations	25%	34
Individuals	18%	14

Table 5. Program Operations

	Pct.	N
Eligibility (% excluding)		
Arson	18.8%	9
Violent offenders	20.8%	10
Sex offenders	39.6%	19
Individuals with severe mental health issues	47.9%	23
Individuals with severe physical disabilities	31.3%	15
Youth aged 18 years or younger	43.8%	21
Client's Religion		
Preference given to individuals who adhere to specific religious or spiritual orientation	12.5%	6
Preference given to individuals with religious or spiritual orientation, regardless of orientation	29.2%	14
Religious affiliation or spiritual orientation <u>not</u> taken into account	58.3%	28
Common Referral Sources		
Prison chaplains	89.8%	43
Prison/ jail officials	83.3%	40
Faith-based in-prison programs	72.9%	35
Secular in-prison programs	50.0%	24
Probation/parole officers	72.9%	35
Local law enforcement	37.5%	18
Local faith-based programs	50.0%	24
Local social services programs	56.3%	27
Family members	72.9%	35
Other : judges, other inmates (word of mouth)	22.9%	11
Service Duration		
Median number of months of service provided	6	
Program Capacity		
Average number of criminal justice-involved individuals referred annually	--	441
Average number of criminal justice-involved individuals served annually	--	507
Share of programs that <u>exclusively</u> serve criminal justice-involved individuals	68.8%	33
Share of programs serving more than 100 criminal justice-involved individuals annually	50.0%	24
Share of programs with a waiting list	47.9%	23

Table 6. Program Outcomes

	Ranked #1 (Prc.)	Top 3 (Prc.)
Outcomes		
Deepening personal spiritual commitment	44.4%	64.4
Reduced offending	37.7%	68.8
Reduced use of drugs and alcohol	11.1%	26.6
Pro-social behavior and attitudes	8.8%	48.8
Family reunification	4.4%	26.6
Steady employment	4.4%	24.4
Improved life skills	2.1%	26.6
Stable housing	--	10.4
Educational attainment	--	4.4

Note: Respondents were asked to identify the three client outcomes their program hopes to achieve, and rank their relevance to the program, '1' being most relevant and '3' being the third most relevant.

Table 7. Faith and Spirituality in Programming: Activities

	Very Important (Pct.)	Somewhat Important (Pct.)	Not Important (Pct.)	Not Allowed/ Not Applicable (Pct.)
Clients pray individually	56.3	20.8	8.3	14.6
Clients pray in groups	39.6	16.7	22.9	20.8
Clients study religious texts or Materials	48.9	14.8	10.6	25.5
Clients participate in religious services or rituals	43.8	20.8	10.4	25.0
Clients join a church, mosque, synagogue, or spiritual group	33.3	22.9	16.7	27.1
Clients obtain support for material needs (food, clothing, shelter)	47.9	12.5	8.3	31.3
Clients gain skills or trainings	80.8	8.5	--	10.6
Clients build or repair support networks	85.1	10.6	--	4.2
Clients develop spiritually	77.1	12.5	--	10.4
Staff/ volunteers build supportive relationships with clients	89.6	8.3	2.1	--
<p>Note: Respondents were asked to indicate the importance of each activity to their program; response options were very important, somewhat important, not important, not allowed/policy prohibits, and not applicable. None selected the last two options.</p>				

Table 8. Faith and Spirituality in Program Operations and Mission

	Strongly Disagree (Pct.)	Disagree (Pct.)	Agree (Pct.)	Strongly Agree (Pct.)
Program has a clearly religious identity	4.6	6.9	34.8	53.4
Focus on whole person; committed to physical, emotional, spiritual wellbeing	--	--	19.5	80.4
Commitment to clients is based on religious beliefs or convictions	6.6	20.0	22.2	51.1
Religious values strongly influence administrative decisions about the program	2.1	12.5	33.3	52.1
The program draws on religious values/ beliefs in training and motivating staff and volunteers	--	8.5	34.0	57.4
Participants must undergo a religious or spiritual transformation for this program to be effective	13.6	36.3	25.0	25.0
The faith or spiritual elements incorporated into this program are made explicit to participants	4.3	15.2	32.6	47.8
Participation in the faith or spiritual elements of this program are mandatory	20.0	31.1	22.2	26.6
Program participants consider this a faith-based program	6.5	6.5	26.0	60.8
Program staff and volunteers perform their work as an expression of their religious values or spiritual beliefs	2.1	10.6	41.3	46.8
Staff and volunteers use religious beliefs or principles to instruct or encourage clients	4.2	18.8	45.8	31.3
Program participants are encouraged to make personal changes in attitudes/ behaviors that are based <u>directly</u> on religious or spiritual principles	8.5	23.4	29.7	38.2
Program participants are encouraged to make personal changes in attitudes/ behaviors that are based <u>regardless</u> of religious or spiritual principles	--	4.3	47.8	47.8
Program participants typically have the same religious beliefs or convictions as the program	9.3	34.8	46.5	9.3
Note: Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which each statement described their program; response options included strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree, not applicable.				

Table 8 Faith and Spirituality in Program Operations and Mission- con't

	Strongly Disagree (Pct.)	Disagree (Pct.)	Agree (Pct.)	Strongly Agree (Pct.)
<u>Executive</u> staff generally share the beliefs and convictions of the program*	4.3	4.3	23.9	67.3
<u>Program</u> staff generally share the beliefs and convictions of the program**	2.2	13.3	33.3	51.1
<u>Support</u> staff generally share the beliefs and convictions of the program***	2.2	13.6	45.4	38.6
Members of the program's board or governing body typically share the religious beliefs and convictions of the program	2.1	10.8	23.9	63.0
The program's partners share its religious beliefs and convictions	7.6	56.4	25.6	10.2
The program model (i.e., structure for delivering services to clients) is based on spiritual principles or religious beliefs	4.4	22.2	28.8	44.4
<p>*Executive staff includes program directors, staff supervisors, executive directors, and others who make decisions about the direction of the program. ** Program staff includes counselors, case managers, therapists, trainers, or those who have direct contact with clients *** Support staff includes administrative, clerical, or secretarial staff in charge of administrative operations</p>				

Table 9. Challenges During the Past Year

	Serious Challenge (Pct.)	Minor Challenge (Pct.)	Not a Challenge (Pct.)
Uncertainties about future funding	52.1	37.5	10.4
Not enough cases/referrals/clients	--	14.6	81.3
Too many cases/referrals/clients	22.9	45.8	25.0
Not enough volunteers	20.8	56.3	22.9
Lack of community support	14.6	37.5	39.6
Political pressures surrounding faith based Programs	12.5	39.6	37.5
Political pressures surrounding prisoner Issues	22.9	35.4	37.5
Lack of clarity about program goals	2.1	14.6	79.2
Difficulties coordinating with criminal justice agencies	10.4	43.8	43.8
Difficulties coordinating with faith-based organizations or congregations	4.2	41.7	52.1
Difficulties coordinating with other social service programs	2.1	41.7	50.0
Difficulties coordinating with local government agencies	12.5	50.0	29.2
Difficulties coordinating with state agencies	16.7	45.8	29.2
Difficulties coordinating with federal agencies	12.5	25.0	25.0

Note: Respondents were asked the extent to which each of fourteen factors posed challenges to the program during the last calendar year (CY2007); the response options were not a challenge, minor challenge, serious challenge, not applicable (if the factor does not apply to the program).

Table 10. External Support

	Not at All Supportive (Pct. SA)	Mildly Supportive (Pct. SA)	Moderately Supportive (Pct. SA)	Very Supportive (Pct. SA)
Jail/ prison officials	--	22.9	20.8	50.0
Law enforcement	4.2	18.8	20.8	27.1
Elected officials	6.3	31.3	22.9	25.0
Local media (TV, newspapers)	6.3	27.1	33.3	22.9
Community groups	--	25.0	35.4	35.4
Churches, congregations, and other religious organizations	2.1	14.6	22.9	60.4
Business community	14.6	39.6	31.3	8.3
Local residents	6.3	29.2	29.2	25.0
Community-based social service programs	2.1	20.8	39.6	31.3
<p>Note: The question was: “In your opinion, how supportive of your program are the following groups in your community; response options were not at all supportive, medley supportive, moderately supportive, and very supportive. Not applicable was offered if the item didn’t apply to the program or community.</p>				

Table 11. Coordination and Collaboration

	Funding (Pct.)	Programming (Pct.)	Volunteers (Pct.)
Federal government agencies	29.2	18.8	6.3
State government agencies	31.3	33.3	14.6
Local government agencies (county or city)	27.1	29.2	20.8
Community-based or civic organizations	31.3	45.8	41.7
Faith-based non-profit agencies	37.5	54.2	50.0
Churches, mosques, synagogues or other religious Communities	66.7	50.0	75.0
Business community	54.2	22.9	33.3
<p>Note: The question was: “In the past year, which of the following entities did your organization/program coordinate with on funding, programming and volunteers; respondents were instructed to check all that apply.</p>			