

HV
9276.5
.R47
1973

V.F.
CORRECTIONS-COMMUNITY
IOWA



RESEARCH
CENTER

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON CRIME AND DELINQUENCY

***RESIDENTIAL CORRECTIONS:
ALTERNATIVE TO INCARCERATION***



Suite D, Brinley Bldg.
609 Second Street
Davis, California 95616

Peter S. Venezia
Roger O. Steggerda
July, 1973

IOWA DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL
SERVICES - LIBRARY

WITHDRAWN
JUL 19 1973

1. Introduction

2. Background

3. Methodology

4. Results

5. Discussion

6. Conclusion

7. References

8. Appendix

9. Acknowledgments

10. Contact Information

11. Declaration of Interest

12. Funding Source

13. Author Contributions

14. Data Availability

15. Ethics Statement

16. Conflicts of Interest

17. Supplementary Materials

18. Correspondence

19. Copyright

20. Publisher's Note

21. Additional Information

22. References

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We wish to express our sincere appreciation to the Director, Harry C. Woods, and staff of the Fort Des Moines Residential Corrections program for their assistance and cooperation throughout the evaluation process.

Further, we are grateful to the Des Moines Police Department, the Municipal Court Clerk's office, the Fifth Judicial District Court Clerk's office, and the Bureau of Adult Corrections for the data which they made available to us.

We are especially grateful to Mr. Robert Bachman, a counselor at Fort Des Moines, for his very substantial assistance in the data collection.

We wish finally to acknowledge Bernard J. Vogelgesang, who as Director of the Fifth Judicial District Department of Court Services has ceaselessly promoted within the Department an atmosphere conducive to cogent evaluation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Acknowledgements	ii
Table of Contents	iii
Summary of Findings	viii
I. <u>Correction in the Community</u>	1
The Half-Way House	3
Fort Des Moines	4
II. <u>Evaluation Design</u>	8
Project Goals and Objectives	8
Data Collection	15
Data Processing and Analysis	16
III. <u>Evaluation Results</u>	18
The Population	18
Client Description	18
Client Sub-Group Comparisons	22
The Process	29
Community Safety	33
New Offenses of Clients During Commitment	34
Sub-Group Comparisons	36
Time of Entry Into RCS	36
Criminal History	37
Employment and Income	39
Illegal Use of Drugs	41
Conclusions	43

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

	<u>Page</u>
Social Effectiveness	45
Employment and Income	45
Education	47
Residence and Family	49
Conclusions	51
Correctional Effectiveness	52
Fort Des Moines Recidivism	54
Client Sub-Group Comparisons	54
Illegal Use of Drugs	54
Employment and Income	57
Criminal History	60
Conclusions	62
Financial Effectiveness	64
Actual Program Cost	65
Comparative Program Costs	67
Conclusions	71

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
I. Client Profile	18
II. Seriousness of Sentencing Offense Categorized by Time of Entry Into Residential Corrections	23
III. Employment at Time of Commitment Categorized by Time of Entry Into Residential Corrections	25
IV. Known Difficulties From or Illegal Use of Drugs Categorized by Time of Entry Into Residential Corrections	26
V. Juvenile Institutional Detention Categorized by Time of Entry Into Residential Corrections	27
VI. Process Profile	30
VII. Offenses Committed by Fort Des Moines Clients During Period of Commitment	34
VIII. Number of Clients Charged With New Offenses During Commitment Categorized by Time of Entry Into Residential Corrections	36
IX. New Offenses During Commitment Categorized by Sentencing Offense	37
X. New Offenses During Commitment Categorized by Number of Prior Convictions	38
XI. New Offenses During Commitment Categorized by Employment Status at Time of Commitment	39
XII. New Offenses During Commitment Categorized by Primary Source of Income	40

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

	<u>Page</u>
XIII. New Offenses During Commitment Categorized by Number of Jobs in Year Prior to Commitment	41
XIV. New Offenses During Commitment Categorized by Illegal Use of Drugs	42
XV. Employment Rates Prior to and After Commitment to Residential Corrections	46
XVI. Primary Income Source Prior to and After Commitment to Residential Corrections	47
XVII. Student Status of Clients Not Employed Full-Time Prior to and After Commitment to Residential Corrections	48
XVIII. New Degrees Obtained by Clients While Committed to Residential Corrections	49
XIX. Number of Legal Dependents and Number of Dependents Supported Prior to and Following Commitment to the Program	50
XX. Recidivism Arrest Rates for Various Types of Illegal Drug Use	55
XXI. Recidivism Conviction Rates for Various Types of Illegal Drug Use	56
XXII. Recidivism Arrest Rates for Employment and Income-Related Variables	58
XXIII. Recidivism Conviction Rates for Employment and Income-Related Variables	59
XXIV. Recidivism Score for Pre-Commit- ment Employment Groups	60

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

	<u>Page</u>
XXV. Recidivism Arrest Rates Categorized by Number of Prior Arrests	61
XXVI. Recidivism Conviction Rates for Criminal History Variables	61
XXVII. Actual Dollar Cost for Operating the Residential Corrections Program	65
XXVIII. Comparison of Cost per Term of Clients Sentenced on Felonies and Non-Felonies	66
XXIX. Residential Corrections Program Costs Adjusted for Administration and Capital Expenditures	67
XXX. Comparative Costs for Various Correctional Programs	69

APPENDICES

- A. Residential Corrections Evaluation
Data Collection Form
- B. Summary of Findings on Socio-Demographic
and Process Variables

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

An empirical evaluation of the Fifth Judicial District Department of Court Services in the State of Iowa is being conducted by the Research Center of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency. The report of a three-year evaluation of the Community Corrections Project has recently been published. The report summarized here provides a descriptive evaluation of the Fort Des Moines Residential Corrections program.

Examination of the experience of the residential corrections program in the light of certain generic program objectives has constituted the primary focus of this evaluative research effort. Following are the results of the evaluation:

The Program. On the basis of the seriousness of the sentencing offense - felony or non-felony - it was discovered that the program exists both as an alternative to jail and as an alternative to prison. Of the 246 clients in the first 18 months, 188 were sentenced on felony charges and 58 on non-felony charges.

The Population. Assessment on forty-two individual, social, and demographic client characteristics provided a profile of program clients. Based upon that profile, and upon additional analysis, it was discovered that clients from the first six-month period were more often sentenced on felony charges, were less often employed, and were more frequent users of both marijuana and narcotics. Overall, the program's clients appear to have had relatively unstable family relationships, poor employment

history, low educational achievement, somewhat high drug usage, and some criminal background.

The Process. The residential corrections program consists of treatment and services provided both by the program staff and by outside community resources. Based upon available information, the typical client received 3.25 service referrals during an average 104.9 day term at the Fort. These service referrals consisted primarily of vocational education, drug and alcohol treatment, and employment, educational, and medical services.

Community Safety. A paramount objective of the correctional system is to protect society. It was found that the community is not endangered as a result of this program. New offenses during the commitment period were charged against only 13% of its clients. Further, only 3% of all clients were charged with offenses against persons, property, morals, or drugs. Additionally, it was found that the vast majority of these new offenses occurred in the first six-month period of the project, with only two clients charged with serious offenses in 1972.

Social Effectiveness. The program appears to be socially effective. A significantly increased proportion of clients, after they were released, were employed, were relying on their own employment as a primary source of support, were supporting their dependents financially, and, if not employed, were more often engaged in an educational program. It appears that the program is successful in its objective to release to society individuals who are capable of functioning legally within it.

Correctional Effectiveness. Due to the lack of comparative recidivism information, it is not possible to determine on an absolute basis the correctional effectiveness of this residential corrections program. New charges subsequent to release from the program were made against 35.7% of all released program clients, while 25.6% have been convicted on new charges.

Factors found to be related to recidivism were use of narcotics, employment status at time of commitment, primary source of income, job stability, and number of prior arrests.

Financial Effectiveness. The Fort Des Moines Residential Corrections program is an extremely low-cost correctional effort when compared to ongoing state correctional programs on the basis of cost per client from commitment to release. On that basis, residential corrections was found to cost only approximately one-fourth the amount of the state institutions per client served. Cost was also found to be approximately equal that of the local county jail, which is purely custodial in nature.

Evaluation Limitations. No program such as the one described here exists in a vacuum. Measurement of community safety, social effectiveness, correctional effectiveness, and financial effectiveness is possible for a single program, but the results often lack in meaning until they can be compared to the results of other programs. To the extent possible, such comparisons were made in the discussion of financial effectiveness, but even those lack somewhat in meaning without the balance which could be provided by comparisons of correctional effectiveness.

For this reason, although the Fort Des Moines Residential Corrections program appears to be doing very well by nearly every measure, definitive conclusions relating to comparative program effectiveness must be postponed until comparable information can be collected, and comparable analysis conducted not only for innovative community programs, but for traditional correctional programs as well. Only after rigorous interprogram effectiveness comparisons are made will comprehensive evaluation conclusions be possible.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

I. CORRECTION IN THE COMMUNITY

Corresponding to the dramatic increase in crime in America has been a growing conviction on the part of most observers that the correctional system is failing to accomplish what it is supposed to accomplish - namely, the "correction" of offenders. In recent years, such criticism has been focused upon the prison system. It appears nearly consentient that the prison system is dehumanizing, is expensive, and, worse than simply being ineffective, is a "positive detriment to rehabilitation." * It is interesting that in response to these shortcomings much current thought seeks to replace rather than to improve the prison; the isolated meditation which was believed to be the correcting agent in the prison system is giving way to social reintegration, the correctional goal which it is believed cannot be accomplished in a maximum security, artificial environment.

Resulting from and contributing to the trend towards community-based corrections has been a proliferation of types of programs throughout the United States. ** Although the specific operations of these programs differ significantly, they seem to be united in the assumption that since prisons are not effective, and since reintegration

* *The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society*, a Report by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, February 1967, p.159.

** See, for example, Nora Klapmuts "Community Alternatives to Prison" in *Crime and Delinquency Literature*. Vol.5, No. 2, June 1973.

into the community is a stated goal of corrections, community-based correctional alternatives will necessarily be more effective than prison has been. (To date, this assumption has been only partially supported by empirical research.) The proponents of community-based correctional alternatives have supplemented their effectiveness argument by suggesting that community-based correction is also usually less expensive and, in any event, is surely less dehumanizing than the institution. Community corrections opponents have countered by arguing that the community needs to be protected from criminals, and that the attempt to correct in the community represents a threat to community safety.

Nevertheless, a wide variety of community correctional programs continues to develop. Alternatives exist both before trial and after conviction, and range from highly supervised to completely unsupervised. Some programs merely supervise, some provide services and treatment, and some only refer individuals for services and treatment. Some programs are residential; some are not. The post-conviction, non-residential community-based programs usually are a form of probation or parole. The residential programs are often considered by society to be half-way houses, although the programs differ substantially and the program administrator often distinguishes between his program and a half-way house. The confusion that exists regarding what is and what is not a half-way house is sufficiently widespread to warrant some attention here.

The Half-Way House

"Half-Way" refers to a stopping point between society and prison. A half-way house is typically a small facility or residence located within a community. Persons assigned to the half-way house are generally involved in the life of the community, either by working or by attending school or training classes. The atmosphere is usually relatively free, devoid of the security precautions that typify the institution. *

Half-way houses can be of two purposes. In its common usage, a half-way house is thought of as a stopping-point for persons being released from prison. It can be used for treatment purposes, or can serve only as a brief stop prior to parole. It is also used for persons who are not doing well while under parole from prison. In this sense, "half-way" means half way out of prison.

Another use of the half-way house, however, exists in the sense that half-way refers to half way into the institution. Often, offenders are deemed unsuited for probation or other non-residential community treatment, but are not necessarily in need of maximum or medium security institutionalization. For such persons, the minimum security or non-secure half-way house may provide the services and/or supervision considered necessary without removing the offender completely from society.

The purposes of the two types of half-way houses are thus also distinguished. On the one hand, the half-way house is used to

* For a more complete discussion, see Oliver J. Keller, Jr. and Benedict S. Alper: *Halfway Houses: Community Centered Correction and Treatment*; Lexington; D.C. Heath & Company, 1970.

re-integrate the offender into a society from which he has been removed and after he has presumably been "corrected." On the other hand, the half-way house is used as an attempt to "correct" the offender within the community, thereby eliminating the need for re-integration. The half-way-out house serves as an arm of the institution; the half-way-in house is an alternative to it.

Fort Des Moines

The Fort Des Moines Residential Corrections facility is a non-secure correctional facility created in 1971 to serve as an alternative to county jail. Already in operation in Polk County, Iowa were the Pre-Trial Release Project and the Model Neighborhood Community Corrections Project. Both of these programs focused on the pre-trial status of accused offenders, and offered alternatives to jail detention during the pre-trial period. Together with the Probation Project, Fort Des Moines offers alternatives to jail detention (and to incarceration in prison) subsequent to conviction.

The facility itself is housed in a remodeled two-story Army barracks at Fort Des Moines, a military reservation with the City of Des Moines. * None of the ordinary security devices are used at the facility, which resembles a large dormitory more than a correctional unit. The main floor consists of a community living area and staff

* This section provides a description of the Fort Des Moines program, and is extracted and summarized from program descriptions provided by the Fifth Judicial District Department of Court Services.

offices, while the second floor provides private bedrooms (and some rooms for three or six persons) for the clients.

A favorable staff ratio of about one staff person for every two clients is insured by means of a fixed maximum client capacity. Responsible to the director of the program are a case supervisor who is responsible for treatment programming and a house supervisor who is responsible for institutional maintenance, purchasing, etc. Custodial and treatment staff are on equal salary levels, and consist primarily of "correctional lay-persons" who lack correctional experience. About one-half of all staff members have a college degree. Lack of experience among the staff creates some problems, but these are more than out-weighed in the opinion of the administration by the problem-solving orientation, the willingness to experiment, and the imaginativeness of the approach that distinguishes the Fort Des Moines staff from a more traditional corrections staff.

Relations with the court system are regarded by the program staff to be very important. Because the program relies upon the community for service and treatment resources, the types of clients referred to the program are crucial. The program has no power to decide who is sentenced to it; it is highly dependent upon judicial discretion in selecting clients who can best and most safely benefit from the community services.

During the initial stages of his commitment to Fort Des Moines, the client is engaged in an orientation which consists primarily of diagnosis of his needs and culminates with the development of a program which is based on the client's perceptions of his own needs as well as the assessment of the counselor. The resultant program is then incorporated into a contract between the client and the facility.

Following the assignment of a permanent counselor, a variety of services might be received by the client. Within the facility itself is a variety of services and treatments, including psychiatric consulting, vocational or educational counseling, employment counseling, and the development of an on-going counseling relationship, either on a one-to-one basis between counselor and client or on a peer-group basis with a team of clients and counselors.

The treatment of a client may be derived primarily from outside community resources ranging from vocational rehabilitation to medical, legal, employment, educational, psychological, and other types of services. The most important characteristic of client treatment is that it is highly individualized, based upon individual needs rather than upon programs that happen to be available.

Supplementing the treatment and services provided the client is the custodial activity which is necessary to some degree in any correctional venture. One person (the desk man) is responsible for the institution for 24 hours a day, checking clients in and out, observing

the temperament and activities of the clients, recording necessary items in the log, and periodically "shaking down" visitors to check for contraband. He is assisted by a "floating man" who is responsible for eye counts every hour, locating missing clients, and observing and recording notable behavior of the clients. The custodial work of the facility is not designed primarily to regulate client behavior and routine so much as to merely "keep track" of what is happening. In this effort, both the desk man and the floating man are readily available to the clients, and are often sought out by the clients for purposes which are essentially counseling in nature.

Thus, the program is somewhat unique, and, if successful, should be considered for replication elsewhere. The remainder of this report attempts to describe the effectiveness of the Fort Des Moines Residential Corrections program.

II. EVALUATION DESIGN

Project Goals and Objectives

Seldom does a given project seek to achieve a single objective. On the other hand, projects seldom have a series of objectives of equal importance. For this reason, the specified objectives of the Fort Des Moines Residential Corrections facility are arranged hierarchically, not necessarily in order of importance, but rather along a temporal sequence. Normally, the more immediate objectives are necessary conditions for the achievement of more long-range objectives. Following is a hierarchy of objectives for the Fort Des Moines program:

ULTIMATE GOAL

To Reduce Future Criminal Behavior

INTERMEDIATE OBJECTIVE

To Reintegrate the Offender Into Society

ENABLING OBJECTIVES

To Utilize Community Resources For
Treatment and Upgrading Services

To Provide Individualized Treatment and
Counseling Within the Facility

IMMEDIATE OBJECTIVE

To Protect the Community From Additional
Crime During the Correction Process

The primary objectives identified here essentially apply to any correctional program. The objectives which specifically relate to Fort Des Moines and are somewhat unique to it are the enabling objectives, the actual activities or efforts expended by the project. Each of the objectives is related to certain issues and assumptions. Further, the objectives are highly interrelated.

As has been discussed above, the fundamental argument used by opponents of community-based corrections is that the community needs to be protected from criminals, and that the attempt to correct within the community represents a threat to community safety. The *raison d'etre* of the correctional system, in the minds of most citizens, is first and foremost to protect society from the criminal. Traditionally, this protection has involved isolating the convicted (and, sometimes, the potential) criminal from society. Historically, this protection also has involved banishment and death for many offenses. Needless to say, capital punishment and life imprisonment are highly effective ways of protecting society against convicted criminals.

However, contemporary values prevent the execution and life imprisonment of all criminals. Corresponding to its desire to be protected from the criminal is society's desire to be humane to the criminal. Society wishes to be protected from criminal activity, but wishes also for the criminal to be rehabilitated. Further, rehabilitation is considered to be a necessary ingredient in the prevention of

further criminal activity and rehabilitation consists of reintegrating the offender into society.

Thus, a trade-off exists in these objectives. Lower recidivism (greater correctional effectiveness) is seen to result from social reintegration (social effectiveness). But social reintegration occurs only with some loss of community safety. For the criminal to be reintegrated into society, he must at some point or another be placed back in society, at some additional risk to society.

The proponents of community-based corrections are willing to tolerate some sacrifice in immediate community protection in exchange for greater rehabilitation and less future crime. This evaluation is not designed to determine acceptable standards - those must be determined by policy-makers. However, it does provide a fairly accurate description of the extent to which each of the objectives has been achieved.

*Objective #1: To Protect The Community From Additional
Crime During The Correctional Process*

Protection of the community will be referred to in the remainder of this report as "community safety." It is assumed that community safety is the primary, immediate objective of the correctional system. It is further assumed that the Fort Des Moines Residential Corrections facility will not compare very favorably with traditional correctional institutions *vis a vis* new offenses committed during the commitment period. By virtue of being a community-based program, as opposed to

incarceration, far greater opportunity exists for the commission of crimes. Hence, the objective becomes one of maintaining a reasonably low level of new offenses.

"Community Safety" is measured by means of new offenses committed at Fort Des Moines. New offenses are examined both from the standpoint of actual frequency and from the standpoint of seriousness of offense. Further, attention will be paid to the actual disposition of new charges, enabling differences between allegations and convictions to be distinguished.

Often, community-based correctional programs are opposed on the basis of presumptions that substantial increases in crime in the geographical area of the program will be experienced. For this reason, some attention is also paid to the area in which new offenses occurred.

Thus, the extent to which community safety has been maintained will be indicated by the following factors:

- alleged new offenses committed by clients of Fort Des Moines during their commitment period
- convictions on alleged new offenses
- seriousness of new offenses
- incidence of crime in the vicinity of the facility

Objective #2a: To Utilize Community Resources for Treatment and Upgrading Services

Objective #2b: To Provide Individualized Treatment and Counseling Within The Fort Des Moines Facility

These enabling objectives refer only to the effort expended by the program. One of the features of the Fort Des Moines Residential Corrections program is that it has the capacity to provide some counseling and treatment services by its own staff as well as by utilizing community resources.

The staff consists of several counseling positions as well as the usual administrative positions. The utilization of community resources is measured simply by determining the number, types, and outcomes of service referrals made.

Objective #3: To Reintegrate The Offender Into Society

Many would suggest that what is needed is not rehabilitation, but habilitation; not reintegration, but integration. This argument is based upon the belief that the criminal has not really been habilitated or integrated, and that the attempt to reintegrate would be an attempt to return him to a condition which did not formerly exist. For the purpose of this evaluation, however, the argument is semantic.

The primary, working goal of the Fort Des Moines program is to return to society an individual who is capable of functioning legally within it. Much of the program is remedial in the sense that it attempts to remedy those deficiencies of the client which contributed to his criminal behavior.

Achievement of this objective is determined by analyzing family and residential information, employment status, income level, support of dependents, educational level, as well as other factors. Additionally, pre-commitment and post-release comparisons on these factors are made to determine the degree of change in social integration which has taken place.

Objective #4: To Reduce Future Criminal Behavior

The ultimate goal of any correctional program is to reduce future criminal behavior (recidivism). Yet seldom is this objective measured directly. Usually, it is considered to be a natural consequence of various kinds of treatment activities. The argument suggests that since activities are being performed, they must be effective.

In a sense, the reintegration of the offender into society is the activity by which the effect of reduced criminal behavior is to be produced. As discussed in the last section, this reintegration is empirically evaluated in this report. Rather than to assume, however, that accomplishment of reintegration implies the accomplishment of reduced crime, actual measurement of new criminal offenses is attempted.

Achievement of this objective is determined by means of analysis of both recidivism rate (i.e. whether or not a client committed a new offense) and recidivism score (which takes into account both number

and seriousness of new offenses). Both recidivism rate and recidivism score are calculated for new arrests as well as for new convictions.

In addition to a straightforward description of the amount of new criminal behavior, several intra-program comparisons are made in an effort to identify those factors which tend to be associated with greater or lesser recidivism. From this type of analysis, ability to predict potential recidivism may eventually be possible.

* * * *

Although not a specific objective of the Fort Des Moines Residential Corrections program, but certainly pertinent to it, is the question of cost. Few programs are sufficiently effective to preclude cost from being an important consideration. It is appropriate, therefore, to consider the expense of operating the Fort Des Moines program.

Usually, when correctional costs are considered, they are figured on the basis of cost per inmate for a given time period, such as a day or a year. However, it may be more valid in comparing dissimilar programs to figure cost on the basis of the period of time from commitment to release. One program, with a high per diem cost, may accomplish its objectives with a client very quickly, while another program, with lower cost per day, might take much longer.

A valid cost-effectiveness assessment must therefore account not only for the cost of operation, but must also relate those costs to the accomplishment of the objectives of the programs.

In this evaluation, several cost comparisons are made between Fort Des Moines and other correctional efforts within the State of Iowa. Such comparisons are not always possible, or valid, because of unavailability of certain cost data and because of dissimilarity of groups. Limitations in the analyses are discussed where they appear to exist.

Data Collection

Data collection is the *sine qua non* of the evaluation. Since no analysis or no conclusion can be valid if based upon non-valid data, an extraordinary amount of care (and time) was taken in the collection, verification, and editing of the Fort Des Moines data.

The data collection instrument itself was developed from the perspective of the information that was needed to conduct the evaluation, rather than on the basis of the information that happened to be available. (The instrument is reproduced in Appendix A.) Most of the individual intake and process information was obtained from the case files of the clients, through interviews with the counselors, and from other records kept by the Department of Court Services and by the evaluation unit. Additional information needs necessitated data collection from the District Court Clerk's office, Municipal

Court Clerk's office, Bureau of Adult Corrections, Polk County Jail, and the Des Moines Police Department. Through all of these data sources, a data form was completed for all Fort Des Moines clients through the end of 1972. (The data form is currently undergoing refinement and revision for collection of 1973 data.)

Data Processing and Analysis

Following the collection of the data, each data form was edited, key punched, and verified. Each data item was then summarized by means of a frequency distribution to provide accurate descriptions of the client population, the processes, and the outcome information. Finally, statistical analyses were conducted, where appropriate, to ascertain the magnitude and meaning of observed differences between population subgroups.

A deliberate effort was made to achieve simplicity in the presentation of the data. Most of the data are presented in frequencies of percentages. When comparisons are drawn, and where rigorous statistical techniques have been utilized, the meanings of the comparisons are focused upon. Laborious explanations of the statistical techniques are, for the most part, avoided. However, a general description of the statistical techniques which were used in this analysis appears appropriate.

Following the summarization of the data in frequency distributions, the nominal and ordinal-level comparisons which appeared

necessary were tested by means of a chi-square (χ^2) analysis, or when frequencies were too small, by means of an exact probabilities test. Interval-level data were analyzed by means of one-way or two-way analysis of variance. In some cases, nominal-level dependent variables were converted to Bernoulli variables, thereby enabling interval-level analysis.

The particular relationships analyzed by means of ANOVA were determined on the basis of an exhaustive correlation matrix, which was generated for all of the variables included in the study. ANOVA was performed on all interval or Bernoulli relationships whose correlation coefficients were significant at or beyond the .05 probability level.

III. EVALUATION RESULTS

The Population

Client Description

A major step in evaluating a project which attempts to induce some change in behaviors of people is to describe as thoroughly as possible the target population prior to the introduction of the presumed behavior modifier. A large amount of socio-demographic data was obtained in the data collection effort. Rather than to report all of the data, a client profile follows which indicates the "typical" characteristics of all Fort Des Moines residents for each data item.

TABLE I
CLIENT PROFILE

(For each item, the modal category and percentage or the mean value and standard deviation are given. Complete frequency distributions are tabled in Appendix B.)				
Item #	Characteristic	Average Value	% of Total	Standard Deviation
6	Number of Prior Commitments to Residential Corrections (RCS)	No Prior Commitments	94.3	
8	Race	Anglo-American	65.7	
9	Residence Area	City of Des Moines	86.4	
10	Length of Time in Present Residential Area	Over 10 Years	69.9	

TABLE I. Client Profile (cont.)

Item #	Characteristic	Average Value	% of Total	Standard Deviation
11	Number of Residence Changes Within the Past 12 Months	1.1		1.44
13	Terms of Occupancy	Pays No Rent	44.8	
14	Number of Siblings	3.8		2.50
15	Marital Status	Single	47.2	
16	Number of Persons Dependent Upon Client for Financial Support	1.1		1.66
17	Number of Persons Actually Supported Financially by Client	0.5		1.26
18	Parents of Client	Married	46.7	
19	Military Status	No Prior Service	75.9	
20	Status Prior to Commitment	In Jail	47.4	
21	Age at First Arrest	17.8		6.05
22	Number of Prior Arrests	4.5		3.09
23	Detention in Juvenile Institution	No	63.7	
24	Number of Prior Adult Convictions	1.9		2.51
25	Number of Probation Terms as an Adult	0.4		0.84
26	Number of Adult Jail Sentences	0.9		1.61

TABLE I. Client Profile (cont.)

Item #	Characteristic	Average Value	% of Total	Standard Deviation
27	Number of Prior Adult Prison Sentences	0.3		0.79
28	Number of Aliases	0.1		0.42
29	Illegal Use of Drugs -			
	a. Marijuana, Hashish	Former Regular Use, Current Use Unknown	43.4	
	b. Amphetamines, Barbiturates, Tranquilizers, etc.	No Use	53.1	
	c. Hallucinogens	No Use	63.2	
	d. Hard Narcotics (Heroin, Morphine, Cocaine, etc.)	No Use	65.6	
	e. Miscellaneous (Glue, Robitussin, etc.)	No Use	76.0	
	f. Drugs Connected With Current Case?	No Known Connection	67.2	
30	Known Difficulties From Alcohol	Uses Alcohol, No Difficulties	45.3	
31	Alcohol Connected With Current Case?	No Known Connection	82.6	
32	Employment at Time of Entry Into RCS	Unemployed	58.0	
33	Primary Income Source	Own Employment	47.8	
34	Longest Held Job	Less than 6 Months	51.9	

TABLE I. Client Profile (cont.)

Item #	Characteristic	Average Value	% of Total	Standard Deviation
35	Usual Occupational Level	Unskilled	51.6	
36	Number of Months Employed During Last 12 Months Prior to Entering RCS	4.2		3.68
37	Number of Jobs Held During Last 12 Months Prior to Entering RCS	1.5		1.23
38	Total Income for Prior 12 Months	\$2510.21		\$3162.97
39	Income for Last Month Prior to Entering RCS	\$ 140.64		\$ 217.43
40	Public Assistance	None	88.0	
42	Years of Schooling Completed	10.4		1.99
43	Diplomas & Degrees	None	50.8	
45	How Proven or Sustained	Guilty Plea	69.7	
46	Source of Commitment	District Court	73.2	
47	Type of Sentence	Jail	54.1	
48	Length of Sentence	181-365 Days	43.5	
49	Attorney	Court-Appointed	57.0	

No profile of characteristics such as the one reported here could possibly be adequate for a thorough understanding of the population of Fort Des Moines. More extensive tables for each of the data items are thus included in Appendix B. Further, it is necessary to describe the clients in a somewhat more detailed fashion in this section from the perspective of some of the variables which have been found to be of importance in explaining the various outcome measures.

Client Sub-Group Comparisons

There exists among most persons familiar with the evolution of the Fort Des Moines program a belief that some substantial changes in the types of persons assigned to the program have taken place since its inception. Specifically, the belief is that, as a group, the clients of the first six-month period were generally poorer risks than those assigned to the Fort subsequently. For this reason several analyses have been carried out which separate the clients into six-month time periods by date of entry into the program. (1st period = July to December 1971; 2nd period = January to June 1972; 3rd period = July to December 1972). The utilization of three time periods better enables detection of a transitional period, if one exists.

The variables which are analyzed throughout the report are time of entry into the program, seriousness of sentencing offense,

employment status at time of commitment, illegal or excessive use of drugs, and criminal history. In this section, the clients of the three time periods are compared with respect to each of these other variables.

TABLE II
SERIOUSNESS OF SENTENCING OFFENSE CATEGORIZED BY
TIME OF ENTRY INTO RESIDENTIAL CORRECTIONS

	Felony	Non-Felony	Total	% Felony
1st Six Months	81	15	96	84.4
2nd Six Months	32	12	44	72.7
3rd Six Months	55	21	76	72.4
<u>Total</u>	<u>168</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>216 *</u>	<u>77.8</u>

From Table II, it is possible to determine that clients in the first six months had a higher percentage of sentences on felony charges than in the next two periods. Although the differences when the first period was compared with the second and third period individually were not significantly large ($\chi^2 = 1.934$, $p = .20$; and $\chi^2 = 3.694$, $p = .10$, respectively), groups two and three combined were sentenced on a significantly

* The total number of observations in the study was 246. The number used in each table will be somewhat less than 246 due to unavailable data for some cases.

smaller proportion of felonies than the group from the first time period ($\chi^2 = 4.351$, $p = .05$).

It is also possible to indicate from this table that the Fort Des Moines Residential Corrections program is both an alternative to jail and an alternative to prison. In general, prison exists for the detention of persons sentenced for longer than a one-year period of time, while the jail exists for sentences of one year or less. The distinction between a felony and non-felony is also, again in general, that a felony is punishable by a sentence of greater than one year, while a non-felony is usually punishable by less than one year.

Although a substantial amount of grey area exists (i.e. felons are often sentenced for less than a year and persons convicted of an indictable misdemeanor can be sentenced to more than a year), the existence of a number of non-felons in the program indicates that the Fort Des Moines Residential Corrections program is an alternative to jail, and the presence of such a large number of felons (168) indicates that it is an alternative to prison as well.

The time periods in which persons entered the program need also to be compared on the basis of their employment status at the time of commitment to residential corrections. Table III portrays the relationship between the three time periods and

employment status. "Employment status" is dichotomized, providing only for "employed" and "unemployed." Persons who were employed either full or part-time were considered to be "employed," while persons unemployed or laid off were included among the unemployed. Students and persons who were not employable were excluded from the analysis.

TABLE III
EMPLOYMENT AT TIME OF COMMITMENT CATEGORIZED BY
TIME OF ENTRY INTO RESIDENTIAL CORRECTIONS

	Employed	Unemployed	Total	% Employed
1st Six Months	31	62	93	33.3
2nd Six Months	15	26	41	36.6
3rd Six Months	40	30	70	57.1
Total	86	118	204	42.2

From Table III, it is evident that the three groups of clients differ substantially on the basis of employment. Clients of the last six months were employed at time of commitment to a significantly greater extent than both group 1 ($\chi^2 = 9.209$, $p = .01$) and group 2 ($\chi^2 = 4.371$, $p = .05$).

An important way in which clients from the three time periods should be compared is with regard to illegal use of drugs.

Rather than to treat all drugs as equally serious, it was determined that a distinction between types of drugs would be appropriate. Table IV indicates the frequencies and percentages of known difficulties from or illegal use of each of a variety of drugs.

TABLE IV

KNOWN DIFFICULTIES FROM OR ILLEGAL USE OF DRUGS
CATEGORIZED BY TIME OF ENTRY INTO RESIDENTIAL CORRECTIONS

	Alcohol	Mari- juana, Hashish	Ampheta- mines, Barbitu- rates	Halluci- nogins	Narcotics
1st Six Months	43.2% (32)	60.2% (50)	36.8% (28)	21.7% (15)	38.2% (31)
2nd Six Months	35.1% (13)	52.9% (18)	33.3% (11)	26.4% (9)	23.5% (8)
3rd Six Months	38.6% (29)	35.1% (26)	22.5% (16)	15.0% (11)	22.2% (16)
Total	39.7% (74)	49.2% (94)	30.5% (55)	19.8% (35)	29.4% (55)

Clients from the three different time periods under study differ significantly only on the basis of use of marijuana and the use of narcotics. Group 1 has a significantly greater history of regular use than group 3 of both marijuana ($\chi^2 = 9.873$, $p = .01$) and narcotics ($\chi^2 = 4.613$, $p = .05$). Additionally, group 1 appears to have a more frequent use of amphetamines and barbiturates than group 3, although the difference is not highly as significant ($\chi^2 = 3.582$, $p = .10$). No differences are observable between the

three groups on the basis of use of either alcohol or hallucinogens.

Criminal history was also used to compare the Fort Des Moines clients of the three different time periods. Table V indicates the relationship between the three time periods and the incidence of detention in a juvenile institution.

TABLE V
JUVENILE INSTITUTIONAL DETENTION CATEGORIZED BY
TIME OF ENTRY INTO RESIDENTIAL CORRECTIONS

	Detained	Never Detained	Total	% Detained
1st Six Months	23	55	78	29.5
2nd Six Months	15	14	29	51.7
3rd Six Months	26	32	58	44.8
<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	64	101	165	38.8

The clients who entered the program during the first six months of its operation had a less frequent incidence of institutional detention as a juvenile than either the second six months ($\chi^2 = 4.564$, $p = .05$) or the third six-month period ($\chi^2 = 3.396$, $p = .10$). Criminal history was also measured by means of:

- age at first arrest
- number of prior arrests

- number of prior adult convictions
- number of adult jail sentences
- number of adult prison sentences
- number of probation terms

No differences between the three groups of clients were found for any of these criminal history items.

* * * *

On the basis of the foregoing analysis it is possible to describe some change in the Fort Des Moines client characteristics during the eighteen-month time period. The clients from the first six months were more often convicted of a felony, were less often employed, were more frequent users of both marijuana and narcotics, and were less likely to have been detained in a juvenile institution than subsequent groups of clients. This would suggest that the selection of persons to be sentenced to Fort Des Moines is being made more conservatively recently than was originally the case. Persons sentenced to the program during 1972 appear to have been "better risks" as a group than were the persons sentenced to the program during the first six months. Whether this apparent change has been by design of the administrators of the program or of the judiciary, or whatever this change in fact reflects, a

change in the overall defendant population is not clear at this time. Additional study is needed to identify those processes or events which resulted in the changed client population in the program.

The next section will describe the types of treatment and services received by the clients of the residential corrections program.

THE PROCESS

The feature which distinguishes the Fort Des Moines program from most other correctional programs is the fact that it both provides treatment and services itself, and also relies heavily upon service resources available in the community. Some understanding of the types of treatments and services stressed by the program is necessary for valid interpretation of the results of the evaluation, and is certainly necessary for attempts at replication elsewhere.

The following table provides a profile of the most typical program process events, treatments, and services. It should be noted that the percentages given refer to the number of clients who fit the typical category. (For example the 92.3% Legal Aid does not mean that 92.3% of all clients were referred to Legal Aid. Rather, it indicates that of all of the legal referrals, 92.3% of them were to Legal Aid.) A

more complete description of the distribution of each process data item is given in Appendix B.

TABLE VI
PROCESS PROFILE

(For each item, the modal category and percentage or the mean value and standard deviation are given. Complete frequency distributions are tabled in Appendix B.)				
Item #	Characteristic	Average Value	% of Total	Standard Deviation
51	Number of Furloughs Granted While at RCS	6.0		7.50
52	Total Number of Days Spent on Furlough	23.1		31.43
53	Length of Time in RCS Before First Furlough Was Granted (Weeks)	5.7		15.41
54	Service Referrals Used as Treatment			
	a. Vocational Rehabilitation	Job Counseling or Placement	46.5	
	b. Employment	Employment Office	46.3	
	c. Education	Adult Education	57.1	
	d. Legal	Legal Aid	92.3	
	e. Drug or Alcohol Treatment	Urinalysis	77.5	
	f. Medical	Deitz Clinic	38.6	
	g. Behavior Modification	Polk County Jail	73.5	

TABLE VI. Process Profile (cont.)

Item #	Characteristic	Average Value	% of Total	Standard Deviation
	h. Other Service Referrals	Polk County Welfare	33.3	
55	Primary Counseling Approach Used	Individual	77.4	
56	Number of Primary Counselor Changes	0.6		1.06
57	Number of New Jobs Obtained While a Resident of RCS	1.6		1.53
58	Number of Weeks After Entering RCS Before Resident Began New Employment or Enrolled in New Vocational or Educational Program	4.1		3.97
59	Amount of Time on Longest Held Job While a Client at RCS	1 Week to 1 Month	34.3	
60	Total Amount of Time Employed While a Client at RCS	1 Wk-1 Mo 1 Mo-3 Mo	27.1 27.1	
61	Total Income While a Client at RCS	\$ 668.53		\$922.28
62	Total Taxable Income While a Client at RCS	\$ 622.08		\$924.86
63	How Many Times During His Stay at RCS Was This Person Returned to Jail Temporarily for Discipline or Treatment?	0.1		0.45
64	Number of Days Spent in Jail and at Other Institutions While a Client at RCS	4.9		16.99
	Total Number of Days From Commitment to Release	104.9		102.8

The 246 clients of the Fort Des Moines program were referred to outside resources roughly 800 times for an average of 3.25 outside referrals per client. This average number of referrals is increased somewhat when consideration is given to the fact that short term clients (up to 30 or 60 days) are rarely, if ever, referred to outside services. The outside referrals can be categorized into the following main categories:

- vocation rehabilitation (200 referrals)
- employment (136 referrals)
- education (91 referrals)
- legal (26 referrals)
- medical (153 referrals)
- drug or alcohol treatment (142 referrals)
- behavior modification (34 referrals)
- other service referrals (18 referrals)

As has been previously discussed, in addition to the outside referrals that are made are the internal services provided by the staff. Each client is assigned a counselor who coordinates the service program with the client. Furloughs may be granted for varying lengths of time and with varying frequency, depending upon the progress and cooperation of the client. After a short time is spent at the Fort, the typical client enters an educational or employment program which usually continues throughout his period of commitment.

Because of the highly individualized treatment programming, it is not feasible to analyze in any detail the comparative effects of various treatments. Each client treatment program is unique to that client. However, it is possible to examine broad differences in treatment approach. (For example, persons who were employed during their stay in the program can be compared with those who were not.) The following sections provide a description of the outcomes of the residential corrections program, as well as identification of the significant relationships between process and outcome.

Community Safety

A primary objective of the Fort Des Moines program is "to protect the community from additional crime during the correctional process." Protection of the community is referred to as "community safety" and is measured by means of the number and seriousness of new offenses committed by clients during their stay in the program. In order to fully understand the extent to which community safety has been maintained during the existence of the residential corrections program, it is necessary to examine:

- new offenses committed by program clients
- crimes committed in the vicinity of the facility
- identifiable characteristics of clients who commit new offenses

New Offenses of Clients During Commitment

Of the 246 clients assigned to the Fort Des Moines program during the first 18 months, 33 clients (13%) were charged with 47 new offenses committed during their stay in the program. Table VII provides a distribution of all of the offenses committed by clients while in the program. It should be noted that Table VII indicates the types of offenses charged against Fort Des Moines clients. More than one offense was alleged against several clients, resulting in the disparity between the number of offenses (47) and the number of clients charged with new offenses (33).

TABLE VII

OFFENSES COMMITTED BY FORT DES MOINES
CLIENTS DURING PERIOD OF COMMITMENT

Type of Offense	<u>Arrests</u>		<u>Convictions</u>	
	N	% Of All Arrests	N	% Of All Convictions
Escape	15	31.9	0	.0
Contempt of Court	12	25.6	10	58.8
Property Offense	7	14.9	3	17.6
Offense Against Persons	4	8.5	2	11.8
Morals	1	2.1	0	.0
Drugs	1	2.1	0	.0
<u>Traffic</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>14.9</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>11.8</u>
Total	47	100.0	17	100.0

The types of offenses categorized above need some additional explanation. "Escape" is self-explanatory, except that it has a somewhat more dramatic sound than necessary. "Escape" merely consists of walking away from the premises. "Contempt of Court" is a kind of catch-all charge. In this table, it includes six escapes and six instances of leaving the grounds without permission (in four of these cases, alcohol was involved). The offenses against property and against persons consisted of burglary, breaking and entering, larceny, shoplifting, robbery with aggravation, and intimidation while masked. The morals charge was assault with intent to rape, and the drug-related charge was for possession of marijuana. The traffic offenses consisted of such charges as hit-and-run, driving without an operator's license, driving the wrong way on a one-way street, and running a red light.

In response to the fear that the community in the area of a residential correctional facility is in danger because of it, it is important to note that other than the contempt of court and escape charges (which had to have occurred in the area of the facility) the only offenses alleged to have been committed in the vicinity of the program were two traffic charges and a single robbery with aggravation (in which the victim was a counselor in the program). It is safe to conclude that the safety of the community has not been seriously threatened as a result of the program.

Sub-Group Comparisons

Time of Entry Into RCS. Suggested earlier (page 22) was that clients assigned to the program during the first six months were somewhat poorer risks than those of subsequent periods. For this reason, it is appropriate to compare the three groups on the basis of new offenses alleged during the period of commitment.

TABLE VIII
NUMBER OF CLIENTS CHARGED WITH NEW OFFENSES DURING
COMMITMENT CATEGORIZED BY TIME OF ENTRY
INTO RESIDENTIAL CORRECTIONS

	New Offense	No New Offense	Total	% New Offense
1st Six Months	24	81	105	22.9
2nd Six Months	7	42	49	14.3
3rd Six Months	2	76	78	2.6
	—	—	—	—
Total	33	199	232	14.2

The number of new offenses reported for the clients assigned to the program during the third time period is probably somewhat deflated, due to the fact that fourteen (14) of the clients from that period had not yet been released from the program when the data collection was completed. However, the difference observed between the new arrest rates of group 1 and group 3 is highly

significant ($\chi^2 = 15.12$, $p = .001$), as is the comparison of group 1 with groups 2 and 3 combined ($\chi^2 = 11.72$, $p = .001$). The difference between groups 1 and 2 was not significant, however, indicating that the second six-month period was a transition from a period of more new offenses to a period of very few new offenses committed. The decrease in new arrests may have been a product of either the change in the risk factor in the client population or increased effectiveness of the program, or both. Additional data on a large number of clients over time will be necessary to define the role of each factor in the reduction of new offenses.

Criminal History. Of all of the "criminal history" items included in the data collection effort, only "number of prior convictions" and "sentencing offense" appear to be significantly related to the commission of new offenses.

"Sentencing offense" is treated dichotomously, with all felony convictions receiving a score of "1" and non-felonies a score of "0."

TABLE IX
NEW OFFENSES DURING COMMITMENT
CATEGORIZED BY SENTENCING OFFENSE

Sentencing Offense	N	Percentage of Group With New Offenses
Felony	175	18%
Non-Felony	52	2%

The two groups were then compared by means of an analysis of variance on the basis of new offenses committed. The analysis indicated that persons who were sentenced on a felony charge were more often charged with the commission of a new offense than were non-felons ($F = 9.32$, $p = .003$).

"Number of prior convictions" was analyzed with five categories ("0," "1," "2," "3," and "4 or more"), again by means of ANOVA (analysis of variance).

TABLE X
NEW OFFENSES DURING COMMITMENT
CATEGORIZED BY NUMBER OF PRIOR CONVICTIONS

Number of Prior Convictions	N	Percentage of Group With New Offenses
0	66	12%
1	37	16%
2	21	10%
3	13	54%
4 or more	34	21%

The results of the analysis ($F = 3.81$, $p = .006$) indicate that more new offenses were committed by persons with three or more prior convictions than persons with fewer than three. Thus, failure in the program is related to prior convictions. This suggests that program effectiveness might be improved by a greater focus upon

identifying and meeting the unique needs of clients whose criminal histories are relatively extensive.

Employment and Income. The employment and income items that are highly related to the commission of new offenses are:

- employment status at time of commitment
- primary source of income
- number of jobs held in the year prior to entering the program

"Employment" was collapsed into two categories - employed and unemployed. Students were included in the employed category, while those who were not employable were dropped from the analysis.

TABLE XI
NEW OFFENSES DURING COMMITMENT
CATEGORIZED BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT TIME OF COMMITMENT

Employment Status at Time of Commitment	N	Percentage of Group With New Offenses
Unemployed	132	22%
Employed and/or student	95	5%

The resulting analysis revealed that persons not employed at the time of commitment to the program were far more often charged with new offenses than those who were employed ($F = 12.68$, $p = .0008$).

"Primary Source of Income" was divided into four categories: None, own employment, other than own employment, and criminal activity.

TABLE XII
NEW OFFENSES DURING COMMITMENT
CATEGORIZED BY PRIMARY SOURCE OF INCOME

Primary Source of Income	N	Percentage of Group With New Offenses
None	20	25%
Criminal Activity	44	27%
Other Than Own Employment	27	15%
Own Employment	117	7%

Persons with no source of income and those whose primary source of income was criminal activity were about equal in new offenses committed, and both were much higher than the group whose income came from other than own employment and from those whose own employment was their primary source of income ($F = 4.72, p = .004$).

Number of jobs held in the year prior to commitment is somewhat difficult to analyze, since either "0" jobs or many jobs are seen as less desirable than 1 or 2 jobs.

TABLE XIII
NEW OFFENSES DURING COMMITMENT
CATEGORIZED BY NUMBER OF JOBS IN YEAR PRIOR TO COMMITMENT

Number of Jobs	N	Proportion of Group With New Offenses
0	27	.19
1	58	.05
2	29	.17
3	15	.27
4 or more	9	.44

The results indicate that persons with only one job committed far fewer new offenses than any other group ($F = 2.73$, $p = .01$). It is interesting to note that "0" and "2" are approximately equal and that the increasingly high proportions among groups "3" and "4 or more" suggest a trend towards a greater number of new offenses as the number of prior jobs increases.

Illegal Use of Drugs. The illegal use of amphetamines and barbiturates, hallucinogens, narcotics, and miscellaneous drugs are all significantly related to the commission of new offenses. Use of marijuana, hashish, or alcohol are not related to new offenses during the commitment period.

TABLE XIV
NEW OFFENSES DURING COMMITMENT
CATEGORIZED BY ILLEGAL USE OF DRUGS

Type of Drug	Group	N	Proportion of Group With New Offenses
Amphetamines, Barbiturates	No Use	100	.10
	Experimental Use	28	.18
	History of Regular Use	61	.28
Miscellaneous (Glue Sniffing, Robitussin, etc.)	No Use	132	.11
	Experimental Use	20	.30
	History of Regular Use	23	.44
Hallucinogens	No Use	114	.11
	Experimental Use	29	.31
	History of Regular Use	40	.20
Narcotics	No Use	132	.12
	Experimental Use	13	.38
	History of Regular Use	52	.23

For amphetamines and barbiturates, as well as for miscellaneous drugs, the relationship between usage and new offenses is fairly evident (for amphetamines and barbiturates, $F = 2.55$, $p = .04$; for miscellaneous drugs, $F = 8.25$, $p = .0001$). As the regularity of use increased, likelihood of commitment of a new offense also increased.

However, the findings for hallucinogens and narcotics usage are a bit more curious. Although significant differences are observed in both instances (for hallucinogens, $F = 2.67$, $p = .03$; for narcotics, $F = 2.03$, $p = .09$), the groups with experimental usage appeared to have the worst record of new offenses. Several explanations are possible. First, especially in the case of narcotics, the

experimental use group is quite small, resulting in relatively unstable findings. Further, it may be that as a result of the intensity of treatment for those with a history of regular use, this group experienced less opportunity for the commission of new offenses. Still further, it is possible that some individuals were erroneously treated as experimental users who were in fact unknown regular users. Finally, it is also possible that persons who have used hallucinogens and hard narcotics experimentally are simply more likely than regular users to commit new offenses.

* * * *

On the basis of the discussion in this section, it is possible to conclude that the community is not particularly endangered by the existence of the Fort Des Moines Residential Corrections program, since only 13% of its clients were charged with any new offenses during their period of commitment, and only 3% were charged with offenses against property, persons, morals or drugs. Further, it has been found that although danger to the community resulting from the program has always been at a reasonably low level, new offenses have diminished dramatically as the program has evolved, with only two clients charged with crimes against property, persons, morals, or drugs in 1972 (neither of whom were convicted for those charges).

Although all of the factors included in the study were

examined, it was found that the commission of new offenses during the period of commitment tended to be related only to the following socio-demographic variables:

- time of entry into the program
- seriousness of sentencing offense
- number of prior convictions
- employment at time of commitment
- primary source of income
- number of jobs held in the year prior to commitment
- illegal use of amphetamines and barbiturates, hallucinogens, narcotics, and certain miscellaneous drugs.

The relationships identified between the commission of new offenses and such variables as employment status, employment stability, and use of drugs should not be construed to imply that new offenses are caused by unemployment, job instability, or use of drugs. Rather, the significant relationships only indicate that the variables are associated. It is likely, for example, that both employment instability and predisposition towards criminal behavior are products of personal inadequacy, and that reduction of criminal behavior can be accomplished most effectively by treating personal inadequacy directly, rather than by treatment of job instability as the causal factor.

Social Effectiveness

As was stated in section II, the primary working goal of the Fort Des Moines program is to return to society an individual who is capable of functioning within it, that is, "to re-integrate the offender into society." Social effectiveness refers to the extent to which clients released from the program are, in fact, capable of functioning within society. In this section, social effectiveness is measured by examining pre-program and post-program employment and income, residential and family status, and education.

Employment and Income

Perhaps, the measure which is the most important in determining social effectiveness is employment. An individual who is employed and has a regular income is considered to be more capable of functioning within society than the individual who is not employed. Table XV indicates the change in rates of employment. In this analysis, employment status itself determined the category into which a given client should be coded. Students who were unemployed were deleted from the analysis.

TABLE XV
EMPLOYMENT RATES PRIOR TO AND
AFTER COMMITMENT TO RESIDENTIAL CORRECTIONS

	Prior to Commitment	After Release
Employed	96 (40%)	162 (76%)
Not Employed	142 (60%)	51 (24%)

The change in employment rates from 40% to 76% is a highly significant one ($\chi^2 = 58.58$, $p = .001$). It is no doubt true that employment is an important factor in the decision to release a client, resulting in a probable employment "peak" at the time of release, which, when combined with the low employment rate prior to entry into the program due to jail detention, produces an optimally large difference between the two points in time. However, the difference is far too large to be completely explained by looking at the time of data collection. Much of this difference is undoubtedly real, indicating that at least from an employment standpoint, clients are able to function substantially better following release.

In addition to employment rate, primary source of income appears to be an important way of determining the social effectiveness of the program.

TABLE XVI
PRIMARY INCOME SOURCE PRIOR
TO AND AFTER COMMITMENT TO RESIDENTIAL CORRECTIONS

	Prior to Commitment	After Release
No Income Source	21 (9%)	33 (15%)
Own Employment	108 (48%)	161 (76%)
Other Than Own Employment	97 (43%)	18 (9%)

Clients whose own employment was their primary source of income increased significantly from before to after commitment as compared to those whose primary source of income was someone other than themselves ($\chi^2 = 63.24$, $p = .001$). Persons with no income source were often students who were living with parents, and did not change significantly between the two time periods. As expected, primary source of income relates directly to employment status.

Education

Education also appears to be related to social effectiveness. Although involvement in an educational program or the receipt of educational degrees do not necessarily imply that an individual is capable of functioning in society, they do imply

that the individual is occupied, and to an extent is motivated to self-improvement.

TABLE XVII

STUDENT STATUS OF CLIENTS NOT EMPLOYED FULL-TIME PRIOR TO
AND AFTER COMMITMENT TO RESIDENTIAL CORRECTIONS

	<u>Prior to Commitment</u>	<u>After Release</u>
Neither Employed Full- Time Nor a Student	145 (95%)	56 (70%)
Student	7 (5%)	24 (30%)

As is indicated in Table XVII, persons who were not employed full-time were much more frequently involved in an educational program following release than prior to commitment ($\chi^2 = 29.20$, $p = .001$). This finding can be supplemented by consideration of those clients who received degrees while still under sentence to the program, as indicated in Table XVIII.

TABLE XVIII
NEW DEGREES OBTAINED BY CLIENTS
WHILE COMMITTED TO RESIDENTIAL CORRECTIONS

New Degree Obtained	f
G.E.D.	19
High School	3
Special Trade	1
	—
Total	23

It appears on the basis of the information contained in Tables XVII and XVIII that the residential corrections program does much to enhance both opportunity and motivation for additional education.

Residence and Family

Another important indication of social effectiveness may be found in the residential and family relationships maintained by a client. Specifically, this may be measured by such considerations as whether or not a client is living with his family, his marital status, stability of his occupancy, receipt of public assistance by his dependents, whether or not he supports his dependents, and so forth.

On the basis of the available information, no significant differences exist between any of the clients' residential and family relationships before and after commitment, except in the number of legal dependents actually supported by the client.

No significant difference exists in the actual number of dependents prior to and after the program. However, the number of dependents actually supported varies significantly. A greater proportion of dependents is supported after the program than before ($t = 2.391$, $p = .01$).

TABLE XIX

NUMBER OF LEGAL DEPENDENTS AND NUMBER OF
DEPENDENTS SUPPORTED PRIOR TO AND FOLLOWING
COMMITMENT TO THE PROGRAM

	Prior to Commitment	Following Release
Number of Dependents Per Client	$\bar{x} = 1.1189$ $s = 1.6640$ $n = 227$	$\bar{x} = 1.1596$ $s = 1.6056$ $n = 213$
Number of Dependents Sup- ported Per Client	$\bar{x} = 0.5363$ $s = 1.2545$ $n = 220$	$\bar{x} = 0.8523$ $s = 1.4810$ $n = 210$

There is some difficulty in interpreting this difference, since it accounts only for differences in the group as a whole, and does not account for either individual differences or disparity between the actual number of dependents and the number supported. To

accomplish this comparison, individual correlations between number of dependents and number supported were generated for both pre-program and post-release data, followed by a test of the significance of the differences between the correlation coefficients.

Prior to commitment to the program, the correlation for all clients between the number of dependents and the number supported was .685 on the basis of 217 observations. The post-release correlation coefficient was .833 on the basis of 209 observations. The difference between these correlations is a significant one ($\chi^2 = 3.686$, $p = .056$).

There is little doubt that the program is making a notable contribution to the community. Not only is it preventing a decrease in dependent support that would result from incarceration, but it is increasing such support as compared to the pre-program period.

* * * *

On the basis of the discussion in this section, the residential corrections program demonstrates a substantial degree of social effectiveness. Most of the persons released from the program are employed, are relying on their own employment as their primary source of support, and are supporting their dependents financially to a much greater extent than prior to

entry into the program. Further, it is evident that among those who are not employed, a much greater number are involved in an educational program after release than prior to entry.

Correctional Effectiveness

The ultimate goal of the correctional system is to prevent future criminal behavior (recidivism). The extent to which the system is successful in reducing future criminal behavior is referred to in this report as correctional effectiveness.

Referring simply to the commission of new offenses, recidivism is not a particularly difficult concept to understand. However, it is a somewhat difficult concept to measure. First, the commission of new offenses cannot be measured directly - rather, it must be inferred by such measures as arrests and convictions. Secondly, the commission of new offenses is unlimited in time - if a former offender ever commits a new offense, he is theoretically a recidivist. To measure recidivism, the time factor must be controlled. Thirdly, recidivism is unlimited in space - a new offense can be committed anywhere, but the present data systems are not sufficiently pervasive to detect it. Finally, is the question of how recidivism should be treated. Should consideration only include whether or not a new offense was committed, or should number of new offenses and seriousness of new offenses also be considered?

Perhaps, the difficulty of measuring recidivism is responsible for the lack of adequate studies of correctional effectiveness. However, the lack of good correctional effectiveness studies may be due also to the lack of effectiveness of most correctional efforts. Recidivism is estimated by some experts to run as high as 50 to 60%; by others it is estimated to run as high as 80% or higher. If these estimates are accurate, it is small wonder that so little in the way of empirical data relating to recidivism is broadly disseminated.

In this study, new offenses were measured by means of analyzing new arrests and new convictions within Polk County and the City of Des Moines. No controls were established for time in the collection of data - rather, time is controlled analytically. Recidivism is analyzed in three different ways: *

- recidivism arrest rate, referring to the proportion of offenders which is arrested and charged with new offenses;
- recidivism conviction rate, referring to the proportion of offenders convicted for new offenses;
- recidivism arrest score, referring to a scaled score developed to account simultaneously for number and seriousness of alleged new offenses.

* A fourth method, recidivism conviction score, is not reported in this study, since insufficient time has elapsed to allow conviction on many of the more serious charges. Recidivism conviction score is thus a rather deflated estimate of its true value.

Fort Des Moines Recidivism

Of the 246 clients assigned to the program, 88 (35.7%) have been charged with new offenses subsequent to their release. The alleged new offenses have ranged per individual from a single simple intoxication charge to multiple felonies, resulting in a range in individual recidivism scores from 1 to 24. * Recidivism conviction rate to date has been 25.6%, based upon 63 convictions for new offenses. To better comprehend the nature of those clients who committed new offenses, client sub-group comparisons were necessary.

Client Sub-Group Comparisons

Although many separate analyses were conducted, no significant relationships were found between recidivism and residential or family relationships, education, or any program treatments or services. Significant relationships were found between recidivism and use of drugs, employment and income, and criminal history. Following are descriptions of those relationships:

Illegal Use of Drugs. Of the various types of drugs studied, no significant relationships were found between recidivism and alcohol or miscellaneous drugs (such as glue sniffing,

* Individual recidivism scores were obtained by assigning 4 points for each felony, 3 points for each indictable misdemeanor, 2 points for each simple misdemeanor, and 1 point for each intoxication charge.

Robitussin, etc.). Use of marijuana and hashish, as well as hallucinogens, were found to be somewhat related to recidivism, though not significantly. Only use of amphetamines and barbiturates and use of narcotics were significantly related to recidivism.

TABLE XX
RECIDIVISM ARREST RATES FOR
VARIOUS TYPES OF ILLEGAL DRUG USE

Type of Drug	Group	N	Recidivism Arrest Rate*
Marijuana, Hashish	No Use	85	.29
	Experimental Use	26	.19
	History of Regular Use	108	.45
Amphetamines, Barbiturates	No Use	110	.25
	Experimental Use	34	.44
	History of Regular Use	63	.43
Narcotics	No Use	141	.29
	Experimental Use	13	.62
	History of Regular Use	61	.43

Alcohol, miscellaneous drugs, and hallucinogens were all unrelated to recidivism arrest rate. The use of marijuana or hashish is related to recidivism arrest ($F = 2.38$, $p = .052$), with experimental users experiencing a lower new arrest rate

* Group Recidivism Arrest Rate is calculated by assigning 1 point for each group member with a new arrest and 0 points for each group member with no new arrests. The summated total is then divided by N. Thus, if all members of the group had a new arrest, the group rate would be 1.0 - if none were arrested, the score would be 0.0.

than either non-users or regular users. The use of amphetamines and barbiturates is somewhat more significantly related to recidivism arrest rate ($F = 2.65$, $p = .03$), with non-users experiencing a much lower rate than either experimental or regular users. Finally, as was found in the analysis of new offenses during the commitment period, the experimental users of narcotics experienced a higher rate of new arrests than either non-users or regular users ($F = 3.80$, $p = .005$), although regular users also have a substantially higher rate than non-users.

TABLE XXI
RECIDIVISM CONVICTION RATES FOR
VARIOUS TYPES OF ILLEGAL DRUG USE

Type of Drug	Group	N	Recidivism Conviction Rate
Marijuana, Hashish	No Use	85	.22
	Experimental Use	26	.12
	History of Regular Use	108	.33
Amphetamines, Barbiturates	No Use	110	.19
	Experimental Use	34	.29
	History of Regular Use	63	.35
Hallucinogens	No Use	127	.19
	Experimental Use	32	.28
	History of Regular Use	42	.38
Narcotics	No Use	141	.21
	Experimental Use	13	.62
	History of Regular Use	61	.31

Neither alcohol nor miscellaneous drugs are related to recidivism conviction rate. Further, use of marijuana or hashish ($F = 2.23$, $p = .07$), amphetamines or barbiturates ($F = 2.11$, $p = .08$), and hallucinogens ($F = 2.15$, $p = .075$) are only marginally related to recidivism conviction rate. For each of these drugs, regular users experienced a higher conviction rate. Use of narcotics again is highly significant ($F = 4.88$, $p = .001$), with the experimental users again experiencing the highest rate of all groups.

Recidivism score, which accounts for number and seriousness of new offenses, is not significantly related to the illegal use of any of the drugs under study, indicating that although drug users commit a disproportionately large number of new offenses, the seriousness of those new offenses does not differ from the offenses committed by non-users of drugs.

Taken together, these findings demonstrate a consistent relationship between use of narcotics (as opposed to other drugs) and recidivism. It is likely that the types of personality maladjustment underlying narcotics use, and the costs associated with obtaining such substances as heroin, contribute to the commission of new crimes. This being the case, it would be warranted to intensify the program's anti-drug abuse approaches.

Employment and Income. Of the employment and income-related items included in the evaluation, the following appear to be related to recidivism:

- employment status at time of commitment
- source of income at time of commitment
- source of income subsequent to release
- job stability prior to commitment
- public assistance subsequent to release

TABLE XXII
RECIDIVISM ARREST RATES FOR
EMPLOYMENT AND INCOME-RELATED VARIABLES

Variable	Group	N	Recidivism Arrest Rate
Employment Status Prior to Commitment	Unemployed	142	.44
	Employed	103	.24
Job Stability Prior To Commitment	Less than 1 Week	16	.63
	1 Week-3 Months	43	.51
	3 Months-1 Year	42	.36
	Over 1 Year	63	.22
Primary Source of Income Prior to Commitment	No Income	21	.33
	Own Income	124	.28
	Other Than Own Income	30	.50
	Criminal Activity	51	.45
Primary Source of Income Subsequent to Release	No Income	35	.48
	Own Employment	171	.33
	Other Than Own Employment	8	.75

Each of the variables listed in Table XXII is significantly related to recidivism arrest rate. Higher recidivism arrest rates are found for unemployed ($F = 10.13$, $p = .002$), low job stability ($F = 2.65$, $p = .01$), and primary source of income other than own employment both prior to ($F = 2.62$, $p = .05$) and after commitment ($F = 4.05$, $p = .02$).

Recidivism conviction rate is likewise related to employment and income factors, as seen in Table XXIII.

TABLE XXIII
RECIDIVISM CONVICTION RATES FOR
EMPLOYMENT AND INCOME-RELATED VARIABLES

Variable	Group	N	Recidivism Conviction Rate
Employment Status Prior to Commitment	Unemployed	142	.33
	Employed	103	.16
Job Stability Prior to Commitment	Less Than 1 Week	16	.44
	1 Week-3 Months	43	.49
	3 Months- 1 Year	42	.26
	Over 1 Year	63	.14
Primary Source of Income Prior to Commitment	No Income	21	.24
	Own Employment	124	.19
	Other Than Own Employ.	30	.43
	Criminal Activity	51	.33
Public Assistance Received Subsequent to Release	None	194	.26
	Self and/or Dependents	20	.45

Again, each of the variables significantly related to recidivism conviction rate follows exactly the pattern that would be predicted. Recidivism conviction rate tends to be higher for the unemployed ($F = 8.75$, $p = .004$), those with low job stability ($F = 2.94$, $p = .006$), those who rely on other than own employment ($F = 3.06$, $p = .03$) and those who receive some form of public assistance ($F = 2.87$, $p = .04$).

Among all of the employment and income-related items, only employment at time of commitment is related significantly to recidivism score.

TABLE XXIV
RECIDIVISM SCORE FOR
PRE-COMMITMENT EMPLOYMENT GROUPS

Employment Status Prior to Commitment	N	Recidivism Score
Unemployed	142	2.35
Employed	103	.85

The mean recidivism score of the unemployed group is significantly higher than the employed group ($F = 10.89$, $p = .001$), indicating that those who were unemployed prior to commitment to residential corrections commit more offenses and more serious offenses subsequent to release from the facility.

Criminal History. Of all of the criminal history included in the data collection, only number of prior arrests is related to recidivism arrest rate.

TABLE XXV
RECIDIVISM ARREST RATES CATEGORIZED BY
NUMBER OF PRIOR ARRESTS

Number of Prior Arrests	N	Recidivism Arrest Rate
0	17	.23
1 or 2	42	.26
3 or more	127	.44

It is clear from Table XXV that clients with a higher number of prior arrests also experience a substantially higher rate of recidivism arrests subsequent to release from the program ($F = 2.67$, $p = .03$). A similar finding is observed for conviction rate, though not as significant. In addition to prior number of arrests, juvenile detention appears to be related to recidivism conviction rate.

TABLE XXVI
RECIDIVISM CONVICTION RATES
FOR CRIMINAL HISTORY VARIABLES

Variable	Group	N	Recidivism Conviction Score
Number of Prior Arrests	0	17	.12
	1 or 2	42	.19
	3 or more	127	.31
Prior Juvenile Detention	Yes	70	.46
	No	113	.33

The differences observed between different levels of number of prior arrests are not highly significant ($F = 1.97$, $p = .10$). However, clients who have previously been sentenced to a juvenile institution have a significantly higher recidivism conviction rate than those who were never sentenced to an institution as a juvenile ($F = 7.14$, $p = .002$).

Recidivism score appears to be unrelated to any criminal history variables. Apparently, criminal history, in this instance, does not affect number of seriousness or recidivism offenses.

* * * *

The correctional effectiveness of the Fort Des Moines Residential Corrections program has been measured by both new arrest rate and new conviction rate. 35.7% of all clients have been arrested on new charges subsequent to their release from the program, and 25.6% of all clients have been convicted on new charges. Due to the lack of any adequate comparative recidivism studies, it is not possible to determine whether these rates are favorable or unfavorable. The recidivism rates experienced by this program are quite probably somewhat lower than similarly-calculated rates for other programs. The need is evident: before definitive conclusions may be drawn, comparative analyses of other correctional programs must be conducted.

Among the clients of the program, several factors tend to be associated with recidivism. Use of narcotics and use of amphetamines/barbiturates are highly associated with recidivism. Also associated with recidivism are several employment and income-related items, most notably employment at time of commitment, primary source of income, and job stability. Finally, recidivism was found to be associated with number of prior arrests and prior juvenile detention.

These preliminary findings point to the need for further exploration in two areas:

- there is the need for program staff to assess their clients to determine those factors which underly the relationship between, for example, narcotics use or job instability and recidivism. More generally, the challenge is to uncover what it is about a person that leads to multiple difficulties, including criminal behavior; then, in each instance, to provide that which is needed to improve the individual's ability to live within society.
- the tasks for research and evaluation will be to examine further the nature and strength of the relationships between client characteristics and outcome. That is, it should be

possible to establish the extent to which given characteristics, or combinations of characteristics, can predict success or failure. This would provide a sharper focus for program concentration.

Further, program changes aimed at improved effectiveness with failure-prone clients could be evaluated precisely, once the quantitative relationships are determined. For example, the effectiveness of an approach aimed at improving the success rate of fourth-offender, unemployed, narcotics users could be determined by contrasting the results obtained against those predicted from past experience with this subgroup. The aid to program improvement from such an evaluation approach is obvious. Less apparent is the benefit to the correctional field of such precise knowledge of the degree to which specific approaches are effective for various types of problems.

Financial Effectiveness

Paralleling the entire discussion of program effectiveness is the question of the cost of operating the program. In order to examine the financial effectiveness of the program, it is necessary to consider first the actual cost of the program, then

to compare its cost with the cost of other correctional programs.

Actual Program Cost

The total dollar cost of the Fort Des Moines Residential Corrections program was \$182,956 in 1971 and \$391,528 in 1972, for a total during the period covered by this evaluation of \$574,487. This total budget is partially offset--in cash--by receipt of rent from clients and by reimbursement from the New Careers program.

TABLE XXVII
ACTUAL DOLLAR COST FOR
OPERATING THE RESIDENTIAL CORRECTIONS PROGRAM

	Gross Program Budget	Client Rent Paid	"New Careers" Reimbursement	Net Program Budget
1971	\$182,956	\$ 5,419	\$ 6,522	\$171,015
1972	391,528	10,992	19,326	361,210
Total	\$574,487	\$16,411	\$25,848	\$532,225

The total number of days served by all clients of the program was 24,478, resulting in a daily per capita cost of \$21.74. As was discussed in Section II, however, daily costs do not portray the entire cost picture. The total cost for the complete term of commitment needs also to be considered in order to compare directly

the costs of programs with varying lengths of client terms of commitment. Table VI (pp 30 ff) indicated that the average (mean) number of days spent in the resident corrections program was 104.9, resulting in a cost per client term of \$2,281.

One client sub-group comparison is necessary for valid program comparisons. As was discussed in Section III - The Population, the program exists both as an alternative to jail and as an alternative to prison. It appears appropriate at this time to compare the relative costs for felony and non-felony convictions.

TABLE XXVIII
COMPARISON OF COST PER TERM OF
CLIENTS SENTENCED ON FELONIES AND NON-FELONIES

Sentencing Offense	N	Mean Number of Days at RCS	Per Client- Term Cost
Felony	188	125.9	\$2,737
Non-Felony	58	23.9	520

Although felony and non-felony costs were figured on the basis of the program average of \$21.74/client day, it appears that clients sentenced for longer terms receive a disproportionately larger share of services and treatment than those sentenced for short terms. While the cost implication of this disparity cannot be estimated accurately, the effect would be a slight reduction in

daily per capita cost for non-felony convictions, and a slight increase for felons.

Comparative Program Costs

Prior to the comparison of the costs of the residential corrections program with other correctional programs, it is necessary once again to adjust the Fort Des Moines cost figure. Although costs of administration and capital expenditures are necessary costs of any correctional program, many correctional programs delete these costs before calculating daily per capita cost. Such is the case with the cost figures from the correctional agencies of the State of Iowa, necessitating the deletion of capital and administrative costs from the Fort Des Moines figures.

TABLE XXIX

RESIDENTIAL CORRECTIONS PROGRAM COSTS
ADJUSTED FOR ADMINISTRATION AND CAPITAL EXPENDITURES

	Net Program Budget (From Table XXVII)	Administration Costs	Capital Expenditures	Adjusted Program Budget
1971	\$171,015	\$13,910	\$28,856	\$128,249
1972	361,210	40,825	13,339	307,046
ADJUSTED CLIENT COSTS				
	Cost Per Client Day	Cost Per Client Term	Cost Per Term-Felony	Cost Per Term- Non-Felony
	\$17.78	\$1865	\$2239	\$425

Several program cost comparisons appear to be appropriate.* First, the overall costs of Fort Des Moines can be compared with the Rockwell City Women's Reformatory in the sense that both programs are relatively non-secure, both are assigned felonies and non-felonies, and both provide some in-house treatment and services as well as external services.

The Fort Des Moines Residential Corrections program can also be compared with the Iowa State Men's Reformatory (Anamosa) and the Iowa State Penitentiary (Fort Madison) for those sentenced on felony charges. Such an analysis is biased somewhat in favor of residential corrections since persons convicted of extremely serious charges (which carry longer sentences) are far less often assigned to residential corrections than to a state institution. As such, the per term costs for the state institutions are slightly higher than the per term costs for only those inmates comparable to the clients of residential corrections.

Finally, residential corrections can be compared with the Polk County Jail for persons convicted of non-felonious offenses. In this analysis, the comparison is probably somewhat biased in favor of the jail. Many very short sentences are assigned to the jail rather than to the residential corrections program,

* Much cost information was provided by the Bureau of Adult Corrections, enabling these comparisons.

since the services and treatment of the program would be of negligible value for extremely short sentences.

TABLE XXX
COMPARATIVE COSTS FOR
VARIOUS CORRECTIONAL PROGRAMS

Program	Daily Cost	Average Sentence Served	Cost Per Term
- For All Offenses -			
Fort Des Moines Residential Corrections	\$17.78	104.9 days	\$1865
Women's Reformatory (Rockwell City)	\$21.86	432.0 days	\$9444
- For Felonies -			
Fort Des Moines Residential Corrections	\$17.78	124.9 days	\$2239
Iowa State Men's Reformatory (Anamosa)	\$14.13	715.0 days *	\$10103
Iowa State Penitentiary (Fort Madison)	\$13.09	715.0 days	\$9359
- For Non-Felonies -			
Fort Des Moines Residential Corrections	\$17.78	23.9 days	\$425
Polk County Jail	\$ 9.01	42.0 days	\$378

*The figures available from the Bureau of Adult Corrections do not differentiate between the reformatory and penitentiary with respect to length of sentence served.

These data provided in Table XXX indicate that the Fort Des Moines Residential Corrections program has a much lower per-client cost than any of the state institutions, and, for non-felonies, nearly as low an actual cost as the Polk County Jail.

If it is assumed that the program effectiveness of residential corrections is only equal to the program effectiveness of the state institutions, residential corrections could be utilized by society at approximately one-fourth of the cost of the state institutions with no sacrifice in effectiveness. * To the extent that residential corrections is more effective than current state programs, its cost-effectiveness would be even more favorable.

In addition to the analysis of actual program costs, is the need to examine some additional financial implications of residential corrections. Several features of residential corrections further deflate the real costs of the program to society.

Primary among these cost-deflating features are taxes paid by the client who is employed while committed to the program and the reduction of welfare needs of his dependents.

* This should not be construed to imply that all state institutions should be closed in favor of residential correctional programs - some offenders probably need a highly-secure institution. However, a great number of offenders could be treated in residential correctional programs at a substantial savings.

Although neither of these features is accurately measurable for the purposes of this report, some discussion is possible.

Of the 189 clients (77%) who were employed while committed to residential corrections, income information was collectable for only 69 such clients. For those clients, the average (mean) income while committed was \$1007, with a range from \$50 to \$5700. The average taxable income for the group was \$990. If these amounts are descriptive of all 189 employed clients, the taxable income for all clients would be well in excess of \$150,000, resulting in a further reduction in the real cost of the program to society.

As has been discussed under "Social Effectiveness," clients support their dependents to a greater extent following release from the program than prior to entry into the program. This fact, combined with the knowledge that far more clients are employed, would suggest that the welfare costs of society are also relieved to an extent as the result of the program.

* * * *

From this section it is apparent that the Fort Des Moines Residential Corrections program may be an extremely low-cost correctional effort when compared to ongoing state correctional programs on the basis of cost per client from commitment to release. On that basis, residential corrections

was found to cost approximately one-fourth the amount of the state institutional programs. It was further discovered that the cost of operating the residential corrections program, with its emphasis upon treatment and services, is approximately equal to the cost per term of the Polk County Jail, which is purely custodial.

The already low comparative costs of the residential corrections program are further reduced as "real costs" to society, when consideration is given to such factors as taxes paid from income while a program client, support of dependents during commitment, and welfare relief.

APPENDIX A

RESIDENTIAL CORRECTIONS EVALUATION

DATA COLLECTION FORM

POLK COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF COURT SERVICES
RESIDENTIAL CORRECTIONS
EVALUATION DATA COLLECTION FORM

1. NAME _____
(Last First Middle)
2. I.D. NUMBER (File Number)
3. SOC. SEC. NUMBER
4. COURT DOCKET NUMBER
 (Order Number)
5. DATE RECEIVED AT RCS
6. NUMBER OF PRIOR COMMITMENTS
 TO RESIDENTIAL CORRECTIONS
7. DATE OF BIRTH
8. SEX AND RACE

	male	female
Mex-Amer	0	5
Negro-Amer	1	6
Anglo-Amer	2	7
Amer-Indian	3	8
Other (specify)	4	9
9. RESIDENCE AREA
 - 1 City of Des Moines
 - 2 Outside Des Moines but
 inside Polk County
 - 3 Remainder of 5th Judicial District
 - 4 Remainder of State of Iowa
 - 5 Out of state
 - 9 Other (specify) _____

10. LENGTH OF TIME IN PRESENT RESIDENTIAL AREA

- 1 Less than six months
- 2 Over six months but less than one year
- 3 Over one but less than two years
- 4 Over two but less than three years
- 5 Over three but less than four years
- 6 Over four but less than five years
- 7 Over five but less than ten years
- 8 Over ten years

11. NUMBER OF RESIDENCE CHANGES WITHIN
THE PAST 12 MONTHS

0-1-2-3-4-5-6-7-8-9-or more

12. LIVING ARRANGEMENTS

- 1 Living alone
- 2 Living with wife and family
- 3 Living with parents
- 4 Living with mother
- 5 Living with father
- 6 Living with one parent and one step-parent
- 7 Living with step-parents
- 8 Living with friends (specify)_____
- 9 Other (specify)_____

13. TERMS OF OCCUPANCY

- 1 Own or buying
- 2 Lease
- 3 Rent by month
- 4 Rent by week
- 5 Rent by day
- 6 Pays no rent
- 9 Other)specify)_____

14. NUMBER OF SIBLINGS

15. MARITAL STATUS

- | | |
|-------------|------------------------|
| 0 Single | 5 Common Law Marriage |
| 1 Married | 6 Homosexual Alliance |
| 2 Separated | 7 Communal Setting |
| 3 Divorced | 9 Other (specify)_____ |
| 4 Widow(er) | |

16. NUMBER OF PERSONS DEPENDANT UPON
CLIENT FOR FINANCIAL SUPPORT

17. NUMBER OF PERSONS ACTUALLY SUPPORTED
FINANCIALLY BY CLIENT

18. PARENTS OF CLIENT

- 1 Single Parent Family
- 2 Married
- 3 Divorced
- 4 Separated
- 5 Widowed
- 9 Other (specify)_____

19. MILITARY STATUS

- 0 No prior service
- 1 Honorable discharge
- 2 Discharge other than honorable
- 3 Prior service-discharge or other
action by military pending
- 4 Presently in reserves (specify)_____
- 9 Other (specify)_____

20. PRIOR TO COMMITMENT TO RCS THIS PERSON WAS:

- 1 Released on bond
- 2 Released by Pre-Trial Release
- 3 Released by Community Corrections
- 4 In jail 1-30 days
- 5 In jail 31-90 days
- 6 In jail over 90 days
- 8 On probation
- 9 Other (specify)_____

21. AGE AT FIRST ARREST

22. NUMBER OF PRIOR ARRESTS

23. HAS CLIENT EVER BEEN DETAINED IN
AN INSTITUTION AS A JUVENILE BY
ORDER OF A COURT?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

24. NUMBER OF PRIOR ADULT CONVICTIONS

25. NUMBER OF PROBATION TERMS AS AN ADULT

26. NUMBER OF ADULT JAIL SENTENCES
(including present sentence)

27. NUMBER OF ADULT PRISON SENTENCES

28. NUMBER OF ALIASES (Identify Falsification only)

29. ILLEGAL USE OF DRUGS

a. Marijuana, hashish

- 0 No use
- 1 Infrequent experimentation
- 2 Former regular use; no current use
- 3 Former regular use; current use unknown
- 9 Other (specify) _____

(Please specify amount of current use if known)

b. amphetamines, barbiturates, tranquilizers,
etc.

- 0 No use
- 1 Infrequent experimentation
- 2 Former regular use; no current use
- 3 Former regular use; current use unknown
- 9 Other (specify) _____

(Please specify amount of current use if known)

c. hallucinogens

- 0 No use
- 1 Infrequent experimentation
- 2 Former regular use; no current use
- 3 Former regular use; current use unknown
- 9 Other (specify) _____

(Please specify amount of current use if known)

29. ILLEGAL USE OF DRUGS (cont.)

d. hard narcotics (heroin, morphine, cocaine, etc.)

- 0 No use
- 1 Infrequent experimentation
- 2 Former regular use; no current use
- 3 Former regular use; current use unknown
- 9 Other (specify) _____

(Please specify amount of current use if known)

e. miscellaneous (glue, robitussin, etc.)

- 0 No use
- 1 Infrequent experimentation
- 2 Former regular use; no current use
- 3 Former regular use; current use unknown
- 9 Other (specify) _____

(Please specify amount of current use if known)

f. drugs connected with current case?

- 0 No known connection between drugs and current case
- 1 Yes, on drugs at time of offense
- 2 Yes, crime committed for money to support habit
- 3 Yes, criminal charge is drug-related
- 9 Yes, other (specify) _____

30. KNOWN DIFFICULTIES FROM ALCOHOL

- 1 No known use of alcohol
- 2 Uses alcohol, no difficulties
- 3 Interpersonal problems
- 4 Legal encounters
- 5 Employment difficulties
- 6 Three and four
- 7 Four and five
- 8 Three and five
- 9 Three, four, and five

31. ALCOHOL CONNECTED WITH CURRENT CASE?

- 0 No known connection between alcohol and current case
- 1 Yes, under influence of alcohol at time of offense
- 2 Yes, crime committed to support alcohol habit
- 3 Yes, criminal charge is alcohol related
- 9 Yes, other (specify) _____

32. EMPLOYMENT

- 0 Unemployed
- 1 Full time
- 2 Part time
- 3 Student full time and unemployed
- 4 Student full time and work full time
- 5 Student part time and work full time
- 6 Student part time and work part time
- 7 Unemployable due to irremediable handicap (specify) _____
- 8 Unemployable due to temporary handicap (specify) _____
- 9 Other (specify) _____

33. PRIMARY INCOME SOURCE

- 0 None (explain) _____
- 1 Own employment
- 2 Spouse's employment
- 3 Family
- 4 Compensation, benefit or retirement
- 5 Inheritance or investments
- 6 Public assistance
- 7 Criminal activity
- 8 Other individual
- 9 Other (specify) _____

34. JOB STABILITY (Longest period of employment)

- 0 None
- 1 Less than 1 week
- 2 1 week - 1 month
- 3 1 month - 3 months
- 4 3-6 months
- 5 6 months - 1 year
- 6 1 year - 2 years
- 7 Over 2 years

35. USUAL OCCUPATION LEVEL

- 0 None
- 1 Unskilled
- 2 Semi-skilled
- 3 Skilled
- 4 Clerical
- 5 Sales
- 6 Manager
- 7 Proprietor
- 8 Professional
- 9 Other

36. NUMBER OF MONTHS EMPLOYED DURING LAST 12 MONTHS PRIOR TO ENTERING RCS

37. NUMBER OF JOBS HELD DURING LAST 12 MONTHS PRIOR TO ENTERING RCS

38. TOTAL INCOME FOR PRIOR 12 MONTHS

39. INCOME FOR LAST MONTH PRIOR TO ARREST

40. PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

- 0 None
- 1 Self only
- 2 Dependents only
- 3 Self and dependents

41. I.D. NUMBER (File Number)

42. YEARS OF SCHOOLING COMPLETED

43. DIPLOMAS AND DEGREES

- | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------------|
| 0 None | 5 B.A./B.S. |
| 1 High School Equivalency (GED) | 6 M.A./M.S. |
| 2 High School | 7 Ph.D., M.D. |
| 3 Special Trade | 8 Post-Doctoral |
| 4 A.A. | 9 Other (specify) |

44. SENTENCING OFFENSE
(use offense code list)

45. HOW PROVEN OR SUSTAINED

- 0 No sentence
- 1 Plead guilty
- 2 Jury verdict
- 3 Judge's finding

46. SOURCE OF COMMITMENT

- 1 Awaiting trial (other than community corrections)
- 2 Volunteer
- 3 Community corrections (awaiting trial)
- 4 State referral
- 5 Municipal Court
- 6 District Court
- 7 County Probation Department
- 9 Other (specify) _____

47. TYPE OF SENTENCE

- 1 Jail
- 2 Jail w/ fine or restitution
- 3 Deferred sentence
- 4 Suspended sentence
- 5 No sentence - awaiting trial
- 6 Probation revocation
- 7 Condition of probation
- 8 Condition of parole
- 9 Other (specify) _____

48. LENGTH OF SENTENCE

- 0 No sentence
- 1 1-30 days
- 2 31-90 days
- 3 91-180 days
- 4 181-365 days
- 5 Indefinite

49. ATTORNEY

- 0 None
- 1 Privately retained
- 2 Court appointed
- 3 Offender advocate
- 9 Other (specify) _____

50. EDUCATIONAL AND VOCATION TRAINING

- 0 None
- 1 GED attempted
- 2 GED completed
- 3 Started training or college-dropped out
(specify) _____
- 4 In training or college program
(specify) _____
- 5 Completed training or college program
(specify) _____
- 9 Other (specify) _____

51. NUMBER OF FURLOUGHS GRANTED WHILE
AT RCS

52. TOTAL NUMBER OF DAYS SPENT ON FURLOUGH

53. LENGTH OF TIME IN RCS BEFORE FIRST
FURLOUGH WAS GRANTED (weeks)

54. SERVICE REFERRALS USED AS TREATMENT

a. Vocational Rehabilitation

- 0 None
- 1 Voc.-Educ. Training
- 2 Medical
- 3 Job counseling or placement
- 4 1 and 2
- 5 2 and 3
- 6 1 and 3
- 7 1,2 and 3

b. Employment

- 0 None
- 1 C.E.P.
- 2 O.U.P.
- 3 New Careers
- 4 M.D.T.A.
- 5 Employment Office
- 6 NABS
- 7 Career Exploration Center
- 8 Job seeking skills
- 9 Other (specify) _____

54. SERVICE REFERRALS USED AS TREATMENT (cont.)

c. Education

- 0 None
- 1 Adult Education
- 2 Learning Lab
- 3 Area XI
- 9 Other (specify) _____

d. Legal

- 0 None
- 1 Legal Aid
- 2 Defender Advocate
- 9 Other (specify) _____

e. Drug or Alcohol Treatment

- 0 None
- 1 MIDAC
- 2 Alcoholics Anonymous
- 3 Harrison Treatment
- 4 Clarinda
- 5 V.A. Hospital - Iowa City
- 9 Other (specify) _____

f. Medical

- 0 None
- 1 Broadlawns
- 2 Still College
- 3 Deitz Clinic
- 4 Iowa City Hospital
- 5 V.A. Hospital
- 6 Evelyn Davis Health Center
- 7 Hawley Welfare, Adult Dental
- 9 Other (specify) _____

g. Behavior Modification

- 0 None
- 1 Child Guidance Center
- 2 Polk County Mental Health
- 3 Oakdale
- 4 Polk County Jail
- 9 Other (specify) _____

54. SERVICE REFERRALS USED AS TREATMENT (cont.)

h. Other Service Referrals

- 0 None
- 1 Polk County Welfare
- 2 Salvation Army
- 3 Volunteer Bureau
- 4 Catholic Charities
- 5 Tiny Tots
- 6 Hawley Welfare-Marriage Counseling
- 7 New Life Center
- 9 Other (specify) _____

55. PRIMARY COUNSELING APPROACH USED

- | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1 Individual Counseling | 5 1 and 3 |
| 2 Triads | 6 2 and 3 |
| 3 Drug Team | 7 1,2, and 3 |
| 4 1 and 2 | 9 Other (specify) _____ |

56. NUMBER OF PRIMARY COUNSELOR CHANGES

57. NUMBER OF NEW JOBS OBTAINED WHILE A
RESIDENT OF RCS

- 0 None
- 1 One
- 2 Two
- 3 Three
- 4 Four
- 5 Five or more
- 6 Remained on job held prior to
commitment to RCS
- 9 Other (specify) _____

58. AT WHAT TIME AFTER ENTERING RCS DID
RESIDENT BEGIN EMPLOYMENT OR ENROLL
IN VOCATIONAL OR EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM?

- 0 Never began employment or Ed/Voc Program
- 1 1st week
- 2 2nd week
- 3 3rd or 4th week
- 4 2nd month
- 5 3rd month
- 6 4th month
- 7 After 4th month
- 8 Already employed on in school

59. AMOUNT OF TIME ON LONGEST HELD JOB WHILE
A CLIENT AT RCS

- 0 None
- 1 Less than 1 week
- 2 1 week - 1 month
- 3 1 month - 3 months
- 4 3-6 months
- 5 6 months - 1 year
- 9 Other (specify) _____

60. TOTAL AMOUNT OF TIME EMPLOYED WHILE A
CLIENT AT RCS

- 0 None
- 1 Less than 1 week
- 2 1 week - 1 month
- 3 1 month - 3 months
- 4 3-6 months
- 5 6 months - 1 year
- 9 Other (specify) _____

61. TOTAL INCOME WHILE A CLIENT AT RCS
(include CEP, MDTA)

62. TOTAL TAXABLE INCOME WHILE A CLIENT AT RCS

63. HOW MANY TIMES DURING HIS STAY AT RCS
WAS THIS PERSON RETURNED TO JAIL TEMPORARILY
FOR DISCIPLINE OR TREATMENT?

- | | |
|--------|-----------------|
| 0 None | 2 Two |
| 1 One | 3 Three or more |

64. NUMBER OF DAYS SPENT IN JAIL
AND AT OTHER INSTITUTIONS WHILE
A CLIENT AT RCS
(specify which institution) _____

65. NEW OFFENSE ALLEGED DURING RCS STAY
(use offense list)

66. DISPOSITION OF NEW CHARGES

- 0 Does not apply
- 1 Charges dropped or case dismissed
- 2 Guilty Plea - Returned to RCS
- 3 Guilty Plea - Not returned to RCS
- 4 Found guilty - Returned to RCS
- 5 Found guilty- Not returned to RCS
- 9 Other (specify) _____

OUTCOME DATA

67. TYPE OF RELEASE OR TRANSFER

- 1 Discharge - completed sentence
- 2 Paroled to Court Services Probation Dept.
- 3 Paroled to State Probation and Parole Office
- 4 Returned to jail
- 5 Sent to other institution (specify) _____
- 9 Other (specify) _____

68. DATE OF RELEASE

69. NUMBER OF DAYS SPENT AT RCS

70. RESIDENCE AREA

- 1 City of Des Moines
- 2 Outside Des Moines but inside
Polk County
- 3 Remainder of 5th Judicial District
- 4 Remainder os State of Iowa
- 5 Out of State
- 6 Other institution
- 7 Unknown
- 9 Other (specify) _____

71. TERMS OF OCCUPANCY

- | | |
|-------------------------|----------------|
| 1 Own or buying | 5 Rent by day |
| 2 Lease | 6 No rent paid |
| 3 Rent by month | 7 Detained |
| 4 Rent by week | 8 Unknown |
| 9 Other (specify) _____ | |

72. LIVING ARRANGEMENTS

- 1 Living alone
- 2 Living with wife and family
- 3 Living with parents
- 4 Living with mother
- 5 Living with father
- 6 Living with one parent and one step parent
- 7 Living with step-parents
- 8 Living with friends (specify) _____
- 9 Other (specify) _____

73. MARITAL STATUS

- | | |
|-------------|-------------------------|
| 0 Single | 5 Common law marriage |
| 1 Married | 6 Homosexual alliance |
| 2 Separated | 7 Communal setting |
| 3 Divorced | 9 Other (specify) _____ |
| 4 Widow(er) | |

74. NUMBER OF PERSONS DEPENDENT UPON CLIENT
FOR FINANCIAL SUPPORT

75. NUMBER OF PERSONS ACTUALLY SUPPORTED
FINANCIALLY BY CLIENT

76. EMPLOYMENT

- 0 Unemployed
- 1 Full time
- 2 Part time
- 3 Student full time and unemployed
- 4 Student full time and work full time
- 5 Student part time and work full time
- 6 Student part time and work part time
- 7 Unemployable due to irremediable handicap
(specify) _____
- 8 Unemployable due to temporary handicap
(specify) _____
- 9 Other (specify) _____

77. PRIMARY INCOME SOURCE

- 0 None (explain) _____
- 1 Own employment
- 2 Spouse's employment
- 3 Family
- 4 Compensation, benefit or retirement
- 5 Inheritance or investments
- 6 Public assistance
- 8 Other individual
- 9 Other (specify) _____

78. PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

- 0 None
- 1 Self only
- 2 Dependents only
- 3 Self and dependents

79. DIPLOMAS AND DEGREES

- 0 None
- 1 High School Equivalency
- 2 High School
- 3 Special Trade
- 4 A.A.
- 5 B.A./B.S.
- 6 M.A./M.S.
- 7 Ph. D., M.D.
- 8 Post-Doctoral
- 9 Other (specify) _____

APPENDIX B

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC AND PROCESS VARIABLES

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

<u>Race</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Military Status</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Mexican-American	7	2.9	No Prior Service	154	75.9
Negro-American	77	31.4	Honorable Discharge	17	8.4
Anglo-American	161	65.7	Discharge Other Than Honorable	23	11.3
American-Indian	0	0.0	Prior Service - Discharge/Other	7	3.4
Other	0	0.0	Action Pending		
Total	245	100.0	Presently in Reserves	0	0.0
			Other	2	1.0
			Total	203	100.0

<u>Age</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>S.D.</u>
	240	25.712	8.847

FAMILY AND RESIDENCE

<u>Residence Area</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Length of Time in Present Residential Area</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
City of Des Moines	210	86.4	Less than 6 Months	17	8.7
Outside Des Moines but Inside Polk County	9	3.7	Over 6 Months But Less Than 1 Year	8	5.1
Remainder of 5th Judicial District	11	4.5	Over 1 Year But Less Than 2 Years	3	1.5
Remainder of State of Iowa	5	2.1	Over 2 But Less Than 3 Years	3	1.5
Out of State	7	2.9	Over 3 But Less Than 4 Years	10	5.1
Other	1	0.4	Over 4 But Less Than 5 Years	7	3.6
Total	243	100.0	Over 5 But Less Than 10 Years	10	5.1
			Over 10 Years	137	70.3
			Total	195	100.0

<u>Marital Status</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Parents of Client</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Single	116	47.2	Single Parent Family	9	4.9
Married	65	26.4	Married	85	46.7
Separated	13	5.3	Divorced	55	30.2
Divorced	45	18.3	Separated	6	3.3
Widower	4	1.6	Widowed	22	12.1
Common-law Marriage	3	1.2	Other or Foster Parents	5	2.7
Homosexual Alliance	0	0.0	Total	182	100.0
Communal Setting	0	0.0			
Other	0	0.0			
Total	246	100.0			

FAMILY AND RESIDENCE (cont.)

<u>Living Arrangements</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Terms of Occupancy</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Living Alone	12	5.7	Own or Buying	11	6.3
Living With Wife and Family	62	29.5	Lease	1	0.6
Living With Parents	31	14.8	Rent by Month	70	40.2
Living With Mother	40	19.0	Rent by Week	5	2.9
Living With Father	5	2.4	Rent by Day	1	0.6
Living With One Parent and One Stepparent	13	6.2	Pays No Rent	78	44.8
Living with Step- parent	0	0.0	Contributes When Able	2	1.1
Living With Friends	30	14.3	Other	6	3.4
Other	17	8.1	Total	174	100.0
Total	210	100.0			

	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Number of Residence Changes Within The Past Twelve Months	171	1.1	1.44
Number of Legal Dependents	227	1.1	1.66
Number of Dependents Supported	220	0.5	1.26
Number of Siblings	165	3.818	2.501

CURRENT CASE DESCRIPTION

<u>Prior to Commitment to RCS This Person Was:</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>How Proven or Sustained</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Released on Own Recognizance	7	3.0	No Sentence	21	8.7
Released on Bond	22	9.4	Plead Guilty	168	69.7
Released to Pre-Trial Release	24	10.3	Jury Verdict	17	7.1
Released to Community Corrections	33	14.1	Judge's Findings	35	14.5
			<u>Total</u>	<u>241</u>	<u>100.0</u>
In Jail 1-30 Days	54	23.1			
In Jail 31-90 Days	30	12.8			
In Jail Over 90 Days	27	11.5			
On Probation	18	7.7			
Other	19	8.1			
<u>Total</u>	<u>234</u>	<u>100.0</u>			

<u>Source of Commitment</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Crime Category</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Awaiting trial (Other than Community Corrections)	13	5.3	Offenses Against Persons	31	12.5
Volunteer	4	1.6	Crimes of Sex	5	2.0
Community Corrections (Awaiting Trial)	5	2.0	Offenses Against Property	90	36.7
State Referral	3	1.2	Crimes of Forgery, Fraud and Conspiracy	38	15.6
Municipal Court	12	4.9	Crimes of Weapons, Drugs and Alcohol	42	17.1
District Court	180	73.2	Offenses Against Family and/or Children	24	9.8
County Probation Department	12	4.9	Miscellaneous	15	6.0
Awaiting Trial at RCS Then Sentenced to RCS	15	6.1	<u>Total</u>	<u>245</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Other	2	0.8			
<u>Total</u>	<u>246</u>	<u>100.0</u>			

CURRENT CASE DESCRIPTION (cont.)

<u>Crime Seriousness</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Type of Sentence</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Felony	165	67.34	Jail	133	54.1
Indictable Misdemeanor	46	18.77	Jail with Fine or Restitution	4	1.6
Misdemeanor	12	4.89	Deferred Sentence	28	11.4
Intoxication	1	0.40	Suspended Sentence	29	11.8
Traffic	4	1.63	No Sentence - Awaiting Trial	17	6.9
Other	14	5.71	Probation Revocation	16	6.5
Uncodable	3	1.22	Condition of Probation	9	3.7
Total	245	100.0	Condition of Parole	6	2.4
			Other	4	1.6
			Total	246	100.0

<u>Length of Sentence</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Attorney</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
No Sentence	20	8.1	None	27	12.1
1 to 30 Days	49	19.9	Privately-Retained	68	30.5
31 to 90 Days	10	4.1	Court-Appointed	127	57.0
91 to 180 Days	22	8.9	Offender Advocate	0	0.0
181 to 365 Days	107	43.5	Other	1	0.4
Indefinite	38	15.4	Total	223	100.0
Total	246	100.0			

CRIMINAL HISTORY

	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Age at First Arrest	188	17.812	6.053
Number of Prior Arrests	186	4.452	3.091
Prior Adult Convictions	188	1.888	2.513
Prior Probation Terms	181	0.365	0.836
Prior Adult Jail Sentences	187	0.904	1.607
Prior Adult Prison Sentences	205	0.337	0.791
Number of Aliases	217	0.106	0.423

<u>Has Client Ever Been Detained in an Institution As a Juvenile on Order of a Court?</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Yes	70	36.3
No	123	63.7
<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	193	100.0

EMPLOYMENT AND INCOME

<u>Employment</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Primary Income Source</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Unemployed	142	58.0	None	21	9.3
Full-Time	91	37.1	Own Employment	108	47.8
Part-Time	3	1.2	Spouse's Employment	6	2.7
Student Full-Time and Unemployed	5	2.0	Family	30	13.3
Student Full-Time and Work Full-Time	1	0.4	Compensation, Benefit, Retirement	2	0.9
Student Part-Time and Work Part-Time	1	0.4	Public Assistance	3	1.3
Unemployable Due To Temporary Handicap	1	0.4	Criminal Activity	51	22.6
Other	1	0.4	Other Individual	2	0.9
			Other	3	1.3
Total	245	100.0	Total	226	100.0

<u>Longest Held Job</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Public Assistance</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
None	9	5.5	None	191	77.6
Less Than 1 Week	7	4.3	Self Only	3	1.2
1 Week to 1 Month	15	9.1	Dependents Only	17	6.9
1 Month to 3 Months	28	17.1	Self and Dependents	1	0.4
3-6 Months	26	15.9	Dependent Upon a Welfare Recipient	5	2.0
6 Months to 1 Year	16	9.8			
1 Year to 2 Years	31	18.9	Total	217	100.0
Over 2 Years	32	19.5			
Total	164	100.0			

EMPLOYMENT AND INCOME (cont.)

<u>Usual Occupational Level</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>		<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
None	11	5.1	Number of Months Employed During Last 12 Months	130	4.2	3.68
Unskilled	112	51.6				
Semi-Skilled	56	25.8	Number of Jobs Held In Last 12 Months	154	1.5	1.23
Skilled	17	7.8				
Clerical	2	0.9				
Sales	10	4.6				
Manager	4	1.8				
Proprietor	1	0.5				
Professional	2	0.9				
Other	2	0.9				
<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>				
Total	217	100.0				

EDUCATION

<u>Diplomas and Degrees</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>		<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
None	124	50.8	Years of Schooling Completed	237	10.4	1.99
GED	42	17.2				
High School	72	29.5				
Special Trade	3	1.2				
AA	0	0.0				
BA/BS	2	0.8				
MA/MS	1	0.4				
Ph.D./MD	0	0.0				
Post-Doctoral	0	0.0				
Other	0	0.0				
<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>				
Total	244	100.0				

DRUG AND ALCOHOL USE

<u>Marijuana and Hashish</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Hallucinogens</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
No Use	85	38.8	No Use	127	63.2
Infrequent Experimentation	26	11.9	Infrequent Experimentation	32	15.9
Former Regular Use No Current Use	7	3.2	Former Regular Use No Current Use	8	4.0
Former Regular Use Current Use Unknown	95	43.4	Former Regular Use Current Use Unknown	33	16.4
Current Heavy Use	6	2.7	Current Heavy Use	1	0.5
Other	0	0.0	Other	0	0.0
Total	219	100.0	Total	201	100.0

<u>Amphetamines, Barbiturates, Tranquilizers Etc.</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Hard Narcotics</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
No Use	110	53.1	No Use	141	65.6
Infrequent Experimentation	34	16.4	Infrequent Experimentation	13	6.0
Former Regular Use No Current Use	12	5.8	Former Regular Use No Current Use	9	4.2
Former Regular Use Current Use Unknown	49	23.7	Former Regular Use Current Use Unknown	50	23.3
Current Heavy Use	2	1.0	Current Heavy Use	2	0.9
Other	0	0.0	Other	0	0.0
Total	207	100.0	Total	215	100.0

DRUG AND ALCOHOL USE (cont.)

<u>Miscellaneous</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Drugs Connected With Current Case</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
No Use	146	76.0	No Known Connection	154	67.2
Infrequent Experimentation	21	10.9	Yes, on Drugs at Time of Offense	9	3.9
Former Regular Use No Current Use	3	1.6	Yes, Crime Committed For Money to Support Habit	29	12.7
Former Regular Use Current Use Unknown	22	11.5	Yes, Criminal Charge is Drug-Related	31	13.5
Current Heavy Use	0	0.0	Yes, Other	5	2.2
Other	0	0.0	Total	228	100.0
Total	192	100.0			

<u>Known Difficulties From Alcohol</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Alcohol Connected With Current Case</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
1 No Known Use of Alcohol	31	14.6	No Known Connection Between Alcohol and Current Case	185	82.6
2 Uses Alcohol, No Difficulties	96	45.3	Yes, Under the Influence of Alcohol at Time of Offense	34	15.2
3 Interpersonal Problems	18	8.5	Yes, Crime Committed to Support Alcohol Habit	2	0.9
4 Legal Encounters	25	11.8	Yes, Criminal Charge is Alcohol-Related	2	0.9
5 Employment Difficulties	0	0.0	Yes, Other	1	0.4
3 & 4	18	8.5	Total	224	100.0
4 & 5	3	1.4			
3,4, & 5	0	0.0			
Total	212	100.0			

TREATMENT/COUNSELING - THE PROCESS

	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Range</u>
Number of Primary Counselor Changes	231	0.571	1.064	7.000
Number of Furloughs	199	6.025	7.501	38.000
Number of Days Spent on Furlough	200	23.105	31.426	99.000
Length of Time Before First Furlough (Weeks)	134	3.917	2.610	13.000
Number of Days Spent in Jail While a Client	229	4.852	16.986	99.000
Number of Referrals to Jail While a Client	231	0.147	0.452	3.000

PRIMARY COUNSELING APPROACH USED

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
1 Individual Counseling	179	77.4
2 Triads	15	6.5
3 Drug Team	5	2.2
1 & 2	16	6.9
1 & 3	14	6.1
2 & 3	1	0.4
1, 2 & 3	1	0.4
<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	231	100.0

EMPLOYMENT AND INCOME DURING COMMITMENT

<u>Number of New Jobs Obtained While a Client at RCS</u>			<u>Total Amount of Time Employed While a Client at RCS</u>		
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>		<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
None	41	17.7	None	40	17.5
One	53	21.5	Less Than 1 Week	12	5.2
Two	32	13.0	1 Week to 1 Month	62	27.1
Three	18	7.3	1 Month to 3 Months	62	27.1
Four	6	2.4	3 to 6 Months	41	17.9
Five or More	12	4.9	6 Months to 1 Year	12	5.2
Remained on Job Held Prior to Commitment to RCS	68	27.6	Total	229	100.0
Other	1	0.4			
Total	231	100.0			

<u>Length of Time on Longest Held Job While a Client at RCS</u>					
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>		<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u> <u>Standard Deviation</u>
None	41	17.8	Number of New Jobs	163	1.61 1.53
Less Than 1 Week	11	4.8	Total Income While at RCS	104	\$668.53 922.28
1 Week to 1 Month	79	34.3	Total Taxable Income While at RCS	105	\$622.08 924.86
1 Month to 3 Months	68	29.6			
3 to 6 Months	25	10.9			
6 Months to 1 Year	6	3.6			
Total	230	100.0			

SERVICE REFERRALS

<u>Vocational Rehabilitation</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Employment</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Number of Clients Referred	114	49.0	Number of Clients Referred	95	41.5
Types of Referrals:			Types of Referrals:		
Vocational/ Educational	28	14.0	CEP	18	13.23
Medical	79	39.5	OUP	1	0.74
Job Counseling and Placement	93	46.5	New Careers	1	0.74
			MDTA	12	8.82
			Employment Office	63	46.32
Total Number of Referrals	200	100.0	Career Exploration Center	29	21.32
			Job-Seeking Skills	3	2.21
			Other	9	6.62
			Total Number of Referrals	136	100.0
<u>Education</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Legal</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Number of Clients Referred	71	28.86	Number of Clients Referred	26	10.57
Types of Referrals:			Types of Referrals:		
Adult Education	52	57.14	Legal Aid	24	92.31
Learning Lab	8	8.79	Offender Advocate	1	3.85
Area XI	18	19.78	Other	1	3.85
Other	13	14.29			
			Total Number of Referrals	26	100.00
Total Number of Referrals	91	100.0			

SERVICE REFERRALS (cont.)

<u>Medical</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Behavior Modification</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Number of Clients Referred	113	46.94	Number of Clients Referred	29	11.70
Types of Referrals:			Types of Referrals:		
Broadlawns	54	35.29	Child Guidance	3	8.82
Still College	6	3.92	Oakdale-Iowa Security Medical Facility	6	17.65
Deitz Clinic	59	38.56	Polk County Jail	25	73.53
Iowa City Hospital	1	0.65			
Veterans Administration Hosp.	7	4.58	Total	34	100.00
Evelyn Davis Health Center	2	1.31			
Hawley Welfare-Adult Dental	12	7.84	<u>Drug or Alcohol Treatment</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Other	12	7.84	Number of Clients Referred	32	13.01
Total	153	100.00	Types of Referrals:		
Other Service Referrals	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	Mid-Iowa Drug Abuse Council	2	1.41
Number of Clients Referred	16	6.50	Alcoholics Anonymous	2	1.41
Types of Referrals:			Harrison Detoxification Center	2	1.41
Polk County Welfare	6	33.33	Clarinda State Mental Hospital	4	2.82
Salvation Army	3	16.67	Veterans Administration -Iowa City-Hospital	2	1.41
Volunteer Bureau	3	16.67	Antabuse	8	5.63
Catholic Charities	1	5.56	Urinalysis	110	77.46
Hawley Welfare-Marriage Counseling	1	5.56	Other	12	8.45
New Life Center	2	11.11	Total	142	100.00
Other	2	11.11			
Total	18	100.00			

ADMINISTRATIVE

At What Time After
Entering RCS Did
Resident Begin
Employment or Enroll
in Vocational or
Educational Program?

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Type of Release or Transfer</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Never Began Employment or Ed/Voc Program	31	13.6	Discharge - completed Sentence	74	31.9
1st Week	29	12.7	Paroled to Court Services Probation Department	81	34.9
2nd Week	22	9.6	Paroled to State Probation and Parole Services	8	3.4
3rd or 4th Week	26	11.4	Returned to Jail	23	9.9
2nd Month	24	10.5	Sent to Other Institution	8	3.4
3rd Month	6	2.6	Escaped	21	9.1
4th Month	1	0.4	Other	17	7.3
After 4th Month	5	2.2			
Already Employed or in School	84	36.8			
<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	228	100.0	Total	232	100.0

	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Range</u>
Number of Days Spent at RCS	232	104.914	102.836	452.000