

PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
EDUCATION OUTCOME STUDY

**Report Prepared
by
Linda G. Smith, Ph. D.**

May 2005

**Stephen Steurer, Ph.D.
Project Director
Correctional Education Association
Lanham, MD**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank Secretary Jeffrey Beard, Ph.D. from the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections and former Secretary Martin Horn for their support of this project. We also would like to acknowledge the assistance we received from Office of Planning, Research, Statistics and Grants at DOC. Two people from that office--Dr. Gary Zajak and Ms. Bethany Gardner—were especially helpful. Dr. Zajak offered many insights into the research and provided thoughtful comments on the writing of the report. Certainly this project would have been difficult, if not impossible, without the help of Bethany Gardner. She organized the training sessions and advisory committee meetings, set up visits to the institutions for both the administration of the surveys and the collection of the data for the case files, coordinated the collection of the data from L & I, and also offered helpful comments on the writing of this report. We would like to express our appreciation to the Bureau of Correction Education for their assistance in carrying out this research project. We would also like to thank the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency who funded this study, and the staff of PCCD who assisted us with reports and fiscal issues. We especially thank Deborah Almoney of PCCD who worked late and on weekends to get us the criminal histories.

We greatly appreciated the assistance we received from all of the correctional institutions who participated in the study. Everyone was always helpful and accommodating. We would be remiss, however, if we didn't send a special thanks to Dan Dugalis and the correctional staff at Dallas State Correctional Institution for extraordinary assistance. Dan along with Terry Bowersox from Cambridge Springs State Correctional Institution kept the surveys coming to us. We also want to thank the education advisory committee for their insights and suggestions during this study.

Special recognition goes to the Lois Fegan who assisted with the data collection and data entry. She drove many miles in all kinds of weather and worked diligently in the collection of data.

Finally we would like to acknowledge all of the offenders who participated in the survey and follow-up interviews and who did so without compensation. It is our hope that the information they provided will help guide us in our recommendations for improved and enhanced services in the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections educational program.

Executive Summary

This study reports the findings from the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections' (DOC) Education Outcome Study (EOS). A previous report documented the process evaluation of the academic and vocational programs implemented and operated within DOC with emphasis on the vocational program (Phase 1). This report (Phase 2) focuses on the outcomes, specifically how well correctional education programs in Pennsylvania work in reducing recidivism and increasing employment opportunities after release from incarceration. We used both a treatment (those inmates who participated in education programs while incarcerated) and a comparison (those who did not participate in any correctional education programming during incarceration) group of inmates for our study population who were released between 2001 and 2003.

This report includes: (1) a literature review of correctional education programming; (2) a brief overview of the Pennsylvania DOC's correctional education program, (3) the purpose of the evaluation; (4) research methodology including hypotheses, research design, limitations of the study, data collection instruments and measures, data collection procedures, data analyses, study population characteristics and a discussion of selection bias; (5) results including recidivism and employment; and (6) conclusions and recommendations.

Study Population and Data Elements

Using a release cohort of 1566 inmates (1123 education participants and 443 non-participants), several data elements were collected and included in this study:

- A Pre-release Survey (1566 inmates)
- Education and Institutional Records (a sub-sample of 500 inmates)
- Official Criminal Histories (980 inmates)
- Official Labor Data (953 inmates)

It should be noted that we were only able to follow the study population for one year because of time constraints, and we were unable to follow the entire study population for recidivism and employment outcomes as not all of the 1566 inmates included in the pre-release survey had been released for at least one year (this was our minimum cutoff for follow-up).

Study Population Characteristics and Needs

The study population, both the participants in correctional education and the non-participants, have characteristics and needs that put them at a high risk for recidivating. These characteristics and needs also increase barriers for them to obtain legal employment. We found that:

- Both groups in the study population had unstable family situations both historically and currently.
- More than half of both groups in the study population were single.
- More than half of both groups in the study population had children under the age of 18 but did not have pre-prison employment wages to support a family (and as the data show they did not have post-prison wages to support a family).
- Both groups in the study population had unstable employment histories with significant periods of unemployment.
- More than 80% of both groups in the study population had significant substance abuse histories but less than half had ever received any type of treatment either out-patient or in-patient.
- Both groups in the study population had low literacy levels (below 9th grade competency level for reading, math and spelling).
- Both groups in the study population had long-term and serious criminal histories including high rates of recidivism in the past.
- Close to 30% of the study population had mental health concerns (rates were significantly higher than national averages for incarcerated populations).
- More than half of both groups in the study population resided pre and post prison in large, high crime urban areas.

Results

The study's findings focused on recidivism and post-release employment as reported in official records for criminal histories and the Labor and Industry Council's employment and wage data.

Recidivism Outcomes

We used rearrest, rearrest by education program type, reimprisonment, reimprisonment by education program type, "all recidivism," and "all recidivism" by education program type as our measures of recidivism. The "all recidivism" measure combined rearrest and reimprisonment into one measure for reasons explained in the body of this document. Because of time constraints resulting in little or no data for reconviction we did not include this measure as originally planned nor did we include recidivism offenses for the same reason. Our findings show:

- For rearrest correctional education participants had lower rates of recidivism (23.6%) compared to the non-participants (29.4%), and using a logistic regression model, correctional education participation was found to significantly reduce the odds of rearrest (statistically significant). These rates are much lower compared to national statistics reported by the Bureau of Justice Statistics (44.1% of 272,111 prisoners followed for one-year were rearrested).

- For rearrest by education program type, participation in multiple education programs (program stacking) resulted in the lowest recidivism rate for rearrest (21.8%) followed by participation in basic education (26.1%), vocational education (27.9%), and GED (31.3%). Again all of these rates are lower than the national statistics for a one-year follow-up.
- For reimprisonment, correctional education participants had a slightly higher rate of reimprisonment (52.7%) compared to non-participants (50.9%). However, there was no statistically significant difference between the two groups and the majority of the correctional education participants were reimprisoned for parole violations (over 90%). It should be noted that we had data from two sources for reimprisonment (official criminal histories and the DOC database) which explains why we have higher reimprisonment rates than rearrest rates. Most recidivism studies rely only on one source for reimprisonment data.
- For reimprisonment by education program type, participation in multiple programs again produced the lowest rates (46.6%) followed by participation in basic education (58.0%), GED (60.0%) and vocational education (62.9%). It should be noted that we had very small numbers in each of the categories because of the short follow-up period.
- For “all recidivism” correctional education participants had lower rates of recidivism (40.9%) compared to non-participants (45.9%) but the results were not statistically significant.
- For “all recidivism” by education program type, we see a consistent pattern with participation in multiple education programs having the lowest rates (38.3%) followed by GED participation (46.9%), vocational education (47.2%) and basic education (48.9%).

Employment Outcomes

We used legally employed, legally employed by program type, quarters worked, and wages earned by quarter as our measures of post-release employment. The following are the results for the employment outcomes:

- For legally employed, correctional education participants had a lower rate of employment (55.8%) compared to non-participants (59.1%) although the differences were not statistically significant.
- For legally employed by education program type, participation in multiple education programs showed the highest rates of employment (56.4%) followed by GED (53.1%), basic education (52.9%) and vocational classes (50.7%).
- For quarters worked, participants showed higher rates for having worked 4 or more quarters (25.6%) compared to non-participants who only showed a rate of

22.5% for having worked 4 or more quarters. While participants showed a slightly higher rate (44.2%) of having worked no quarters compared to the non-participants (41.0%), for those employed, participants were working for a longer period of time compared to non-participants.

- For wages earned, the quarterly wages for the education participants averaged \$5060.88 per quarter. From this information we also figured the participant's monthly and weekly wages which were \$1686.96 monthly, and \$389.59 weekly (which is slightly lower than their reported pre-incarceration weekly wage). The non-participants averaged \$5095.46 per quarter, \$1698.48 monthly, and \$392.25 weekly, which was also slightly lower than their pre-incarceration salary. There was almost no difference between the participants and the non-participants on wages per quarter, monthly wages, and weekly wages although the wages earned was slightly higher for the non-participants than the education participants.

Recommendations

Based on our findings in the EOS we make the following recommendations:

- Utilize better testing, assessment and education planning for participants in correctional education especially pre and post educational testing and educational assessment prior to release.
- Share and collaborate more with treatment staff and community program providers. Teachers are sometimes unaware of problems other than education that offenders may have.
- Encourage offenders to participate in other education programs with a progression from ABE to GED to vocational classes when possible along with participation in non-traditional education programs such as life skills.
- Strengthen ties to education programs in the community and assist inmates in making contact with them prior to release.
- Recognize the achievement by inmates in some meaningful way. The state of Indiana by statute can reduce sentence length for GED attainment.
- Recognize the achievement by staff such as opportunities to attend conferences, seminars, and advanced education classes.
- Provide more training for staff. New research for education problems such as reading disabilities could improve the delivery of education programs.
- Work on a better match-up between vocational classes and labor market demands and work more closely with community employers.

- Improve data maintenance to show what has been accomplished in the education programs.
- Conduct a longer follow-up period, three years at a minimum, to assess the recidivism and employment outcomes for correctional education participants.

Overall, the results of the recidivism portion of the study are promising. The results for the rearrest measure showed a significantly lower rate of rearrest for correctional education participants compared to non-participants. In addition, the rearrest rates were much lower than those in the national study conducted by the Bureau of Justice Statistics for offenders released from incarceration after one year.

The post-release employment outcomes, however, did not show any significant difference between the correctional education participants and non-participants. This is where improvement and enhancement of the education program is critically needed, and by DOC and BCE focusing their efforts on employment outcomes, they could see better outcomes for these measures in the future. Also the assumption is that better employment outcomes would most likely produce improved recidivism outcomes.

It should be emphasized as pointed out previously that the characteristics of the study population show that the education staff is dealing with a high-risk population that has serious barriers to successful reentry upon release from incarceration particularly with employment. Having knowledge of these characteristics particularly the past offense/recidivism history, the prior employment and substance abuse history, the low literacy levels and the unstable family backgrounds might help in understanding the more disappointing outcomes of this study.

The Pennsylvania Department of Corrections has already implemented many of the recommendations related to the findings from the process evaluation. We believe that the findings and recommendations from the EOS (the second phase of the correctional education study) in the Pennsylvania DOC correctional education program will also result in improved outcomes.

Table of Contents

	Page
Acknowledgements.....	ii
Executive Summary.....	iii
List of Tables.....	x
Introduction	1
Brief Literature Review.....	2
Pennsylvania Department of Corrections Education Program.....	5
Purpose of the Study.....	7
Research Methodology.....	8
Research Hypotheses.....	9
Research Design.....	9
Study Limitations.....	10
Data Collection Instruments and Measures.....	11
Inmate Pre-Release Survey.....	12
Institutional/Education Case File Data Collection Form.....	13
Criminal History Data.....	14
Employment Data.....	15
Measures.....	16
Data Collection Procedures.....	17
Inmate Pre-Release Survey.....	17
Institutional/Education Case File Data Collection Form.....	20
Criminal History Data.....	21

Employment Data.....	22
Data Analyses.....	22
Study Population Characteristics.....	23
From the Pre-Release Survey.....	24
From the Institutional/Education Case Files.....	34
Selection Bias.....	36
Results.....	39
Recidivism Outcomes.....	40
Employment Outcomes.....	47
Conclusions.....	50
Recommendations.....	53
References.....	56
Appendix A: Informed Consent and Pre-Release Survey.....	57
Appendix B: Institutional/Education Case File Form.....	83
Appendix C: Interviews Schedules and Letters.....	95
Appendix D: Case File Tables.....	102

List of Tables

	Page
Table 1: Study Population by Institution.....	18
Table 2: Study Population by Custody Levels.....	19
Table 3: Study Population by Correctional Education Participation.....	23
Table 4: Demographic Variables for Study Population.....	25
Table 5: Family Variables for Study Population.....	26
Table 6: Employment and Wage Data for Study Population.....	28
Table 7: Criminal History Data for Study Population.....	30
Table 8: Education Variables for Study Population.....	32
Table 9: Misconduct./Informal Resolution Charges for Study Population....	33
Table 10: Logistic Regress Model for Motivation.....	38
Table 11: Univariate and Bivariate Descriptives for Rearrest.....	41
Table 12: Logistic Regression Model for Rearrest.....	43
Table 13: Rearrest by Type of Education Program.....	43
Table 14: Univariate and Bivariate Descriptives for Reimprisonment.....	44
Table 15: Reimprisonment by Type of Education Program.....	45
Table 16: Univariate and Bivariate Descriptives for All Recidivism.....	46
Table 17: All Recidivism by Type of Education Program.....	46
Table 18: Post Release Employment.....	47
Table 19: Post Release Employment by Type of Education Program.....	48
Table 20: Post Release Quarters Worked.....	49
Table 21: Post Release Wages.....	50

INTRODUCTION

Educating incarcerated offenders continues to be a challenging and controversial issue. Correctional administrators, along with policymakers, are faced with answering the question of how well do correctional education programs "work" in reducing recidivism and increasing employment prospects in addition to the traditional outcomes of increasing literacy and job skill levels. Despite recent research indicating that these programs show promise of lowering recidivism and improving employment opportunities, correctional education programs constantly face scrutiny and fear of reduced budgets or termination of programs (Steurer and Smith, 2002; Lawrence, Mears, Dubin, and Travis, 2002; Cecil, Drapkin, MacKenzie, and Hickman, 2000; Wilson, Gallagher and MacKenzie, 2000; Phipps, Korinek, Aos, and Lieb, 1999).

While the climate for both education and treatment programs for incarcerated offenders was always difficult, Congress got much tougher on crime in the 1990s. Consequently, programs including correctional education were viewed as a luxury not deserved by inmates, and many programs for incarcerated offenders were either eliminated or sustained reduced budgets during this time. Inmate eligibility for Pell grants for post secondary education was entirely abolished in 1994. Federal adult and vocational education set asides for correctional agencies were dropped a few years later. There were even limitations put on the right to special education services for the incarcerated. One state even terminated all full time teachers in the state prisons (Smith, 1997). Therefore, it is not surprising that correctional education for incarcerated offenders has become an important issue for policymakers and correctional administrators across the country.

Brief Literature Review

Because the allocation of scarce resources for correctional programs depends on valid and empirically sound research which shows positive outcomes for these programs, evaluations of correctional programs including education are receiving more attention and closer examination. Until recently, most evaluations of correctional education programs have been methodologically weak lacking the research rigor needed to draw definitive conclusions about the impact and outcomes of these programs. The Evaluation Research Group at the University of Maryland concluded that “Many of the studies evaluating basic education and GED programs for correctional offenders employed methodological strategies that can only produce questionable findings” (Cecil, Drapkin, MacKenzie, and Hickman, 2000, p. 211).

The Urban Institute in *The Practice and Promise of Prison Programming* reviewed evaluation research of correctional programs and also examined educational, vocational, prison industries, and employment services programs in seven states --Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin (Lawrence, Mears, Dubin, and Travis, 2002). They also cited weak research designs, failure to address issues related to selection bias, failure to identify and isolate specific program effects, inability to differentiate the types of programs, and a lack of any meaningful examination of long-term outcomes. But, they, too, concluded that despite the weaknesses of previous studies, correctional programming does show promise of reducing recidivism and increasing post-release employment of offenders.

The Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP) (Phipps, Korinek, Aos, and Lieb, 1999) conducted one of the most comprehensive reviews of both community-based and institutional correctional programs in the United States and Canada including education. In their overview of Adult Basic Education programs, they state:

Adult Basic Education (ABE) of felony offenders appears to be a promising, but still unproven, crime reduction strategy. The premise behind ABE is that many inmates lack basic abilities in reading, writing, and mathematics and if these skills are increased, then offenders have a better chance of avoiding criminal behavior when released from prison. The Institute's review of the national research literature found that this question has not been extensively or rigorously evaluated. Only a handful of studies have been published on this topic, and most employ fairly weak research designs. (p.53)

Wilson, Gallagher, and MacKenzie (2000) conducted a meta-analysis of 33 independent experimental and quasi-experimental evaluations of recidivism for education, vocation, and work programs. Meta-analysis is a statistical approach that has been used in corrections to evaluate "what works" questions by using rigorous, quantitative techniques to examine program effectiveness. They found that program participants are employed at a higher rate and recidivate at a lower rate than non-participants in education, vocation, and work programs in corrections with "the reduction in reoffending greater for education programs than for work programs" (p. 361). They too raised concerns about methodological weaknesses in corrections-based research as well as problems of self-selection bias as did the previous studies by the Maryland Evaluation Research Group, the Urban Institute, and the Washington State Institute for Public Policy.

The OCE/CEA Three-State Recidivism Study of Correctional Education was rigorously designed to eliminate most of the methodological weaknesses pointed out in the literature and answer the question – is there any value in education for the incarcerated (Smith, 2003). Funded by the U. S. Department of Education, Office of Correctional Education, the Correctional Education Association (CEA) began a four-year study of Maryland, Minnesota, and Ohio's prison education programs. The study included: (1) using both a treatment and comparison group for the study; (2) using statistical controls for factors other than participation in correctional education that might impact recidivism; (3) addressing concerns related to self-selection bias; (4) using more than one measure of recidivism including re-arrest, re-conviction,

and re-incarceration; and, (5) using a longer period of time for assessing outcomes (three years). Initially, this study focused primarily on the recidivism outcome but the focus of the research was extended to include employment and wage data as well. This information has been rarely examined in the context of the impact of correctional education. In addition, a great deal of demographic/background data was collected from the study participants to really look carefully at the characteristics and needs of incarcerated offenders who participated in correctional education and those incarcerated offenders who did not participate. This was done to gain information that could assist correctional education administrators in their strategic planning for correctional education programming. Eight research hypotheses were developed for the study which focused on the post-release behavior of recidivism and employment.

The study groups in the OCE/CEA recidivism study consisted of a release cohort of offenders from Maryland, Minnesota, and Ohio who had participated in correctional education during incarceration (N=1375, 43.3%) and those who had not participated while incarcerated (N=1797, 56.7%). A total of 3170 inmates were selected for participation in the study and criminal history records for 3099 were examined for a period of three years after release from incarceration. Data for the study were collected from five primary sources: (1) Inmate Self-Report Pre-Release Survey, (2) Institutional/Educational Records, (3) Parole Officer Surveys, (4) Criminal history data, and (5) Employment and Wage data. Several analyses were conducted as part of this study including bivariate and multivariate analyses and propensity score analyses to address selection bias. All states showed reductions in recidivism for the correctional education participants in the bivariate analyses and two states showed statistically significant reductions in recidivism for the participants. The multivariate analyses also showed that participants in correctional education were less likely to recidivate than non-participants. The employment

data showed, post-release, the earnings of the correctional education participants were higher than the non-participants but the non-participants had higher rates of employment compared to the participants. Higher wages generally indicate that individuals are better able to support themselves and their families and are engaged in jobs that hold promise of sustainability (Smith, 2003). The Pennsylvania Department of Corrections Education Outcome Study (EOS) replicates many of the components of the OCE/CEA recidivism study and will add to the ongoing base of knowledge of how well correctional education works. In addition, the current study examined in depth the institutional and educational records of 500 of the 1566 study participants and includes a sub-sample of follow-up interviews with the study participants after their release from incarceration.

Pennsylvania Department of Corrections Education Program

The Pennsylvania Department of Corrections Education Program offers many educational opportunities for those incarcerated in the state's prison system. Education programs are offered in 26 prisons and are under the Bureau of Correction Education (BCE) within the Department of Corrections. The three primary areas of the education program include academic education, vocational programs, and non-traditional education programs. Academic education includes Mandatory Education, Adult Basic Education (ABE), Chapter 1, Special Education, Laubach Literacy, General Education Development (GED), Pre-GED, Commonwealth Secondary Diploma, English as a Second Language (ESL), and Post Secondary Education (college-level courses). Vocational programs offer entry level employment skills in technology, mechanical and technical, business, trades/industrial, and service occupations. Several apprenticeship programs are available to inmates serving a longer sentence (see the process report for a complete listing of vocational programs offered). The non-traditional

education programs include Victim Awareness Act 143, Life Skills, Read to Your Children, Multiculturalism, Citizenship, Employability Skills, Career Planning, Wellness, HIV Peer Instruction Education, and Parenting. It should be noted that in some institutions the responsibility for these classes are handled by or shared with the prison's counseling/treatment staff.

All teachers are state certified and the Special Education program follows the state standards and regulations. Although inmates are screened at the the Diagnostic and Classification centers at Camp Hill and Muncy for medical and programmatic needs including education, inmates are usually screened again upon arrival at their assigned institution and are given educational information during that facility's orientation. Request forms for participation in education classes are provided, and all requests are followed by a contact for screening, testing, interviews, and placement. Education programs are designed as open-entry/open-exit enabling students to progress at their own pace. Enrollment, testing, and attendance data are maintained at each institution.

The Pennsylvania Department of Corrections Education Program serves about 25-30% of the total inmate population on any given day and about 70% during the year. DOC awarded 958 GED's and 3700 vocational certificates to inmates participating in correctional education programs in 2003 (Pennsylvania Department of Corrections, 2004). All of their institutions are accredited by the Correctional Education Association which ensures that the education program meets all six of the applicable principles of effective interventions: integrity of services, responsivity, criminogenic needs, theoretical foundations, community-based program integration, and assessment (Pennsylvania Department of Corrections, 2003 p. 2-3). Seventy-eight standards provide a comprehensive framework for evaluating educational programs in

correctional settings, and in order to achieve accreditation by CEA an agency must comply with 100% of the 24 required standards and 90% of the non-required standards (see the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections *Program Analysis: A Description of PA DOC Programs and an Evaluation of their Effectiveness*, May 2003 for a complete breakdown of how the CEA standards ensures compliance with the principles of effective intervention).

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

In keeping with their efforts to continually evaluate the efficacy and effectiveness of programs within the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections, former Secretary of Corrections, Martin Horn requested proposals through the Office of Planning, Research, Statistics, and Grants (PRSG) to conduct both a process and outcome evaluation of the correctional education program. The present Secretary of Corrections, Jeffrey Beard, Ph.D., also supports the current project and has provided assistance through his staff in carrying out the evaluation of the education programs in DOC. The primary purposes of the evaluations were (1) to study the processes by which the Department of Corrections and the Bureau of Corrections Education implement and operate the education programs for inmates with a specific focus on the vocational education programs (the process evaluation), and (2) to examine both the recidivism and employment outcomes of the inmates who participated in correctional education and a comparison group of those inmates who did not participate in any correctional education programming after release from incarceration (outcome evaluation).

The solicitation for proposals was issued by the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency (PCCD) in 2000. PCCD is the third-party source of funding and a totally separate entity from the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections. PCCD reviewed by committee the proposals submitted and selected and awarded the Correctional Education Association a grant to

conduct both the process evaluation and outcome evaluation in two phases. The first phase of the project (the process evaluation) has been completed and submitted. The present report presents the findings from the second phase of the project - the outcome evaluation. During both phases of the evaluations, an advisory committee made up of correctional education teachers and principals, superintendents from various institutions, research staff, and staff from the central office of the Department of Corrections monitored the progress of the evaluations. The purpose of the advisory committee was to offer insight into the education programs and to answer questions from the research team regarding the correctional education programs.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In this section of the report, the methodology for the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections Education Outcome Study (EOS) is outlined. Research hypotheses, research design, study limitations, data collection instruments and measures, data collection procedures, data analyses, and study population characteristics are included in the discussion. A discussion of selection bias as it relates to this study is also included in this section. It should be noted that this evaluation replicates to a great extent the research design used in the Three-State OCE/CEA Recidivism Study conducted in Ohio, Maryland, and Minnesota (Smith, 2002) and improves upon some of the limitations cited in Three-State study. Specifically, the lack of programmatic information was one of the limitations of the Three-State study. We were able to obtain programmatic information in the Pennsylvania EOS through intensive case file reviews using a sub-sample of 500 participants and non-participants from the larger study group of 1566 inmates.

Research Hypotheses

The primary focus of the EOS was to track the performance of correctional education participants and a comparison group of non-participants in the community after release from incarceration. Specifically, the study assessed the impact of correctional education on recidivism and post-release employment. The study hypothesized that participation in correctional education programs would result in reduced rates of re-arrest, re-conviction, and re-imprisonment compared to non-participants (Hypotheses 1-3). The study also hypothesized that for participants who did recidivate, they would commit less serious offenses (Hypothesis 4) when compared to non-participants. The two final hypotheses state that participation in correctional education programs would result in higher rates of employment for participants (Hypothesis 5), as well as higher wages (Hypothesis 6) than those of non-participants.

Research Design

Although an experimental design is the most rigorous (and the most desirable) of all research designs, criminal justice research often precludes, for legal and ethical reasons, randomization for selection of experimental and control groups. Many times, in correctional settings, there are also practical and administrative barriers that prohibit the utilization of an experimental design. Time constraints and legal issues regarding mandatory education for some inmates in the Pennsylvania prison system were the primary obstacles to conducting an experimental design in the current study. Thus, we utilized a quasi-experimental design which is an accepted methodology commonly used in criminal justice/corrections research.

The main distinction between experimental and quasi-experimental designs is the lack of random assignment to a treatment or control group. Therefore, when randomization is not possible, using a quasi-experimental design with close attention to procedures for selection of the

study groups, techniques for measuring dependent variables, and utilization of other controls are methods that can reduce threats to the validity of the research and increase the rigor of the study (Maxfield and Babbie, 2001, p. 176). While a quasi-experimental design is practical for use in settings such as corrections, this design does not sacrifice the ability of the study to examine the impact of a treatment as long as an assumption of comparability can be met between the treatment and control group.

In this research, we used a release cohort (a group of inmates being released from incarceration during a certain time frame) for our study population. A cohort study is a methodology employed in quasi-experimental designs for nonequivalent groups where there is a belief that the treatment group does not systematically differ from the comparison group on important variables. Only after the release cohort is selected would data that would identify the cohort participants as either the treatment or comparison group be collected. This design takes advantage of the natural flow of cases through the criminal justice process with an assumption that the treatment group and the comparison group are similar on key variables known to impact recidivism and employment.

Study Limitations

There were three main study limitations for this project. First, as mentioned in the previous paragraphs, randomization of the study participants was not possible. To address this limitation, a release cohort was used to select the treatment and control groups to be studied. Second, the findings cannot be generalized to other settings. The study group was selected only from Pennsylvania. Other states may have characteristics that could impact recidivism and employment outcomes differently from the impact in Pennsylvania. For example factors such as how criminal acts are defined by each state's statutes, state sentencing guidelines determining

who goes to prison, how criminal history data elements are reported to the state's criminal history repository, and the quality of the state's employment data could impact study outcomes in other states. Third, the follow-up period was only for one year. We had hoped that we would be able to follow the study participants in the Pennsylvania EOS for three years. However, the start-up was delayed and the administering of the pre-release surveys (which would define our study population) took longer than anticipated, and as a result we were only able to follow the offenders for a one-year period following release from incarceration for measures of recidivism and employment. The most rigorous studies use a three-year follow-up, and this time frame is used by the Bureau of Justice Statistics to assess recidivism in their special reports (Langan and Levin, 2002). Three years is also a more desirable time frame for assessing employment outcomes, primarily because of delayed times in reporting and recording official wage and labor data at the state level. Despite these limitations, the results of this study will continue to add to the base of knowledge about the efficacy of education programs in correctional settings and provide a general framework for continued research in this area.

Data Collection Instruments and Measures

There were five sources of data for this study: three main data collection instruments, offender criminal histories from official records, and offender employment data also from official records. The three main instruments included the Pre-Release Survey, the Educational/Institutional Data Collection Form, and the interview schedule. Each instrument is described below (See Appendix A-C for copies of the instruments). The offender criminal history data and the offender employment data are also described in this section.

Inmate Pre-Release Survey

The pre-release survey is a self-report instrument which included questions designed to gather information on inmate demographics, family information, prior employment data, adult and juvenile criminal histories, educational experiences both prior to and during incarceration, participation in programs other than education, motivation questions, and release plans including post-release residence, employment and criminal justice information. The pre-release survey was comprised of 73 questions chosen to elicit information pertinent to recidivism factors and participation in educational programming. The questions covered the following areas:

- a. Participant demographics including DOC number (used as the study participant identifier), SSN, race, gender, age, and area lived in prior to incarceration;
- b. Family background including 12 questions on such topics as prior and current government assistance, marital status, number of dependents, number of children, and religious affiliation;
- c. Criminal history, including eight questions on both juvenile and adult arrests and incarcerations including the age at first arrest, types and numbers of commitments/incarcerations and family/friends involvement in the criminal justice system;
- d. Employment information to determine the inmate's prior work and wage history;
- e. Educational experiences both prior to and during current incarceration, including questions on academic and vocational education, questions about their parents involvement in their education, and how well they liked school;
- f. Current situation in prison including length of incarceration, time at current prison, time left on sentence, visitation information, religious service attendance, if participated in education program - type, hours/weeks of attendance, participation in other treatment programs, jobs in prison, transfers, misconducts/charges, motivation questions, medical,/dental/mental health status;
- g. Release information, including questions about the inmate's plans after release, employment prospects, housing arrangements, and contact information.

The pre-release survey was designed to gather important information relevant to the outcomes being studied, but it was also designed to collect information typically found in a "needs assessment" to assist program managers with strategic planning.

Institutional/Education Case File Data Collection Form

The data collected from the Institution/Education case files included identifiers (DOC number, state ID number, FBI number and social security number), basic demographic information (race, gender and age), family information such as number of children, information about parents and siblings, family abuse/trauma history, the crime and sentence length of current incarceration, number of prior felony arrests and convictions, information about probation and parole involvement, juvenile criminal history, adult criminal history, major institutional infractions as a measure of institutional adjustment, employment while incarcerated, information about other treatment program participation, D&A score, drug/alcohol history, caseworker recommendations, parole board recommendations, and release plans. While much of this information was requested from the inmates in the pre-release survey, we wanted to crosscheck as much of the data as possible for accuracy. We were also looking for any factors that might impact recidivism such as long-term substance abuse, mental illness, family violence, and unstable family backgrounds. Thus questions about the inmate's involvement in programs that address these types of problems were part of this data collection instrument.

We also included questions about the inmate's educational test scores, whether they had participated in special education classes prior to incarceration, and the level of current participation in education programs/activities. Because we specifically wanted to know how education study participants did based on the type of education program they participated in, we examined the education records for information on all of the education programs including academic programs (ABE, GED, and college), vocational education/training, and non-traditional education programs, in which the inmate was enrolled, the level of participation from first date

of entry into the program to final exit from the program, and the number of diplomas and/or certificates received.

With the exception of the education variables, data for this instrument were collected for study participants whether or not they were enrolled in correctional education programming. All documents in the files were reviewed thoroughly including pre-sentence investigation reports if they were included.

Criminal History Data

Criminal history data was obtained through the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency to examine the study participants' post-release behavior (recidivism). The focus was on: (1) re-arrest, re-conviction, and re-incarceration; (2) time to re-arrest, re-conviction, and re-incarceration; and (3) re-arrest, re-conviction, and re-incarceration offenses. The categories we selected to use for classifying recidivism offenses were based on the categories used by the U. S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. These categories were violent, property, drug/alcohol, misdemeanor, traffic, and probation/parole violations. A seventh category classified as "other" was added for offenses that did not fit into other categories. The criminal history data was obtained for a one-year period following the offender's release from incarceration. Data was also collected from the Department of Corrections data base regarding reimprisonment information for one year following release. While it is more prudent and generally recommended to follow inmates for a three-year time period, as mentioned previously, the research team was unable to do this because of time constraints. Most of the inmates were released in 2002 and 2003, and for the present study the criminal history record collection began in 2003 and continued through the spring of 2004.

Employment Data

Collecting wage and labor data for offenders after release from incarceration has been rare in correctional/criminal justice research. Any employment information reported in past studies has generally been self-reported. While it took some time to negotiate the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between DOC and the Pennsylvania Commonwealth's Department of Labor and Industry (L & I), we were able to get important employment and wage data. The information collected for the offenders' post-release employment was official data maintained by L & I in accordance with the Federal Department of Labor guidelines. Only a limited amount of information was collected and included whether or not the study participant had ever worked in a job reported to L & I, how many quarters they worked and quarterly wages. While data elements for employment were limited, it did provide information about whether or not the offender was employed in a legal job and what their quarterly/annual earnings were. This allowed us to compare the education participants and the comparison group on these important variables. Again because of time constraints, the employment data followed the study participants' work and wage history for a period of only one year following their release from incarceration. Collecting these data elements requires an 18-month window (one year follow-up plus six months for the data to be recorded by state department of labor).

The labor data did not provide the type of employment (job classification) that the offender was engaged in after release, hourly or weekly wages, and number of hours, days, or weeks worked each quarter. Also there are some labor classifications that are not required to report such as farm labor. Therefore, it is likely that some underreporting of actual employment for the study group would occur. The assumption is, however, that it occurs for both groups, participants and non-participants, equally.

Measures

A number of measures were utilized by the study to test the hypotheses proposed. Three measures were used to test the recidivism hypotheses: re-arrest, re-conviction, and re-incarceration. All three were dichotomous dependent variables with yes or no categories. This information was obtained from official criminal history records maintained by the state. Re-arrest was defined as any arrest for any of the seven defined offense categories. Re-conviction was defined as a “guilty” judgment in criminal court for any criminal act including violation of probation/parole. Re-incarceration was determined if the data reported a sentence to prison and/or county jail based on information in the official criminal histories or by examining the Department of Corrections database for recommitments. A fourth recidivism measure examined re-arrest offenses for both study groups. Re-arrest offenses were broken down into seven categories utilizing the same categories defined by the Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice. The offenses were based on legal definitions of the crime provided by the state sentencing guidelines.

Legal employment of the study participants was measured using official labor data collected by L & I. These official records provided information about whether or not the study participants were employed in legitimate positions by employers who reported earned income and withheld taxes. A dichotomous dependent variable for legal employment (yes, no) was created based on this information. L & I also provided information on the amount of wages earned by the study participants and quarters worked.

Data Collection Procedures

Inmate Pre-Release Survey

The pre-release survey used for the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections EOS was previously piloted and subsequently used in the Three-State Recidivism study. The Flesch-Kincaid readability test had been conducted which showed a reading level of 6.1 for the survey instrument. While most of the questions posed no difficulty for the inmates, there were a few questions that were revised to address inmate concerns. The pilot study was also used to determine the length of time needed for inmates to complete the survey instrument. On average the survey took approximately 45 minutes for inmates to complete. At the request of the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections some revisions of the original instrument were made to specifically deal with their population and their system (i.e. questions/wording regarding specific programs, disciplinary infractions, sentences, etc.).

The decision was made to have program managers, supervisors, or principals administer the survey instrument. In discussion with DOC, the goal was to select 1500 inmates for participation in the study. Originally, a sampling design was created so that a proportionate number of inmates from each prison (26 total prisons) would be selected for participation in the study in order to mirror the entire prison population's custody levels (custody levels in DOC range from 1 to 5 with 1 being the most minimal security level and 5 being the most secure custody level) until the study group reached a total of 1500 participants. During the start-up phase, it became clear that this could be accomplished just as easily by collecting the data from fewer prisons from various geographic locations around the state. As it turned out, study participants were selected from 17 prisons spread across Pennsylvania (see Table 1 for a

breakdown of study participants by institution). The custody levels of the study participants primarily fall into levels 2, 3, and 4 with level 3 contributing almost half of the participants for the study group (see Table 2 for custody levels of participants).

All data collection began with training the Department of Corrections staff responsible for administering the pre-release survey. Training included question and answer sessions, a walk through of the questions on the survey, and a written detail of the protocol for collecting the data. Those administering the survey were encouraged to present the survey and provide explanations in a positive and enthusiastic manner in order to reduce the number of refusals. Small group settings were recommended for the survey administration - no more than 20 at one time.

Table 1: Study Population by Institution

	Participants		Non-Participants	
	N	%	N	%
Number at Institution				
Albion	14	1.2%	17	3.8%
Camp Hill	57	5.1%	55	12.4%
Coal Township	108	9.6%	48	10.8%
Dallas	264	23.5%	102	23.0%
Graterford	4	.4%	7	1.6%
Houtzdale	25	2.2%	18	4.1%
Huntingdon	100	8.9%	35	7.9%
Mahanoy	94	8.4%	32	7.2%
Pittsburgh	47	4.2%	24	5.4%
Rockview	177	15.8%	56	12.6%
Somerset	22	2.0%	12	2.7%
Waymart	35	3.1%	8	1.8%
Frackville	25	2.2%	1	.2%
Cresson	12	1.1%	5	1.1%
Muncy	37	3.3%	8	1.8%
Mercer	15	1.3%	9	2.0%
Cambridge Springs	87	7.7%	6	1.4%
Total	1123	71.7%	443	28.3%

Table 2. Study Population by Custody Levels

Current Custody Level				
1	39	3.5%	24	5.4%
2	289	25.7%	118	26.6%
3	506	45.1%	202	45.6%
4	193	17.2%	63	14.2%
5	9	.8%	6	1.4%
Did Not Report	87	7.7%	30	6.8%
Total	1123	100.0%	443	100.0%

Administrators of the survey were instructed to make note if the number of refusals exceeded 20%. Refusals were defined as those who did not want to participate once the study and survey were explained to them. Those who were unavailable because of sick call, disciplinary confinement, visitation, or other legitimate reasons were not counted as refusals. Refusals exceeding 20% were not identified during the data collection period. The research team made several onsite visits for the administration of the survey to ensure that protocol was being followed. The research team also conducted several administrations of the survey to identify any potential problems. No specific problems were noted during any of these administrations by the research team. It should be noted that when the research team administered the survey at several sites, they rarely had any refusals - most of the time none refused and no more than two during an administration.

To identify potential study participants, program staff from the Department of Corrections at the various institutions was asked to generate a list of inmates who were going to be released from their institution within 90 days. They could begin the administration of the pre-release survey at any point during the 90-day period. During the next several months, beginning in late 2001 and continuing through 2003 a number of administrations of the survey occurred at

the institutions listed in Table 1 until a total of 1500 study participants was reached. We decided to over sample from the female institutions so we would have a large enough group to study women participants. Because we were not getting enough from the first female institution (Muncy SCI) selected for the study, we added a second institution (Cambridge Springs SCI) later in the project.

All potential participants were advised that the survey was strictly voluntary and that no sanctions would be used against those who did not want to participate. They were given an informed consent form (see Appendix A) to sign which included contact information for the research team. The informed consent form was approved by the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections Office of Planning, Research, Statistics and Grants and included language required by them regarding participation and “Human Subjects” protocol. Instructions for filling out the Pre-Release Survey were included with the survey packet, and participants were verbally instructed as well. It should be noted that although the DOC releases approximately 10,000 inmates per year, the staff trained to administer the surveys often had more pressing responsibilities. As a result, the inmate pre-release surveys were administered as their time permitted.

Institutional/Education Data Collection Form

A convenience sample of 500 inmates who had participated in the pre-release survey was selected for intensive review of their institutional/educational case files. Because this endeavor was extremely labor intensive, it was impractical to review all 1566 case files of the study participants therefore we decided to sample one-third of the original 1566 cases.

The research team collected the educational/institutional data. The Department of Corrections Office of Planning, Research, Statistics, and Grants made contact with each institution to advise of visits by the research team, and numerous visits to several institutions throughout the state were made to gather data for this component of the study. Both current and archived records were pulled and reviewed by the research team. Records were reviewed thoroughly and relevant information was recorded on a form created by the principle researcher. The visits were made until 500 case files had been reviewed.

Criminal History Data

Each state has an agency responsible for maintaining the criminal history database for the state's crime information center which reports the information to the National Crime Information Center (NCIC). To collect the criminal history data (re-arrest, re-conviction, re-incarceration and re-arrest offense), agreements between the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency (PCCD) and the research team had to be coordinated along with assurances of confidentiality (this was done by sending a letter following their protocol for assurances of confidentiality to PCCD). PCCD was provided a list of cases with state identifiers such as DOC #, SID #, SSN, FBI #, name, date of birth, race and gender for each participant in the study population. PCCD provided the research team with the criminal histories. The research team hand-coded all the criminal history records, and entered the information on a data code sheet. Using the data code sheet the information was then entered into the SPSSpc database. Hand coding was necessary to ensure that the recidivism data were reported accurately. Criminal history data were collected for a one-year period following the offender's release from incarceration.

Employment Data

Lists with the study participants' names, social security numbers, dates of birth, ages and race were sent to the Department of Corrections, Office of Planning, Research, and Grants for coordination in obtaining the labor data. Since employers are supposed to report the wages of each worker quarterly, the requested information for the study participants was sent to us in the quarterly format from the Commonwealth's Department of Labor and Industry (L & I). The collection of information began with quarter one in 2002 and ended with quarter 4 in 2003. We were advised that L & I needed an 18 month window to pull the data for one year after release. All data were submitted to the research team electronically. However, the data still required "cleaning-up" particularly for outliers.

Once the data were entered, the total amount of wages earned per quarter was calculated by summing the wages for each job during the quarter. A dichotomous variable for employment was created. If any of the study participants had any income reported at any time during release, they were coded as yes for the variable "ever employed". This variable represents offenders who worked for employers who withheld payroll taxes. Although the data available were limited, the use of these data establishes a precedent for the inclusion of official labor data in future studies of criminal offenders.

Data Analyses

A SPSSpc database was created for the research and over 730 variables were subsequently entered into the database. With SPSSpc, the researchers could conduct univariate (simple percentages), bivariate (t-tests and chi-square), and multivariate analyses (logistic regression analysis). Several logistic regression models were developed and tested, but only those contributing meaningful information are presently reported. We have reason to believe

that given more time to work with these models we would see that correctional education works better for some types of offenders than for others. We set the alpha level at .05 to provide strong evidence for making inferences about the data (Agresti and Finlay, 1986, p.147).

Study Population Characteristics

As stated in the methodology section, we used two different sampling procedures for the EOS – one for the inmate self-report pre-release surveys and one for the institutional/educational case files. For the inmate pre-release survey, we wanted a large enough sample that would allow us to look at a number of different variables so we selected 1500 inmates for the study group. The surveys were collected over an 18-month period of time. Table 3 shows that overall there were 1566 study participants in the study cohort: 1123 (71.7%) correctional education participants and 443 (28.3%) non-participants.

Table 3: Study Population by Correctional Education Participation

	N	%
Total Study Population		
Participants	1123	71.7%
Non-Participants	443	28.3%
Total	1566	100.0%

The second sampling we used was for the institutional/educational case file reviews. Because the endeavor was very labor intensive and required the reading and review of an inmate’s entire DOC history, we selected one-third of the original 1566 inmates for this portion of the study. We collected a list of inmates who participated in the study by institution, and using that list, traveled to the institutions to collect the data starting systematically with the first ones on the list and working through the names (see Appendix D for all tables for the case file reviews).

Study Population Characteristics and Descriptions from the Pre-Release Survey

The study group from the self-report pre-release surveys was comprised of a cohort of inmates released from incarceration between late 2001 through 2003. As stated earlier, the selection of a release cohort is a method used for non-equivalent “treatment” and comparison groups with an assumption of comparability. However, to further ensure the comparability of the two groups, significance tests were conducted for several key characteristics to see if the two groups differed on important variables that might impact the recidivism and employment results.

Certain demographic characteristics such as age, gender, race/ethnicity, and living environment place offenders at greater risk for recidivism. We wanted to compare the two study groups, participants and non-participants, on these key variables to determine if either study group was at greater risk of recidivism when compared to each other. As shown in Table 4, we found that the mean age of the participants was 34.5 years and 36.3 years for the non-participants. As is typical in prison populations, a large majority in both groups were male (88.9% of the participants and 96.8% of the non-participants) while only a small number were female (11.1% of the participants and 3.2% of the non-participants). Forty-nine percent of the participants were African-American, 36% were white, 13.9% were Hispanic, 1.1 were classified as other. For the non-participants group, 42% were African American, 47% were white, 11% were Hispanic, and none were classified as other. These statistics mirror very closely DOC population characteristics except for gender as we over sampled the female population. More than half of the survey respondents (62.2% of participants and 50.1% of non-participants) reported being from large cities/urban areas. Only 6.0% of the participants and 7.9% of the non-participants reported living in a rural area before their current incarceration

Table 4: Demographic Variables for Study Population

	Participants			Non-Participants		
	Mean	Range	N	Mean	Range	N
Age	34.52	19-78	1106	36.25	19-69	436
	N	%		N	%	
Gender						
Male	998	88.9%		429	96.8%	
Female	125	11.1%		14	3.2%	
Total	1123	100.0%		443	100%	
Race						
African American	547	48.7%		186	42.1%	
White	401	35.7%		210	47.3%	
Hispanic	156	13.9%		47	10.6%	
Other	12	1.1%		-	-	
Did Not Report	7	.6%		-	-	
Total	1123	100.0%		443	100.0%	
Area Lived in Before Incarceration						
City	698	62.2%		222	50.1%	
Suburb of a City	128	11.4%		62	14.0%	
Small City	113	10.1%		56	12.6%	
Town	104	9.3%		48	10.8%	
Rural Area	67	6.0%		35	7.9%	
Did Not Report	13	1.2%		20	4.5%	
Total	1123	100.0%		443	100.0%	

Family stability can also impact recidivism. Such factors as being married, having children to support, and being financially able to take care of your family can reduce the risk of recidivism. Thus when we examined the family variables (see Table 5), we discovered that the majority of both the education participants and non-participants were single, divorced, or separated with only 12% in each group married. More than half of the study participants had children under the age of 18 (59.0% for the education participants and 58.2% for the non-participants), but only 51.2% of the education participants financially supported their children prior to their current incarceration, and only 35.6% of the non-participants provided financial

Table 5: Family Variables for Study Population

	Participants		Non-Participants	
	N	%	N	%
Marital Status				
Married	135	12.0%	56	12.6%
Common Law	96	8.5%	44	9.9%
Separated	68	6.1%	24	5.4%
Divorced	118	10.5%	68	15.3%
Single	690	61.4%	236	53.3%
Did Not Report	16	1.4%	15	3.4%
Total	1123	100.0%	443	100.0%
Have Children Under Age 18				
Yes	663	59.0%	258	58.2%
No	311	27.7%	134	30.2%
Did Not Report	149	13.3%	51	11.5%
Total	1123	100.0%	443	100.0%
Financially Supporting* Children/Grandchildren				
Yes	340	51.2%	92	35.6%
No	271	40.8%	84	32.6%
Did Not Report	52	8.0%	82	31.8%
Total	663	100.0%	258	100.0%
How Many People Depended on you for income?				
None	349	31.7%	129	30.6%
One	187	17.0%	68	16.1%
Two	197	17.9%	97	23.0%
Three	168	15.2%	78	18.5%
Four or More	201	18.2%	50	11.8%
Did not report	21		21	
Total	1123	100.00%	443	100.00%
Received Gov't Benefits				
Yes	167	26.2%	35	19.6%
No	471	73.8%	144	80.4%
Did not report	485		264	
Total	1123	100.00%	443	100.00%
Religious Affiliation				
Protestant	204	18.2%	72	16.3%
Catholic	114	10.2%	35	7.9%
Buddhist	1	.1%	1	.2%
Muslim	98	8.7%	18	4.1%
Jewish	3	.3%	1	.2%
Other	28	2.6%	10	2.3%
None	43	3.8%	7	1.6%
Did Not Report	632	56.3%	299	67.5%
Total	1123	100.0%	443	100.0%
Other Language				
Yes	230	20.5%	68	15.3%
No	889	79.2%	364	82.2%
Did Not Report	4	.4%	11	2.5%
Total	1123	100.0%	443	100.0%

support for their children. Over half of both the educational participants and non-participants had two or more people depending on them for income prior to their incarceration. In the year prior to their incarceration, 26.2% of the education participants received some type of government assistance while 19.6% of the non-participants received government assistance. Religious affiliation was similar for both groups with most reporting affiliation with a Protestant or Catholic Church. A large number in both groups did not report the religious affiliation (56.3% for education participants and 67.5% for non-participants). Twenty percent of the education participants and 15% of the non-participants reported speaking a language other than English in their home.

Research has shown that employment is a key factor in the successful reentry of offenders into the community after incarceration. When we examined and compared the two study groups on employment variables (see Table 6) we found that 84.5% of the education participants had been unemployed at some time during their lifetime and 28.2% had been unemployed for over a year or never employed during their life. Of the non-participants 81.9% had been unemployed at some point in time during their lifetime and 21.2% had been unemployed for over a year or never employed. A significant number of both participants and non-participants changed jobs frequently during the year prior to their incarceration. Only 59.8% of the participants compared to 63.4% of the non-participants had been employed full time in the year prior to their incarceration. The mean weekly wage for education participants was \$415.08 and \$435.08 for non-participants. These variables indicate that both groups shared similar employment situations which include job instability and wages too low to support a

family. These factors put both groups at a disadvantage for successful employment after release from incarceration.

Table 6: Employment and Wage Data for Study Population

	Participants		Non-Participants	
	N	%	N	%
Longest Period of Unemployment				
Never Unemployed	164	14.6%	80	18.1%
1-6 Months	546	48.6%	223	50.3%
7-12 Months	76	6.8%	24	5.4%
1 Year or More	212	18.9%	62	14.0%
Never Employed	104	9.3%	32	7.2%
Did Not Report	21	1.9%	22	5.0%
Total	1123	100.0%	443	100.0%
How Many Different Jobs in the Year Prior to Incarceration				
Zero	243	21.6%	81	18.3%
One or Two	656	58.4%	271	61.2%
Three or Four	134	11.9%	43	9.7%
Five or More	38	3.4%	10	2.3%
Seven or More	13	1.2%	4	.9%
Did Not Report	39	3.5%	34	7.7%
Total	1123	100.0%	443	100.0%
Employment Situation In the Year Prior to Incarceration				
Mostly Full Time	672	59.8%	281	63.4%
Workers Comp	6	.5%	3	.7%
Unemployed	99	8.8%	27	6.1%
Mostly Part Time	134	11.9%	40	9.0%
When I get Work	66	5.9%	10	2.3%
Did Not Report	146	13.0%	82	18.5%
Total	1123	100.0%	443	100.0%
	Mean		Mean	
Wage Data				
< Minimum Wage	\$4.14		\$3.79	
> \$8.00/hr	\$11.60		\$12.24	
Daily Wages	\$85.25		\$78.50	
Weekly Wages	\$415.08		\$435.08	
Annual Wages				

One of the best predictors of recidivism is prior criminal behavior. In addition, based on social learning theory (Akers and Sellers, 2004) family members and/or close friends who are involved in criminal behavior can also influence decisions to engage in criminal activities. Thus, we wanted to examine a number of criminal history variables including age at first arrest, juvenile criminal history, and adult criminal history. We also examined probation, parole and incarceration history. Finally we looked at family/close friends' incarceration history.

What we found (see Table 7) was that the education participants reported being younger (19.31 years of age) at age of first arrest than were the non-participants at age of first arrest (19.82 years of age). The education participants had fewer mean number of juvenile arrests (1.51), adult arrests (5.56) and felony arrests (3.05) compared to non-participants who had a mean number of juvenile arrests of 1.61, adult arrests of 6.58 and felony arrests of 3.07. This would seem to correlate with the age difference between the education participants and non-participants since the non-participants were slightly older and have had more time to be involved with the criminal justice system. However, more of the education participants (38.5%) had served time in a juvenile facility compared to non-participants (30.2%). Eighty-one percent of the education participants had been on probation at least once, and 82.8% of the non-participants had been on probation at least once. The majority of both education participants (53.9%) and non-participants (72.8%) had been under parole supervision although the numbers were significantly higher for the non-participants. The number of participants with family in prison or jail (46.5%) and close friends incarcerated in prison or jail (56.3%) was similar to the statistics for non-participants with family (44.2%) and close friends (56.9%) in jail or prison. Overall these variables indicate that both groups possess a similar amount of risk for recidivism based on past criminal behavior.

Table 7: Criminal History Data for Study Population

	Participants		Non-Participants	
	Mean	Range	Mean	Range
Age of 1st Involvement in Criminal Activity	18.10	6-52	18.75	6-58
Age of 1st Arrest	19.31	8-67	19.82	10-58
Arrest Statistics				
Juvenile Arrests	1.51		1.61	
Adult Arrests	5.56		6.58	
Felony Arrests	3.05		3.07	
	N	%	N	%
Juvenile History¹				
Juvenile Facility (General)	433	38.5%	134	30.2%
Juvenile Detention Center	308	27.4%	97	21.9%
Youth Development Center	170	15.1%	64	14.4%
Private Sector/ Group Home	131	11.7%	40	9.0%
Probation				
Never	209	18.6%	76	17.2%
Once	362	32.2%	137	30.9%
Twice	277	24.7%	106	23.9%
Three Times	175	15.6%	76	17.2%
Four or More	78	6.9%	26	5.9%
Did Not Report	22	2.0%	22	5.0%
Total	1123	100.0%	443	100.0%
Parole				
Never	518	46.1%	125	28.2%
Once	305	27.2%	138	31.2%
Twice	159	14.2%	89	20.1%
Three Times	90	8.0%	59	13.3%
Four or More	34	3.0%	10	2.3%
Did Not Report	17	1.5%	22	5.0%
Total	1123	100.0%	443	100.0
Family Incarcerated in Prison or Jail				
Yes	522	46.5%	196	44.2%
No	579	51.5%	219	49.4%
Did Not Report	22	2.0%	28	6.3%
Total	1123	100.0%	443	100.0%
Friends Incarcerated in Prison or Jail				
Yes	632	56.3%	252	56.9%
No	465	41.4%	166	37.5%
Did Not Report	26	2.3%	25	5.6%
Total	1123	100.0%	443	100.0%

¹ Percentages may total to more than 100% as the study participants may have had placements in multiple facilities.

In order to assess the impact of education, we wanted to determine where both study groups were in terms of their educational backgrounds. The results of the WRAT (Wide Range Achievement Tests) obtained from the DOC database and the institutional records demonstrate that both groups scored similarly on all three portions of the test.² However, both groups' scores reflected low skill levels for reading (8.4 for the participants and 8.5 for the non-participants), spelling (7.1 for the participants and 7.2 for the non-participants) and math (6.7 for the participants and 7.4 for the non-participants). All scores for both participants and non-participants were below a ninth grade competency level. This is interesting because the participants had lower levels of educational attainment. Seventy-three percent of the education participants had not completed high school compared to 54% of the non-participants. The institutional records showed similar intelligence ratings for the education participants (92) and non-participants (94) -- ratings which fall into the average range of intelligence. Thus, both groups came to the DOC with equivalent levels of need for educational services: assignment to DOC educational programs is driven largely by assessed level of proficiency.

Considering that both groups had low levels of educational achievement, they all experienced high levels of enjoyment in elementary, middle, and high school. On a scale examining parental involvement in their education, both the education participants and non-participants reported that their parents were not often engaged in their education. It would be beneficial to share this with inmates during parenting classes by stressing the importance for them to be involved in their child/children's education.

² It should be noted that the BCE now uses TABE for all its educational testing.

Table 8: Educational Variables for Study Population

	Participants		Non-Participants	
	N	Mean	N	Mean
WRAT Scores				
Reading	327	8.4	139	8.5
Spelling	274	7.1	103	7.2
Math	282	6.7	102	7.4
Intelligence Rating	341	92	139	94
	N	%	N	%
Grade Completion				
< 8 th Grade	101	11.5%	31	9.9%
9 th Grade	130	14.9%	26	8.3%
10 th Grade	191	21.9%	47	15.1%
11 th Grade	218	24.9%	64	20.5%
12 th Grade	234	26.8%	144	46.2%
Did Not Report	249		131	
Total	1123	100.0%	443	100.0%
School Enjoyment				
Enjoyed Elementary School	523	86.7%	146	83.9%
Enjoyed Middle School	492	82.6%	131	78.4%
Enjoyed High School	413	70.5%	128	75.7%
	Mean		Mean	
Parental Educational Involvement	Scale: 1=Never, 2-Sometimes, 3=Often, 4=Always			
Read to me as a child	2.13		2.06	
Helped me with my Homework	2.57		2.39	
Attended parent/ teacher meetings	2.46		2.35	
Encouraged me to make good grades	3.34		3.31	
Attended school Functions	2.26		2.18	
Rewarded me for good grades	2.71		2.66	
Punished me for bad Grades	2.37		2.35	

We also examined Misconduct and Informal Resolution Charges to see if education participation resulted in lower numbers compared to non-participants (see Table 9). A higher percentage of education participants (52%) reported having received a misconduct or informal

resolution while incarcerated compared to non-participants (43%). This can be explained in part because those who are mandated to attend school and do not attend can receive a disciplinary infraction. Also in the classrooms they are more closely observed for misbehavior.

Table 9: Misconduct/Informal Resolution Charges for Study Population

	Participants		Non-Participants			
	N	%	N	%		
Receive any Misconduct or Informal Resolutions						
Yes	382	52.0%	92	43.0%		
No	353	48.0%	122	57.0%		
Did not report	388		229			
Total	1123	100.0%	443	100.0%		
Number of Misconducts or Informal Resolutions						
One	139	38.4%	46	52.3%		
Two	73	20.2%	13	14.8%		
Three	53	14.6%	3	3.4%		
Four or More	97	26.8%	26	29.5%		
Did not report	761		355			
Total	1123	100.0%	443	100.0%		
	N	Range	Mean	N	Range	Mean
Number of Misconducts	160	1-17	2.59	48	1-13	2.81
Number of Informal Resolutions	72	1-4	1.39	20	1-2	1.20

The description/characteristics of the education participants compared to the non-participants showed that the two study groups were not significantly different on a number of key variables. For the small number of variables where they did differ significantly, the difference almost always put the education participants at a greater risk of recidivism than the non-participants. Overall, the two study groups were sufficiently equivalent to support inferences about how correctional education participation affects recidivism.

Study Population Characteristics and Descriptions from the Institutional/Education Case Files

The Institutional/Education Case Files provided some of the same information found in the pre-release survey; however, the files also provided some additional important information. A significant number of both participants and non-participants from the case file study group had experienced abuse in the home during their childhood (participants, 45.9%; non-participants, 39.3%). Information in the files indicated that 17.1% of the participants and 7.8% of the non-participants had attended special education classes although educational test scores and IQ's were not significantly different. More of the participants (46.8%) were incarcerated for violent crimes compared to non-participants (31.6%) while more non-participants (25.7%) were incarcerated for property crimes compared to participants (15.1%). About the same percentage of both groups were incarcerated for drug crimes (23.3% for participants, and 22.2% for non-participants). The type of current charges for which participants were incarcerated (mostly violent) would account for differences in sentences compared to non-participants. Participants had a mean minimum sentence of 3.82 years and a mean maximum sentence of 9.59 years and had served 5.76 years on average. Non-participants had a mean minimum sentence of 2.57 years and a mean maximum sentence of 7.03 years and had served 4.80 years on average.

Although the records reported that 53.3% of the participants' current incarceration offense was related to drugs/alcohol compared to 47.9% of the non-participants, both participants (84.4%) and non-participants (88.1%) had a significant history of drug/alcohol abuse. Only 31.9% of the participants had received any type of treatment for substance abuse (in-patient, out-patient, both in-patient and out-patient) compared to 36.2% of the non-participants. The substance of choice for education participants was alcohol (34.5%) followed by marijuana

(26.9%), cocaine (21.4%), heroin (10.3%) and others (6.9%). The substance of choice for non-participants was similar – 33.9% alcohol, 22.6% marijuana, cocaine 16.5%, heroin 12.2% and others (14.8%). Both groups had a mean Drug and Alcohol score over 5 indicating serious problems with substance abuse requiring treatment.

More than one-fourth of the education participants and non-participants had medical concerns worth noting, and close to 30% of both groups had mental health concerns (either a past history of hospitalization for mental health problems or a current history of treatment including medication). More of the education participants took part in treatment programs including anger/stress management, individual counseling, COR, Drug and Alcohol, Sex Offender, Health and Wellness, and other programs compared to non-participants. Education participants also had on average more hours/weeks of attendance and higher completion rates compared to non-participants.

For only the education participants, we looked at the type of education program in which they participated (ABE, GED, Vocational Classes, College Classes, Life Skills, and Others), the sessions/hours/weeks they participated, whether or not they completed the program, and whether or not they received a certificate. Fifty-one percent of the case file study group participated in ABE classes and 78.1% completed. They spent on average 141 hours and 30 weeks in attendance. For GED classes, 44% of the case file study group participated, and 73.6% of those participating received a GED. They were in attendance for 111 hours and 29 weeks on average. For vocational classes 46.9% participated and 79.6% received a certificate. On average, they spent 822 hours and 28 weeks in attendance. For those who took college classes (14.6%), 76.5% completed at least one course spending on average 54 hours and 12 weeks in attendance. Those taking life skills classes spent 44 hours and 12 weeks in attendance with 91% completing the

course. The case file study group (60.8%) also took other education classes spending about 42 hours and 18 weeks in attendance with 83.8% receiving a certificate for completion.

For post-release plans, we found that more than half of the education participants (55.9%) and non-participants (53.8%) were paroled to a Community Correctional Center (CCC). More of the non-participants (26.9%) maxed out their sentence compared to the education participants (20.5%) while more of the participants (21.5%) were paroled home compared to the non-participants (12.9%).

The characteristics of both the education participants and the non-participants based on the data in the pre-release survey and the case files would indicate that the chances for successful reentry back into the community for either group are diminished by a number of factors including family situation, prior criminal history, employment record, literacy levels, history of serious substance abuse, and medical and mental health concerns. Considering that 72.2% of the participants and 82.5% of the non-participants already have a history of recidivism (see Appendix D tables), it would not be surprising to see a continuation of this pattern of reoffending. The “Results” section will provide us with this information; however, the next section will address the issue of selection bias in correctional research.

Selection Bias

When individuals are not randomly assigned to a treatment which in this case is correctional education, and it becomes necessary to use a nonequivalent comparison group design for the research, there is always concern that the differences in the outcomes between the treatment group and the comparison group might be the result of self-selection. Self-selection factors are always suspect and considered a threat to validity of the outcomes. Differences in

outcomes between the two groups must take into account any confounding conditions or rival explanations such as self-selection.

Specifically there is always the question of whether or not the treatment group is comprised of individuals who self-select into the treatment because they are more motivated than the comparison group thereby offering a rival explanation for any differences in outcomes and possibly biasing the results. While this may be the case in some situations, it is not necessarily true in correctional settings. Because of the limited availability of correctional programs, there may be highly motivated individuals who wish to participate in the treatment but cannot because there wasn't an opportunity for them to do so. In addition, the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections has mandatory education requirements, so that too may make the issue of selection bias less of a concern.

Nonetheless we anticipated that selection bias (self-selection) might be a concern, and we addressed this by including a series of motivation questions on the pre-release survey. Having the data from the motivation questions provided us with an opportunity to compare the two groups on this important issue. Logistic regression was used to examine the possibility that subjects in the two groups varied in terms of motivation. To examine this, correctional education participation (yes=1) was regressed on subjects' feeling of importance of eleven reasons for participating in correctional education programs: 1) to increase educational level; 2) to get a better or higher paying job; 3) to improve work skills; 4) to feel better about self; 5) to help support children/family; 6) to make children/family feel proud of subject; 7) to become less dependent on others; 8) to make others feel better about subject; 9) to keep busy in prison; 10) to look good to prison or parole official to get out; 11) to get a better situation in prison regarding housing, money, or safety. Each of these measures used a five-point likert scoring system

ranging from very important to very unimportant. The model was significant (chi-square=24.629, p=.010) and explained 4-5% of the variance (Cox & Snell $R^2=.035$, Nagalkerke $R^2=.054$), with 78.9 percent of the cases predicted correctly (see Figure 1). Only one variable was found to be significant: correctional education participants expressed more sentiment that it was very important to keep busy in prison. Thus, what we found was that the two groups were sufficiently equivalent with respect to motivation. Therefore, any concern about whether or not the treatment group was more motivated than the comparison group should be alleviated, and the question with respect to self-selection adequately addressed.

Table 10: Logistic Regression Model for Motivation

	Correctional Education Participation (N=693)		
	B	SE	Exp(B)
Important: Increase Education Level	-.195	.136	.823
Important: Get Better Job	.158	.157	1.171
Important: Improve Work Skills	-.239	.188	.788
Important: Feel Better About Self	.037	.127	1.038
Important: Support Family	.076	.124	1.079
Important: Make Family Proud	-.148	.121	.863
Important: Become Less Dependent	.088	.110	1.092
Important: Others Feel Good About Me	.080	.075	1.083
Important: Keep Busy While in Prison	-.198*	.084	.820
Important: Look Good to Prison Officials	.066	.077	1.068
Important: Get Better Situation in Prison	-.008	.079	.992
Constant	1.717***	.222	5.567
Model Chi-square, Sig.	$\chi^2=24.629, p=.010$		
-2 log likelihood	691.591		
Cox & Snell R^2	.035		
Nagelkerke R^2	.054		
% Correct	78.9		

* p<.05
 ** p<.01
 *** p<.001

RESULTS

Several research hypotheses were proposed in the Pennsylvania EOS. The first four research hypotheses focused on recidivism. Hypothesis 1 stated that offenders who participated in correctional education programming would have lower re-arrest rates than those offenders who did not participate in correctional education programming. Hypothesis 2 stated that correctional education participants would have lower re-conviction rates than non-participants. Hypothesis 3 proposed that correctional education participants would have lower re-imprisonment rates than non-participants. The study also hypothesized that for participants who did recidivate, they would commit less serious offenses (Hypothesis 4) when compared to non-participants. However, not enough data was available to draw conclusions about Hypothesis 2 and 4. For Hypothesis 2, the one-year follow-up period did not allow enough time to gather reconviction data because of court backlogs for trials and sentencing and because of the lag time in reporting the data to the state criminal history repository. Given that reporting rearrest, reconviction, and reimprisonment is a voluntary process and that court dockets are overloaded, we did not expect to find much information about reconviction in only a one-year follow-up. While we did have data on the recidivism offenses, the numbers were too small in each offense category to allow comparisons between the two groups and will not be reported (Hypothesis 4).

It should be noted that we created an "all recidivism" variable because some of the reimprisonment data we gathered from the DOC database did not show up on the criminal histories, and we needed to combine the rearrest and reimprisonment data to get an accurate picture of true recidivism. Although normally you would have a funneling effect as an offender moves from rearrest to reconviction to reimprisonment, this was not the case with our data. Because we had access to DOC data which allowed us to collect better information on the

reimprisonment variable, we ended up with offenders who were back in prison but did not show up on the official criminal history/rearrest records. This was because many of those who were back in prison were there for technical parole violations which may not have been recorded as rearrests. We also included recidivism data based on the type of education program the participant attended to see if there were any differences in recidivism between education programs. This information is based on data collected from the institutional/education case files.

The two final hypotheses state that participation in correctional education programs would result in higher rates of employment for participants (Hypothesis 5), as well as higher wages (Hypothesis 6) than those of non-participants. We also looked at these outcomes based on type of education program the participant attended to examine differences between educational programs.

Although we had 1566 study participants from the pre-release survey, we were only able to follow 1065 which were those who had been released from incarceration for one year. The remaining 501 had been released for less than one year, and we did not feel it appropriate to track their recidivism and employment outcomes. Of the 1065 tracked, we lost some after we cleaned up the data for recidivism and employment (losses occurred primarily because they could not be matched with the official records). We ended up with 988 for the recidivism outcomes (980 for rearrest) and 953 for the employment outcomes.

Recidivism Outcomes

The recidivism outcomes are reported using univariate, bivariate, and multivariate analyses. Tables 11-13 show the results of the univariate, bivariate, and multivariate analyses for (1) rearrest, and (2) rearrest by program type (only for correctional education participants). For reimprisonment, Table 14 reports the univariate and bivariate results, and Table 15 reports

reimprisonment by education program type (only for the correctional education participants). The “all recidivism” outcomes are reported in Tables 16-17.

Rearrest

Table 11 shows that correctional education participants had lower rates of recidivism as measured by rearrest (23.6%) compared to the non-participants (29.4%) for a difference of 5.8%. This recidivism measure showed a substantial difference between the participant and non-participants and was extremely close to being statistically significant (p=.057) with an alpha level set at .05. It should be noted that in the most recent report from the Bureau of Justice Statistics in a nation wide study of recidivism of 272,111 prisoners, 44.1% were rearrested after a one-year follow-up (Langan and Levin, 2002). Pennsylvania’s releasees show a significantly lower rearrest rate.

Table 11: Univariate and Bivariate Descriptives for Rearrest

	Rearrest (chrear)		
	No (%)	Yes (%)	
Correctional Education			
-- Participants (N=687)	76.4	23.6	
-- Non-Participants (N=293)	70.6	29.4	$\chi^2=3.619, p=.057$

Although the bivariate analyses did not show any statistically significant differences for the rearrest measure, we decided to develop some logistic regression models to examine how rearrest and program exposure were affected by variables known in other studies to impact recidivism. These variables included:

1. Demographic Characteristics - gender, race, age, marital status, and residential area lived in prior to incarceration;

2. Prior Criminal Justice Variables - # of arrests, # of convictions, # of commitments, # of times on probation, # of times on parole, and
3. Program Exposure - participation/non-participation in correctional education.

We used logistic regression analyses to examine the effectiveness of correctional educational participation on rearrest, controlling for the effects of theoretically-relevant factors (see Table 12). The dependent variable, recidivism, was coded as 1 if the individual was re-arrested and 0 if no re-arrest occurred. Five independent variables were included in the model: sex (female included, male was reference), race (African-American and other race included, white was reference), age, number of prior felony arrests, and participation in the correctional education (yes=1). The model was significant (chi-square=34.182, p=.001) and explained 4-6% of the variance (Cox & Snell $R^2=.04$, Nagalkerke $R^2=.06$), with 75.4 percent of the cases predicted correctly.

In terms of the control variables, the results suggest that rearrest varied by race, age, and number of prior felony arrests. An increased likelihood of rearrest was also associated with being African American, younger, and having more prior felony arrests. Contrary to the bivariate results, correctional education participation was found to **significantly** reduce the odds of rearrest (O.R.=.683) once the control variables were introduced. It appears that differences in the racial composition of the treatment and comparison groups (i.e., greater proportion of African Americans in the treatment group, greater proportion of whites in comparison group) were masking the effect of the education program exposure. Therefore, based on the multivariate analyses, we can say that participation in correctional education does show a statistically significant reduction in the odds of rearrest compared to those who do not participate in correctional education.

Table 12: Logistic Regression Model for Rearrest

	Rearrest (N=.833)		
	B	SE	Exp(B)
Sex			
--Female (Yes=1)	-.005	.489	.995
--Male (Reference)			
Race			
--African American	.549**	.179	1.732
--White (Reference)			
--Other Race	.548	.282	1.729
Age	-.032***	.009	.968
# Prior Felony Arrests	.048**	.016	1.049
Correctional Education Partic. (Yes=1)	-.381*	.179	.683
Constant	-.254	.363	.776
Model Chi-square, Sig.	$\chi^2=34.182, p<.001$		
-2 log likelihood	893.214		
Cox & Snell R ²	.040		
Nagelkerke R ²	.060		
% Correct	75.4		

* p<.05
 ** p<.01
 *** p<.001

We also wanted to examine the rearrest outcomes by the type of education program inmates participated in during their incarceration. Table 13 shows that participation in multiple education programs (program stacking) produced the lowest rearrest rates (21.8%) followed by participation in basic education (26.1%), vocational education (27.9%), and GED (31.3%).

Table 13: Rearrest by Type of Education Program

	N	%
Basic Education		
Yes	23	26.1%
No	65	73.9%
Total	88	100%
GED		
Yes	20	31.3%
No	44	68.8%
Total	64	100%
Vocational		
Yes	19	27.9%
No	49	72.1%
Total	68	100%
Multiple		
Yes	68	21.8%
No	244	78.2%
Total	312	100%

Reimprisonment

Table 14 describes the univariate and bivariate outcomes for the **reimprisonment** measure. The education participants had a slightly higher rate of reimprisonment (52.7%) compared to the non-participants (50.9%) although the difference was not statistically significant (p=.690). It should be noted that a large number of technical parole violations were reported as the recommitment offense for the education participants which is why the reimprisonment rates are higher than the rearrest rates. As said earlier, many of the offenders who were reincarcerated did not show up on the official criminal history records but did show up in DOC’s data base.

Table 14: Univariate and Bivariate Descriptives for Reimprisonment

	Reimprisonment (chreimp)		
	No (%)	Yes (%)	
Correctional Education			
-- Participants (N=370)	47.3	52.7	
-- Non-Participants (N=173)	49.1	50.9	$\chi^2=0.159, p=.690$

We also conducted multivariate analyses for the reimprisonment outcome using logistic regression models. However, unlike the rearrest measure, we did not find any differences when we analyzed several different models where we introduced a number of different theoretically relevant variables. Therefore, we will not report the findings and we feel confident in saying that for the reimprisonment outcome, there was no significant difference between participants and non-participants.

As we did for rearrest, we also wanted to examine the reimprisonment outcomes by the type of education program inmates participated in during their incarceration. Table 15 shows that participation in multiple education programs (program stacking) again produced the lowest

rates (46.6%) followed by participation in basic education (58.0%), GED (60.0%), and vocational education (62.9%). It should be noted that the numbers in each of these categories are very small.

Table 15: Reimprisonment by Type of Education Program

	N	%
Basic Education		
Yes	29	58.0%
No	21	42.0%
Total	50	100%
GED		
Yes	18	60.0%
No	12	40.0%
Total	30	100%
Vocational		
Yes	22	62.9%
No	13	37.1%
Total	35	100%
Multiple		
Yes	83	46.6%
No	95	53.4%
Total	178	100%

All Recidivism

The measure for all recidivism shows that the correctional education participants had lower recidivism rates (40.9%) compared to the non-participants (45.9%) for a difference of 5 percentage points (See Table 16). Although not statistically significant ($p=.146$), Gaes and Kendig (2003) state that small differences even though not significant can have a meaningful impact, and we should not ignore incremental differences even if they are not statistically significant. The cost-savings as well as the other social benefits (supporting families, paying taxes, etc.) might be well worth the investment of inmate education programs.

Table 16: Univariate and Bivariate Descriptives for All Recidivism

Correctional Education	All Recidivism (chrecid)		
	No (%)	Yes (%)	
-- Participants (N=694)	59.1	40.9	$\chi^2=2.111, p=.146$
-- Non-Participants (N=294)	54.1	45.9	

In examining “all recidivism” by type of education program attended, we see a consistent pattern with participation in multiple education programs producing the lower recidivism rates (38.3%) followed by GED participation (46.9%), Vocational classes (47.2%) and Basic Education (48.9%).

Table 17: All Recidivism by Type of Education Program

	N	%
Basic Education		
Yes	44	48.9%
No	46	51.1%
Total	90	100%
GED		
Yes	30	46.9%
No	34	53.1%
Total	64	100%
Vocational		
Yes	34	47.2%
No	38	52.8%
Total	72	100%
Multiple		
Yes	120	38.3%
No	193	61.7%
Total	313	100%

Employment Outcomes

For the employment outcomes (Hypotheses 5 & 6), we examined the official records from L & I. We looked first at whether or not the study group had been employed at any time during the one-year follow-up after release from incarceration (“Legally Employed”). We also looked at this by type of education program the participants attended. Finally, we examined the number of quarters worked and the wages earned for both groups (based on the official records).

Legally Employed

The official labor data for the education participant's employment outcomes in the year after release showed that only 55.8% had worked in a legitimate job compared to 59% of the non-participants (See Table 18). The univariate and bivariate descriptives showed no significant differences between the education participants and non-participants for legal employment (yes/no). The number unemployed in the year after release was high for both groups (44.2% for participants and 41.0% for non-participants) compared to national unemployment rates for the general population during this time period.

Table 18: Post-Release Employment

	Legally Employed (legwork)		
	No (%)	Yes (%)	
Correctional Education			
-- Participants (N=660)	44.2	55.8	
-- Non-Participants (N=293)	41.0	59.1	$\chi^2=0.893, p=.345$

As we did for the recidivism outcomes we wanted to examine post release employment by type of program education participants attended. Again participation in multiple education

programs (see Table 19) showed the highest rates of employment (56.4%) followed by GED (53.1%), Basic Education (52.9%) and Vocational classes (50.7%).

Table 19: Post Release Employment by Type of Education Program

	N	%
Legal Work After Incarceration		
Basic Education		
Yes	46	52.9%
No	41	47.1%
Total	87	100%
GED		
Yes	34	53.1%
No	30	46.9%
Total	64	100%
Vocational		
Yes	35	50.7%
No	34	49.3%
Total	69	100%
Multiple		
Yes	167	56.4%
No	129	43.6%
Total	296	100%

Quarters Worked

The number of quarters worked varied for both the participants and non-participants (See Table 20). The participants showed a slightly higher percentage (44.2%) for having worked no quarters compared to the non-participants (41.0%). The participants, however, showed higher rates for having worked four or more quarters (25.6%) compared to non-participants who only showed a rate of 22.5% for having worked 4 or more quarters. This indicates that for those employed, participants were working for a longer period of time compared to non-participants.

Table 20: Post Release Quarters Worked

	Participants		Non-Participants	
	N	%	N	%
Total Quarters Worked				
0	292	44.2%	120	41.0%
1	62	9.4%	35	11.9%
2	73	11.1%	38	13.0%
3	64	9.7%	34	11.6%
4	83	12.6%	30	10.2%
5	86	13.0%	36	12.3%
Unreported	463			
Total	1123	100.0%	443	100.0%

Wages Earned

In Table 21, we show the range and mean quarterly wages for the study population collected from the official data from L & I. To get a more realistic portrayal of the actual average wages, we removed the outliers and recalculated by hand the average quarterly wages for both participants and non-participants. For the participants the average was \$5060.88 per quarter. From this information we also figured the participant’s monthly and weekly wages which were \$1686.96 monthly, and \$389.59 weekly (which is slightly lower than their reported pre-incarceration weekly wage). The non-participants averaged \$5095.46 per quarter, \$1698.48 monthly, and \$392.25 weekly, which was also slightly lower than their pre-incarceration salary. There was almost no difference between the participants and the non-participants on wages per quarter, monthly wages, and weekly wages, although the non-participants had slightly higher wages.

Table 21: Post Release Wages

	Participants			Non-Participants		
	N	Range	Mean	N	Range	Mean
Wages						
Quarter 1, 2002	41	\$15 - \$9,126	\$2,276.98	11	\$733 - \$8,230	\$2,945.91
Quarter 2, 2002	87	\$41 - \$16,653	\$2,978.76	50	\$29 - \$18,237	\$2,183.44
Quarter 3, 2002	183	\$28 - \$18,800	\$3,031.36	90	\$23 - \$23,635	\$2,686.83
Quarter 4, 2002	245	\$19 - \$20,354	\$3,295.78	118	\$30 - \$20,340	\$3,005.15
Quarter 1, 2003	251	\$24 - \$18,346	\$3,030.68	102	\$80 - \$18,237	\$2,980.61
Quarter 2, 2003	193	\$11 - \$21,413	\$3,480.65	78	\$40 - \$24,046	\$3,642.04
Quarter 3, 2003	120	\$14 - \$21,790	\$3,553.04	44	\$9 - \$19,811	\$3,930.80
Quarter 4, 2003	42	\$25 - \$18,818	\$3,657.17	20	\$56 - \$8,491	\$4,102.50

CONCLUSIONS

The Pennsylvania Education Outcome Study examined a cohort of inmates released from prison during late 2001 through 2003. The purpose of the study was to assess the impact of correctional education on the recidivism and employment outcomes to test the efficacy and effectiveness of providing education to inmates during incarceration. The study participants were followed for one year after release from prison. Using a treatment group (education participants) and a comparison group (non-participants in education) for the study sample, a total of 1566 inmates (1123 education participants and 443 non-participants) participated in a pre-release survey, and 500 of these inmates were selected for intensive case file reviews from the institutional/education records. The results of the data lead to several interesting conclusions.

Based on our findings about the characteristics of both the participant and non-participants, we find that both groups (participants and non-participants) in the study sample had unstable family and employment histories, severe substance abuse problems, low literacy levels, long-term and serious criminal histories, and mental health problems (the mental health rates were higher than national averages for prison populations). These characteristics present serious barriers to successful reentry into the community after release from incarceration. To expect

correctional education alone to impact recidivism and employment might be asking for more than the education programs can deliver. More effective outcomes may be achieved when a multi-faceted approach combining treatment and education for incarcerated offenders is undertaken and contacts with the community are established. Although DOC does offer treatment and education to offenders, rarely do these two areas work in concert with one another or with community programs where inmates would be assessed and staffed by a team of educators, treatment staff, and community program providers to create a viable plan that would assist offenders in successful reentry after incarceration. However, our responsibility was, in fact, to address and examine how well correctional education programs work in reducing recidivism and increasing employment opportunities after release from incarceration.

First, for recidivism using rearrest as the outcome, we find that correctional participants are significantly less likely to be rearrested than non-participants. This did not initially show-up in the bivariate analysis, and taking the next step and controlling for theoretically relevant variables, we found this to be true in the logistic regression model. For reimprisonment, we found no significant difference between the participants and the non-participants in either the bivariate or multivariate analyses although the participants had slightly higher rates of reimprisonment (explained by the large number of those reimprisoned for parole violations). For the measure we created combining the rearrest and reimprisonment data (“all recidivism”), we also did not find any significant differences between the participants and non-participants but the correctional education participants had lower rates compared to the non-participants. We were unable to collect data for reconviction because of the short follow-up period. We did, however, collect data for recidivism by program type. In every instance, participation in multiple education programs had the greatest impact with lower recidivism rates for rearrest,

reimprisonment and “all recidivism.” This leads to the conclusion that program “stacking” is more beneficial than participation in any one program alone. Overall, correctional education participants showed mixed results for the recidivism outcomes. Significant differences for rearrest (statistically significantly lower rates for education program participants) were noted but not so for reimprisonment and the “all recidivism” outcomes.

Second, the employment outcomes for participants and non-participants after release from prison were examined. These results were more disappointing in that there were no differences between the participants and non-participants for the employment outcomes measured by legal employment, quarters worked, and wages earned. Both groups had high levels of unemployment (over 40% for both groups) indicating that the barriers to employment discussed earlier are in fact impeding their ability to gain and sustain employment. Although the results were not statistically significant the correctional education participants had slightly lower rates of employment and lower wages compared to the non-participants...

The disappointing results on the employment measure could be the result of correctional education participants still having lower educational attainment compared to the non-participants since they started out with fewer high school diplomas and GED's. We couldn't really determine if this was the case because the Bureau of Correction Education did not have data readily available to answer this question. While we were able to get information for a sub sample through intensive case file reviews about the types of programs in which the education study group participated, how many hours they attended, and whether or not they completed programs,³ we still could not determine how the two groups compared on educational attainment at the time of their release. While we know that coming into prison the two groups were comparable as to literacy competency levels, having a high school diploma or GED could greatly

³ It should be noted that having this information was a significant improvement compared to other studies.

impact post-release employment, and thus we would need to know how the two groups compared on educational attainment at the time of their release from prison. In addition, the Bureau of Correction Education does not have a formal plan for pre/post educational testing of inmates which could provide some very important data regarding intermediate objectives accomplished during incarceration. For example, if correctional education participants increase their literacy levels during their incarceration, that would be an important and positive accomplishment. Even with intensive case file reviews we found almost no post-testing data for correctional education participants, and the Bureau of Correctional Education confirmed that they did not have a formal plan for educational post-tests.

Recommendations

Based on our findings in the EOS we make the following recommendations:

- 1. Utilize better testing, assessment and education planning for participants in correctional education. Rarely did we see pre- and post-testing for educational gains nor did we see educational assessment prior to release.**
- 2. Share and collaborate more collaboration with treatment staff and community program providers. Teachers are sometimes unaware of problems other than education that offenders may have.**
- 3. Encourage offenders to participate in other education programs with a progression from ABE to GED to Vocational classes when possible along with participation in non-traditional education programs such as life skills.**
- 4. Strengthen ties to education programs in the community and assist inmates in making contact with them prior to release.**
- 5. Recognize the achievement by inmates in some meaningful way. The state of Indiana by statute can reduce sentence length for GED attainment.**
- 6. Recognize the achievement by staff such as opportunities to attend conferences, seminars, and advanced education classes.**

- 7. Provide more training for staff. New research for education problems such as reading disabilities could improve the delivery of education programs.**
- 8. Work on a better match-up between vocational classes and labor market demands and work more closely with community employers.**
- 9. Improve data maintenance to show what has been accomplished in the education programs.**
- 10. Conduct a longer follow-up period, three years at a minimum, to assess the recidivism and employment outcomes for correctional education participants.**

These recommendations are made with the goal of improving outcomes for correctional education participants as well as improving the delivery of the education programs in the institutions. We know that DOC can make these improvements as we have seen them do so with the recommendations from the process evaluation.

Overall, the results of the recidivism portion of the study are promising for a one-year follow-up period. The results for the rearrest measure showed a significantly lower rate of rearrest for correctional education participants compared to non-participants. In addition, the rearrest rates were much lower than those in the national study conducted by the Bureau of Justice Statistics for offenders released from incarceration after one year. The other recidivism measures, however, did not show any significant difference between the two groups but a longer follow-up period might produce different results.

The post-release employment outcomes also did not show any significant difference between the correctional education participants and non-participants. This is where improvement and enhancement of the education program is critically needed, and by DOC and BCE focusing their efforts on employment outcomes, they could see better outcomes for these measures in the

future. Also the assumption is that better employment outcomes would most likely produce improved recidivism outcomes.

It should be emphasized that the characteristics of the study population show that the education staff is dealing with a high-risk population that has serious barriers to successful reentry upon release from incarceration particularly with employment. Having knowledge of these characteristics particularly the past offense/recidivism history, the prior employment and substance abuse history, the low literacy levels and the unstable family backgrounds might help in understanding the more disappointing outcomes of this study.

References

- Agresti, A., and Finlay, B. (1986). *Statistical Methods for the Social Sciences* (2nd ed.). Dellen: San Francisco, CA. p. 147
- Akers, R. and Sellers, C. (2004). *Criminological Theories: Introduction, Evaluation, and Application*, (4th ed.). Roxbury Publishing Company: Los Angeles, CA.
- Cecil, D.K., Drapkin, D.A., Mackenzie, D.L., and Hickman, L.J. (2000). The Effectiveness of Adult Basic Education and Life-Skills Programs in Reducing Recidivism: A Review and Assessment of the Research. *Journal of Correctional Education*, 51, 207-226.
- Gaes, G.G. and Kendig, N. (2003). *The Skill Sets and Health Care Needs of Released Offenders*. The Urban Institute: Washington, D.C.
- Langan, P. and Levin, D. (2002). *Recidivism of Prisoners Released in 1994*. Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report. U.S. Department of Justice: Washington, D.C.
- Lawrence, S., Mears, D., Dubin, G., and Travis, J. (2002). *The Practice and Promise of Prison Programming*. The Urban Institute, Washington, D.C.
- Maxfield, M. and Babbie, E., (2001). *Research Methods for Criminal Justice and Criminology*, 3rd Edition. Wadsworth: Belmont, CA. p.176.
- Pennsylvania Department of Corrections, (2003). *Program Analysis: A Description of PA DOC Programs and an Evaluation of their Effectiveness*. State of Pennsylvania: Harrisburg, PA.
- Phipps, P., Korinek, K., Aos, S., and Lieb, R. (1999). *Research Findings on Adult Corrections Programs: A review*. Washington State Institute for Public Policy.
- Smith, L. (2002). *OCE/CEA Three-State Recidivism Study*. U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C.
- Smith, L. (2003). "Does Educating Incarcerated Offenders Work? Examining the Results of the OCE/CEA Three-State Recidivism Study." American Correctional Association, Lanham, MD, 2003.
- Steurer, S. and Smith, L (2003). *Education Reduces Crime*. MTC Institute: Centerville, UT,
- Wilson, D.B., Gallagher, C.A., and Mackenzie, D.L. (2000). A meta-analysis of corrections-based education, vocation, and work programs for adult offenders. *Journal of Research on Crime and Delinquency*, 37, 347-368.

**Appendix A: Informed Consent Form
& Pre-Release Survey**

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Project Title: Pennsylvania Department of Corrections Education Program

Statement of Age of Subject: I state that I am over 18 years of age, in good physical health, and wish to participate in a program of research being conducted by Dr. Linda G. Smith of the Correctional Education Association, 4380 Forbes Boulevard, Lanham, Maryland 20706.

Purpose The purpose of the research is to conduct an evaluation of the Department of Corrections Correctional Education Program. The findings will allow program personnel an opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness of the program and assess the program’s progress in meeting strategic planning goals, all of which could lead to improved/enhanced services for offenders. In addition, states receiving federal funding are required to submit reports on the progress of participants during the program and after their release from incarceration. If you did not participate in any correctional education programming we are still interested in your opinions as this will help other inmates who may wish to participate later during their incarceration.

Procedures: The procedures require me to take part in a survey during my participation in the program which includes questions about my individual and family background, my prior work history, my previous involvement with the criminal justice system, my current involvement with the criminal justice system, my medical and mental health status and questions about my participation in the project. I understand that the researchers will also review my institutional/educational files, criminal history data, and employment and wages earned after incarceration.

Confidentiality: All information collected in this research is confidential, and my name will not be identified at any time. The data I provide will be grouped with data other participants provide for reporting and presentation. The Correctional Education Association and not the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections will maintain the data. No staff from the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections will be given any responses from individual inmates.

Risks: I understand that answering certain questions about my life may cause some discomfort, however, there are no other expected risks from my participation in the research study.

Benefits, Freedom to Withdraw I understand that the research is not designed to help me personally, although I may experience improved/enhanced services while participating in education programs. The Pennsylvania Department of Corrections’ policy prohibits payment to any inmate for participation in research. I am free to ask questions or to withdraw from participation at any time without penalty.

Linda G. Smith, Ph.D.
Correctional Education Association
4380 Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, MD 20706
(301) 918-1912

Printed Name of Subject _____

Signature of Subject _____

Witness _____ **Date:** _____

**CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
EDUCATION SURVEY
FOR PARTICIPANTS AND NON-PARTICIPANTS**

The Correctional Education Association, 4380 Forbes Boulevard, Lanham, Maryland, is conducting this survey. The survey asks a series of questions about your family situation, employment experiences, criminal history, educational background, current program participation, medical/mental health status, and post sentence plans. The information from your answers will be put together with others who answer this survey to produce statistics. The findings will allow program personnel an opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness of their current policies and assess progress in meeting strategic planning goals, all of which could lead to improved/enhanced services for inmates. No one will know your individual answers because all data will be reported as group statistics. In other words, your answers to the survey are completely anonymous and confidential.

Your participation is completely voluntary, and you may refuse participation at any time without penalty or prejudice. If there are questions, which you do not wish to answer, please indicate by placing an R by the question. Remember, however, this data will be presented as group data not individual data and this data may impact future programming or policies. Your participation or non-participation will not affect your release date or parole eligibility. If you decide to end participation, please advise the survey administrator.

We will be happy to answer any questions you have about the survey. Because the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections policy prohibits payment for participation in research, we cannot offer any compensation to you for completing this survey. **We appreciate your willingness to participate in this important research.**

Directions

Please mark your answers directly on the survey. If you want to add any additional comments to any question, please do so on the back of the survey indicating the question number.

If you have any concerns or if you are having problems understanding a particular question, please do not hesitate to raise your hand and ask the survey administrator for assistance.

Inmate ID Number _____

CURRENT INDIVIDUAL/FAMILY BACKGROUND INFORMATION: The following questions ask about you and your current family situation.

1. Under federal law, people participating in this survey DO NOT have to tell us their Social Security Number. However, it is very useful and helps us to do follow-up studies. May I have your Social Security number?

2. Race:

- African American
- White
- Black Hispanic
- White Hispanic
- Native American
- Asian
- Other _____

3. Gender

- Male
- Female

4. What is your current marital status?

- I am married
- I have a common law relationship with a wife/husband
- I am separated
- I am divorced
- I am single

5. What is your date of birth? _____

6. How many children do you have? _____

7. How many children under the age of 18 do you have? _____

If you have children, please list their ages: _____

8. Do you speak a language other than English at home?

Yes

No

If yes, what language?

Spanish

Asian (Chinese, Vietnamese, Korean, etc.)

Other _____

9. What is your religious affiliation? _____

10. Is your family currently receiving any government benefits? (Spouse, Children, Parents, Grandparents, etc.)

Yes

No

Don't know

If yes, please list the benefits:

PRIOR TO PRISON QUESTIONS: The following questions ask about your situation prior to your current incarceration.

Individual/Family Situation Prior to Prison:

11. What type of area did you live in **before this incarceration**? (Check only One)

- In a city - Where? _____
Neighborhood _____
- In a suburb of a city - Where? _____
Neighborhood _____
- In a small city (over 10,000 to 50,000 people)
Where? _____
Neighborhood _____
- In a town (less than 10,000 people)
Where? _____
Neighborhood _____
- In a rural area - Where? _____
Neighborhood _____

12. In the year **prior to this incarceration**, how many people depended on you for income?

- None One Two Three Four or more

13. In the year **prior to this incarceration**, were you the person financially supporting one or more of your children/grandchildren?

- Yes, my child (children) lived with me
- Yes, I paid support for their care but I am not court ordered to pay
- Yes, I paid court-ordered support
- Yes, I supported my grandchildren
- No

14. Did you receive any of the following government benefits in the year **prior to this incarceration**? Please check any that you received.

- | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|--------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Food stamps | <input type="checkbox"/> | TANF | <input type="checkbox"/> | Medicaid |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Public Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> | Unemployment | <input type="checkbox"/> | Worker's |
| Comp <input type="checkbox"/> | VA Disability | <input type="checkbox"/> | SSI | <input type="checkbox"/> | Social Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Social Security | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other: _____ | | |

15. How often did you attend religious services in the community **prior to this incarceration**?

- | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------|--------------------------|---------------|--------------------------|-------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Twice a week | <input type="checkbox"/> | Twice a month | <input type="checkbox"/> | Once a Year |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Once a week | <input type="checkbox"/> | Once a month | <input type="checkbox"/> | Never |

Involvement in the Criminal Justice System Prior to Prison:

16. Has anyone in your family ever been incarcerated in prison or jail? (Brothers, sisters, parents, children, grandparents, etc.)

- Yes
 No

If yes, who was incarcerated: _____ How long? _____

If yes, who was incarcerated: _____ How long? _____

If yes, who was incarcerated: _____ How long? _____

If yes, who was incarcerated: _____ How long? _____

17. Do you have any close friends (someone you see at least once a week) from your neighborhood that have ever been incarcerated in prison or jail?

- Yes
 No

18. How old were you when you were first involved in criminal activities?

Years of Age

What was your first crime? _____

19. How old were you (as an adult or juvenile) when you were first arrested (taken to the police station to be booked and fingerprinted)?

Years of Age

20. Have you ever been confined in a juvenile facility?

Yes

No

If yes, what was it in? Juvenile detention Juvenile incarceration

21. How many times were you arrested **as a juvenile** (include both misdemeanor and felony)

_____ Times

22. How many times have you been arrested **as an adult** (include both misdemeanor and felony)

_____ Times

23. How many **felony** arrests have you had before this incarceration? (**Count both adult & juvenile**)

_____ Arrests

24. How much time have you spent in prisons and jails since turning 18 years of age (include current stay)?

Years Months

25. How many times have you been on probation?

Never Once Twice Three Times Four times or more

30. Have you ever held a legal job that paid more than \$8.00 per hour?

- Yes
- No
- If yes, what was the hourly rate? \$ _____

31. Have you ever held a job that paid less than minimum wage? (Less than \$5.15/hour or the minimum wage rate at the time you were employed)

- Yes
- No
- If yes, what was the hourly rate? \$ _____

32. What job or jobs did you hold **in the year prior to this incarceration** (legal or illegal)? Please list them:

_____	How long?	_____
_____	How long?	_____
_____	How long?	_____
_____	How long?	_____

33. If you held a legal job **before this incarceration**, how much did you earn?

- I was not employed
- Weekly wages: \$ _____ or Daily wages: \$ _____

34. Did your employer pay for any benefits for the longest job you held **before this incarceration**?

- Yes, they did
- No, they did not
- If yes, what were the benefits? (Annual leave or vacation, sick leave, retirement plan, unemployment, other)

Education Prior to Prison:

35. **Prior to this incarceration**, what is the highest grade you had completed in school?

- Less than 4th grade
- Vocational education after high school
- 5th to 8th grade
- 9th grade
- 10th grade
- 11th grade
- Completed high school
- Some college
- AA degree
- Four year college degree
- Graduate school
- GED

36. Were you in school **the year prior to incarceration**?

- Yes
- No

37. What type of school were you in **before you came to prison?**

- | | | | |
|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> | I was not in school | <input type="radio"/> | Vocational/technical school |
| <input type="radio"/> | Junior High School | <input type="radio"/> | College |
| <input type="radio"/> | High School/GED | <input type="radio"/> | Other _____ |

38. Did you enjoy:

- | | | | | |
|---------------------|-----------------------|-----|-----------------------|----|
| Elementary School ? | <input type="radio"/> | yes | <input type="radio"/> | no |
| Middle School ? | <input type="radio"/> | yes | <input type="radio"/> | no |
| High School? | <input type="radio"/> | yes | <input type="radio"/> | no |

39. Think back to your experiences in school before you were ever in a juvenile or adult facility. Rate your experience in school. Please fill in the bubble that best describes how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

	Strongly Agree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
In general the teachers didn't understand me.	○	○	○	○	○	○
I studied very hard.	○	○	○	○	○	○
I had trouble reading in class.	○	○	○	○	○	○
I did my homework.	○	○	○	○	○	○
I was always a discipline problem.	○	○	○	○	○	○
I usually got very good grades.	○	○	○	○	○	○
I was frequently in trouble.	○	○	○	○	○	○
I did my work in class.	○	○	○	○	○	○

40. As a child, did your parents:

	Never	Sometimes	Often	Always
Read to you	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Help you with your homework	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Attend Parent/Teacher meetings	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Attend school functions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Encourage you to make good grades	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reward you for good grades	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Punish you for bad grades	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

In Prison: These questions ask about your current situation in prison.

41. How long have you been incarcerated on current charges?

Years Months

42. How long have you been at this prison?

Years

43. How much time do you have left on your sentence?

Years Months

44. In the last month who has visited you? (check all that apply)

Spouse Children Parents Other Relatives Friends

45. During this incarceration, how often do you see your children? (If you don't have any children, just check N/A)

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> N/A | <input type="radio"/> Every 3 months |
| <input type="radio"/> Once a week | <input type="radio"/> Every 6 months |
| <input type="radio"/> Once a month | <input type="radio"/> Never |
| <input type="radio"/> Once a year | |

46. While in prison, how often do you attend religious services?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="radio"/> Never | <input type="radio"/> Weekly |
| <input type="radio"/> Once a year | <input type="radio"/> Two or Three times per week |
| <input type="radio"/> Once every couple of months | <input type="radio"/> Daily |
| <input type="radio"/> Monthly | |

47. What education programs did you or do you participate in **during this incarceration**?
Check as many as you were enrolled in.

- Basic education classes Hours attending per week____
How many weeks? _____
- GED classes Hours attending per week____
How many weeks? _____
- Life skills, job prep Hours attending per week____
How many weeks? _____
- Spector Grant Hours attending per week____
How many weeks? _____
- Vocational classes Hours attending per week____
How many weeks? _____
- College classes Hours attending per week____
How many weeks? _____
- Others If other, please list:

Hours attending per week____
How many weeks? _____

Hours attending per week____
How many weeks? _____

Hours attending per week____
How many weeks? _____

48. Did you participate in any of the following treatment programs **during this incarceration?**

Family Counseling	<input type="radio"/>	Yes	<input type="radio"/>	No	Wanted to but it wasn't available
Individual counseling/	<input type="radio"/>	Yes	<input type="radio"/>	No	Wanted to but it wasn't available
Anger management	<input type="radio"/>	Yes	<input type="radio"/>	No	Wanted to but it wasn't available
Drug/Alcohol treatment	<input type="radio"/>	Yes	<input type="radio"/>	No	Wanted to but it wasn't available
Sex Offender Program	<input type="radio"/>	Yes	<input type="radio"/>	No	Wanted to but it wasn't available
Other _____	<input type="radio"/>	Yes	<input type="radio"/>	No	Wanted to but it wasn't available

49. What was your most recent job **in prison?**

- | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> | I had no job in prison | <input type="radio"/> | Laundry |
| <input type="radio"/> | Clerical/secretarial | <input type="radio"/> | School Aide/tutor |
| <input type="radio"/> | School/vocational training | <input type="radio"/> | Sanitation/janitorial |
| <input type="radio"/> | Food service | <input type="radio"/> | Pre-release work crew |
| <input type="radio"/> | Work release | <input type="radio"/> | Prison industry program |
| <input type="radio"/> | Computer work | <input type="radio"/> | Other _____ |

How long did you hold this job? _____

50. What other jobs did you have **in prison?** Please list:

_____	How long?	_____
_____	How long?	_____
_____	How long?	_____
_____	How long?	_____
_____	How long?	_____

51. How many times have you been transferred during this incarceration?

_____ Times

52. Have these transfers interrupted your participation in programs?

Yes

No

If yes, programs:

53. Did you receive any “Misconduct” or “Informal Resolutions” **during your current incarceration?**

Yes

No

54. If you answered yes, how many did you receive and indicate whether it was a Misconduct or an Informal Resolution and the charge)

one

two

three

More than four

What was your punishment?

55. How important to you are the following reasons for participating in the education program offered by the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections? Check 1 for “very important” or 5 for “very unimportant” or a number in between such as 2, 3 or 4.

	Very Important		Very Unimportant		
	1	2	3	4	5
a. To increase my educational level	0	0	0	0	0
b. To get a better or higher paying job	0	0	0	0	0
c. To improve my work skills	0	0	0	0	0
d. To feel better about myself	0	0	0	0	0
e. To help support my children/family	0	0	0	0	0
f. To make my children/family proud of me	0	0	0	0	0
g. To become less dependent on others	0	0	0	0	0
h. To make others feel better about me	0	0	0	0	0
i. To keep busy in prison	0	0	0	0	0
j. To look good to prison or parole official to get out	0	0	0	0	0
k. To get a better situation in prison (housing, earn money, safer environment)	0	0	0	0	0

Current Medical/Dental/Mental Health Status:

Are you currently taking medications?

- Yes
- No

If you answered yes, what medications are you taking?

Have you been treated for any of the following medical/mental health problems during the last year? (Check all that apply)

- Hypertension
- Diabetes
- Heart Problems
- Sexually transmitted Diseases
- Hepatitis B
- Hepatitis C
- HIV/AIDS
- High Cholesterol
- Skin Problems
- Vision
- Sickle Cell Anemia
- Bipolar Disorder

- ⊖ Depression
- ⊖ Schizophrenia
- ⊖ Headaches
- ⊖ Back Problems
- ⊖ Dental
- ⊖ Other Medical: _____
- ⊖ Other Mental Health: _____

Do you have any Medical/Dental/ Mental Health concerns at the present?

- Yes
- No

If you do, please list them.

After Prison: The following questions ask about future plans after release from prison.

When do you expect to be released? _____

Do you have a place to live when you get out of prison?

- ⊖ Yes
- ⊖ No
- ⊖ I think so
- ⊖ I don't know

Where do you plan to live after release from prison?

Street

City and State

62. What is the zip code for your residence after release?

_____ Zip Code
_____ Don't know

63. What will be your mailing address after release from prison

_____ Don't know yet

64. Will you be living with members of your family when you get out of prison?

Yes No I think so I don't know

If yes, what family member will you be living with (i.e., mother, father, brother sister, grandparent)?

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

65. When did you last speak to the person you are planning to live with?

66. Do you plan to go to school when you are released from prison?

Yes No I think so I don't know

If yes, what type of school?

- Adult education classes
- GED
- Vocational/Technical School
- Community College
- 4 year college
- Other _____

67. Will you be under supervision after release?

- Yes
- No

68. Do you know who your probation/parole officer is?

- Yes
- No

If yes:

Name: _____

Office: _____

69. Who have you kept in touch with since you have been incarcerated (people you call/people who visit you)?

Name _____ Relationship _____

Street Address: _____

City _____ State _____

Home Phone _____ Work Phone _____

Name _____ Relationship _____

Street Address: _____

City _____ State _____

Home Phone _____ Work Phone _____

Name _____ Relationship _____

Street Address: _____

City _____ State _____

Home Phone _____ Work Phone _____

Name _____ Relationship _____

Street Address: _____

City _____ State _____

Home Phone _____ Work Phone _____

70. Will you be attending religious services when you are released?

Yes

No

If yes, where do you plan to attend? _____

71. Will you have a job in the community when you get out?

Yes No I think so I don't know

If yes, what is the job? _____

If no, do you plan on looking for a job? _____

72. Is there anyone on the outside who will help you find a job?

Yes No I think so I don't know

If yes, who will help you (relative, former employer, employment agency)

73. Do you have any concerns about your upcoming release?

Yes

No

If yes, what are they:

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION!

**Appendix B: Institutional/ Education
Case File Form**

PADOC Release Form

1st State Incarceration: Yes No

Institution Code: _____

Has the Inmate been re-arrested or are they back in prison? Yes No

DOC #: _____

Release Date: _____

Inmate Name: _____ **Gender:** Male Female

Birthday: _____

Age: _____

SSN: _____

Race: _____

SID: _____

Custody Level: _____

FBI#: _____

Religious Affiliation: _____

Parole Board #: _____

Marital Status: Married Common-Law Separated Divorced Single

Other: _____

Children: How many? _____ Ages: _____ # of mothers/fathers: _____

Pays Child Support? Yes No How Much? _____

Family: Does the inmate claim to have a supportive family? Yes No

Are there any indications regarding childhood traumas or abuse? Yes No

If yes, what are they? _____

Parents Marital Status at Birth: _____ Currently? _____ Place of Birth: _____

Number of Siblings: _____ **Military Service:** Branch _____ How Long _____

Do any family members have a criminal history or are currently incarcerated?

Yes No

Comments about family situation:

Employment: Employed w/in 6 mos. of Incarceration: Yes No

Location of last employment: _____

Job Title: _____

Address: _____ Length of Employment: _____

Wages: _____ (Hourly) _____ (Weekly) _____

Participation in Educational and Vocational Prison Programming:

Source of Information: (1) Institutional Records (2) Ed Records (3) Counselor Records (4) Other

* Please specify in the Blanks provided before each category

__ Educational Attainment prior to prison:

Grade Level: _____ High School Diploma GED Some College AA Degree

BA/BS Degree Graduate Level Degree **Special Ed?** Yes No

__ Test Scores:

TABE: Date Given: _____ Reading: _____ Math: _____ Language: _____

Date Given: _____ Reading: _____ Math: _____ Language: _____

WRAT: Date Given: _____ Reading: _____ Spelling: _____ Math: _____

IQ: _____

__ Vocational Training prior to Prison: _____

Certificates: _____

__ Educational Programs in Prison:

Was the inmate enrolled in Educational Programs? Yes No

1) Type of Educational Program: ABE GED College/Post Secondary Other: _____

Program Title: _____

Dates of Attendance: Start Date: _____ End Date: _____

Participation: Hours _____ Sessions: _____ Weeks: _____ Months: _____

Completed: Yes No Certificate: Yes No Diploma: Yes No

If not completed, why? _____

2) Type of Educational Program: ABE GED College/Post Secondary Other: _____

Program Title: _____

Dates of Attendance: Start Date: _____ End Date: _____

Participation: Hours _____ Sessions: _____ Weeks: _____ Months: _____

Completed: Yes No Certificate: Yes No Diploma: Yes No

If not completed, why? _____

3) Type of Educational Program: ABE GED College/Post Secondary Other: _____

Program Title: _____

Dates of Attendance: Start Date: _____ End Date: _____

Participation: Hours _____ Sessions: _____ Weeks: _____ Months: _____

Completed: Yes No Certificate: Yes No Diploma: Yes No

If not completed, why? _____

4) Type of Educational Program: ABE GED College/Post Secondary Other: _____

Program Title: _____

Dates of Attendance: Start Date: _____ End Date: _____

Participation: Hours _____ Sessions: _____ Weeks: _____ Months: _____

Completed: Yes No Certificate: Yes No Diploma: Yes No

If not completed, why? _____

__ Vocational Programs in Prison:

1) Program Title: _____

Dates of Attendance: Start Date: _____ End Date: _____

Participation: Hours _____ Sessions: _____ Weeks: _____ Months: _____

Completed: Yes No Certificate: Yes No Diploma: Yes No

If not completed, why?

2) Program Title: _____

Dates of Attendance: Start Date: _____ End Date: _____

Participation: Hours _____ Sessions: _____ Weeks: _____ Months: _____

Completed: Yes No Certificate: Yes No Diploma: Yes No

If not completed, why?

3) Program Title: _____

Dates of Attendance: Start Date: _____ End Date: _____

Participation: Hours _____ Sessions: _____ Weeks: _____ Months: _____

Completed: Yes No Certificate: Yes No Diploma: Yes No

If not completed, why?

Criminal History:

__ Does the inmate have a juvenile record? Yes No **1st Crime:** _____

If yes, how many arrests? _____ Adjudications? _____ Commitments? _____

How many adult arrests? _____ Convictions? _____ Commitments? _____

Previous crimes the inmate has been charged for? _____

__ Current Incarceration:

What was the inmate's crime for current incarceration? _____

Was the Victim a Child? Yes No

Reception Date: _____ Effective Date: _____

Minimum Sentence: _____ Maximum Sentence: _____

Minimum Date: _____ Maximum Date: _____

Does the Inmate have any Detainers? _____

Is this offense related to Drugs or Alcohol? Yes No

__ Probation:

How many times have the inmate been on Probation? _____

Was this Probation Revoked? Yes No If Yes, Why? _____

__ Jail: Number of Times in Jail: _____ How long? _____

__ Parole:

How many times has the inmate been on Parole? _____

Was this Parole Revoked? Yes No If Yes, Why? _____

1st parole release Date: _____ Date of Return: _____

__ Transfers:

How many times has the inmate been transferred? _____

Which Institutions? _____

__ Medical/Mental Health/Substance Abuse:

Does the inmate have any serious medical conditions? Yes No

Please List: _____

Does the inmate have a history of Mental Illness? Yes No **VPI:** ____ **SPI:** ____

Diagnosis: _____ **Suicide Attempts:** Yes No

Current Medications: _____ **Stability Score:** _____

Hospitalizations? _____

Does the Inmate have a history of Alcohol or Drug Abuse? Yes No

D& A Score: _____

Was this abuse treated before Incarceration? Yes No

Drug of Choice: _____

Where? _____ In-Patient Out-Patient

Institutional Infractions:

Does the inmate have any infractions on their record? Yes No

Misconducts: _____ # Informal Resolutions: _____ Date: _____

What were the charges for the previous infractions?

Institutional Employment:

Was the inmate employed during their incarceration? Yes No

If yes, Where? _____ How long? _____

Where? _____ How long? _____

Where? _____ How long? _____

DOC In Prison Programming:

1. Verified Treatment Programs:

Alcohol Drugs Assault Escape Sex Offender Psychiatric Physical Vocational

Academic Other: _____

__ 2. DOC Caseworker recommendations for In-Prison Programming:

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Stress /Anger Classes | <input type="checkbox"/> Vocational Classes | <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-Release Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Misconduct Free | <input type="checkbox"/> Psychiatric Treatment | <input type="checkbox"/> Participate in Leisure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Victim Awareness Classes | <input type="checkbox"/> D &A Classes | <input type="checkbox"/> Sex Offender Classes |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ED/GED Classes | <input type="checkbox"/> COR | <input type="checkbox"/> Boot Camp |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Good Work/Housing report | <input type="checkbox"/> Prison Work Prog | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

__ 3. Treatment Program Participation:

1) Program: _____ Start Date: _____

Hours Attended: _____ Sessions: _____ Weeks: _____ End Date: _____

Excellent Completion Successful Completion Marginal Completion

Failure Dropped

If not completed, why? _____ Certificate of Completion

2) Program: _____ Start Date: _____

Hours Attended: _____ Sessions: _____ Weeks: _____ End Date: _____

Excellent Completion Successful Completion Marginal Completion

Failure Dropped

If not completed, why? _____ Certificate of Completion

3) Program: _____ Start Date: _____

Hours Attended: _____ Sessions: _____ Weeks: _____ End Date: _____

Excellent Completion Successful Completion Marginal Completion

Failure Dropped

If not completed, why? _____ Certificate of Completion

4) Program: _____ Start Date: _____

Hours Attended: _____ Sessions: _____ Weeks: _____ End Date: _____

Excellent Completion Successful Completion Marginal Completion

Failure Dropped

If not completed, why? _____ Certificate of Completion

5) Program: _____ Start Date: _____

Hours Attended: _____ Sessions: _____ Weeks: _____ End Date: _____

Excellent Completion Successful Completion Marginal Completion

Failure Dropped

If not completed, why? _____ Certificate of Completion

__ Post Release Planning:

Release Status: Maximum Sentence Served Parole to CCC Parole Home

Post Release Plans:

__ Parole Board Instructions:

- No Alcohol Pay Monthly Fee: \$ _____ Pay court costs: \$ _____
- May not enter an establishment that serves or sells alcohol
- Provide plan for court restitution payments
- Consult with a county collection agency w/in 72 hrs of release
- Sex Offender Treatment
- Do not contact co-defendant Maintain stable employment
- If unemployed, will actively seek employment
- Make no contact with the victim Support dependents
- Abide by set curfew Subject to urinalysis testing
- Motor Vehicle Restrictions Obtain Valid Drivers License
- Take Prescribed medications Travel or Residence Restrictions
- Must attend NA, AA or other support groups: _____
- Do not associate with persons who are known to sell drugs outside a treatment setting
- Electronic Monitoring No Drug Paraphernalia
- Outpatient D & A Therapy Domestic Violence Protocol
- Other: _____

__ Address Information:

1) CCC/Treatment Home: _____

2) Name/Relation: _____

Street Address _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

Phone Number: _____

3) Name/Relation: _____

Street Address _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

Phone Number: _____

Parole Officer: _____

Street Address _____ Region: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____ Phone Number: _____

Predicted Risk Factors:

1) _____

2) _____

3) _____

4) _____

5) _____

6) _____

7) _____

Predicted Success Factors:

1) _____

2) _____

3) _____

4) _____

5) _____

Appendix C: Interview Letters and Forms

FOLLOW-UP LETTER #1

March 10, 2003

Mr.
(Street)
City, State Zip

Dear Mr. _____: (Address all by Mr., Ms.)

My name is Dr. Linda Smith and I am following up on research I am conducting for the Correctional Education Association (CEA) on Pennsylvania's prison education programs. You participated in a survey and may have had a one-on-one interview with me during your incarceration. I would like to talk to you on the phone or in person to see how you are doing, if you are having any problems, and if we can help you get in contact with any resources that may assist you.

Any discussion in this interview will not be given to your parole officer or the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections. You can be assured of complete confidentiality of anything said either on the phone or in person. If you are willing to take the time to talk to me, please fill out the form at the bottom, tear it off, and send it back to me in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope. I would like to begin conducting these interviews in late march or early April at your convenience. You will notice that I have a new address. Due to prior difficulty in getting my mail in a timely fashion and letters getting lost, these responses will now come directly to me.

I am looking forward to hearing from you and hope that you can make time to help us in this important research. If you are willing to meet with me in person, I will set up the time and place when I call.

Sincerely,

Linda G. Smith, Ph D

Name: _____

- I would like to conduct this interview by phone
- I would like to conduct this interview in person.

The best times to reach me by phone are:

- Morning Afternoon Evening or at _____ o'clock. (am/pm)

The best phone number to reach me is:(____)_____

FOLLOW-UP LETTER #2

Date

Name

Address

City, State, Zip

Dear _____:

My name is Dr. Linda Smith and I recently sent you a follow-up letter regarding your participation in a survey conducted by the Correctional Education Association during your incarceration. I would like to stress the importance of your participation in the follow-up portion of the educational and vocational program evaluation. Your input and ideas are essential to the project because the PA Department of Corrections will see your comments and will be able to improve their services based on your opinions.

I would really like to talk to you on the phone or in person to see how you are doing, if you are having any problems, and if we can help you get in contact with any resources that may assist you. Previous follow up interviews (either on the phone or in person) have been very helpful and informative, for both the participant and myself, and I want to encourage your involvement as well. I have attached another follow-up reply slip for you to return to me if you wish to speak to me in person or on the phone.

I am looking forward to hearing from you and hope that you can make time to help us in this important research. If you are willing to meet with me in person, I will set up the time and place when I call.

Sincerely,

Linda G. Smith, Ph.D.

PA INMATE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Inmate Name: _____ **Date of Interview:** _____

DOC# _____

Interviewer: Hello, my name is _____. We sent you a letter recently to ask if you would be willing to talk to us about how you are doing since you have been released from the PA Department of Corrections and you agreed to have us call you.

Interviewee: They may ask what this is about.

Interviewer: I don't know if you remember but some time ago you participated in a survey that was given at one of the prisons in PA. as part of a research project to study the impact of education on prisoners. We are trying to follow-up with some of the individuals who participated in this study. This study is important because it may impact how PA DOC budgets money for programs for inmates. We have conducted similar studies in other states that have resulted in increased funding for education programs and have prevented some states from terminating programs.

Interviewee: They may ask what is in it for them.

Interviewer: We may be able to make some referrals if you are having any problems but this will also help prisoners who are currently incarcerated and who may benefit from education programs. We strongly believe that former prisoners are an excellent source of information to help guide prison programming. This is an opportunity to voice your opinions that will be heard not only at the state level but also at a national level.

Interviewer: Do you mind answering some questions. It will only take a few minutes of your time and all of your answers are confidential. Your individual answers will not be shared with anyone except the research team. Once we have completed all of the interviews we will put all of the responses together in group form. Again your individual answers are confidential. If there is any question during the interview that you don't want to answer just let me know.

If they say no, ask them if they would be interested in a personal interview by Dr. Linda Smith, the lead researcher on this project. If they say no, thank them for their time and tell them if they change their mind to please contact us.

If they say yes, have them answer the following questions:

Family:

Where do you live? _____

Do you live with anyone? _____ With Whom do you live? _____

Did you have any trouble finding a place to live? _____

Only ask these next five question if they did not indicate that they lived with their children. If they said that they lived with their children skip the first one and do the next three.

Do you have any children? _____ How old are your children? _____

Do you see them often? _____ Any problems with them adjusting to you returning home? _____

Do you think that they are doing better since you returned? _____

Employment:

Are you currently working? _____

Where are you working? _____

What do you do there? _____

You don't have to answer this if you don't want to but do you mind telling me how much your salary is? \$ _____

Did you have any problems finding a job? _____

How long did it take you to find a job after you were released? _____

Did anyone help you find this job? _____

Post-Release Supervision:

Were you at a CCC prior to your release?_____Which one?_____

How was that experience? (try to get them to tell you if it was good/bad/so-so etc.)

Are you on Parole now?_____ (they may say they have terminated parole if so ask them the following question as if they were on parole)

Any problems?_____

Post-Release Treatment/Education:

Are you receiving any kind of help in the community now?_____ What kind of help (drug treatment, mental health, sex offender)?_____

Are you having any difficulties with drugs or alcohol?_____

Are you attending any type of education classes (adult ed, vocational training, technical school, college)? _____ Where?_____

Problems:

Are you having any problems or difficulties now?_____ What are they?_____

Is there anything that we might help you with?_____

Follow-up:

Would you mind if we call you again in a few months to see how you are doing?_____

THANK YOU SO MUCH FOR YOUR TIME AND FOR SHARING YOUR INFORMATION.
WE WISH ONLY THE BEST FOR YOU AND HOPE YOU CONTINUE TO HAVE
SUCCESS WITH YOUR RELEASE.

**IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO SEE THE RESULTS OF THE STUDY WHEN IT IS
COMPLETED WE WILL BE HAPPY TO SEND IT TO YOU. WE SHOULD HAVE IT
COMPLETED IN ABOUT SIX MONTHS.**

Yes_____ No_____

(Ask them if the address we sent the letter to is a good address if they want to see the results)

Appendix D: Case File Tables

Table 1: Case File - Custody Level

	Participants		Non-Participants	
	N	%	N	%
Custody Level				
1	1	.3%	1	.6%
2	86	29.0%	54	31.0%
3	161	54.2%	90	51.7%
4	48	16.2%	28	16.1%
5	1	.3%	1	.6%
Data Not Available	12		3	
Total	309	100%	177	100%

Table 2: Case File - Inmate Demographics

	Participants			Non-Participants		
	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean
Age	21	78	35.77	21	69	37.11
	N		%		%	
Gender						
Male	284	91.9%		172	97.2%	
Female	25	8.1%		5	2.8%	
Total	309	100%		177	100%	
Race						
African American	135	43.7%		66	37.3%	
White	138	44.7%		99	55.9%	
Hispanic	35	11.4%		9	5.1%	
Other	1	.3%		3	1.8%	
Total	309	100%		177	100%	
Place of Birth						
Pennsylvania	135	70.7%		88	72.1%	
Out of State	34	17.8%		28	23.0%	
Puerto Rico	19	9.9%		3	2.5%	
Foreign Country	3	1.6%		3	2.5%	
Data Not Available	118			55		
Total	309	100%		177	100%	
Religion						
Protestant	77	35.6%		52	38.2%	
Catholic	54	25.0%		28	20.6%	
Muslim	45	20.8%		18	13.2%	
Other	15	6.9%		13	9.5%	
No Preference	25	11.6%		25	18.4%	
Data Not Available	93			41		
Total	229	100%		177	100%	
Ever Serve in the Military?						
Yes	22	11.5%		19	14.3%	
No	170	88.5%		114	85.7%	
Data Not Available	117			44		
Total	309	100%		177	100%	

Table 3: Case File - Family Variables

	Participants		Non-Participants	
	N	%	N	%
Supportive Family?				
Yes	202	68.7%	126	73.3%
No	92	31.3%	46	26.7%
Data Not Available	15		5	
Total	309	100%	177	100%
Inmate Marital Status				
Married	55	18.2%	27	15.6%
Common-Law	10	3.3%	8	4.6%
Separated	16	5.3%	6	3.5%
Divorced	35	11.6%	30	17.3%
Single	186	61.6%	102	59.0%
Data Not Available	7		4	
Total	309	100%	177	100%
Inmate Children Under 18				
0	89	30.6%	53	31.0%
1	71	24.4%	47	27.5%
2	61	21.0%	32	18.7%
3	35	12.0%	16	9.4%
4	23	7.9%	9	5.3%
5 or More	12	3.9%	14	8.2%
Data Not Available	18		6	
Total	309	100%	177	100%
Inmate Paying any Child Support?				
Yes	12	16.9%	7	7.8%
No	59	83.1%	83	92.2%
Data Not Available	238		87	
Total	309	100%	177	100%
Experienced Abuse in the Home?				
Yes	135	45.9%	68	39.3%
No	159	54.1%	105	60.7%
Data Not Available	15		4	
Total	309	100%	177	100%
Parents Marital Status at Birth				
Married	138	70.1%	101	75.9%
Living Together	10	5.1%	1	.8%
No Contact/Not Married	42	21.3%	28	21.1%
Common Law	7	3.6%	3	2.3%
Data Not Available	112		132	
Total	309	100%	177	100%
Inmate Family Incarcerated in Prison or Jail				
Yes	110	39.0%	47	28.1%
No	172	61.0%	120	71.9%
Data Not Available	27		10	
Total	309	100%	177	100%

Table 4: Case File - Employment /Wage Data

	Participants		Non-Participants	
	N	%	N	%
Employed Within 6 Months Of Incarceration				
Yes	159	61.4%	99	63.1%
No	100	38.6%	58	36.9%
Data Not Available	50		20	
Total	309	100%	177	100%
Wage Data				
Hourly Wages	M=\$8.31		M=\$11.45	
Weekly Wages	M=\$444.12		M=\$434.89	

Table 5: Case File - Education Background Data

	Participants			Non-Participants		
	N	%		N	%	
Highest Grade Completed In School						
Below 8 th Grade	6	2.0%		4	2.6%	
8 th Grade	15	5.2%		6	3.8%	
9 th Grade	31	10.8%		16	10.1%	
10 th Grade	76	26.4%		37	23.4%	
11 th Grade	53	18.4%		37	23.4%	
12 th Grade	107	37.2%		58	36.7%	
Data Not Available	21			19		
Total	309	100%		177	100%	
Receive GED or HS Diploma						
GED	39	12.6%		60	33.9%	
HS Diploma	87	28.2%		51	28.8%	
Data Not Available	183	59.2%		66	37.3%	
Total	309	100%		177	100%	
Complete any Higher Education?						
Some College	13	4.2%		11	6.2%	
AA Degree	5	1.6%		0	0	
BA/BS Degree	1	.3%		1	6.8%	
Masters Level Degree	0	0		0	0	
Data Not Available	290	93.9%		165	93.2%	
Total	309	100%		177	100%	
Ever Attend Special Education Classes as a Child?						
Yes	27	17.1%		7	7.8%	
No	131	82.9%		83	92.2%	
Data Not Available	151			87		
Total	309	100%		177	100%	
Test Scores						
	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean
WRAT: Reading	.1	13.0	8.2	2.0	13.0	8.6
WRAT: Spelling	.3	13.0	6.8	2.0	13.0	7.5
WRAT: Math	1.8	13.0	6.8	3.0	13.0	7.1
TABE: Reading	2.2	13.0	8.0	2.4	12.9	8.4
TABE: Math	1.6	12.9	6.7	4.2	12.9	7.2
TABE: Language	.3	13.0	6.6	3.2	12.9	7.9
Intelligence Rating	50	132	91.8	67	122	93.9
Participation in Education Classes	N			%		
Yes	309			63.6%		
No	177			36.4%		
Total	486			100%		

Table 6: Case File - Criminal History 1st Crime

What was your 1 st Crime	Participants		Non-Participants	
	N	%	N	%
Violent	106	33.4%	40	24.1%
Property	101	31.9%	58	34.9%
Drugs	70	22.1%	34	20.5%
Misdemeanor	21	6.6%	13	7.8%
Traffic	12	3.8%	10	6.0%
Other	7	2.2%	11	6.6%
Total	317	100%	166	100%

Table 7: Case File - Prior Juvenile Criminal History

	Participants			Non-Participants		
	N	%	M	N	%	M
Arrest?						
Yes	149	45.0%		70	40.9%	
No	182	55.0%		101	59.1%	
Number			2.79			2.51
Adjudication?						
Yes	116	35.0%		62	36.3%	
No	215	65.0%		109	63.7%	
Number			2.02			2.06
Commitment?						
Yes	101	30.5%		48	28.1%	
No	230	69.5%		123	71.9%	
Number			1.64			1.60

Table 8: Case File - Prior Adult Criminal History

	Participants			Non-Participants		
	N	%	M	N	%	M
Prior Arrest?						
Yes	306	92.4%		164	95.9%	
No	25	7.6%		7	4.1%	
Number			7.30			7.98
Prior Convictions?						
Yes	287	86.7%		160	93.6%	
No	44	13.3%		11	6.4%	
Number			5.14			5.68
Prior Incarcerations?						
Yes	239	72.2%		141	82.5%	
No	92	27.8%		30	17.5%	
Number			2.65			3.49

Table 9: Case File - Criminal History - Probation

	N	%	N	%
Number of Times on Probation				
Never	153	47.2%	81	48.2%
Once	92	27.8%	47	28.0%
Twice	41	12.4%	21	12.5%
Three Times	25	7.6%	13	7.7%
Four or More	13	3.9%	6	3.6%
Total	324	100%	168	100%

Table 10: Case File - Criminal History – Parole

	N	%	N	%
Number of Times on parole				
Never	160	49.5%	64	38.1%
Once	101	31.3%	64	38.1%
Twice	38	11.8%	18	10.7%
Three Times	17	5.3%	13	7.7%
Four or More	7	2.2%	9	5.4%
Total	323	100%	168	100%

Table 11: Case File - Current Incarceration Charges

	Participants		Non-Participants	
	N	%	N	%
Violent	155	46.8%	54	31.6%
Property	50	15.1%	44	25.7%
Drugs	77	23.3%	38	22.2%
VOP	26	7.9%	14	8.2%
Misdemeanor	12	3.6%	6	3.5%
Traffic	2	.6%	8	4.7%
Other	9	2.7%	7	4.1%
Total	331	100%	171	100%

Table 12: Case File - Current Incarceration Sentencing

	Participants			Non-Participants		
	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean
Minimum Sentence	.10	17.00	3.82	.60	10.00	2.57
Maximum Sentence	2.00	40.00	9.59	2.00	10.00	7.03
Time Incarcerated	.79	19.41	5.76	.79	19.29	4.80

Table 13: Case File - Current Incarceration Offense Related to Drugs/Alcohol

	Participants		Non-Participants	
	N	%	N	%
Yes	104	53.3%	67	47.9%
No/Unknown	91	46.7%	73	52.1%
Total	195	100%	140	100%
History of Drug/Alcohol Abuse?				
Yes	211	84.4%	141	88.1%
No	39	15.6%	11	11.9%
Total	250	100%	160	100%
Treated for Drug/Alcohol Problems prior to Incarceration?				
Yes, In-Patient	68	26.2%	47	29.4%
Yes, Out-Patient	10	3.8%	3	1.9%
Yes, In-Patient and Out-Patient	5	1.0%	8	5.0%
No	177	68.1%	102	63.8%
Total	260	100%	160	100%

Table 14: Substance of Choice

	Participants		Non-Participants	
	N	%	N	%
Alcohol	50	34.5%	39	33.9%
Marijuana	39	26.9%	26	22.6%
Cocaine	31	21.4%	19	16.5%
Heroin	15	10.3%	14	12.2%
PCP	1	.7%	1	.9%
LSD	0	0	1	.9%
Crack	6	4.1%	12	10.4%
Prescription Pills	1	.7%	1	.9%
Methamphetamine	1	.7%	2	1.7%
Acid	1	.7%	0	0
Total	145	100%	115	100%
D&A Score (0-10)				
Mean	M=5.11		M=5.98	

Table 15: Case File - Physical and Mental Health Concerns

	Participants		Non-Participants	
	N	%	N	%
Medical Concerns?				
Yes	48	28.4%	33	25.4%
No	121	71.6%	97	74.6%
Total	162	100%	130	100%
Mental Health Concerns?				
Yes	187	28.1%	43	27.0%
No	73	71.9%	116	73.0%
Total	260	100%	159	100%

Table 16: Case File - Treatment Program Participation

	Participants			Non-Participants		
	N	%	M	N	%	M
Anger/Stress Mgt.						
Yes	197	64.2%		87	49.4%	
No	110	35.8%		89	50.6%	
Hours			9.68			9.57
Weeks			8.67			8.99
Complete the Program?						
Yes	170	99.4%		76	97.4%	
No	1	.6%		2	2.6%	
Individual Counseling						
Yes	60	19.6%		15	8.5%	
No	246	80.4%		161	91.5%	
Hours			14.8			10.75
Weeks			19.0			8.00
Complete the Program?						
Yes	7	100%		3	75.0%	
No	-	-		1	25.0%	
COR						
Yes	125	40.7%		62	35.2%	
No	182	59.3%		114	64.8%	
Hours			58.32			58.44
Weeks			2.53			2.15
Complete the Program?						
Yes	115	100%		55	100%	
No	-	-		-	-	
RSAT						
Yes	3	1.0%		5	2.8%	
No	301	99.0%		171	97.2%	
Hours						-
Weeks						13.5
Complete the Program?						
Yes	1	100%		2	50%	
No	-	-		2	50%	
Drug and Alcohol						
Yes	233	75.9%		104	59.1%	
No	74	24.1%		72	40.9%	
Hours			51.94			20.7
Weeks			13.24			14.6
Complete the Program?						
Yes	192	94.1%		72	83.7%	
No	12	5.9%		14	16.3%	

Table 16: Case File - Treatment Program Participation, cont.

	N	%	M	N	%	M
Sex Offender						
Yes	37	12.1%		8	4.5%	
No	270	88.0%		168	95.5%	
Hours			43.86			10.0
Weeks			73.88			10.0
Complete the Program?						
Yes	18	72.0%		6	85.7%	
No	7	28.0%		1	14.3%	
Health and Wellness						
Yes	40	13.0%		12	6.8%	
No	267	87.0%		164	93.2%	
Hours			19.94			15.6
Weeks			9.67			16.0
Complete the Program?						
Yes	26	89.7%		9	100%	
No	3	10.3%		-	-	
Other						
Yes	178	58.4%		71	40.3%	
No	127	41.6%		105	59.7%	
Hours			12.89			11.4
Weeks			8.25			10.9
Complete the Program?						
Yes	138	96.5%		62	94.0%	
No	5	3.5%		4	6.0%	

Table 17: Case History - Education Class Participation and Attendance Record*

	N	%	M
Adult Basic Education			
Yes	157	51.0%	
No	151	49.0%	
Sessions			4.16
Hours			140.52
Weeks			30.08
Complete the Class?			
Yes	75	78.1%	
No	20	20.8%	
Don't Know	1	1.0%	
Total	96	100%	
GED			
Yes	136	44.0%	
No	173	56.0%	
Sessions			3.57
Hours			110.67
Weeks			28.79
Receive a GED?			
Yes	53	73.6%	
No	18	25.0%	
Don't Know	1	1.4%	
Total	72	100%	
Vocational Classes			
Yes	145	46.9%	
No	164	53.1%	
Hours			821.93
Weeks			27.90
Receive a Certificate?			
Yes	86	79.6%	
No	19	17.6%	
Don't Know	3	2.8%	
Total	108	100%	
College Classes			
Yes	45	14.6%	
No	264	85.4%	
Hours			53.84
Weeks			11.52
Complete the Course?			
Yes	26	76.5%	
No	8	23.5%	
Total	34	100%	
Life Skills			
Yes	35	11.3%	
No	274	88.7%	
Sessions			2.00
Hours			43.74
Weeks			12.36
Complete the Program?			
Yes	32	91.4%	
No	3	8.6%	
Total	35	100%	

Table 17: Case History - Education Class Participation and Attendance Record, cont.

Others			
Yes	188	60.8%	
No	121	39.2%	
Sessions			1.86
Hours			42.04
Weeks			17.74
Receive a Certificate?			
Yes	145	83.8%	
No	28	16.2%	
Total	173	100%	

* Data for this table only for those that participated in Education Classes

Table 18: Case File - Misconduct/Informal Resolution

	Participants		Non-Participants	
	N	%	N	%
Did You Receive Either a Misconduct or an Informal Resolution?				
Yes	192	60.6%	88	53.0%
No	125	39.4%	78	47.0%
Total	317	100%	166	100%
If Yes, How Many?				
One	59	31.9%	32	35.6%
Two	40	21.6%	15	16.7%
Three	29	15.7%	10	11.1%
More Than Four	57	30.8%	33	36.7%
Total	185	100%	90	100%

Table 19: Case File - Prison Employment

	Participants		Non-Participants	
	N	%	N	%
Yes	136	80.0%	83	63.8%
No	34	20.0%	47	36.2%
Total	170	100%	130	100%

Table 20: Case File - DOC Caseworker Recommendations

	Participants		Non-Participants	
	N	%	N	%
Stress and Anger Class	139	42.0%	71	41.5%
Remain Misconduct Free	274	82.8	144	84.2%
Victim Awareness Class	11	3.3%	6	3.5%
ED/GED Classes	148	44.7%	56	32.7%
Vocational Classes	168	50.8%	87	50.9%
Psychiatric Treatment	33	10.0%	20	11.7%
Drug and Alcohol Classes	224	67.7%	124	72.5%
COR	45	13.6%	24	14.0%
Prison Employment	129	39.0%	63	36.8%
Pre-Release Planning	43	13.0%	23	13.5%
Leisure Activities	134	40.5%	80	46.8%
Sex Offender Classes	39	11.8%	10	5.8%
Boot Camp	1	.3%	2	1.2%
Positive Work Reports	156	47.1%	96	56.1%
Citizenship Class	14	4.2%	11	6.4%

Table 21 : Case File – Post Release Information

	Participants		Non-Participants	
	N	%	N	%
Max Out	68	20.5%	46	26.9%
Parole to CCC	185	55.9%	92	53.8%
Parole Home	71	21.5%	22	12.9%
Remains Active in Prison	7	2.1%	11	6.4%
Total	331	100%	171	100%