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| Central Focus of Study:          | Development of an evaluation plan to evaluate the effectiveness of the Alternative Incarceration Center Project |

This report was prepared in conjunction with the EMT Adjudication Technical Assistance Project under a cooperative agreement with the Bureau of Justice Assistance of the United States Department of Justice.

Organizations undertaking such projects under federal government sponsorship are encouraged to express their own judgments freely. Therefore, points of view or opinions stated in this report do not necessarily represent the official position of the Department of Justice. EMT is solely responsible for the factual accuracy of all material presented in this publication.
MEMORANDUM

TO: James A. Byrne, Coordinator, AIC
FROM: Joel Phillips, EMT Group, Inc.
SUBJECT: Development of an Evaluation Plan for AIC (T/A No. 006A)
DATE: June 27, 1986

The following memorandum presents the results of the on-site technical assistance visit to the Alternative Incarceration Center conducted on June 24 - 26 in Hartford, CT. The purpose of the assignment was to provide assistance in two areas: (1) development of an effective and reliable screening tool that accurately predicts incarceration-bound convictions, and (2) preparation of an evaluation plan to document and assess the success of the project in achieving its goals. A two member team was assigned to this technical assistance effort which consisted of Joel Phillips, an evaluation expert, and Harley Lieber, a community corrections expert.

This report focuses on the evaluation plan. A separate report, prepared by Harley Lieber, will address the steps and procedures involved in establishing a statistically reliable screening tool.

BACKGROUND

Early in 1986, the Connecticut State Criminal Justice Planning Agency gave the State Department of Corrections a grant of $25,000 from the State's Bureau of Justice Assistance Act block grant. The Department of Corrections then subcontracted with the Connecticut Prison Association to develop and operate an Alternative Incarceration Center (AIC) Project. The AIC is developing a program designed to reduce jail and prison overcrowding. Specifically the AIC seeks to offer an alternative to incarceration "which is more punitive and restrictive than traditional probation, parole, and supervised pre-trial release programs". Various criminal justice agencies will commit offenders/defendants to the AIC who would otherwise be incarcerated and the AIC's director expects the program, with funding assured through January, 1987, to be refunded for a second year.

The AIC proposes to use state-of-the-art methodologies for testing and selecting clients for assignment to the program. The AIC also seeks to develop procedures which will provide creditable information for purposes of program evaluation. Technical assistance has been requested to aid in the formulation of both the classification and evaluation
designs. On June 23rd, a two member team from EMT Group visited the project to provide assistance on these issues.

During the two-and-one-half day site visit, the EMT team met with the project staff and representatives from the proposed service agencies to discuss AIC (See Attachment A for a list of individuals contacted). In addition, team members were given copies of the initial grant and progress reports prepared by the staff.

PROCEDURES

The purpose of conducting interviews and reviewing the relevant project documents was to develop a evaluation plan that was: (1) based on AIC project goals; (2) could be implemented by AIC staff; and (3) would be efficient in terms of personnel time and costs, given the limited fiscal and staff resources available T/A No. 005A for this effort. Despite these limitations, it was expected that the evaluation plan will result in a accurate and reliable summary of the project activities.

The process for developing the evaluation plan consist of six distinct steps:

STEP 1. Determine Project Goals

Evaluations simply determine the degree and success of a project or a program in achieving stated goals. Thus the first step in any evaluation plan is to identify project goals. The project goals for AIC were determined through a review of the initial grant proposal, discussions with the project director and an interview with a commissioner in the Connecticut Department of Corrections.

STEP 2. Identify Evaluation Questions and Issues

The second step in developing an evaluation plan requires the identification of the pertinent questions and issues that need to be addressed in order to determine the extent to which a goal was accomplished. Through a careful examination of the project goals it is possible to develop a list of questions that defines the intent and purpose of the goal in more measurable terms.

The questions will help to determine for each goal the measurable criteria for assessing relative success. The extent possible, the goals should be reviewed carefully with the program developers to identify what measures could be considered the symbols of achievement. In some cases, the goals must be translated into specific, measurable, quantitative terms.

STEP 3. List and Describe the Evaluation Procedures

The third step in the process is to describe the evaluation activities in terms of steps and procedures that will be required to address the evaluation issues and questions identified in the second step. These activities also provide a checklist of discrete activities to be undertaken in order to collect the necessary data and information.

Specifically, this step involves three distinct activities:
0 Identify all major evaluation activities. These activities parallel the evaluation questions. Major individual activities are broad components, comprised of a series of more detailed tasks.

0 Determine the specific procedures for each evaluation activity. Define and describe the specific data collection tools, instruments, forms, or questionnaires that will need to be developed or modified to collect the necessary information.

0 Schedule the entire data collection process. There is a need to identify the schedule of data collection activities in terms of which data elements need to be collected at what point in time. Some data will be collected each and every month (e.g., AIC client expense rates) while other information about the project might only be collected at the completion of the project (e.g., interviews with CJIS personnel).

STEP 4. **Data Collection**

The fourth step involves the actual collection of the data elements identified in the previous step. This might involve the use of personal interviews or specifically designed data collection forms. Interview responses and other information is recorded systematically and consistently according to predetermined format.

STEP 5. **Data Analysis**

The fifth step involves the analysis of the collected information. This can include a variety of statistical analyses, document reviewing, and synthesis of interview notes.

STEP 6. **Report Preparation**

The final step involves the preparation of a written report based on results derived from the analyses.

In summary these are the broad steps to be undertaken by the AIC staff in developing and completing the evaluation plan. The following sections of this memorandum present the procedures to successfully conduct each of these steps in the evaluation plan.

STEP 1. **Define Project Goals**

Based on our review of the grant proposal, project summaries and interviews with the Director and Department of Corrections staff, the consultants identified the following four project goals:

**GOAL 1.** To develop an Alternative Incarceration Center (AIC) for the Department of Corrections that results in the reduction of pretrial and sentenced populations at Connecticut correctional facilities. Specifically, the goal is to divert 50 individuals during the first year of operation, of which 50% would have served time in a correctional facility.

**GOAL 2.** To become a recognized and accepted institutionalized correctional tool in the Connecticut criminal justice system.
GOAL 3. To provide a comprehensive and cost-effective service delivery system that in the long term results in a reduction in the recidivism rates of AIC clients as compared to similar offenders who are incarcerated.

GOAL 4. To involve various sectors of the community, including private industry, in a meaningful correctional process. Specifically, to encourage the use of volunteers in AIC activities and to encourage AIC clients to volunteer in community efforts and organizations.
EVALUATION DESIGN

Exhibits A through D present a detailed overview of an evaluation design to evaluate AIC success in achieving its four goals. It incorporates steps 2, 3 and 4 described in the procedures sections of this memorandum.
## EXHIBIT A
### EVALUATION DESIGN FOR GOAL 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Goals</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions and Issues</th>
<th>Evaluation Activities/Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Goal 1:** Develop an Alternative Incarceration Center that results in the reduction of pretrial and sentenced populations at Connecticut Correctional facilities. Divert 50 individuals in year 1. | Q1. What is the current institutional population at each Connecticut facility?  
Q2. How many individuals were admitted annually to Connecticut facilities over the past 5 years?  
Q3. How many individuals are referred to AIC?  
Q4. How many individuals referred to AIC are (1) diverted? (2) not diverted?  
Q5. Did AIC establish a reliable screening tool to identify the 50% of their client population that were bound for a correctional setting?  
Q6. Did AIC achieve the 50 individual case load?  
Q7. Who were the clients of AIC? | 1/2. Obtain statewide correctional admissions and population data. Corrections annual reports will suffice. Compile table of:  
(a) annual average daily population by institution for 5 years and  
(b) annual admissions by institution for 5 years.  
3/4. Review and document case files to determine and document:  
a. number of individuals referred  
b. number selected and  
c. reasons for acceptance/rejection.  
This should be done monthly on a simple case tracking form.  
5. Analyze selection criteria and assessment procedures.  
--TEST. Was 50% of the case load correctionally bound?  
--METHOD. Use same statistical procedures to develop screening instrument on this client load. How close were AIC clients in matching correctional board profiles determined in the pretest phase.  
6/7. Collect detailed profile data on the AIC cases (e.g., demographic, criminal histories, etc.) See Monthly Log Sheets in Attachment C.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Goals</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions and Issues</th>
<th>Evaluation Activities/Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. Interview assistant state attorneys, bail commissioners, judges, etc., concerning the clients selected by AIC. This should be done near the end of the project and preferably should be conducted by a non-AIC staff person. Questionnaire should be prepared prior to these interviews. EMT will develop one, if necessary.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions and Issues</th>
<th>Evaluation Activities/Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Goal 2: Become a recognized and accepted institutionalized correctional tool in the Connecticut criminal justice system. | Q1. To what extent did AIC become a recognized and accepted correctional alternative in Hartford? | 1. Document steps and procedures taken by AIC to ensure credibility and acceptance. -- Review reports -- Interview staff  
-- Interview community-based organizations that networked with AIC. |
| | Q2. At what stage of the sentencing process are individuals screened for AIC? | 2. Review screening process and paper work. |
| | Q3. Who reviews cases for AIC and refers them? | 3. Identify all categories of personnel involved in this process and determine proportion who do and do not review for AIC. |
| | Q4. Do referred cases meet criteria; are they appropriate and "corrections bound"? | 4. Review monthly summaries of client profile data. |
| | Q5. What is the level of awareness among other agencies in the criminal justice system? | 5/6/7. Conduct key informant interviews with criminal justice system personnel including: -- State's attorneys -- Bail Commissioners -- Judges -- D.O.C. -- Public Defenders These interviews could be conducted at the same time as the interviews scheduled for Goal 1. Again, they are most appropriately done by a non-AIC staff member. EMT can assist in the development of the questionnaires. |
| | Q6. What is the level of support/approval for AIC among representatives of the criminal justice system? | |
| | Q7. How did they learn of AIC? | |
### EXHIBIT C

**EVALUATION DESIGN FOR GOAL 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions and Issues</th>
<th>Evaluation Activities/Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Goal** | **Q1. Did AIC develop the necessary support systems to provide assistance to AIC clients?** | 1. **Document range of AIC support services and linkages with these services.**  
   -- Describe the services provided to AIC by each of these supporting agencies.  
   -- Determine the intensity of the service interaction (e.g., Did AIC clients receive more intense support than non-AIC clients?) |
| **Goal 3:** Provide a comprehensive and cost-effective service delivery system that in the long term results in a reduction in the recidivism rates of AIC clients as compared to similar offenders who are incarcerated. | **Q2. What was the frequency and duration of AIC contacts with their clients?** | 2. **Document frequency of client contacts including AIC staff.**  
   -- METHOD. Use a daily log to document in-house AIC client contacts. Add contact hours per month per client. |
| | **Q3. How successful was AIC in supervising the clients?** | 3. **Document type and range of AIC clients (see Objective 1).** |
| | **Q4. How successful was AIC in detecting violations involving AIC clients?** | 4. **Document days without violation.** |
| | **Q5. What types of violations were AIC clients involved with?** | 5. **Develop moving recidivism function of analysis (monthly recidivism rates-see Attachment A).** |
| | **Q6. How successful were AIC clients in their reintegration into society?** | 6. **Document clients in jobs, non-subsidized housing, those who return to families, and other "reintegration" criteria.** |
| | **Q7. How cost effective was the AIC in comparison with the more traditional approaches?** | 7. **Collect cost data for other system approaches.** |
### EXHIBIT D

**EVALUATION DESIGN FOR GOAL 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions and Issues</th>
<th>Evaluation Activities/Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal</strong></td>
<td>Q1. To what extent did AIC involve private organizations in AIC efforts?</td>
<td>1/2. Document and describe AIC involvement with private industry/community groups. How many organizations were contacted? How many participated? What types?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q2. How many community based groups and organizations interacted with AIC?</td>
<td>2. Track volunteers' hours contributed to AIC on a monthly basis. <strong>-- METHOD.</strong> Track on a monthly basis contacts with private organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q3. How many volunteers, and volunteer hours were provided by volunteers to AIC? What type of activities were they involved in?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q4. How extensively were AIC clients involved in community volunteer work? How many hours did they contribute? What type of work did they do? How successful were they in their volunteer efforts?</td>
<td>2. Interview private sector volunteers to AIC about their experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Track volunteers' hours provided by AIC clients on a monthly basis (e.g., note organization's type of work done, success of the volunteers in completing their assignment. A follow-up form should be sent by AIC at the completion of the volunteer's involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Interview private sector organizations and community-based groups concerning the use of AIC volunteers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT A

LIST OF INDIVIDUALS/PROGRAMS CONTACTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Gordon S. Bates</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Connecticut Prison Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>James R. Byrne</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>Alternative Incarceration Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Connecticut Prison Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Tracy Norwood</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Coalition Employment Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Larry Albert</td>
<td>Deputy Commissioner</td>
<td>Connecticut Department of Corrections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for Field Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT B
A MODEL FOR CALCULATING RECIDIVISM RATE
METHODOLOGY FOR RECIDIVISM ANALYSIS

The effectiveness of any program designed to deter crime can be measured by the recidivism rate of individuals released from the program. A methodology which calculates a performance function for clients released from a program over a period of time is presented in this section. This performance function estimates the cumulative percentage of incidents for a population of released clients over time.

EXHIBIT A
Recidivism Formula

Where:
- CPI = Cumulative proportion with incidents
- NI = Actual number without incidents
- CPNI = Cumulative proportion without incidents
- I = Actual number with incidents

If a population of clients were all released on the same day it would be relatively simple to track them through time and determine the number of clients with an incident in the first month, the number with an incident in the second month, and so on. One would calculate the percent of clients with incidents for the first month in the following way:

\[
\frac{\text{Incidents Month}}{\text{Total}} \times 100 = \% \text{ with incidents}
\]

At the end of the second month the cumulative percent with incidents would be calculated by adding the number with incidents for the first and second months and dividing by the total population, as follows:
Incidents Month + Incidents Month \[ \times 100 = \text{cumulative \% with incident} \]

\[ \text{Total} \]

Clients may tend to recidivate the most during the first few months after release, or the occurrence of subsequent incidents may occur over a period of many months. The above analysis will produce a description of how a population of clients behaves after release, with respect to incidents, over time.

In real life, clients are not all released from a program on the same date. When looking at a population of program clients, the additional factor of length of time out of program is introduced. The size of the population changes, and so a straightforward calculation of percent with incidents, as shown above, is not completely accurate. We need to develop a method for adjusting the proportion so that figures derived from a fluctuating population will be accurate.

The adjustments and calculations are obtained using the following formula:

\[
\text{CPI} = \frac{\text{Cumulative proportion with incidents}}{n} \times 100
\]

\[
\text{NI} = \text{Population with no incidents at beginning of month } n
\]

\[
I = \text{Number of incidents during month } n
\]

Where:

\[
\text{CPI} = \text{Cumulative proportion with incidents}
\]

\[
n = \text{Month}
\]

\[
\text{NI} = \text{Population with no incidents at beginning of month } n
\]

\[
I = \text{Number of incidents during month } n
\]

Notice that the cumulative proportion with incidents from the previous month (CPI) is used to calculate the value of CPI for the current month (CPI). The expression:

\[
\text{CPI} = \frac{\text{CPI}_{n-1} + I}{n} \times 100
\]

is the performance function mentioned above, and is used to adjust the population and incidents figures.

We can clarify this formula by looking at a hypothetical example in which a population of 50 clients comes out of a program over a period of six months.
TABLE A

Program Clients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Months</th>
<th>No Incidents</th>
<th>Incidents</th>
<th>Estimated Cumulative Incidents</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Cumulated Percentage of Incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In month six (i.e., six months ago) there were no clients released from the program. Since then, as the months went by, clients left the program and joined the population. At the same time, some of the clients who were out had incidents and so left the population. The number of individuals in the population is affected by the dual scales of released clients adding to the population and recidivistic clients subtracted from it. The changing population is represented under the heading No Incidents in Column 2 of the Table.

The estimated cumulative incidents and the base values are adjusted versions of the figures in Columns 3 and 2. These values are obtained in the formula itself. The formula breaks down to the following circular equations:
CPI, the cumulative proportion with incidents, feeds back into equation (1) to produce the performance function for the subsequent month. To obtain the cumulative percentage of incidents, multiply the CPI by 100. The figures for the hypothetical case are listed in Table B along with a graphic demonstration of the equation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Clients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**TABLE B**
ATTACHMENT C

FORMAT FOR MONTHLY LOG SHEET AT AIC