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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

In September 2003, the San Diego County Sheriff’s Department was awarded a three-year grant from the U.S. Department of Education (DOE) to implement the Family TIES (Targeted Intervention, Education, and Services) Program. The goal of the program was to reduce recidivism of adult inmates through the development and improvement of life skills necessary for successful family reintegration and community reentry. With a demonstrated connection between substance abuse, domestic violence, and child abuse and/or neglect, the Family TIES Program targeted life skills with the most relevance to inmates’ lives with the hope of creating healthier coping skills to break existing patterns of behavior and confront negative influences and other challenges once released.

The San Diego County Sheriff’s Department contracted with the San Diego Association of Governments’ (SANDAG) Criminal Justice Research Division to complete a formal process evaluation of the Family TIES Program to determine if it was implemented as planned, as well as an impact evaluation to assess how the program affected clients who completed.

PROGRAM HIGHLIGHTS

- The George Bailey jail commander’s observation of marked behavioral improvements of inmates involved in the Family TIES Program directly resulted in the development of a new program at George Bailey jail based on the Family TIES Program model;
- Recidivism rates were lower among male clients who completed the program (23%) compared to those who did not complete (42%);
- Clients exhibited gains in knowledge in all four life skills, with the greatest gain seen in employment readiness skills;
- On average, clients spent eight fewer days in jail for post-release bookings compared to their instant offense. Fewer days in jail resulted in a cost savings of $100 per day per client, with additional savings in court costs;
- More than one-half (52%) of clients at follow-up had sought post-release services on their own; and
- All clients who completed a follow-up interview rated their experience in the Family TIES Program as either very positive or positive.
**PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

The Family TIES Program provided a six-week life skills education to male and female inmates focusing on four core life skills: employment readiness; substance abuse; parenting; and domestic violence/anger management. Partners in this program were the San Diego County Sheriff’s Department, three community-based organizations (CBO), including Community Connection Resource Center (CCRC), ParentCare, and Family Literacy Foundation, and Las Colinas and George Bailey detention facilities. In addition to the core instruction, two enrichment classes were offered to clients: a reunification workshop for individuals who were actively working with Child Welfare Services (CWS) to reunify with their child(ren); and Building Bridges with Books, which focused on enhancing literacy among clients and provided them the opportunity to be videotaped while reading a book aloud to their child(ren) and mail the videotape home to their families. Pre-release case management was conducted with clients on a bi-weekly basis to assist them in planning for successful reentry into their daily lives.

Services began in March 2004 and the last client entered the program in July 2006. Participation in the Family TIES Program was strictly voluntary; however, eligibility required that the inmate have sufficient time left on their sentence to complete the six-week session; not be a known security risk to staff and other inmates; not have a serious violent criminal history; and be physically and mentally able to participate in the program. Of the 551 clients who expressed interest in participating, 520 attended classes. The program successfully enrolled 502 participants into the research study, and data on these individuals are described in this final report.

**RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

The San Diego County Sheriff’s Department contracted with SANDAG’s Criminal Justice Research Division to complete a formal process and impact evaluation of the Family TIES Program. A process evaluation was conducted to determine whether the Family TIES Program was implemented as planned; and the impact evaluation explored what effects, if any, the program had on clients’ lives after release. The impact evaluation describes rates of recidivism, knowledge gain, and improvements in the targeted life skills. To answer the research questions, a pre-post evaluation design was used.

**Was the Program Implemented as Designed?**

The original design of the Family TIES Program was adhered to by providing a six-week curriculum in four life skills domains to all eligible participants at both Las Colinas and George Bailey detention facilities. In addition, two enrichment classes offered by Family Literacy Foundation (Building Bridges with Books) and ParentCare (reunification workshop). Clients received pre-release one-on-one case management by staff with expertise to assist with the client’s primary presenting problem indicated during the engagement interview.

**What Modifications Were Made, if any, and Why?**

Several modifications were made to the program throughout its three-year duration, chief among them being the delay in receiving full certification to provide domestic violence treatment classes for court-ordered clients. Another modification involved a change in the frequency of case management meetings between program staff and clients. The program staff agreed
that it would be more beneficial to begin case management meetings with clients toward the end of their sentences due to the immediacy of their circumstances (i.e., living situation, family relations). Finally, the Building Bridges with Books enrichment program consolidated its two classes into one to allow clients to attend the workshop and conduct their videotaped reading in the same class period.

What was the Nature of the Partnerships on this Project, and What Systematic Changes Resulted from these Partnerships?

The Family TIES Program used a multi-disciplinary approach combining staff from community-based organizations and correctional counseling units to deliver services. Coordination of these various agencies and the establishment of partnerships was accomplished through regular on-going meetings among the leadership team, program staff, and Advisory Board members. Two significant systematic changes that developed as a result of the program included:

- The implementation of pre-release classes at Vista Detention Facility in the northeastern portion of San Diego County for all inmates scheduled for release within the next 60 to 90 days; and
- Conducting focus groups with inmates at the George Bailey jail between July and August 2005 to explore ways to reduce inmate-on-inmate violence. These focus groups were the direct result of an informal study conducted by the commander of George Bailey jail that found the Family TIES Program graduates were less likely to be involved in physical assaults with other inmates. From these focus groups emerged the Effective Living Program, which was implemented by correctional counseling staff and volunteers from community-based organizations. This program incorporated many of the same life skills taught in the Family TIES Program within a cognitive-behavioral instructional model and served as a response to the inmates’ requests for more structured and constructive activities while incarcerated.

What Were the Family TIES Program Staff’s Perceptions of the Program’s Implementation and Management?

Overall, staff felt they understood the goals of the program and that those goals were met. They also agreed that, despite some room for improvement, program coordination was effective. Staff pointed most often to the commitment to helping inmates and the core curriculum as the program’s greatest strengths. Conversely, they most often mentioned inconsistencies in implementing the program and lack of sufficient time and organization to provide case management as program weaknesses.

What Were the Characteristics and Needs of Eligible Clients at Intake?

The age and ethnicity of the Family TIES Program clients matched closely the overall jail population throughout San Diego County. Although the goal of the Family TIES Program was to serve an equal number of males and females, there was more physical classroom space available at the women’s jail, resulting in a higher number of female clients (57%) than male clients (43%). More than three-quarters of the clients reported having issues with substance abuse, over one-third identified as primary caregivers, and almost one-quarter identified as homeless. Over one-half of clients said they had ever received
mental health treatment, with women significantly more likely than men to have received treatment in the past year. The majority of clients had a booking and conviction within the three years prior to their enrollment in the program, and more than three-quarters of the most recent convictions were for felony property offenses.

**How Long did Clients Participate in the Program, and What Were Reasons for Not Completing?**

The average time in the program among clients was approximately seven and one-half weeks, with more than three-quarters completing the program. One probable explanation for the additional time in, past the six-week time period, was that at the program’s onset, eligible clients were required to wait until a new six-week class cycle began before entering. This was later changed to allow clients to begin classes during an existing session.

The reasons for not completing were refusing to participate (42%), being released early (22%), being terminated from the program (19%), and receiving an administrative transfer before completing (18%).

**What was the Rate of Recidivism Among Clients?**

Of the 323 individuals eligible for data collection at 12-months post-release, nearly one-half (46%) had a new booking and over one-quarter (28%) were newly convicted. At 12-months post-release, clients were most likely to be booked (45%) and convicted (47%) on a drug-related offense. Female clients were more likely to have a new booking than male clients (50% versus 32%, respectively).

Forty-two percent (42%) of the males who did not complete the program were convicted on a new offense within 12-months post-release, compared to just 23 percent of the males who did complete. For females, these differences were not statistically significant, with 30 percent of the females who did not complete the program, compared to 26 percent who did complete, being convicted on a new offense.

**Did Clients Make Improvements in Targeted Life Skills?**

Knowledge gains were seen in all four domains to varying degrees, with the greatest improvement seen in employment readiness (71%), followed by substance abuse (62%), parenting (56%), and domestic violence/anger management (45%). Based on follow-up interviews conducted by SANDAG at six and twelve months post-release, clients reported financial burdens and employment as among the most common unmet needs. Despite employment being identified as the greatest unmet need, clients gave themselves high marks at six months and even slightly higher marks at the year mark for improving in all four life skills, including employment-related needs.

**Were Clients Satisfied with the Services they Received**

All of the 36 individuals who conducted six-month follow-up interviews rated their experience in the **Family TIES Program** as either very positive or positive, and almost all (94%) felt their case manager was helpful, with approximately one-third (31%) crediting the staff and/or the curriculum. The only suggestion for improving the program was to increase its duration and time available with a case manager.
What Percentage of Clients Engaged in Services after Release from Jail, and What Factors were Related to Post-Release Engagement?

SANDAG conducted 6-month follow-up interviews with 36 individuals, 21 of whom were successfully reached for a 12-month interview. At 6 months post-release, more than one-half (52%) had sought post-release services on their own and 48 percent said they had not contacted any due to not needing services (71%) or having been re-arrested (29%).

RECOMMENDATIONS

The combination of the relatively high recidivism rate among clients and the fact that most subsequent convictions were drug-related speaks to the need to target a similar population in the future by offering a higher level of substance abuse education and treatment in jail. In addition, research has shown that post-release case management services are critical to successful reentry (Little Hoover Commission, 2003). Although this grant was limited to funding educational services and not case management, the data indicate that post-release case management may be an influential factor in helping clients land on their feet once released into their daily lives. Additionally, based on the researcher’s analysis, which found that male graduates recidivated at a significantly lower rate than female graduates, it is possible that females may have fared better if provided gender-responsive services.
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INTRODUCTION

In September 2003, the San Diego County Sheriff’s Department received a three-year grant from the U.S. Department of Education (DOE) to implement the Family TIES (Targeted Intervention, Education, and Services) Program. The goal of the program was to reduce recidivism of adult inmates through the development and improvement of life skills necessary for successful family reintegration and community reentry.\(^1\) Three community-based organizations (CBO) collaborated with the Sheriff’s Department in implementing the program by providing pre-release case management and facilitating the life skills classes. These organizations included the Community Connection Resource Center (CCRC), ParentCare, and Family Literacy Foundation. The program was implemented at two local jails in San Diego County: Las Colinas Women’s Detention Facility located in eastern San Diego County; and George Bailey Men’s Detention Facility, a maximum security level jail located in the southern portion of the county near the Mexican border. The San Diego Association of Governments’ (SANDAG) Criminal Justice Research Division was tasked with completing a formal process evaluation of the Family TIES Program to determine if it was implemented as planned, as well as an impact evaluation to assess how the program affected clients who completed.

This final evaluation report on the Family TIES Program is being submitted to the DOE. This chapter provides an overview of the project and its implementation and development. In Chapter 2, the evaluation methodology is described and the results of the process evaluation are presented in Chapter 3. Results from the impact evaluation are provided in Chapter 4, followed by Chapter 5, consisting of five case studies of Family TIES Program clients who completed the program. Finally, Chapter 6 provides a summary of the program’s successes and challenges, as well as recommendations for future programs.

PROJECT OVERVIEW

Funded for three years, the goal of the Family TIES Program was to provide life skills education to male and female inmates to enhance their successful reentry into their community and families. The Family TIES Program was conducted in two local detention facilities and targeted life skills in four domains using a six-week curriculum of two-hour class sessions. With a demonstrated connection between substance abuse, domestic violence, and child abuse and/or neglect, the Family TIES Program targeted life skills with the most relevance to inmates’ lives with the hope of creating healthier coping skills to break existing patterns of behavior and confront negative influences and other challenges once released. Components of the project, which are described below, included intake and assessment of eligible clients and provision of services within the jail setting.

\(^1\) Due to available funding, the program was discontinued in November 2006.
Eligibility, Intake, and Assessment

Participation in the Family TIES Program was strictly voluntary on the part of the client. However, the program did adhere to the following general eligibility guidelines. It was required that the inmate:

- have sufficient time left on their sentence to complete the six-week session;
- not be a known security risk to staff and other inmates;
- not have a serious violent criminal history; and
- be physically and mentally able to participate in the program.

Correctional counseling staff at both facilities selected eligible inmates based on these criteria and approached these individuals to further engage with them about the content and benefits of the program. After securing the inmate’s agreement to participate, the correctional counselor conducted an intake interview and assessments to determine the inmate’s level of risk and need, as well as their primary presenting problem. This information was later used to match the client with the appropriate case manager. In addition, the counselors discussed the research study with the client and obtained informed consent for their participation.

In order to get a glimpse of how many potential candidates the program could expect to serve, SANDAG and the Project Director conducted a two-week pipeline study in January 2004 using the San Diego County Sheriff’s Jail Inmate Management System (JIMS). The JIMS database provides information on an individual’s arrest and booking history, as well as basic demographics. Based on this pipeline study, the program felt confident it could serve at least 500 clients to meet the goal of the research sample. Subsequently, the program conducted intake and assessment on 551 clients, 520 of whom enrolled in and attended classes. Although clients began receiving services in March 2004, Family TIES Program participants were not enrolled into the study until May 3, 2004, to allow time to pilot the instruments and make any needed adjustments.

Service Provision

Key features of the Family TIES Program included weekly life skills instruction in all four core class areas, including domestic violence/anger management, parenting, substance abuse, and employment readiness. The six-week program required that clients attend all four of the core life skills classes for two hours per class for a total of eight hours per week. In addition to this core instruction, clients also could attend two enrichment classes: ParentCare offered classes for individuals who were actively working with Child Welfare Services (CWS) to reunify with their child(ren); and Family Literacy Foundation provided a workshop called Building Bridges with Books, which focused on enhancing client literacy by giving clients the opportunity to be videotaped while reading a book of their choice aloud to their child(ren). For the taping, clients were given civilian clothing to wear to reduce the stigmatization of jail clothing and therefore normalize the video presentation for the children. The final video was then mailed home to their families.
Staff from CCRC and ParentCare provided bi-weekly individualized case management with clients to prepare their pre-release plan and ensure that they had referrals to appropriate services within the community. Clients were matched with staff according to their expertise in the areas most needed by clients.

**STAFFING AND TRAINING**

**Staffing**

Staff from the San Diego County Sheriff’s Department and each of the three community-based agencies were dedicated to the implementation of this project. The Sheriff’s Department staff member (also the Project Director) worked in close collaboration with both detention facilities to ensure buy-in from command and correctional counseling staff and coordinate the complex logistics of inmate movement. Each detention facility dedicated one supervisor and three to four correctional counselors to conduct outreach and engagement with inmates and administer the standardized assessments, intake interview, and informed consent.

ParentCare and CCRC dedicated staff to develop curriculum, facilitate the life skills classes, and provide case management according to their area of expertise. The Family Literacy Foundation dedicated one staff member to provide the Building Bridges with Books enrichment class. Additionally, CCRC provided one full-time administrative support staff person to conduct data entry and coordinate transfer of data to SANDAG on a regular basis.

Program staff were mostly college-educated, with five staff holding Bachelor’s degrees, three Master’s degrees, and one a Ph.D. Three of the CBO staff had prior experience working with incarcerated clients. There were relatively few staffing changes throughout the three-year program. Two of these changes occurred at CCRC with a new administrative support staff hired to replace the original staff member in 2004 and the replacement of a substance abuse facilitator in 2005. George Bailey replaced one of their correctional counselors in 2006; and, within three months of the end of the grant, the Executive Director of Family Literacy Foundation resigned and was replaced by a new staff member.

**Training**

In the first year of the program, CBO staff received specific training and orientation about working in a detention facility setting, and all staff working directly with clients received formal training in Motivational Interviewing techniques, and administering the Adult Substance Use Survey (ASUS) and Level of Service Inventory-Revised-Short Version (LSI-R-SV). In the second year of the program, all program staff were invited to attend an advanced training in Motivational Interviewing (Prochaska & DiClemente, 1982) and the Stages of Change (Miller & Rollnick, 1991). In attendance at these trainings were 27 correctional staff (including 7 from the Family TIES Program), 5 from ParentCare staff, and 3 CCRC staff. Finally, all but two correctional counselors completed the required 40-hour training to facilitate the certified Domestic Violence classes.
SUMMARY

The Family TIES Program was a three-year program funded by the U. S. Department of Education to provide life skills education to incarcerated individuals at two local San Diego jails, Las Colinas and George Bailey. Inmates who met the general eligibility criteria were enrolled in the program and received life skills instruction in four core topics, as well as individual pre-release case management. All services were received while incarcerated. The Family TIES Program was fully staffed and began providing services in March 2004. During the first two years of the program, staff received training in conducting business in a detention facility, Motivational Interviewing, and the Stages of Change. The second chapter discusses the methodology used in conducting the process and impact evaluation, including specific research questions, data sources, and analyses.
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INTRODUCTION

The San Diego County Sheriff’s Department contracted with the San Diego Association of Governments’ (SANDAG) Criminal Justice Research Division to conduct an independent process and impact evaluation of the Family TIES (Targeted Intervention, Education, and Services) Program. This chapter includes a description of the research design used for both the process and impact evaluations. Additionally, the chapter specifies how the research questions were answered for the process evaluation, such as how implementation occurred and what challenges were faced; and the impact evaluation, which highlights whether or not the program was effective in reducing recidivism and improving clients’ knowledge and application of the life skills.

RESEARCH DESIGN OVERVIEW

Ideally, research that compares a treatment and control group is the preferable design. However, due to budgetary constraints, it was not feasible to conduct an evaluation using an experimental or quasi-experimental design. Services were provided to all eligible clients, and information is provided in this report on 502 unduplicated clients who agreed to participate in the program and the research study. SANDAG submitted and received approval for its research protocol in December 2003 from a local Institutional Review Board (IRB).

The leadership team selected standardized assessment instruments to be used at intake and also offered input on the data collection tools designed by SANDAG. Data collection was conducted by staff from the correctional facilities, community-based organizations (CBO), and SANDAG. Specifically, the correctional counselors collected intake data on clients’ risks and needs, and CBO staff gathered information on client knowledge in the life skills areas, completion status, and locator information (for follow-up purposes). Data collected by SANDAG included criminal activity three years prior to enrollment and 6 and 12 months post-release, 6- and 12-month follow-up interviews, and case studies.

SANDAG staff maintained regular contact with Community Connection Resource Center’s (CCRC) data entry staff to closely monitor the timely transfer of electronic and hard copy data, document any errors in data entry, and notify the program when items needed correction. The data entry staff entered data into an Access database and sent the data electronically to SANDAG, who then transferred the data into SPSS for Windows (13.0), a statistical software package for cleaning and analysis. Data entry staff delivered hard copies of all completed instruments to SANDAG for quality control.

SANDAG trained the correctional counseling staff on the overall purpose and design of the research study, as well as in administering the intake interview and informed consent.
In order to locate clients after release, SANDAG designed a client locator form and trained program case managers on the best ways to complete the form with their clients during regular case management sessions. However, early in the program, the quality and accuracy of these locators was not adequate for SANDAG staff to be able to reach the random sample of 40 clients. According to program staff, some clients refused to give contact information or did not know where they would be living upon release. In order to minimize the number of clients who were reluctant to give contact information, SANDAG staff took the opportunity to attend class graduations and introduce themselves to the clients, describe SANDAG’s role in the study, and encourage clients to give adequate contact information to facilitate follow-up interviews after their release. This face-to-face contact between SANDAG and clients seemed to have a positive effect on their willingness to provide contact information. For example, after SANDAG’s presentations, several clients voluntarily reported back to their case managers to update their information.

**PROCESS EVALUATION**

**Background and Process**

A process evaluation was conducted to determine whether the Family TIES Program was implemented as planned. A variety of methods were used to collect the qualitative data necessary to document program implementation and modification. These included attendance at meetings of the leadership team, program staff, and Advisory Board; reviewing program documentation; surveying program staff; conducting follow-up interviews with clients; and conducting five case studies.

**Research Questions**

Seven research questions were asked in the process evaluation, the answers to which are described in Chapter 3. For ease of reference, the questions have been categorized as “Model Fidelity,” “Partnerships and Systematic Changes,” “Staff Perceptions,” and “Client Characteristics.” These questions are enumerated below and their corresponding data sources and methods of analyzing those data are described.

**Model Fidelity**

To determine whether the Family TIES Program model was implemented as originally planned, the following questions were asked:

- Research Question 1: Was the program implemented as designed?
- Research Question 2: What modifications were made, if any, and why?

To address the first two research questions, SANDAG staff regularly attended and prepared minutes for all meetings of the leadership group to document the progress of the program, including any changes to its design and the reasons for those changes. In addition to leadership meetings, SANDAG attended all Advisory Board meetings, as well as monthly program staff meetings on an as-needed basis.
Partnerships and Systematic Changes

Due to the blending of vastly different agencies, there was an interest in learning whether the Family TIES Program would have an echoing effect on existing systems and institutions. Therefore, the researchers asked the following question:

- Research Question 3: What was the nature of the partnerships on this project?
- Research Question 4: What systematic changes resulted from these partnerships?

The information which answers question three and four was provided by the Project Director and included his notes from meetings he attended with jail commanders. In addition, information also was gleaned from minutes taken by SANDAG at the leadership team meetings.

Staff Perceptions

Since implementing a successful program depends considerably on the expertise and buy-in of its staff, the following question was asked:

- Research Question 5: What were the Family TIES Program staff’s perceptions of its implementation and management?

To address the fifth research question, SANDAG staff administered two Key Staff Surveys to program staff to collect their impressions of the implementation and management of the Family TIES Program. The first survey was administered and completed in November 2004, and the second in December 2005. The surveys asked respondents about their level of education, prior experience working with jailed clients, and training received to implement the Family TIES Program. In addition, staff were asked to rate the overall effectiveness of team coordination, strengths and weaknesses of the program administration, and areas of training still needed. Surveys gave opportunities to provide open-ended responses, which have been coded for additional information.

Client Characteristics

In order to learn more about the clients who participated, as well as what characteristics were common to those who engaged in services post-release, the following questions were asked:

- Research Question 6: What were the characteristics and needs of eligible clients at intake?
- Research Question 7: How long did clients participate in the program, and what were reasons for not completing?

Information regarding client characteristics to address the sixth research question was gathered from the intake interview, which was designed specifically for this program and administered to eligible individuals by correctional counselors at both detention facilities. The instrument included questions pertaining to the client’s parenting status, alcohol and drug use history, and mental health treatment history. It also gathered data on client demographics such as ethnicity, reliance on public support, marital status, and living situation.
The program used two standardized screening instruments as part of the intake process: the Level of Service Inventory-Revised-Short Version (LSI-R-SV), and the Adult Substance Use Survey (ASUS). The LSI-R-SV is a criminogenic tool consisting of only eight items compared to the full 54-item LSI used by the San Diego County Probation Department as a monitoring tool for all probationers on intensive supervision. The LSI-R-SV was selected by the Family TIES Program leadership team to help quantify clients’ propensity to re-offend and was administered to eligible clients at intake. The ASUS is a 64-item screening tool which asks about alcohol and drug use over the client’s lifetime and within the last 30 days. The eleven scales measure how significantly clients are involved in substance use and to what degree drugs and alcohol are disrupting the client’s life. These assessments were conducted at intake only.

To answer research question seven, program staff completed an exit form indicating whether the client completed or not and the reasons why. There were 28 exit forms that were not made available to the researchers by the program staff, and an additional 81 forms that did not have intake or exit dates entered and, therefore, could not be used for analysis.

**Analysis**

Responses to the Key Staff surveys were aggregated and frequencies are presented. Data from the intake interview, exit form, and standardized screening tools were analyzed using frequencies, cross-tabulations, and measures of central tendency, as well as inferential statistics such as t-tests and chi-squares. Statistically significant results are reported at the significance level of $p < .05$ or lower for all tests. Data that are found to be statistically significant are noted. The data from the follow-up interviews are purely descriptive using frequency distributions.

**IMPACT EVALUATION**

**Background and Process**

The goal of the Family TIES Program was to reduce recidivism of adult inmates through the development and improvement of life skills necessary for successful family reintegration and community reentry. As such, SANDAG conducted an impact evaluation to determine if the Family TIES Program was effective in reducing recidivism and improving clients’ knowledge and application of the life skills.

**Research Questions**

Four research questions were asked in the impact evaluation, the answers to which are described in Chapter 4. These questions are described as “Client Improvements and Satisfaction.” These questions are noted below with their corresponding data sources and methods of analyzing those data.

**Client Improvements and Satisfaction**

To determine what effect the program had on clients who participated, the following research questions were asked:
• Research Question 1: What was the rate of recidivism among clients?

• Research Question 2: Did clients make improvements in targeted life skills?

• Research Question 3: Were clients satisfied with the services they received?

• Research Question 4: What percentage of clients engaged in services after release from jail, and what factors were related to post-release engagement?

Data for the impact evaluation were collected using the Sheriff’s databases to gather client criminal history three years prior to enrollment, as well as the most current offense. These data answer the first research question. The remaining three research questions were addressed from data collected in follow-up interviews with clients at 6 and 12 months post-release and results from pre- and post-knowledge tests in the four life skills areas.

Although 40 randomized follow-up interviews were planned, there was some inconsistency in the accuracy and quality of the client contact information provided to SANDAG. As a result, SANDAG chose to select clients for follow-up based on a sample of convenience to maximize the number of follow-up interviews completed. The follow-up interviews, which were conducted by telephone, contained closed and open-ended questions that asked clients to rate their level of improvement in all life skills areas, as well as their impressions of the program. All clients who completed an interview received a $15 cash incentive.

The knowledge tests were created by each community-based agency using curriculum previously prepared. They contained between 12 to 22 questions, including true/false and multiple choice. Analysis was conducted only on those clients who completed both a pre- and a post-test in each knowledge area. In addition, on a quarterly basis, CCRC administered a workshop satisfaction survey to clients to get their feedback on satisfaction of the facilitators and the curriculum.

**Analysis**

These data were analyzed using frequencies, cross-tabulations, and measures of central tendency, as well as inferential statistics including t-tests and chi-squares. Statistically significant results are reported at the significance level of $p < .05$ or lower for all tests. Any data that are found to be statistically significant are noted.
DATA AVAILABLE FOR ANALYSIS

To clarify what data were collected for analysis, Table 2.1 shows the instruments used to collect data and the corresponding number of clients for which these data were collected. The variability in these numbers reflects changes in the types of instrument used, lack of client knowledge tests over time, and clients exiting the program or being released from jail six months or one year from the end of data collection. This will help the reader understand the differing totals of clients discussed under each section of data analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF CLIENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intake interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSI-R-SV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Tests (pre and post)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence/Anger Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Readiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre (3 years prior)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Offense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Months Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Months Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Months Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Months Post</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHANGES TO THE RESEARCH STUDY

Due to the nature of field research, a number of changes to the original research design were necessary over the course of the evaluation to accommodate program delivery issues and other factors that arose. These are outlined below.

Adult Substance Use Survey (ASUS)

In the second year of the program, the ASUS instrument was discontinued primarily due to the fact that there were issues relating to staff not having the skills to accurately score the instrument. Additionally, the leadership team felt the information gathered in the intake interview was sufficiently capturing the data necessary.\(^2\)

Parenting Knowledge Test

After analyzing preliminary outcome data of pre- and post-test scores in all four core classes, the researchers found some discrepancy between knowledge gained and reported client involvement in the parenting classes. Specifically, according to the workshop satisfaction surveys, clients gave the parenting class material and the facilitator higher marks than the other three classes, but the clients' scores in the parenting classes did not parallel this level of involvement. The leadership team discussed possible reasons for this discrepancy, chief among them being that the curriculum did not match all the questions on the knowledge test. In July 2005, a decision was made to revise the content of the test, as well as its format, to bring it in alignment with the other subject knowledge tests. This was achieved by changing the test's Likert scale format (1 through 5 with 1 representing “Strongly Agree” and 5 representing “Strongly Disagree”) to a combination “true/false” and multiple choice format. The researchers agreed to analyze the scores from the newly formatted tests separately from the original test scores to maintain consistency across the data.

SUMMARY

To determine if the Family TIES Program was implemented as designed and the expected outcomes were realized, both process and impact evaluations were conducted. This chapter presented an outline of the research methodology, including a description of the methods used to address the research questions and the associated statistical tests used for analysis. The research included participating in all meetings of the leadership team, program staff, and Advisory Board and reviewing minutes, as well as conducting surveys and interviews, doing case studies, and tracking criminal history.

---

\(^2\) Because the ASUS was discontinued after being administered to only 34 clients, no result data were entered by the program and, therefore, were not available for analysis in this report.
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INTRODUCTION

The current chapter includes information pertaining to the process evaluation, which addresses the seven research questions discussed in Chapter 2. Presented in this chapter are analyses from data collected on program design and modifications, key partnerships and institutional changes which resulted from the program, client level of need regarding substance abuse and mental health, and client criminal history. In addition, key staff perceptions are provided from the Family TIES (Targeted Intervention, Education, and Services) Program staff regarding the implementation, strengths, and weaknesses of the program. Data are presented from client intake instruments, criminal records, staff surveys, and client follow-up interviews.

MODEL FIDELITY

Was the Program Implemented as Designed?

Overall, the original design of the Family TIES Program was adhered to by providing a six-week curriculum in four life skills domains to all eligible participants at both Las Colinas and George Bailey Detention Facilities. In addition, the two enrichment classes were offered by Family Literacy Foundation (Building Bridges with Books) and ParentCare (reunification workshop). Clients also received pre-release one-on-one case management by staff with expertise in the areas most needed by clients.

What Modifications Were Made, if any, and Why?

As can be expected, there were several modifications made to the program throughout its three-year duration. Most of these changes were enhancements to the project as a result of creative brainstorming among different staff members.

Domestic Violence Certification

The program’s initial plan was to provide separate classes in domestic violence and anger management because of the philosophic differences between the two curricula. To successfully deal with this challenge, the Project Director succeeded in ensuring that all but two correctional counselors received the necessary certification to facilitate the domestic violence treatment classes. He also met with the head domestic violence prosecutors at both the San Diego City Attorney’s Office and the San Diego County District Attorney’s Office to gain their support for having the

---

3 The program planned to provide County-certified facilitators in the Duluth model of domestic violence treatment to allow court-ordered inmates to begin their domestic violence treatment classes while incarcerated.
domestic violence class offered in jail. Additionally, the Project Director garnered support from the judge of the San Diego Superior Court’s specialized Domestic Violence Court, as well as the Chief of Probation.

While there was some concern in the domestic violence provider community about the efficacy of this model, there were other significant factors that precluded this goal being achieved. Specifically, upon closer examination of the certification requirements, it became apparent that the court-approved domestic violence treatment program was based on a psychotherapy model rather than an educational model such as that offered by the Family TIES Program. In spite of that, the Project Director attempted to apply for a partial certification that would have allowed the development of a cognitive-behavioral classroom curriculum which would lay the conceptual foundation in the jail-based program. This curriculum then would be built upon by community providers following the participant’s release from jail and enrollment in community programs. Due to an internal reorganization of the Sheriff’s Department which resulted in the Project Director’s assignment to another Division, the application for partial certification was not completed.

Client Graduation

In July 2004, the Las Colinas correctional counseling supervisor suggested holding regular graduation ceremonies to acknowledge clients who successfully completed the program. These ceremonies were piloted at Las Colinas in August 2004, with the men’s facility following suit shortly thereafter. Graduates received certificates of completion, recognition for perfect attendance, photos of themselves with their case manager, and an opportunity to give a brief speech. Their audience consisted not only of correctional and program staff, but also currently enrolled clients who saw first-hand the acknowledgement bestowed on the graduates, as well as their pride for achieving success and recognition.

Case Management

The frequency of case management meetings between program staff and clients was reduced from the original plan of meeting every other week or so after intake. Program staff believed that by meeting with clients closer to their release dates, they would have more accurate information regarding the client’s living situation, family relations, and other needs. This would allow the case manager to create a more appropriate release plan that met the client’s immediate needs. Therefore, although case managers did meet with clients on a bi-weekly basis, the first meetings were held much later in the client’s entry into the program, thereby reducing the overall number of visits.

Building Bridges with Books

In the third year, the Building Bridges with Books program consolidated two classes into one so that clients attended the workshop and conducted their videotaped reading in the same class period. Consequently, the program was able to serve more clients through lack of attrition between the first and second class meeting, as well as allowing them to schedule a greater number of classes throughout each six-week period. In the end, the Family Literacy Foundation, which presented the reading workshop, succeeded in maximizing their limited staff time and resources.
PARTNERSHIPS AND SYSTEMATIC CHANGES

One of the crucial elements of the process evaluation was to explore not only how the agencies partnered to implement the program, but also whether the Family TIES Program resulted in any institutionalized changes to existing systems.

What was the Nature of the Partnerships on this Project?

Partnerships

The Family TIES Program blended professionals from various disciplines, including community-based organizations and the San Diego County Sheriff’s Department. Developing effective partnerships required building bridges between these divergent disciplines to foster communication and coordination. This was accomplished through regular ongoing meetings among the leadership team, program staff, and the Advisory Board members.

Coordination

Leadership Meetings

The program leadership, under the direction of the Project Director, met monthly from October 2003 to August 2006. In regular attendance were the Project Director, supervisory staff from the three community-based organizations (CBO), data entry staff, and SANDAG. These meetings were held at both locations to facilitate staff attendance and served as a forum to discuss items related to the program design and implementation, the evaluation, and staff development. The researcher regularly attended all meetings and prepared minutes which served as documentation for the process evaluation.

Program Staff Meetings

The Project Director convened bi-monthly program staff meetings at each detention facility to ensure regular communication between CBO and detention facility staff members, assign and review cases for management, and discuss staffing issues. Research staff attended these meetings as necessary to stay apprised of any changes in procedure and to share recommendations for improving data collection, specifically client contact information for follow-up interviews.

Some of the more prominent issues that arose over the course of the program were balancing the CBO staff’s need for access to jail facilities and inmates to provide services, while at the same time ensuring that CBO staff understood and complied with the complex logistics and regulations of working inside a detention facility.

Another issue inherent to working inside a detention facility is the occurrence of lock-downs, which entail all inmates being locked in their cells until a perceived or actual security threat to correctional staff and inmates is alleviated. Lock-downs occurred at both George Bailey and Las Colinas jails over the course of the three-year program and, as such, hampered class facilitation and case management meetings. To the credit of the program team, they overcame this challenge by agreeing to allowing clients to make up class sections missed due to the lock-down, thereby minimizing any demoralizing effect from missing out on program services and the possibility of not successfully completing the program.
Advisory Board

With input from all leadership team members, individuals were identified to participate on the Family TIES Program Advisory Board. The purpose of this body was to provide policy guidance in addressing the needs of clients. The Board met quarterly between June 2005 and June 2006 to learn more about the program and its progress, evaluation findings, as well as offer recommendations to enhance services to inmates. The ten Advisory Board members included representatives from the following agencies and disciplines:

- San Diego County District Attorney’s Office;
- San Diego County Public Defender’s Office;
- San Diego County Sheriff’s Department;
- City of San Diego Police Department;
- San Diego County Probation Department;
- San Diego County Alcohol and Drug Services;
- San Diego Workforce Partnership;
- First 5 Commission of San Diego;
- Private defense bar; and
- Public relations.

In March 2006, the Advisory Board held its meeting at Las Colinas to allow members the opportunity to observe the graduation ceremony, hear clients’ remarks, and personally meet the participants. Before the Advisory Board disbanded at the end of the grant, members focused their attention on how to effectively promote the Family TIES Program and educate the greater community about it. As a result, in September 2006, a local cable access channel taped a class at George Bailey jail and interviewed clients and facilitators. This video aired in late September 2006.

What Systematic Changes Resulted from these Partnerships?

Despite the Family TIES Program ending at both the Las Colinas and George Bailey Detention Facilities, several changes were made in other detention facilities indicating that the program’s success had reverberated beyond Las Colinas and George Bailey jails. For example, the Vista Detention Facility in the northeastern portion of San Diego County began conducting a pre-release class for all inmates scheduled for release within the next 60 to 90 days. These classes provided inmates with resource information and a release plan.

Due directly to the Family TIES Program resulting in a noticeable reduction in behavioral problems among its clients, the program received high regard from the commanders at both Las Colinas and George Bailey Detention Facilities. The commander at the George Bailey jail decided to convene a committee of Sheriff’s Department staff to strategize on how to improve inmate behavior and opted to conduct three focus groups with 26 George Bailey inmates between July and August 2005.

The chief themes emanating from the focus groups were the negative relationship between deputies and inmates, specifically a lack of respect shown toward inmates; inconsistent application of policies and procedures; a dearth of constructive and organized activities for inmates; and the seemingly indiscriminate use of lock-downs, which were perceived by participants as a way to punish or threaten inmates for not following rules. One of the responses to address these issues was
to have correctional counselors make “rounds” throughout the yards to give inmates an opportunity to approach them with concerns and maintain open lines of communication between inmates and staff. Another change made was increasing the availability of structured activities, as well as games and magazines. Recognizing the desire for more structured activities, the facility designed the Effective Living Program, which incorporated many of the life skills taught in the Family TIES Program within a cognitive-behavioral instructional model.

Finally, the Family TIES Program was planned as an opportunity to implement changes in the Correctional Counselors’ role and function by leveraging training resources to enhance their role in the jail. A result of implementing the program, as well as the training provided through the grant, was that the Correctional Counseling staff became much more active and involved with the inmates, provided assessments, developed interviewing skills, conducted classes, and initiated community referrals on a more active basis than they had prior to the program’s implementation.

STAFF PERCEPTIONS

What Were the Family TIES Program Staff’s Perceptions of the Program’s Implementation and Management?

Part of the process evaluation included administering two annual Key Staff Surveys. The first survey, conducted in November 2004, garnered responses from all 12 key staff (7 correctional counselors and 5 CBO staff), but the number of respondents for the second round survey in December 2005 dropped to eight (3 correctional counselors, all of whom were from Las Colinas, and 5 CBO staff). Of the eight respondents in the second administration, only one person was taking the survey for the first time.

The basic goals of the program seemed to be understood by almost all of the staff. Compared to the first survey, in which 5 of the 12 respondents felt the program was meeting its goals, the second survey indicated 6 of the 8 respondents felt this way. This increase most likely is due to the program’s progress over the course of a year.

Perceived Strengths and Weaknesses of the Program

Most multi-disciplinary teams share a vision but need time to grow accustomed to each other’s unique perspectives and skill sets before the program can operate smoothly. The first survey indicated that 11 of the 12 respondents felt team coordination could be improved. This was similar to the second survey, with 6 of the 8 respondents feeling coordination could be improved. The most common suggestions in both surveys pointed to the need for better communication among the team and for members to keep in mind that they were all working toward the same goal.

Despite the impression that there was room for improvement in team coordination, nearly all respondents in the first and second surveys (10 and 7, respectively) felt that coordination was indeed effective. One possible indication that lines of communication were fairly open is that all but one respondent said they had given their input about the program to the leadership team, the majority of whom said their input was well-received. However, one individual felt that the administration “didn’t care” about their input.
In both the first and second round of surveys, all but one individual felt there were strengths in the program administration, with the most common being staff’s commitment to assisting inmates and the program’s core curriculum. At the second survey, fewer staff felt there were weaknesses (5 out of 8) than at the first survey (11 out of 12). Specific weaknesses mentioned in both surveys included inconsistencies in implementing the program and lack of sufficient time and organization to provide case management. Specifically, many comments reflected that there were logistical limitations in working inside a detention facility, including lock-downs, which may have impeded some attempts to provide services.

**Final Staff Comments**

At the end of the survey, staff were given the opportunity to add an open-ended comment about the program as a whole. One prominent theme to emerge was the need to “streamline” the program, again pointing to the earlier recommendation to improve procedural inconsistencies and communication. This should not come as a surprise since the task of building a strong multi-disciplinary team may take years. Over the course of the program, community-based organization staff with no prior experience working inside a detention setting, exhibited a transformation as they became more comfortable working inside the jails. Additionally, consideration should be given to the fact that the Family TIES Program brought together professionals from vastly different disciplines and, at times, seemingly disparate perspectives, with the expectation to overcome their differences for the benefit of the clients.

**CLIENT CHARACTERISTICS**

**What Were the Characteristics and Needs of Eligible Clients at Intake?**

As part of the process evaluation, SANDAG compiled data on client characteristics, including basic demographics, marital and parenting status, living situation, and whether there were any needs regarding substance abuse or mental health issues. To enrich the analysis, data were compared between Family TIES Program clients and the overall local jail population.

**Gender, Age, and Ethnicity**

The demographic data provide a profile of the 502 study participants at intake. The average age of Family TIES Program clients was 34.4 years (range 19 to 61 years, SD = 3.14) and compared closely with the overall local jail population of 32.8 years. There was no significant difference in age between males (32.5) and females (33.1) (not shown).

With regard to gender, over one-half (57%) of the clients were female and 43 percent were male. Figure 3.1, which compares demographics of Family TIES Program clients to the overall jail population, shows that males accounted for 85 percent and females for 15 percent of all inmates. With males comprising more than two-fifths of the overall local jail population, the under-representation of males in the Family TIES Program sample could be attributed to various factors. For example, the Las Colinas jail had larger classrooms than the men’s facility. Additionally, George Bailey jail is a maximum security jail and houses more inmates who pose serious security risks, thus shrinking the pool of eligible clients. Also, the men’s facility at George Bailey experienced a much higher number of lock-downs than the women’s facility at Las Colinas during which it was necessary to suspend enrollment of new clients.
The ethnic breakdown among Family TIES Program clients compared to the overall local jail population shows that Hispanics were underrepresented (26% of Family TIES Program clients versus 38% of jail inmates) (Figure 3.2). Almost all clients (94%) said their primary language was English (not shown).
Marital and Parenting Status

Overall, only 17 percent of Family TIES Program clients said they were currently married, with the majority unlikely to report being in a stable relationship with a significant other. More than one-half (52%) said they were never married, and almost one-third (31%) said that they currently were separated, divorced, or widowed (not shown). However, as Figure 3.3 shows, there were significant differences in marital status between the male and female clients, with males more likely to have never been married (58% versus 47%) and females more likely to be separated/divorced/widowed (37% versus 23%) \( (\chi^2 (2) = 11.52) \).

One of the goals of the program was to target inmates who would benefit from improvement in parenting skills\(^4\). Of all 502 clients, the program served more than one-third (38%) who identified as a primary caregiver of a minor child at the time of their most recent arrest. Of these 190 individuals, 80 percent said they had physical custody of the child(ren), with mean number of minor children per client of 1.87 (range 1 through 10, \( SD = 1.15 \)). Eleven percent (11%) of all clients reported that they were working with Children’s Welfare Services (CWS) to reunite with their child(ren) (not shown).

\(^4\) Although not all clients were primary caregivers of minor children, the program required that all attend parenting classes.
Figure 3.3
CLIENT MARITAL STATUS

An interesting observation is that of the 76 males who said they were primary caregivers, only 59 percent reported having actual physical custody of the child(ren). On the other hand, of the 114 females reporting as caregivers, almost all (94%) said they had physical custody. One possible reason for this difference is provided through anecdotal evidence reported by program staff to the evaluator. According to staff, a number of male clients said they considered themselves “caregivers” of their child(ren) because they provided financial support for the child’s care (not shown).

Client Risks and Needs

Living Situation and Reliance on Public Assistance

Financial reliance on public aid did not appear to be a risk factor for the majority of Family TIES Program clients. According to data from the LSI-R-SV, 81 percent of all clients said they were employed at the time of their current arrest (Table 3.2). Eighteen percent (18%) of all clients reported receiving some type of public assistance at intake, most of whom (40%) said they received CalWORKS benefits (cash aid and services to families with eligible needy children) (not shown).

Overall, clients reported relatively stable living situations at arrest, with nearly three-quarters (72%) saying they were living in a house or an apartment at the time of their arrest, and nearly one-quarter (22%) were homeless. Others (6%) said they were living in a supported housing setting, residential treatment, or other living arrangement (not shown).
To further explore multiple risk factors, cross-tabulations were run to determine how many homeless individuals were also primary caregivers. Of the 111 individuals reporting to be homeless at the time of their arrest, 13 percent (or 24 individuals) said they were the primary caregiver of a minor child, with no difference between males and females (not shown).

**Substance Abuse**

According to SANDAG’s 2005 interviews with recently arrested individuals booked into local detention facilities, 70 percent tested positive for at least one type of drug (Burke, 2006). Therefore, it is not surprising that 84 percent of all Family TIES Program clients said they had tried to cut down or quit using drugs over the past year. This percentage increased to 93 percent when asked if they had ever tried to cut down or quit. With regard to alcohol use, almost two-thirds (62%) said they tried to cut down in the past year, which increased to 77 percent when asked if they had ever tried to cut down. Clients reported they had ever received treatment for alcohol use (31%) or drug use (55%). It is worth noting that the question posed to clients at intake was whether they “tried” to cut down or quit using drugs or alcohol and does not take into account those clients who may have been using drugs and/or alcohol but did not try to cut down or quit (not shown).

While there were no significant differences between males and females regarding trying to quit drugs within the last year (60% of females and 64% of males, of those who used) (Table 3.1), or having drug abuse issues at all (87% of males and 88% of females) (not shown), there were significant findings in other areas of substance abuse by gender. For example, while males were significantly more likely than females to report having any alcohol issues (74% versus 38%, respectively) ($\chi^2 (1)=62.73$) (not shown), of those who used alcohol, females were significantly more likely than males to report ever trying to cut down or quit using alcohol (85% versus 71%, respectively) ($\chi^2 (1)=7.59$) (Table 3.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.1</th>
<th>ATTEMPTS TO CUT DOWN OR QUIT USING DRUGS/ALCOHOL BY GENDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drugs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past 12 months*</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever in Lifetime*</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alcohol</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past 12 months</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever in Lifetime</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>159 - 215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at $p<.05$.

NOTE: Cases with missing information not included.

SOURCE: SANDAG; Family TIES Program Intake Interview, May 2004 – August 2006
As Figure 3.4 shows, the primary drug of choice for approximately two-thirds of clients for both time periods (12 months prior to arrest and ever in their lifetime) was methamphetamine (67% and 69%, respectively), followed by marijuana (32% and 44%, respectively), crack (13% and 20%, respectively), cocaine (4% and 12%, respectively), and heroin (7% and 11%, respectively).

**Figure 3.4**
CLIENT DRUG OF CHOICE PAST YEAR AND LIFETIME

NOTE: Percentages based on multiple responses.

SOURCE: SANDAG; Family TIES Program Intake Interview, May 2004 – August 2006
Mental Health

The Family TIES Program did not target chronically mentally ill individuals, but rather, required that clients were emotionally and cognitively able to participate in the classes. This doesn’t necessarily mean, however, that clients were free from needing mental health assistance at some time in their lives. It was found that more than one-half (55%) of the 501 clients for whom the data were available reported receiving some type of mental health treatment ever in their lifetime, with fewer than one-quarter (23%) reporting receiving treatment in the past year.

Figure 3.5 shows the types of mental health treatment clients received within the year previous to their most recent arrest, with medication management most frequently reported (62%), followed closely by ongoing counseling (61%), and psychiatric hospitalization (13%), crisis counseling (11%), and other types (7%) reported less frequently. Nearly one-quarter (23%) of clients reported receiving mental health treatment while currently incarcerated, with medication management being the most frequent type of treatment received (82%), and counseling (30%) the second most common type (not shown). Treatment could include ongoing counseling, medication management, crisis counseling, hospitalization, and other modes of assistance.

Figure 3.5
TYPES OF MENTAL HEALTH TREATMENT IN LAST YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medication Management</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitalization</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis Counseling</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL = 115

NOTE: Cases with missing information not included. Percentages based on multiple responses.

SOURCE: SANDAG; Family TIES Program Intake Interview, May 2004 - August 2006

5 Other types of mental health treatment received included group counseling and use of day centers.
Worth noting is that a significantly higher number of females than males reported receiving treatment within the last 12 months prior to intake (26% versus 18%, respectively) ($\chi^2 (1) = 5.308$) as well as ever in their lifetime (75% versus 38%, respectively) ($\chi^2 (1) = 55.259$) (not shown). These outcomes are consistent with previous research conducted by SANDAG evaluating the San Diego County Sheriff’s Department’s Connections program, which provided targeted case management to mentally ill offenders who previously had been incarcerated in local jails (Burke and Keaton, 2004).

**Criminogenic Background**

To assess a client’s risk of re-offending, the program administered the Level of Service Inventory-Revised Short Version (LSI-R-SV), which provides information on a client’s risk of re-offending. Data from the LSI-R-SV were available for 436 clients and provide a score recommending the level of supervision needed by an inmate or probationer. The instrument consists of eight domains, the total score of which is based on an eight-point scale (0 indicating “minimal supervision” and 8 indicating “maximum supervision”). An individual whose score falls between three and five is considered to have a “medium” level of risk and need. Three of the domains are static, or unchanging in nature, (prior adult conviction, non-rewarding parenting, and arrested before age 16), while the remaining five (currently employed, criminal friends, alcohol/drugs affect school or work, psychological issues, and supportive of crime) are dynamic, or subject to change.

On average, Family TIES Program clients’ score was 4.68 (range 0 to 8, $SD = 1.79$). Among clients, the most common domains indicating higher level of risk were having a prior conviction (75%), criminal friends (73%), and issues with alcohol and drugs (71%). These areas of risk were tempered by fewer clients having been arrested before the age of 16 (26%) and a high percentage reporting that they were currently employed at time of arrest (81%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>LSI-R-SV Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Currently Employed</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Adult Conviction</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Friends</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol/Drugs Affect School or Work</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Issues</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Rewarding Parenting</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive of Crime</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrested Before Age 16</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL                                  | 436            |

**Criminal History**

**Pre Period**

Using the local Sheriff’s Department database, SANDAG collected criminal history data for the three years prior to enrollment for all 502 study participants. The history that was collected was limited to local jail bookings and does not reflect any prior prison sentences or offenses that occurred outside of San Diego County.

The majority of clients had some criminal record in the past three years, not including the most current offense. Eighty-six percent (86%) had been booked into a local jail during the previous three years, with an average of 3.22 (range 1 through 17, SD = 2.99) separate bookings during that time period. Of those clients, 77 percent also had a conviction with a mean of 1.57 convictions (range 1 through 3, SD = .70). The median number of days clients spent in local jail during the three years prior to enrollment was 24.5 (not shown). Whether a program such as the Family TIES Program can help reduce the number of days spent in local jails, and thus, the cost of housing inmates, may be of interest to policy makers when recommending future programs.

Of those individuals with prior criminal activity, the majority (87%) were booked on a felony level charge and more than two-thirds (68%) were subsequently convicted of a felony (not shown). Figure 3.6 shows the breakdown of the types of crimes for which clients were booked during this pre-period, with property crimes being the most common (35%), followed by drug (31%), violent (25%), other (8%), and probation violations (2%). The “other” category of crimes includes vehicle-related offenses, prostitution, and loitering.

**Figure 3.6**

**CLIENT HIGHEST PRE-BOOKING OFFENSE TYPE**

- Property: 35%
- Drug: 31%
- Violent: 25%
- Other: 8%
- Probation Violation: 2%

TOTAL = 502

NOTE: Percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding.

Gender differences were found in the types of offenses clients committed in the past, with males significantly more likely than females to be booked (32% versus 18%; $\chi^2(4)=17.91$) as well as convicted (20% versus 10%; $\chi^2(3)=17.82$), for violent crimes and females being significantly more likely than males to be booked (41% versus 28%) (Figure 3.7) and convicted (45% versus 32%; $\chi^2(3)=17.82$) for property crimes.

**Figure 3.7**

**PRIOR BOOKING OFFENSE TYPE BY GENDER**

![Graph showing prior booking offense type by gender]

Current Offense

SANDAG collected information on all 502 clients' current offense for their most recent incarceration. Similar to the pre period, the majority currently were booked on a felony charge (77%), followed by misdemeanors (12%), and probation violations (11%). Clients also were primarily booked for property offenses (33%), followed by drug (27%), other (15%), and violent (14%) crimes (Figure 3.8).

Figure 3.8
CLIENT HIGHEST CURRENT BOOKING TYPE
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In looking at the dispositions of clients' current offense, SANDAG found that there were 20 individuals whose criminal cases still were open at the close of data collection in September 2006; therefore, no disposition information could be gathered. However, for clients whose cases had been determined within the data collection window, SANDAG collected both conviction and probation revocation data on the current offense. As with bookings, the majority of the clients' current convictions were for a felony charge (84%), followed by misdemeanors (16%). Similar to the bookings, clients also were primarily convicted for property offenses (33%), followed by drug (27%), other (15%), and violent crimes (13%) (not shown). There were no significant differences between males and females across current booking levels, types, or level and types of convictions. However, males were significantly more likely than females to be convicted for their current offense (73% versus 63%; \( \chi^2 (2) = 5.18 \)) (not shown).
COMPLETION STATUS

The Family TIES Program consisted of six weeks of instruction and case management. The date the client completed their engagement interview with correctional counseling staff was used as the date of entry into the program, and their last day of class attendance was considered their exit date. The goal of the Family TIES Program was to have at least 70 percent of clients complete the program.

How Long did Clients Participate in the Program, and What Were Reasons for not Completing?

The average time in the program among the 393 individuals for which both a date of entry and exit were available was 52.58 days (or seven and one-half weeks) (range 0 – 121 days, SD = 16.74). One probable explanation for the additional time in past the six-week time period was that at the program’s onset, eligible clients were required to wait until a new six-week class cycle began before entering. This was later changed to allow clients to begin classes during an existing session.

Of the 474 clients for which completion data were available, more than three-quarters (78%) successfully completed, surpassing the program’s completion goal. Of the 102 clients who did not complete the program, 42 percent refused to participate after enrollment, 22 percent were released early, 19 percent were terminated by the provider (primarily for rules violations), and 18 percent received an administrative transfer to another detention facility (not shown).

Rate of completion between genders was fairly similar, with 80 percent of females completing versus 76 percent of males. However, there were significant findings between gender when looking at reasons for not completing. Specifically, male clients were significantly more likely to voluntarily refuse treatment than female clients (21% versus 8%, respectively) ($\chi^2$ (2) = 27.262), while women had a higher rate than men of leaving the program due to administrative reasons, such as transfers and early release (12% versus 3%, respectively) (Figure 3.9).

---

In an effort to ease crowding at local jails, the Sheriff’s Department instituted early release “kicks” of five percent off all inmates’ sentences in late 2004. This partially was responsible for the 22 clients who were released early.
SUMMARY

Information for this chapter, describing the results of the Family TIES Program process evaluation, was compiled from meeting minutes; staff and client surveys; intake, exit, and follow-up interviews, and criminal records. Overall, the program generally was implemented as designed, with the exception of difficulties related to obtaining domestic violence treatment certification and modification to the frequency of case management provision. The multi-disciplinary team was not without challenges, but generally worked well. Consistent with expectations, clients in this study had a history of alcohol and drug abuse, mental health treatment, and prior involvement with the criminal justice system, primarily due to property and drug-related crimes rather than violent offenses. The program exceeded its completion rate expectation for both men and women, despite an unanticipated time period when inmates at both facilities received a five percent reduction in their overall sentences. Staff members overall felt the goals of the program had been reached due to staff’s dedication to helping inmates; and that although they felt some frustration in the number of procedural changes that occurred over the course of the grant, they believed overall project coordination was effective.

SOURCE: SANDAG; Family TIES Program Exit Form, May 2004 – September 2006
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INTRODUCTION

The results of the impact evaluation are presented in this chapter and focus primarily on what effect, if any, the program had on clients' lives. The research questions presented in this chapter address whether the Family TIES (Targeted Intervention, Education, and Services) Program was able to accomplish its primary goal of helping clients improve their life skills in order to reduce recidivism. This was measured by looking at new bookings and convictions, changes in at-risk behaviors, and improvements clients made in their lives in the four life skills. Specific analyses also were conducted to determine what factors may have been predictive of reduced recidivism.

RECIDIVISM

To measure the rate of recidivism among clients, SANDAG collected data on clients' criminal activity using local criminal record databases. These records were used to gather information on clients' criminal activity up to one year after release at two six-month junctures.

What was the Rate of Recidivism Among Clients?

There were 323 individuals eligible for data collection in the 12-month post-release period, and of these, nearly one-half (46%) had at least one new booking, with an average of 1.47 bookings (range 1 to 5, SD = 0.84), and a median of 57.5 days in jail (range 1 to 345, SD = 49.3). Of the 149 individuals who received a new booking, 44 percent were booked during the first six months post-release, 36 percent were booked during the second six months, and 20 percent were booked during both time periods.

While there were no significant differences between males and females in the number of days in jail or the number of bookings that occurred through 12-months post-release, there were significant differences found across the type of booking. While females were more likely than males to be booked for drug charges, (50% and 32%, respectively), males were more likely than females to be booked for violent crimes (16% and 7%, respectively) and other felonies and misdemeanors (24% and 9%, respectively) ($\chi^2(4) = 11.23$) (Figure 4.1).

---

7 There were no significant differences found between the 323 clients with 12-month follow-up data and the 117 with 6-month follow-up data in the rate of recidivism during the first six months post-release. This is measured by number of bookings, days spent in jail, level and type of bookings, and level and type of convictions.
By measuring recidivism using the rate of convictions against the clients, it was determined that over one-quarter (28%) of the clients were convicted of a new charge up to 12-months post-release (not shown). Figure 4.2 presents a survival-type analysis for the clients who completed the **Family TIES Program**, compared to those who did not complete the program. Specifically, this figure shows the percentage of clients with no new convictions at each of the two six-month post-release junctures. At program exit, all of the clients (100%) had no new convictions. At six-months post-release, 84 percent of the clients who had completed the program remained conviction-free (and 16 percent had at least one new conviction), compared to 77 percent who were conviction-free who had not completed the program (and 23 percent having at least one new conviction). Recidivism was slightly higher at 12-months after release. For example, the percentage of those who completed and did not have a new conviction decreased to 75 percent (with 9 percent receiving at least one new conviction). Similarly, the percentage of those who did not complete and were conviction-free went down to 65 percent (with 13 percent receiving at least one new conviction). While it appears those who completed the program had a lower recidivism rate, these differences were not found to be statistically significant.
Figure 4.2
PERCENT OF CLIENTS WITH NO NEW CONVICTIONS POST-RELEASE
BY PROGRAM COMPLETION STATUS

Of the 89 individuals with a new conviction during the 12-month follow-up period, the majority (67%) had been convicted of a felony level offense (not shown). The most common types of offense included drug-related (47%), followed by property (28%), other felony or misdemeanor (14%), and violent (11%) (Figure 4.3). There were no significant differences in these findings between the individuals who completed the Family TIES Program and those who did not complete the program.

While program completion alone was not a significant predictor of recidivism, further investigation found an interaction between completion status and gender on recidivism during the 12-month follow-up period. Specifically, while completing the program had no effect on the female’s recidivism rates after release, it made a significant impact on the males. Forty-two percent (42%) of the males who did not complete the program were convicted on a new offense within 12 months post-release, compared to just 23 percent of the males who did complete. For females, these differences were not statistically significant, with 30 percent of the females who did not complete the program, compared to 26 percent of those who did complete, being convicted on a new offense.
This effect is apparent when utilizing the same survival-type analysis as described earlier, controlling for gender. Specifically, Figure 4.4 shows the percentage of male clients with no new convictions at each of the two six-month post-release junctures. At program exit, all of the male clients (100%) had no new convictions. At six months post-release, 18 percent of the male clients who had completed the program had at least one new conviction, compared to 25 percent of the male clients who had not completed the program. By 12 months after release, this difference between the groups continues to widen, with an additional 5 percent of the males who had completed the program receiving at least one new conviction, compared to an additional 17 percent of the males who had not completed the program ($\chi^2 (2)=6.20$).

**Figure 4.4**

**PERCENT OF MALE CLIENTS WITH NO NEW CONVICTIONS POST-RELEASE BY PROGRAM COMPLETION STATUS**

Another indication of a program’s success is a reduction in the level and type of convictions between the client’s current offense at intake and the 12-month post-release period. For example, while clients still may be convicted post-release, improvements could be visible if the level and/or type of the conviction was less severe at follow-up than what had been measured at intake. While there were no significant program effects on this measure of success by itself, when controlling for gender it is seen once again that there was an interaction whereby the program had a significant impact on lowering the number of convictions among male clients but had no effect on females.

Specifically, 66 percent of the males who completed the Family TIES Program had lower levels (i.e., misdemeanor versus felony) of convictions during follow-up, versus only 42 percent of those who did not complete ($\chi^2 (2) = 6.93$). Examples of this include clients who had been convicted of a felony at intake but only of a misdemeanor at follow-up, as well as clients who had been convicted for any level offense at intake but were not convicted at all during follow-up. Additionally, 17 percent of the males who had not completed the program versus just 6 percent of those who had completed the program were convicted of higher level crimes at follow-up than they were at intake (Figure 4.5).

**Figure 4.5**

Changes in Level of Convictions for Males Between Intake and 12-Months Post-Release

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Completed (n=84)</th>
<th>Did Not Complete (n=36)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayed the Same</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worsened</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were no significant differences between the males who completed the program and those who did not complete the program across age or ethnicity. However, the males who did not complete the program were significantly more likely to have been convicted for a property crime (44% versus 27%) or not convicted at all (36% versus 21%) for their instant offense, whereas the males who completed the program were more likely to have been convicted for a violent crime (11% versus 8%), drug crime (21% versus 8%) or other felony or misdemeanor (19% versus 3%) ($\chi^2(5)=11.80$) (not shown).

**CLIENT KNOWLEDGE CHANGE**

**Did Clients Make Improvements in Targeted Life Skills?**

Clients who completed both a pre- and post-knowledge test in each of the life skills classes showed improvement to varying degrees. Table 4.1 shows how client knowledge gains compared across the four life skills topics, with employment showing the greatest percent of clients (71%) improving their scores, followed by substance abuse (62%), parenting (56%), and domestic violence/anger management (45%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Life Skill</th>
<th>Percent Who Improve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence/Anger Management</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>103 - 270</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Cases with missing information not included.

**Employment**

A total of 270 (or 54%) clients completed the pre- and post- employment test. The test consisted of 10 “true or false” questions, as well as 10 multiple choice questions, for a maximum score of 20 correct answers. Analyses revealed that clients who completed both a pre- and post-test were able to answer an average of 2.65 more questions correctly at exit (average score of 16.03) (range 4 to 18, $SD =1.78$) compared to at entry (average score of 13.38) (range 4 to 18, $SD =2.96$) (Table 4.2).
What stands out when reviewing these test results is that clients learned most about the best ways to search and interview for a job. For the ten “true or false” questions, they learned they should not give a lot of information to a potential employer over the phone (60% to 93%), that one of the best sources of potential employers is the Yellow Pages (69% to 97%), and that during an interview is not the best time to ask about benefits and time off (71% to 97%). For the multiple choice questions, clients learned that one of the best job search approaches is calling an employer to see if they are hiring (49% to 88%), that employers retain workers who show interest and get along well with co-workers (48% to 73%), and that employers will often hire ex-offenders because they are ready to work and can do the job (73% to 93%) (not shown).

Substance Use

Overall, 236 (or 47%) clients completed both a pre- and post-test on substance abuse. The substance abuse test consisted of 10 “true or false” questions, as well as 10 multiple choice questions, for a maximum score of 20 correct answers. Clients’ tests scores increased on average of 2.0 points between the pre-test (average score of 11.78) (range 3 to 19, $SD = 2.76$) to the post-test (average score of 13.78) (range 6 to 19, $SD = 3.07$) (Table 4.2).

Of the ten “true or false” questions, clients improved to the greatest degree (by 11 percentage points for each question) in knowing that alcohol is the most widely used and abused drug in the world (81% to 92%), that it is not necessary for an addict to “hit bottom” to stop using (73% to 83%), that an addict does not need to believe in God in order to follow the 12-step programs (67% to 78%), and that methadone is, in fact, an addictive way to treat heroin addiction (75% to 86%). For the multiple choice questions, the greatest improvement was seen for questions that related to being able to accurately describe the three “deadly Ds” (denial, doubt, and detour) of addiction (29% to 69%), the elements of one’s “addiction quotient” (64% to 86%), and identifying the “intolerance stage” (25% to 42%) (not shown).

Parenting

Between July 2005 and August 2006, 103 clients completed the revised parenting knowledge test for both the pre and post periods. This test consisted of 22 “true or false” questions and 2 multiple choice questions for a maximum score of 24 possible correct answers. Analyses revealed that clients showed virtually no change between the pre- and post-test, with an average of less than one (.92) question answered correctly at exit (average score of 18.57) (range 11 to 23, $SD = 2.71$), compared to entry (average score of 17.65) (range 9 to 22, $SD = 2.80$) (Table 4.2).

Among the “true/false” questions that showed the greatest gains between exit and entry were not being overly concerned if their child didn’t learn as quickly as other children (36% to 58%), developing strong character by giving their child choices rather than placing demands on them (59% to 77%), how non-verbal communication has more impact than verbal communication (24% to 36%), and that it is acceptable for boys and girls to play with the same toys (47% to 59%). Of the two multiple choice questions, clients showed a marked improvement in correctly identifying three types of non-verbal communication (67% to 81%) (not shown).
Domestic Violence/Anger Management

There were 159 clients who completed both a pre- and post-test for the domestic violence/anger management class. This test was composed of 12 “true or false” questions. The clients showed virtually no change in knowledge from pre (average score of 9.06) (range 4 to 12, \( \text{SD} = 1.61 \)) to post (average score of 9.33) (range 4 to 12, \( \text{SD} = 1.46 \)) (Table 4.1). More than one-half of clients performed either worse (26%) or maintained the same score at post-test (29%). However, it’s worth noting that since clients answered more correct questions on the domestic violence/anger management pre-test than any of the three other life skills pre-tests, there was less room for improvement between pre and post. It would be interesting to know how many clients previously participated in anger management or domestic violence classes and, therefore, were more aware of the curriculum before entering the Family TIES Program (not shown).

The three questions for which clients showed the greatest improvement included understanding that admitting to one’s actions is not the same as being accountable for them (27% to 35%), that anger is not necessarily a bad emotion (62% to 70%), and that the desire for power and control in relationships is the major cause of domestic violence (89% to 96%) (not shown).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in Life Skills Test Scores Pre to Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Readiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence/Anger Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL = 103 - 270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Cases with missing information are not included.

Literacy

Although not part of the core curriculum, included in this section are data from Building Bridges with Books literacy enrichment class. There were 100 clients who completed a pre- and post-survey, which included eight questions with responses based on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 being “strongly agree” and 5 being “strongly disagree”). The data show that roughly three-quarters of clients each came into the class understanding the benefits of reading aloud to their child (78%), feeling comfortable reading aloud (71%), and choosing age appropriate books for their child (74%). The most improvement over time was found in the belief that they could overcome reading problems (65% versus 81%, respectively), enjoyment in reading aloud to their child (60% versus 70%, respectively), and feeling they were a good role model for their child (70% versus 77%, respectively) (not shown).
POST-RELEASE INFORMATION

SANDAG conducted 6- and 12-month follow-up interviews with clients based on a sample of convenience. These interviews serve to answer the following research questions:

- Did Clients Make Improvements in Targeted Life Skills Areas?
- Were Clients Satisfied with the Services they Received?
- What Percentage of Clients Engaged in Services after Release from Jail, and What Factors Were Related to Post-Release Engagement?

Six- and Twelve-Month Follow-up Interviews

Research indicates that post-release services are a key factor to the successful reintegration of previously incarcerated individuals (Little Hoover Commission, 2003). The Family TIES Program grant proposal originally included a post-release case management component based on evidence-based practices. However, the Department of Education did not include funding for post-release case management services, but rather as an educationally focused program. Consequently, there are limitations on the post-release data available for clients.

The researcher’s goal was to conduct follow-up interviews at 6 and 12 months after release with 40 clients who completed the program to gather anecdotal information about their successes and challenges as they reintegrated back to their everyday lives. Follow-up interviews at six months post-release were attempted with 105 individuals. These were individuals who had provided sufficient contact information in the client locator form. Research staff was successful in contacting 36 of these clients 6 months after their release from jail and 21 of these same individuals again at 12 months. Of these 36 individuals, 19 percent were re-arrested within six months of being released, and 11 percent had a subsequent arrest at the 12-month mark. In fact, the researcher conducted one 6-month follow-up interview inside the Central Jail, and research staff learned that two other clients had been sent to prison and were unable to be contacted for the 12-month follow-up. All clients who completed an interview were given a $15 cash incentive (not shown).

To give an overall view of the successes and challenges these 36 individuals were facing at 6-months post-release, several highlights are listed below:

- Clients met an average of 2.75 (SD = 1.25) times with their case manager and received a mean of 6.3 (SD = 4.99) agency referrals before being released. Of the 25 individuals who said they received referral information from their case manager, more than one-half (52%) said they contacted at least one of the agencies; 48 percent said they had not contacted any due to not needing services (71%) or having been re-arrested (29%). The fact that more than one-half of these clients took their own initiative to contact agencies for assistance is encouraging and reflects favorably on the program staff’s ability to establish rapport with clients and imbue them with the confidence they needed to take positive steps (not shown).
• All of the individuals rated their experience in the **Family TIES Program** as either very positive or positive, and almost all (94%) felt their case manager was helpful. Of those who took time to give reasons why their experience was positive, over one-half (52%) credited the staff and/or the curriculum, 24 percent credited the parenting class specifically, 14 percent said it improved their self-perception, and 10 percent credited the employment readiness class. The most common suggestion for improving the program was to increase its duration and time available with a case manager (not shown).

• For both the 6- and 12-month follow-up periods, clients were most likely to seek services for substance abuse (46% and 33%, respectively) and mental health (8% and 17%, respectively). In addition, when asked to specify what “other” services they sought, employment assistance was the most commonly mentioned at 6 months (50%) and 12 months (100%). Financial burdens and employment were among the most common unmet needs for more than one-third (38%) at 6 months, increasing to more than one-half (57%) of clients at 12 months (not shown).

• Clients were asked to rate their improvement in each of the life skills based on a scale of 1 to 5 (with 1 “improved a lot” and 5 “not applicable”). For clarity in reporting these findings, the responses were collapsed into two categories, “improved” or “did not improve,” and any responses indicating that a life skill was not applicable was removed. Overall, clients gave themselves high marks at 6 months, and even slightly higher marks at the year mark, as shown in Table 4.3. Since this information is based solely on the client’s self-reporting, it is not clear whether these improvements were actually realized, or if the clients were interested in giving a socially acceptable response.

### Table 4.3

**CLIENT IMPROVEMENT IN LIFE SKILLS POST-RELEASE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percent at 6 Months</th>
<th>Percent at 12 Months</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substance Use</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>+7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Management</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>+7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>+4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Readiness</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>+1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>+1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL = 21 - 36**

NOTE: Cases with missing information not included
SUMMARY

The current chapter presented the outcome evaluation results, including recidivism data for up to 12 months post-release, client pre/post knowledge tests, and client follow-up interviews. Criminal activity data collected on Family TIES Program clients 6- and 12-months after release show a pattern of clients having been most often arrested and convicted for felony level offenses, with the drug- and property-related crimes among the most common types committed. Violent offenses were not common among this group, which is not surprising given the eligibility criteria of the program. Almost one-half of the clients received a new booking within one year after release and were booked on property- and drug-related crimes and felony level offenses. Although clients who completed the program had a lower recidivism rate than those who did not, these differences were not found to be statistically significant. There was, however, a statistically significant finding that program completion had a positive effect for the males’ recidivism rate but not for the females’. Clients posted the greatest knowledge gains in employment readiness and substance abuse, with minimal gains in parenting and domestic violence. Although clients at follow-up mentioned still needing assistance with employment, they expressed greater confidence in how to appropriately search and interview for a job.
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INTRODUCTION

To enrich the qualitative data collected on clients’ progress throughout the program, SANDAG elected to conduct individual case studies with five clients in the Family TIES (Targeted Intervention, Education, and Services) Program. This chapter contains narrative summaries that describe the client’s experience from intake to exit. These narratives will hopefully give a snapshot of who Family TIES Program clients were, their background, and their progression throughout the program. The narratives include a brief history of the client’s background, the researcher’s observations of the client in each of the four life skills classes, and the outcome of a private interview conducted by SANDAG staff with the client after exiting the program.

Methodology

Three case studies were conducted with women at Las Colinas and two with men at George Bailey. Clients were selected by the correctional counselors at each facility prior to completing the engagement interview or the standardized assessment but after agreeing to participate in the study by signing the informed consent. The correctional counselor administered the informed consent with the client privately without SANDAG staff in attendance. This was to ensure that the client was not unintentionally swayed into agreeing to be part of the study.

Research staff observed the initial engagement interview between the client and the correctional counselor, as well as one class session from all four life skills and the client’s graduation ceremony. After each class observation, SANDAG met briefly with the client to discuss their opinions about the classes and case management services. After the client’s successful completion from the program, and prior to their release, SANDAG scheduled a private “pro visit” with the client to document their feedback on the program in general, as well as each core topic area, their post-release plan, and how they planned to apply what they learned in the program to their everyday life.

Six and 12-month follow-up interviews were conducted with three of the five case studies, two of whom were not contacted at either point due to inadequate or incorrect contact information. The clients’ names have been changed and other identifying information has been excluded to ensure client confidentiality is maintained.
CASE STUDY NUMBER ONE: “SHIRLEY”

Client History

At the time of the case study, Shirley was a 26-year old, White, English-speaking female, married with three children ages 7, 18 months, and 3 months. Unlike most clients, Shirley had no prior arrests or convictions. Her current offense involved stealing $90,000 from her employer, and she pled guilty to grand theft and began her sentence October 2004.

Another characteristic atypical of most TIES clients was that Shirley did not have a current problem with drugs or alcohol. She tried marijuana once in her early teens and drank alcohol only occasionally in social settings, and never during her three pregnancies.

As is common for many women who enter the criminal justice system, Shirley was the victim of both domestic and sexual violence. At the age of 13, she was date-raped and soon after, made a non-lethal suicide attempt. She disclosed a history of domestic violence in her first marriage which ultimately led to divorce. Shirley’s first marriage at age 18 resulted in one daughter, now 7 years old, for whom she had custody. Shirley had been married to her current husband since October 2004, and they have two daughters, ages 18 months and 3 months. After her conviction, her husband moved to another state with the children to be closer to his mother, who would help care for the children. Her husband works full-time as a security guard. Her parents currently live in San Diego with her brother, his wife, and their children.

Shirley’s most recent employment was working at a health club day care facility, and it was there that she misappropriated funds. Her last day of work was July 30, 2003, and she was receiving unemployment until her incarceration. The highest grade level Shirley completed was ninth grade.

Shirley said what she hoped to learn from participating in the Family TIES Program was to address anger management issues, especially as it affects her interaction with her children. Shirley’s reentry plan was to move to reunite with her husband and children and begin medical vocational training.

Class Participation and Life Skills Progress

Shirley showed a high level of interest in each class by asking relevant questions and offering responses when asked to do so by the facilitator. Shirley interacted with inmates during class only to answer a question posed by the facilitator. She didn’t seem to initiate conversation but was focused on the instruction and not easily distracted.

In January 2005, Shirley was granted trustee status. In one Domestic Violence/Anger Management class, she shared how the stresses of working as a trustee entailed supervising a civilian employee and a demanding work schedule. Despite getting no sleep on some days, she still attended her GED and Family TIES Program classes.

Regarding power and control issues, Shirley shared that she had a great deal of power and control over her husband. However, since being incarcerated, she found that her husband was capable of caring for the children and household chores on his own. Shirley reported that she learned to control her anger and become more relaxed when things did not go according to her plans.
Shirley said the Anger Management classes were most helpful and was disappointed that there weren’t any other such classes in jail besides what the Family TIES Program offered. She was able to apply the skills she learned during a phone call with her 7-year old daughter, in which the daughter began crying. Shirley said normally she would respond by “yelling and screaming” at her child, but this time was able to calm her daughter and “didn’t feel stressed out afterward.”

Shirley also described the employment readiness facilitator was a “huge inspiration” to help her believe she could overcome the obstacle of having a felony conviction when looking for a job.

**Private Interview with Shirley**

The evaluator met privately with Shirley on January 10, 2005, in the professional visitor meeting area of Las Colinas. Shirley was asked several questions pertaining to her experience in the Family TIES Program.

**What do you feel you learned in the program?**

Shirley stated that the Employment Readiness facilitator gave her concrete tools for explaining her conviction to employers and helped her believe that her felony conviction didn’t make her a bad person. She stated emphatically that she developed more self-esteem and self-confidence from this class because of the tools the facilitator provided her. She also mentioned that the Substance Abuse facilitator served as a role model by openly sharing her past history of drug use and criminal behavior.

**Did the program meet your expectations?**

Shirley’s main motivation for attending the program was to learn better parenting skills and to deal with her children’s abandonment issues from being separated from her. Shirley said the program far exceeded her expectations in that the other classes taught her things she hadn’t expected, such as being a better listener, how to be more assertive, and how to manage her anger when communicating with her children and husband.

Shirley said the learning environment was safe to ask questions and give feedback. There was some frustration on her part due to being in class with a few inmates who didn’t take the program seriously and were somewhat disruptive. She said she would like more in-depth classes following the six-week course.

**How will you apply what you have learned in each life skill?**

**Parenting**

Shirley said she learned how to discipline her children appropriate to the problem behavior and to the child’s age. She learned that she can spend more time with them doing fun things and not “stress out” if chores aren’t done. She has learned how to express her feelings more appropriately and clearly and that saying “no” to her children doesn’t mean she doesn’t love them. She has learned what boundaries are appropriate for her two oldest children and plans to assert these with them. She plans to share this new knowledge with her husband.
**Domestic Violence/Anger Management**

Shirley said the classes have helped her learn not to blame others, not take what people say so literally, and to “own” her feelings. Shirley said that her ex-husband was violent with her, and that she repeated some of the old dynamics with her current husband, such as “getting up in his face” when she’s angry. She realized that this behavior did not foster open communication.

**Substance Abuse**

Shirley had no issues of alcohol or drug dependence, nor did her husband.

**Employment Readiness**

Shirley had very positive feedback on this curriculum and the facilitator. She said the facilitator “gave me back my self-esteem” and told the class that they can do whatever they want and to “always try first.” Shirley said she learned it was crucial to be completely candid with prospective employers about her criminal history, to think before speaking, and to listen carefully to questions being asked in order to answer them accurately. She said she felt very prepared for job interviewing because of the videos shown in class and the practice exercises. Shirley said repeatedly that she wanted more in-depth training from the facilitator of the employment class.

**Enrichment Classes**

Despite not having an open case with the Child Welfare System, Shirley attended the Reunification enrichment class provided by ParentCare. She learned that it is crucial to take care of herself both emotionally and physically in order to be a fit mother. Additionally, Shirley participated in Building Bridges with Books and was videotaped reading a book to her children. She wanted me to give the program her suggestion to have inmates read for children other than their own, such as foster children.

**Additional Comments**

Shirley continued taking parenting classes offered by the jail with correctional counselors. She completed her GED and continued taking classes to obtain her high school diploma. She enjoyed being a trustee and, although she applied for Sheriff’s parole in March, she was denied. In December 2004, Shirley was assigned to a case manager who specialized in parenting and reunification.

**Follow-Up Interviews**

Shirley completed both 6- and 12-month follow-up interviews after her release. As she had indicated prior to her release, she had moved and was living with her husband and three children. She indicated making “great strides” in becoming a better mother to her three children, something that had been a key goal she’d set for herself in the program. Specifically, Shirley described herself as having “more confidence” in her skills as a parent and that her bond with her children had improved. She credited this partly due to having also learned anger management skills while in the program, especially in knowing how to “let go” of trivial things. A year after her release, Shirley also had met her vocational goal of enrolling in nursing school at a local university. She commended the case manager who she thought was “very helpful” as well as the program as a whole. In her
words, the program staff “made time for all of us to make sure we understood everything; I never felt they thought any question was stupid”.

**CASE STUDY NUMBER TWO: “MELINDA”**

**Client History**

This case study had more characteristics common to many Family TIES Program clients, including prior criminal history and substance abuse. Melinda was a 24 year-old single Hispanic woman who, at the time of the case study, was six months pregnant with her third child. Melinda was never married but lived with her boyfriend at various hotels before her current arrest. She had a 3-year old son with whom she was ordered to have supervised visitation, but according to her, had no active case with Child Welfare Services. Melinda gave birth to a daughter in January 2001, who died from SIDS at four days old.

Melinda said most of her friends were involved in criminal activities, and one of her family members also was serving time in Las Colinas during the course of this case study. Her own criminal history began at the age of 15, when she was arrested and sentenced to juvenile hall for transporting marijuana across the U.S./Mexico border. A year later, she was arrested again for petty theft and received probation. As an adult, Melinda was charged and convicted for domestic violence in February 2001 and placed on three years probation. Approximately one year later, she was arrested again for domestic violence but not convicted. Melinda’s current offense was for auto theft, to which she pled guilty and sentenced to one year. Other charges, including burglary and drug-related charges, were dismissed as a result of this plea agreement.

As with the majority of female TIES clients with drug issues, Melinda’s drug of choice was methamphetamine, which she first used at age 15 and continued to use regularly until her arrest. She admitted using meth during this current pregnancy. She stated she tried many times to quit using meth, including entering rehab, but failed to complete the program. Other drugs Melinda previously used include heroin, marijuana, crack cocaine, and powder cocaine. She said her current boyfriend, who also is the father of her unborn child, used meth and, to her knowledge, had no plans to stop using. Between the ages 15 and 19, she drank hard liquor every weekend until inebriated. She said she stopped drinking on her own when she was pregnant but never received any formal treatment.

Melinda did not complete high school and had never had a legitimate job. She had never received mental health treatment but showed outward feelings of grief over the death of her infant daughter and expressed interest in talking with someone about the sadness. The correctional counselor explained that there were groups which provided grief counseling and her case manager could refer her to them.

**Class Participation and Life Skills Progress**

Overall, Melinda’s participation in class was very minimal. Due to her advanced pregnancy, she had trouble sitting for any length of time. Melinda sat at the table furthest from the instructor with the same inmate during each class. She also was observed frequently to either be asleep or have her head down with eyes closed.
Since Melinda had risks and needs in each of the four life skills, it was surprising that none of the classes seemed to capture her attention. She did not participate in any of the class discussions or exercises, doodled in her workbook while other inmates shared their histories and comments, and when a video was shown, immediately put her head down on the desk and fell asleep. Many of the other inmates in the class actively participated by answering questions, providing examples, and sharing personal stories.

Melinda showed no reaction or camaraderie with other inmates, even when the other participants shared personal stories about leaving their children behind and other situations relevant to Melinda’s own life.

During the Domestic Violence/Anger Management class, Melinda was asked how she would alleviate stress, and she responded “I’d smoke and smoke and get high.” Another exercise consisted of students volunteering to read aloud recommendations for managing anger effectively. This exercise involved significant discussion and sharing, and the class became quite animated as inmates shared personal experiences, feelings about parents and spouses, and ways they handled their anger. Despite the congeniality of the group, Melinda did not share a personal story or make any comment in class. She did not look at the other inmates while they shared, but rather looked outside or put her head down. She interacted with only one other inmate in Spanish.

During a private meeting with Melinda after class, she was asked for her feedback about the program. She had no specific input to give except that she had trouble sleeping because of her pregnancy but was otherwise doing okay.

**Private Interview with Melinda**

Before scheduling this meeting, SANDAG staff confirmed with the Correctional Counselor that Melinda was physically able to meet. It was learned that she had delivered her baby several days previously and was back in custody and doing fine. Melinda’s mother was caring for the baby during Melinda’s sentence. Melinda’s mother said she would not immediately relinquish responsibility of the child until Melinda proved she could properly care for the baby.

Melinda said her newborn was her main focus, and that she felt she was given a second daughter to prove she can be a good mom. She realized she made many mistakes with her son by ignoring him and getting high instead of interacting with him. She said the **Family TIES Program** helped her understand how much a child needs parental attention and planned to be more engaged with her daughter.

**What do you feel you learned in the program?**

Melinda stated that the employment readiness facilitator “gave us hope that we’ll get a job” and “gave us ways to overcome our felony convictions” when interviewing for a job. She also mentioned that the substance abuse class showed very graphic images of the physical effects drugs have on a person, which she thought were an effective deterrent.

**Did the program meet your expectations?**

Melinda said she didn’t have many expectations but felt the program information was “very relevant”. She said, “Each class made you see yourself in it.”
How will you apply what you have learned in each life skill?

**Parenting**

Melinda’s only feedback was to say that the activities and the facilitator were “good.”

**Domestic Violence/Anger Management**

Melinda felt she learned the most from this class and that the information will be useful in all parts of her life. She said the class role-plays were “realistic” and that most of the inmates could relate to the scenarios. She said the class helped her “deal with triggers,” and that now, she doesn’t get mad as quickly. She said before she took the class, she would get mad and sulk if someone hurt her feelings. She gave an example of her sister, who also is in Las Colinas, who let her down recently. Melinda said normally she wouldn’t look her in the eye and would give her “the cold shoulder.” She said now she can let things like that “roll off me.”

**Substance Abuse**

Melinda didn’t provide much feedback on this class, and because drug use was one of her issues, was asked if she thought she would continue to use when she got out. Specifically, she was asked if she planned to be in touch with her baby’s father, a boyfriend who she used drugs with regularly before being arrested. Melinda said she told the boyfriend that she didn’t plan to use drugs when she got out because her main focus would be the baby. She said she didn’t think he would be involved in the baby’s life (she said “he’s still young,” although he’s only three years younger than she is) and didn’t believe she would seek out his company.

Melinda said that her main motivation for not using drugs was to not disappoint her father. She said that she and her sister were the only children her father had, and that both of them had severely disappointed him by their criminal behavior. She began to cry as she told this and said she couldn’t stand letting him down again, especially because he was getting older.

**Employment Readiness**

Melinda planned to attend beauty college and knew of a couple of schools in the area where she planned to live when released. She said her father offered to pay for school and living expenses.

**Additional Comments**

Melinda received her GED while in custody and said that she was proud of herself for completing it. She explained that her father emphasized the importance of getting her GED, so she felt for once she didn’t let her father down and met his expectations. Melinda wanted me to know that she thought “everything about the program was relevant and good.”

**Follow-Up Interviews**

SANDAG staff was successful in contacting Melinda at her mother’s home for a 6-month follow-up interview, but despite her seeming willingness at that time to be contacted again in 12 months, she did not return calls made by research staff. During the 6-month follow-up interview, Melinda had a combination of successes and challenges in reaching her goals. On one hand, she was successful in
landing a full-time job and had even gotten a raise. On the other, she seemed to be struggling with her parenting skills with her infant daughter, and described herself as “not having that motherly touch.” She admitted that her mother was “more of the caretaker” for her baby than she was. One of her suggestions of the program was to “teach us how to handle the emotional part of parenting.” She also confided that having a full-time job greatly reduced the amount of time she could spend with her baby. Melinda had a dependence on meth at the time of her arrest, and when asked if she’d made any progress in that regard, she said that she had quit using meth and stopped hanging out with friends who used, but said that it was mostly due to being on probation and having to submit to regular urinalysis. She had not contacted any service providers nor had she received treatment for her meth use.

CASE STUDY NUMBER THREE: “JOHN”

Client History

John was a 21-year old African American male, engaged for the past two years to a woman with two children ages two and five. Prior to his arrest, he stayed home with the children while the mother worked. The children’s biological father was in prison and played no role in their lives. John was raised in San Diego by his grandparents as his biological mother was a drug user and involved in the criminal justice system and his father was deceased. He felt he had strong family support as he was close to his grandparents and most of his siblings.

John was kicked out of his home at 18, and soon after, he began to sell drugs. John had no juvenile criminal history but had two prior adult arrests for selling marijuana and was on probation prior to his current arrest. John’s current arrest was for possession of marijuana and child endangerment.

Although he denied any gang involvement, John still felt he experienced negative peer influences as many of his friends used marijuana. He reported first trying alcohol and marijuana in high school, and although he didn’t care much for alcohol, he enjoyed the effects of marijuana and smoked socially “to relax.” He feels he could “quit at any time” and said he planned to quit after his release.

Regarding employment history, John said he worked throughout high school until he began selling drugs. He had a variety of different types of jobs but reported his favorite was working for Dell Computers and had an interest in pursuing a career in electronics.

As with more than one-third of male TIES clients, John denied having any history of mental health issues or seeking treatment for emotional problems. John’s goals during the program were to learn how to be a good father and develop good employment skills.

Class Participation and Life Skills Progress

As mentioned, John’s primary interest was to learn parenting skills to become a better stepfather. During parenting classes, John was particularly interested in how to appropriately discipline the children. When the class was asked the question “What would you like to do differently with raising your children than your parents did with you?”, John answered he would not “beat” or “whoop” his children.
In meeting with John after the substance abuse session, John reported liking the class, but felt he didn’t need help with substance abuse as much as parenting and employment. He didn’t believe he was addicted to marijuana and reported he will not smoke when he is released. The main thing he learned from the substance abuse class was that drugs were not the only thing you could be addicted to.

When asked in the employment class to list personal assets, John wrote that he was “hard working,” “loyal,” and had a “positive attitude.” Throughout the lecture, John seemed very interested and engaged, especially during the discussion on how to disclose criminal conviction information on an employment application and in an interview. Specifically, he was observed taking notes when the teacher began discussing how to disclose a child endangerment charge in an interview. The facilitator gave an example of how to disclose this to an employer during an interview by saying, “I had a child on the premises while I was in possession of an illegal substance.”

Although John initially felt he didn’t have issues with domestic violence or anger management, he later said he will be able to use some of the coping tools offered for dealing with frustration.

During John’s graduation, he was singled out by the Project Director for turning down a Sheriff’s parole hearing, which could have granted him an early release, because he wanted to finish the Family TIES Program. John stood in front of the class and thanked Family TIES Program staff and SANDAG for the opportunity to participate in the program. He also stated he learned a lot and thought it was a very good program.

Private Interview with John

SANDAG staff met with John privately a week after graduation to ask the following questions about his experience as a Family TIES Program participant.

**What do you feel you learned from the program?**

John stated he felt he learned how to be a better father. After probing on why he felt this, he explained he learned the importance of spending quality time with his children and that the classes taught him the correct way to discipline his children. He also said he felt more confident about getting a job after he is released because the classes taught him how to interview for jobs and fill out job applications correctly. He also felt he learned to deal with his temper. He felt the most important thing the program taught him was the capability to think about the consequences before acting on certain situations, and that this would keep him focused on himself and his family, and subsequently, out of trouble with the law.

**Did the program meet your expectations?**

John stated that initially he hadn’t expected the program to have much of an impact on him but, in fact, the program exceeded his expectations. He felt the program made him a more confident person and changed his way of thinking. He stated he used to have a very negative view of life but has become more positive.
How will you apply what you have learned in each life skill?

Parenting

John said he learned the importance of spending quality time with his children and, instead of letting them sit and watch TV, he planned to read to them or take them to the park. He planned to change the way he disciplined. For example, instead of screaming and yelling, he would take something away like a toy to teach them consequences. He and his fiancée would decide on appropriate punishments together when it came to disciplining.

Domestic Violence/Anger Management

John had frequently said domestic violence was never an issue for him. However, he said the Family TIES Program Domestic Violence/Anger Management classes did teach him new tools to improve his relationship and deal with anger and frustration. John explained he wanted to be a better husband/fiancée. He said the classes taught him how important good communication was in a relationship, and when he got out, hoped to improve communication with his fiancée. He planned to set goals with his fiancée and to discuss their problems. John also said he would take a walk to cool down to keep an argument from escalating.

Substance Abuse

John said he did not plan to smoke marijuana again. He knew getting involved with drugs could jeopardize his future job, family, and ultimately, his freedom. Before going through the Family TIES Program, John said he never thought about the consequences of using drugs. He learned that marijuana was not worth losing what was important to him.

Employment Readiness

John planned to look for employment immediately after release, probably for warehouse/inventory jobs. He stated the Family TIES Program employment readiness class taught him to be aware of what the pay scale should be for certain jobs and skills. He felt the program prepared him for interviewing and filling out job applications. He also stated he learned how to discuss his criminal history during an interview. The skills learned in the employment readiness class made him more confident overall about gaining employment.

Additional Comments

John was being released the following week. He would return to the same home to live with his fiancée. He stated after he was settled with a job, he wanted to get married and start a family of his own. Also, as soon as he could afford to, he wanted to move away from his old friends because of their negative influence. He stated, “I need to get out and take care of business with my family and work.”
Follow-up Interviews

John completed both a 6- and 12-month follow-up interview. He was living with his girlfriend and her children at the time of both interviews. During the program, John set two primary goals for himself, which were to become a better stepparent and to find employment. Within 6 months after his release, John was able to find a full-time job, which he was able to keep, despite being sent back to jail for one month for failure to pay court-ordered fines. He said the classes made it “much easier to go on job interviews,” and that although he didn’t “think about the classes everyday…I use a lot of the things they taught me.” At one year after his release, John said he felt he had a better bond with his stepchildren and had gained confidence in his parenting abilities. John said he quit smoking marijuana and hanging out with friends who used. He did not contact any service providers once released because as he stated, he “didn’t need services.”

CASE STUDY NUMBER FOUR: “DANNY”

Client History

Danny was an Asian American (Filipino and Japanese) male, age 20, who had never been married or had children. However, at the time of his arrest, he lived with his 32-year old girlfriend and her four children. During Danny’s incarceration, his girlfriend gave birth to Danny’s child.

At 15, Danny was involved with a 45 year-old woman who was married to a Navy officer. Danny lived with her for three years as the woman’s husband was rarely home and believed Danny to be his wife’s cousin. When the husband found out about their relationship, Danny moved back in with his mother but continued the relationship for another year. During this relationship, Danny was convicted for domestic violence.

Danny had two stepbrothers and two stepsisters, ages 11, 10, 9, and 8. All of these children live with their respective fathers’ families. Danny moved out of his mother’s home at 15 years old, because of her meth use. His father lived in California, but had no contact with him for the past 12 years. Danny’s only social contact was his current girlfriend.

Danny admitted being arrested for check fraud as a juvenile and spending 240 days in a detention camp. He said he became heavily involved with gambling and writing fraudulent checks after meeting his 45 year-old girlfriend, whom he described as “greedy.” He said they spent all of her husband’s money and then deposited false checks. Danny said he successfully terminated juvenile probation and was a “conflict manager” and a “team leader” while in detention.

As an adult, Danny was convicted of domestic violence approximately two years ago in a previous relationship and failed several times to comply with court-ordered domestic violence classes. He had outstanding warrants for this and for charges of fraud that had been ignored. Danny’s current offense was “fleeing the scene of a hit-and-run,” which he explained was the pedestrian’s fault. He claimed that he was not under the influence of any drugs or alcohol and that he was going the speed limit. Within 30 minutes of committing this crime, he decided to turn himself in and face the consequences of his outstanding warrants. He went into custody on February 16, 2005, with a release date of September 9, 2005.
Danny’s girlfriend also decided to turn herself in for failing to appear on a petty theft charge. Consequently, she was serving time in Las Colinas and, although she mentioned the Family TIES Program to Danny, she could not enroll because her sentence was not long enough.

At 13 years of age, Danny first tried meth and used it consistently while living with his 45 year-old girlfriend. He reported being around meth frequently because his mother and other relatives used it. Danny stated that he quit using meth about six months before turning himself in. He quit on his own and never received drug treatment. Danny no longer considered himself to have drug problems.

Regarding employment history, Danny's first job was at the age of 15, when he worked for one year for a moving and storage company. He later stated that he had had “lots of jobs” but was paid “under the table” for each and never had a “real job.” He dropped out of high school in the ninth grade and never attempted to get his GED. He said the only time he attended school since then was in juvenile camp. Danny appeared genuinely interested in getting his GED at some point. Danny was a trustee, beginning in March 2005, working at least four kitchen shifts per week between the hours of 1:00 a.m. – 10:00 a.m. Again, Danny was in the majority of men who claimed no history of mental illness or treatment.

Danny’s post-release plans were to find full-time employment to support his newborn child, although he did not know what type of job he would seek.

**Class Participation and Life Skills Progress**

Throughout many of the classes, Danny was observed having minimal interest and interaction, and spotty attendance in both domestic violence/anger management and employment classes. He missed two domestic violence/anger management classes due to illness, and left an employment class under the guise of being taken to meet with his case manager when, in fact, he returned to his housing unit to sleep. He also was observed sleeping during videos in the employment class.

During the substance abuse class, he asked only one question, which was how long meth stayed in one’s system. When research staff asked for his feedback on the classes, Danny said he felt the substance abuse class was “boring” and that “it’s the same thing each week.”

Although parenting was one of the classes Danny previously reported being interested in, he did not appear to be very involved. He only participated when called upon and didn’t seem to follow the facilitator’s directions very well on activities. It seemed he was rarely focused on the class discussion.

One parenting class activity asked inmates to list what values their parents had instilled in them for categories such as money, ecology, religion, sex, and politics. Danny was called upon to share his learned values for “money.” His response was that his mother always gave him money when he asked for it as a child (from age 5 until now) and that he should do the same with his kids. When the facilitator probed to see if his mother was well-off and not worried about money, he replied that she was on welfare but that she still gave him money when he needed it. During other discussions regarding goals taught by parents and gender stereotypes, Danny seemed interested but did not give input.
The observed employment class focused on “networking” to find jobs. The facilitator informed the group that Community Connection Resource Center had a post-release employment resource center that could assist them in finding a job. As she explained the key points of interviewing, Danny seemed to pay attention and review the hand-outs. However, once the video was started, Danny leaned back against the wall and nodded off to sleep. The facilitator either did not see Danny sleeping or chose not to wake him up.

The only time Danny spoke was to tease another classmate who was talking about graduating this month. Danny seemed to think that the particular classmate had missed too many classes to graduate. This implied that Danny was aware of the consequences of missing class.

**Private Interview with Danny**

**What do you feel you learned in the program?**

Danny felt the program taught him how to properly fill out a job application, be honest about his criminal history, and show remorse for his actions. He stated that 80 percent of getting hired was attitude and 20 percent depended on your technical skills.

**Did the program meet your expectations?**

Danny said the program was as he expected and gave him all the information he wanted. He didn’t feel there was anything lacking. The only part he did not like was that he was often tired from working an early morning shift in the kitchen prior to attending the class.

**How will you apply what you’ve learned in each life skill?**

**Parenting**

Danny said he would spend more time with his four stepchildren and his own child; he would “be there,” listen to them and not yell at them or punish them physically. He learned to look at life from a child’s point of view in order to be more understanding.

**Domestic Violence/Anger Management**

Danny said he would work on thinking before he acts and will try to solve problems in his head first instead of getting mad right away. He stated the need to solve a problem without having to be in control and not always having to “win.”

**Substance Abuse**

Danny didn’t remember much from class and felt that the instructor “just handed out paper” and didn’t really teach anything. Despite missing two classes, he planned to stay away from drugs because he already learned that they don’t help him. He was self-motivated to stay clean for his sake and for his newborn. He was going home to a family that was relying on him and needed him to stay away from drugs.
**Employment Readiness**

Danny stated he would fill out a job application truthfully and appear at interviews clean-shaven and dressed properly. His plan was to look for job opportunities on-line and explore “Urban Corps,” where you work while in school and get paid to get your GED. Danny mentioned installing stereos as a possible side job. Danny did not take the GED classes offered in jail because he saw the GED certificates had the Sheriff’s emblem on them, and said he didn’t want that kind of information on his GED. Danny said he planned to find a job and spend time with his new baby. He will need to start working right away because his girlfriend only earned $1,000 from CalWORKS each month and their rent is $750. Danny expressed goals of saving money in order to own his own home and car and to support his family. He wanted to be a father who could support his family.

**Additional Comments**

Although Danny had generally positive input about the classes, he felt he would have gotten more out of them had he not been working so many early hours in the kitchen and had been able to come to class well-rested. Danny didn’t prepare a specific plan with a case manager. He didn’t feel he needed any continued treatment for any outstanding issues.

**Follow-up Interviews**

Unfortunately, none of the contact information Danny gave to the program was accurate; therefore, no follow-up interviews were possible.

**CASE STUDY NUMBER FIVE: “TINA”**

**Client History**

Tina was a 43 year old, White, English-speaking female, married with no children. While working as a trustee in the library where the Family TIES Program classes met, she became very interested in enrolling and did so on March 22, 2006. Tina said by enrolling in the Family TIES Program, she hoped to learn how to re-evaluate her perception of life and change her belief system. She stated she never wants to return to jail as an inmate but would love to return as an inspirational speaker.

Raised by both parents in California, Tina also had two younger brothers with whom she hoped to build a closer relationship. After suffering physical abuse by her first husband, Tina had the marriage annulled; and remarried in November 2002 to her current husband, who had a cocaine addiction and was serving a seven-year sentence at R. J. Donovan state prison for drug-related charges. She did not have children but said she would like to become pregnant once released.

Tina had no juvenile criminal record and was first convicted in 1980 for a drug-related misdemeanor. Subsequently, she was in and out of jail throughout the 1990s and had many drug-related convictions. Since 2003, she had only been out of jail for a total of three months. When not incarcerated, Tina said she maintained steady employment. For five years, she was the general manager of a book store and worked as a professional artist for two years.
Tina reported experimenting with drugs as a teenager and was addicted to heroin between the ages of 18 and 29. She quit using on her own, without support groups, and managed to stay clean for ten years. During that time, she was employed and involved in organized sports such as triathlons. At 39, she began drinking alcohol and using cocaine, and initially was still able to continue working. However, after she met her current husband, she began using both substances more heavily.

Since 2000, Tina took anti-depressants and sought psychiatric help at various detention facilities. She had a vague memory of being sexually abused as a child and planned to see a psychiatrist after her release to continue to explore childhood trauma.

When she was asked about her social support system, she said that because of her involvement with drugs, she only had one long-term friend who was a good role model. Tina stated she had many people in her life who were not true friends but only drug acquaintances.

Upon release, Tina planned to request having her probation transferred to another county in California where she would live with her sister-in-law, which also would be near a probation office and NA/AA groups. She planned to attend community college, had already set up an appointment with a psychiatrist, and said she planned to write a book about her life experiences. She wanted to help others by sharing her own struggles.

Class Participation and Life Skills Progress

Tina knew most of the inmates in the class and was very friendly with them. She was very engaged in all of the lectures, sharing personal experiences and participating in exercises. Although Tina was not a parent, she was planning to start a family, and felt the class offered great information on how to parent. She explained the class was helping her prepare for parenthood and to explore and understand her own childhood.

During a discussion in the substance abuse class regarding the four stages of drug addiction, Tina shared that when she was 13 years old, she and her sister would go to Mexico to buy marijuana. At the age of 16, she would inject herself with animal tranquilizers while working for a veterinarian, and by 18, she was using heroin with her boyfriend. The teacher asked Tina when she became aware that she was an addict and she answered she believed she never really cared if she was an addict.

In the employment class that was observed, the instructor distributed job applications for the inmates to complete, and then the instructor explained the best way to fill them out, especially when asked to disclose if they had been convicted of a felony. Tina seemed very engaged in the lecture and later stated she felt the class would help her be more confident in searching for a job. She said she learned how to best answer the conviction question on applications and how important it is to not be shy during an interview but rather emphasize the value she could be to the organization.

The lecture in the domestic violence/anger management class focused on the need to change in order to make positive turns in life. Tina stated she believed change is good for your inner self, and that ignorance, shame, and denial can make change difficult. Tina said she needed to learn to love herself and have positive self esteem.
Private Interview with Tina

What do you feel you learned in the program?

Tina stated she learned that she needs to “keep learning.” She said before participating in the Family TIES Program, she thought she knew everything there was to know. She explained the program was a huge eye-opener and couldn’t wait to continue learning how to be an effective member of society. The program also helped her realize she needed to learn a healthier perspective of life.

Did the program meet your expectations?

She stated the program exceeded her expectations. In the beginning of the program, she thought it might be an “I’ve heard it all before situation,” but the open discussions helped her learn different perspectives; and listening to other inmates’ stories helped her realize she was not alone. She also said the written assignments helped her validate and organize her own thoughts.

How will you apply what you have learned in each life skill?

Parenting

She felt the information and tools she learned in the class were going to be extremely useful, because once released, she would live with nieces and nephews and wanted to be a good influence on them. She also thought the class would help her understand her relationship with her parents.

Domestic Violence/Anger Management

Tina thought this class was an “eye-opener.” She said she never knew she had such anger issues, but that she thought she was “meek and mild.” The class helped her learn her inner emotions were “boiling over with anger.” She said she learned how to set boundaries and how to take care of herself and her needs. She said she could take responsibility for her own actions. She said the class taught her not to depend on other people because this could lead to resentment and anger. She stated she also learned about shame and how to overcome it. She would no longer let people make her feel badly about herself.

Substance Abuse

Tina explained she’d been through multiple substance abuse treatment programs but never took them seriously. She didn’t deny she had a problem but never cared about herself enough to want to be sober. The Family TIES Program substance abuse class changed the way she cared about herself. She felt that, because she was in jail and open-minded at the same time, she took seriously the lectures and class discussions. She learned it was not acceptable to be in and out of jail, and was confident she would not relapse after being released.
Employment Readiness

Tina felt the employment readiness class was very realistic because they taught basic ways to get a job, primarily by being competitive and confident. She would eventually like to have her own business and would utilize the tools taught in the class. She said the facilitator was a great role model on how to present yourself in a professional setting and was consistent and patient and always able to answer questions. The class gave her self-confidence, despite her history. She felt the class gave her more confidence to search for a job, mostly because she learned how to overcome the obstacle of having a conviction.

Additional Comments

Tina used the phrase, “you can get the girl out of jail but you can’t get the jail out of the girl,” but felt that having participated in the Family TIES Program, she can end this cycle. She said jail typically hardened an individual, but in her case, felt it softened her. She said she still thought about the classes every day and would remember to apply all the skills and tools she learned. She felt very proud she completed the six week program.

Follow-up Interviews

Due to Tina’s late release date (June 2006), no follow-up interviews were able to be completed at the 6- and 12-month junctures before the end of the grant.
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INTRODUCTION

This final chapter summarizes the findings and implications of the results of the Family TIES (Targeted Intervention, Education, and Services) Program. Although funding for the Family TIES Program has been discontinued, this chapter discusses lessons learned and recommendations for potential improvements to the program in the event replication is explored.

SUMMARY

The Program

The San Diego County Sheriff’s Department partnered with three community-based service organizations (CBO) in an effort to improve life skills in areas relevant to inmates’ lives and enhance their successful reintegration into the community. The ultimate goal was to reduce recidivism among local jail inmates and create healthier relationships. Although services began being offered in March 2004 and continued through November 2006, data collection for the evaluation did not start until May 2004 to allow the piloting of instruments and procedures. The researchers stopped data collection in September 2006 to begin preparing this final report.

Understanding the nexus between substance abuse, poor parenting choices, and domestic violence, as well as the lack of soft skills for obtaining gainful and permanent employment among those in the criminal justice system, the project leaders designed a six-week education curriculum of four core life skills classes. Two-hour classes were held weekly in employment readiness, parenting skills, substance abuse, and domestic violence/anger management. In addition to the four core classes, two optional enrichment classes were offered: Building Bridges with Books and a Parent Reunification Workshop. Classes were facilitated by staff possessing expertise in each domain from the three CBOs: Community Connection Resource Center; ParentCare; and Family Literacy Foundation.

The Program’s Impact

Successes

One of the key successes of the program was the ripple effect it had on inmate behavior in the two detention facilities. The commander at Las Colinas Detention Facility felt the Family TIES Program kept inmates constructively occupied during their sentence and, therefore, reduced their level of depression and propensity to commit rule violations.
Even more specifically, the commander at George Bailey conducted an informal study comparing the number of inmate-on-inmate physical assaults between **Family TIES Program** graduates and non-graduates. He found that graduates committed 50 percent fewer assaults overall. It is important to keep in mind that the program selected inmates based on their lower level of security risk, so this may not be that surprising. However, it may also speak to the program’s effects on these individuals and is worth noting.

One of the more apparent successes was the feedback provided by the 36 clients who completed follow-up interviews with research staff six months after their release. All of these clients spoke in glowing terms about the program as a whole, and more specifically about the staff’s genuineness, caring, and expertise. Clients also felt the curriculum was indeed relevant to their everyday lives and would prove useful to them in the future. The only recommendation these clients gave for improving the program was to make it longer and increase the time spent with their case managers. This clearly shows that the clients appreciated the one-on-one attention they received and spending time engaged in a structured and positive activity.

Finally, the leadership team deserves to be mentioned for its ability to create open systems of communication between themselves and the program staff at the detention facilities and community-based organization staff. They achieved this by conducting regular meetings and using the time efficiently and effectively by updating staff on programmatic changes, requesting staff’s feedback and suggestions, and ensuring that a proficient level of services was being provided to all clients.

**Challenges**

One challenge posed to both the CBO and correctional staff was uniting as a team and overcoming the complex security logistics of providing services within a jail setting. On one hand, CBO staff were required to learn these complexities and how to maneuver through them without placing an inordinate demand on correctional staff time. On the other, correctional staff were asked to increase their workload to accommodate the program and CBO staff security needs. This understandably resulted in some friction at first, but because they came together as a team at regular meetings to discuss these issues, most obstacles were resolved.

A second challenge resulted in not obtaining full certification to conduct domestic violence treatment classes, despite concerted efforts on the part of the Project Director. Although there was judicial support for conducting domestic violence treatment as part of the **Family TIES Program**, the therapeutic community raised concerns about altering the therapeutic model to fit the program’s curriculum. As a result, all clients received those elements that overlapped between the anger management and domestic violence curriculum.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Drug Treatment in Jail

The combination of the relatively high recidivism rate among clients (46 percent through 12 months post-release), and the fact that most (47%) of their subsequent convictions were for drug-related offenses, speaks to the need to tailor a program. If targeting a similar population in the future, offering a higher level of substance abuse education and treatment in jail may be warranted.

Post-Release Case Management

Education alone may not be sufficient for individuals to land on their feet once released into their daily lives. Research has shown that following through with post-release case management services is critical to successful reentry (Little Hoover Commission, 2003). This was an element missing from the Department of Education’s original funding scope and, therefore, it is not a critique of the Family TIES Program implementation.

Gender-Responsive Services

Based on SANDAG’s analysis that found males who completed the Family TIES Program recidivated at a significantly lower rate than females who completed, it is possible that females may have fared better with gender-responsive services. This is an area that is gaining wider attention in the reentry community, and experts are designing instrumentation and curricula tailored to issues common among women in the criminal justice system (i.e., sexual trauma and other types of victimization).
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