

**Evaluation of the Illinois Going Home Program
Interim Report—Year One
September 1, 2003 – September 1, 2004**

Submitted to the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority

**Susan M. George
Robert J. LaLonde
Martha Van Haitsma**

**The University of Chicago
September 2004**

**The Irving B. Harris Graduate School of Public Policy Studies
1155 East 60th Street
The University of Chicago
Chicago, IL 60637**

**Telephone: 773-702-3429
smgeorge@uchicago.edu**

Evaluation of the Illinois Going Home Program
Interim Report—Year One
September 1, 2003 – September 1, 2004
Executive Summary

The Illinois Going Home Program has consistently had the support of the Illinois Department of Correction staff. The obvious commitment to this program from the top has filtered down so that participating agency administrators and line staff are well aware that the program is to be taken seriously. Most share the strong belief that re-integration of ex-offenders is the ultimate goal of their work and they want to cooperate with and further programs that move men in that direction.

The program began accepting participants in February of this year and is still in the early stages of being operationalized and tested. As a consequence, it is too soon to draw final conclusions about its effectiveness. Nevertheless, part of the role of the implementation side of the evaluation is to provide ongoing feedback so that the information gathered at this stage of the program can be used to adjust and improve the program in progress. Below we summarize three areas commonly cited by staff at all levels as current priorities for the program:

1. The number of participants enrolled in the program has been much lower than anticipated. At the current rate of enrollment, the program will not meet its goal of serving 200 men. The barriers to enrolling more participants have been identified and plans to enroll men through alternative strategies have been developed but not yet approved or implemented.
2. Among the men who have enrolled in GH, a number of them have fallen short of the program's goals both because of their characteristics and characteristics of the program. Total enrollment is too low to use the experiences of these men as reliable indicators of specific outcomes, but these first enrollees have provided program staff with early warning about elements of the program design that are not a good fit with the service population and require modification. GH staff have consistently highlighted two areas that most need attention:
 - Pre-release: The current length of stay of some GH participants at the ATC is not sufficient to address underlying substance abuse issues/mental health problems or educational deficiencies. Ways to systematically identify men eligible for GH services as they enter IDOC and enroll them in appropriate services at the earliest possible time are being developed by GH staff.
 - Post-release: Two key issues have been identified in the post-release phase of the program. First, once paroled, ongoing participation in GH is voluntary. An effective system of incentives that would encourage participants to remain engaged in GH, especially after they are paroled, has been identified as critical to the long-term success of the program. GH staff is currently preparing a list of recommended incentives and graduated responses. Further, the proposal to make participation a condition of parole through "Rule 15" appears to have

broad support among GH staff. Secondly, establishing a voucher system to reimburse agencies for providing post-release services will assist in transitioning participants from pre-release to post-release status.

3. Creating a program that depends on close collaboration among state and community based agencies to provide comprehensive reentry services has proved to be a complex task. The administration and staff of the West Side ATC, and direct service staff from parole, were not brought into the process as full partners from the beginning. Other agencies that were identified at the program's inception have had to allocate unanticipated staff time and agency resources to making the collaborative process work. At this time, some of the day-to-day practical issues that needed to be addressed in order to implement an effective collaboration have been resolved, but many others are still outstanding and further work is needed.

**Evaluation of the Illinois Going Home Program
Interim Report—Year One
September 1, 2003 – September 1, 2004**

Table of Contents

	Page
Executive Summary	
I. Introduction to the Going Home Program and Evaluation	5
II. A Description of the Illinois Going Home Program	9
III. Participation in Illinois Going Home Program	13
IV. Accessing Services Inside IDOC to Prepare Men for Going Home	16
V. The Design of Program Participation Incentives	17
VI. Leveraging Resources and Agency Partnerships	21
VII. Recommendations and Next Steps	24
VIII. Appendices	27
1. Illinois Department of Corrections Going Home Reentry Initiative Standard Operating Procedures***	28
2. Going Home Program Revision Proposal^^^	42
3. Designing Program Participation Incentives for Prisoner Reentry Programs	50

***A “Going Home Program Schedule,” which is intended to serve as part of the Standard Operating Procedures document is an EXCEL SPREADSHEET and is transmitted with this report as a separate electronic document.

^^^A “Going Home Flow Chart” which is intended to serve as part of the Going Home Program Revision Proposal is a PDF FILE, and is transmitted with this report as a separate electronic document

**Evaluation of the Illinois Going Home Program
Interim Report—Year One
September 1, 2003 – September 1, 2004**

I. Introduction to the Going Home Program and Evaluation

The Illinois Department of Corrections is the lead agency overseeing the Going Home Program (hereafter, GH program). This program aims to provide a comprehensive set of social and employment-related services to 18 to 24-year-old males who are returning to the North Lawndale community in Chicago after their release from state prison. GH officials have designed the program to include an assessment of men in the program by a transition team, access to drug treatment, case management, life skills job readiness training, job placement, and referrals to transitional housing, education and vocational training.

The GH program is designed to procure these services not by starting new programs, but rather by linking existing programs into a coherent trajectory through which case managers shepherd participants. Program operators intend that most participants will start receiving these services while they are incarcerated and continue receiving services after they are released on parole. At this time, the key partners responsible for implementing the program are:

- The Program Director and Assistant Program Director
- The Westside ATC
- Parole
- Treatment Alternatives for Safe Communities (TASC),
- The North Lawndale Employment Network (NLEN)
- The Institute for Clinical Social Work (ICSW)

The GH Program has five goals:

1. Prevent Re-offending
 - Begin the re-entry planning process within the correctional setting and initiate contact with key service providers, law enforcement and community corrections agencies prior to the offender's parole.
 - Ensure that the offender is fully engaged in the planning process and clearly understands expectations and consequences.
 - Identify needs and provide support and services to promote successful re-entry
 - Exercise active supervision of the offender, ensuring accountability and/or appropriate, graduated sanctions for non-compliance.
2. Enhance Public Safety
3. Re-deploy and leverage existing community resources by fostering linkages and accessing currently provided services.
4. Assist the offender to avoid crime, engage in pro-social community activities and meet family responsibilities
5. Ensure program sustainability.

To assess how the GH program has done in achieving these objectives, the University of Chicago has been contracted to evaluate the program. The evaluation is divided into two parts:

- The impact study. This part of the study is designed to answer the question, “was Going Home effective in lowering recidivism rates and improving other important outcomes, such as employment?” This part of the study will use matched administrative records from IDOC, IDES, IDHS, DCFS and ICJIA to compare the outcomes of Going Home participants to non-participants. The data-sharing agreements required to carry out this part of the study are now in place, and work is underway to establish baseline outcomes against which we can measure the outcomes Going Home participants.
- The implementation study. This part of the study is designed to observe and document how the program actually operates in the field. Part of the purpose of the implementation study is to provide feedback so that the information gathered can be used to adjust and improve the program as it unfolds.

This interim report deals only with the implementation segment of the evaluation. Its focus is the first six months (February through August) of the program's implementation—highlighting participation to date, summarizing the challenges that have arisen for GH officials and program providers, and outlining plans currently under consideration as next steps in the program's ongoing development and implementation.

The information reported here is based on observations of more than 25 meetings and 15 personal interviews with program staff from the executive level to line agency staff that interact directly with Going Home participants. In addition, we visited program settings to learn about the facilities at which different parts of the program are being conducted. We have also reviewed participation records for all participants to date.

At this stage in the evaluation, our findings reflect the concerns of program staff about foundational issues rather than reflecting concerns about measuring progress toward any of the five ultimate goals laid out for the program originally. This emphasis is due primarily to the fact that although the project officially got underway during the summer of 2003, the first participant did not enter the program until February of 2004. Including that initial participant, only fourteen men have been enrolled in GH by September of 2004. In this report, we summarize GH participation patterns to date and underscore the fact that there is insufficient quantitative data for assessing the impact of the program on participants. Rather, the information on which this report is based is qualitative and concerns the functioning of program operations rather than ultimate outcomes for participants. We conducted open-ended interviews with program staff at all participating agencies and at various levels, giving staff the opportunity to share their knowledge and opinions concerning the set-up and initial functioning of the program. We observed staff meetings in order to document the process through which the program has been brought online.

Because the program is effectively still at an early stage of implementation, it is natural that program staff we interviewed focused on their views of the necessary perquisites to a successful program. Such concerns are appropriate during the first phase of program implementation. Also, because too few men have come through to provide evidence about how well particular goals are being met in the GH program, staff are inclined to draw on their considerable experience with other men like those GH is designed to serve. This means that much of their input is in the form of advice about what is and is not likely to work based on what staff have seen with similar programs and similar men.

In keeping with our goal of providing useful feedback during program implementation, this report examines six key areas of concern that have been raised in our interviews with GH staff. These areas are as follows.

- Increasing the flow of inmates into the program.
- Transferring GH participants to the Westside ATC more than 3 months prior to their scheduled release from IDOC custody.
- Ensuring the appropriateness of GH services for GH participants
- Developing appropriate and effective incentives to keep initial recruits in the program.
- Moving back the start of the reentry planning process to the beginning of an inmate's stay in IDOC in order to provide educational and drug treatment services as early as possible as preparation for GH.
- Improving the quality and efficiency of the collaborative process among the many stakeholders in the GH program.

The remainder of this report is organized as follows:

- Section II, A Description of the Illinois Going Home Program, summarizes some of the essential features of the program, both as they were originally designed to function and as they have functioned thus far.
- Section III, Participation in the Illinois Going Home Program, provides an overview of the flow of participants into GH to date, the current status of those GH participants, and barriers to increased enrollment into GH.
- Section IV, Accessing Services Inside IDOC to Prepare Men for Going Home, reviews the current consensus of program staff that participants should be enrolled in GH at the earliest possible point in their incarceration. In this model, Transitional Assistance Plans would include accessing the appropriate treatment and educational services inside IDOC to prepare them to take advantage of the reentry services provided by GH.
- Section V, The Design of Program Participation Incentives discusses concerns about participation incentives in the program design and provides a brief overview of a framework that can be used to guide the development of appropriate participation incentives.
- Section VI, Leveraging Resources and Agency Partnerships, focuses on concerns of some program staff about the complexities of implementing and operating a program that requires collaboration among many agencies.
- Section VII Recommendations and Next Steps provides a list of GH staff and Evaluation Team recommendations and outlines the next steps in the evaluation process.

II. A Description of the Illinois Going Home Program

This section summarizes some of the essential features of the program, both as they were originally designed to function and as they have functioned thus far. One point that arose repeatedly during both our formal interviews and informal discussions with individuals connected with the program is that during this first implementation period staff were not provided early on with one uniform, clear outline of how the various program components are supposed to fit together. In many of the line-staff interviews, respondents sought a more comprehensive overview of the program from the evaluation interviewers. IDOC officials have since prepared a Standard Operating Procedures document and it is included as an Appendix to this report.

The description of the program components provided here is meant to foster further discussion of the program's implementation and to elicit careful consideration of suggested program revisions. The GH program was designed to move men through a series of four stages:

1. Engagement
2. Transition Team Meetings and Transitional Assistance Plans
3. Services While at the ATC
4. Post-ATC/Prison Services

Below we describe the process as envisioned in the original program design and as it has functioned thus far. This will help readers understand the subsequent discussions about actual participation patterns, barriers to participation, program staff concerns about access to services at IDOC, program participation incentives, and linkages between participating agencies.

Engagement

As originally designed, GH allows for five ways for eligible men to enter the program through three pre-release, and two-post-release tracks. The table below outlines these five tracks.

Accessing GH Services Pre-release	Number of men Enrolled as of 9/1/04
1. Inmates already incarcerated at the WS ATC, and participating in services provided by the ATC	6
2. Inmates serving time in a downstate facility transferred to the WS ATC 90 days pre-release	7
3. Inmates who were eligible to participate in GH but not eligible for transfer to the ATC before release. This group would receive reentry planning services via teleconference	
Accessing GH Services Post-release	
4. Men paroled back to the community from a downstate facility voluntarily enrolling	1
5. Men released from a downstate facility but not on parole voluntarily enrolling	

It was assumed that the majority of men would be enrolled pre-release, and would transfer to the ATC after enrolling in GH while incarcerated at a higher security level prison (hereafter referred to as the parent institution). This process was to happen through collaborative efforts on the part of different divisions within IDOC. Counselors in these prisons would initiate contact with inmates that were 18 –24 years of age and returning to the North Lawndale area. They would introduce the GH program including what would be required and the benefits inmates could expect from participating.

An important stage in the GH design is the transfer of participants from their parent institutions to the West Side ATC 90 days prior to their release on parole. The ATC is a 200-bed facility near North Lawndale and IDOC officials have reserved 15 beds for GH participants. To estimate when this transfer should take place, the GH Program Director and GH Assistant Director are to receive regular reports on eligible inmates' release dates 6 months before their actual release date. These reports are compiled from IDOC's Offender Tracking System (OTS). The GH design calls for IDOC's Transfer Coordinator's Office to oversee the transfer to the ATC at least 90 days before release.

The problem that has arisen is that this report does not always include all good time/earned good time credits. As a result the MSR release date on these reports is not necessarily an accurate date by the time participants in GH get to the ATC. After such men arrive at the ATC their MSR release date is recalculated and it may be found that

they are eligible for release earlier than expected. Consequently, some track 2 participants will not stay at the ATC long enough to receive the scheduled 90 days of programming. (See Appendix.)

Other issues also have arisen during the GH engagement stage. Program staff report that some men being transferred from their parent institutions to the ATC seem to have gotten incorrect information from the counselors at their parent institution about GH and expected preferential treatment and immediate rewards well beyond what the program was designed to provide. Moreover, the direct service staff at the ATC felt unprepared to respond to the inmates questions about the program since they had not received any formal training about how the program was suppose to function or their role in it. This problem has abated somewhat as ATC has become better informed about GH.

Transition Team Meetings and Transitional Assistance Plans

After eligible inmates agree to participate in GH, the program design calls for them to meet with the Transition Team. The Transition Team consists of the GH Program Director or GH Assistant Director, the parole agent likely to be assigned to his case upon release, a GH caseworker from Treatment Alternatives for Safer Communities (TASC), a representative from the North Lawndale Employment Network (NLEN), and a counselor from the Institute for Clinical Social Work (ICSW). It was originally envisioned that these meetings could be conducted by videoconference before inmates were transferred to the ATC—or substitute for face-to-face meetings for inmates that could not be transferring to the ATC pre-release. During these meetings the parties were expected to draw up an individualized Transitional Assistance Plan for the inmate. The Transition Assistance Plans would be monitored on a monthly basis with input from the inmate and revised as needed.

The Transition Team, chaired by the GH Assistant Director, and attended by at least one representative from each partner in the GH program, has become the central working group among the participating agencies. Beginning in April 2004, the Team increased its meeting schedule from once a month to once a week. At these meetings, the Team reviews the progress of GH participants, makes treatment and service decisions to address the GH participant's needs, works to identify and resolve programmatic issues, and fosters collaboration among front-line staff. The first meeting between the entire Transition Team and a GH participant occurred just recently.

Services While at the ATC

Once Going Home participants have been transferred to the West Side ATC, they are to receive services from several local community organizations. TASC was originally envisioned as the “lead organization”, and its role was to provide intensive case management to all participants, to monitor participation. In addition, based on assessments of a participant's needs, connect them with other resources as needed including drug treatment, education, and transitional housing.

The second key service organization, NLEN, is responsible for providing participants with services intended to augment their life skills and improve their job placement prospects in a program called “U-TURN Permitted”. U-TURN provides participants with about 96 hours of job readiness programming, followed by career planning and job placement services.

Finally, the third key organization, ICSW, was to focus on providing participants with individual and family counseling on an as-needed basis.

From the earliest stages of program implementation however, it became clear ATC administration and staff also are important stakeholders in GH, and that while they were always supportive of the program in spirit, they needed to be brought into the GH program as a fourth key organization. It has taken some time to incorporate ATC administrators and staff into regular meetings and exchanges of information about GH participants and program functioning.

Post-ATC/Prison Services

The program designers expected that successful participants would continue to receive GH services after their release from the ATC or other IDOC facility. The GH design calls for each participant’s transition team to meet regularly to evaluate his post-release participation in the program. At this point however, only one of four participants has chosen to remain in contact with GH staff while on parole. He has accessed services through NLEN, met with his TASC caseworker and his parole agent.

A second component of post-release services is to provide program participants access to a wide range of services including transitional housing, education, drug treatment. In order to do this, the program must develop and implement a more formal referral and voucher system that would reimburse other agencies for these services.

III. Participation in Illinois Going Home Program

The Flow of Enrollees into Going Home

Between 2-7-04 and 8-31-04, 14 men enrolled in the GH Program. Eight of these men enrolled during the first three months of this period and 6 enrolled during the remaining three months of this period. At this rate the program will not meet its goal of enrolling 200 men over a two-year period. Accordingly, one of the most immediate challenges facing GH officials is to increase the flow of eligible men into the program.

Seven of the 14GH enrollees were transferred to the ATC in order to participate in Going Home; one was self-referred after being paroled, and 6 were self-referred from inside the ATC. Because there are approximately 65 additional inmates identified by IDOC officials to be eligible for the program, and who expressed interest in participating. However, because of their security or felony status, these inmates were not eligible to be transferred to the Westside ATC. In principle, some of these individuals can choose to participate as track 3 participants (see the table in section II) once they are released from their parent institution.

What is potentially significant about the 65 inmates that were requested to be transferred to the ATC, is that if they had been transferred then enrollment in GH would have been even higher than what was estimated for the program's first six months. However, it is clear that the GH design did not anticipate the number of otherwise eligible 18-24 year inmates who would not be approved for transfer to the Westside ATC.

Status of Going Home Participants

The current program status of the 14 GH men varies. At this time five individuals are receiving the standard GH services, two others are participating in other services arranged for by GH staff, and one participant continues to participate in the program and is employed. Of the remaining 6 participants, two are on parole and are not receiving any GH services; three were transferred back to their parent institutions prior to their release for violations of IDOC policies while at the ATC. One person was sent back after being released from prison, for continually violating curfew, other parole conditions, and testing positive for drugs while on parole. More specifically:

- 1 completed U-TURN and is currently employed. He is in contact with his parole officer and his GH case manager. This participant was self-referred after being paroled.
- 1 had movement privileges revoked and is now in substance abuse treatment at the ATC, and is receiving individual counseling.
- 1 has withdrawn from the NLEN U-TURN program at his request.

- 3 are currently participating in U-TURN and are making good progress.
- 3 are on parole and are not in contact with the program—one of these men had started U-TURN prior to ending contact with the program.
- 4 have been transferred back to their parent institution for parole violations or violations of ATC policy. These violations include fighting at the ATC, alcohol use, and positive drug tests. Two of these men completed U-TURN.
- 1 is a new arrival at the ATC and is currently in orientation.
- Seven of the 14 men attended an initial individual counseling session with the ICSW counselor. Six of these men continue to receive counseling services.
- 3 men have been placed in jobs by NLEN.

The number of men who have enrolled in the program is too small to project outcomes for future GH participants. However, according to staff and community members who have worked for years with the same or similar populations, the program participants to date are highly representative of their peers; and their behavior in and out of the GH program is not surprising. Staff at various levels and across agencies have expressed the opinion that program stakeholders should focus attention on strategies to improve program outcomes.

Barriers to Increased Enrollment into the GH Program

There were no specific targets set for enrollment during the first year of the program; however, from information we gathered during individual interviews and observations of program meetings from September 2003 through August 2004, there is broad consensus across participating agencies and staff at all levels that:

- The number of men enrolled is well below what was expected
- The current pace of enrollment is a threat to the viability of the program.

The problem with low enrollment rates in GH appears to be coming primarily from three sources:

- The OTS report provided to GH does not always have all of the earned good time credits calculated into an inmates MSR date (release date). By the time an inmate is transferred to the ATC, the GH participant may have less than 90 days to serve before parole.
- Many of the men identified through the OTS as meeting the criteria for participating in Going Home have not been able to transfer to the ATC for

pre-release services because of restrictions on eligibility for transfer based on risk classification and type of felony conviction.

- Approval of host¹ sites is often not finalized within a time period that allows inmates to be identified early enough for them to be transferred to the ATC 90 days before release.

At this date many of the problems with using the OTS to identify eligible inmates have been resolved. But there are ongoing, significant, unanticipated restrictions limiting an inmate's eligibility for transfer to an ATC. And there is an ongoing internal disagreement about implementing an original protocol that was agreed to with the Transfer Coordinator's Office that granted increased flexibility about which inmates would be allowed to transfer to the ATC under the Going Home Program. .

As indicated above, program staff report that most men they have identified as being eligible for the program are ineligible for transfer to an ATC because of their security status. These men are eligible to participate when they are finally released as track 3 or track 4 participants. (See table in Section II.) However, these men cannot currently receive GH services pre-release and they will not receive any of the orientation services provides to track 1 and track 2 participants at the ATC. Some program staff have remarked that the implication of the current policy is that young inmates who are high security risks will receive no GH services prior to release in contrast to men who are lower security risks who will receive these services at the ATC.

Program staff recognize the foregoing barriers to increasing program enrollments rates. In response, the following steps have been taken to increase enrollment:

- As of August 2004, the pool of potentially eligible applicants was increased by expanding geographic eligibility beyond the North Lawndale community. The target area will now include individuals returning to a broader geographic range within the 60612; 60623; 60624, and 60608 zip codes, including parts of the surrounding communities of East and West Garfield Park, and the Near West Side.
- GH administrators have begun working within the IDOC system to better understand when there may be some flexibility in determining an inmate's eligibility for transfer to the ATC, and how discretionary authority is exercised in these decisions. This may allow for the implementation of an

¹ The host-site is the address to which an inmate is paroled, and all inmates are required to have a host-site approved prior to being paroled. For GH, the "host-site" address is used to determine if an inmate is returning to the North Lawndale area. One of the inherent challenges with this system is that for inmates who are having trouble finding a host-site, this can present a "catch-22": GH has the resources to help returning inmates find transitional housing, but it is difficult (if not impossible) for the system to recognize a potentially eligible inmate if they do not have their housing situation settled. Since transitional housing is one of the client needs with which Going Home is supposed to help, this creates the additional challenge of identifying the inmates that are most in need of the services (particularly housing) that the program has to offer.

earlier internal IDOC agreement with the Transfer Coordinator's Office that granted increased flexibility about which inmates would be allowed to transfer to the ATC under the Going Home Program. .

- GH administrators are finalizing a protocol that will utilize existing TASC infrastructure to screen all men for eligibility for GH when they are admitted to IDOC. Men meeting the eligibility criteria, and due to be released before June 2006 would be recruited and enrolled in GH at that time. Once enrolled, the Transition Team would work with the staff at the inmate's parent institution to develop a Transitional Plan. This plan would allow the participating inmate to receive services out of a medium security institution where TASC already has a significant programmatic presence and subsequently to be transferred to the ATC at the earliest possible date.

IV. Accessing Services Inside IDOC to Prepare Men for Going Home

Improving outcomes among men who enroll in GH is an ongoing topic of discussion in GH meetings and in staff interviews.

There is a consensus among staff that many participants need long-term substance abuse/mental health and educational services in order to be ready to make good use of GH services at the ATC or while on parole. The needed substance abuse, mental health and educational services are available within the IDOC system (though not in sufficient supply to meet the overwhelming need for services); unfortunately, when inmates are not assessed by the GH team until they reach the ATC 90 days before parole, it is generally too late to access such programs.

One suggestion that has strong support among the GH staff is to put procedures in place that would identify potential GH participants as early in their incarceration as possible and track them into the facilities and programs that can address these needs. Such a system would ensure that men tracked into the GH program were ready to make use of the GH services provided at the ATC and during parole. Such an approach would also have the benefit of providing a structure to engage participants in long-term planning for reentry.

V. The Design of Program Participation Incentives

The program's first participant was paroled in March 2004, and "dropped out" of the Going Home Program that same day. At the next Transition Team meeting, and at numerous meetings since then, a major topic of discussion has been the issue of designing and implementing a system of rewards and penalties to keep men engaged in services and hold them accountable for their choices. The information provided in this section is based on our observations of those discussions as well as interviews and discussions with direct service and/or supervisory program staff from all the agencies currently participating in Going Home.

The Case for Participation Incentives While At the ATC

There appears to be some consensus that pre-release, the opportunities to transfer back to Chicago and to have movement outside the facility are strong incentives to attract men into the Going Home program.

Currently, ATC staff are using their discretionary authority to reward men still living at the ATC for showing good judgment and reaching program milestones with movement to participate in Going Home Program services outside the ATC (primarily U-TURN) or to go home on a pass. In parallel, they are using this same discretionary authority to shorten, delay, or withdraw these privileges when men exhibit poor judgment or fail to comply with program expectations.

It is uncertain whether or not the men who have failed to complete even the pre-release portion of GH would have performed better with more incentives. But direct service staff generally express the opinion that these men have serious drug/alcohol and/or anger management issues that needed to be addressed before they would have been able to make effective use of GH services. Experienced line staff pointed out that not all men come in with enough basic education or emotional maturity to make use of the GH services. Other inmates are still too firmly addicted to drugs or alcohol to expect that GH services will be productive. It is important that men recruited into GH are either brought up to a minimum level through IDOC programs prior to transfer to the ATC or that recruits are inmates who are already at a point that enables them to make use of GH services.

The Case for Participation Incentives After Parole

Rewards

Much discussion at meetings has been devoted to how to keep participants in the program once they have been paroled. The question of what rewards would be meaningful to men between the ages 18 – 24 coming home to realities of life in the greater North Lawndale area is hard to answer. This is currently a top concern for front

line staff, and an issue of regular discussion at weekly Transition Team and monthly Executive Committee Meetings.

Very few of the men that have gone through the program have any expectations that their families can provide them with a financial safety net. Commonly, they expect instead to contribute financially themselves to help hold their family of origin together and to raise their children. The economic realities many are returning to, and entry-level wages they can expect even if the program leads to full-time employment, make it very hard to encourage young men to participate for a prolonged period in programs that offer reentry services. For the most part, these young men have a history of making substantially more money illegally than they could make in the legitimate labor market.

Sanctions

Once a GH participant is released, the parole agents are the only members of the GH team with the authority to impose sanctions. Because participating in GH post-release is currently not a condition of parole but is instead entirely voluntary, parole agents cannot impose sanctions when an inmate who has been participating in GH pre-release drops out of the program.

Like everyone else paroling out of an ATC, GH men are currently placed on Level 2 parole. Level 2 parole mandates only one face-to-face meeting with a parole officer every 60 days. Parole agents have some discretionary authority to increase the number of phone call “check ins”, face-to-face contacts, or request that a parolee be placed in electronic monitoring, but these options place an extra burden on parole officers and are not always effective in turning around a parolee’s behavior. A parole agent’s strongest leverage is the threat of violating a parolee and returning him to his parent institution to serve out his sentence after which he will be released without any reporting requirements whatsoever. GH Program staff at all levels sees returning a participant to his parent institution as a poor program outcome.

There is agreement across all the agencies involved that increasing program participation post-release is important to the long-term success of GH. Two central issues that are frequently raised by staff are:

- *Making GH participation part of Parole Board Orders:* Currently, participation in GH is not in the Parole Board Orders of men who volunteer to participate in GH pre-release. IDOC GH staff are currently developing recommendations to present to the Parole Board to make participating in GH a condition of parole for pre-release GH participants through the use of “Rule 15.”
- *Increasing the number of “intermediate range” sanctions:* Two intermediate sanctions (Halfway Back and a West Side Day Reporting Center) are in development but until they are implemented the number of intermediate sanctions available to parole agents will remain limited.

While there appears to be broad consensus that participation incentives are needed post-parole, the empirical basis for this concern is still tentative, largely because so few men have participated in GH at this stage. We observe that only four GH participants have been paroled at this date. Of these four men, three were transferred from their parent institution to the Westside ATC and then were paroled. One of these men does not wish to participate further in GH and case managers have lost contact with the other two. The fourth parolee was self-selected. Thus, although he continues to receive services, the fact that he volunteered for GH after he was released from his parent institution makes it likely that personal characteristics, not just program characteristics, are an important part of the explanation for his current success. These outcomes are consistent with the views of the GH providers that as presently constituted the program has inadequate participation incentives/sanctions for parolees. However, the number of men involved is so small that we cannot reliably identify a trend. Nor can these few cases serve as a reliable basis for projecting future GH participation rates among parolees.

Designing Appropriate Participation Incentives is Difficult

While there is substantial support among program staff for increased use of participation incentives, there is disagreement among program and ATC staff about the efficacy of the rewards and penalties that the program is using. Some believe that it is unfair to reward men for behavior that should simply be expected of them and they believe that doing so undermines the effort to move ex-offenders into non-criminal society. Law-abiding citizens are not rewarded for obeying the law; they are simply expected to do so. Some believe the incentives being offered are not sufficiently attractive to hold men in the program once they are released from prison. Incentives that were suggested as having real clout included a one-time opportunity to really start over by having the felon's record purged, allowing him to get regular employment if he kept clean in the future. Early release from parole was another incentive some saw as having enough real appeal to keep men in the program. Some were annoyed that suggested rewards have included luxury entertainment items like tickets to a Bull's game. The rewards, some suggest, could be designed to more effectively meet the goal of having the men assume appropriate family and community responsibility (e.g. passes to a museum so that men could take their children somewhere educational).

Many of the individuals we interviewed thought the design of incentives for GH participants should receive more attention from GH program staff. Front-line staff emphasized the importance of appropriate incentives when we spoke with them, and the topic also came up regularly at weekly Transition Team and monthly Executive Committee Meetings. But the question of what rewards and penalties would be meaningful to these men has proven hard to answer. Because of these frequent concerns raised about participation incentives and because the question is a difficult one to address, we take time to outline a framework below to help foster further discussions on this issue. We believe this framework can be used to guide the design of incentives and to identify appropriate circumstances for implementing rewards and penalties for participants in a prisoner reentry program such as Going Home.

Summary of Key Principles When Designing Program Participation Incentives

The Personnel Economics literature suggests five key principles to follow when designing participation incentives in programs like prison reentry programs.²

- (1) Most of the time there is no substantive difference between the incentive created by a reward and incentive created by a penalty.
- (2) Providing incentives is costly. Those that design participation incentives should consider whether the value of increased participation is sufficient to justify the cost of the incentives.
- (3) The structure of the incentive scheme should be consistent with the effects of the services provided to the participants.
- (4) Providing an incentive through a reward or bonus makes the most sense when a certain minimum threshold of participation must be attained before the program is of any value to participants or to society.
- (5) Providing an incentive through a penalty or sanction makes the most sense when participation in a program beyond some maximum threshold produces no additional value to the participant or to society.

In Appendix 3 we discuss in greater detail how these principles apply to the Going Home Program. The key points to grasp are:

- GH staff should not spend time debating the relative merits of rewards vs. punishments as incentives since both in principle appear to be equally effective.
- The total costs of incentives should not exceed the expected gain from the behaviors the incentives are meant to motivate.
- GH staff should determine whether men in the GH program are expected to benefit incrementally from each bit of program participation or whether no significant benefits are expected unless men complete the entire GH program. Incentives should then be constructed accordingly. Incentives should either focus on getting a higher percentage of avid beginners to finish or on getting more reluctant beginners to stay in longer before dropping out.

Although there is no empirical basis for choosing between these two incentive schemes (reward for finishing vs. incremental rewards along the way for staying in each segment), we recommend that GH officials and providers address these issues qualitatively before implementing any participation incentive. In particular, GH officials should consider how to structure incentives with regard to completion of U-TURN modules, contacts with case managers, and participation in other GH services.

- For example, suppose GH officials and service providers decide that completing 1/2 of the U-TURN modules is of value compared to completing none. In this

² See Edward P. Lazear, Personnel Economics For Managers, New York: John L. Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1997.

case program officials should consider whether it is worthwhile to design an incentive scheme that not only rewards completing all U-TURN modules, but also rewards completing some modules.

If case management is considered an important component of GH, program officials should consider incorporating incentives for GH participants to make contacts with their case manager after they are released on parole.

■

If GH officials believe that it is important for GH participants to receive a comprehensive set of services, program officials should consider whether the program should incorporate incentives that encourage participants to receive multiple services.

VI. Leveraging Resources and Agency Partnerships

Developing a successful collaboration among agencies and stakeholders is a complex task. As the GH program has developed there has been an increasing awareness of the time involved in making the collaboration a reality. Defining roles and responsibilities, and developing systems that hold individuals and agencies accountable has been, and continues to be, a work in progress for the GH program. Issues about proper procedures and protocols for sharing information are continuing to evolve.

Staff Did Not Understand Program

For the first several months of the programs operation, front line staff expressed several concerns that they believed would reduce the programs' effectiveness as the number of enrollees increased. They contended that they did not fully understand the program at the time participants first began to arrive. "No one explained" the program to them or asked for their input in its design or implementation. They often did not understand how the components fit together. And they reported that they were neither consulted about nor trained in the practical aspects of the Going Home program and this made it difficult for them to supervise GH men appropriately. Many concerns about not understanding the program or how the components fit together began to come to light in May and June of 2004 and steps have been taken by IDOC GH staff to address these concerns.

Not having been asked for their input during the early planning stages of GH however has been particularly troublesome for staff that feels strongly that their hands on knowledge about offenders and reentry would have been helpful in designing the program, and could have helped prevent some of the program's early and ongoing difficulties.

Integrating GH with the ongoing day-to-day functioning of the ATC has been particularly challenging. The groundwork for gaining the cooperation of the ATC in GH began with IDOC GH staff reaching out to the top officials at the ATC: the Supervisor and Assistant Supervisor. Apparently though, very little information about the program

was shared with line staff at the ATC, and when both the Supervisor and Assistant Supervisor left early in the year there was no one at the ATC who understood either the program or their role in it. At the time GH participants began arriving at the ATC was no clear plan in place for how the GH program would be coordinated with the ATC's existing orientation program for all inmates and its other work-related programs. And ATC protocols set in place to serve the bulk of the 200+ residents could not easily be revised to accommodate the few GH inmates the facility served at any one time.

ATC line staff and GH staff have worked on resolving many of these issues. For example, bringing direct service staff at the ATC into GH as a full partner has allowed for more face-to-face interaction between staff who deal with the men directly inside the ATC and those who deal with them directly outside the ATC. Consequently, there is now more transfer of information between those in direct contact with participants at different times of day or on different days of the week concerning intangible factors such as "attitude" or small problems that fall short of a program violation. ATC staff believe that this communication has enhanced their ability to head off small problems early. However, there is no clear indication at this time that the current administration at the ATC has been brought fully on board.

Staff Uncertainty About the Going Home Program Created Confusion Among Participants

Some interviewees believe that differences in how line staff understood the program early on created confusion among participants about the program's purpose and expectations about their participation in the program. Although all participants have received and signed their agreement of participation that outlines the expectations and incentives of the program, staff that deal with these men when they first arrive at the ATC have often received little or no information and believe that the GH men actually do not fully understand the program's expectations. Steps have been taken to arrange meetings between the GH TASC case manager and new GH arrivals at the ATC as a way to address this problem.

Another factor cited that may contribute to different understandings of the GH program is that program staff have different views about which program components are most important and likely to work. Some believe that entry-level wage jobs, difficult enough for an ex-felon to obtain, can never compete with the big, easy money associated with drug dealing. Some believe that men cannot really be expected to become independent on what they can earn in an entry-level position. Those who take this position tend to emphasize the need for rehabilitation and counseling services that change men's attitudes about their goals in life and desired role in their families. Others think that few of these men survive on their own in any case: most live with a mother, girlfriend or somebody else. Thus, the ex-offenders could survive on entry-level wage jobs and the key is to keep them in the legitimate labor market. This diversity of opinion translates into different expectations about the retention and progress of men in the Going Home program, as well as into different practical activity. Staff who believe jobs are the key may put considerable time and effort into helping Going Home men find a job, while

others who see little long-term success associated with entry-level wage jobs may believe that getting men into drug-treatment and counseling programs is the best service they can be providing.

Increasing the Number of Agencies Providing Going Home Services

IDOC program staff recently chaired a community meeting in North Lawndale specifically intended to build relationships with potential community partners. The GH program was explained and each agency that attended was given an opportunity to meet with IDOC to discuss potential opportunities to collaborate and given information on how to establish a contractual relationship with IDOC.

VII. Conclusions and Recommendations

The following recommendations are those suggested by GH staff themselves in light of their prior experience with incarcerated and post-incarcerated men and the functioning of the GH program so far. As indicated earlier in this report, steps are currently being taken to implement these changes. A detailed outline of these proposed changes is included as an appendix.

- Enroll men in GH at the time they are first incarcerated to allow GH staff to identify educational and treatment needs early and route the men into appropriate services within IDOC prior to transfer to the ATC. In this way more program participants will arrive at the ATC better prepared to benefit from GH services.
- Regularly include participants in the reentry planning process. This will help reduce the misunderstandings that some GH men appear to have about the program's services and their responsibilities when they arrive at the ATC and after they are released on parole.
- Revise the current system so that once a participant enrolls, there would be sanctions for leaving the program. Include compliance with GH in an inmate's board orders for parole. Program staff believe that these incentives will help reduce the likelihood that participants will "game the system" for the purposes of getting transferred from their parent institution downstate to their community near the ATC.
- Develop a clear and consistent set of graduated incentives and sanctions for program participation. This would provide a structure for making participants accountable for their behavior. This practice would provide feedback to participants by providing frequent rewards or penalties for meeting or failing to meet program milestones.

In addition to the above recommendations, flowing primarily from front-line staff, program administrators have recognized that low enrollment is by far the most pressing problem. As indicated in section III program administrators have developed a plan to address this issue.

The GH staff's recommended steps outlined above are in response to program difficulties and are in line with program objectives. We will continue to monitor progress as GH staff implement these program changes.

Recommendations from the Research Team

Based on our observations and interviews, we believe that the steps proposed by project staff should be implemented. In addition we have identified several key issues not well addressed by the staff recommendations above:

First, the design of appropriate program participation incentives is a topic that the GH team should consider more thoroughly. In particular the evaluation team has raised several questions that should be addressed prior to implementing additional incentives. For example, the GH team should discuss whether appropriate incentives entail rewards or penalties, and whether and how they should reward incremental progress in the program.

Second, GH officials should continue to address the lack of clarity perceived by program providers about the GH program. Third, GH officials should develop a feasible mechanism for incorporating line staff and inmate suggestions into the re-entry planning process. To address these last two points, we recommend that GH staff consider the following steps for improving the program:

1. Develop a clear flow-chart of the Going Home program steps, detailing at each step what is required of men who reach that step before they can move on, what the consequences are for men who fail to meet expectations at any given step. Also, at each step, define who is responsible for monitoring men's behavior, providing given services and enforcing particular program rules.
2. Clearly define each agency's responsibilities with respect to the transfer of men between locations. Provide practical detail about who phones whom under what circumstances (e.g. tardiness or absence at a program session), who has the power to grant movement of what kind, what sort of transportation, if any, will be provided by whom, and what kind of paper records must be kept (and who gets copies).
3. Hold a series of focus groups to react to the materials described above. One group would be ATC and core program agency front-line staff. Another group would include representatives from other agencies in the community that serve ex-offenders but who are currently not directly involved in Going Home. A third group would be comprised of ex-offenders themselves (not men in the program, but men like them or older men who were once like them). Revise the practical aspects of the program according to feedback elicited during these three group sessions.
4. Have ALL staff who have face-to-face contact with Going Home men and their immediate supervisors attend a single training at which they go over the revised materials described above. Provide the name of a point person to which all future questions about the program can be referred (see next point).
5. Establish a "point person" position. All staff associated with the Going Home program should be encouraged to call this person with any program-related questions or problems. This person should be responsible for contacting the relevant official to obtain a definitive answer for any question received. In other words, this person would be the clearinghouse for questions so that actors at all different levels of an agency or in different agencies could all get consistent answers to the same questions.

Next Steps for Implementation Evaluation

The implementation evaluation design originally called for repeated interviews with staff at core GH programs and single interviews with more peripheral agencies to which GH men were being referred for services. The evaluation team was originally scheduled to visit only a few initial planning meetings. In light of the program's slow start and current evolution, it has become clear that attending regular planning meetings is an important mechanism for monitoring the project's implementation.

In the coming year, University of Chicago staff will continue to observe planning meetings and will conduct follow-up interviews with program staff as needed. In addition, GH staff have asked for assistance in gathering feedback from ATC inmates (NOT those currently in GH since participants are unlikely to be candid about sanctions that would affect them personally) about actual and potential GH program protocols. Such information will aid in identifying rewards and sanctions to which men in GH are likely to respond.

During the second year of the evaluation, more emphasis will be given to the impact study. At this date, the evaluation team is preparing historical measures of recidivism rates by community, age, and racial groups. We will work closely with ICJIA and IDOC staff in establishing definitions of recidivism, and appropriate interpretation of these data. We have also recently secured a data sharing agreement between IDOC, IDES, and ourselves that will enable us to examine baseline employment histories of reentrants by community, age, and racial groups. We will soon begin the process of matching IDOC and IDES records so that we begin this analysis. Finally, as more men enroll in GH, we will be able to compare their outcomes to outcomes in the historical data.

VIII Appendices

There are three documents included in the Appendix to this report:

1. The first document, entitled Illinois Department of Corrections Going Home Reentry Initiative Standard Operating Procedures, was prepared by GH officials at the IDOC and provides an outline of the program standard operating procedures (Pages 28 – 41)***
2. The second document, entitled Going Home Program Revision Proposal, was also prepared by GH officials and constitutes a proposal to revise various components of the program (Pages 42 - 49)^^^.
3. The third document, entitled Designing Program Participation Incentives for Prisoner Reentry Programs, was prepared by the GH evaluation team. It discusses in greater detail the principles summarized in section five of the report (Pages 50 – 55).

*** A “Going Home Program Schedule,” which is intended to serve as part of the Standard Operating Procedures document is an EXCEL SPREADSHEET and is appended to this report as a separate document

^^^A “Going Home Flow Chart” which is intended to serve as part of the Going Home Program Revision Proposal is a PDF FILE, and is appended to this report as a separate document.

1. Going Home Standard Operating Procedures

Illinois Department of Corrections Going Home Reentry Initiative Standard Operating Procedures³

PURPOSE

The Illinois Department of Correction will serve as the coordinating agency for the Going Home Reentry Initiative. The purpose of the Going Home Reentry Initiative is to enhance public safety by promoting systems changes that will provide a more successful reintegration of formerly incarcerated offenders into society. The purpose for the standard operating procedures is to outline the process for the Going Home Initiative, including the inter-agency cooperation that is required in the initiative.

RESPONSIBILITY

Implementation responsibilities are shared between the Illinois Department of Corrections and the following community agencies; Treatment for Safe Communities (TASC), North Lawndale Employment Network (NLEN), and SAFER. All agencies participating in the GHP have signed a Contract (See Attachments 1, 2 & 3) outlining their roles and responsibilities.

DEFINITIONS & ABBREVIATIONS

<i>SVORI</i>	Serious and Violent Offender Reentry Initiative – a federally funded grant to enhance transition and reentry services for offenders
<i>GHP</i>	Going Home Program – the reentry program developed by the Illinois Department of Corrections to meet the SVORI program requirements
<i>TCO</i>	Transfer Coordinator Office – the Department of Correction staff that are responsible for reviewing each offender’s eligibility for transfer to the ATC and overseeing the transfer process.
<i>PD</i>	Program Director – the individual designated by the Department of Correction to have oversight of the GHP

³ Created by Christine Rothwell
Last updated 7/25/04

<i>APD</i>	Assistant Program Director – the individual designated by the Department of Correction to work directly under the Program Director and assist with oversight of the GHP
<i>AWP</i>	Assistant Warden of Programs
<i>CSS</i>	Clinical Services Supervisor
<i>TT</i>	Transition Team – a group of representatives from various criminal justice, human service and community based agencies identified to assist in the development, implementation, and monitoring of an offender’s transition and reentry plan based on identified needs
<i>TASC</i>	Treatment Alternatives for Safe Communities
<i>CRM</i>	Clinical Reentry Manager – a person employed by TASC to manage the daily cases of the Going Home Program participants
<i>ECM</i>	Employment Case Manager – a program manager employed by NLEN to manage the needs of the program participant while attending U-Turn.
<i>WSATC</i>	West Side ATC – Adult Transition Center where the GHP participants will be housed 90 days prior to release.
<i>MSR</i>	Mandatory Sentenced Release date – the date the offender will be released from custody.
<i>PA</i>	Parole Agent – Each zip code will have one agent assigned to it: Agent Margherio (60608 & 60623), Agent Anderson (60612), Agent Dade (60624)
<i>ICSW</i>	Institute of Clinical Social Work – Contracted to provide individual and family counseling to program participants.
<i>TJ</i>	Transitional Job – A temporary job that offers a transition to real work and combines skill development and support services to help ex-offenders overcome substantial barriers to employment.
<i>NLEN</i>	North Lawndale Employment Network – Contracted to provide anger management, life skills, job readiness and job placement services.

**Illinois Department of Corrections
Going Home Reentry Initiative
Standard Operating Procedures**

Phase I: Institution-Based Programs

Identification

APD will identify potential GHP participants based on set criteria:

- (1) Between the age of 18-24 at time of release;
- (2) Will have a **minimum** of 90 days until MSR date;
- (3) Will have a minimum of 90 days of community supervision; and
- (4) Has a parole plan to return to the North Lawndale Community at time of release.

APD will generate a list of eligible offenders within 4-18 months of release. The ADP will forward the list to the TCO for eligibility and pre-approval to participate in the GHP. The TCO will review the offender for eligibility to participate and transfer to WSATC and Outlook a list of approved participants to the APD.

Participant Agreement 1

The APD will send an Outlook to the appropriate institution where the offender is housed requesting that the AWP or CSS meet with the potential program participant. The AWP or CSS will meet with the identified offender to read and review the **Going Home Program Description** (Attachment 5). If the offender agrees to participate, he will sign the **Participation Agreement** (Attachment 4). The AWP or CSS will follow the **Transfer Protocol** (Attachment 6) and fax the signed participant agreement to the APD and place the original in the offender's Master File.

Participant Agreement 2

After arriving at WSATC, the CRM will meet with the participant to provide a more in depth description of the GHP. If the participant still wishes to participate with the program, he will sign a 2nd participant agreement. (Attachment 5) The CRM will mail the original signed participant agreement to the PD to obtain the necessary signatures from the Prisoner Review Board Chair and the participant's Parole Agent.

Offender Transfer

The APD will send an Outlook to the AWP or CSS verifying receipt of the signed agreement and request a Transfer Request Packet be sent to the TCO as soon as possible. The APD will send an Outlook to the TCO noting the offender's participation in the program and the desired date of transfer. The APD will forward a copy of the signed participant agreement form to the CRM to be placed in the Case Management File.

If the offender has been transferred to WSATC, and then decides he no longer wants to participate in the program, he will be returned to the sending unit. If a participant fails to cooperate and comply with the program requirements, the TT will staff the case and determine the appropriate sanction, as per the sanctions matrix (Attachment 7). See section *Program Termination* for protocol.

Offender Coding

Upon receipt of the Transfer Request Packet, the TCO will code the offender as “WSD” with a Special Placement code of “GHP.” The TCO will ensure that all necessary transfer paperwork is completed and notify the ADP of the intended date of transfer to Stateville. The TCO will ensure that the offender is transferred to Stateville on the appropriate Wednesday. The offender will then be transferred to WSATC on the Friday of the same week.

Background Approval

The PD or APD will submit a list of names of all individuals working with the Going Home TT who may need to enter WSATC to work with the program participant. Appropriate background checks will be completed on all program staff as required by IDOC Administrative Directives.

ATC Orientation

The first seven days that a GHP participant spends at WSATC will be spent being oriented to the policies and procedures of the facility.

*Initial Interview/
Assessment*

Also during this first seven days, the CRM will interview the offender, begin an assessment and gather the necessary information to initiate a Case Management Plan.

Program Schedule

See (Attachment 6) – Going Home Program Schedule for 90-day offenders going through WSATC.

Transition Team

Each TT includes 1) a reentry case manager that focuses on participants long-term recovery needs and provides ongoing assessments and linkages to needed services; 2) the participant’s parole agent; 3) a North Lawndale Employment Network job-developer; and 4) SVORI program staff.

The TT will review the new GHP participant assessment during the weekly meeting, held no later than 14 days from the date of transfer to the ATC. All team members will discuss the needs of the offender. The CRM will use the results of this discussion to begin the development of the first phase of the offender’s Case Management.

The TT will continue to meet weekly throughout program implementation to discuss ongoing identified needs of each offender. The TT will also identify other resources or agencies that need to be a part of the offender’s TT based on identified needs.

Reentry/Case Plan

A preliminary Reentry Case Plan will be developed based on the offender's existing Case Management Plan. A meeting with the offender will be scheduled to review and finalize the Reentry Case Plan no later than 30 days prior to MSR date. A copy of the completed reentry case plan will be given to the GHP Directors, Parole Agent and the offender. The CRM will contact additional partner agencies, as needed, to participate in the development/ implementation of the case plan. Any and all updates and changes will be forwarded to the GHP Directors.

Available Resources

While at the ATC, participants will have resources available to them to aid in preparation for transition and reentry in to the community. Each participant will have a program schedule that is designed to fit the time he has left until his MSR date. (Attachment 7)

(1) NLEN

U-Turn Permitted – *Located at United Baptist Church, 4220 W. Roosevelt*

Anger Management – The first job readiness training module is 17 hours and consists of a violence interruption program that helps participants better understand and deal with the roots of violent behavior and offers tools for effective conflict resolution. The Institute for Clinical Social Work is contracted to teach this module and is certified in techniques useful in dealing with conflict resolution.

Right Thinking - The second module is 20 hours and is a thought-restructuring training that helps ex-offenders examine their current thought patterns, make the connection between thought patterns and outcomes, identify positive new ones, and learn to take responsibility for their actions. Deer Rehabilitation Services is contracted to teach this certified cognitive-based training module that exposes the maladjusted thinking of the subculture norm and gives the participant positive community centered values.

Workin' It Out - The third module is 30 hours of training, in which participants have the opportunity to extend their learning from the prior two trainings to think through, discuss, and role play workplace situations that, if handled with skill, could help them keep and progress in their jobs. This module imparts a deeper understanding of conflict cycles, workplace values, and employer expectations. An independent contractor hired by NLEN facilitates this module.

Getting the Edge - The fourth module is 30 hours and consists of job seeking skills training, including life skills management review, career assessment, interviewing skills, job search, and personal strategy development. National ABLE Network is contracted to teach this module.

Save Up – This savings program is managed through NLEN and is available to each participant who has completed all 4 weeks of U-Turn Permitted and the 8 hours of required Basic Budgeting classes.

Participants save money in an Individual Development Account (IDA) towards the purchase of a home or higher education. Every \$1 the participant puts in to his account is matched with \$2, which is saved in a match account until the participant reaches his goal and is ready to purchase a home or pay for school. The amount saved by the participant will be no less than \$55 per week and the total match provided by participating local agencies will be \$4000. For a more detailed description of the Save Up program (See Attachment 7)

Employment Case Manager – The Employment Case Manager is responsible for facilitating orientation and paperwork for new participants. The ECM is also responsible for ongoing case management regarding any employment needs or concerns with each participant. The ECM will ensure accountability for the whereabouts of participants coming from the ATC during program hours at the United Baptist Church and will promptly notify ATC staff within 15 minutes if participant does not show for, or leaves early from a scheduled program. The ECM will document all case notes and enter them in to NLEN’s “Project Match System.”

ECM will immediately notify the Counselor at the ATC and the Reentry Case Manager about any behavior by the participant that is unacceptable or causes concern.

Job Developer – The Job Developer refers clients to employers whose jobs match with a client’s skill sets, provides client with intensive case management, and provides 30 days of transportation support. In addition, the SVORI participants will use the new NLEN Resource Center (developed with support from the IDOC SVORI program) for access to and training on computers to prepare resumes and cover letters, conduct job searches, post resumes and apply for jobs online, and participate in online educational activities. Through the Resource Center, clients can also receive further assessments and career counseling, use phones and voice mail boxes to communicate with employers, use fax machines and a photocopier, and use the reference library of books, newspapers, and magazines related to careers and networking.

Safer Foundation

At least six (6) annual cycles of 6 or 8 week academic training sessions will be delivered to program participants who do not have a HSE or GED. Program participants will be provided access to commonly employed tests of vocation aptitude and vocational preference during program progression.

Programming will be provided on a daily basis Monday through Friday to include academic and workplace acclimation sessions. Training activities will be peer-centered, and participant interaction will take the place of textbooks and worksheets as the medium of instruction. Class work is done in ad hoc aggregations of three to five members, with the more proficient members instructing those who are less proficient. Facilitators will make frequent, but relatively brief contact with each of the program participants to assess progress, diagnose difficulties, answer questions, and provide information. *(This program will be implemented if the supplemental funding is received)*

TASC

Clinical Re-Entry Management (CRM) responsibilities during phase I include:

- Meet with client within forty-eight hours at ATC
- Provide client with in-depth description of Going Home, have him sign Participant Agreement (Attachment 5) and forward it to the Program Director

- Assist client with transportation to required services as determined by CRM (e.g., U-Turn, state ID procurement)
- Screen and assess for motivation, appropriate level of clinical reentry management intensity and service needs to move client toward self-management
- Facilitate Life Skills groups and Inner Circles in ATC
- Serve as the in-house link for ATC staff on reentry activities requiring authorized movement and community programming
- Work with Parole, PRU, NLEN and other Transition Team members to develop and maintain individual recovery plan that will be shared with primary SVORI stakeholders

*Institute of Clinical
Social Work*

The approved individuals from the ICSW will provide individual and family counseling. This service will be free of charge to the program participant as long as he remains in compliance of the GHP. A staff member from ICSW will conduct an initial assessment and family members and/or a significant other will be selected by the participant to be included in the counseling. Including the family in the counseling portion of the GHP will be an attempt to aid in the understanding of the participant's reentry back to the home/community and to describe how important their role will play in the transition.

Graduated Responses

See (Attachment 8 & 9) – Violations/Milestones Response Matrices

Transportation

Program participants are eligible for transportation vouchers (cta cards) to assist with transportation needs for an approximate period of 90 days. Exact amount provided to each participant will be evaluated on an individual basis.

Participants in the U-Turn Permitted classes will receive cta cards from the ECM on a daily basis to get back and forth from the ATC to U-Turn and/or the Resource Center located at 3726 W. Flournoy. Transportation vouchers will be issued by NLEN staff and must be signed for by the participant at time of receipt.

Participants needing transportation assistance to get to and from work must see their CRM to obtain cta cards. The ECM will ensure that the participant is informed how to obtain transportation assistance.

Any participant found to be abusing the cta transportation cards provided by the GHP will lose this privilege for a period of time to be determined by the Transition Team. During this time of suspension, the participant will be responsible for his own transportation costs required to remain in compliance with the requirements and

guidelines of the GHP. At the end of the suspension time, the participant must go before the Transition Team to ask for his transportation assistance to be reinstated.

Mentor Program

(It has been discussed that this component could possibly be handled through the Community Action Team that NLEN is putting together in the North Lawndale Community). If we target these guys 1 year out, we can use this extra time to match them with a mentor prior to moving to the ATC and contact can begin immediately after arrival at the ATC and continue into the community upon release.

Transitional Housing

Arrangements for transitional housing will begin preparation during the incarceration phase. The RCM will meet individually with the program participant and assess the need for transitional housing at the time of program entry. All efforts will be made by the RCM to establish a secure housing environment for each program participant no longer than 30 days prior to release. A more in depth explanation about transitional housing can be found under the **Community-Based Transition Programs** section of this document.

Program Termination

If an offender fails to comply with the GHP case plan or is given disciplinary sanctions, the RCM will notify the TT. The TT will discuss the situation with the offender at the next TT meeting and make a recommendation, unless the RCM feels a more rapid response is necessary. Final decision on whether or not to terminate the offender due to non-compliance, behavioral issues or unwillingness to participate will be determined by the TT and documented in the GHP case plan. Issues involving behavior violations will require inclusion of security staff and the ATC Supervisor.

If after the offender has signed the first participant agreement, has been transferred to WSATC, and has met with the RCM, he chooses not to participate and does not sign the 2nd participant agreement, (see Attachment 4) he will be transferred back to his parent institution **without** disciplinary action.

If after the offender has been transferred to WSATC and signed the 2nd participant agreement, he chooses to terminate his participation with the GHP, the CRM will notify the TT and they will staff the case and make a decision regarding the appropriate action to be taken.

Week prior to release

NO LATER THAN the week prior to an offender's MSR date, the following things **will** take place.

1. The RCM will meet with the offender to discuss any last minute concerns or barriers that need to be addressed prior to release and ensure that the offender has all contact information for reaching TT members
2. Members from the TT will meet to ensure that all potential barriers have been addressed and case plan is in order
3. TT members will meet with offender to go over the case plan and ensure that he has a full understanding of what is required of him after release (this meeting will include the parole agent assigned to the offender)
4. If unable to attend the TT meeting, the PA will meet with the offender to explain reporting requirements for the upcoming week.

Phase II: Community-Based Transition Programs

Day of Release

- All release documents will be signed and kept with the Master File (Attachment 10).
- The offender will be given an updated copy of the GHP Discharge Summary detailing all scheduled appointments, meetings and interviews.
- The PA will give the offender reporting instructions.
- The TT will meet with the offender within one (1) week of release. Team members will report any problems or concerns to the PA during this phase.

Parole Supervision

The PA assigned to the GHP participant will be the primary person responsible for the monitoring and supervision of the participant once released, although the RCM will meet with the participant weekly (a minimum of 2 face to face visits per month) to discuss how things are going, barriers, needs and compliance issues.

Any problems or concerns will be staffed at the next TT weekly meeting, unless the RCM feels there is an urgent need to staff the case sooner. Any violations of the offender's case plan will be addressed at the first available staffing. Any violation of the statutory orders witnessed by or admitted to the CM must and will immediately be reported to the PA and PD or APD.

Non-Compliance

Technical Violations

Any technical violation will be discussed by the TT at staffing. The PA or RCM will follow the graduated response matrix for appropriate response to specific behaviors. (Attachment 8)

*Major Violation
/New Crime*

Any major violation or new crime will result in the PA or RCM calling a meeting of the TT to discuss all aspects of the GHP participant's case. As required by policy, the PA will have to follow IDOC violation policy (Attachment 12) that outlines specific responses to major violations and/or new crime(s). The PA will inform the TT of the violation policy guidelines and document the appropriate response on the case plan. The final decision to continue with supervision or to proceed with revocation will be determined by the Parole Supervisor and the Parole Review Board

TASC

The roles and responsibilities of the Clinical Reentry Manager during Phase II are as follows:

- Continue to assist client with transportation to required services as determined by CRM (e.g., U-Turn, state ID procurement)
- Continue to screen and assess for motivation, appropriate level of clinical reentry management intensity and service needs to move client toward self-management
- Continue to facilitate Life Skills groups and Inner Circles in ATC
- Continue to serve as the in-house link for ATC staff on reentry activities requiring authorized movement and community programming
- Continue to work with Parole, PRU, NLEN and other Transition Team members to develop and maintain individual recovery plan that will be shared with primary SVORI stakeholders
- Assist client in establishing secure housing at least 30 days prior to release

NLEN

Employment Retention Specialist – An NLEN Employment Retention Specialist will help clients complete pre-employment training, access educational programs and job skills training when needed, and help clients to secure and retain employment. The Work with each client will begin before release with pre-employment counseling. Each participant will meet weekly with the Specialist during the first month of U-Turn Permitted program. They then meet twice a month for the next two months, and monthly through the first full year of employment. These meetings may take place at the NLEN Resource Center, the

participant's place of employment and/or in conjunction with meetings with other TT members, such as a participant's PA or RCM. The Specialist will follow each client through programming, placement and post-placement to maintain a continuous client relationship.

The Specialist will conduct career assessments and help clients develop career plans with short and long term goals based on interests and skills, and identify educational opportunities needed to attain more long term goals. Participants will update these career plans at the monthly meetings with the Specialist, who will also help the client access training and education identified as part of the career plan.

The Specialist will refer clients to additional hard skills training or education as needed, such as NLEN's training program with Advocate Trinity Hospital, and help with enrollment, such as helping clients to secure health care waivers needed to qualify for the program.

After programming is complete, the Specialist will follow up with the client to make sure they are pursuing employment opportunities, and refer clients back to the Job Developer for additional placement opportunities as needed. The Specialist will initiate the contact to get these clients to access the assistance they need and will also follow up with employers after each job interview, one week after a client begins employment, and then again at 30 days. The Specialist will help with additional job placements when a client loses a job.

ICSW

Transportation

cta cards will be available through NLEN for program participants that have a need for assistance with transportation to and from the resource center, job interviews and work. Cards must be requested in advance from the RCM.

Clothing Allowances (Still working on the logistics of this – I am looking for a community partner/ agency that could take the lead at establishing an agreement with a couple of local businesses that would be interested in forming a relationship wherein program participants could provide a voucher to be used to purchase clothing for job interviews, items that might be necessary for a specific job function and other necessary personal hygiene type items).

Transitional Housing Funds will be available to help those participants who have not yet secured employment or do not have adequate income to pay all costs associated with housing. Funds will be paid directly to the community partner providing the transitional

living arrangement. No funds will be given directly to the program participant to cover the cost of housing.

An inclusive list of approved Transitional housing providers will be included in this section after received from PRU.

Transitional Jobs

End of Supervision

The TT will meet 30 days prior to the end of supervision to assess the offender's progress and to prepare a long-term case plan. A copy of the final case plan will be kept on file with the GHP Director.

Parole Agents

Phase III: Community-Based Long Term Support

Aftercare

A Community-based TT will be assigned to monitor and manage the participant's transition and reentry into the community and continue to offer services and/or support to GHP participants. The RCM assigned to this team will be responsible for helping address the participant's specific barriers to reentry and monitoring program compliance. The community-based TT will continue to report progress at the weekly TT meetings. Any assistance needed should be addressed at that time. Emergency needs should be brought to the attention of the PD or APD as soon as possible.

Aftercare activities will be based on the needs of participants and available resources of community-based agencies and organizations.

TASC

- Interact with client at least weekly upon release (minimum of two face-to-face contacts per month)
- Serve as client advocate and TASC representative with individual community stakeholders and stakeholder groups
- Complete Support Service Requests for submission to PRU as needed
- Identify and refer clients to non-traditional and/or other ancillary service providers
- Assist Transition Team in collaborating with traditional and non-traditional community-based service providers around SVORI parolees' needs
- Track clients' progress and report progress and non-compliance to the Transition Team and Parole
- Produce monthly report to meet data requirements of funder
- Ensure participant access to Winners' Circles and/or other support groups

- Facilitate Winners' Circles
- Participate in cross training with external stakeholders on an as needed basis
- Serve on QI process
- Collaborate with evaluators
- Participate in regularly scheduled interdisciplinary staffings with all community stakeholders as well as Parole, PRU and IDOC that recommended client services are delivered in a coordinated and integrated manner

Other Policies

<i>Reporting Procedures</i>	Each community partner will provide a monthly report of enrollment and termination statistics, ongoing development and participant progress for participants on inmate and parole status. A brief narrative should be included to summarize program efficiency, effectiveness and concerns. (see Attachment 13)
<i>Technical Assistance</i>	The PD will be available to the TT to provide technical assistance and support as needed. There is also technical assistance offered by the Department of Justice, which can be accessed by the PD when the need arises.
<i>Program Evaluation</i>	The University of Chicago has been contracted to provide an in depth program evaluation. The main objectives of the evaluation are to address two key questions: “How did Going Home operate in the field?” and “Did Going Home work?” The results of the study will provide all participating agencies with a clear understanding of how the program operated and indicate whether or not it was effective in lowering recidivism rates and improving other important outcomes, such as employment. We also hope to achieve some concrete recommendations for improving the program’s design for future use. The University of Chicago’s evaluation will thoroughly describe the program, noting distinctive features, implementation dates, milestones, key stages or phases of development, changes or expansions in project missions or goals, staff training, and adequacy of resources to accommodate program growth.
<i>Program Completion</i>	The Team needs to determine what defines “Program Completion” for participants.

2. Going Home Program Revision Proposal.

Participation: We would like for this program to have a voluntary enrollment but once a participant signs the agreement to participate, we would like for him to be sanctioned if he chooses to drop out of the program.

Parole Board Orders: We propose that the Discharge Summary that is developed by the Transition Team and the participant is added to the parole board orders to eliminate participants dropping out of the program due to their participation not being mandated.

Screening at R&C – Offenders are screened by TASC staff for eligibility for Going Home Program and separated into four tracks.

Track 1A: Participants identified as not being drug or alcohol dependent that are eligible for Adult Transition Center (ATC) placement will be transferred to a parent institution. Services will be the same as other residents, except the case management will be more intense and programming will include specific GHP requirements. Participants in track 1A will have the following case management plan.

**** R&C → Parent Institution → WSD ATC → Community Case Management****

1 Year Prior to Release

One IDOC staff member, one Clinical Reentry Manager (CRM) and one Psychologist from the Institute of Clinical Social Work will either travel to or arrange for a videoconference with each participant to assess needs and develop an individualized Case Plan. The Case Plan will be signed by the Going Home Program Manager, RCM, host site Counselor and the program participant. The original Case Plan will be kept in the offender's Master File and copies provided for the host site, GHP participant case file, RCM participant case file and the participant.

CRM will make monthly telephone contact with participant's Counselor to evaluate changes in needs and progress and ensure that participant is receiving/participating in program requirements included in Case Plan. This time can be utilized to get participants into programs that can offer an increased success rate prior to being transferred to the ATC. These evaluations would take place via telephone conversations between the RCM, Counselor and program participant.

6 Months Prior to Release

Monthly videoconference meetings with CRM and program participant are conducted to begin establishing a more personal form of communication. Review of needs and barriers to transition and reentry are ongoing during this phase.

Additional staffings may be conducted on an as needed basis for issues that arise prior to the monthly scheduled conference.

5 Months Prior to Release

Transfer paperwork prepared and submitted to TCO for transfer within 30-45 days.

4 Months Prior to Release

- Transfer for those who are approved by TCO to be moved to West Side ATC to begin specific Going Home Programming
- Meet with Transition Team within 2 weeks arrival at the ATC
- The first month after arriving at the ATC will be spent in:
 - Orientation
 - CRM one on one needs assessments
 - CRM daily group meetings
 - Inner Circle weekly meetings
 - Initial evaluation from ICSW
- Those found to be in need of a GED can be enrolled in the GED program at the ATC through Roosevelt University
- Those still in need of Substance Abuse or Drug Treatment will be enrolled in an Outpatient treatment program (unless we can find someone to deliver such a program inside the ATC)

3 Months Prior to Release

- Participants begin U-Turn classes with NLEN and prepare for interviews upon completion
- Ongoing CRM daily group meeting
- Weekly Inner Circle meetings continue
- Ongoing counseling with ICSW for those who are identified as having a need and wishing to participate
- Reentry / Discharge plan is started to be developed

2 Months Prior to Release

- Housing needs are addressed for participants with housing needs
- Home visit is performed to ensure appropriateness
- Ongoing CRM daily group meetings
- Weekly Inner Circle meetings continue
- Ongoing counseling with ICSW
- Begin to introduce family in to the counseling piece
- Identification documents are obtained either through the ATC trips or arrangements made with the CRM for those with extenuating circumstances

- Participant meets with the Transition Team to go over his Discharge Plan

1 Month Prior to Release

- Discharge plan is finalized
- Counseling with ICSW continues (to include family if appropriate)
- Final review for program participant to review Discharge Plan with Transition Team
- Transitional or regular housing and funding are all in place for release date
- Participant is employed
- Mentor and participant are matched
- Location of Winner Circle meetings is discussed
- Link is made with Faith based organization if he so chooses
- Initial meeting with Parole Agent no less than 1 week prior to release
- Transportation to/from work is addressed
- Portfolio is finalized

Two Weeks Prior to Release

-

Day of Release

-

Track 1B: Participants identified as not being drug or alcohol dependent and not eligible for transfer to an ATC will be sent to the lowest level security facility according to classification level. They will have the following case management plan.

***** R&C → Parent Institution → Community Case Management*****

1 Year Prior to Release

One IDOC staff member, one Clinical Reentry Manager (CRM) and one Psychologist from the Institute of Clinical Social Work will either travel to or arrange for a videoconference with each participant to assess needs and develop an individualized Case Plan. The Case Plan will be signed by the Going Home Program Manager, RCM, host site Counselor and the program participant. The original Case Plan will be kept in the offender's Master File and copies provided for the host site, GHP participant case file, RCM participant case file and the participant.

CRM will make monthly telephone contact with participant's Counselor to evaluate changes in needs and progress and ensure that participant is receiving/participating in program requirements included in Case Plan. This time can be utilized to get participants into programs that can offer an increased success rate prior to being transferred to the ATC. These evaluations would take place via telephone conversations between the RCM, Counselor and program participant.

6 Months Prior to Release

Monthly videoconference meetings with CRM and program participant are conducted to begin establishing a more personal form of communication. Review of needs and barriers to transition and reentry are ongoing during this phase.

Additional staffings may be conducted on an as needed basis for issues that arise prior to the monthly scheduled conference.

2 Months Prior to Release

- Housing needs are addressed for participants with housing needs
- Home visit is performed to ensure appropriateness
- Counseling with ICSW (should we reach out to them via video conference?)
- Participant meets with the Transition Team to go over his Discharge Plan via video conference

1 Month Prior to Release

- A plan is developed to assist participant in obtaining identification documents
- Counseling with ICSW continues (to include family if appropriate)
- Final review for program participant to review Discharge Plan with Transition Team
- Transitional or regular housing and funding are all in place for release date
- Mentor and participant are matched
- Location of Winner Circle meetings is discussed
- Link is made with Faith based organization if he so chooses
- Transportation to/from work is addressed
- Portfolio is finalized

Two Weeks Prior to Release

- Meeting with Parole Agent via video conference to discuss expectations during first 72 hours and appointment is scheduled for first meeting
- Community meeting with TT is scheduled w/in 72 hours of release (includes representative from each service provider)
- Final pre-release meeting w/ TT to review reporting instructions and discharge plan

Day of Release

- At least one (1) member of the TT will meet with participant the day of discharge to provide and review a copy of discharge plan, notify of upcoming meeting dates and briefly explain reporting requirements of Parole (If this is not the parole agent, it will be explained that the participant is to remain at the residence until which time he hears from the agent with more specific reporting requirements)
-

Track 2A: Participants identified as being drug or alcohol dependent that can be reclassified for ATC placement after drug / alcohol treatment. These participants will have no less than 12 months and no more than 15 months left until MSR date.

Participants will be sent to Robinson Correctional Center for 5 weeks of TASC's Pre-Treatment Orientation services.

After completing Pre-Treatment, participants will be transferred to Southwestern Illinois Correctional Center (SWICC) to complete 5 – 6 months of (existing) drug / alcohol treatment program.

***** R&C→ Robinson→ SWICC→ WSD ATC *****

5 -9 Months Prior to Release (depending on intended transfer date)

Transfer paperwork prepared and submitted to TCO for transfer within 30-45 days.

4 – 8 Months Prior to Release

- Transfer for those who are approved by TCO to be moved to West Side ATC to begin specific Going Home Programming
- Meet with Transition Team within 2 weeks arrival at the ATC
- The first month after arriving at the ATC will be spent in:
 - Orientation
 - CRM one on one needs assessments
 - CRM daily group meetings
 - Inner Circle weekly meetings
 - Initial evaluation from ICSW
- Participants in need of a GED can be enrolled in the GED program at the ATC through Roosevelt University
- Participants still in need of additional Substance Abuse or Drug Treatment will be enrolled in an Outpatient treatment program (unless we can find someone to deliver such a program inside the ATC)
- Participants complete U-Turn classes immediately following completion of facility Orientation
- Prepare for interviews upon completion

3 Months Prior to Release

- Participants begin U-Turn classes with NLEN and prepare for interviews upon completion
- Ongoing CRM daily group meeting
- Weekly Inner Circle meetings continue

- Ongoing counseling with ICSW for those who are identified as having a need and wishing to participate
- Reentry / Discharge plan is started to be developed

2 Months Prior to Release

- Housing needs are addressed for participants with housing needs
- Home visit is performed to ensure appropriateness
- Ongoing CRM daily group meetings
- Weekly Inner Circle meetings continue
- Ongoing counseling with ICSW
- Begin to introduce family in to the counseling piece
- Identification documents are obtained either through the ATC trips or arrangements made with the CRM for those with extenuating circumstances
- Participant meets with the Transition Team to go over his Discharge Plan

1 Month Prior to Release

- Discharge plan is finalized
- Counseling with ICSW continues (to include family if appropriate)
- Final review for program participant to review Discharge Plan with Transition Team
- Transitional or regular housing and funding are all in place for release date
- Participant is employed
- Mentor and participant are matched
- Location of Winner Circle meetings is discussed
- Link is made with Faith based organization if he so chooses
- Initial meeting with Parole Agent no less than 1 week prior to release
- Transportation to/from work is addressed
- Portfolio is finalized

Two Weeks Prior to Release

- Meeting with Parole Agent via video conference to discuss expectations during first 72 hours and appointment is scheduled for first meeting
- Community meeting with TT is scheduled w/in 72 hours of release (includes representative from each service provider)
- Final pre-release meeting w/ TT to review reporting instructions and discharge plan

Day of Release

- At least one (1) member of the TT will meet with participant the day of discharge to provide and review a copy of discharge plan, notify of upcoming meeting dates and briefly explain reporting requirements of Parole (If this is not the parole agent, it will be explained that the participant is to remain at the residence until which time he hears from the agent with more specific reporting requirements)
-

Track 2B: Participants identified as being drug or alcohol dependent that will not be reclassified for ATC placement after drug / alcohol treatment. These participants will have no less than 12 months and no more than 15 months left until MSR date.

***** R&C→ Robinson→ SWICC→ Community Case Management*****

1 Year Prior to Release

One IDOC staff member, one Clinical Reentry Manager (CRM) and one Psychologist from the Institute of Clinical Social Work will either travel to or arrange for a videoconference with each participant to assess needs and develop an individualized Case Plan. The Case Plan will be signed by the Going Home Program Manager, RCM, host site Counselor and the program participant. The original Case Plan will be kept in the offender's Master File and copies provided for the host site, GHP participant case file, RCM participant case file and the participant.

CRM will make monthly telephone contact with participant's Counselor to evaluate changes in needs and progress and ensure that participant is receiving/participating in program requirements included in Case Plan. This time can be utilized to get participants into programs that can offer an increased success rate prior to being transferred to the ATC. These evaluations would take place via telephone conversations between the RCM, Counselor and program participant.

4 Months Prior to Release

Monthly videoconference meetings with CRM and program participant are conducted to begin establishing a more personal form of communication. Review of needs and barriers to transition and reentry are ongoing during this phase.

Additional staffings may be conducted on an as needed basis for issues that arise prior to the monthly scheduled conference.

2 Months Prior to Release

- Housing needs are addressed for participants with housing needs
- Home visit is performed by RCM and Parole Agent to ensure appropriateness
- Need for identification documents is addressed
- Participant meets with the Transition Team via video conference to go over his Discharge Plan

1 Month Prior to Release

- Discharge plan is finalized

- Final review via video conference with program participant and TT to review Discharge Plan – Job Developer is included
- Transitional or regular housing and funding are all in place for release date
- Job Developer Participant identifies potential employers and establishes goals and employment plan
- Mentor and participant are matched
- Location of Winner Circle meetings is discussed
- Link is made with Faith based organization if he so chooses
- Initial meeting with Parole Agent no less than 1 week prior to release
- Transportation to/from work is addressed
- Portfolio is finalized

2 Weeks Prior to Release

- Interviews are scheduled by Job Developer for post-release
- Contact is made with Mentor to ensure contact information is shared
- Transportation to/from work is finalized
- Community meeting with TT is scheduled w/in 72 hours of release (includes representative from each service provider)
- Final pre-release meeting w/ TT to review reporting instructions and discharge plan

Day of Release

- At least one (1) member of the TT will meet with participant the day of discharge to provide and review a copy of discharge plan, notify of upcoming meeting dates and briefly explain reporting requirements of Parole (If this is not the parole agent, it will be explained that the participant is to remain at the residence until which time he hears from the agent with more specific reporting requirements)

3. Designing Program Participation Incentives for Prisoner Reentry Programs

Why Rewards and Penalties Usually Provide the Same Incentive

Although it may seem counterintuitive, in general, there is little difference between a reward or a penalty in terms of its expected effects on participants' behavior. In many circumstances, an incentive scheme that includes rewards can easily be reformulated to include instead penalties to have the same effect on individuals' behavior.

A simple example illustrates the foregoing principle. Suppose a prisoner reentry program is design as follows: Eligible applicants are told that if they participate in the program they will receive U-TURN services and two Chicago Bulls tickets. However, the design also includes a penalty, in which participates lose their Bull tickets if they do not complete all U-TURN modules. Alternatively, in another program, eligible applicants are told that if they participate in the program they can receive U-TURN services. If they complete all U-TURN modules they also will receive a reward: two Chicago Bulls tickets.

Why are the two foregoing incentive schemes the same? The incentives are the same because the cost to the individual of not completing all U-TURN modules is the same under both programs. Consider the incentives for a program participant who has completed all U-TURN modules except for one and is contemplating whether to drop out of the program or to continue and complete the last module. In the penalty program (this first scenario described above) the cost to the participant of dropping out of the program is any potential benefit he would have received from attending the last U-TURN session plus the forfeited Bulls tickets. But, this cost also is the cost of not attending the last U-TURN module for a participant in the reward program (the second scenario described above). In the reward program, if the participant drops out prior to completing the last U-TURN session he also gives up two Bulls tickets that he would have received as a reward.

This same rationale follows for all program participants no matter how many U-TURN modules they have completed. Whether the program design frames the Bull tickets as a penalty or a reward should not have much effect on participants' behavior. In light of this principle, discussions about appropriate participation incentives for the Going Home Program should not dwell much on whether to implement incentives in the form of rewards or penalties. In general, if program officials want to reformulate a desirable participation incentive from a rewards scheme to a penalty scheme or visa versa, this option is usually available. We expect the effect of the desired participation incentive on participants' behavior to be similar no matter which scheme is chosen.

Although the psychology literature recognizes that how program operators frame incentives does influence participants' behavior, we believe these effects are likely small relative to the effects of the incentive itself.⁴ Accordingly, we do not believe that discussions about framing participation incentives should receive high priority among GH officials and providers.

⁴ See Daniel Kahneman and Amos Tversky, "Choices, Values, and Frames," *American Psychologist*, 39(4): 341 - 50 (1983).

The Costs of Participation Incentives Should Be Compared to the Change in Behavior That They Cause

Participation incentives are designed to change behavior. In Going Home, program officials and providers have talked about using incentives to change both the duration and quality of participation. When designing such incentives, program officials should consider, at least qualitatively, whether the cost of the incentive exceeds the value of any benefits expected to accrue from the behavior that the incentives were intended to change.

For example, program officials would not want to offer a \$100,000 cash reward to U-TURN completers, if they believed that it was highly unlikely that completing U-TURN could generate \$100,000 in benefits to participants and to society. Notice that in this extreme hypothetical example, we expect such a large an incentive to generate high completion rates among participants in U-TURN. In this way the incentive has worked to achieve an important objective of program officials. But at the same time, we would be skeptical that the benefits from the impressive participation rates resulting from this incentive are worth such large expenditures.

The foregoing example is extreme for the purposes of illustration. But the concept illustrated here is helpful when assessing other incentive schemes. Some people we have interviewed suggest that a GH participant should be transferred back to his parent institution from the ATC if he fails to comply with various program participation criteria. This proposal has several variations ranging from (a) allowing for several warnings or intermediate penalties before transferring a participant back to his parent institution to (b) petitioning the state Parole Review Board to allow failure to participate in GH at a satisfactory level after parole to constitute a parole violation. When such a violation occurs, the GH participant might have to return to his parent institution to serve out the remainder of his term. A common component in all of these incentive schemes is that failure to participate in GH leads to the penalty that the GH participant returns to prison.

Does this participation incentive have merit? We have no empirical basis for answering this question one-way or the other. But our framework indicates that qualitative discussions of this incentive should consider the following two points: First, will the incentive cause sufficient behavior change and will the change be in a desired direction? This suggested policy appears to create a strong incentive for participants to remain in Going Home and to complete different components of the program. But, in practice, a key question is how much are participants actually affected by such a strong incentive? For example, what will be the likely percentage point increase in completion rates of U-TURN modules with this incentive compared to what it would be presently without it?

Second, whether the program should incorporate the penalty of transferring those whose GH participation is unsatisfactory back to their parent institution depends on whether the cost of this incentive is worth the behavioral change it generates. Sending a GH participant back to his parent institution to serve out the remainder of his term is an expensive incentive compared to allowing him to complete his time at the ATC and be released for parole. Computations of the high average cost of incarceration are well known (and available on the IDOC's website). To be sure, these average cost calculations likely overstate the incremental cost of sending a GH participant back to his parent institution. But, they are illustrative of the approximate value of

benefits that program officials should expect participants and society to receive from increased GH participation if they were to choose to incorporate this participation incentive into the current GH program. The idea here is that to justify an expensive participation incentive, it must yield valuable improvements in program participation.

Do Participation Incentives Change Behavior In Desirable Ways For All Participants?

A third question to consider when designing participation incentives in a prisoner reentry program is whether the range of behavioral changes caused by the incentive constitute uniformly desirable outcomes. Consider the following example in which a reward for completing a prisoner reentry program may provide undesirable incentives for those participants who are unlikely to complete all program components anyway.

Assume that in this hypothetical incentive scheme program participants receive a significant amount of pocket money as a reward for completing the program.⁵ They receive no prorated benefits if they complete part of the program. The point to recognize about this scheme is that it does not reward participation unless the participant completes the program. The structure of the incentive suggests that program officials do not think that participation short of completing the program is valuable to the participant or to society. According to this incentive scheme, the value to the participant and to society from completing only one-half of the program is the same as if the same participant was a program no-show.

It is possible that in a program like U-TURN, the skills acquired are only valuable when individuals complete all program modules. But this possibility should be discussed as officials and providers consider incorporating more participation incentives into the GH program. The question here is: Does the foregoing incentive scheme cause some participants to receive fewer reentry services than they might have received if the scheme was prorated? A related question is: Are the added incentives being implemented in conjunction with increased expectations for GH participants in program?

To help foster discussions of these questions we provide an example from the high stakes testing education literature. Many states have enacted policies that require all secondary students to pass a standardized exam in order to receive a high school diploma. This test is intended to certify that the student has mastered certain skills considered essential for high school graduates. Under this policy, students have an incentive to master these skills in return for a very important reward: a high school degree.

Although, the high-stakes testing regime has positive effects on the skill attainment of some students, this policy has undesirable effects on the behavior of students who are likely to dropout of school anyway (Jacobs 2001). Students who believe that higher skill standards make it less likely they can succeed have a greater incentive to dropout earlier. Without the high stakes regime, they would believe that their chances of completing high school are greater and they would stay in school at higher rates.

⁵ As an example, participants in the U.S. Department of Labor's Job Corps program receive a small cash bonus if they complete the program. This program provides a comprehensive set of residential, health, education and training services to economically disadvantaged 16 to 24 year olds.

What is the problem with higher and earlier high school dropout rates? If completing additional years of high school short of attaining a high school degree had no effect on an individual's labor market prospects, we might conclude that this outcome is not a big problem. In fact, however, those who complete more years of school earn more in the labor market during their working lives even if they do not receive a high school diploma. In particular, individuals who complete 11 years of school on average earn more than individuals who complete only 10 years of school. If high stakes testing causes higher and earlier dropout rates, the benefits associated with high school graduates who attain the required skill levels may be offset by the loss of skills among the program dropouts. In summary, the incentives created by high stakes testing appear to have led to higher skills among high school graduates (i.e. the program completers) and lower skill levels among the high school dropouts.

The foregoing example of high stakes testing carries over to the design of appropriate participation incentives for the Illinois Going Home program. Suppose GH officials consider implementing one of two participation incentives. The first incentive scheme provides a bonus only after participants complete a range of program components. The second incentive scheme provides a smaller reward when participants complete each component of the program. In the first scheme the reward is "back loaded," while in the second scheme reward payments are spread out over the program components. The high-stakes testing example above suggests that these incentive schemes will generate different behaviors for different participants.

Consider the first incentive scheme. Individuals who are likely to participate in some GH services without any incentives are likely to increase their participation because of the incentive. For those with initial interest in the program, completing the program involves less additional commitment than does program completion by a participant who would be a program no-show if the program had no additional participation incentives. For the program no-shows, the first incentive scheme requires a much larger commitment in order for them to receive the reward. Since their small changes in commitment to the program are not rewarded, there is no point in the no-shows increasing participation as a result of the incentive. Accordingly, we expect that such no shows (or early dropouts) will be unaffected by the first incentive.

The second scheme provides incentives for the no-shows (and early dropouts) to increase their participation in GH. For example, in this case, attending and completing an additional U-TURN module is rewarded. By contrast, for those who would have completed many GH sessions even without additional participation incentives, the second incentive scheme is likely less attractive and so induces less change in their participation patterns. Since the reward in the second incentive scheme is not "back loaded" the smaller additional commitment required of these individuals to complete the program is not rewarded as heavily as it is under the first incentive scheme. Since the rewards for these participants are less, we expect fewer of them to complete all the desired GH components than would be the case under the first incentive scheme.

We summarize the participation outcomes associated with these two incentive schemes as follows: Program completion rates are likely higher under the first scheme than under the second scheme. The first incentive scheme rewards completion. But total reentry services received may be higher under the second incentive scheme than the first. The second scheme rewards the

completion of components of the program. Which scheme to choose depends on how important it is for participants to complete a total designated set of services relative to the value of completing individual program components.

Provide Rewards or Bonuses When A Program Requires That Participants Attain a Minimum Threshold for Performance Before Its Services Have Value

A fourth question to consider when designing program participation incentives are those circumstances under which officials should characterize their incentives as a reward or bonus. These circumstances might arise if GH has value only after its participants complete a certain number of sessions or program components. For example, if U-TURN officials believed that their services only had value once a participant had attended all modules, then an appropriate incentive scheme would provide a reward or bonus to the participant only after they completed all modules. No rewards (or penalties) should be provided prior to attaining this participation threshold, because program operators believe that these services by themselves do not yet have value. For example, suppose the value of program participation by two participants, one who had attended 1/4 of the U-TURN sessions and the other who had attended 1/5 of the sessions is the same. Since these different levels of participation are valued equally they should be rewarded equally. In this case participants who complete 1/4 of the session should not receive any reward (or penalty) relative to their counterparts who completed 1/5 of the sessions.

Provide Penalties and Sanctions When Participants Attain a Level of Performance In Which Additional Participation Ceases to Have Value.

Based on our formal interviews and informal discussions with individuals who work with male reentrants, we believe this principle is not likely to apply to GH participants. It would arise if some participants used program services excessively, beyond the point at which program operators believed that the participant or society was gaining any additional value from their participation in the program. If this type of participant was common, GH officials might want to consider implementing an incentive scheme that would deter this type of behavior. However, everything that is known about the young males targeted for GH services indicates that the problem of excessive use of GH services is highly unlikely.

Why Participation Incentives May Be Necessary And For Whom

The problem of implementing appropriate participation incentives for Going Home arises because participants themselves do not perceive that the benefits they expect to attain from the program are worth the commitment. Some people we interviewed mentioned that the young men targeted for GH lack sufficient knowledge about the world of work to be able to make informed decisions about the duration and quality of their participation in the program. Indeed, part of the purpose of programs such as U-TURN is to provide such information to reentrants.

Under this scenario, a fully informed participant would not require additional participation incentives. Their incentive to participate is the benefits they will later realize when after they acquire the full range of GH services. Participants who are unfamiliar with the value

of GH services may require additional participation incentives not because GH services are less beneficial for them, but simply because they perceive them as less beneficial than they really are.

In this vein, it is not surprising that the most successful GH participant to date is a man who voluntarily enrolled in the program after being paroled from his parent institution. This person's incentives to participate are different from participants who have been transferred from their parent institution to the Westside ATC. GH participants who volunteer once on parole tend to be individuals who perceive that the benefits of the GH program to be larger than do other participants. This is why they do not require the additional participation incentive.

An important question to follow in the GH evaluation is whether the duration and quality of participation differs between participants who are transferred to the ATC and those who volunteer once paroled. We expect the latter group to perform better while in the program. If this is the case, how should program officials interpret any differences in outcomes, such as recidivism and employment rates, between the two groups? How much of the differences in outcomes are due program participation and how much are the result of preexisting systematic differences between these two groups of reentrants? We will examine these issues further in the final report.