

PREP: POST RELEASE EMPLOYMENT PROJECT

INTERIM REPORT

Office of Research and Evaluation  
Federal Bureau of Prisons

October 1, 1985

## ABSTRACT

### PREP: POST-RELEASE EMPLOYMENT PROJECT

#### THE EFFECTS OF WORK SKILLS ACQUISITION IN PRISON ON POST-RELEASE EMPLOYMENT AND RECIDIVISM AMONG FEDERAL OFFENDERS

The Post Release Employment Project (PREP) is designed to answer two fundamental questions about the Bureau of Prisons' work and vocational training programs. Do these programs assist the offender's transition back into society, helping him/her to find and maintain a job? Which prison industry jobs, vocational and apprenticeship training programs are most effective in meeting this goal of successful transition?

In August, 1983, Gerald Farkas, Assistant Director overseeing UNICOR, asked the Office of Research to design an evaluation of these work programs. With the endorsement of Norman Carlson, Director, and the Executive Staff, a nationwide evaluation of all Bureau of Prisons' industrial and vocational training programs was begun in the Fall of 1983.

This abstract summarizes the data currently available from PREP. In addition to the data reported here, an interim report is available describing the research design, data collection procedures, comparison group selection procedure and a theoretical discussion of skills acquisition.

There are essentially two research groups in the PREP design. A study group is comprised of inmates who work in prison industries and/or who take vocational training courses and/or who are enrolled in an apprenticeship training curriculum, and a comparison group is comprised of members who have not participated in any of these programs.

The preliminary data available from PREP can be divided into two basic sets of results. The first set of results describes the differences between study and comparison group members based on pre-incarceration, offense and release method information. Although the more interesting results will be the post-release differences in employment and recidivism for these two groups, the current data gives us an insight into the type of inmate most likely to take these programs. The second set of results describes the training and employment characteristics of study group members, including information from pre-incarceration, incarceration and post-release occupations.

#### Who is Most Likely to Participate in Work and Vocational Training Programs?

The results of the analyses contrasting comparison and study group offenders indicate that relative to the comparison population, study group members are:

- . disproportionately female and nonhispanic--females and nonhispanics being overrepresented
- . disproportionately non-black--blacks being underrepresented
- . offenders with fewer previous convictions
- . offenders with more prior commitments
- . more likely to have been incarcerated for longer periods of time on current or prior sentences

- . less likely to have a recent history of any minor violent episode prior to their current commitment offense
- . less likely to have a recent history of any serious violent episode prior to their current commitment offense
- . younger at commitment
- . more likely to have a violent commitment offense
- . less likely to have been committed for extortion, fraud or bribery
- . more likely to have higher security score totals indicating that the study group members were originally designated at higher security level institutions
- . more likely to release to a CTC rather than to parole

The picture that emerges from this "profile" of study group offenders is that, as a group, they are more likely to have committed a violent instant offense and generally have more serious criminal careers than the comparison population; however, prior to their current offense, they were less likely to have committed any kind of violent behavior than was the comparison population. One of the reasons that they tend to participate in programs is that they serve more time in prison and therefore have a longer period of time to train and work.

#### A Profile of Occupational Characteristics of the Study Group

In order to address the issues involved in skills acquisition, PREP was designed to follow the occupational chronology of an offender. This chronology includes: pre-incarceration occupation, prison jobs or vocational training, CTC employment, and employment the offender pursues when he/she is released to the community under supervision. Although there is currently not enough data to examine specific changes the individual offender makes in his/her employment history, Table 1 represents the occupational distributions of 750 study group members over the observation period. The columns display the relative percentages of the study group who were employed (or trained) in the occupational groups. For comparison purposes, column 1 represents the U.S. labor force in 1971. The six month follow-up column represents the first job of an offender under parole supervision. See Appendix A for lists of occupations.

Relative to the U.S. labor force in 1971, study group offenders are significantly underrepresented in professional, technical, managerial and clerical, sales occupations. It is only within UNICOR that offenders approach the level of clerical and sales occupations of the U.S. labor force. It is also clear from Table 1 that UNICOR jobs are concentrated in clerical, sales and benchwork occupations. This is partly due to the nature of the labor intensive industries required by UNICOR to employ its inmates.

There is not a very drastic change in the pre-incarceration and parole supervision distribution of occupations. Professional, technical and managerial occupations decline and miscellaneous occupations increase somewhat. An additional analysis not represented in Table 1 indicated that close to 50% of the study group maintained the same pre- and post-prison occupational category. These kinds of analyses will be more meaningful when contrasted to comparison group offenders and when more data is available to examine more specific occupational subgroups.

### Other Preliminary Study Group Findings

Some of the other findings for the study group include:

- . Only 30% of the group have worked continuously for the five years prior to the current incarceration
- . On average, these offenders have worked 32.7 out of a possible 60 months prior to incarceration
- . 44% of the group had less than a high school equivalency degree prior to their commitment--37% had a high school degree or high school equivalency degree
- . 25% of the sample had improved their educational standing while in prison
- . 81.2% of the group completed their CTC stay--the major reasons for CTC failure were disciplinary infractions (7.8%), escapes (4.8%), and administrative reasons (4.0%)
- . Among offenders who successfully completed their CTC stay, the average tenure was 104 days; the average number of work days was 74; the average percentage of days worked out of all possible work days was 77%; the average hourly earnings was \$5.35; 50% of all inmates made less than \$4.00 per hour; the average total earnings while at a CTC was \$2,133.50; 15% had no full time job while at the CTC; 62% had one full time job throughout their CTC tenure, 18% had two consecutive jobs, and 4.5% had three or more consecutive jobs
- . Almost 70% of all offenders obtained a job on their own initiative, either by themselves (47.9%), through their relatives (8.9%), or friends (12.8%)
- . A CTC counselor is four times as likely to help an offender get a job than is a local employment agency
- . During the first six months of parole supervision, 15% of the offenders have been unable to find any jobs, 64% have had one job, and 21% have had two to four consecutive jobs
- . The average monthly earnings of offenders on parole in the first six months rose from \$896.50 in the first month to \$944.40 in the sixth month, an increase of 5.4%; this applies only to those who had a job.

Although PREP is already yielding interesting data on the employment patterns of the offender, the more important questions require more data. The issue of specific skills acquisition in UNICOR or vocational training and its effect on post-release employment and crime is the main purpose of the evaluation. The Research Office will produce another interim report when enough comparison group data is available to make some post-release contrasts.

TABLE 1

OCCUPATIONAL CHANGES IN THE STUDY GROUP

Occupational Classification	U.S. Labor Force, 1971	Study Group Sample				
		Pre-Incarceration	Vocational Training	UNICOR	CTC	Six Month Follow-Up
Professional, Technical	25%	14.4%	11.3%	2.1%	8.5%	9.2%
Clerical, Sales	25	16.4	13.2	22.1	17.9	18.0
Service	16	14.5	7.8	2.1	15.2	12.1
Agriculture, Fishing	4	3.5	1.6	0	1.6	4.8
Processing	2	1.2	9.1	.9	1.1	1.1
Machine Trade	6	10.5	21.3	14.3	8.9	10.3
Benchwork	4	4.3	2.2	44.0	3.7	4.0
Structural Work	9	23.9	25.1	5.8	33.8	25.0
Miscellaneous	8	11.2	8.2	8.8	9.4	15.4
	100%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Number of Cases	60,441	696*	319	434	627	272

\*Although the study group has a total of 750 observations, the column totals differ for several reasons:

- The pre-incarceration column has a small percentage of missing data (7%)
- The vocational training and UNICOR columns represent only those members of the study group sample who were participating in either of these programs
- The CTC column represents only those offenders having CTC employment
- The six month follow-up column has 272 cases because there are only 319 offenders who have completed six months of supervision, and 15% of this total held no jobs during this follow-up period

## APPENDIX A

### LISTING OF OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES, DIVISIONS, AND GROUPS

PROFESSIONAL, TECHNICAL, AND MANAGERIAL OCCUPATIONS INCLUDE OCCUPATIONS IN:

Architecture, engineering, surveying, mathematics, physical sciences, life sciences, social sciences, medicine, health, education, museum sciences, library sciences, archival sciences, law, jurisprudence, religion, theology, writing, art, entertainment, recreation, administrative specializations, managing, officiating, and miscellaneous professional, technical and managerial occupations.

CLERICAL AND SALES OCCUPATIONS INCLUDE OCCUPATIONS IN:

Stenography, typing, filing, and related occupations, computing and account-recording, production and stock clerking and related occupations, information and message distribution, miscellaneous clerical occupations, sales occupations and services, consumable commodities, commodities and miscellaneous sales occupations.

SERVICE OCCUPATIONS INCLUDE OCCUPATIONS IN:

Domestic service, food and beverage preparation and services, lodging and related services, barbering, cosmetology, and related services, amusement, recreation services, miscellaneous personal services, apparel and furnishings services, protective services, building and related services.

AGRICULTURAL, FISHERY, FORESTRY, AND RELATED OCCUPATIONS INCLUDE OCCUPATIONS IN:

Plant farming, animal farming, miscellaneous agricultural and related occupations, fishery and related occupations, forestry, hunting, trapping and related occupations.

PROCESSING OCCUPATIONS INCLUDE OCCUPATIONS IN:

Processing of metal, ore refining, foundry, processing of food, tobacco, and related products, processing of paper and related materials, processing of petroleum, coal, natural and manufactured gas, and related products, processing of chemicals, plastics, synthetics, rubber, paint, and related products, processing of wood and wood products, processing of stone, clay, glass, and related products, occupations in processing of leather, textiles, and related products.

MACHINE TRADES OCCUPATIONS INCLUDE OCCUPATIONS IN:

Metal machining, metalworking, mechanics repair, machinery repair, paperworking, printing, wood machining, machining stone, clay, glass, and related materials, textiles, machine trades.

BENCHWORK OCCUPATIONS INCLUDE OCCUPATIONS IN:

Fabrication, assembly, and repair of metal products, fabrication and repair of scientific, medical, photographic, optical, horological, and related products, assembly and repair of electrical equipment, fabrication and repair of products made from assorted materials, painting, decorating, and related occupations, fabrication and repair of plastics, synthetics, rubber, and related products, fabrication and repair of wood products, fabrication and repair of sand, stone, clay, and glass products, fabrication and repair of textile, leather, and related products.

STRUCTURAL WORK OCCUPATIONS INCLUDE OCCUPATIONS IN:

Metal fabricating, welding, cutting, electrical assembling, installing, and repairing, painting, plastering, waterproofing, cementing, excavating, grading, paving, and construction.

MISCELLANEOUS OCCUPATIONS INCLUDE OCCUPATIONS IN:

Motor freight, transportation, packaging and materials handling, extraction of minerals, production and distribution of utilities, amusement, recreation, motion picture, radio and television, and graphic art work.

## PREP: POST RELEASE EMPLOYMENT PROJECT

### THE EFFECTS OF WORK SKILLS ACQUISITION IN PRISON ON POST-RELEASE EMPLOYMENT AND RECIDIVISM AMONG FEDERAL OFFENDERS

In August, 1983, the Office of Research and Evaluation was asked by Gerald Farkas, Assistant Director in charge of UNICOR, to design and implement an evaluation of the Bureau of Prisons' work and vocational training programs. The Post Release Employment Project (PREP) was designed to address two primary issues. Do these programs assist the offender's transition back into society, helping him to get and maintain a job? Which prison industry jobs, and vocational or apprenticeship training programs are most effective in meeting the goal of successful transition? Rather than approach this problem piecemeal, the Bureau of Prisons' Executive Staff endorsed a national project to examine all prison industry jobs and all vocational and apprenticeship programs.

Vocational and apprenticeship training programs primarily provide opportunities for the acquisition of specific work skills. However, prison industries serve many purposes. They offer an offender meaningful work and an opportunity to earn money to help provide for his family or cushion his transition into the community. Prison industry employment allows the offender to acquire the habits of work: punctuality, dependability, job performance and job supervision. Any meaningful evaluation must consider both the acquisition of specific skills and the development of good work habits.

An integral part of some inmates' post-release success has been thought to be the employment opportunities encountered in a community treatment center (CTC). For this reason, the Community Program's branch, which administers the CTC program, participated in the initial planning of PREP. PREP was subsequently expanded to assess the employment experience of an offender during his CTC tenure, and to formalize a method of providing CTC counselors with the offender's work and vocational training experience.

Since PREP's inception, the Office of Research has received the cooperation and assistance of the Community Programs, Education and Correctional Programs branches. Because PREP has required the assistance of institutional staff in case management, education and UNICOR and community program managers throughout the country, it has been crucial to gain the continued support of these line staff (approximately 450 employees) for the success of the project. UNICOR has provided funding and administrative support, without which the project would be hard-pressed to survive.

This interim report is divided into three sections intended to provide an overview of the purpose of PREP, the logistics and status of data collection efforts and an initial examination of some of the data already collected.

In the first section, the question of skills acquisition and training is placed in the broader context of unemployment and crime.



## I. Theoretical Background: The Link Between Unemployment and Crime

There is a great deal of theoretical and empirical support for the proposition that unemployment results in criminal activity<sup>1</sup>. An unfortunate consequence of this link is the cycle of criminal activity that results. Having committed crime, the offender is less likely to pursue licit activities once again. There are many theoretical reasons for this reciprocal relationship between crime and unemployment (see especially Thornberry and Christenson,<sup>2</sup>). All of these points of view converge on the proposition that it is difficult to break the chain of criminal activity, especially for the young offender.

Efforts at interrupting this chain of criminal activity have focused on the rehabilitation of the prisoner. Because the terminology of rehabilitation has a medical and/or psychological connotation, the model was associated with unsuccessful attempts to change enduring personality traits of the offender. This orientation has since met its demise in criminological theory and practice and less ambitious goals of rehabilitation have supplanted the former model.

Prison systems have a very difficult agenda if they are to impact on the criminal "carrer". A prison term typically is the result of many previous arrests and convictions for the offender. Thus, for many incarcerates, the reciprocal influence of criminal activity and unemployment is well established. Data from PREP indicates that in the five years previous to the offender's current incarceration, half of the study group sample worked less than fifty percent of the time. Forty-two percent worked two years or less in that five year period. At this point we cannot rule out the possibility that the younger offenders were primarily responsible for this unemployment figure. Young people in general are less likely to be employed and are more likely to have other socially acceptable preoccupations such as school.

Two major investigations of the link between work and crime offer insights into the employment-crime relationship. The transitional aid research project (TARP), which took place in Texas and Georgia, examined the influence of providing ex-offenders with monetary compensation during the first year after release from prison. Rossi, Berk and Lenihan<sup>3</sup> concluded that this kind of "unemployment insurance" had two competing influences: the money provided allowed offenders more of an opportunity to find gainful employment without resorting to crime or settling for a menial job; however, the money was also a disincentive. Ex-offenders were less likely to look for work because they were receiving money. Rossi et al. have suggested that transitional aid can work if it is coupled with an incentive to find a job.

Schmidt and Witte<sup>4</sup> have reviewed the evidence regarding post-release employment among offenders. These authors have concluded the following:

- . job terminations are typically the releasee's choice rather than the employer's choice
- . post-release supervision has competing influences on employment productivity--supervision results in maintaining a job, but at lower

- wages than unsupervised releasees
- . when work programs allow offenders to accumulate money, inmates are more successful following release because they have more freedom to find a better paying job
- . unlike most subpopulations of the labor force, inmates' age and education have little impact on their labor market success
- . jobs obtained by releasees are typically low wage and low skilled
- . offenders exhibit a great deal of instability in their post release employment record
- . offenders who remain employed typically have jobs in the lowest skill categories, working mainly in large manufacturing industries
- . in Michigan, at least, halfway house (CTC's) participation has contributed to higher post-release wage earnings
- . relatively stable characteristics of the offender population contribute to higher wages--thus white, able bodied, married men with dependents earn higher wages upon their release; since these are traits that cannot be manipulated, they are included in the research overview because they are characteristics one must account for in any research or evaluation endeavor
- . the most compelling variables in determining post-release wages are those associated with the economic structure of the labor market--these include the occupation of the employed, the industry of employment and the economic climate of the geographic area of employment
- . Schmidt and Witte cite Borus, Hardin and Terry<sup>5</sup> who concluded that programs designed to improve basic or vocational skills of offenders have failed to affect post-release employment

In related research on the hard core unemployed (HCU), Goldstein<sup>6</sup> has reviewed the training literature devoted to helping HCUs overcome unemployment. Goldstein argues that skill training alone does not address the problems of the hard core unemployed. HCUs have developed expectations of job failure that are difficult to overcome. It is unclear the extent to which the hard core unemployed and criminally unemployed populations overlap. Nevertheless, the problems faced by each population are similar. Their experience with the labor market has been generally unsuccessful, and their skill levels are quite low.

In yet another related topic, some economists (see especially Piore<sup>7</sup>) have argued for a segmented labor market to explain differences in the unemployment patterns of the poor and the more advantaged. The primary sector of the labor market is characterized by jobs which form a progression from lower to higher pay. One's skills and experience contribute to promotional opportunities. In the secondary labor market, all skill levels are relatively low. This has the unfortunate consequence of making human labor expendable in the sense that one individual is as good as any other. The secondary labor market is characterized by high instability, a low expectation for advancement and low wages.

If one's entry level is an occupation in the secondary labor market, then one's opportunities are severely limited. There is no good evidence concerning the entry level occupations of ex-offenders, although it can be surmised that many have low or no skills. This would suggest that skills

training can raise the entry level position of ex-offenders in order that they may gain successful entry into the primary labor market.

Although Schmidt and Witte have presented evidence on broad occupational classes of ex-offenders' jobs upon release, PREP has the advantage of organizing occupations by Dictionary of Occupational Title codes. This will allow us to use job characteristics already developed by the Department of Labor<sup>8</sup>.

These characteristics include an occupation's relation to data, people and things. For example, the eight possible relations for people are mentoring, negotiating, instructing, supervising, diverting, persuading, speaking-signalling, serving and no significant relationship. A training scale (General Educational Development) is also available in which each occupation has a score of one (apply common sense understanding) to six (apply principles of logic or scientific thinking). The SVP scale (Specific Vocational Preparation) ranges from one to nine and indicates skill acquisition time. A job is also scored for temperaments including variety, repetitiveness, degree of independent judgment and degree of independent control. All of these scales should allow us to specifically characterize the kinds of training offenders are receiving and the kinds of occupations they are getting upon release from prison. This composite picture of skill level will allow us to address the issue of skills acquisition in relation to the entry level into the labor force.

One limitation of PREP is that the measurement of employment chronology will only be for one year. Labor force mobility tables are often based on ten or more years of data. However, the first year after release is most crucial for the ex-offender. This is true from both a criminological perspective (initial wage earnings are important in predicting recidivism) and from an economic perspective (entry level occupations are crucial in restricting or expanding further employment opportunities).

In summary, the evidence on the employment patterns of released offenders is that they constitute a somewhat unique labor market segment. Traditional methods of employer training and educational enhancement often prove to be inadequate in elevating post-release wages and enhancing work stability. Although the empirical evidence on specific skill training for prisoners is scant, some researchers have claimed that skill training alone is inadequate to bolster the employment stability of the ex-offender.

PREP was undertaken to examine closely the impact of skill training both within a work environment (industrial employment in UNICOR) and within the classroom (vocational training). Past research has either contrasted broad programs such as work release without assessing differences in skill training, or has failed to account for the inmate's relative performance in learning or demonstrating his skills and/or work habits. PREP includes work and vocational training performance evaluations as an integral part of the data collection procedure to assess these influences on the inmate's post-release success.

If specific skill training can be identified which improves the likelihood of an ex-offender acquiring and maintaining a job, then the Bureau of Prisons

can contribute to the successful mainstreaming of inmates in meaningful work. Based on the evidence already reviewed, meaningful work should result in lower recidivism rates.

An ancillary, but equally important issue addressed by PREP is the degree to which institutional adjustment is affected by UNICOR and/or vocational training participation. Institutional misconduct records are part of the PREP data collection effort. They serve a twofold purpose. Misconduct is a control variable which will be incorporated into analyses of post-release employment and recidivism. The expectation is that inmates who have a record of misconduct are more likely to exhibit poor adjustment back into society.

Furthermore, we expect inmates with little or no UNICOR experience and little or no effort in education and vocational training to have poorer institutional adjustment. Although this is generally presumed to be the case among line staff, the extent or strength of this relationship will be of particular interest.

The following section provides an overview of the data collection procedures, instruments and the research design.

## II. Research Design and Data Collection Methods

### II.A. The Research Design

PREP is a longitudinal assessment of two research groups, a study and comparison group. Study group members are participants in programs involving industries (UNICOR) and/or vocational training and/or apprenticeship training. Thus, study group members can be participants in any or all of these programs. Table 1 indicates the percentage of study group participants for whom we have data who have participated in these programs. There are 742 study group members who have been released either to a CTC or community supervision whose data has been received and coded.

Table 1

<u>Inmate involved in:</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
UNICOR Only	56.5%
Vocational Training Only	22.9%
Apprenticeship Training Only	1.9%
UNICOR and Vocational Training	15.0%
UNICOR and Apprenticeship Training	1.1%
Vocational and Apprenticeship Training	2.0%
UNICOR, Vocational and Apprenticeship Training	.7%

The study group is actually several subgroups as indicated by the above table. Comparison group members are a sample of inmates who do not meet the programming criteria indicated in the above table. This group is selected based on a matching methodology, discussed below, called propensity score

analysis. Briefly, propensity score analysis is a method to match or pair study group members with comparison group members who have similar criminal history and demographic characteristics.

To ensure post-release evaluation, a further requirement for both study and comparison group participants is that they are released through a CTC or that they have at least six months of supervision.

The research design and the data to be collected are represented in Table 2A on the following page. Table 2B represents the follow-up periods and procedures for offenders who release directly to community supervision or who release to a CTC. As can be seen from these tables, most data collection procedures are the same for the study and comparison groups. The major exception is the misconduct record. This information comes from the inmate's central file. Although the source of these records for both study and comparison groups is the central file, the misconduct data is being recorded by institutional staff for the study group and by the Research Office for the comparison group. The central file is a composite of any information contained on the offender. When an inmate is released, other records including his medical history and clinic utilization are archived as a part of the central file.

Data collection for PREP began in the fall of 1983 with the implementation of the project in four pilot institutions. Full data collection began in January, 1984 in all Bureau of Prisons institutions; however, startup in some institutions did not begin for nearly a year. Because all of the data collection for this project is done by field staff, research staff made site visits to over 20 of the 47 institutions involved in the study and attended national meetings involving these staff to clarify and receive feedback on the project. Many logistical details were cleared up and modifications to the instructions for the project were made.

Two major evaluation procedures necessary for the purposes of this study were implemented in UNICOR and Education departments nationally. UNICOR instituted a mandatory work performance evaluation that is also to be filed in an inmate's central file (see Appendix A.). This makes his work record available to other institutional staff and established a uniform procedure for evaluation. A course completion evaluation was also established for vocational training courses. Both of these uniform procedures were instituted with the cooperation of UNICOR and Education and were fully endorsed and implemented by these departments.

The following section briefly describes the logistics of data collection for the research groups.

## II.B. Data Collection

Because PREP is a longitudinal design, inmates are constantly being identified for inclusion in the study whether they are study or comparison group subjects. Field personnel are responsible for determining which inmates who are soon to be released will qualify as study group participants. Research staff match study group participants with comparison group participants who release in the same time frame (on a quarterly basis).

TABLE 1

OCCUPATIONAL CHANGES IN THE STUDY GROUP

Occupational Classification	U.S. Labor Force, 1971	Study Group Sample				
		Pre-Incarceration	Vocational Training	UNICOR	CTC	Six Month Follow-Up
Professional, Technical	25%	14.4%	11.3%	2.1%	8.5%	9.2%
Clerical, Sales	25	16.4	13.2	22.1	17.9	18.0
Service	15	14.5	7.8	2.1	15.2	12.1
Agriculture, Fishing	4	3.5	1.6	0	1.6	4.8
Processing	2	1.2	9.1	.9	1.1	1.1
Machine Trade	6	10.5	21.3	14.3	8.9	10.3
Benchwork	4	4.3	2.2	44.0	3.7	4.0
Structural Work	9	23.9	25.1	5.8	33.8	25.0
Miscellaneous	8	11.2	8.2	8.8	9.4	15.4
	100%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Number of Cases	60,441	696*	319	434	627	272

\*Although the study group has a total of 750 observations, the column totals differ for several reasons:

- The pre-incarceration column has a small percentage of missing data (7%)
- The vocational training and UNICOR columns represent only those members of the study group sample who were participating in either of these programs
- The CTC column represents only those offenders having CTC employment
- The six month follow-up column has 272 cases because there are only 319 offenders who have completed six months of supervision, and 15% of this total held no jobs during this follow-up period

TABLE 2A

DIAGRAM OF POST RELEASE EMPLOYMENT PROJECT DATA ELEMENTS

Research Group	Criteria for Inclusion in the Project	Pre-determined Factors to be Controlled For	Institutional Factors	Evaluation Criteria
Study Group	All inmates who work in UNICOR for six months or longer or who have completed a vocational training or apprenticeship program while incarcerated	Pre-incarceration education, employment, and criminal history information--to be collected from the UNICOR/Vocational Training Evaluation Form and BOP automated data files	Misconduct reports, program involvement--to be collected from the UNICOR/Vocational Training Evaluation Form and BOP automated data files	Job category (DOT code), number of days worked, earnings, recidivism--to be collected via telephone interviews to the CTC, if applicable, and to the parole officer six and twelve months after an inmate's release from Bureau of Prisons' custody
Comparison Group	A sample of inmates with less than six months or no UNICOR work experience, or who did not enroll in or successfully complete a vocational training or apprenticeship program while incarcerated	Pre-incarceration education, employment, and criminal history information--to be collected from BOP automated data files only	Misconduct reports, program involvement--to be collected from an inmate's Central File and from BOP automated data files	Job category (DOT code), number of days worked, earnings, recidivism--to be collected via telephone interviews to the CTC, if applicable, and to the parole officer six and twelve months after an inmate's release from Bureau of Prisons' custody

TABLE 2B

SCHEDULE OF PHONE CALL FOLLOW-UPS FOR DATA COLLECTION FOR THE POST RELEASE EMPLOYMENT PROJECT

Method of Release	Preliminary Call	Interview 1	Interview 2
1. If an inmate transfers from an institution to a CTC, then is released to parole:	1-3 mos. after transfer from institution:	6 mos. after release from CTC:	12 mos. after release from CTC:
	Initial call to CTC to find out release date and parole officer's name.	First call to parole officer	Final call to parole officer
2. If an inmate is released from institution to supervision (parole or mandatory release):		6 mos. after release from institution:	12 mos. after release from institution:
		First call to parole officer	Final call to parole officer
Months after release from Federal Bureau of Prisons' custody		0*	6
			12

\*At the time of release from the CTC, a questionnaire is completed by the CTC Counselor. The institution and CTC release dates will be determined from an automated data file (continuous action file) on a weekly basis.



Study group participants have a data collection form, called a UNICOR/Vocational Training Evaluation Form (U/VT form), filled out by line staff. Comparison group offenders do not have this instrument; however, their automated records and central files will be culled for similar information.

#### II.B.1. Data collection: Field Personnel

Information concerning an inmate's participation in UNICOR, vocational training or apprenticeship programs as well as his or her institutional conduct is collected on the nine page UNICOR/Vocational Training Evaluation Form. Instructions detailing the selection of inmates and the completion of the U/VT form were distributed as an Operations Memorandum which appears in Appendix B. The U/VT form itself, which is actually a part of the Operations Memorandum, appears in Appendix C. The Case Manager (an inmate's caseworker) is responsible for overseeing the completion of this form and deciding whether an inmates meets the study group criteria. This decision occurs when the Case Manager prepares the release paperwork on an inmate, approximately two weeks prior to an inmate's release from the institution.

The Case Manager completes the first three pages of the form which contain identifying information (name, social security number, etc.), the criteria on which the inmate qualifies for inclusion as a research participant, location of the halfway house, if any, and of the supervising Probation Office, information about pre-incarceration education and employment history, and a record of any institutional misconduct. If the inmate has been employed in UNICOR for six months or longer, the Case Manager must also attach a copy of the inmate's most recent work performance evaluation.

The form is then forwarded to the Education Supervisor (the head of the Education Department) who has designated a staff member to complete questions pertaining to all vocational training or apprenticeship courses which an inmate has completed, including the course title, enrollment date, and a performance rating. When the Education Section is complete, the form is returned to the Case Manager who checks to see that the first two sections have been filled out and that the UNICOR performance evaluation is attached, if necessary.

The form is then sent to the Case Management Specialist (the supervisor of all Case Managers at an institution) along with other materials pertaining to the inmate's release. The Case Management Specialist (CMS) detaches a duplicate copy of the first page of the U/VT form, which includes identifying information and the basis for inclusion in the project. The duplicate first page is mailed to the Central Research Office so staff may begin scheduling follow-up telephone calls to the CTC and to the inmate's parole officer. A case management activities assignment of "PREP" was installed on the Bureau's online data base, SENTRY. This assignment is used to ensure accountability of the institutional data collection process by both the CMS and Central Office staff.

After reviewing the first two sections of the form for completeness, the CMS sends it to one of two places: if the inmate is released directly to

the community, the form is sent to the Community Programs Branch in the Central Office; if the inmate is released through a CTC, the form is sent to the appropriate Community Programs Manager (the person responsible for placing the inmate in the halfway house) along with the inmate's other release papers.

The Community Programs Manager (CPM) then forwards the form to the CTC so that the final section may be completed by the Employment Counselor at the halfway house immediately after the inmate is released to the community. The CTC Section contains questions pertaining to the jobs an inmate held while residing at the halfway house, and upon its completion, the form is returned to the CPM who checks it for completeness and then forwards it to the Community Programs Branch in the Central Office. A staff member in Community Programs has been designated to review all of the forms that come in to the Central Office for accuracy and to then send the completed forms to the Research Office.

#### II.B.2. Data Collection: Research Personnel

The follow-up process is initiated when the duplicate first page of the UNICOR/Vocational Training Evaluation Form is received in the Central Research Office. Research staff enter the information provided on the first page into a computerized data base. This allows the Research Office to create a "tickler" file to keep track of the release chronology of an inmate.

For inmates released through a CTC, a telephone call is made to the halfway house approximately three months after the inmate leaves the institution in order to collect information concerning the inmate's date of release from the CTC and about his or her supervision in the community, if any. Telephone interviews with an inmate's parole officer are then scheduled at two time intervals: the first call is made six months after the inmate is released from Bureau of Prisons' custody (either from an institution or from a CTC), and the second call is made twelve months after the inmate is released from custody. These two calls focus in detail on the jobs the inmate has held while under community supervision. The data collection instrument for telephone follow-ups appears in Appendix D .

In order to evaluate the effectiveness of institutional job training on post-release employment, we must select another group of inmates to which we can compare the study group participants. This comparison population is comprised of offenders who were not employed in UNICOR for at least six months and who did not complete vocational training or participate in an apprenticeship program while in prison.

In order to match some inmates in the comparison population with those in the study group, it is necessary to extract pre-incarceration data on each inmate's social and criminal history from automated files. The precise method for statistical matching is described in section II.B.3, "Comparison Group Selection Using the Propensity Score".

One can see that the process of data collection for this project is quite lengthy and complex and that it requires the coordination of staff members

from many parts of the system. For example, for a typical case in which an inmate is released through a CTC, it would take approximately four months from the time the inmate left the institution for the completed U/VT form to reach the Central Research Office. Follow-up information would not be complete until ten to sixteen months from the inmate's institution release date. At least six Bureau of Prisons' employees (Case Manager, Education representative, possibly a UNICOR staff member, Case Management Specialist, Community Programs Manager, a quality control staff member in the Community Programs Branch of the Central Office), one halfway house staff member and one parole officer would be involved in the data collection process. In addition there are three Research staff who enter and collate data for PREP and three Research Analysts who oversee the project.

Due to the complexity of the data collection process, the number of line staff having data responsibilities and the logistical problems inherent in a national research project, procedures for monitoring compliance and ensuring quality control were implemented.

### II.B.3. Comparison Group Selection Using the Propensity Score

Unlike experimental studies which control for selection bias through randomization of participants to research groups, PREP is an observational study. In an observational study there is a potential inferential problem, that the effects observed for the study group may be attributable to pre-existing differences in the subpopulations of the study and comparison groups. Thus, if offenders in the study group exhibit higher employment and lower recidivism rates this may be attributable to the motivation levels or prior work experience of offenders who participate in industrial and vocational programs, rather than the skills they acquire in the programs.

Two basic methods are used to address this problem. The first is referred to as covariance analysis and implies correct specification of the self selection or assignment process. If all of the variables that differentiate the characteristics of the study and comparison groups can be measured (call these controlling variables), then in any statistical analysis these variables can be used to represent the differences in the study and comparison group samples, and the variables of interest (e.g. training or work participation) are statistically adjusted for the impact of the controlling variables.

A second method of adjustment is generically referred to as matching. For every participant in the study group one tries to select a second participant who is not a study group member, but who has the same pre-determined characteristics as the study group participant. The classic method of matching is twin studies in which identical or fraternal twins are identified who have been raised in different environments.

Rubin and Rosenbaum<sup>9</sup> have developed a method of statistical matched sampling using what they call a propensity score. This procedure was adopted for PREP since it is the most modern method of trying to simulate an experimental design with observational data. The remainder of this section is a discussion of statistical techniques and computer algorithms necessary

to develop propensity score based matching for the first quarter in which a comparison group was generated.

As mentioned before, for every quarter beginning in 1984, study group members are compared to all other releasees in the same quarter. The offender who most resembles the study group participant is selected as a matched comparison group member.

The "reservoir" or population of releasees not in the study group was further reduced by examining other automated files of program participation. Based on this information, offenders who met the study group criteria, but for some reason were not included in the study group, were eliminated from the comparison reservoir. Of the remaining population of potential comparison group offenders (2698), 512 were selected as matches for the 512 study group participants in that quarter.

Using other automated files containing demographic, pre-incarceration and criminal history information, a file of these variables was created containing all study group and comparison reservoir offenders. The variables culled from the automated files are represented in Table 3 on the following page. These variables are intended to represent differences and similarities among the study group and comparison population.

A logistic regression using study group participation as the criterion was estimated. Logistic regression is a statistical procedure for explaining the cell frequencies of a multi-dimensional contingency table in a way analogous to linear regression. The variables in Table 3 were recoded into fewer categories and treated as categorical variables, except for the security designation score. These categories were necessary to reduce the number of covariate patterns used in the logistic regression. For the purpose of this analysis, missing values were treated as a qualitative state, and coded as a category.

The method of estimation was a maximum likelihood solution obtained from a forward stepwise solution with backwards stepping. The results of the estimation are presented in Table 4.

The logistic regression is at the heart of this procedure. This analysis determines which variables are important in the offender's assignment or self selection into the study or comparison groups. Looking at Table 4, one can see that study group members are:

1. more likely to release to a CTC rather than to parole
2. younger than the control reservoir
3. offenders with more prior commitments
4. more likely to have a violent commitment offense
5. less likely to have a commitment offense involving extortion, fraud or bribery
6. more likely to have been incarcerated for longer periods of time on current or prior sentences
7. more likely to have little or no violence in their recent history
8. less likely to have a recent history of serious violent episodes, excluding the instant commitment offense

TABLE 3

VARIABLES USED IN LOGISTIC REGRESSION MODEL TO COMPUTE PROPENSITY SCORE

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Minimum Value</u>	<u>Maximum Value</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Description of Values</u>
Age at first arrest	7	67	23.53	9.43	Number of years
Age at first commitment	9	71	27.91	10.01	Number of years
Age at current commitment	17	84	34.84	10.21	Number of years
Age at current discharge	19	85	36.93	10.17	Number of years
Number of prior arrests	0	83	6.11	7.68	0 and higher
Number of prior commitments	0	56	1.41	2.70	0 and higher
Number of prior convictions	0	83	3.81	5.75	0 and higher
Longest time free from confinement	0	780	36.98	69.51	Number of months
Longest time served	0	721	12.99	27.06	Number of months
Years of education	0	20	10.90	2.46	Number of years
Age at completion of highest educational level	8	52	17.68	3.80	Number of years
Months of military service	0	527	8.38	25.20	Number of months
Months on job at arrest	0	480	52.73	72	Number of months
Months at longest job	0	480	59.09	67.04	Number of months
Security Designation Items (BP14):					
Type of detainer	0	7	.75	1.52	0, 1, 3, 5, 7
Severity of current offense	0	7	2.53	1.98	0, 1, 3, 5, 7
Expected length of incarceration	0	5	.71	.84	0, 1, 3, 5
Type of prior commitments	0	3	1.23	1.35	0, 1, 3
History of escapes or attempts	0	7	.42	1.14	0-7
History of violence	0	7	1.16	2.22	0-7
Precommitment status	0	6	2.21	2.86	0, 3, 6
Square root of security total	0	4.24	.54	1.12	Square root of 0-36
Individual security level	1	4	1.01	.14	1-6

TABLE 3 (CONTINUED)

<u>Categorical Variables (nominal level)</u>	<u>Description of Categories</u>
Sex	male, female
Race	white, black, other
Ethnicity	hispanic, non-hispanic
Marital status	single, married, widowed, divorced, separated, common-law
Type of military discharge	honorable, general, other than honorable, bad conduct, not discharged, non-veteran
Method of release	CTC, parole
Current offense category	drug/liquor, firearms/explosives/arson, violent, property, white collar, court/corrections, immigration, extortion/fraud/bribery, miscellaneous

TABLE 4

LOGISTIC REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS AND T VALUES

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Coefficient</u>	<u>T Value</u>
Release method:		
CTC	0.830	11.5
Parole	-0.830	-11.5
Age at current commitment:		
18 to 24	0.666	5.36
25 to 29	-0.070	- 0.617
30 to 39	-0.052	- 0.546
40 to 49	-0.137	- 1.13
50 or more	-0.407	- 2.22
Number of prior commitments:		
Missing	-2.523	-2.49
0	-0.004	-0.015
1	0.249	1.26
2	-0.044	-0.206
3	0.511	2.22
4	0.392	1.53
5	0.079	0.254
6-10	0.190	0.736
11 or more	1.15	2.83
Category of current offense:		
Drug/liquor	0.173	1.44
Firearms/explosives/arson	-0.006	-0.025
Violent	0.652	4.70
Property	0.106	0.760
White collar	0.072	0.337
Court/corrections	-0.515	-1.59
Immigration	-0.173	-0.475
Extortion/fraud/bribery	-0.416	-2.02
Miscellaneous	0.107	0.443
Longest number of months served:		
Missing	.439	2.08
0	-0.107	-0.628
1-6	-0.219	-1.51
7-12	-0.328	-1.75
13-24	0.026	0.176
25-36	0.402	2.30
37-48	-0.312	-1.26
49 or more	0.099	0.517
History of violence (BP14)		
None	0.254	2.05
Minor, more than 10 years ago	1.01	3.04
Minor, 5-10 years ago	-0.533	-1.29
Minor, less than 5 years ago	-0.199	-0.738
Serious, more than 15 years ago	-0.234	-0.732
Serious, 10-15 years ago	0.158	0.657
Serious, 5-10 years ago	-0.0003	-0.002
Serious, less than 5 years ago	-0.452	-1.74

TABLE 4 (CONTINUED)

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Coefficient</u>	<u>T Value</u>
Number of prior convictions:		
Missing	0.921	0.900
0	-0.119	-0.610
1	0.119	0.624
2	0.203	1.07
3	-0.302	-1.36
4	-0.203	-0.866
5	-0.269	-1.11
6-10	0.286	1.60
11-15	-0.429	-1.49
16 or more	-0.207	-0.784
Type of detainer (BP14):		
None	-0.092	-0.811
Lowest/low moderate	0.209	1.42
Moderate	-0.403	-2.33
High	-0.122	-0.496
Greatest	0.408	1.47
Sex:		
Male	-0.328	-3.74
Female	0.328	3.74
Ethnicity:		
Hispanic	-0.212	-2.22
Non-Hispanic	0.212	2.22
Race:		
White	-0.147	-1.13
Black	-0.344	-2.60
Other	0.491	2.14
Number of years of education:		
Missing	1.260	1.88
0-6	0.110	0.360
7-9	-0.302	-1.51
10-11	-0.568	-3.03
12	-0.035	-0.205
13-14	-0.044	-0.187
15 or more	-0.421	-1.46
Age at completion of highest educational level:		
Missing	-1.399	-2.09
1-13	-0.218	-0.652
14	0.514	1.94
15	0.400	1.72
16	-0.155	-0.818
17	0.185	1.19
18	-0.013	-0.078
19	0.304	1.32
20-25	0.393	1.89
26 or more	-0.011	-0.043



TABLE 4 (CONTINUED)

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Coefficient</u>	<u>T Value</u>
Square root of security total (BP14)*	0.188	0.199
Constant	-1.90	-7.97

\*This is a continuous variable

9. more likely to have fewer previous convictions
10. disproportionately female and non-hispanic; blacks are disproportionately underrepresented
11. more likely to have a higher security score total, representing a higher security level designation

The data concerning violent instant offenses (for a complete offense list, see Appendix E) may mean that inmates committing these offenses have served more time and have more opportunities to participate in UNICOR or vocational training. This interpretation is less convincing due to the fact that there is a variable measuring longest time served and the logistic regression analysis should indicate the effect of violent instant offenses independent of longest time served. Since longest time served can refer to a previous offense and not the instant offense, there remains the possibility that violent offenders simply have a longer time frame in which to achieve program participation.

There are other substantive issues in the variables reflecting the differences in study versus comparison group assignment; however, the essential point of the propensity score analysis is the parsimony which is achieved by summarizing the differences in a single measure. The propensity score is the estimated logit or log odds that an offender will be in the study or comparison group conditional on the variables entered into the logistic regression.

Propensity scores are estimated for both the study and comparison group members. Comparison group members with high propensity scores are offenders who, based on the variables used in the analysis, look very much like the study group. In this sense they are said to be misclassified.

The next step in the matching process was to merge the propensity score with the item pool of all the variables indicated in Table 3. The differences in the study and comparison group on these variables are indicated in Table 5. Although there are a lot of statistically significant values, most of the mean differences between groups are small in a substantive sense.

A missing values estimation program (BMD PAM) was also used. The procedure estimated missing values using the two most significant predictors of a variable from the variable pool. If there were no predictors meeting a significance criterion, the mean was substituted for the missing value. These analyses were stratified on sex and release method so that separate estimations were done for subgroups of these strata.

After the missing values estimation procedure, the study and comparison groups were once again contrasted. The results are represented in Table 6. The only significance test difference between Tables 5 and 6 is for the variable indicating the age at completion of the highest educational level.

It was necessary to estimate missing values in order to compute a Mahalanobis  $D^2$ . The missing value estimation procedure was used because there would have been a substantial loss in observations if listwise deletion were

TABLE 5

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN STUDY AND COMPARISON GROUPS ON  
PRE-INCARCERATION HISTORY VARIABLES WITHOUT ESTIMATION OF MISSING VALUES

	<u>Group Mean</u>	<u>Minimum Value</u>	<u>Maximum Value</u>	<u>Number of Subjects</u>	<u>T Value</u>	<u>Probability</u>
Age at first arrest:						
Study Group	20.58	8	67	496	-5.55	.0001*
Comparison Population	22.65	7	64	2181		
Age at completion of highest educational level:						
Study Group	17.82	10	49	476	1.68	.0931
Comparison Population	17.53	8	52	2056		
Age at first commitment:						
Study Group	24.64	12	67	485	-5.58	.0001*
Comparison Population	27.09	9	71	2133		
Age at current commitment:						
Study Group	31.71	18	67	512	-5.56	.0001*
Comparison Population	34.22	17	84	2690		
Age at current discharge:						
Study Group	34.61	20	69	512	-3.56	.0004*
Comparison Population	36.23	19	85	2690		
Number of prior arrests:						
Study Group	3.54	0	83	497	2.95	.0033*
Comparison Population	2.61	0	70	2194		
Number of prior commitments:						
Study Group:	0.26	0	25	497	2.45	.0142*
Comparison Population	0.16	0	56	2164		
Number of prior convictions:						
Study Group	1.70	0	83	497	2.71	.0068*
Comparison Population	1.21	0	58	2183		
Number of years of education:						
Study Group	11.13	3	20	478	1.63	.1043
Comparison Population	10.92	0	20	2101		
Longest number of months served:						
Study Group	3.70	0	721	451	2.99	.0027*
Comparison Population	2.20	0	481	2031		
Number of months of military service:						
Study Group	.0939	0	265	512	0.43	.6668
Comparison Population	.0807	0	527	2698		

\*Differences between means are statistically significant within a 95% confidence interval

TABLE 5 (CONTINUED)

	<u>Group Mean</u>	<u>Minimum Value</u>	<u>Maximum Value</u>	<u>Number of Subjects</u>	<u>T Value</u>	<u>Probability</u>
History of escapes (BP14)**:						
Study Group	.0011	0	7	509	-0.37	.7109
Comparison Population	.0013	0	7	2686		
History of violence (BP14):						
Study Group	.0134	0	7	509	-0.57	.5693
Comparison Population	.0163	0	7	2686		
Type of detainer (BP14):						
Study Group	.0182	0	7	509	.78	.4374
Comparison Population	.0144	0	7	2686		
Expected length of incarceration (BP14):						
Study Group	0.54	0	5	509	5.22	.0001*
Comparison Population	0.36	0	5	2686		
Severity of current offense (BP14):						
Study Group	2.68	0	7	509	1.80	.0714
Comparison Population	2.51	0	7	2686		
Type of prior commitments (BP14):						
Study Group	1.24	0	3	509	0.31	.7559
Comparison Population	1.22	0	3	2686		
Pre-commitment status (BP14):						
Study Group	2.19	0	6	509	-0.16	.8719
Comparison Population	2.21	0	6	2686		
Security total (BP14):						
Study Group	.0003	0	10	509	1.65	.1004
Comparison Population	.0001	0	18	2686		
Individual security level (BP14):						
Study Group	1.02	1	3	509	1.25	.2100
Comparison Population	1.01	1	4	2686		
Propensity score:						
Study Group	-1.07	-4.69	1.46	509	26.15	.0001*
Comparison Population	-2.40	-6.62	0.90	2672		

\*\*Numbers on the BP14 items are not scale values but only categories. For example, on the item asking about the type of prior commitments, the response categories are 0 (none), 1 (minor), and 3 (serious).

TABLE 6

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN STUDY AND COMPARISON GROUPS ON  
PRE-INCARCERATION HISTORY VARIABLES WITH ESTIMATION OF MISSING VALUES

	<u>Group Mean</u>	<u>Minimum Value</u>	<u>Maximum Value</u>	<u>Number of Subjects</u>	<u>T Value</u>	<u>Probability</u>
Age at first arrest:						
Study Group	20.63	7.99	67	512	-5.82	.0001*
Comparison Population	22.69	6.99	64	2695		
Age at completion of highest educational level:						
Study Group	17.79	9.99	49	512	2.68	.0074*
Comparison Population	17.37	7.99	52	2694		
Age at first commitment:						
Study Group	24.70	11.99	67	512	-5.56	.0001*
Comparison Population	27.09	8.99	71	2695		
Age at current commitment:						
Study Group	31.71	17.99	67	512	-5.55	.0001*
Comparison Population	34.21	16.99	84	2696		
Age at current discharge:						
Study Group	34.60	19.99	69	512	-3.55	.0004*
Comparison Population	36.22	18.99	85	2696		
Number of prior arrests:						
Study Group	3.48	0	83	512	3.72	.0002*
Comparison Population	2.45	0	70	2695		
Number of prior commitments:						
Study Group:	0.25	0	25	512	3.13	.0018*
Comparison Population	0.14	0	56	2695		
Number of prior convictions:						
Study Group	1.67	0	83	512	3.53	.0004*
Comparison Population	1.12	0	58	2695		
Number of years of education:						
Study Group	11.12	3	20	512	2.20	.0282*
Comparison Population	10.86	0	20	2695		
Longest number of months served:						
Study Group	2.78	0	721	512	2.95	.0033*
Comparison Population	1.71	0	481	2694		
Number of months of military service:						
Study Group	.0939	0	265	512	0.43	.6668
Comparison Population	.0808	0	527	2698		

\*Differences between means are statistically significant within a 95% confidence interval

TABLE 6 (CONTINUED)

	<u>Group Mean</u>	<u>Minimum Value</u>	<u>Maximum Value</u>	<u>Number of Subjects</u>	<u>T Value</u>	<u>Probability</u>
History of escapes (BP14)**:						
Study Group	.0011	0	7	509	-0.37	.7109
Comparison Population	.0013	0	7	2686		
History of violence (BP14):						
Study Group	.0134	0	7	509	-0.57	.5693
Comparison Population	.0163	0	7	2686		
Type of detainer (BP14):						
Study Group	.0182	0	7	509	0.78	.4374
Comparison Population	.0144	0	7	2686		
Expected length of incarceration (BP14):						
Study Group	0.54	0	5	509	5.22	.0001*
Comparison Population	0.36	0	5	2686		
Severity of current offense (BP14):						
Study Group	2.68	0	7	509	1.80	.0714
Comparison Population	2.51	0	7	2686		
Type of prior commitments (BP14):						
Study Group	1.24	0	3	509	0.31	.7559
Comparison Population	1.22	0	3	2686		
Pre-commitment status (BP14):						
Study Group	2.19	0	6	509	-0.16	.8719
Comparison Population	2.21	0	6	2686		
Security total (BP14):						
Study Group	.0003	0	10	509	1.65	.1004
Comparison Population	.0001	0	18	2686		
Individual security level (BP14):						
Study Group	1.02	1	3	509	1.25	.2100
Comparison Population	1.01	1	4	2686		
Propensity score:						
Study Group	-1.07	-4.69	1.46	509	26.22	.0001*
Comparison Population	-2.40	-6.62	0.90	2686		

\*\*Numbers on the BP14 items are not scale values but only categories. For example, on the item asking about the type of prior commitments, the response categories are 0 (none), 1 (minor), and 3 (serious).

used in estimating  $D^2$ .  $D^2$  would have been based on only those observations with complete data. This would have introduced some form of systematic bias of unknown sources and undetermined consequences.

$D^2$  was used in the algorithm to compare each observation in the study group with each observation in the comparison group. A Mahalanobis  $D^2$  was computed for each offender in the comparison group who was similar to a given offender in the study group. Similarity is based on all of the variables from the initial item pool as well as the propensity score.  $D^2$  is a geometric representation of the distance between two observations in the variable "space".

For each study group offender the idea is to choose one comparison group offender whose  $D^2$  is closest to the study group member on each variable. Because there were potentially 2689  $D^2$ 's that had to be computed for each of the 512 study group members on each of the 15 variables, it would have been necessary to compute 20,651,520  $D^2$ 's before the closest comparison group member could be selected. A technique suggested by Rubin and Rosenbaum was used to save on computations.

Rubin and Rosenbaum suggest computing "calipers" for each study group observation based on the propensity score and the propensity score variance. A caliper for each propensity score is the individual study group score plus or minus a percentage of the standard deviation. In this case, 20% of the standard deviation was chosen. According to Rubin and Rosenbaum, this should have reduced any selection bias by 93 percent. For a given study group observation,  $D^2$  was computed on each observation in the comparison group that had a propensity score within the calipers of the given observation of the study group. This procedure restricted the number of  $D^2$ 's that had to be computed. The last algorithm written was used to select the observation in the comparison group reservoir which was closest to the study group member. The comparison group member, once chosen, was deleted from the remaining comparison reservoir. This procedure results in a one-for-one matching of study and comparison group members and is repeated on a quarterly basis.

The following sections provide a preliminary look at some of the data gathered on study group members. It is too early in the data collection process to compare study and comparison groups; however, at the end of this section some of the analyses which will be done are outlined.

### III. A Preliminary Look at The Data

There is currently data available on 752 inmates whose U/VT forms have been completed and returned to the Research Office. Information on the U/VT form can be divided into pre-incarceration education and work history, an institutional misconduct record, institutional vocational training and/or apprenticeship training, work performance evaluations for inmates working in UNICOR, and, where applicable, the employment record of inmates who spent time at a Community Treatment Center. In addition, there is some data from the six month telephone follow-up with parole officers.

### III.A. Pre-incarceration Education and Work History

As previously indicated, only 30% of the study group offenders have worked continuously in the five years previous to their incarceration. On the average, they have worked 32.7 months out of a possible 60 months. Researchers have coded the occupations of offenders using the Department of Labor's coding scheme, called the Dictionary of Occupational Titles. This will allow us to later rank occupational skills for more refined analysis. The data have been coded using six classification digits; however, for the present purposes we have grouped the occupations using the broadest occupational categories.

These categories and the percentages of offenders whose pre-incarceration occupations fall into them are presented in Table 7. For a complete description of the occupations contained in these categories, see Appendix F. As a benchmark, the distribution of the U.S. labor force in 1971 is also shown.

Table 7

<u>Occupational Category</u>	<u>Offender Sample</u>	<u>Labor Force, 1971</u>
Professional, Technical, Managerial	14.4%	25%
Clerical, Sales	16.4	25
Service	14.5	16
Agriculture, Fishing	3.5	4
Processing	1.2	2
Machine Trade	10.5	6
Benchwork	4.3	4
Structural Work	23.9	9
Miscellaneous	11.2	8

Offenders are clearly overrepresented in structural work (mostly manufacturing and construction trades) and machine trade categories and underrepresented in the professional and clerical-sales categories when compared to the remaining labor force.

The education levels of offenders prior to their most recent offense were also recorded. Forty-four percent of the study group had less than a high school or high school equivalency degree. Thirteen percent of the study group had some schooling beyond high school and five percent of the sample had an advanced degree. Among members of the study group there was a marked educational improvement while in prison. Twenty-five percent of the sample had improved their educational standing during incarceration.

### III.B. Institutional Misconduct

Misconduct reports for study group offenders indicate the date and type of misconduct. As is typical of most samples, the majority of inmates have few or no disciplinary reports (in this sample 88.2% had one or no infractions). This data will be most important in analyses which will contrast the disciplinary infractions of the control and study groups.



Many proponents of inmate programs have argued that prison industries and training programs are justified on the basis of combatting inmate idleness and providing inmates with meaningful work. Some view it as a moral obligation and a commitment to humane treatment, others as a method of inmate management. From this latter perspective especially, study group offenders should exhibit a lower level of misconduct.

### III.C. Vocational Training and Apprenticeship Training Evaluations

The major purpose of recording the D.O.T code and performance evaluations of inmates receiving vocational and apprenticeship training is to examine whether such training results in new post-release job opportunities.

Table 8 represents the occupational subgroups for which inmates receive training. The second column represents the percentages of inmates receiving training in prison and the third column represents the pre-incarceration occupational categories duplicated from Table 7.

Table 8

<u>Occupational Classification</u>	<u>Vocational Training</u>	<u>Job Distribution, Pre-incarceration</u>
Professional, Technical	11.3%	14.4%
Clerical, Sales	13.2	16.4
Service	7.8	14.5
Agriculture, Fishing	1.6	3.5
Processing	9.1	1.2
Machine Trade	21.3	10.5
Benchwork	2.2	4.3
Structural Work	25.1	23.9
Miscellaneous	8.2	11.2

The emphasis in vocational training is on machine trade and structural work occupations. Although this table does not indicate whether inmates are retraining themselves in different occupational groups, it does indicate that, as a group, inmates who receive vocational training are receiving more processing and machine trade skills than indicated by their pre-incarceration occupations.

Further analyses, when more data is available, will indicate not only the extent to which inmates are retraining themselves, but also the extent to which this training results in similar post-release occupations.

### III.D. UNICOR Work Experience and Performance Evaluations

The distribution of UNICOR occupational experience of study group members is represented in Table 9. Once again the pre-incarceration work experiences of the group are represented in the last column.

Table 9

<u>Occupational Classification</u>	<u>UNICOR</u>	<u>Job Distribution, Pre-incarceration</u>
Professional, Technical	2.1%	14.4%
Clerical, Sales	22.1	16.4
Service	2.1	14.5
Agriculture, Fishing	0	3.5
Processing	.9	1.2
Machine Trade	14.3	10.5
Benchwork	44.0	4.3
Structural Work	5.8	23.9
Miscellaneous	8.8	11.2

Benchwork trades and occupations are the predominant form of skill employment experienced by the study group. These occupations include jobs such as the assembly, fabrication and repair of metal, scientific, photographic, electrical, wood, rubber, glass and textile products. The second largest occupational grouping is clerical and sales. It is not surprising that these occupational subgroups dominate UNICOR work experience since they are labor intensive occupations. This is often a prerequisite in choosing industries to ensure an abundance of jobs for the inmates.

### III.E. Employment History in the Community Treatment Center

The Community Treatment Center provides an important transitional environment for the offender to re-establish a community work ethic. Of the 693 study group offenders whose data we have recorded, 81.2% successfully completed their CTC tenure. The major reasons for failure were a result of disciplinary infractions (7.8%), escapes (4.8%) or other administrative reasons (4.0%). Data on the work history of the failures will not be considered because there are still too few cases to draw any conclusions.

The average number of days spent by an offender at a CTC who successfully completed his tenure was 104. This resulted in an average of 74 work days using a five day work week. On the average, an offender was employed 77% of those work days and earned \$2,133.50 at a rate of \$5.35 an hour. Fifty percent of the offenders made less than \$4.00 per hour. Most offenders worked full time jobs and maintained the job throughout their CTC residence. Fifteen percent of the inmates had no full time job while at the CTC, sixty-two percent had one job, eighteen percent had two jobs, and about four and a half percent had three or more jobs. Very few inmates worked day labor or part time jobs.

Although one of the functions of the CTC is to provide the offender with job counselling, most offenders acquire jobs through their own initiative and resources. Almost seventy percent of all jobs are either initiated by the offender (47.9%) or come from relatives (8.9%) or friends (12.8%). The CTC, for this first quarter study group cohort, has been credited with finding jobs for 20% of the inmates. Although this may seem low compared to jobs obtained due to the offender's initiatives, the CTC counselors were

four times more likely to help an offender gain employment than was an employment agency.

A major question to be addressed by PREP is whether or not offenders are getting jobs based on their UNICOR experience or vocational training. Using the nine rather broad occupational classifications, we compared the UNICOR prison occupations with CTC occupations. The table of these results appears in Appendix G. About 18 percent have jobs in the same occupational category. However, if we look at benchwork and clerical and sales occupations in which most UNICOR employees are employed, forty-six percent have the same or similar job occupations upon release to a CTC. Similarity for benchwork occupations is defined as jobs in benchwork or structural work.

III.F. Post Release Supervision

Information on the post-release employment and recidivism record of study and comparison group members is being initially collected through phone call follow-ups with the offender's parole officer, who monitors his behavior during the parole or mandatory release supervision period. The follow-up period for this source of information is one year. It is anticipated that we will collect employment history data from the social security administration during the same time frame as well as longer time frames. This will allow us to methodologically contrast employment information from both the social security and parole officer sources and will allow us to look at longer follow-up periods.

A complementary rearrest follow-up will be pursued by collecting FBI and NCIC arrest records. This will also extend the rearrest follow-up period.

There is currently data available on about 300 offenders from the six month follow-up. For this group, 15% have been unable to find a job, 64% have had one job, and 21% have had two to four jobs in the six month period.

The occupations that offenders first took under supervision are listed below in Table 10. The CTC occupations are also categorized.

Table 10

<u>Occupational Classification</u>	<u>Job Distribution, Pre-Incarceration</u>	<u>Job Distribution, CTC</u>	<u>Job Distribution, Six Month Follow-Up</u>
Professional, Technical	14.4%	8.5%	9.2%
Clerical, Sales	16.4	17.9	18.0
Service	14.5	15.2	12.1
Agriculture, Fishing	3.5	1.6	4.8
Processing	1.2	1.1	1.1
Machine Trade	10.5	8.9	10.3
Benchwork	4.3	3.7	4.0
Structural Work	23.9	33.8	25.0
Miscellaneous	11.2	9.4	15.4

The distribution of occupations has changed very little from pre-incarceration to post-incarceration. There has been a reduction in professional and technical occupations and an increase in structural work occupations but this is mostly for CTC associated jobs. This aggregate look at the occupational structure is crude. Further analyses will look at the individual changes an offender makes in his occupational history. Two examples of this kind of analysis are represented in Appendices H and I. Appendix H represents the switches made from pre- to post-incarceration occupations. Although the data is sketchy, there is an indication that almost half of all offenders resume an occupation in the same general occupational category they held jobs in prior to their commitment.

Appendix I examines the relationship between the job offenders held in UNICOR and their post-release employment. There is too little data to draw any firm conclusions; however, it appears that inmates are less likely to take or find a post-release job that they held in UNICOR than the job they held previously. It is important to emphasize these are only preliminary data and are intended more to demonstrate the kinds of conclusions that can be drawn from the data, rather than to draw attention to the current results.

The monthly earnings for the first six months for the releasees who found jobs are reported below in Table 11.

Table 11

<u>Month</u>	<u>Earnings</u>
One	\$ 896.50
Two	898.10
Three	878.70
Four	917.70
Five	921.10
Six	944.40

The data indicate that ex-offenders who have found jobs have raised their monthly earnings 5.4% in the six months following their release from a CTC or prison.

### III.G. Further Analyses

Although there is some limited information currently available in PREP, by far, the more interesting analyses are yet to come. The following questions will be addressed when sufficient data is available:

1. What is the impact of broad and specific occupational skills acquired in prison on post-release employment?
2. Are there regional or local job market factors such as unemployment, cost of living and "discouraged work force" indicators which preclude program success?
3. Are the factors mentioned in 2 (above) occupation specific, in which case the Bureau of Prisons must readjust its thinking in training and work experience?

4. Does program involvement inhibit recidivism or is there a mutual relationship between gainful employment and recidivism?
5. What is the overlap between the so-called secondary labor force and the inmate post-release population? Related to this issue is whether we're overtraining our inmates. If inmates are unable to find employment in an occupation for which they have acquired skills, do they become more discouraged than if they had not acquired these skills? This discouragement factor is suggested by researchers in the training literature.
6. Can we find evidence of any "human capital" variables (education, work experience, skills acquisition) on post-release success? Or are offenders relegated to the secondary labor market?
7. What is the nature of post-release employment? Do ex-offenders take low prestige, entry level jobs and work their way up, or do they exhibit job instability trying to find a better job? What factors intervene in the differences between stability and instability?
8. What is the effect of work and job training programs on the adjustment and management of inmates in the institution and the Community Treatment Center?

Under the current data collection timeframe, some of these analyses will be available in nine months, although data collection should continue well beyond that point. The Research Office will produce another interim report comparing study and comparison group offenders when there is enough data to warrant comparisons.

William G. Saylor  
Gerald G. Gaes  
Suzanne D. Vanyur

Office of Research and Evaluation  
October 1, 1985

## FOOTNOTES AND REFERENCES

- <sup>1</sup>Glaser, D., and Rice, K. Crime, age and employment. American Sociological Review, 1959, 24, 679-686.
- Pownall, G.A. Employment problems of released offenders. U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C., 1967.
- Thornberry, T.P., and Farnworth, M. Social correlates of criminal involvement: Further evidence of the relationship between social status and criminal behavior. American Sociological Review, 1982, 47, 505-518.
- Davis, J.R. The relation between crime and unemployment - An econometric model. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology, Denver, Colorado, November, 1983.
- Sickles, R.C., Schmidt, P., and Witte, A.D. An application of the simultaneous Tobit model: A study of the determinants of criminal recidivism. Journal of Economics and Business, 1979, 32, 166-171.
- Witte, A. Estimating the economic model of crime with individual data. Quarterly Journal of Economics, 1980, 94, 57-84.
- Borus, M.E., Hardin, E., and Terry, P.A. Job placement services for ex-offenders: Comprehensive Offender Manpower Program (OMP) job placement efforts. Journal of Human Resources, 1976, II, 391-401.
- Hardin, E. Human capital and the labor market success of new parolees. In proceedings of the American Statistical Association, Washington, D.C., pp. 330-335.
- Witte, A., and Reid, P.H. An exploration of the determinants of labor market performance for prison releasees. Journal of Urban Economics, 1980, 8, 313-326.
- <sup>2</sup>Thornberry, T. P., and Christenson, R. L. Unemployment and criminal involvement: An investigation of reciprocal causal structures. American Sociological Review, 1984, 49, 398-411.
- <sup>3</sup>Rossi, P., Berk, R. A., and Lenihan, K.S. Money, Work and Crime. Academic Press: New York, 1980.
- <sup>4</sup>Schmidt, A., and Witte, A. An Economic Analysis of Crime and Justice. Academic Press: New York, 1984.
- <sup>5</sup>Borus, M.E., Hardin, E., and Terry, P.A. Job placement services for ex-offenders: Comprehensive Offender Manpower Program (OMP) job placement efforts. Journal of Human Resources, 1976, II, 391-401.
- Goldstein, I.L. Training: Program development and evaluation. Brooks Cole: Monterrey, 1974.

<sup>7</sup>Piore, M.J. Notes for a theory of labor market stratification. In R.C. Edwards, M. Reich, and D.M. Gordon (Eds.): Labor Market Segmentation, D.C. Heath and Co.: Lexington, 1975.

<sup>8</sup>Dictionary of Occupational Titles, Fourth Edition. U.S. Department of Labor, 1977.

<sup>9</sup>Rubin, D.B. Bias reduction using Mahalanobis - Metric matching. Biometrics, 1980, 36, 293-298.

Rubin, D. B. Using multivariate matched sampling and regression adjustment to control bias in observational studies. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 1979, 74(366), 318-328.

Rosenbaum, P.R., and Rubin, D.B. Reducing bias in observational studies using subclassification on the propensity score. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 1984, 79(387), 516-524.

Cochran, W. G., and Rubin, D.B. Controlling bias in observational studies: A review. Sankhya, 1973, Series A, 35(4), 417-446.

Rosenbaum, P.R., and Rubin, D.B. Constructing a control group using multivariate matched sampling methods that incorporate the propensity score. The American Statistician, 1985, 39(1), 33-38.







**U.S. Department of Justice  
Federal Prison System**

# Operations Memorandum

Number : 37-85(1070)  
 Date : February 19, 1985  
 Subject : Continuation of  
 Special Project:  
 Post Release  
 Employment  
 Cancellation date : October 1, 1985

1. PURPOSE: The Post Release Employment Project (PREP) is designed to accomplish the following major goals: (a) provide an administrative procedure for institutions to directly advise CTC/Work Release facilities of an inmate's training and work experience to promote an effective job placement, (b) evaluate the marketability of releasees who are trained in programs presently offered in Federal prisons, and (c) compare inmate placements among different institutions providing similar training programs.
2. DIRECTIVES REFERENCED:
  - A. Program Statement 1176.3.
  - B. Program Statement 5140.18.
  - C. Operations Memorandum 151-83(8130).
  - D. Operations Memorandum 239-84(1070).
  - E. Operations Memorandum 134-84(5890).
3. DIRECTIVES AMENDED:
  - A. Operations Memorandum 247-83(1070).
4. BACKGROUND: This study will specifically look at the relationship between different work and training experiences in institutions and employment after release. The study will address questions such as: Which types of training provide the greatest benefit (where we define benefit in terms of job placement, job stability and earnings) for the least cost?

A pilot study was conducted at four institutions (Lewisburg, Danbury, Petersburg and Fort Worth). The implementation of the full project and evaluation began in January of 1984. This memorandum updates the previous Operations Memorandum on this project, OM 247-83(1070). The major changes are noted in the last paragraph to this memorandum, entitled "Summary of PREP Changes."

5. ACTION: A supply of blank UNICOR/VOCATIONAL TRAINING EVALUATION (U/VT) forms (Attachment A) have been distributed to the field. Additional forms can be obtained from the Office of Research, Central Office, by calling FTS 724-3121. Through September 30, 1985, the U/VT form will be completed on all CTC transfers and community parole cases who meet both of the following two sets of criteria.
1. RELEASE SUPERVISION CRITERIA:
    - A. Inmates who are either released through a CTC/Work Release Center or who are released to the community with at least 6 months of supervision are to be included in the study.
    - B. Inmates who are to be released to a detainer or those who are serving only a parole violation term will be excluded.
  2. JOB TRAINING CRITERIA: Subjects to be included must also meet one or more of the following criteria:
    - A. They will have completed (or can be expected to have completed) six months or more of UNICOR employment at the time of their departure from the institution.
    - B. They will have completed (or can be expected to have completed) a formal VT program (including the special UNICOR-funded programs) at the time of their departure from the institution.
    - C. They are enrolled in an apprenticeship program (including the special UNICOR-funded programs) at the time of their departure from the institution.

#### INSTRUCTIONS BY AREA OF RESPONSIBILITY

WARDEN: Wardens will appoint the Case Management Coordinator as the project coordinator at their facilities. The project coordinator functions as the project monitor and liaison for the institution.

CASE MANAGEMENT COORDINATOR(CMC): The CMC is responsible for monitoring those cases identified by the Case Manager for inclusion in the research project. CMC's are to establish a log as well as other local procedures for monitoring the research project. This may include referencing SENTRY, using the Case Management Activities assignment (CMA) "PREP".

1. Cases released via a CTC: The CMC will ensure that the Case Manager has provided a completed U/VT form in the furlough transfer package of all individuals meeting the criteria for inclusion in the study. The CMC will forward the pre-addressed yellow duplicate of the first page of the U/VT form to the Office of Research, Central Office, and the remainder of the form to the appropriate CPM. In cases where an inmate is not accepted at any CTC the inmate's U/VT form should be treated under the alternative procedures for inmates being released to the community with supervision.

2. For cases released to the community with 6 months or more of supervision: The CMC will request that Case Managers identify inmates who meet the study's inclusion criteria. Prior to the release of such inmates, the CMC will remove the completed U/VT forms from their packets of other release materials, and forward them to the Community Programs Branch, Central Office, Room 570.

CASE MANAGERS: The Case Manager is responsible for identifying subjects who meet the criteria for inclusion in the project and for ensuring there is an adequate supply of the most current version of the U/VT form. If the forms do not contain a yellow duplicate of the first page addressed to the Central Office, please contact the Office of Research at FTS 724-3121 for a supply of these forms. At regular program reviews, Case Managers are to determine each inmate's status pertaining to the project. SENTRY is to be accessed and inmates who meet the project criteria are to be given the assignment of "PREP" under the Case Management Activities category.

The Case Manager will initiate a U/VT form when he/she begins to compile the release materials on the inmate. The Case Manager first completes the Case Manager Section of the U/VT form. If the inmate has worked in UNICOR for 6 months or longer, the Case Manager will also attach copies of all CHRONOLOGICAL UNICOR WORK PERFORMANCE EVALUATION RECORDS. The Case Manager will then forward the entire U/VT form to the designated Education Department staff member for completion of the Education section. (Please do not separate any sections of the U/VT form.) Upon its return, the Case Manager will place the entire form with the inmate's other release materials. The U/VT form will then accompany other release materials when they are sent to the CMC for review.

Specific instructions on the Case Manager Section:

(1) It is crucial that the Case Manager complete the information about the study criteria (Item 14);

(2) If neither the PSI nor the BP-6 is complete, use inmate-supplied information to complete Items 16 through 19. The occupational title specified in Item 18 should be as specific as possible;

(3) If, for some reason, the CHRONOLOGICAL UNICOR WORK PERFORMANCE EVALUATION RECORD is not in the fourth section of the Central File along with other work-related information, contact the foreman for the most recent copy of this record. If the Central File contains the previous version of the CHRONOLOGICAL UNICOR WORK PERFORMANCE EVALUATION RECORD, both formats should be included. In the event that an evaluation has not been completed, the foreman's impressions of the inmate during the immediately preceding quarter will be recorded.

UNICOR SUPERINTENDENTS/CASE MANAGERS: The Superintendent of Industries is responsible for ensuring that, at the close of each calendar quarter, all UNICOR staff supervising inmates complete the appropriate section of the YEARLY CHRONOLOGICAL UNICOR WORK PERFORMANCE EVALUATION (Attachment B), as directed by OM 151-83 (8130). These forms have been distributed to institutions through normal UNICOR distribution channels. Additional forms can be ordered through UNICOR's Data Graphics Division.

The new format is a multipart form with a white original and yellow, pink, pale yellow and green carbonless copies. On the white original each calendar quarter is marked. The first quarter is in the top left corner, the second quarter is in the top right corner, etc. After UNICOR staff complete each calendar quarter on the white original, the bottom carbonless copy for that quarter is sent to the Case Manager to be filed in Section 4 of the inmate's Central File. The yellow copy is for the first quarter, January - March, the pink is for the second quarter, April - June, the pale yellow copy is for the third quarter, July - September, and the green copy is for the fourth quarter, October - December.

As the Case Manager receives each quarter's information, he or she can discard the previous quarter for that calendar year, since the most recent carbonless copy will consist of previous and current quarterly evaluations. The green carbonless copy the Case Manager receives for the last quarter will remain in the inmate's Central File, along with copies of quarterly evaluations from previous calendar years. There will be inmates whose UNICOR evaluation stops in a quarter other than the last quarter. In these cases, the most recent carbonless copy for that calendar year should be kept in the inmate's Central File. This information should accompany inmates who transfer to other institutions.

If a CHRONOLOGICAL UNICOR WORK PERFORMANCE EVALUATION RECORD already exists in the previous format as per OM 151-83 (8130), this information should not be discarded but should accompany the U/VT form along with copies of all more recent performance records that may have been completed using the new format.

In the event that the performance record has not been completed on an inmate who is included in this project, it may be necessary to specifically prepare an evaluation. In this event, Case Managers will request UNICOR to provide an evaluation based on the impressions of the inmate's supervisor.

EDUCATION SUPERVISOR: The Supervisor of Education is responsible for completion of the Education Section. The training programs funded by UNICOR should be considered as vocational or apprenticeship training and included in the Education Section. The Case Manager gathers information on an inmate's vocational and apprenticeship training (in order to respond to Items 14b and 14c) from the IPRS Report 7285. There may be some discrepancies between the 7285 Report and the Education transcripts. For this reason, the Education staff member filling out the Education Section should use both the 7285 and the Education Transcript in completing the Education Section. Note that the number of completed VT courses and/or apprenticeship programs will dictate whether to answer questions 4-27.

As directed by the December 11, 1984, OM 239-84(1070), each VT or apprenticeship instructor is responsible for rating the performance of individuals completing their programs.

After rating each individual, the IPRS course title, IPRS course number and the rating assigned must be recorded in the designated fields on the Official

Education Transcript in the inmate's Education File. In completing the Education Section of the U/VT form, the Supervisor or his/her designee will transcribe the required information from the Official Education Transcript. Any certificates issued or transcripts indicating hours and proficiency should be attached to the U/VT form before returning it to the Case Manager. Education staff must complete forms in a timely manner and return them to the Case Manager for forwarding to the CMC.

COMMUNITY PROGRAMS MANAGERS/CTC STAFF: Upon receiving the U/VT forms with the furlough transfer package, the CPM will insure that they are complete. In particular, the CPM should check the CTC facility ID number, Item 11, on the first page of the U/VT Form, to ensure that the number is filled in and that it is correct. If the number is missing or incorrect, the CPM should fill in the correct number. The entire package should then be forwarded to the CTC for completion of the CTC Employment Counselor Section.

The CPM will be responsible for maintaining a log of each form as it passes through his/her office, whether he/she is receiving it from the institution to be forwarded to a CTC, or whether he/she is receiving it from a CTC to be forwarded to the Community Programs Branch, in the Central Office. The log should include log-in and log-out dates, inmate name and register number, and appropriate institution and CTC facility numbers.

Information must be collected on each job an inmate holds; therefore, the number of jobs the inmate has will dictate the amount of information which must be collected. After the inmate's discharge from a Center, the CTC Section of the U/VT form must be completed and the entire form should be returned to the CPM. He/she will check them for completeness and unanswered questions and, if more information is required, the CTC must be contacted to obtain the information needed to complete the CTC Section of the form.

By the fifth business day of each month, the CPM will forward the previous month's completed forms to the Community Programs Branch in the Central Office.

In the event that an inmate is a program failure, it is still necessary to complete the the CTC Section. The CTC staff member completing the form should indicate that the inmate was a program failure by choosing the appropriate response in Item 9 (choices 1-4, or 7). Then, the form should be returned to the CPM for forwarding to the Community Programs Branch in the Central Office.

SUMMARY OF POST RELEASE EMPLOYMENT PROJECT (PREP) CHANGES:

1. The U/VT form is no longer initiated at the time of CTC referral, but rather upon initiation of the furlough transfer package or paperwork necessary for release to the community.
2. The CMC has responsibility for ensuring that the form is either included in the releasee's furlough transfer package or is sent to the Community Programs Branch, Central Office, depending on the method of release.
3. The CHRONOLOGICAL UNICOR WORK PERFORMANCE EVALUATION RECORD has been modified and has been distributed through UNICOR distribution channels.
4. The CPM will maintain a log of each U/VT form when it is received from an institution to be forwarded to a CTC and when it is received from a CTC to be forwarded to the Community Programs Branch, Central Office.
5. A new SENTRY Case Management Activities assignment has been developed to facilitate monitoring by institutional, Regional, and Central Office staff.

GERALD M. FARKAS  
Assistant Director

WADE B. HOUK  
Assistant Director

G. L. INGRAM  
Assistant Director

APPENDIX C  
POST RELEASE EMPLOYMENT PROJECT  
UNICOR/VOCATIONAL TRAINING EVALUATION FORM

CASE MANAGER SECTION

- 1. REGISTER NUMBER     -
- 2. FORM REVISION DATE     |   |   |   |
- 3. INMATE NAME (LAST, FIRST, MI)
- 4. DATE OF BIRTH (MM DD YY)
- 5. SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER
- 6. OFFENSE CODE (FOR RESEARCH USE ONLY-CM NEED NOT ENTER)
- 7. INSTITUTION NUMBER
- 8. A. CASE MANAGER'S NAME (Please Print)
- B. LOCATION OF SUPERVISING U. S. PROBATION OFFICE (Please Print)
- 9. TODAY'S DATE (MM DD YY)
- 10. WILL INMATE BE RELEASED THROUGH A CTC?      1. YES      2. NO
- 11. IF INMATE IS TO BE RELEASED THROUGH A CTC,  
    WHAT IS THE CTC FACILITY ID NUMBER?
- 12. WILL INMATE BE RELEASED TO THE COMMUNITY,  
    UNDER SUPERVISION, FOR AT LEAST 6 MONTHS?      1. YES      2. NO
- 13. ANTICIPATED DATE OF DEPARTURE FROM  
    INSTITUTION (MM DD YY)

UNICOR VOCATIONAL TRAINING STUDY CRITERIA

- 14. ON WHAT BASIS DOES THIS INMATE QUALIFY FOR INCLUSION IN THIS STUDY:
  - A. 6 MONTHS OR LONGER OF UNICOR EMPLOYMENT?      1. YES      2. NO
  - B. SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF A VOCATIONAL TRAINING PROGRAM?      1. YES      2. NO
  - C. INVOLVEMENT IN AN APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAM?      1. YES      2. NO

FOLD AND STAPLE THIS COPY AND MAIL IT VIA BOP BATCH MAIL TO THE ADDRESS ON THE BACK OF THIS PAGE.

UNICOR WORK PERFORMANCE

15. UNICOR EMPLOYMENT

- 1) INMATE NEVER WORKED IN UNICOR
- 2) INMATE HAS WORKED IN UNICOR BUT THE EMPLOYMENT WAS PRIOR TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CURRENT WORK PERFORMANCE EVALUATION RECORD
- 3) INMATE IS WORKING IN UNICOR OR HAS WORKED IN UNICOR SINCE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CURRENT WORK PERFORMANCE EVALUATION RECORD

IF THE RESPONSE TO ITEM 15 ABOVE IS 3, APPEND COPIES OF ALL CHRONOLOGICAL UNICOR WORK PERFORMANCE EVALUATION RECORDS TO THE BACK OF THIS U/VT. EVALUATION FORM.

PRESENTENCE REPORT INFORMATION (THE PSI INFORMATION CAN ALSO BE OBTAINED FROM THE BP-6)

16. HIGHEST ACADEMIC EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT PRIOR TO INCARCERATION

- 1. 8TH GRADE OR LESS
- 2. 9TH THRU 12TH (NO DIPLOMA)
- 3. G.E.D.
- 4. HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA
- 5. SOME HIGHER LEVEL ACADEMIC EDUCATION AT AN INSTITUTION WITH A HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA PREREQUISITE (E.G., COLLEGE, TECHNICAL SCHOOL)
- 6. DEGREE OR DIPLOMA FROM A HIGHER LEVEL ACADEMIC INSTITUTION WITH A HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA PREREQUISITE

17. DURING THE 5 YEARS PREVIOUS TO THIS INCARCERATION, HOW MANY MONTHS DID THE INMATE WORK IN THE FREE COMMUNITY? (0-60 MONTHS)

18. WHAT WAS THE PRECISE OCCUPATION TITLE OF THE LONGEST HELD JOB IN THE FREE COMMUNITY? (PRINT LEGIBLY) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

19. IS THERE ANY INDICATION THAT THIS LONGEST HELD JOB (ITEM 18) WAS FULL OR PART TIME?

- 1) FULL TIME
- 2) PART TIME
- 3) NO INFORMATION



DISCIPLINARY-REPORTS

20. BP-15 (CUSTODY CLASSIFICATION FORM) ITEM 3, FORM COMPLETION DATE (MMDDYY)

21. BP-15 SECTION B ITEM 4, SEVERITY

22. BP-15 SECTION B ITEM 5, FREQUENCY

23. DISCIPLINARY REPORTS FILED DURING THE IMMEDIATELY PRECEDING THREE YEAR PERIOD (CODE AS MANY DISCIPLINARY REPORTS AS OCCURED WITHIN THIS 3 YEAR PERIOD, BEGIN WITH THE MOST RECENT REPORT, WORK BACK IN TIME, UP TO A MAXIMUM OF 14 REPORTS). THESE DO NOT HAVE TO BE LISTED IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER. IF THERE ARE NO DISCIPLINARY REPORTS, PLACE AN 'N' IN THE SPACE TO THE RIGHT.

DATE	INST CODE	PROHIBITED ACTS CODE
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

24. IF MORE THAN 14 REPORTS WERE FILED, COUNT AND RECORD THE NUMBER OF OCCURRENCES (OVER THE ABOVE 14) OF EACH GENERAL PROHIBITED ACTS CODE LEVEL.

A. # of 100  B. # of 200  C. # of 300  D. # of 400



10. DATE OF ENTRY INTO PROGRAM (MM DD YY)

11. PERFORMANCE RATING SCALE (1=SATISFACTORY THRU 4=EXCEPTIONAL)

=====

12. THIRD MOST RECENT VT COURSE TITLE (USE SPECIFIC IPRS TITLE,  
BEGINNING WITH LEFT-MOST SPACE)

13. IPRS COURSE NUMBER (D.O.T. CODE)

14. DATE OF ENTRY INTO PROGRAM (MM DD YY)

15. PERFORMANCE RATING SCALE (1=SATISFACTORY THRU 4=EXCEPTIONAL)

=====

16. FOURTH MOST RECENT VT COURSE TITLE (USE SPECIFIC IPRS TITLE,  
BEGINNING WITH LEFT-MOST SPACE)

17. IPRS COURSE NUMBER (D.O.T. CODE)

18. DATE OF ENTRY INTO PROGRAM (MM DD YY)

19. PERFORMANCE RATING SCALE (1=SATISFACTORY THRU 4=EXCEPTIONAL)

---

APPRENTICESHIP-PROGRAMS (INCLUDE BOTH REGULAR AND UNICOR-FUNDED PROGRAMS)

20. MOST RECENT APPRENTICESHIP COURSE TITLE (USE SPECIFIC IPRS TITLE,  
BEGINNING WITH LEFT-MOST SPACE)

21. IPRS COURSE NUMBER (D.O.T. CODE)

22. DATE OF ENTRY INTO PROGRAM (MM DD YY)

23. PERFORMANCE RATING SCALE (1=SATISFACTORY THRU 4=EXCEPTIONAL)

=====



UNICOR VOCATIONAL TRAINING EVALUATION FORM

CTC EMPLOYMENT COUNSELOR SECTION

\*\*\*\*\*
NOTE: AFTER COMPLETION OF THIS SECTION, RETURN THIS FORM TO COMMUNITY PROGRAMS MANAGER
IF YOU NEED ASSISTANCE COMPLETING THIS FORM, PLEASE CALL 724-3121
\*\*\*\*\*

NOTE: PLEASE PLACE AN 'N' IN THE SPACE PROVIDED IF AN ITEM IS NOT APPLICABLE.
THIS SECTION IS TO BE COMPLETED AND RETURNED EVEN IF THE INMATE IS A PROGRAM
FAILURE.

1. A. CPM'S NAME (Please Print)

Grid for CPM's name: 15 columns, 1 row

B. LOCATION OF SUPERVISING U. S. PROBATION OFFICE (Please Print)

Grid for probation office location: 15 columns, 1 row

2. TODAY'S DATE (MM DD YY)

Grid for today's date: 3 columns, 1 row

3. FACILITY ID NUMBER

Grid for facility ID number: 3 columns, 1 row

4. FACILITY NAME

Grid for facility name: 15 columns, 1 row

5. DID YOU RECEIVE ANY INFORMATION ON UNICOR EMPLOYMENT, VOCATIONAL TRAINING
PROGRAMS COMPLETED OR APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAM INVOLVEMENT?

1. YES 2. NO [ ]

6. IF ITEM 5 ABOVE IS NO, DID YOU CONTACT THE CPM FOR THIS ADDITIONAL
INFORMATION?

1. YES 2. NO [ ]

7. DATE INMATE ARRIVED AT CTC (MM DD YY)
(IF INDIVIDUAL DID NOT REPORT ENTER '999999' AS DATE)

Grid for arrival date: 3 columns, 1 row

8. DATE INMATE WAS TERMINATED FROM CTC (MM DD YY)

Grid for termination date: 3 columns, 1 row

9. TERMINATION FROM CTC 0. TRANSFER TO PUBLIC LAW STATUS

- 1. ESCAPE [ ]
2. NEW ARREST
3. RETURNED TO CUSTODY FOR DISCIPLINARY REASONS
4. RETURNED TO CUSTODY FOR ADMINISTRATIVE REASONS
5. SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION
6. TRANSFERRED TO ANOTHER CTC
7. OTHER--SPECIFY: \_\_\_\_\_



23. SOURCE OF JOB
1. CTC
  2. SELF
  3. FRIENDS
  4. RELATIVES
  5. EMPLOYMENT AGENCY
  6. OTHER--SPECIFY: \_\_\_\_\_

24. IF NO LONGER EMPLOYED ON THIS JOB, GIVE REASON FOR LEAVING JOB:
- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>0. ESCAPED/RETURNED TO CUSTODY</li> <li>1. FIRED DUE TO INADEQUATE SKILLS</li> <li>2. FIRED DUE TO POOR WORK HABITS</li> <li>3. FIRED DUE TO CRIMINAL RECORD</li> <li>4. FIRED FOR OTHER REASONS--<br/>SPECIFY: _____</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. LAID OFF</li> <li>6. QUIT FOR BETTER JOB</li> <li>7. QUIT DUE TO LACK OF PAY</li> <li>8. QUIT DUE TO LACK OF INTEREST</li> <li>9. QUIT FOR OTHER REASONS--<br/>SPECIFY: _____</li> </ol> |
|---|--|

LONGEST JOB HELD AT THE CTC

25. IS THE JOB HELD MOST RECENTLY, DESCRIBED ABOVE, ALSO JOB HELD THE LONGEST? 1. YES 2. NO   
(IF YES, DO NOT FILL OUT ITEMS 26 THROUGH 33)
26. DATE STARTED (MM DD YY)
27. HOURS PER WEEK
28. D.O.T. CODE (FOR RESEARCH USE--CTC COUNSELORS DO NOT NEED TO COMPLETE THIS ITEM)
29. THE PRECISE OCCUPATIONAL TITLE OF THE JOB HELD LONGEST (PRINT LEGIBLY)
30. LAST DATE OF EMPLOYMENT ON LONGEST HELD JOB (MM DD YY)
31. HOW MUCH MONEY DID THE INMATE EARN OVER THE DURATION OF HIS/HER EMPLOYMENT ON THIS JOB? (ROUND TO NEAREST DOLLAR VALUE.) \$ .00
32. SOURCE OF JOB
1. CTC
  2. SELF
  3. FRIENDS
  4. RELATIVES
  5. EMPLOYMENT AGENCY
  6. OTHER--SPECIFY: \_\_\_\_\_

33. IF NO LONGER EMPLOYED ON THIS JOB, GIVE REASON FOR LEAVING JOB:
- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. FIRED DUE TO INADEQUATE SKILLS</li> <li>2. FIRED DUE TO POOR WORK HABITS</li> <li>3. FIRED DUE TO CRIMINAL RECORD</li> <li>4. FIRED FOR OTHER REASONS--<br/>SPECIFY: _____</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. LAID OFF</li> <li>6. QUIT FOR BETTER JOB</li> <li>7. QUIT DUE TO LACK OF PAY</li> <li>8. QUIT DUE TO LACK OF INTEREST</li> <li>9. QUIT FOR OTHER REASONS--<br/>SPECIFY: _____</li> </ol> |
|---|--|

APPENDIX D

Interviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

GENERAL INFORMATION FOR:

NAME: \_\_\_\_\_

REGISTER NUMBER: \_\_\_\_\_ - \_\_\_\_\_

CALL BACKS TO BE MADE ON:

6 mos. call: \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_

12 mos. call: \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_

INSTITUTION NUMBER: \_\_\_\_\_

CASE MANAGER'S NAME: \_\_\_\_\_

EXPECTED RELEASE DATE FROM INSTITUTION: \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_

ACTUAL RELEASE DATE FROM INSTITUTION: \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_

RELEASED FROM INSTITUTION TO: 1. CTC 2. PAROLE

\_\_\_\_\_  
 |  
 v

CTC NUMBER: \_\_\_\_\_ CTC CALL TO BE MADE ON: \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_

CTC NAME: \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

TELEPHONE #: \_\_\_\_\_ - \_\_\_\_\_ - \_\_\_\_\_

CTC CONTACT PERSON: \_\_\_\_\_

EXPECTED RELEASE DATE FROM CTC: \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_

ACTUAL RELEASE DATE FROM CTC: \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_

WILL HE/SHE BE UNDER SUPERVISION UPON CTC RELEASE? 1. YES 2. NO

↓  
 v

PAROLE OFFICER'S NAME: \_\_\_\_\_

(ADDRESS): \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

CITY/STATE \_\_\_\_\_

(TELEPHONE #): \_\_\_\_\_ - \_\_\_\_\_ - \_\_\_\_\_



(Register No.): \_\_\_\_\_  
(Today's Date): \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

INITIAL CTC CONTACT (To be phased out)

(3 months after actual release date from institution)

1. ON WHAT DATE DID HE (SHE) FIRST REPORT TO THE CTC?: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

2. IS HE (SHE) STILL AT THE CTC? 1. YES 2. NO

↓  
WHAT IS HIS (HER) EXPECTED DATE OF RELEASE FROM THE CTC? \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_  
(Skip to #3.)  
(Transcribe to general info. sheet)

↓  
ON WHAT DATE DID HE (SHE) LEAVE THE CTC? \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_  
(transcribe to general info. sheet)

↓  
UNDER WHAT CONDITIONS DID HE (SHE) LEAVE THE CTC?

- 1. SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF PROGRAM
- 2. ESCAPE
- 3. RETURNED TO CUSTODY FOR DISCIPLINARY REASONS
- 4. RETURNED TO CUSTODY FOR PAROLE VIOLATION
- 5. RETURNED TO CUSTODY FOR NEW OFFENSE
- 6. TRANSFERRED TO ANOTHER CTC-----> CTC NAME: \_\_\_\_\_  
CTC CODE: \_\_\_\_\_
- 7. OTHER (SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

3. WILL HE (SHE) BE UNDER SUPERVISION UPON RELEASE FROM THE CTC?

1. YES 2. NO -----> THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME.

↓  
PAROLE OFFICER'S NAME: \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_

TELEPHONE #: \_\_\_\_\_

(transcribe supervision and Parole Officer information to general info. sheet)

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME.

PAROLE OFFICER'S NAME & CITY (if different): \_\_\_\_\_ (Register No.): \_\_\_\_\_ - \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Today's date): \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

\*\*\*\*\* S I X M O N T H S P A R O L E O F F I C E R C A L L \*\*\*\*\*

1. ON WHAT DATE DID HE (SHE) FIRST REPORT FOR PAROLE? \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_
2. IS HE (SHE) STILL UNDER SUPERVISION? 1. YES 2. NO

↓ (If YES)  
 WHAT IS HIS (HER) EXPECTED DATE OF PAROLE COMPLETION ? \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_  
 (Skip to #3.)

↓ (If NO)  
 WAS HIS (HER) PAROLE COMPLETED, REVOKED, OR WAS HE (SHE) SENT BACK TO CTC? 1. COMPLETED 2. REVOKED 3. SENT BACK TO CTC

↓  
 ON WHAT DATE WAS HIS (HER) PAROLE COMPLETED/REVOKED? \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

(If parole COMPLETED, skip to #3.) (If sent back to CTC, make 12 month call to the CTC)

↓ (If REVOKED)  
 WAS PAROLE REVOKED AS A RESULT OF A NEW OFFENSE OR A PAROLE VIOLATION? 1. NEW 2. P.V.

3. HOW MANY JOBS HAS HE (SHE) HELD, NOT INCLUDING DAY LABOR, DURING THE LAST 6 MONTHS OF PAROLE ? (If NO jobs held, skip to #11.) NUMBER OF JOBS \_\_\_\_

NOW I'M GOING TO ASK YOU A SERIES OF QUESTIONS ABOUT THE VARIOUS JOBS HE (SHE) HAS HAD WHILE ON PAROLE. LET'S BEGIN WITH THE MOST RECENT, OR CURRENT, JOB & WORK BACK. (If more than 6 jobs, list only the 6 longest jobs.)

4. IS HE (SHE) WORKING NOW? (If YES = present tense, NO = past tense) 1. YES 2. NO
- JOB #1.

5. WHAT TYPE OF WORK IS (WAS) HE (SHE) DOING?  
 (Job description) \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Job title) \_\_\_\_\_ (DOT CODE) \_\_\_\_\_

6. ON WHAT DATE DID HE (SHE) START THIS JOB? DATE STARTED: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

7. HOW MANY HOURS PER WEEK DOES (DID) HE (SHE) WORK? (Average is OK) HRS/WEEK \_\_\_\_

8. HOW MUCH MONEY HAS HE (SHE) EARNED AT THIS JOB?  
 (Last month) (6 months ago)

	6th MONTH	5th MONTH	4th MONTH	3rd MONTH	2nd MONTH	1st MONTH
\$/MONTH	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
OR \$/HOUR	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
OR \$/WEEK	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
OR \$/YEAR	\$ _____					
OR PIECE-RATE	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
OR COMMISSION	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
OR OTHER (specify: _____)	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____

(Register No.): \_\_\_\_\_ - \_\_\_\_\_

9. HAS HE (SHE) BEEN WORKING CONTINUOUSLY AT THIS JOB DURING THIS PERIOD? 1. YES 2. NO

(If STILL employed at this job, attach additional job information sheets, if necessary, and when all job information is collected, skip to #11.)

10. (If NO LONGER employed at this job):

ON WHAT DATE DID HE (SHE) STOP WORKING AT THAT JOB? DATE ENDED: \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_

WHY DID HE (SHE) LEAVE THAT JOB?

1. FIRED DUE TO INADEQUATE SKILLS
2. FIRED DUE TO POOR WORK HABITS
3. FIRED DUE TO CRIMINAL RECORD
4. FIRED FOR OTHER REASONS (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
5. LAID OFF
6. QUIT FOR BETTER JOB
7. QUIT DUE TO LACK OF PAY
8. QUIT DUE TO LACK OF INTEREST
9. QUIT FOR OTHER REASONS (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

(If more than one job, attach additional job information sheets.)

11. HAS HE (SHE) WORKED ANY DAY LABOR JOBS IN THE LAST 6 MONTHS? 1. YES 2. NO  
| (Skip to #12.)

v (If YES)

NOW I'M GOING TO ASK YOU A SERIES OF QUESTIONS ABOUT THESE DAY LABOR JOBS. FOR EACH OF THE LAST SIX MONTHS, I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW HOW MANY DAYS WERE WORKED AT DAY LABOR JOBS, ABOUT HOW MANY HOURS PER DAY HE (SHE) WORKED AT THESE JOBS, AND HOW MUCH MONEY WAS EARNED.

SO, IN THE PAST MONTH HOW MANY DAYS HAS HE (SHE) WORKED DAY LABOR? (Record below)  
AND ABOUT HOW MANY HOURS PER DAY DID HE (SHE) WORK? (Record below)  
AND HOW MUCH MONEY DID HE (SHE) EARN? (Record below)

MONTH	DAYS WORKED	AVERAGE HOURS PER DAY	MONEY EARNED (Round to nearest \$)
(last mo.) 6	---	---	\$ _____
5	---	---	\$ _____
4	---	---	\$ _____
3	---	---	\$ _____
2	---	---	\$ _____
(6 mos. ago) 1	---	---	\$ _____

12. IS HE (SHE) A STUDENT? 1. YES 2. NO  
|

v (If YES,)

WHAT DEGREE IS HE (SHE) WORKING TOWARD, OR WHAT FIELD OF STUDY ARE THEY IN?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME.

IS HE (SHE) A FULL-TIME OR A PART-TIME STUDENT? 1. FULL-TIME 2. PART-TIME

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME.

(Register No.): \_\_\_\_\_  
(Today's Date): \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

\*\*\*\*\* ADDITIONAL JOB INFORMATION SHEET \*\*\*\*\*

(Additional jobs for: 1. Six Months Call 2. Twelve Months Call)

JOB # \_\_\_\_\_ (fill in)

A. WHAT TYPE OF WORK WAS HE (SHE) DOING?

(Job description) \_\_\_\_\_  
(Job title) \_\_\_\_\_ (DOT CODE) \_\_\_\_\_

B. ON WHAT DATE DID HE (SHE) START THIS JOB? DATE STARTED: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

C. HOW MANY HOURS PER WEEK DID HE (SHE) WORK? (Average is OK) HRS/WEEK \_\_\_\_

D. HOW MUCH MONEY DID HE (SHE) EARN AT THIS JOB?

	(Last month)					(6 months ago)
	6th MONTH	5th MONTH	4th MONTH	3rd MONTH	2nd MONTH	1st MONTH
\$ /MONTH	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
OR \$ /HOUR	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
OR \$ /WEEK	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
OR \$ /YEAR	\$ _____					
OR PIECE-RATE	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
OR COMMISSION	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
OR OTHER	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
(specify: _____)						

E. HAS HE (SHE) BEEN WORKING CONTINUOUSLY AT THIS JOB DURING THIS PERIOD? 1. YES 2. NO

(If STILL employed at this job, attach additional job information sheets, if necessary, and when all job information is collected, skip to #11 on 6 Months Call or to #10 on Twelve Months Call.)

F. (If NO LONGER employed at this job):

ON WHAT DATE DID HE (SHE) STOP WORKING AT THAT JOB? DATE ENDED: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

WHY DID HE (SHE) LEAVE THAT JOB?

1. FIRED DUE TO INADEQUATE SKILLS
2. FIRED DUE TO POOR WORK HABITS
3. FIRED DUE TO CRIMINAL RECORD
4. FIRED FOR OTHER REASONS (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
5. LAID OFF
6. QUIT FOR BETTER JOB
7. QUIT DUE TO LACK OF PAY
8. QUIT DUE TO LACK OF INTEREST
9. QUIT FOR OTHER REASONS (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

(If more than one job, attach additional job information sheets.)

PAROLE OFFICER'S NAME & CITY (if different): \_\_\_\_\_

(Register No.): \_\_\_\_\_  
(Today's date): \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

\*\*\*\*\* TWELVE MONTHS PAROLE OFFICER CALL \*\*\*\*\*

1. IS HE (SHE) STILL UNDER SUPERVISION? 1. YES 2. NO

v (If YES)

WHAT IS HIS (HER) EXPECTED DATE OF PAROLE COMPLETION ?

\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_  
(Skip to #2.)

v (If NO)

WAS HIS (HER) PAROLE COMPLETED, OR REVOKED?

1. COMPLETED 2. REVOKED

v

ON WHAT DATE WAS HIS (HER) PAROLE COMPLETED/REVOKED?

\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

(If parole COMPLETED, skip to #2.)

v (If REVOKED)

WAS PAROLE REVOKED AS A RESULT OF A NEW OFFENSE OR A PAROLE VIOLATION?

1. NEW 2. P.V.

2. HOW MANY JOBS HAS HE (SHE) HELD, NOT INCLUDING DAY LABOR, DURING THE LAST 6 MONTHS OF PAROLE ? (If NO jobs held, skip to #10.)

NUMBER OF JOBS \_\_\_\_\_

NOW I'M GOING TO ASK YOU A SERIES OF QUESTIONS ABOUT THE VARIOUS JOBS HE (SHE) HAS HAD DURING THE LAST SIX MONTHS. LET'S BEGIN WITH THE MOST RECENT, OR CURRENT, JOB & WORK BACK.

(If more than 6 jobs, list only the 6 longest jobs.)

3. IS HE (SHE) WORKING NOW? (If YES = present tense, NO = past tense) 1. YES 2. NO

JOB #1.

4. WHAT TYPE OF WORK IS (WAS) HE (SHE) DOING?

(Job description) \_\_\_\_\_

(Job title) \_\_\_\_\_

(DOT CODE) \_\_\_\_\_

5. ON WHAT DATE DID HE (SHE) START THIS JOB?

DATE STARTED: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

6. HOW MANY HOURS PER WEEK DOES (DID) HE (SHE) WORK? (Average is OK)

HRS/WEEK \_\_\_\_\_

7. HOW MUCH MONEY HAS HE (SHE) EARNED AT THIS JOB?

(Last month)

(6 months ago)

	6th MONTH	5th MONTH	4th MONTH	3rd MONTH	2nd MONTH	1st MONTH
\$/MONTH	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
OR \$/HOUR	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
OR \$/WEEK	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
OR \$/YEAR	\$ _____					
OR PIECE-RATE	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
OR COMMISSION	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
OR OTHER	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____

(specify: \_\_\_\_\_)

(Register No.): \_\_\_\_\_ - \_\_\_\_\_

8. HAS HE (SHE) BEEN WORKING CONTINUOUSLY AT THIS JOB DURING THIS PERIOD? 1. YES 2. NO

(If STILL employed at this job, attach additional job information sheets, if necessary, and when all job information is collected, skip to #10.)

9. (If NO LONGER employed at this job):

ON WHAT DATE DID HE (SHE) STOP WORKING AT THAT JOB? DATE ENDED: \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_

WHY DID HE (SHE) LEAVE THAT JOB?

- 1. FIRED DUE TO INADEQUATE SKILLS
- 2. FIRED DUE TO POOR WORK HABITS
- 3. FIRED DUE TO CRIMINAL RECORD
- 4. FIRED FOR OTHER REASONS (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- 5. LAID OFF
- 6. QUIT FOR BETTER JOB
- 7. QUIT DUE TO LACK OF PAY
- 8. QUIT DUE TO LACK OF INTEREST
- 9. QUIT FOR OTHER REASONS (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

(If more than one job, attach additional job information sheets.)

10. HAS HE (SHE) WORKED ANY DAY LABOR JOBS IN THE LAST 6 MONTHS? 1. YES 2. NO  
| (Skip to #11.)

|  
v (If YES)

NOW I'M GOING TO ASK YOU A SERIES OF QUESTIONS ABOUT THESE DAY LABOR JOBS. FOR EACH OF THE LAST SIX MONTHS, I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW HOW MANY DAYS WERE WORKED AT DAY LABOR JOBS, ABOUT HOW MANY HOURS PER DAY HE (SHE) WORKED AT THESE JOBS, AND HOW MUCH MONEY WAS EARNED.

SO, IN THE PAST MONTH HOW MANY DAYS HAS HE (SHE) WORKED DAY LABOR? (Record below)  
AND ABOUT HOW MANY HOURS PER DAY DID HE (SHE) WORK? (Record below)  
AND HOW MUCH MONEY DID HE (SHE) EARN? (Record below)

MONTH	DAYS WORKED	AVERAGE HOURS PER DAY	MONEY EARNED (Round to nearest \$)
(last mo.) 6	---	---	\$ _____
5	---	---	\$ _____
4	---	---	\$ _____
3	---	---	\$ _____
2	---	---	\$ _____
(6 mos. ago) 1	---	---	\$ _____

11. IS HE (SHE) A STUDENT? 1. YES 2. NO  
|

|  
v (If YES,)

WHAT DEGREE IS HE (SHE) WORKING TOWARD, OR WHAT FIELD OF STUDY ARE THEY IN?

v  
THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME.

IS HE (SHE) A FULL-TIME OR A PART-TIME STUDENT? 1. FULL-TIME 2. PART-TIME

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME.

## APPENDIX E

### DESCRIPTION OF OFFENSE CATEGORIES

White Collar offenses include: embezzlement, counterfeiting, bankruptcy law violations, banking and insurance law violations, etc.

Immigration offenses include: illegal entry, importation of aliens, passport fraud, false personation of U.S. citizen, etc.

National Security offenses include: impersonation of federal or foreign official, sedition, mutiny, national defense and security law violations, selective service and training act violations, etc.

Firearms, Explosives, and Arson offenses include: importing, manufacturing, distributing, licensing, or transporting explosives, property destruction by explosives, possession of a deadly weapon, firearms laws violations, arson, etc.

Drug and Liquor offenses include: manufacturing, distributing, possessing, or importing a controlled substance, smuggling liquor, transporting liquor into a dry state, alcohol tax violations, etc.

Sex offenses include: prostitution, incest, sodomy, etc.

Extortion, Fraud, and Bribery offenses include: internal revenue law, communications act, labor and social welfare law violations, etc.

Court, Corrections offenses include: bail or bond jumping, contempt charges, perjury, escape, flight, harboring a fugitive, jury tampering, material witness only, etc.

Property offenses include: burglary, larceny, forgery, auto theft, lottery, racketeering, customs laws and interstate commerce act violations, etc.

Violent offenses include: assault, murder, kidnapping, robbery, rape, etc.

Miscellaneous offenses include: disorderly conduct, trespassing, vagrancy, gambling, stowaway law violations, civil rights violations, civil aeronautics act violations, migratory bird, fish and game law violations, etc.

## APPENDIX F

### LISTING OF OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES, DIVISIONS, AND GROUPS

#### PROFESSIONAL, TECHNICAL, AND MANAGERIAL OCCUPATIONS INCLUDE OCCUPATIONS IN:

Architecture, engineering, surveying, mathematics, physical sciences, life sciences, social sciences, medicine, health, education, museum sciences, library sciences, archival sciences, law, jurisprudence, religion, theology, writing, art, entertainment, recreation, administrative specializations, managing, officiating, and miscellaneous professional, technical and managerial occupations.

#### CLERICAL AND SALES OCCUPATIONS INCLUDE OCCUPATIONS IN:

Stenography, typing, filing, and related occupations, computing and account-recording, production and stock clerking and related occupations, information and message distribution, miscellaneous clerical occupations, sales occupations and services, consumable commodities, commodities and miscellaneous sales occupations.

#### SERVICE OCCUPATIONS INCLUDE OCCUPATIONS IN:

Domestic service, food and beverage preparation and services, lodging and related services, barbering, cosmetology, and related services, amusement, recreation services, miscellaneous personal services, apparel and furnishings services, protective services, building and related services.

#### AGRICULTURAL, FISHERY, FORESTRY, AND RELATED OCCUPATIONS INCLUDE OCCUPATIONS IN:

Plant farming, animal farming, miscellaneous agricultural and related occupations, fishery and related occupations, forestry, hunting, trapping and related occupations.

#### PROCESSING OCCUPATIONS INCLUDE OCCUPATIONS IN:

Processing of metal, ore refining, foundry, processing of food, tobacco, and related products, processing of paper and related materials, processing of petroleum, coal, natural and manufactured gas, and related products, processing of chemicals, plastics, synthetics, rubber, paint, and related products, processing of wood and wood products, processing of stone, clay, glass, and related products, occupations in processing of leather, textiles, and related products.



MACHINE TRADES OCCUPATIONS INCLUDE OCCUPATIONS IN:

Metal machining, metalworking, mechanics repair, machinery repair, paperworking, printing, wood machining, machining stone, clay, glass, and related materials, textiles, machine trades.

BENCHWORK OCCUPATIONS INCLUDE OCCUPATIONS IN:

Fabrication, assembly, and repair of metal products, fabrication and repair of scientific, medical, photographic, optical, horological, and related products, assembly and repair of electrical equipment, fabrication and repair of products made from assorted materials, painting, decorating, and related occupations, fabrication and repair of plastics, synthetics, rubber, and related products, fabrication and repair of wood products, fabrication and repair of sand, stone, clay, and glass products, fabrication and repair of textile, leather, and related products.

STRUCTURAL WORK OCCUPATIONS INCLUDE OCCUPATIONS IN:

Metal fabricating, welding, cutting, electrical assembling, installing, and repairing, painting, plastering, waterproofing, cementing, excavating, grading, paving, and construction.

MISCELLANEOUS OCCUPATIONS INCLUDE OCCUPATIONS IN:

Motor freight, transportation, packaging and materials handling, extraction of minerals, production and distribution of utilities, amusement, recreation, motion picture, radio and television, and graphic art work.

APPENDIX G

CTC JOB DOT CODE BY UNICOR JOB DOT CODE

CTC JOB DOT CODE	UNICOR JOB DOT CODE											TOTAL
	PROF, TECH, MGR	CLERICAL & SALES	SERVICE	PROCESS- ING	MACHINE TRADE	BENCH- WORK	STRUCTU- RAL WORK	MISCEL- LANEOUS				
PROF, TECH, MGR	1	14	0	0	3	6	1	1				26
CLERICAL, SALES	3	34	1	0	5	21	6	2				72
SERVICE	1	7	0	2	10	29	1	7				57
AGRICULTURAL	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3				5
PROCESSING	0	1	0	0	0	4	0	1				6
MACHINE TRADE	1	5	0	1	7	15	1	2				32
BENCHWORK	0	2	0	0	2	8	1	1				14
STRUCTURAL WORK	1	15	4	0	21	58	9	12				120
MISCELLANEOUS	1	7	2	0	2	15	4	6				37
TOTAL	8	85	7	3	51	157	23	35				369

APPENDIX H

PRE- INCARCERATION JOB DOT CODE BY SIX MONTH JOB DOT CODE

PRE- INCARCERATION JOB DOT CODE	SIX MONTH JOB DOT CODE											TOTAL
	PROF, TECH, MGR	CLERICAL & SALES	SERVICE	AGRICUL- TURAL	PROCESS- ING	MACHINE TRADE	BENCH- WORK	STRUCTU- RAL WORK	MISCEL- LANEOUS			
PROF, TECH, MGR	5	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	3	2		13
CLERICAL, SALES	4	7	0	0	0	1	1	2				17
SERVICE	0	1	5	1	0	1	0	2	1			11
AGRICULTURAL	1	0	1	2	1	0	0	2	0			7
PROCESSING	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0			2
MACHINE TRADE	2	1	0	1	0	2	0	2	4			12
BENCHWORK	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	1	2			7
STRUCTURAL WORK	0	2	1	0	0	2	0	19	4			28
MISCELLANEOUS	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	6			13
TOTAL	12	15	9	4	1	9	3	36	21			110

APPENDIX I

UNICOR JOB DOT CODE BY SIX MONTH JOB DOT CODE

UNICOR JOB DOT CODE	SIX MONTH JOB DOT CODE											TOTAL
	PROF, TECH,MGR	CLERICAL & SALES	SERVICE	AGRICUL- TURAL	PROCESS- ING	MACHINE TRADE	BENCH- WORK	STRUCTU- RAL WORK	MISCEL- LANEOUS			
PROF, TECH, MGR	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
CLERICAL, SALES	0	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	3		13
SERVICE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0		1
PROCESSING	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0		1
MACHINE TRADE	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	3		6
BENCHWORK	3	3	5	0	1	3	1	12	5			33
STRUCTURAL WORK	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2			2
MISCELLANEOUS	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	1			6
TOTAL	5	10	8	2	1	3	1	20	14			64