

**NORFOLK DRUG TREATMENT PROGRAMS:
A PROCESS EVALUATION**

Prepared by:

**Ann Marie Rocheleau
Research Unit**

Massachusetts Department of Correction

**Michael V. Fair
Commissioner**

**PUBLICATION #: 13778-78-250-9-84-CR
Approved by Daniel Carter, State Purchasing Agent**

NORFOLK DRUG TREATMENT PROGRAMS: A PROCESS EVALUATION

ABSTRACT

This study presents the results of a process evaluation completed on the three drug treatment programs at MCI-Norfolk - the Span, YTT and CASH programs. Included in the results are a description of program participants, the level of attendance, budget and personnel, the type of modality and program processes. Perceptions on the merits of the programs, their level of effectiveness and their image within the prison are also explained.

The main thrust of each of the programs is to help inmates with drug-related problems and to provide support for them to become and remain drug-free. However for SPAN, this goal is overshadowed by their goal to provide re-entry services to those inmates being released to the street. The YTT program also deals with some re-entry issues although to a much lesser extent. Both SPAN and YTT also provide services to inmates who have been released from prison.

All three programs utilize the same basic modality of treatment - the group therapy or self-help approach. Their primary service to inmates is their weekly group session lasting from one to two hours. Both SPAN and CASH provide a limited amount of individual counseling and SPAN offers re-entry services. However, according to MCI-Norfolk administrators and program personnel, this limited amount of individual counseling only begins to address the needs of inmates who prefer one-to-one counseling. In addition, there is a lack of drug education for Norfolk inmates.

Besides only providing one type of drug treatment counseling to the inmates at Norfolk, the three programs only service a small number of inmates. Monthly attendance sheets and reports at Norfolk revealed that SPAN serviced 128 different inmates, CASH serviced 15 and YTT serviced 30 during the 1983 calendar

year. These 173 inmates only represent 7% of all the inmates who were at Norfolk sometime during 1983.

The cost of all three programs' services at Norfolk totalled almost \$50,000. The cost per client figure for each of these programs was similar (around \$62.00) with YTT costing slightly less at \$59.40 per client. However SPAN had the lowest cost per hour of direct service (\$17.13), with CASH slightly higher (\$21.97) and YTT the highest (\$54.82).

Profiles of program participants show that each program attracts a different type of inmate. CASH's participants tend to be mostly white inmates, who are serving long sentences, mostly for offenses against the person. YTT participants are usually black inmates, who are somewhat older and have been around drugs and the criminal justice system for a long time. Participants of SPAN tend to be younger inmates, with shorter sentences who are within one year of their parole eligibility dates. They are split racially as well as by the type of offenses committed.

Throughout the evaluation SPAN has always appeared as somewhat apart from YTT or CASH. It is a much larger program than the others and also serves inmates who are close to being paroled. In addition, SPAN has a better image and reputation among DOC administrators and staff. Both YTT and CASH do not have the recognition afforded to SPAN mostly because DOC staff know little about these programs. While it appeared that the CASH Director and participants are not concerned about this lack of recognition, the YTT Director and its participants complained that they did not receive the recognition they believe they deserve.

This report also presents the pros and cons of having outside drug treatment programs providing services to inmates within Norfolk prison. Finally it addresses the probability of future research, concluding that it would not be appropriate at the present time.

Table of Contents

	Page Number
INTRODUCTION	1
RESEARCH METHODS	3
FINDINGS	7
I. Description of Drug Treatment Programs	8
A. History	8
B. Program Goals	10
C. Treatment Modality	12
D. Program Process	13
1. Program Enrollment and Attendance	14
2. The Process - From Intake to Termination	18
3. A Look at the Group Therapy Sessions	27
4. Other Program Services	31
E. Program Personnel, Costs and Monitoring	34
F. Description of Program Participants	38
II. Perceptions of the Programs	44
A. How People View Each Program	44
B. Perceptions of Program Effectiveness	50
C. Substance Abuse Needs of MCI-Norfolk Inmates	52
D. The Use of Outside Community Programs Within MCI-Norfolk	56
III. The Feasibility of a Future Outcome Evaluation	59
SUMMARY	62
APPENDIX	67
FOOTNOTES	74
BIBLIOGRAPHY	76

NORFOLK DRUG TREATMENT PROGRAMS: A PROCESS EVALUATION

Substance abuse among offenders has consistently posed a problem over the years to criminal justice administrators and planners. At the correctional level, substance abuse among inmates within the prison setting has been of equal concern as has the return to drug use once an inmate has been released. In a bulletin on "Prisoners and Drugs", the Bureau of Justice Statistics reported that 78% of inmates surveyed in state prisons across the nation have used drugs at one time. Fifty-six percent (56%) have used drugs recently and almost one-third (32%) were under the influence of drugs when they committed the crimes for which they were incarcerated (March 1983).

Over the years the Massachusetts Department of Correction (DOC) has responded to this problem by starting up its own drug treatment programs and by encouraging outside programs to operate within its institutions. In keeping with its trend of increased program accountability and evaluation, the DOC administration was interested in evaluating some of the outside drug treatment programs that have been operating within its facilities. Because MCI-Norfolk (hereafter referred to as Norfolk) had the largest number of these programs, it was chosen as the site for the evaluation. The three drug treatment programs evaluated are Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow (YTT), Counseling and Self-Help (CASH), and SPAN, Inc. (SPAN). The first two are funded and monitored by the Division of Drug

Rehabilitation (DDR) which is part of the Department of Public Health. The third, SPAN, is funded by contract with the Department of Correction.

Evaluations of the Norfolk drug treatment programs ideally would consist of determining program impact and whether the goals of the programs have been met. Although this would be the ideal, much clarification at the level of program goals and objectives needed to be undertaken before such an outcome evaluation could be conducted. This evaluation, then, is a process evaluation. Grizzle and Witte define this as an evaluation that "describes the content of the program, assesses the quality of the program, and defines the character and quantity of the program's immediate products." (1980:261) It is often used as a monitoring device to determine whether or not a program is being carried out as was planned. A process evaluation should touch on various issues including: 1) the political, economical and social environment in which the program must operate, 2) the people and institutions that affect the program, 3) a description of program activities and 4) a description of the target population.

The primary goal of this evaluation then is the construction of a description of what these programs look like in operation. It should reveal the extent to which these programs fit into the DOC's notion of drug treatment and should provide some basis for deciding whether parts of these programs should be improved, replaced or expanded. Along with providing a much needed description of all features of program treatment, it assesses the feasibility of conducting an outcome evaluation of these programs in the future.

RESEARCH METHODS

The proposed design used both quantitative and qualitative research methods. The former included the examination of attendance records, as well as background information on inmate participants such as demographic data, offense history, drug treatment history and institutional variables. The qualitative methods included observation of weekly treatment groups of each program and semi-structured interviews with program staff, inmate participants and DOC administrative personnel.

It should be noted here that this process evaluation was begun at an earlier date by another member of the Research Unit.¹ Unfortunately, the evaluation was not completed at that time and the research was not of the type that could simply be continued by another person. It was decided by the Research staff that data collection needed to be redone by the present researcher. The directors of all three programs (SPAN, CASH and YTT) were resistant to the renewal of the evaluation. They felt that restarting the evaluation was too much of a disruption to their programs, saying it affected the therapeutic milieu of the sessions and made inmates worry about confidentiality. Some program staff also wanted to have more control in the designing of the research. While this resistance and its ramifications are discussed in a later section of this report, the end result of it affected the actual data collection. In addition to delaying the research for four months, the data actually collected on the CASH program was different from that collected on YTT and SPAN. The actual research methods used are described below and the differences are outlined in Table 1.

1. **Observations of the Group Therapy Sessions.** The SPAN program runs three separate groups at Norfolk. Because a staff transition was taking place, the researcher observed only two of the three groups. The YTT program runs one group at Norfolk and this group was observed. Observation consisted of sitting in on the hour and a half group for four consecutive weeks and taking field notes. Despite the fact that observation would inevitably affect the group in some way, the researcher attempted to remain as unobtrusive and non-verbal as possible. Attention was given mostly to the types of issues discussed within the SPAN and YTT groups and the interaction between the group leader and participants. The researcher was not allowed to observe the CASH group.

2. **Interviews with Program Staff.** Individual interviews were conducted with staff members from each of the three programs. The interviews were semi-structured and addressed the following issues: program history, goals and objectives, process and treatment techniques, personnel and monitoring efforts.

3. **Interviews with Inmate Participants.** Individual interviews were also conducted with those inmate participants who agreed to it. For SPAN, the inmates who were in the two groups observed were asked to be interviewed. Of the approximately sixteen men in these two groups, thirteen agreed to be and were interviewed. For YTT, four of the eight men enrolled in the group were interviewed. Only one CASH participant agreed to be interviewed out of the five inmates who were asked. Interviews were also conducted with four inmates who had dropped out of SPAN but who were still at Norfolk. No drop outs were identified in the CASH program and the two identified in YTT were not interviewed due to time constraints.

The semi-structured interviews concentrated on the participants' perceptions of the usefulness of these programs to them as well as their descriptions of the programs. They also included some questions on the participants' prior drug use and drug treatment participation. The SPAN drop outs were asked the same questions as present program participants were asked, plus others surrounding the issue of their leaving the program. Interviews took from 45 minutes to two hours, depending on the person interviewed.

4. **Examination of Records.** Attendance and monthly enrollment records were examined and analyzed for each program. SPAN and YTT provided these records for the entire 1983 year and CASH provided them for the latter part of 1983. Program contracts were also gathered. Each program submitted a packet of forms they use to collect essential information on program participants. They include: intake forms, treatment plans, client reviews and various evaluative forms.

5. **Background Information on Inmate Participants.** Background data were collected on every person who participated in any of the three programs during 1983, regardless of the length of time in the program. Data included: demographics, offense history, drug abuse treatment history, some movement variables and information on disciplinary reports. The data were analyzed for each group separately, in order to be able to accurately describe each program and to make comparisons.

6. **Interviews with DOC Administrative Personnel.** Semi-structured interviews were also conducted with DOC staff. They included the DOC Director

of Programs, the Superintendent of Norfolk, the Deputy Superintendent, the Director of Treatment and the Assistant Staff Psychologist. Interviews were also conducted with Norfolk's Institutional Parole Officer and the Chief Mental Health Coordinator of South Norfolk Division of Legal Medicine (DLM), both of whom work with one or another of these programs. The interviews attempted to extract any information known about each of the programs as well as the administrators' opinions on the drug treatment needs of inmates at Norfolk.

Data collection began on December 7, 1983, and due to delays, was not completed until April 19, 1984. It should be noted here that the bulk of the information provided on the CASH program was extracted from one interview with the CASH Director and one interview with a CASH participant. Despite the resistance and delays, the researcher attempted to gather as much data as possible in order to paint a clear and complete picture of each program.

TABLE 1

Actual Research Methods Used

	SPAN	CASH	YTT
Number of Groups	3	1	1
Number of Groups Observed	2	0	1
Number of Inmates in Groups When Interviews Began	28	7	8
Number of Inmates Interviewed	13	1	4

FINDINGS

The process evaluation of SPAN, CASH and YTT generated a wealth of descriptive and statistical information on each program. This information has been divided up into a number of topics and is presented on the following pages.

The first findings came out at the beginning of the study, before the data collection began. As mentioned earlier, all three program directors were resistant, to varying degrees, to the idea of renewing the research when it was presented to them on November 30, 1983. At the beginning, SPAN and YTT agreed to cooperate with the research. CASH, however, refused to allow an observer into the group. The research was begun on SPAN on December 7, 1983. However, around this time, the Division of Drug Rehabilitation was brought into the picture and the research on YTT and CASH did not resume until April 1, 1984.

At the end of the four month delay, it was decided that it was up to the director and the group to decide whether an observer could come into the group. By this time the data collection on SPAN was completed. On April 4, the researcher met with the YTT group who agreed to be observed and interviewed. The CASH group maintained their stand that no person could observe the group and only one CASH participant agreed to be interviewed.

Some resistance to evaluation is considered natural and was expected, especially since this research had been started once before. However, resistance from YTT and especially CASH highlighted the autonomy these programs have within the institution. Up until the research, YTT and CASH were run within the institutions without DOC possessing much knowledge of what they do or how many inmates they service. The situation was slightly different with SPAN in that it is

funded by the DOC and therefore is held more accountable. It was also found that it is difficult to do research/evaluation on a non-DOC program unless there is a previous understanding. While research can be planned and begun on any DOC program with relative ease, it seems that research on non-DOC programs should be anticipated prior to the signing of a contract and should be included as part of it.

The resistance to research also pointed out the lack of a working relationship between DDR and the DOC. This issue is discussed further in a later section.

I. Description of Drug Treatment Programs

This section covers all facets of each of the three drug treatment programs. It includes: a history of the program, the programs' goals and descriptions of the treatment modalities and program processes as outlined by program staff. The next two sections discuss program personnel and costs. The final section is a description of the program participants in each of the three programs.

A. History

This section presents the history of SPAN, CASH and YTT as presented by their directors. All three drug treatment programs have a history with the Department dating back to the late 1970's. SPAN was founded in 1978 by its present Director. Based on volunteer work done at MCI-Concord and a job with Self-Development Groups Agency at MCI-Walpole, she realized the need for a program like SPAN, and began working on funding in July 1976. She saw that many inmates were unprepared for release with no resources to back them up and no support systems on the street. In May 1978, SPAN was funded by LEAA to provide

services to inmates at MCI-Walpole and MCI-Norfolk. Additional funding was secured from the Division of Drug Rehabilitation for MCI-Walpole and MCI-Concord, (hereafter referred to as Walpole and Concord).

At the end of 1980, LEAA funding was cut. The DOC provided temporary funding for six months to keep the Walpole and Norfolk programs going. It also provided funding to begin a SPAN group at MCI-Framingham. In June of that year, the contracts were renegotiated and funding was provided by the DOC to the SPAN programs at these three institutions for twelve months. The funding of these institutions by DOC has continued to the present, as has DDR funding for Walpole, Concord and a group on the street for those former participants who are released.

Both YTT and CASH were founded in 1976 as self-help drug treatment programs run by inmates. Back in 1974, inmates in Norfolk began to work toward developing a program conducive to staying drug-free. They submitted a proposal to DDR and got funding and permission by the Superintendent to run an inmate self-help drug treatment program. Since its conception in 1976 its present Director has been involved with it and YTT has been funded by DDR consistently to the present time.

The CASH program had a similar beginning in 1976 at Walpole. Initially it received LEAA plus DDR funding. It also was set up to be a self-help program with groups run by inmates within the minimum security section of Walpole. When the present Director took a position as a half-time Clinical Director in December 1979, the federal funding had run out and the program depended solely on DDR funding.

In its beginning stages, the YTT program was all in-house with inmates running group counseling sessions and receiving stipends. An outside coordinator was hired to do community work and to provide follow-up services to those released. The CASH program was similarly run. However, in 1979 there was a

full-time outside Executive Director and a full-time Inmate Director. The present Director began co-leading the group with inmates, and also trained inmates in group counseling.

In June 1981, the DOC made a policy that there could be no paid inmate-run programs. This caused the temporary discontinuance of both CASH and YTT until the contracts could be renegotiated for the programs to be run by individuals outside of the prisons. The issuing of stipends to inmates was also ended. With the discontinuance of inmate staff and a limited amount of resources with which to hire outside staff, the new modality resulted in narrowing the number of program participants and the number of groups held each week.

The YTT program expanded to Bay State Correctional Center and to the Dedham House of Correction. It also runs a program on the street for men who have been released. CASH expanded to MCI-Gardner and MCI-Norfolk. However, the group at Gardner was discontinued in July 1983 due to lack of funding. Both agencies are still funded by DDR.

B. Program Goals

This section outlines each of the programs' goals and objectives as described by program staff and official written descriptions. The Program Coordinator of DDR said the general goal for these types of programs would be to help men and women re-enter the community drug-free and to try to give them enough strength so they do not return to their old destructive ways. While each program is considered to be a drug treatment program, each has their own unique twist in terms of program goals.

The YTT program bills itself as a "Drug Treatment/Prevention Program" the objectives of which are to serve inmate residents, to assist program members in their transition from incarceration to the community and to provide on-going weekly group meetings that deal with the prevention and treatment of drug abuse. Its Director explained that YTT's two main goals are to: 1) give "the men coping skills with which to go back to the community and help them cope" and 2) to "give them the strength to stay drug-free". Within the institution, YTT's services are geared toward strengthening the inmate by having him attend group, get into programming that will give him direction and become drug-free. Outside of prison, its services are geared toward giving support to men so that they stay out of prison and remain drug-free.

In the past, the CASH program had a dual function: 1) to provide drug rehabilitation and 2) to act as a vocational rehabilitation program. The program now concentrates solely on the first function. Its main goals are to: 1) get the participants to stop using drugs and 2) to prepare the participants for future long-term individual therapy. The CASH Director felt that drug use is a symptom of other problems and it is therefore necessary for drug abusers to become involved in group psychotherapy to address those problems. In addition to advocating the discontinuance of drug use, the program advocates a change of attitude so that participants begin to feel that they are responsible for their lives and that they do have some control over the directions their lives will take.

The official program description for SPAN states that the goal of the offender services is to "assist clients to effectively plan for their release, and to become more aware of the transitional issues they must deal with upon their release". This emphasis on release necessitates that program participants be one

year within their parole eligibility date. When asked about the program's goal, all three SPAN staff interviewed gave a response similar to the official goal. More specifically, the SPAN staff enumerated the following objectives: 1) to provide participants with support, constructive feedback and a back-up system during incarceration and on the street; 2) to establish a positive relationship with inmates built on therapeutic goals; 3) to become aware of what is going on within the prisons and outside in the community and to act as a bridge between the two; 4) to engage the inmates in an "introductory" therapeutic experience so that they will recognize and begin to work out problems; and 5) to provide the inmate with an outsider, independent of DOC authority, with whom he can communicate and find the best course of action to take to survive in a positive way within the institution and on the street. All three felt that the program aimed toward making its participants understand that they are responsible for their own lives and their actions instead of letting themselves be controlled by drugs. Within the groups many issues are discussed including: substance abuse, employment, personal relationships, pre-release placements, and being on parole.

C. Treatment Modality

While SPAN, CASH and YTT all provide individual counseling to a very small number of inmates, the main treatment modality is that of the group therapy approach. This approach has its roots in the Synanon House program founded in California in 1958. Synanon House and others like it, are therapeutic communities which provide housing and communal support to persons who are substance abusers. One of their supports is their group therapy sessions which have been adopted by

many programs over the years. As the New England Economic Research Foundation explained, "in this approach, drug use is seen as the immature personality's escape route from reality. The object of treatment, therefore is to help the patient achieve sufficient emotional maturity so that he can face life on his own without having to depend on drugs for support" (1970: 38). In this self-help approach it is hoped that those involved will share their experiences, problems and advice which will lend the support needed to deal with various issues and to remain drug-free.

The Directors of CASH and SPAN felt that the group therapy approach was the most effective and economical approach for incarcerated substance abusers given the number of potential clients and the resources available. YTT's Director felt that the structured peer pressure of the group process was more productive and self-sustaining since the inmates had similar problems and could relate to each other. One SPAN counselor believed the group therapy approach was a "good idea because people are dealing with other people who are substance abusers. They can't get over with each other. They can accept confrontation better from each other than from me." All agreed that the group approach lent a support factor that was more powerful than a one-on-one situation. An interview with the DDR Program Coordinator revealed that the agency was supportive of this approach, especially for those substance abusers who are isolated from the main-stream community and for those who have not responded to conventional sorts of treatment.

D. Program Process

A description of the various facets and processes of each program will be

described in this section. It involves examining the number of program participants, how they get into and go through the programs, the services offered them, and the type of feedback they receive. The data for this section were extracted from interviews with program personnel, inmate participants and DOC and DDR administrators, as well as from observation and program statistics.

1. Program Enrollment and Attendance

As mentioned previously SPAN runs three separate group therapy sessions and YTT and CASH each run one apiece at Norfolk. Each of the programs runs groups at other institutions² and SPAN and YTT have groups that are on the street for released inmates. Monthly attendance sheets and reports for Norfolk revealed that SPAN serviced 128 different inmates, CASH serviced 15 and YTT serviced 30 during the 1983 calendar year. The attendance sheets listed the number of participants enrolled for each group and the number who actually attended. This information was available for the whole calendar year for SPAN and YTT. For CASH, this information was available for the months of June to December, 1983 only. However, the CASH Director was able to provide the researcher with the names of clients who had been in CASH from January to June, 1983.

The data for enrollment, attendance and number of clients served are presented in Table 2. SPAN had a total average weekly enrollment of 32 men in its three groups. Of the 32 enrollees, an average of 24 men (75%) attended on a weekly basis. This figure is in agreement with SPAN's estimate that an average of 8 to 12 men come to each group. The maximum number of enrollees for SPAN's groups is 12. For YTT, the average weekly enrollment was 12, similar to YTT's estimate. The actual average weekly attendance was 9 inmates or 75% of those

enrolled. It is difficult to make a similar comparison for the CASH program since the weekly enrollment numbers were identical to the weekly attendance numbers. That is, those who attended a meeting one week were enrolled that week and enrollment and attendance decreased and increased identically week by week. Nonetheless the average weekly attendance for CASH for the six months was 7 inmates.

Table 2
Attendance Measures for Span
CASH and YTT

	<u>SPAN</u>	<u>CASH</u>	<u>YTT</u>
Total 1983 Attendance	128	15	30
Average Weekly Enrollment	32	7	12
Average Weekly Attendance	24	7	9
Average Weekly Percent of Those Enrolled Who Attended	75%	100%	77%
Average Number of Clients Served Monthly	46	8	12
Average Number of New Clients Monthly	9	1	2
Average Number Released/Terminated Clients Monthly	9	1	1
Average Length of Stay in Program	3.8 Months	2.1 Months	2.0 Months

If we break it down by month, we see that SPAN serviced an average of 46 clients per month. An average of 9 new clients joined SPAN each month and a monthly average of 9 were also released or terminated. The YTT program serviced an average of 12 men per month, with about 2 new clients joining monthly and about 1 being released or terminated monthly. For CASH, the average number of clients serviced monthly was 8 with one new client joining monthly and about one being released. From these figures we can see that there is a higher turnover rate for SPAN than the other programs, which makes sense given SPAN's criteria that a participant must be within one year of parole eligibility.

Inmate participants of each program are expected to attend one group session weekly. Each program has its own policy regarding absences. In the SPAN program, participants are allowed two excused absences per month if they make the time up either individually or in another group. If a participant has two unexcused absences, he is called to come and speak with a program staff person. Depending on the circumstances, a warning might be given or the client is terminated. SPAN's Director reported that 3 or 4 inmates are terminated due to non-attendance monthly. Some of these though are men who have gotten a new sentence or were denied parole and so drop out of the program until they are again closer to release. Interviews with SPAN drop-outs confirmed that many drop out because they are no longer eligible for parole within one year for one reason or another.

For the YTT program, the Director stated that "more come to the group because they wanted to come" and therefore their attendance is "on them". He stated that if a client missed a couple of sessions, he would talk with him, go over the ground rules and warn about possible termination if consistently absent.

The CASH program held a somewhat stricter stance toward absenteeism. If a

participant is absent a few times, they will receive a written warning. If there is no response, the participant is suspended for 4-6 months. However, if the participant withdraws from the group voluntarily, he can again re-enroll when he is ready.

Legitimate excuses are similar for each of the programs. They include: being sick or hospitalized, being in any type of lock-up, going to court or having to go in front of the Parole, Disciplinary of Institutional Classification Committee (ICC) Boards.

Visits are considered legitimate excuses if they are not consistently at the same time group is held and for YTT only if they are unexpected. SPAN considers absence due to work or school as legitimate if for a special reason and not consistent. While the CASH program kept no records of the reasons for absences, and YTT kept them sporadically, SPAN kept complete weekly records. A look at the breakdown of the absences gives the reader an idea of why absenteeism in these programs occurs.

Table 3
Type of Absences for SPAN Clients

	Number	Percent
Locked Up	61	26%
Sick/In Hospital	52	22%
Visit	49	20%
Court/Board	36	15%
Work/School	30	13%
Other	<u>11</u>	<u>5%</u>
TOTAL	239	100%

Program staff for every program believed that once an inmate got "hooked" into the program, their absenteeism or possibility of dropout declined. The Director of CASH said that if a participant stuck it out for three months, he usually remained in CASH for his whole stay at Norfolk. SPAN staff believed that most inmates who are released from Norfolk and then return, rejoin the group. They also told of people who join SPAN and get transferred out of Norfolk before they have a chance to really become invested. Attendance in all three programs is cyclical and depends on a number of factors, including turnover rate, season and staff change.

The observations of SPAN and YTT caught the programs at the low end of the cycle. At the time the researcher observed YTT, the group was going through a group leader transition and the attendance ranged from 3 to 5 participants. One of the SPAN groups was at a period of very high turnover and this resulted in attendance ranging from 2 to 6 men. The other SPAN group was stable at the time and had 6 to 7 men attending weekly.

2. The Process - From Intake to Termination

Each program process will be explained from beginning to end in this section. Data for this section were extracted from the Departmental computerized database and from interviews with program staff. The majority of men joining the drug treatment programs at Norfolk, originate from either Walpole or Concord. A greater percentage of SPAN (82%) and YTT (83%) clients were at Concord prior to their transfer to Norfolk; while CASH clients were split - half originating from Walpole (53%) and half from Concord (47%).

The time span between the date an inmate entered Norfolk and the date they

entered the program is shown in Table 4. SPAN has the highest mean and median for this variable which makes sense considering their one year-to-parole eligibility requirement. The average client of these programs joined between two months and five months, with inmates joining YTT sooner after transfer to Norfolk than the other two programs.

Table 4
Time Span Between Date Entered Norfolk
and Date Entered Program

	SPAN (N=122)	CASH (N=5)	YTT (N=20)
Mean	4.5 Months	5 Months	2.5 Months
Median	2.6 Months	.9 Months	1.5 Months
Range	1 day to 2.7 years	13 days to 1.8 years	1 day to 1.3 years

The reasons for enrollment in the drug treatment programs varied. Almost half of the SPAN participants interviewed initially enrolled in it because it was suggested by either the Parole or ICC boards or by a social worker. One inmate in YTT also enrolled for this reason. About a third of SPAN participants' responses and half of YTT's were that they wanted to get help for their drug problems. Other reasons for joining included: help with outside resources (SPAN), good reputation (SPAN and CASH), and for support during incarceration (YTT).

When asked how they found out about their respective programs, over half of the SPAN clients who remembered said they learned about it from fellow inmates. All YTT participants and the one CASH participant interviewed also found out in this way. Other sources included: Parole Board, ICC Board, and social workers. Two-thirds of the SPAN inmates and all of the YTT and CASH inmates knew of the existence of other substance abuse programs when they joined their own. Reasons for choice of one program over the others will be discussed in a further section dealing with program perceptions.

The selection criteria for each of the programs are far from stringent. Most inmates interviewed were unaware of any screening process or selection criteria. For SPAN, the only requirement is that the inmate be within a year of parole eligibility. The vast majority report having substance abuse problems. From my interview with SPAN staff and inmates, there are a small number of inmates (three that I interviewed) who claim to not have any substance abuse problems, but who joined for the support and the re-entry services. For YTT and CASH, participants must have a history of drug use and must be willing to participate so as to remain or become drug-free. The CASH group interviews new participants to ensure their seriousness about participation. All program directors felt that inmates who were not committed to the group and to obtaining help, selected themselves out at the beginning or were dropped for non-attendance. As one SPAN staff person explained, there are "always some who are very much involved and committed to dealing with issues. Others, with less maturity are less involved" and still others are even less involved and are often those who are mandated to attend by Parole or DOC. "The majority stay but some do drop out."

While most inmates hear about the programs from other inmates, some referrals are made by Parole, DLM, and by social workers. Inmates usually join the

programs by notifying one of the staff and setting up an interview/intake. SPAN holds weekly orientation sessions on Thursday afternoons where the program is explained to the prospective client. If the inmate is eligible and is interested in joining, he is put on the waiting list. SPAN is the only program that consistently has a waiting list. The Director of YTT stated that when his group is at capacity, he keeps in touch weekly with men waiting to get into the group and attempts to integrate them into it as soon as possible.

All three programs conduct intakes on new clients, preferably before they come to their first group meeting. CASH's intake form is the most extensive of the three programs and inquires extensively into family history, drug and alcohol history and other topics. The YTT program has the least extensive intake form. All touch on such issues as substance abuse, criminal history, goals and needs, education and employment, and issues to deal with.³ For SPAN, the inmate's time eligibility is verified before he is actually enrolled in a group.

Treatment plans are devised for each inmate, according to the program directors. Each of the treatment plan forms includes short and long-term goals and types of services or problems that need to be addressed.

SPAN's Director stated that treatment plans stem from the intake. They include short-range goals that the inmate must work on while in the group and long-range goals, that are geared to his release. She said they are not treated like contracts and that inmates may even be unaware of them since they are integrated into the whole intake process.

The CASH program makes treatment plans within one month after the inmate joins the group. The Director stated that the ideal is to fill them out with the inmate but that this is often difficult given the time constraints. He said the first treatment plan lasts for three months and that subsequent plans are now drawn up

every three months. They address psychological, substance abuse, family, vocational and recreational needs. The YTT Director stated that his program got away from making treatment plans temporarily but that he has revised the form and plans to use them again soon.

More than two-thirds of the SPAN clients interviewed and all of those from YTT and CASH were not aware of any formal treatment plans. Some mentioned informal treatment plans and discussed long-term release goals, working on issues and preparing for the Parole Board. None was aware that actual treatment plans existed for them. From this one can only conclude that treatment plans are either used as a tool to help staff know the particular needs of the clients in order to better service them or that they are merely filled out because they are required by DDR and DOC regulations. They do not seem to be actively used by inmates as a guide nor as a yardstick of their progress.

Process notes and progress reports are written up for each client, according to program directors. Feedback is given to participants of SPAN, CASH and YTT on an informal basis. SPAN's Director reported that most feedback takes place right in the groups but that staff try to meet individually with each client every 3 to 4 months. They discuss how they are progressing toward their goals and what they need to work on in the future. Individual meetings are also arranged prior to an inmate going before a board, if the inmate is having any problems, or if they decide to alter their long-term release plans.

Both CASH and YTT Directors believed that inmates are given direct feedback within the groups. The Director of YTT said that if an individual has a specific problem or seems to be regressing, that he will meet with that inmate individually. The CASH Director stated that his program used to hold regular individual feedback sessions but found it unrealistic due to limited staff and

difficulty in bringing client records into the institution. He felt that the best reflection of progress is that CASH participants do get transfers and move quickly through the system toward lower security.

None of the inmates interviewed knew of the existence of any formal progress reports. However, half of them said they received feedback informally. Most discussed receiving feedback within the group while a few said they received it individually or figured it out themselves.

The various types of forms used and the information collected are shown in Table 5. All of this information is kept confidential and is shared only with the permission of the client.

Table 5
Information Collected and Contained
In Inmate Folders

	SPAN	CASH	YTT
Intake Assignment	✓		
Intake/Evaluation	✓	✓	✓
Treatment Plan	✓	✓	✓
Progress Report	✓	✓	✓
Process Notes	✓	✓	
Monthly Evaluation			✓
Treatment Reviews			✓

Termination from all three programs occurs either when an inmate is released from Norfolk or dropped due to lack of attendance. Table 6 gives a more in-depth look at the termination of clients from the programs during 1983. Nineteen percent (19%) of SPAN's clients, 33% of CASH's clients and 43% of YTT's were still in the program at the end of 1983. This further confirms SPAN's higher inmate turnover rate. Lack of attendance was the reason for termination for 16% of the SPAN population and 7% of the YTT population. SPAN had the highest number (18%) of clients released on parole. The majority of terminations for each program were due to releases to lower security. It should be noted that these data, taken from monthly program reports, were very consistent with actual release data from Norfolk. While there was a slight variation due to the addition of the release information for terminations due non-attendance, it demonstrates the accuracy of program records in this area.

Table 6
Reasons for Program Termination ⁴

	<u>SPAN</u>		<u>CASH</u>		<u>YTT</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
N.A./Still in Program	24	(19)	5	(33)	13	(43)
Lack of Attendance	21	(16)	0	(0)	2	(7)
Paroled	23	(18)	2	(13)	3	(10)
Transfer to Pr-Release	17	(13)	0	(0)	0	(0)
Transfer to Minimum	33	(26)	2	(13)	11	(37)
Transfer to Medium or Maximum	6	(5)	4	(27)	0	(0)
Other	4	(3)	0	(0)	1	(3)
Unknown	0	(0)	2	(13)	0	(0)

Although termination data were accurate, it was difficult to secure information from YTT and CASH on dates of entry into the program. This information was missing for 10 CASH clients and 10 YTT clients. The SPAN program was able to provide entry dates for all its clients. This information allows one to measure the length of program participation. (Tables 7 and 8).

Table 7
Length of Program Participation for
Individuals who left the Program*

	SPAN (N=104)	YTT (N= 12)
Mean	3.8 Months	2 Months
Median	2.9 Months	1.5 Months
Range	6 Days to 2.8 Years	11 Days to 6 Months

* Statistics for CASH are excluded due to the large number of cases where this information was missing.

Table 8
Time Span for Those Still in the Program*

	SPAN (N=24)	YTT (N= 8)
Mean	4 Months	3.3 Months
Median	2.4 Months	2.5 Months
Range	38 Day to 14.5 Months	1 Month to 8.7 Months

* Statistics for CASH are excluded due to the large number of cases where this information was missing.

As one can see from Tables 7 and 8, there was wide variation in the length of program participation for those SPAN clients who had left the program and for those who were still in SPAN. The middle of the range fell at 2.9 months for those who were no longer in SPAN, and at 2.4 months for those who were still in SPAN. For 12 YTT inmates who were terminated, the middle of the range fell at 1.5 months, lower than for those 8 YTT clients still in the program (2.5 months). No comparisons between the programs could be made on length of program participation because of the missing data for CASH and YTT. The amount of time spent at MCI-Norfolk ranged from one month to 3.6 years. Of those released inmates, YTT participants had the shortest average stay with 6.4 months. SPAN participants stayed at Norfolk for an average of 8.1 months and CASH participants stayed the longest at 11.1 months.

Finally, there is a small number of inmates who terminate from the program and who re-enroll at a later date. Most of these terminate either on their own and re-enroll when they are ready or are released from Norfolk and re-enroll upon re-admission to that institution. Table 9 shows that about one-fourth (27%) of SPAN's clients had enrolled twice in the program and that only a small number had re-enrolled from CASH and YTT. Twenty-two of the 36 SPAN inmates who re-enrolled returned to Norfolk and the SPAN program after being in lower security. Another 8 had dropped out and had re-enrolled at a later time. The length of time between leaving SPAN initially and re-enrolling averaged 13 months, yet ranged from 7 days to 3.5 years. Similar data were unavailable for the 2 CASH and 3 YTT re-enrollees.

Table 9
Number of Times Participants
Enrolled in Their Programs

	<u>SPAN</u>		<u>CASH</u>		<u>YTT</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Once	92	(72)	13	(87)	27	(90)
Twice	34	(27)	2	(13.3)	3	(10)
Three Times	2	(2)	0	(0)	0	(0)

3. A Look at the Group Therapy Sessions

An in-depth account of the group sessions will be discussed in this section. Data for this discussion were collected from inmate and staff interviews as well as from observation of the YTT and SPAN groups.

The types of issues discussed in each group varies for all programs. The Director of CASH stated that the group usually takes 10 to 15 minutes to warm up before a serious discussion arises. (This was similarly observed in the YTT and SPAN groups.) He stated that the main topic of discussion is around problems with drugs. He often tries to focus in on the men's involvement with their families since that is such a crucial factor of recidivism.

The SPAN and YTT staff reported discussing a large number of issues within their groups. Observations of the two SPAN groups and the YTT group clearly confirmed this. Following are issues that were discussed in all three groups (two SPAN and one YTT): 1) resources on street; 2) family; 3) abstaining from drug use in prison and in future; 4) parole; and 5) employment on the street. Certain groups discussed

other issues like: 1) future social ties (YTT); 2) reasons for drug use (SPAN-1)⁵; 3) crime (SPAN-1); 4) difficulty of pre-release placements (SPAN-2); 5) how to respond to authority (SPAN-1); and 6) dealing with fellow inmates (SPAN-2).

One typical group session observed involved seven inmate participants and the group leader. Discussion for the first several minutes centered on the research and how it might affect the program. The group leader then explained the situation of an ex-program member who, once released to the street, went back to drugs. This person had no place to live and no jobs and was having a very difficult time. In answering the group leader's question on how to help this man, most of the participants said that you cannot make anyone accept help unless he wants it and is ready for it. One inmate suggested the reason that the person in question had gone back to drugs was because he had no place to live and no job. The group leader and a couple of the inmates suggested that maybe the reverse was true. A long discussion ensued.

The discussion then proceeded to finding out when various participants realized that they had to stop abusing alcohol and drugs. Participants gave many different reasons. However, one inmate said he thought it was possible to just smoke pot or drink a beer and not go on to harder drugs or liquor. Most participants disagreed, challenging this inmate's future success on the street. Thus the inmate was put on what is often called the "hot seat" by program participants.

The group session ended with a discussion about how beneficial it would be if the program also ran a residential component on the street. Many complained about the number and quality of the residential programs available to them.

Most groups observed were similar to this, with discussion going from one topic to the next. Often discussions about alcohol and drugs were interspersed with ones about family, re-entry issues and problems within the institution. Sometimes

group participants complained together. Other times they confronted each other or were confronted by the group leader. Although many different views were put forth, in all the groups I observed, inmates all listened to each other and to the group leader.

Throughout the observations, there was some discussion about the worth of the programs, the research and its impact and complaints about the DOC. This was expected especially during the first day of observation for each group. The staff of SPAN felt that the researcher's presence had a definite effect on the group. Almost half of the inmates agreed with this. Staff complained that inmates refrained from discussing individual problems but instead talked in a "we" mode. SPAN's Director felt that some inmates were quieter than usual but that others were grandstanding. She felt that she, herself, had been less confrontative. Both staff made reference to the greater amount of complaining or "weeping" as one put it, than is usually done. Some inmates reported that sessions usually get "hotter" or more intense and that people weren't as open about discussing their feelings.

Despite the assertion that the presence of an observer affected the group, various issues were discussed as noted above and the researcher was able to get a feel for group interaction. It was apparent from the observations and from inmate interviews that the group leader and the composition of inmates has a great impact on group interaction. Two of the three group leaders observed were very confrontative and direct with their groups in contrast to the other who acted more as a facilitator of discussion. Participants of both programs discussed differences in group leaders and how that affected the groups in various ways. Another consideration surrounding the group leader is their tenure with the program. Counselors who have been in a program for a long time build a reputation among

inmates and develop a stronger rapport with them. Thus, a change of group leader changes the atmosphere of the group. For these types of programs, how group sessions are run depends to a large extent on the stability, personality and skill of its staff.

The composition of inmate participants also affects the group interaction. Groups, which have men that have all been in the group a long time, usually can discuss more serious topics and deal with deeper, personal feelings. Groups in transition, with new participants, more often will discuss surface issues in a general way until they begin to trust each other. A couple of SPAN re-enrollees mentioned that age was a factor in group interaction. They stated that participants who were young and incarcerated for the first time often did not take the discussion seriously and did not invest themselves in the group. On the contrary, older inmates, especially those who had been around, were more committed to remaining drug-free and thus committed to serious thought and discussion within the group.

All three programs reported that inmate participants usually set the pace and run the groups themselves. They said that often the group leader acted as a mere facilitator when necessary. However, observation of the groups and discussion with the inmates yielded a different assessment - that in fact, the group leader has a very crucial role to play. How he or she plays that role determines the environment of the group and the way in which issues are dealt with by the participants.

4. Other Program Services

The main activity for YTT, CASH and SPAN is the weekly group sessions. However, each program provides other services to inmates in varying degrees. One such service common to all three programs is the writing of recommendations for the Parole and ICC Boards. The YTT program will write letters of recommendation upon an inmate's request two weeks prior to their appearance. An inmate must be in the program for one month in order to get a letter saying he has joined and longer than one month for the letter to say anything beyond that.

The CASH program also gives letters, however, they are very limited. Its Director stated they are somewhat like a form letter and simply indicate the inmate's level of participation and what his attitude has been toward counseling. He does not encourage requests for recommendations since he wants inmates to be in the group for themselves and not to get help with boards.

The SPAN program will give a letter of recommendation to an inmate after 6 hours of group participation. However, what the letter says varies as do those from YTT, and depends on how long an inmate has been in the group and what he has put into it. None of the program directors believed that inmates abused this privilege. As the SPAN Director stated, "People get involved in the program because they think it can help them get out. I think that's healthy, not abuse." She said an inmate has to be motivated to "stay in and participate to get a letter really pulling for him". During fiscal year 1983, SPAN wrote 84 letters to the Parole Board, in addition to their letters to the ICC Board.

As far as the weight given by boards to these letters, all felt that it varied depending on how well board members knew the program in question. The YTT Director said that it was never a concern of his because his letters were just one of

the many pieces of paper up there. He felt that there had to be a consistent pattern in all types of contacts the inmate had in order for the YTT letter to be given any weight.

Each group will also occasionally meet with individual participants if they have a specific problem or issue that cannot be addressed within the group. Both CASH and SPAN see a small percentage of clients on an individual basis for actual counseling. These clients are either not in general population or are not yet ready to deal with their issues in a group therapy session. SPAN will have 6 or 7 inmates in individual counseling at any given time and CASH has 4, one or two of whom may be at a different institution.

All three programs do follow-up with inmates, however, to varying degrees. The CASH Director, for example, is usually in contact with about 3 or 4 released inmates from his Walpole or Norfolk CASH groups. YTT staff visit inmates released from Norfolk to a minimum security institution on a monthly basis. Once the inmates reach the pre-release stage, they are able to participate in YTT's weekly group meetings in the community.

In addition to the group therapy and individual counseling sessions, SPAN specializes in re-entry and follow-up services. As the Director of Treatment at Norfolk put it, "SPAN goes beyond the scope of drug treatment". Many inmates commented positively on this aspect of the program.

While SPAN groups often discuss issues of re-entry, individual re-entry services begin at intake. Here the counselor and inmate will begin developing a plan of action for the inmate to take upon his release from Norfolk. These plans change and develop over time and include decisions about alcohol/drug treatment counseling, housing, residential programs, jobs and education. Three or four weeks before an inmate is to go before a board, he usually notifies SPAN staff. The staff

person will then meet with the individual to firm up plans and prepare them for the board. For example, a person going before the Parole Board might go over his plans for housing, employment and future counseling with SPAN staff. They would then contact the necessary programs in the community to find out the feasibility of this person joining the program once on the street. In addition, SPAN would write a letter to the Parole Board discussing the client's participation, motivation and recommendations for future treatment. The SPAN counselor might also sit down with the Institutional Parole Officer about 3 weeks before the board and confer with him. After the board SPAN will follow through the decision, making sure that the necessary paperwork and referrals are completed. When a client is about to leave, the counselor will meet with him and discuss what SPAN offers on the street.

The inmate will usually be pushed to join SPAN's weekly group in the community and is told about SPAN's 24-hour emergency phone line. Inmates who are in pre-release centers or who have been released by DOC can come to the weekly sessions and can also make individual appointments with their counselor in the Boston office.

Included in the re-entry and follow-up services are a lot of advocacy and casework. SPAN sets up appointments for its clients to go to various half-way houses and residential programs. They will also aid in such things as: clearing up good time, clearing up old warrants, finding employment, and clarification of parole eligibility or good conduct discharge dates. Former clients who re-enter Norfolk are put at the top of the waiting list, so as to continue services. If a former client receives a new sentence, he will be given an 8-week enrollment in order to give him time to process his feelings about what had happened and his future. One SPAN counselor felt that this was not only helpful for the client, but

also for the group to see the problems and temptations one must deal with on the street.

E. Program Personnel, Costs and Monitoring

This section will address the operations aspect of each of the programs as it pertains to MCI-Norfolk. There are three SPAN staff who work with Norfolk inmates. Together they put in a total of 38 hours at Norfolk. Included in these hours are the 1 1/2 hour groups that each one runs, the individual counseling, the weekly orientation sessions, intakes, case work and advocacy. They also put in another 33 hours in their Boston office, doing follow-up, advocacy, individual counseling and running the group for those ex-offenders in the community. While a B.A. and relevant experience are the requirements for these counselor positions, all have degrees at the Master's level or are licensed as clinical social workers.

Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow has one staff person running the group at Norfolk. The staff person is usually a part-time counselor hired specifically to run the group. Approximately two hours are spent at Norfolk, 1 1/2 hours for the group and the remaining time to talk with inmates, if necessary. Most YTT staff have been ex-offenders or ex-addicts, yet some do have clinical backgrounds. In addition to the time spent at Norfolk, there is a group on the street for inmate participants who have been released. The CASH group at Norfolk is run by the program Director at this time. Counselors at CASH must have at least a Master's level degree. Like YTT, CASH spends about two hours per week with Norfolk inmates.

The hiring procedure for staff is somewhat different for each of the programs. All three programs solicit resumes and interview applicants themselves.

At CASH, the final decision for hiring is with the Executive Director. The Director, however, is hired by the CASH Board of Directors. AT YTT, all new staff are brought before the Board. At SPAN, the new recruit is brought to the institution to sit in and meet a group of inmates and also one of the DOC institutional staff.

As for training, new SPAN staff are put through a 3 to 6 month orientation and probation period before they are assigned to run a group. He or she will usually go around with another staff person for a while until ready to be on their own. SPAN also has a consultant trainer who comes in from time to time to run training sessions for the whole staff.

The Director of CASH reported that he tries to provide a new staff person with whatever training they may need. This would most likely include 1 1/2 hours supervision by him and training in the prison. He stated that there has been a lot of cross-training with the Division of Legal Medicine (DLM) and the Department of Mental Health (DMH). The YTT program has a consultant who spends 1 1/2 hours per week with the staff. He alternates each week between case/group supervision and training.

As previously noted, the SPAN program at MCI-Norfolk is funded by the Department of Correction. The budget for fiscal year 1984 is \$33,841. CASH and YTT are funded by DDR. However, included in their budgets are the services provided at other institutions, in addition to the services at Norfolk. The 1984 fiscal budget for CASH is \$26,271,⁶ which includes services at Walpole and Norfolk. For YTT, the fiscal year budget of \$35,638 includes services at Norfolk, Bay State Correctional Center, Dedham House of Correction and a group session held within the community.

A look at Table 10 shows the budgets broken down in a variety of ways. The first way divides the monthly budget by the average number of clients serviced per month. This latter figure was taken from actual attendance sheets for SPAN. For YTT and CASH, the average number of Norfolk clients serviced per month (also extracted from attendance sheets) was multiplied by the number of groups each of the programs runs. Looking at it this way, there is not much difference between the three programs. The lowest average monthly cost per client is \$59.40 for YTT, with SPAN at \$61.84 and CASH spending \$64.38.

The second way of breaking down the budget divides the total budget by the yearly total of direct service hours. This latter figure was established by adding together the hours, reported by program directors, that are involved in direct service to clients. Direct service includes time in groups, intakes, interviews and counseling sessions with clients. It excludes paperwork and time not spent in the institutions. Direct time spent with clients on the street is counted for CASH and YTT since that is part of their budget, but not for SPAN since that is not part of the DOC budget. This calculation yields a varying figure for the programs. The lowest average hourly cost of direct service is for SPAN with \$17.13 per hour. The CASH program spends \$21.97 per hour for direct services and YTT spends a high of \$54.82 per hour. One of the probable reasons for YTT's high costs is that it uses counselors on a part-time consultant basis at more than twice the rate that the other programs pay counselors. Also, while SPAN has a larger staff, they are also paid by their DDR grants for their work at other institutions, which offsets their lower salaries at Norfolk.

Monitoring and evaluation is the third and final aspect of program operations to be addressed. In an interview with DDR representatives, it was learned that stricter monitoring and evaluation guidelines have recently been enforced. This

change came about as a result of DDR being switched from the jurisdiction of the Department of Mental Health to the jurisdiction of the Department of Public Health. Presently DDR does a monthly financial monitoring of the YTT and CASH programs and of the contracts it has with SPAN at the other institutions. The DOC performs a similar financial audit of SPAN's program at Norfolk.

Table 10
Program Expenditures

	SPAN	CASH	YTT
Total Budget F.Y. 1984	\$33,841	\$26,271	\$35,638
Monthly Budget	\$ 2,820	\$ 2,189	\$ 2,970
Average Number of Clients Served per Month	45.6	34	50
Average Monthly Cost Per Client	\$ 61.84	\$ 64.38	\$ 59.40
Weekly Average Number of Direct Service Hours	38	23	12.5
Average Hourly Cost of Direct Service	\$ 17.13	\$ 21.97	\$ 54.82
Director's Hourly Salary (Includes any clinical compensation)	\$ 9.75	\$ 13.93	\$ 7.93
Counselor's Hourly Salary	\$ 7.25	\$ 8.77	\$ 20.00

In conversations with program directors and staff, it was learned that DDR performed quality-assurance reviews on a somewhat irregular basis. However, just recently, DDR officials finished an in-depth evaluation of each of the programs. They took a random sample of 15 client folders from each program and checked process notes and treatment plans for their existence, clinical common sense and continuity of

care. The results of this evaluation are forthcoming.

Almost since its inception, SPAN has submitted monthly reports and attendance sheets to the DOC. It also issues a yearly program report. In 1983, YTT and CASH also began submitting monthly reports and attendance to the Department.

As far as self-evaluation, there have been no regular attempts by any of the programs, or their sponsors, to evaluate the effectiveness of their treatment. Most staff felt that they can get a sense of the program's effectiveness by looking at client behavior. This would include noting when inmates are returned from parole or to higher security, and noticing when they make either concrete gains (e.g. no major D-reports for a long time) or personal gains (e.g. taking responsibility for themselves). Besides its annual report, SPAN performs written and verbal staff evaluations every six months and the staff meets regularly to discuss client-oriented issues. The Director of YTT discussed the difficulty of performing an evaluation given the high turnover rate of inmates in institutions. He noted that an evaluation of the old modality was conducted several years ago and yielded positive results. However, no recent evaluation has been conducted on any of the programs.

F. Description of Program Participants

This section will describe the inmates who participated in the three Norfolk substance abuse treatment programs during 1983. The description will include demographic information on the participants as well as criminal history backgrounds and history of drug/alcohol use and treatment. Tables for these variables are located in the Appendix.

As far as race, SPAN's population was somewhat split with a slightly higher percentage of blacks (54%) than whites (45%). SPAN inmates were predominantly

young with 75% of them being age 30 or younger and the median age of a SPAN participant being 27. Only 10 inmates in this program (8%) were 36 years old or more.

As far as education, only 32% of SPAN's participants have graduated from high school or have obtained a G.E.D. (high school equivalency). Forty-five percent (45%) of the SPAN inmates had some high school education and 22% had only completed the 8th grade or less. The average grade completed for SPAN participants was the 10th grade.

The majority (74%) of SPAN participants were single. Fourteen percent (14%) were married and 11% were either divorced, separated or widowed. As far as occupation prior to incarceration, 47% had worked in manual labor jobs and 23% in services.

For CASH participants, 11 of the 15 (73%) were white. As far as age, two-thirds of the CASH inmates were age 30 or younger. The median age for these men was 30 years old.

As for education, 6 of the 15 CASH participants had graduated from high school or have earned their G.E.D. Three of these also had some college completed. Of the 8 who hadn't completed high school (53%), 5 had only completed the eighth grade or less. The average grade completed was 9.6 years.

A little over half of the CASH inmates were single (53%). Of the others, 4 were married (27%) and 3 were either divorced, separated or widowed. While previous occupation was unknown for one-third of these inmates, for those whom it was known, 4 worked in manual jobs, and the rest were spread out in the other categories.

The YTT participants were mostly black (60%). While their median age of 30 was similar to the CASH participants, their ages had a greater range. Fifty-six

percent (56%) were ages 30 or younger and 13% were ages 41 and older.

The YTT participants had the highest average grade completed (11.3 years) of all three programs. Fifty percent (50%) had completed high school, some of whom had attended some college.

A larger percent of YTT inmates were married (40%) than were those in other programs. Forty-three percent (43%) were single. YTT inmates had similar previous occupations with 37% in manual labor jobs and 20% in services.

In terms of criminal history, the number of court appearances for SPAN participants ranged from 1 to 38, with the average being 15. Thirty-seven percent (37%) of the SPAN participants had no previous adult incarcerations. The average number of prior adult incarcerations was about one for all SPAN participants, however, 34% had two or more previous incarcerations.

As far as previous charges, SPAN participants averaged 11.9 property offenses, 4.9 offenses against the person and 2.9 drug offenses. For their present offense, 61% had person offenses, 23% had property offenses, 9% had drug offenses and 6% had sex offenses.

The average age of the SPAN participant at the beginning of his incarceration was 25 years old. Almost half of those incarcerated (44%) were Walpole commitments, the others being Concord commitments (56%). Since the sentencing is structured differently for each of these types of commitments, length of sentence will be reported separately. For those with a Walpole commitment, a look at the minimum sentence reveals that the average SPAN inmate received at least 6 years. For the Concord commitments⁷, the maximum sentence for SPAN participants averaged 12 years. In looking at the original parole eligibility dates, the SPAN inmate will serve the shortest sentence with 2.5 years.

For CASH participants, the number of court appearances ranged from 2 to 34, with the average being 14. Fifty-three percent (53%) of the CASH participants had no prior incarcerations and the average number of them was less than one (0.9%).

CASH participants averaged 8.1 prior property offenses, 6.3 prior person offenses and 5.1 prior drug offenses. For their present offense, the majority (73%) had committed offenses against the person, with 13% being committed for property and another 13% for drug offenses.

The average age of the CASH participant at incarceration was 26 years old. The majority of CASH participants (73%) were committed to M.C.I. Walpole. For these Walpole commitments, the average CASH participant received a minimum sentence of 11 years. For the four CASH inmates with Concord sentences, the average maximum sentence was 10 years. The parole eligibility dates for the average CASH participant confirms that he will be serving the longest sentence (5 years).

Finally, YTT participants had a similar number of court appearances as did other program participants, ranging from 1 to 38 and averaging 15. The average YTT participant had 1.7 prior adult incarcerations. Only 40% had no prior incarcerations and 23% had been incarcerated four times or more.

YTT participants had an average of 11.4 prior property offenses, 4.7 prior person offenses and 4.3 prior drug offenses. As for present offense, similar to other programs, YTT inmates were mostly committed for person offenses (67%). Other present offenses included property (17%) and drug offenses (13%).

The average age of the YTT participant at incarceration was 29 years, somewhat older than other program participants. The majority of YTT participants (73%) were Walpole commitments. Of those, the average minimum sentence was

7.6 years. For the 8 YTT inmates with Concord sentences, the average maximum sentence was 10 years. According to original parole eligibility dates, the average YTT inmate will be serving 4 years.

As for drug use, only three SPAN inmates interviewed reported no substance abuse problems. One-third of the SPAN participants interviewed reported problems with alcoholism. The rest of the SPAN and YTT inmates had drug-abuse problems. One participant from each program had a problem with both drugs and alcohol. The percent of inmates with some history of drug offenses are 9% for SPAN, 13% for CASH and 13% for YTT. The average age at first drug arrest for SPAN and CASH participants was about 18 years old and 22 years old for YTT participants.

In recent interviews the most used drug seemed to be heroin, used alone or in some combination with other drugs. The next most popular drug seemed to be cocaine and this again was either used alone or in a combination with other drugs, usually heroin. Over half of those interviewed reported having a substance abuse problem for over ten years. More than one-third said they had started abusing alcohol and/or drugs at age 15 or younger. Only 3 of the 22 inmates interviewed began this abuse recently after the age of twenty. The majority of interviewed participants stated that they had either a very serious substance abuse problem or that they were addicted at the time they were incarcerated. Many had drug habits costing several hundred dollars a day. All of YTT's participants, two-thirds of SPAN's participants and the one CASH participant interviewed reported that they were under the influence of drugs or alcohol at the time they committed their present offense.

The majority of participants have received at least one disciplinary report (D-report) for possession, use or suspected use of a controlled substance since the beginning of their incarceration. Participants of YTT had the smallest average

number of substance abuse D-reports (1) and were the largest group with no reports at all (47%). Thirty-nine (39%) percent of SPAN's participants had no substance abuse D-reports and the average number per inmate was 1.4. Only one-fourth of CASH's participants had none of these D-reports (27%) and the average number per inmate was 2. It should be noted that of all the substance abuse D-reports received only a small fraction were received at Norfolk while the participant was enrolled in the program. Only 11 of the 128 SPAN participants (9%) were found guilty of this type of D-report during this time period. Similarly, 3 of CASH's 15 participants (20%) and 3 of YTT's 30 participants (10%) received substance abuse D-reports for which they were found guilty while participating in the program.

As far as previous participation in substance abuse programs, two-thirds of the participants interviewed, reported being in other programs previously. Evidence of prior participation was also gathered from inmate folders. Many of the inmates with previous programming had attended AA meetings and some had attended programs at various institutions including those programs being studied. A number of inmates had been enrolled in the same program they are in now, but at another institution. Almost half of CASH's participants (47%) had been enrolled in CASH at Walpole. Similarly 32% of SPAN's participants had been enrolled in SPAN at either Walpole or Concord. Only 3% of the YTT participants had been enrolled in YTT programs elsewhere. Also 34% of the SPAN participants had once been enrolled in the SPAN group within the community.

A small number of inmates were participating in AA in addition to their participation in YTT, CASH or SPAN. This number ranged from a low of 10% of YTT inmates to 29% of SPAN inmates to a high of 33% of CASH inmates. There were also 6 inmates who had been in both YTT and SPAN during 1983 and one who had been in both CASH and SPAN.

II. Perceptions of the Programs

This section will present the perceptions which various people have of each of the programs. This will include how inmates, program staff and DOC administrators describe the program and its goals, and how effective they think the program is. It will also summarize what people think the substance abuse needs are of Norfolk inmates as well as address the issues of having outside programs coming into the institutions.

A. How People View Each Program

Each of the three drug treatment programs has its own unique and distinctive image. In this section the researcher will take each program separately and report on how it is viewed by the inmates, program staff, DOC administration, other relevant people and the researcher herself.

The first program to be discussed will be CASH. The researcher was not allowed to observe the CASH group and only one participant agreed to be interviewed. The result of this is that it is hard to grasp the essence of the program and to go beyond what has been reported. In fact, this almost lack of image or at least lack of knowledge seems to characterize the program as far as many people are concerned. All of the administrators interviewed from the DOC were aware that CASH existed and that it was a drug treatment program utilizing the group therapy approach. Beyond that, not much was known about its effectiveness, size, content or participants. They felt that most DOC staff and even most inmates were unaware of its existence.

Some of the DOC administrators interviewed had a sense that group

therapy sessions were spent discussing issues of incarceration and complaints about the prison rather than discussing substance abuse and its cause. Others felt that the Director acted more as an advocate for inmates, aligning himself with them against the DOC administration. Some of this was observed by the researcher when she spoke with the CASH group on a single occasion to try to obtain permission to observe the group. At that time, the Director referred to the DOC as the "enemy" and supported the inmates' decision not to allow observation.

However, this alignment with inmates is appreciated by them. It was reported that they have complete trust in their group leader and feel comfortable opening up their innermost feelings in the group. The one inmate interviewed said that the CASH group helps him to cope with the present and helps him to take a look at himself and prepare himself for the street. He felt that CASH was "nothing but productive for the inmates to get involved with". This view was shared by the Chief Mental Health Coordinator of South Norfolk DLM. He stated that "CASH is a credible program" that has a lot of respect from the inmate population. He felt that its Director should be credited for maintaining high standards of confidentiality and that he has gained the inmate's trust. DLM makes and accepts referrals to and from CASH.

The CASH Director believes that the inmate's trust has been instrumental in making the groups serious and effective. He stated that one main difference between his program and the other two is that CASH has a professional staff and uses more of a Mental Health approach than do YTT or SPAN. He also stated that CASH tends to see its clients on a long-term basis and that the main topic of discussion is drug abuse and its causes.

In summary, the CASH group at Norfolk appears to be a small off-shoot of CASH at Walpole. The group's size tends to be small with mostly young white males serving longer sentences. Thus the turnover rate is low and inmates seem to

have developed a loyalty to each other and to the group leader. A few SPAN and YTT participants who had initially approached the CASH group, felt uncomfortable in the group as if it was too exclusive for them to join. In essence, the CASH program is one for which those involved have high praise. However for those on the outside, it remains somewhat unknown and distant.

The second program to be discussed is the YTT program. This program, like CASH, seems to be somewhat of an unknown entity to the DOC. However, unlike CASH this is a major complaint of YTT staff and participants. The program agreed to the observation of the groups and to cooperate with interviews in the hopes that YTT may gain some recognition from Norfolk DOC staff as a serious, viable and effective drug treatment program. Inmates reported that despite its lack of recognition, they joined YTT to obtain help for themselves. However, they stated they would like the administration to recognize YTT as an important program that is on the same level as AA or SPAN.

The discussion of YTT with administrators confirmed its lack of recognition. They reviewed the program as a "freebie" from DDR over which they have limited control and about which they have little knowledge. Most did however speak of its Director as impressive and as a good role model for drug-involved inmates. The Norfolk Assistant Staff Psychologist felt that the Director's personal experience was a definite asset to the program. This was also the opinion of the inmate participants, because they said he could really relate to their problems and knew when an inmate was trying to "get over on him."

During interviews with YTT participants, the program was described as a self-help drug program. While all three programs are in reality self-help groups, more emphasis was placed on this aspect in YTT. In observing the groups and in interviewing, phrases like "it's up to you" or "it's on you" were frequently heard. As

the Director stated, "it is up to the program to make services available, how (an inmate) uses it depends on him".

Although drug abuse as a problem is often discussed in group, participants liked the fact that other topics are also discussed. These include how to deal with day-to-day living in a prison setting, how to keep away from drugs now and in the future, how to deal with family issues and how to build up their self-images. Transition issues are also discussed but more in terms of feelings and expectations vs. concrete things like employment and housing. While YTT puts more emphasis on transition than does CASH, it puts less emphasis on this issue than SPAN. One YTT participant said that the program helps inmates deal with the present and doesn't teach them about six months from now as does SPAN. Instead it helps them learn about themselves and their present problems so that when they are released, they will know who they are and what they want.

In summary, YTT is a self-help drug program whose participants are predominantly black and somewhat older than those of other groups. While drug abuse is the main theme of group discussion, many other issues are discussed and dealt with. Most participants seem to join the group shortly after arriving at Norfolk and tend to continue participation until released. While there is somewhat of a turnover rate, there is also a core of inmates who have been in the program for a while. This core brings a certain continuity to the group and maintains a serious level of open discussion. It is also concerned that YTT become recognized as a drug treatment program that helps its participants.

The final substance abuse program to be discussed is SPAN. More information was gathered on this program since the researcher interviewed 13 current and 4 prior SPAN participants and several SPAN staff and observed four sessions of two separate groups. Unlike CASH and YTT, SPAN seems to enjoy

greater credibility and professional recognition at Norfolk. Every Norfolk DOC administrator that was interviewed commented on SPAN's good reputation with the administration, with line staff and with inmates. Several felt that its Director works hard in public relations, especially with the administration. She pointed out that inmates view SPAN differently from the other programs because they know it is recognized more by DOC and Parole and therefore more valuable to the inmate. She also asserted that she and her staff are more willing to work directly with DOC and Parole on behalf of their clients. This was confirmed by Norfolk's Deputy Superintendent and by Norfolk's Institutional Parole Officer, both of whom spoke of working directly with SPAN's Director.

The Parole Officer spoke very highly of SPAN and its staff and said they had been working in cooperation with each other for five years. He stated that SPAN accepts referrals from himself and the Parole Board, as well as performing drug evaluations for Parole and developing viable re-entry plans for inmates about to be paroled. He felt that the re-entry services SPAN provides are invaluable. This was confirmed in interviews with inmate participants, most of whom highlighted SPAN's ability to prepare clients for return to the street. Some of them centered on the group that meets within the community, others talked about how SPAN staff can hook them up with half-way houses, residential programs, employment resources and other services. In describing the program, participants called SPAN a self-help program and described the group as a place to discuss problems. However, their emphasis was on SPAN as a re-entry program. Most DOC staff pointed out this emphasis also. One administrator stated that "SPAN is a re-entry program called a drug program". While observation and discussion with various parties has revealed that SPAN does deal with drug abuse issues, the frequency of this issue depends on the make-up of the group and the group leader. However, it

appears that this is just one of several issues dealt with and that re-entry is the main thrust of the program.

One of the notable aspects of SPAN is all the advocacy/casework that staff do, only some of which is for re-entry purposes. The casework geared toward re-entry includes making referrals to various social service agencies, developing parole plans and ensuring that an inmate's paperwork for parole and/or release is properly channeled. However staff work on other types of advocacy like ensuring that an inmate is credited for his proper good-time, helping inmates clear outstanding warrants, preparing inmates for Parole or ICC Boards, helping inmates deal with family issues and generally advocating. SPAN's Director discussed how doing this sort of advocacy work took inmates' minds off the petty institutional worries and freed them so they could deal with real issues. Inmates interviewed discussed how SPAN helps "people get out" of prison and "solve inmate's problems". Several noted the personal attention inmates receive. As one person put it, "They took a personal interest in me and my development as well." While inmates obviously appreciate the advocacy, one wonders how this fits into the modality of a drug treatment program.

In summary SPAN is a re-entry program for inmates within a year of parole eligibility, the great majority of whom have substance abuse problems. These problems include alcohol, as well as drugs and sometimes a combination of the two. While participants of each program believed that they took their own participation in their program more seriously than those in the other programs, at SPAN the level of commitment seemed to vary. From observations of group sessions and interviews with staff, it seems that participants fall into three groups. First, there seemed to be the younger inmates who either were told by a Board to go to SPAN or who had heard SPAN could help you get out. These participants tended not to be

serious about their involvement and were probably responsible for most of the drop-out rate. The next group seriously wanted help either to stop drug usage or to do planning for release. They showed up on a regular basis and made an effort to participate. But there was also a third, more committed group, who were trying to really deal with their issues and who were highly involved in participation. These inmates complained about the younger inmates who were not serious about using the groups to learn and grow. Thus the quality of any given group depends on its make-up, the turnover rate and even the group counselor. Meanwhile, SPAN staff are kept consistently busy with the outside-of-group activity.

B. Perceptions of Program Effectiveness

While this evaluation was not designed to measure the effectiveness of the three substance abuse programs, different perceptions regarding program effectiveness were gathered. As far as the DOC administrators at Norfolk viewed program effectiveness, SPAN again was seen in a more positive light than were YTT or CASH. For these latter programs, it was not so much that people did not think they were effective, but again that they simply had nothing on which to base an opinion. Conversely, administrators had seen concrete things SPAN has done for inmates and the results of that help. One noted that SPAN was able to provide services to a large group of inmates and that added to their chances of effectiveness. It was also pointed out that inmates must think it is effective since SPAN has such a long waiting list.

SPAN inmates do believe in the effectiveness of their program, as YTT and CASH inmates believe in the effectiveness of theirs. All participants listed, in interviews and in the groups, a variety of ways that their program has helped them.

One of the ways the programs have helped them is in dealing with substance abuse. Three of the YTT and a couple of the SPAN participants stated that their participation helped them stay away from drugs within the institution. Some realized the seriousness of their alcohol/drug problems and others learned about the negative effects of drugs. Still others said it helped them to deal with the issues leading to their abuse.

In addition to aiding an inmate with his substance abuse problem it has helped them in other ways. One of these is the support they get just from being listened to and receiving feedback. YTT participants highlighted this peer support as an important aid in coping and staying out of trouble. The YTT Director believed that YTT participants have fewer problems in the institution as a result of program participation than do general population inmates. Participants of all three programs agreed and several said they have worked on their attitude and on thinking before reacting. One SPAN client said, "I'm more of a thinker now than an actor". Also mentioned was that participation has given the inmates insight into their problems and contributed to the improvement of their self-image. A YTT participant stated that YTT had given him a sense of belonging and an "enormous support as far as reconstructing (his) self-image". One SPAN staff person pointed out how SPAN's treatment of its clients with respect and dignity helps to build their self-esteem. Finally SPAN inmates said it has helped them prepare for the streets and for the Parole and ICC Boards.

All inmates interviewed were satisfied with their progress, but to varying degrees. Many felt that they had changed, one of whom said, of himself, "this is another person from the one he was two years ago". All believed that it was either participation in the group, their relationship with a counselor or a combination of both which led to the change.

Program staff however attributed effectiveness to the basic philosophies of their own program. The Director of CASH attributed it to the trust that participants have in him as a group leader. The Director of YTT believed that providing ex-offenders and ex-addicts as role models was the key to success. SPAN staff attributed their effectiveness to a number of reasons. One was that SPAN staff act as models for inmates to follow because they are trustworthy, up front, dependable and responsible. They also portray a general positive attitude that change is possible. Another reason given for its effectiveness is the image SPAN has as being a community-based program and as separate from DOC, without any authority over the inmates. Finally SPAN is geared toward preparing for release and that in itself is a popular goal among inmates.

The impression that this researcher has gotten about the effectiveness of these programs, is that it is effective for some participants, but not others. A great deal depends on the individual client and how willing he is to change and help himself. After all, each of these programs, despite their unique twists, are self-help programs using the same group therapy modality. Effectiveness depends on the individual as well as the make-up of the group, the skill of the group leader, and whether an inmate will stay long enough at Norfolk to benefit from it. While perceptions and impressions are helpful and informative, they are of a somewhat limited value. A more definite assessment of effectiveness would have to be made by a longer-term outcome evaluation.

C. Substance Abuse Needs of MCI-Norfolk Inmates

In this section, the notion of substance abuse treatment - what it is, what it entails and what it means in a medium security institution such as Norfolk, will be

discussed. The three modalities of drug treatment that have been mainly utilized nationally in recent years are: 1) methadone maintenance, 2) the self-help approach and 3) a multi-modal treatment approach based on psychotherapeutic concepts. This last approach includes a mixture of medically assisted detoxification, individual and group psychotherapy, and social and vocational counseling. The three substance abuse treatment programs evaluated all stem from the second modality, the self-help approach.

In examining the needs of substance-abusing inmates of Norfolk, one must take into consideration whether the needs of inmates are different at a medium security institution than they are at other levels of security. The DOC administrators interviewed had a variety of ideas on this subject. Some saw no distinction between the drug treatment needs of medium security and other security levels. A couple believed that drug treatment should be concentrated at the beginning of incarceration when the inmate stops using drugs and again, at minimum or pre-release when an inmate is about to be released, to prevent him from returning to their use.

The Superintendent of Norfolk believed that the DOC should provide to inmates services that promote abstinence, self confidence and change in attitude at the medium and minimum levels of security. He felt it was too difficult for inmates to begin to work out the underlying causes of drug abuse at the maximum security level and that not until an inmate reached medium security could one expect a change in attitude. The inmates of YTT thought it was very important for them to have a program while at Norfolk to support and help them abstain from drug use within the institution. Many inmates also felt that since they spend the bulk of their incarceration at medium security, that is where they should begin to take a look at their drug use and its causes. The Director of Program Services

summed up the substance abuse needs of inmates at Norfolk. They include: 1) support to stay straight within the institution, 2) the need to work on the underlying causes of drug abuse, 3) general support and 4) drug education. She also felt that the intensive work begun at medium security should be continued at lower levels of security where the preparation for release was more urgent.

While all have acknowledged, to various degrees, the contribution of the three programs in question, everyone including the program staff and the researcher herself, feel that there are definite gaps in substance abuse treatment at Norfolk. One of the major gaps is that the three programs can only service a small number of inmates. The Superintendent estimated that 80% of Norfolk inmates have some history of drug involvement. However, the three programs in question only serve a small percentage of those inmates, and as the Director of Treatment put it, "It's a drop in the ocean."

One DOC administrator felt that drug abuse treatment at Norfolk was terribly inadequate since only one modality of drug treatment was offered. Almost all felt the need for more types of services. Each program director felt that there should be a variety of treatment modalities that the inmate could choose from. They thought that the population should be given different options to meet various inmate needs. While program directors felt that drug treatment should be provided solely by programs outside of DOC, some DOC administrators believed that programs should be run by the Department. This issue will be discussed in a further section.

In questioning people about the gaps in drug treatment, several areas emerged. The two most predominant gaps were the lack of drug education and the lack of individual counseling. While deterrence and enforcement against drug use were deemed important, it was pointed out that inmates should be given drug

education and insight into their use of drugs so that they will also abstain from drug use because they choose to. Other ideas included incorporating substance abuse treatment within psychiatric services, setting up a drug evaluation and referral system, and providing follow-up services and support for inmates when they leave. While all interviewed acknowledged the need for extending and expanding drug treatment services, the cost of such expansion was also acknowledged as the main obstacle to that expansion.

Adequate services for drug-involved offenders appears to be lacking in most correctional facilities across the country (Research Concepts, Inc., 1973; National Institute on Drug Abuse, 1977). In one study that surveyed these types of services in seven states, it was noted that "because the opportunities for drug use while incarcerated are assumed to be considerably reduced, the emphasis on drug control elements in prison programs is almost totally lacking". It went on to conclude that "the availability of specialized programs was uniformly seen by survey staff and by most agency personnel as inadequate when compared with the estimated numbers of offenders considered drug involved" (Research Concepts, Inc. 1973: 831, 832).

The National Institute on Drug Abuse also cited the large number of drug-involved offenders entering the prison system, as well as the fact that recidivism tends to be higher for the drug-abusing population of inmates. It discussed the importance of having the criminal justice system and the drug-abuse treatment system interface. In a report on the two systems, it was stated, "without treatment, there is little chance that the incarceration of the drug-abusing criminal offender will be anything but futilely punitive" (1977: 31). However the factors affecting this interface, and thus program availability often include: 1) limited financial resources, 2) a lack of program coordination, 3) the lack of a

programmatic needs assessment, 4) the inflexibility of state policies and procedures and 5) the lack of planning or decision-making in this area.

At least two of the above factors affect drug-treatment services for Norfolk inmates. The first, already mentioned, is the lack of financial resources, cited by all the interviewees. The second is the lack of coordination between the Division of Drug Rehabilitation and the criminal justice system. The DDR Program Coordinator and the DOC Director of Program Services both discussed their intention to foster a much closer relationship between the two departments. The latter person believed that DDR should be involved in the drug treatment planning of the DOC and that DDR should seek input from and give feedback to the DOC on the DDR-funded programs within the institutions. This exchange might have lessened the resistance and thus reduced the delays that existed in the attempt to carry out the present evaluation. Instead, this exchange of ideas and feedback between DDR and DOC could promote a well-rounded, comprehensive treatment system for incarcerated drug-involved offenders.

D. The Use of Outside Community Programs Within MCI-Norfolk

The issue of having outside, community-based programs bringing drug treatment services into correctional institutions such as Norfolk, has been a topic of much debate throughout this evaluation. The pros and cons of this type of policy have been put forth by inmates, program staff and DOC administrators alike.

One of the main advantages espoused by inmates and program staff to having outside programs come into Norfolk is around the issue of trust. Many inmates said that they would not attend a program like their own if it was run by DOC personnel. They felt the confidentiality afforded them by outside programs would

not be available to them even by DOC staff who were in treatment services. This was reiterated by YTT, CASH and SPAN staff who felt that their programs offered inmates a place to go where they could feel totally free to discuss their personal problems and past experiences.

The Director of Program Services believed that the notion of not being able to trust DOC programs/personnel was not valid. She noted other DOC programs that were trusted by inmates and stated that when the DOC enters a new area of programming that it is just a matter of time before trust builds up. She felt that YTT, SPAN and CASH fostered this attitude because it gives the programs prestige and acts as their drawing card.

On the other hand, she pointed out other advantages to having outside programs provide drug treatment within DOC institutions. One advantage is that it simply alleviates boredom and staleness by introducing new faces and new energy into the institutions. Another is that programs run by ex-addicts or ex-offenders provide participants with a role model with whom to identify. The Director of Treatment pointed out that outside programs have more flexibility in that they can better coordinate services with outside agencies, conduct follow-ups and act as real advocates for inmates.

In discussing the disadvantages of having outside drug treatment programs, one must first note that DOC administrators stated that they have had no specific problems with YTT, CASH or SPAN outside of their resistance to this evaluation. However, all listed the lack of control as the main disadvantage of having outside programs. This seemed to be more a problem with YTT and CASH since they are funded by DDR than it was with SPAN, where DOC at least has some fiscal control. The Superintendent listed several problems with having outside programs. They include: 1) lack of participation in staff selection and

termination, 2) lack of knowledge about what the programs actually do, 3) not being able to ensure that programs are meeting the needs and goals of the institution and 4) the lack of accountability. Several people felt that with DDR funding YTT and CASH to provide services at the institutions, they fall through the cracks and end up not being accountable to anyone. One DDR administrator said this was changing. He stated that programs like YTT and CASH are increasingly being called upon to answer to DDR and that accountability has increased. Again, a closer relationship between DDR and DOC could ensure that programs are held accountable to a greater degree.

Another aspect of outside programs providing services within the institutional setting is the obstacles the institution presents to the programs themselves. One main obstacle is the inability to provide consistent services due to inmates being transferred, locked up or unable to obtain a pass. Often if a person is absent from group, the staff do not know if he has dropped out or is unable to come because of an institutional restriction. Other obstacles have to do with various inmate attitudes. SPAN staff members stated that the whole issue of trust that therapy is based on is lacking in a correctional facility. Inmates often are paranoid and do not trust each other or program staff when entering a program despite its being necessary for the group process to succeed. They also believed that inmates are afraid to bring up certain issues in an institution - another hindrance to the therapeutic process. It was also pointed out that when inmates are frustrated with the whole system, they often set aside their own issues that they should be dealing with.

Several program staff discussed the overcrowding problem and its ramifications. YTT's Director said that the overcrowding and high turnover makes men anxious to move on and less concerned about dealing with their own issues.

SPAN's Director believed that overcrowding often led to decisions being made based on custody and not on treatment needs which also caused anxiety to inmates. She stated there were fewer options available to inmates due to overcrowding and that it also resulted in her program being run more rigidly, with more formal groups and more restrictions on who can join and how services are provided. The CASH Director discussed the difficulty for new staff to learn all the DOC regulations and how to deal with inmates' frustrations.

As for improvements, all program staff would like more resources to expand and reach more inmates. YTT staff would like to run YTT group meetings twice weekly to bring more consistency to inmates. SPAN and CASH staff wanted more resources so that they could work and follow inmates through their entire incarceration. SPAN's Director suggested that it would be preferable for SPAN to have a contract with DOC central office so that her program could do just that.

The CASH Director would like to expand CASH's capabilities by adding a vocational component, providing family psychotherapy, involving successful ex-offenders and using more community involvement. He and the Director of YTT would also like to see the reinstatement of inmate staff to their programs. SPAN on the other hand, wanted more flexibility with their staff hours and where they spent them so that at any given time they could devote the hours to wherever they were most needed. In all the improvements suggested above, the underlying factors are again financial resources and the relationship between these programs and the host institution.

III. The Feasibility of a Future Outcome Evaluation

In addition to the primary goal of describing the drug treatment programs at

Norfolk, another goal was to discuss the feasibility of conducting an outcome evaluation of each of these programs. In order to do this type of evaluation, the proposal stated the need to identify program goals and then translate those goals into measurable indicators of goal achievement. While this study has reported the goals of each program, operationalizing them into concrete measures would be more difficult. An example of an easy goal to measure would be the goal of offering weekly group therapy sessions for discussion. With this, the researcher could simply attend and count the number of group sessions offered where there was some discussion. A more difficult goal to operationalize would be the goal of having participants remaining drug free once released to the community. This goal presents numerous problems. For example, one would have to measure behavior after incarceration. It would also be difficult to determine if a person did stop using drugs, whether it was due to program participation or other factors.

In addition to the difficulty of operationalizing some of the goals, other obstacles to this type of research come to mind. The first is that the programs (except for SPAN) have so few clients, that research may be inconclusive at best. It would involve extensive observations of group sessions and follow-up of inmates who have been released. One would also have to utilize a control sample of other drug-involved inmates with whom to compare behavior. Finally, for SPAN, since its major thrust is re-entry, it is questionable whether an outcome study on its drug treatment goals would even make sense.

While it is not being recommended that further research be conducted on these programs, the researcher does have one recommendation for future research of this type. That is, the possibility of research/evaluation monitoring should be written in as part of the contract or mutually understood when a contract is awarded to a program like SPAN. In the case where another agency, like DDR

funds the contract, an understanding between the funding agency and the DOC should be made as soon as the request to operate within a correctional institution is being considered. Had this been the case, this research endeavor would probably have proceeded more smoothly. Programs which refuse such research should not be funded since evaluation/monitoring is necessary to see that programs offer services promised and are held accountable.

SUMMARY

This report has presented the results of the process evaluation completed on the SPAN, YTT and CASH programs. Included in the results have been a description of program participants, the level of attendance, budget and personnel, the type of modality and program processes. Perceptions on the merits of the programs, their level of effectiveness and their image within the prison have also been explained. Finally this report also contains a discussion of the possibility of conducting further research.

All three programs utilize the same basic modality of treatment - the group therapy or self-help approach. All three programs' primary service to inmates is their weekly group session lasting from one to two hours. Both SPAN and CASH provide a limited amount of individual counseling and SPAN offers other services geared toward re-entry into the community. The researcher observed varying levels of seriousness and commitment by inmates and also different topics of discussion, depending on the group make-up and the group leader. One might surmise that these types of programs are probably beneficial to most inmate participants, and possibly highly effective for a small number of them. One must take into consideration that the success of drug treatment programs in general, is usually relatively low and that any positive effects should be appreciated and recognized. However, these programs offer inmates only one type of drug treatment. There may be persons who are not able to deal with a group approach - who would prefer one-to-one counseling. Others might simply require more knowledge in the way of drug education. Presently, these two types of help are lacking for drug-involved inmates at Norfolk.

Each of the three programs is geared either by design or fate toward a specific type of inmate. CASH's participants tend to be mostly white inmates who originate from MCI-Walpole. They are serving long sentences, mostly for offenses against the person. When it comes to their program, they are closed-mouth and prefer being left alone. The low turnover rate and small number of participants result in a clique that is very protective of their program and its Director.

The YTT program has somewhat of a higher turnover rate and therefore serviced twice the number of inmates as did CASH. Participants are usually black inmates, who are somewhat older and have been around drugs and the criminal justice system for a long time. Most reported being sick of that life style and wanting to make a positive change. YTT participants who wish to remain involved in the program can do so at Bay State Correctional Center to where many are released, and can later join the YTT group on the street when released or transferred to a pre-release center.

Both YTT and CASH do not have the recognition and praise afforded to SPAN. However they differ on this. It seems as if CASH does not care about recognition, and possibly does not even want it. On the other hand, YTT staff and participants are seeking the recognition they believe they deserve. Both YTT and CASH serve such small numbers of inmates, that some have questioned whether it was worth having them in the institution. Obviously the participants of these programs believe that they are worthwhile.

Throughout the study SPAN has always appeared as somewhat apart from YTT or CASH. It is a much larger program than the others and also serves a different type of inmate. Participants tend to be younger inmates, with shorter sentences who are within one year of their parole eligibility dates. They are split racially as well as split by the type of offenses committed and by their level of commitment to the program. SPAN has a better image and reputation among

DOC administrators and line staff. However, from what the researcher observed, they actively work to create this image and to please both inmates and the DOC.

Several times this study had mentioned that the main thrust of SPAN is re-entry. While the issue of drugs is definitely dealt with, SPAN should be called a re-entry program. It is the re-entry services that inmates praise and for which they join the program. While SPAN staff no doubt work hard to provide these services, a couple of questions arise. Should drug treatment be funding re-entry services? Should SPAN be operating in medium security institutions such as Norfolk, as opposed to lower security institutions where release is a more urgent issue? While the community reintegration model supposes the release of inmates from either minimum security or pre-release centers, 6% (92) of the 1982 releases from Norfolk were to the street. Another 23% (280) were released directly to pre-release centers or contracted halfway houses. Therefore there is some need for re-entry services at Norfolk - for those going to the street and for those going to pre-release. How the SPAN program fits in with the overall needs of MCI-Norfolk must be determined by that institution and the Department of Correction in general.

Besides only providing one type of drug treatment counseling to the inmates at Norfolk, the three programs only service a small number of inmates. Approximately 2500 inmates passed through Norfolk in 1983.⁸ One can conservatively estimate that 60% of these (1500) have some history of drug involvement. Of these 1500 inmates who could benefit from some type of drug treatment or drug education, only 12% (173 inmates) were provided services by YTT, CASH and SPAN together. This figure highlights the relatively low impact that these three programs have on the drug treatment needs of Norfolk inmates. Yet almost \$50,000⁹ is spent annually to service this small percentage of

inmates at Norfolk. Broken down by program CASH serviced 1%, YTT serviced 2% and SPAN serviced 8.5% of the Norfolk inmates estimated to be at risk.

The cost-per-client figure for each of these programs was similar (around \$62.00) with YTT costing slightly less at \$59.40 per client. However SPAN had the lowest cost per hour of direct service (\$17.13), with CASH slightly higher (\$21.97). The YTT program had a very high hourly cost for direct services (\$54.82) which may be attributed to their use of consultant group leaders at \$20.00 per hour and/or their lack of documentation of services rendered.

Finally there is the issue of having outside drug treatment programs providing services to inmates within Norfolk prison. The best way to sum up this issue is to divide the comments of inmates, program staff and DOC administrators into the advantages and disadvantages of this practice. One of the first advantages cited is that outside programs often bring a fresh outlook, new energy and new faces into the institutions where they provide services. It has also been pointed out that since they are community-based, they can act as the important bridge between inmates and the community, by hooking up inmates with community services and providing follow-up to inmates once released. It was also argued that outside programs can act as real advocates to individual inmates in a way that would be unrealistic for the DOC to attempt, due to the large number of inmates and a possible conflict of interest. Finally, a program like YTT that uses ex-inmates and ex-addicts, provides an important role model to drug-involved inmates with whom they can identify.

As for the disadvantages to having outside programs within Norfolk, the main one cited was the lack of accountability to Norfolk administrators. This was viewed as more of a problem with YTT and CASH which are funded by DDR, than it was with SPAN, which is funded by DOC directly. Another disadvantage stated

was the lack of input that the DOC had into the selection of staff and the type of services they provide. Both the lack of accountability and the lack of input by the DOC have resulted in a limited knowledge of what these programs actually do. It may be interesting to note at this point how the program which was most known to DOC personnel, SPAN, had the largest number of inmates and that the least known program, CASH, had the smallest number of inmate participants. It is very probable that the degree of usability of a program is dependent on the amount of knowledge one has about that program. For example, since Norfolk staff know a lot about SPAN services and have been made aware of its results, both DOC and Parole staff at Norfolk make inmates aware of SPAN and thus a cycle of knowledge and use occurs. The danger that programs with little recognition face is that they may drift into non-usability by the DOC.

A final disadvantage of having all outside drug treatment programs is that there is nobody in the institution on a full-time basis who can provide consistency, crisis intervention or who can keep track of inmates who are at risk. Presently one can only assume that many needy drug-involved inmates fall between the cracks of the present drug treatment system at Norfolk.

These advantages and disadvantages to having outside programs must be weighed by Norfolk administrators and the DOC in general. In addition, one must take into consideration the cost of the three programs in question, the services presently provided and the drug treatment needs of Norfolk inmates. This comprehensive look would afford the DOC the opportunity to develop a drug treatment system that would provide a variety of services to all inmates who need some type of drug intervention.

APPENDIXTable 11Participants' Race

	<u>SPAN</u>		<u>CASH</u>		<u>YTT</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
White	58	(45)	11	(73)	11	(37)
Black	69	(54)	4	(27)	18	(60)
Unknown	1	(1)	0	(0)	1	(3)

Table 12Participants' Present Age

	<u>SPAN</u>		<u>CASH</u>		<u>YTT</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
25 & Under	48	(38)	5	(33)	4	(13)
26 - 30	47	(37)	4	(27)	13	(43)
31 - 35	22	(17)	5	(33)	5	(17)
36 - 40	4	(3)	1	(7)	3	(10)
41 & Over	6	(5)	0	(0)	4	(13)
Unknown	1	(1)	0	(0)	1	(3)
Mean	28 Years		29 Years		32 Years	
Median	27 Years		30 Years		30 Years	
Range	18-54 Years		21-38 Years		22-48 Years	

Table 13
Participants' Last Grade Completed

	<u>SPAN</u>		<u>CASH</u>		<u>YTT</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
8th Grade or Less	28	(22)	5	(33)	2	(7)
9th-11th Grade	57	(45)	3	(20)	11	(37)
12th Grade or GED	34	(27)	3	(20)	12	(40)
Some College	6	(5)	3	(20)	3	(10)
Unknown	3	(2)	1	(7)	2	(7)
Mean ¹⁰	10 Years		9.6 Years		11.3 Years	

Table 14
Participants' Marital Status

	<u>SPAN</u>		<u>CASH</u>		<u>YTT</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Married	18	(14)	4	(27)	12	(40)
Single	95	(74)	8	(53)	13	(43)
Other*	14	(11)	3	(20)	4	(13)
Unknown	1	(1)	0	(0)	1	(3)

*Other includes those divorced, separated or widowed.

Table 15
Participants' Occupation

	<u>SPAN</u>		<u>CASH</u>		<u>YTT</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Professional/Business	2	(2)	2	(13)	4	(13)
Sales/Clerical	8	(6)	3	(20)	2	(7)
Manual	60	(47)	4	(27)	11	(37)
Services	30	(23)	1	(7)	6	(20)
Other	3	(2)	0	(0)	1	(3)
Unemployed	5	(4)	0	(0)	1	(3)
Unknown	20	(16)	5	(33)	5	(17)

Table 16
Number of Court Appearances

	<u>SPAN</u>	<u>CASH</u>	<u>YTT</u>
	(N=122)	(N=14)	(N=28)
Mean	15	14	15
Range	1-38	2-34	1-38

Table 17
Number of Prior Adult Incarcerations

	<u>SPAN</u>		<u>CASH</u>		<u>YTT</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
None	47	(37)	8	(53)	12	(40)
One	38	(30)	4	(27)	6	(20)
Two	13	(10)	1	(7)	5	(17)
Three	15	(12)	1	(7)	0	(0)
Four or More	15	(12)	1	(7)	7	(23)
Mean	1.4		.9		1.7	

Table 18
Average Number of Prior Charges for Various Offense Categories

	<u>SPAN</u>	<u>CASH</u>	<u>YTT</u>
Person	4.9	6.3	4.7
Sex	.2	.2	.3
Property	11.9	8.1	11.4
Drug	2.9	5.1	4.3
Drunkenness	.4	.9	.9
Escape	.1	.3	.7

Table 19**Present Offense**

	<u>SPAN</u>		<u>CASH</u>		<u>YTT</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Person	78	(61)	11	(73)	20	(67)
Sex	8	(6)	0	(0)	0	(0)
Property	29	(23)	2	(13)	5	(17)
Drug	12	(9)	2	(13)	4	(13)
Unknown	1	(1)	0	(0)	1	(3)

Table 20**Minimum Sentence - Walpole Commitments**

	<u>SPAN</u>	<u>CASH</u>	<u>YTT</u>
	(N = 56)	(N = 11)	(N = 22)
Mean	5.6 Years	11.4 Years	7.6 Years
Median	5.0 Years	8.8 Years	6.5 Years
Range	2 Yrs. - 15 Yrs.	5 Yrs. - Life	3 Yrs. - Life

Table 21**Maximum Sentence - Concord Commitments**

	<u>SPAN</u> (N = 72)	<u>CASH</u> (N = 4)	<u>YTT</u> (N = 8)
Mean	12 Years	10 Years	10 Years
Median	10 Years	7 Years	10 Years
Range	2 Yrs. - 30 Yrs.	4 Yrs. - 20 Yrs.	2 Yrs. - 20 Yrs.
Missing	0	0	1

Table 22**Number of Disciplinary Reports for Substance Abuse Offenses**

	<u>SPAN</u>		<u>CASH</u>		<u>YTT</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
None	50	(39)	4	(27)	14	(47)
One	34	(27)	3	(20)	9	(30)
Two	14	(11)	3	(20)	3	(10)
Three or More	30	(24)	5	(33)	4	(13)
Mean	1.4		2.1		1.0	

Table 23
Past Participation in Substance Abuse Programs¹¹

	<u>SPAN</u>		<u>CASH</u>		<u>YTT</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
AA	38	(30)	7	(47)	4	(13)
SPAN	N/A		1	(7)	4	(13)
CASH	8	(6)	N/A		2	(7)
YTT	13	(10)	0	(0)	N/A	
Other Institutional Programs	18	(14)	4	(27)	2	(7)
Other	5	(4)	0	(0)	0	(0)
No Evidence of Past Programming	70	(55)	7	(47)	22	(73)

FOOTNOTES

1. The initial research design proposal was written by Dennis Cronin, a former DOC research assistant. Although data collection was begun in the Spring of 1983, the research was cut short when Mr. Cronin resigned from his position. This resulted in the need for the present researcher to begin data collection over again in order to achieve a clear understanding of the drug treatment programs. The initial research design was retained with a small number of modifications.
2. SPAN provides services at MCI-Walpole, MCI-Concord, MCI-Framingham as well as MCI-Norfolk. YTT provides services at the Bay State Correctional Center and at the Dedham House of Correction. CASH runs three groups at MCI-Walpole.
3. While the researcher received blank forms from all three programs, she was not able to confirm how thoroughly the forms were used. Due to strict federal guidelines surrounding confidentiality, the researcher did not check actual client folders for the use of these forms.
4. The N for this table as well as all further tables unless otherwise noted, is as follows: SPAN = 128, CASH = 15, and YTT = 30.
5. SPAN-1 and SPAN-2 are labels given to the two separate SPAN groups that the researcher observed. Labels were given by the researcher merely to make a distinction between the two and are not meant as any order of rank.
6. This is the amended figure effective January 1, 1984. Prior to that the budget was \$25,630.
7. Concord commitments receive indeterminate sentences and therefore, minimum sentence cannot be calculated.
8. This estimate was derived by taking the Norfolk population on January 1, 1983 and adding to it the number of admissions to Norfolk during 1982, since the figures for 1983 are unavailable at this time. This estimate is therefore a conservative one since it is expected that there were more admissions in 1983 than there were in 1982.

FOOTNOTES

9. The figure of \$50,000 was developed by taking the total SPAN budget (\$33,841) and adding to it one-fourth of the YTT budget (\$8,910) and one-fourth of the CASH budget (\$6,568). One-fourth of each was added since the one group run at Norfolk represents one-fourth of the groups each runs in all.
10. Tables that report only the means and not the medians, are so done because the medians were nearly identical to the means.
11. It is possible that this table underestimates the use of prior substance abuse programs as data in inmate folders on this topic are often incomplete or unavailable.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bureau of Justice Statistics (1983) "Prisoners and Drugs". Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Justice.

DeLeon, George and Mitchell, S. Rosenthal (1979) "Therapeutic Communities", in R. Dupont, A. Goldstein and J. O'Donnell (eds.), Handbook on Drug Abuse. Washington, D.C.: National Institute on Drug Abuse. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Grizzle, Gloria A. and Witte, Ann D. (1980) "Criminal Justice Evaluation Techniques: Methods Other Than Random Assignment", in M. W. Klein and K. S. Teilmann (eds.), Handbook of Criminal Justice Evaluation. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, Inc.

Krisberg, Barry (1980) "Utility of Process Evaluation: Crime and Delinquency Programs", in M. W. Klein and K. S. Teilmann (eds.), Handbook of criminal Justice Evaluation. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, Inc.

National Institute on Drug Abuse (1977) Drug Use Treatment and the Criminal Justice System: Three Reports. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

New England Economic Research Foundation (1970) Drug Use and Treatment Programs for Drug Dependent Persons in New England. Boston.

Research Concepts, Inc. (1973) "Treatment and Rehabilitation Programs for Drug-Involved Offenders in State Correctional Systems", in the National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse, Drug Use America: Problem in Perspective. Washington, D.C.

Sternberg, David (1963) "Synanon House: A Consideration of Its Implications for American Correction", Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science 54 (4): 447 - 455.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Tobin, Patricia (1983) Population Movements in the Massachusetts Department of Correction During 1982. Massachusetts Department of Correction.

Yablonsky, Lewis (1967) SYNANON: The Tunnel Back. Baltimore: Penquin Books.