

Goodwill Industries of the Chesapeake Employment Enhancement Program at Baltimore City Drug Treatment Court

Process Evaluation - Final



Submitted to:

Drug Treatment Court of Baltimore City
111 N. Calvert St., Room 520E
Baltimore, MD 21202

Gray Barton
Executive Director
Office of Problem-Solving Courts
2011-D Commerce Park Drive
Annapolis, MD 21401

Submitted by:

NPC Research
Portland, Oregon

December 2007



4380 SW Macadam Ave., Suite 530
Portland, OR 97239
(503) 243-2436
www.npcresearch.com

**Goodwill Industries of the Chesapeake
Employment Enhancement Program
at Baltimore City Drug Treatment Court
*Process Evaluation - Final***

Submitted By
NPC Research

Research Team

Tamara Perkins, Ph.D., Project Director
Juliette R. Mackin, Ph.D., Senior Process Study Consultant

For questions about this report or project, please contact Tamara Perkins at
(503) 243-2436 x 112 or perkins@npcresearch.com.

December 2007



Informing policy, improving programs

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report is made possible by the good work, support, and participation of many people and organizations including:

- Mr. Gray Barton, Executive Director, and Jennifer Moore, Deputy Director, Maryland Judiciary, Office of Problem-Solving Courts
- Judges Jamey H. Weitzman, Chair, Maryland Judiciary Conference Standing Committee on Problem-Solving Courts; and Baltimore City Drug Treatment Court (BCDTC) District Court Administrative Judge, Kathleen G. Cox, Vice Chair, Maryland Judiciary Conference Standing Committee on Problem-Solving Courts
- Judge Sylvester Cox, Supervising Judge for Baltimore City Drug Treatment Court, Circuit Court
- Judge Martin Welch, Presiding Judge of the Circuit Court, Baltimore City Drug Treatment Court
- Staff at Goodwill: Ms. Karen Pearson, Vice President for Workforce Development, Goodwill Industries of the Chesapeake; Ms. Claudette Costley, Program Manager for SEETTS; Ms. Chere Torsiello, Case Manager Supervisor; Mr. Erthman Naesea, Job Readiness Counselor; Mr. Maurice Hill, Case Manager and other Goodwill staff who participated in key stakeholder interviews or supported data collection efforts
- Mr. Ryan Smith, Coordinator, Baltimore City Drug Treatment Court at Circuit Court; Ms. Latesha Parks, Coordinator, Baltimore City Drug Treatment Court at District Court; and the staff at the Baltimore City Adult Circuit and District Drug Treatment Court, including judicial/legal, parole and probation staff, and others who participated in key stakeholder interviews
- Baltimore City Adult Circuit and District Drug Treatment Court participants who provided the evaluation team with their unique perspectives on the program
- Staff at NPC Research and Beacon supporting this study: including Mr. Charley Korn, Mr. Travis Ward, Mr. Jeremiah Raining Bird, Ms. Lisa Lucas, Ms. Sarah Strong and Ms. Dawn James

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	I
BACKGROUND.....	1
Organization of this Report.....	2
METHODS	3
Site Visits.....	3
Key Informant Interviews.....	3
Participant Interviews	3
Document Review.....	4
PROGRAM PROCESS DESCRIPTION	5
Implementation	5
Capacity and Enrollment	5
The GIC Program.....	6
Mission and Values.....	6
The Goodwill Team	6
Program Intake.....	7
Job Readiness Training.....	7
GIC Case Management.....	9
GIC Employment Placement	10
GIC PROGRAM COMPLETION AND AFTERCARE	11
Data Collected by GIC for Tracking and Evaluation Purposes	11
THE GOODWILL-DRUG TREATMENT COURT COLLABORATION PROCESS DESCRIPTION.....	13
GIC-DTC Program Goals	13
GIC-DTC Team and Team Communications.....	13
Participant Eligibility for, and Referral to, GIC	14
Eligibility	14
Referral to the GIC Program.....	15
Incentives for DTC Participants to Enter (and Complete) the Goodwill Program.....	19
Alternatives to the GIC Program	20
Funding and Future of the GIC-DTC Program.....	21
SUGGESTIONS FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT	23
Step One. Primary Recommendation for the DTC.....	23
Step Two. Recommendations for Improving the DTC-GIC Collaboration.....	23
Recommendations For The DTC-GIC Team:.....	23
Recommendations for the GIC:	24
Recommendations for DTC:	25



SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	27
APPENDIX A: DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE BALTIMORE CITY DISTRICT AND CIRCUIT DRUG TREATMENT COURTS	29
APPENDIX B: PARTICIPANT FEEDBACK.....	33
APPENDIX C: KEY STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEW GUIDE.....	37
APPENDIX D: SERVICES TO BE PROVIDED BY GOODWILL INDUSTRIES OF THE CHESAPEAKE, INC., AS DETERMINED BY THE MOU WITH BALTIMORE CITY DRUG TREATMENT COURT	41
APPENDIX E: GLOSSARY	45

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In early 2006, Goodwill Industries of the Chesapeake (GIC) and the Baltimore City Drug Treatment Court (BCDTC) program began a collaboration to help drug treatment court participants get off drugs and alcohol, get back on their feet and back working in the community by providing job readiness training, life skills training and employment placement services to drug court participants.

Drug court programs are designed to blend the resources, expertise and interests of a variety of jurisdictions and agencies in support of those individuals convicted of less severe drug possession and related charges. In the Baltimore City Drug Treatment Court (BCDTC) program, participants are closely supervised by a judge who is supported by a team of agency representatives who operate outside their traditional roles. The DTC team members work together to provide needed services to drug court participants.

This model of linking the resources of the criminal justice system and substance treatment programs has proven to be effective for increasing treatment participation and for decreasing criminal recidivism. The addition of a job readiness training program, career training, employment placement, and full case management services seeks to further support DTC participants in breaking the cycle of addiction, as well as to provide self-confidence, hope, financial stability, and self-sufficiency through employment.

NPC Research (NPC), under contract with the Administrative Office of the Courts of the State of Maryland (AOC), has been conducting evaluations of Maryland drug courts since 2001, including recently completing process evaluations of the Baltimore City Drug Treatment Court (BCDTC) programs.¹

¹ Crumpton, D., Brekhus, J., Weller, J. M., & Finigan, M. W. (2004). *Cost analysis of Baltimore City,*

This report represents the process evaluation for an enhanced set of employment-related services provided to the participants of BCDTC by Goodwill Industries of the Chesapeake (GIC). This 2-year collaborative project is funded by the Bureau of Justice Administration (BJA).

Information for this process evaluation was obtained from several sources, including key informant (including client) interviews, the MOU between GIC and DTC, the Goodwill Client Handbook, 2006 GIC Annual Report, as well as curriculum and other materials relating to the Goodwill program. The methods used to gather this information from each source are described in detail in the main report.

Process Evaluation Results

NPC examined the practices of the Goodwill employment enhancement program provided to BCDTC participants. The Goodwill program offers a comprehensive set of services, including job readiness training, employment placement services, and a full case management program, to support DTC clients as they transition out of the criminal justice system and back into the community.

The Goodwill program is very responsive to the needs of both the Department of Pa-

Maryland Drug Treatment Court. Report to the State of Maryland Judiciary, Administrative Office of the Courts and Baltimore Substance Abuse Systems, Inc.; Crumpton, D., Mackin, J., Weller, J.M. Linhares, R., Carey, S.M., & Finigan, M.W. (2007). *Baltimore City Drug Treatment Court (Adult Offenders in Circuit Court) Process Evaluation.* Submitted to the State of Maryland Judiciary, Administrative Office of the Courts; Mackin, J., Weller, J.M. Linhares, R., Carey, S.M., & Finigan, M.W. (2007). *Baltimore City Drug Treatment Court (Adult Offenders in Circuit Court) Process Evaluation.* Submitted to the State of Maryland Judiciary, Administrative Office of the Courts.

role and Probation (DPP) agents and their supervisees, keeping in close touch with DPP staff about their clients' progress at GIC. Respondents repeatedly noted that the GIC program is unique among employment enhancement agencies that DTC participants are referred to in the level of staff accessibility and communications with agents regarding client progress.

The vast majority of clients who complete GIC training find employment. The services provided by Goodwill have resulted in a large number of BCDTC participants learning about what it means, and what it takes, to find and hold a job through job readiness training. Over 95% of clients who completed the program were placed in transitional, temporary or competitive employment, exceeding the initial expectation of 40-80% of all referrals to GIC.

Referrals to GIC were less than anticipated in the MOU. Given that DPP agents were originally expected to refer 200 clients per year to GIC, the concern among collaboration partners about the low number of referrals is understandable. The referral rate for the first year was about 120 DTC clients, but referrals appear to be decreasing: 10 clients per month, on average, were referred in the first year. This decreased to about 6 clients referred per month in the first half of 2007, and then to about 3 clients per month in the third quarter of 2007.

Referral rates from District and Circuit Courts are comparable. Although many respondents felt that one reason for the lower than expected referral rates was that District Court agents were referring DTC participants to GIC at much lower rates than Circuit Court agents, this is not the case. A review of the referrals to GIC finds that when DTC capacity in both courts and one high-referring Circuit Court DPP agent are factored in, agents from both courts are actually referring clients at about the same rate based upon court capacity.

There are several reasons why the goal of referring 200 clients per year was not met:

1. DTC has a "treatment first" philosophy requiring clients to focus intensively upon their substance abuse issues
2. Parole and Probation guidelines and requirements may impact client's ability to participate in GIC
3. Not all clients are in need of job readiness training and, in fact, many have found jobs on their own
4. Some clients receive job readiness training as part of their substance abuse treatment program or already possess job skills/training
5. Not all clients volunteer to participate in GIC
6. The GIC program, as originally structured, may not fit the needs of some DTC clients, and this may have led to some dissatisfaction with the GIC program among both agents and clients
7. GIC is only one of several employment training programs used by DPP and Baltimore City Treatment Facilities
8. Both DPP agents and clients may be unaware of the unique aspects of the GIC program

Although the goal of 200 referrals may have been high precisely because of some of the reasons listed above, addressing the last four points above may lead to increased referrals and, ultimately, more jobs for DTC clients.²

DTC and GIC staff agrees on the importance of individualized services. Although DPP agents and GIC staff report a basic difference in their philosophy of working with clients (criminal justice and social service,

² Key staff felt that 200 referrals may have been high for a new pilot program and that the nature of the work with unique individuals with very different life situations made establishing such a number difficult.

respectively), both DTC and GIC staff interviewed do agree that the best supervision/service for DTC clients lies in an individualized approach that concentrates on the particular issues and needs of each client. This is a great strength of the collaboration and can be utilized to further the goals of supporting clients in turning their lives around through employment and sobriety.

There is a need for increased communications. This program is a collaboration between DTC and GIC and, as such, there are other areas in which all parties could make further efforts, the most important of which is to increase communications—and to diversify the types of communication—between drug court coordinators, DPP agents and supervisors, treatment providers, clients, and GIC staff. In particular, educating each other about each partner agency’s role in supporting the shared mission, as well as sharing successes and challenges among DTC, DPP, and GIC staff will strengthen the shared goal of assisting clients with treatment stability, reducing criminal recidivism, and increasing self-confidence, financial security through employment.

There are also areas where both GIC and DTC can make further efforts independently of each other. (A full list of detailed recommendations can be found on p. 23.)

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Primary recommendation for DTC:

There is a core set of issues facing the DTC team that need to be addressed before any other recommendations are discussed. These involve answering the following questions:

- How well do the other job readiness and employment placement programs serve clients over both the short and long term?
- Under what circumstances are short-term positions such as day labor positions the best option for a client?

Would a focus on training/apprenticeship programs work better for some clients?

- Does it make sense to cultivate strong relationships with one or more employment enhancement programs or keep all options open, even though the efficacy of other programs may not be clear (nor are these programs accountable) to the DTC?

Once these questions have been discussed, the DTC program should set policies for involvement in this or similar programs and services, as well as expectations for probation agent referrals.

Assuming that DTC wants a strong relationship with GIC, the following recommendations are for the team jointly, as well as for GIC and DTC separately.

2. Recommendations for the DTC-GIC collaboration team:

- Provide more opportunities for DTC-GIC team members to interact with each other at DTC, at team meetings, open houses, etc.
- Provide more opportunities for DTC-GIC team members to have a say in program decisions to increase stakeholder buy-in; e.g., establish regular quarterly team meetings with representatives of DTC and GIC to work together on common goals. At these meetings, stakeholders can discuss MOU program guidelines, implementation, share successes and challenges, and strategies for program improvement, as well as review this evaluation report together.
- Explore the issue of what an appropriate number of referrals is by analyzing program data about the progress of clients from DTC entry to exit, including the number that relapsed, were reincarcerated, were in

treatment longer than expected, returned to a former job, found a job on their own, were referred to an employment program other than GIC, etc.

3. Recommendations for GIC:

- Provide more information and training and updates about the GIC program to all members of the DTC team (e.g., create a flier that is client friendly)
- Fully utilize the data available to help guide program improvements and advocate for the program with DTC stakeholders such as agents, judges, public defenders, state attorneys, and treatment providers

3. Recommendations for DTC:

- During District DTC staffing meetings prior to drug court sessions, the DTC District team might dis-

cuss referral to GIC as part of the supervisee's plan for employment

- DTC-Circuit staff currently does not conduct a regular team meeting to discuss client progress prior to DTC sessions, but DTC-Circuit staff could explore ways to incorporate GIC into existing systems, such as drug court sessions and/or DPP supervision
- Develop more specific guidelines to help agents identify appropriate clients for GIC

Clients who finish the GIC program do well and GIC program participation benefits DTC clients through more stability in recovery and reduced recidivism.

Developing a clear structure of policies and procedures (e.g. referral protocols) to guide ancillary services such as the GIC will help ensure that more clients succeed.

BACKGROUND

In 2001, the State of Maryland released 9,448 ex-offender prisoners sentenced to more than a year in prison, over half of whom returned to Baltimore City (Urban Institute, 2003). Almost 80% of a sample of ex-offenders from Baltimore reported abusing alcohol and/or drugs prior to going to prison (Visher, La Vigne, & Travis, 2004). The effects of drug use, sales, and crime that results directly and indirectly from addiction-related behaviors on Baltimore area communities has prompted a wave of innovative programs to address the issue of re-entry (Baltimore City Mayor's Office of Employment Development Website). The collaboration between Supporting Ex-Offenders in Employment Training and Transitional Services (SEETTS) program at Goodwill Industries of the Chesapeake (GIC) and BCDTC is one such program.

A Brief Description of Baltimore City Drug Treatment Court and the GIC Collaboration

The purpose of drug courts is to guide offenders with substance abuse addictions into treatment that will reduce drug dependence and improve the quality of life for both offenders and their families, as well as provide increased safety and productivity to the communities offenders return to.

As in most typical drug court programs, participants in the Baltimore City Drug Treatment Court (BCDTC) are closely supervised by a judge who is supported by a team of agency representatives who operate outside of their traditional roles. The team includes a drug court coordinator, addictions treatment providers, state's attorneys, public defenders, and probation agents who work together to provide supervision and an array of services

to drug court participants. Drug court programs blend resources, expertise, and interests of a variety of jurisdictions and agencies to support drug court participants in kicking their addictions and in supporting their re-entry into society.

According to BCDTC drug court staff, drugs of choice for BCDTC participants are heroin and cocaine, reflecting current drug use trends³ among the general population of drug abusers in Baltimore City.

The Goodwill Industries of the Chesapeake (GIC) program is one of the outside resources that drug court participants may be referred to by Department of Parole and Probation (DPP) agents in order to help participants move on to a sustainable life of sobriety. The GIC program provides job readiness training, case management, and employment placement for many ex-offenders in the Greater Baltimore area, including those participants in the BCDTC program who have been referred to GIC by DPP agents.

NPC Research (NPC), under contract with the Administrative Office of the Courts of the State of Maryland (AOC), has been conducting evaluations of Maryland drug courts since 2001, recently completing process evaluations of the Baltimore City Drug Treatment Court (BCDTC) programs.⁴ This

³ The National Institutes of Health, Community Epidemiology Work Group (2000) reported Baltimore had the "US's highest cocaine and heroin ED [Emergency Department] rates."

⁴ Crumpton, D., Brekhus, J., Weller, J. M., & Finigan, M. W. (2004). *Cost analysis of Baltimore City, Maryland Drug Treatment Court*. Report to the State of Maryland Judiciary, Administrative Office of the Courts and Baltimore Substance Abuse Systems, Inc.; Crumpton, D., Mackin, J., Weller, J.M. Linhares, R., Carey, S.M., & Finigan, M.W. (2007). *Baltimore City Drug Treatment Court (Adult Offenders in Circuit Court) Process Evaluation*. Submitted to the State of

report contains the process evaluation for an enhanced set of employment-related services provided to BCDTC participants by GIC.

The BCDTC consists of two courts—the Circuit Court for felony cases, and the District Court for misdemeanor cases. Participants in both courts are supervised by Maryland Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services, Division of Parole and Probation (DPSCS). Participants from either court may be referred to the GIC program.

Although there are several important differences between District and Circuit Drug Treatment Court, both courts use many of the same or similar processes and procedures in their operations. (For a summary of the primary differences between the two court programs, please see Appendix A.)

The basic goals of both courts are the same. According to the procedures manuals, BCDTC program goals are to:

1. Divert pre-trial detainees who have been assessed as drug-dependent and who present low risk to public safety into treatment systems with close criminal justice supervision and monitoring
2. Provide an alternative to incarceration for criminal defendants whose crimes are drug involved, in turn providing the judiciary with a cost-effective sentencing option, freeing valuable incarceration resources for violent offenders, and reducing the average length of pre-trial jail time
3. Provide the criminal justice system with a fully integrated and comprehensive treatment program

4. Provide graduated levels of incentives and sanctions for defendants
5. Reduce criminal justice costs, over the long run, by reducing addiction and street crime
6. Facilitate, where appropriate, the acquisition or enhancement of academic, vocational, and pro-social skill development of criminal defendants

How the Goodwill Employment Program Aligns with the Goals of BCDTC

The Goodwill program fits closely with the goals of BCDTC. The job readiness training and employment placement function of the GIC program is most directly related to Goal 6 listed above. If DTC participants meet this goal by obtaining good jobs, then there is little doubt that this will reduce criminal justice costs in the long run by reducing addiction and street crime (Goal 5). Similarly, the case management function of the GIC program, in which each client is provided services tailored to their individual needs and desires, may act as an extension and strengthening of the DPP agent's case management and client monitoring function (Goal 1) through the close collaboration between GIC staff and agents who currently have supervises in the GIC program.

Organization of this Report

The first section of this report is a description of the methods used to perform this process evaluation, including site visits and key stakeholder interviews. The second section contains the evaluation, including a detailed description of the Goodwill services to drug court participants.

Maryland Judiciary, Administrative Office of the Courts; Mackin, J., Weller, J.M. Linhares, R., Carey, S.M., & Finigan, M.W. (2007). *Baltimore City Drug Treatment Court (Adult Offenders in Circuit Court) Process Evaluation*. Submitted to the State of Maryland Judiciary, Administrative Office of the Courts.

METHODS

Information was acquired for the process evaluation from several sources, including observations of GIC job readiness courses, key informant interviews (including client interviews)⁵, and the GIC client handbook, curriculum and other materials. The methods used to gather this information from each source are described below.

Site Visits

In April and July 2006 and April and June 2007, NPC evaluation staff visited the offices of Goodwill Industries of the Chesapeake (GIC) in Baltimore, met with staff responsible for implementing the program and observed a job readiness class. Attempts were also made to contact program participants for their feedback. In September 2007, NPC arranged client interviews with Goodwill participants from BCDTC. These activities provided the researchers with firsthand knowledge of the structure, procedures, and routines of the program.

Key Informant Interviews

Key informant interviews were a critical component of the process study. NPC staff interviewed 16 individuals involved with the Goodwill program at BCDTC, including the GIC Vice President for Workforce Development, the Supporting Ex-Offenders in Employment, Training and Transitional Services (SEETTS) Program Manager, the Case Manager Supervisor, the GIC Case Manager, the BCDTC coordinators at both Circuit and District Court, the judge responsible for setting up the Goodwill program, one treatment provider, three probation agents/case managers, and two probation field supervisors.

⁵ See Appendix B for a summary of client interview responses.

NPC adapted the Drug Treatment Court Interview Typology Guide for use in this evaluation.⁶ The guide provides a consistent method for collecting structure and process information from drug court-related programs. To better reflect local circumstances, this guide was modified to fit the purposes of this evaluation and of this particular employment enhancement to the BCDTC program. The information gathered through the use of this guide helped the evaluation team focus on the most significant and unique characteristics of the Goodwill Program at BCDTC. For the process interviews, key individuals involved with the BCDTC were asked the questions in the Interview Guide most relevant to their roles in the program.

Participant Interviews

NPC attempted on several occasions to conduct focus groups with current participants in the Goodwill Program, but was unable to do so due to low client turnout. NPC was able to contact one DTC participant who was currently in the GIC program for a one-on-one interview.⁷

This interview allowed one current DTC-GIC participant to share with the evaluators their experiences and perceptions about the Goodwill program.

⁶ This guide was originally developed under a grant from the Bureau of Justice Assistance and the Administrative Office of the Courts of the State of California for use in drug court evaluations.

⁷ NPR tried to set up two focus groups. One group was to be with people currently attending the job training program, while the other group was to be made up of people currently working in the transitional employment program. The first resulted in one client interview while the second never was organized despite repeated efforts. Attempts were made to call 15 former clients, none of which resulted in an interview.

Document Review

The evaluation team reviewed documents and materials provided by Goodwill Industries of the Chesapeake, including the Client/Trainee Handbook, 2006 GIC Annual Report, GIC Web site, intake packet, and curriculum materials, copies of agreements, forms, and other information used in the daily operations of the GIC program. Review of this documentation helped to further the evaluation team's understanding of GIC operations and practices.

Literature addressing the issues faced by people in recovery from substance abuse and ex-offenders who are trying to turn their lives around and re-integrate into their communities was also reviewed for this evaluation to ensure full understanding by the evaluation team of the complexities and best practices involved in serving this population of offenders.

Also consulted and drawn upon were the process evaluations for both BCDTC courts recently completed by NPC Research.⁸

⁸ Crumpton, D., Brekhus, J., Weller, J. M., & Finigan, M. W. (2004). *Cost analysis of Baltimore City, Maryland Drug Treatment Court*. Report to the State of Maryland Judiciary, Administrative Office of the Courts and Baltimore Substance Abuse Systems, Inc.; Crumpton, D., Mackin, J., Weller, J.M. Linhares, R., Carey, S.M., & Finigan, M.W. (2007). *Baltimore City Drug Treatment Court (Adult Offenders in Circuit Court) Process Evaluation*. Submitted to the State of Maryland Judiciary, Administrative Office of the Courts; Mackin, J., Weller, J.M. Linhares, R., Carey, S.M., & Finigan, M.W. (2007). *Baltimore City Drug Treatment Court (Adult Offenders in Circuit Court) Process Evaluation*. Submitted to the State of Maryland Judiciary, Administrative Office of the Courts.

PROGRAM PROCESS DESCRIPTION

The information that supports this process description was collected from interviews with Baltimore City Drug Treatment Court (BCDTC) and Goodwill Industries of the Chesapeake (GIC) staff, client interview, observation of the job readiness sessions, Goodwill program curricula and other documents. The majority of the information was gathered from one-on-one key informant interviews of staff and other agency partners. The evaluators have attempted to represent the information as it was provided by both GIC and DTC staff. This section focuses exclusively upon describing the GIC program provided to DTC clients. An analysis of the successes and challenges of the program as well as resulting suggestions are provided in the following section of this report (see page 13).

Implementation

GIC began enrolling BCDTC participants in the Supporting Ex-Offenders in Employment Training and Transitional Services (SEETTS) program in February 2006, with the goal of providing drug court participants with job readiness training; transitional, temporary and/or competitive employment; and individualized case management services focused upon reducing barriers to employment. This program is an important extension of a client's transition from the criminal justice system and substance abuse treatment back into the community.

Capacity and Enrollment

As of September 17, 2007, 157 BCDTC participants had been referred to Goodwill (five of whom had been referred twice), with 126 (80%) reporting to the program. Of those who reported to the program, 72 (57%) completed job readiness training, 8 (6%) were currently active in the program, and 48

(38%) did not complete the program. Of the 72 clients who completed the job readiness program, 69 (96%) unduplicated clients were placed in transitional, temporary or permanent positions.

Data collected from program inception through September 10, 2007, shows that 149 participants were referred to the BCDTC–GIC program.⁹ Two thirds of DTC clients referred to GIC were male, and the other third were female. Fifty-seven percent of clients were 40 years old or older, 28% were 30 to 39 years old, 13% were 22 to 29 years old, and 2% were 18 to 21 years of age.

DTC clients referred to the GIC program averaged just under an 11th grade education. About three-quarters of the clients reported being single and the same proportion reported having children. Ninety percent were African American and 9% were Caucasian. As reported in the U.S. Census Bureau's 2000 Census, the population of Baltimore City is 64% African American and 32% Caucasian.

According to the MOU between GIC and BCDTC, 200 participants per year were slated to be served in the GIC program. Many, if not all, of the respondents interviewed reported that DTC client referrals to and enrollments at GIC were much lower than expected and that this was an area of concern for all involved in the GIC-DTC collaboration. One key stakeholder felt that the original number of referrals was too high given the serious substance abuse issues, cycles of relapse, mental health issues and other barriers preventing DTC participants from participating meaningfully in the program. Others felt that Department of Parole

⁹ The demographic data was in a different database, obtained at a different time from the enrollment information, hence the two different dates.

and Probation (DPP) agents might not be referring all eligible clients. This issue will be further explored later in the report in the sections on eligibility and referrals.

The GIC Program

Goodwill Industries of the Chesapeake has been delivering services to area residents since 1919, and providing job training for almost 60 years (GIC Web site).¹⁰ In 2006 alone, GIC enrolled 5,111 people in job training and placed 2,016 people into permanent and temporary positions.

GIC is committed to helping those individuals with the most barriers to employment find jobs. To this end, GIC launched the Supporting Ex-Offenders in Employment Training and Transitional Services (SEETTS) program in 2001. As its name suggests, the primary goal is to help ex-offenders transition back into the community by assisting them with job readiness training, job placement, and case management services. For the purposes of this report, the SEETTS program is synonymous with the GIC program, for this is the program that DTC clients participate in when they are referred to GIC.

Although the ultimate goal of the GIC program is to place clients in employment so that they can become self-sufficient, there are many inter-related program components to actually help clients do so. Therefore the program provides job readiness training to facilitate clients finding work quickly, and combines this training with case management services to help eliminate barriers to employment, and help clients develop reachable career goals. GIC also provides further skills training and assistance with finding employment based on the skills clients develop at

GIC – or on skills newly identified through their participation in the GIC program.

GIC intake, job readiness, case management, and job placement staff work very closely to provide a web of support for each client.

MISSION AND VALUES

The mission of the Goodwill agency is to “foster individual economic self-sufficiency by providing personal and career development services and employment opportunities for persons with disabilities and other special needs” (GIC Client/Trainee Handbook). One of the areas of GIC expertise is providing these services to ex-offenders.

GIC’s corporate values inform the staff’s daily work. These include:

- Recognition of people as our most important asset
- Equal opportunity for all
- Respect for the individual
- Employment as an integral component of self-esteem
- Integrity, accountability, and good stewardship as a fundamental in all actions
- Continuous pursuit of improving customer satisfaction
- Using experience, knowledge, and expertise to continually improve our quality

Key stakeholders from BCDTC, although not specifically asked about these values, consistently commented on the “good work that Goodwill does,” and GIC staff professionalism, accountability, desire to strengthen collaboration and continuously work to improve services for DTC participants.

THE GOODWILL TEAM

GIC staff reported having a team-based approach to services. The staff members working with DTC clients meet as a group every 2 weeks. They conduct case staffing informally

¹⁰ Goodwill Industries of the Chesapeake, Inc.
<http://www.goodwillches.org/docs/Gic2006AnnualReport.pdf>

every day and in a more structured way once per week. The staff providing services to DTC clients sits in the same area at the office, and reportedly uses the proximity to share new ideas with each other.

The GIC team that works most intensively with DTC clients is primarily made up of a Job Readiness Counselor, the SEETTS Program Manager, Case Manager and the Job Placement Coordinator. There are also a host of other program and support staff, some in other departments and divisions at GIC, that DTC clients may come in contact with. However, GIC staff has consciously made an effort to limit initial client interactions with GIC staff to a few key people to foster a relationship of trust and to minimize any apprehensions that a client may have when he or she arrives at GIC.

The description of services in the next several sections is organized by how the client proceeds through the GIC program.

PROGRAM INTAKE

Once drug court participants have been referred to the GIC program, they report to the GIC facility for intake.

Goodwill staff have set aside Friday mornings from 8 a.m. to 11 a.m. for DTC participant intakes, although they may report at other times if the Friday intake time is not convenient. Intake appointments last about 20 minutes to an hour to complete, depending on the client.

There is one job readiness counselor at GIC dedicated to conducting intakes of DTC participants. This structure provides consistency of program and point of contact for DTC clients. Because the job readiness counselor also conducts the job readiness training for DTC clients—usually beginning the Monday following their intake appointment—clients can begin to build rapport with their instructor right away. This process helps clients to feel comfortable about being in a new place, with new faces, and of being in a classroom

setting: many of these clients have not been in class for years, if not decades.

In addition to the important task of beginning to establish a trusting relationship between the client and the GIC staff, the preliminary screening asks prospective clients why they have come to GIC, what their interests are, what types of services they looking for, what types of career they may be interested in, as well as any life goals.

Clients come into GIC with a wide variety of backgrounds, skills, education and experience. Participants range from having no work experience at all and a 9th grade education to college educated people who have been in management positions. The job readiness counselor conducts assessments to determine what the optimal services are for each client.

The client is registered into the GIC Employment to Opportunity (ETO) database and the DPP agent is informed that the client showed up, voluntarily enrolled in the GIC program, and plans to return the following Monday for job readiness class.

Even if a DTC participant comes to GIC without any valid identification except their court ID, GIC staff will work with them to get their Social Security card, birth certificate, and/or other identity cards they might need, both for employment and for life. Thus far in the program, no DTC client has been turned away from intake or from the GIC program for any reason.

JOB READINESS TRAINING

After intake, clients attend job readiness training, which may last up to 4 weeks—or beyond—depending on the participant's needs.

Job readiness training is much more than job training: it is a combination of job readiness and life skills training. This involves résumé writing, interviewing, mock interviews, appropriate dress, decision-making, problem solving on the job, communications, positive

attitudes and behaviors, attitude adjustment and anger management.

Two basic assessments are conducted early in the client's time at GIC. The Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE) is an educational test assessing reading and math proficiency for those clients who may want to go into skills training, higher education, or earn their GED. The Barriers to Employment Success Inventory (BESI) is the career inventory assessment used to help clients identify career interests and any barriers to reaching them.

The job readiness counselor assesses how clients are doing in job readiness class: if he suspects that they might be using substances again, the client may be referred back to the treatment provider. If the client needs to spend more time in treatment, he or she would be accepted back to GIC at any time after that intensive phase of treatment was complete. In other words, clients may come back to GIC when the treatment appointments are no longer an obstacle to attending class, going for job interviews, and/or obtaining and maintaining a job.

Respondents reported that one of the main obstacles to getting DTC clients to go to Goodwill was that clients were so eager to get a job that they did not want to sit in job readiness class for 4 weeks. Some clients might come to GIC with a resume in hand ready for an immediate employment placement. Others need some, but not all, components of the job readiness program. While GIC has generally tried to match up training components with an individual client's needs so that clients are not required to sit through training modules they do not need, the feedback from DTC staff and participants was strong enough that GIC made further program refinements.

GIC staff responded by shortening the job readiness training for clients with strong work histories or who are in other ways ready to go right to work by setting up a 4-

day brush-up course for those with strong work backgrounds. Having these few days allows GIC staff the time it needs to ensure that all client barriers to employment have been resolved in order to help the client find a suitable job placement.

One person interviewed suggested that GIC institute more vocational programs. Although many clients would not want to sit in job readiness class, this respondent believed clients would be willing to sit in a class for 3 to 4 months to learn a trade. This difference is because vocational training such as truck driving, plumbing, and heating would be something they are interested in and could do on their own in the hopes of eventually starting their own company.

GIC offers a pre-apprenticeship program for qualified participants who want to engage in entry level skills training in the construction field. These areas consist of carpentry, electrical and plumbing. Along with the pre-apprenticeship program, GIC offers training in clerical and computers, retail, GNA, custodial/floor tech and hospitality training. Pre-GED classes are also available at GIC for those clients interested in obtaining their GED certification. Staff may also provide referrals to partner programs with other vocational training and apprenticeship opportunities.

Most challenging for GIC (and sometimes their DPP agents) are the clients who would benefit from job readiness training, but decide not join the GIC program because they feel a great urgency to find work and/or simply do not want to sit through a 4-week class. This is despite the fact that the program may be very helpful to them in finding higher-paying or more satisfying work than they might find on their own or with the help of another program.

Reasons why DTC clients who showed up for the GIC program but did not finish is instructive: several had their cases closed or

were transferred by the Department of Parole and Probation, seven went back to treatment, six were re-incarcerated or were on warrant status, three had medical issues, one found work on his own, one was terminated for violent behavior, one was not interested in the GIC program, and one was deceased.

GIC CASE MANAGEMENT

Each DTC participant meets with a case manager as needed. One case manager is completely devoted to DTC clients, though he also works with non-DTC clients. This full case management component is what sets the GIC program apart from most other job training and employment programs and, at the same time, is an integral part of both the job readiness and job placement components of the GIC program.

The case manager goes into the job readiness classroom in about the second week of class to give students an overview of GIC case management services. At this time, he sets up one-on-one sessions with clients. This is one of the differences between services for DTC participants and other GIC clients: every DTC client receives some level of case management, while all the other GIC clients receive case management on a needs only basis.

The case manager works with the client to develop an individual service plan (ISP) focusing on any remaining barriers to employment, such as education, substance abuse, mental health issues, housing, child support, homelessness, dental care, and obtaining clothes for interviews and work. The ISP also lays out a workable strategy for the client to reach his or her career goals.

The job readiness counselor and case manager both make referrals to other services. The most common referrals are for clients to obtain valid identification (e.g., state identification cards, driver's licenses and Social Security cards); information about transitional housing, GED programs, apprenticeship pro-

grams, Baltimore City Community College, as well as mental and physical healthcare providers.

By contract, substance abuse treatment providers associated with drug court have to be able to handle at least some mental health issues so that clients needing mental health support usually receive it through the core DTC program. Most DTC providers also have ties with other resources in the community to assist with addressing mental health concerns. However, it is often the case that a DTC client is not identified as needing mental health services until he or she arrives at Goodwill and has spent time with GIC staff. If this is the case, the GIC team will work with the client to access appropriate services.

GIC staff noted that the barriers to employment facing male and female clients are a bit different. Most of the male clients who come to GIC have housing, while there are very few housing placements in the Baltimore area for female participants. This often makes finding supportive/transitional housing for female clients quite a challenge. To ensure that housing placements are safe and appropriate, GIC staff also visit the transitional housing as a precaution prior to making referrals to new locations.

There are other differences between the needs of male and female clients. Women are more likely to need affordable childcare than male clients if they are going to be able to enter the workforce. Additionally, female clients often require extensive dental work before employers will consider hiring them. GIC staff noted that many of the jobs that male clients obtain such as construction and janitorial jobs do not have high expectations for appearance, whereas personal appearance is important for many of the jobs for women (clerks, restaurant staff, etc.). This may also simply be a function of societal double standards: women are generally expected to have a pleasant appearance, while it is not considered as important for men. In any case, GIC

has reportedly been very successful in helping female clients obtain the dental care they need in a relatively short amount of time, thereby reducing a major barrier to employment.

GIC staff pointed out that many treatment providers also play a role in the case management process by doing much of the barrier removal, crisis intervention, and substance abuse treatment prior to, or simultaneously with, a client's GIC program involvement. This means that GIC case management for many clients primarily revolves around employment and self sufficiency.

Finally, the case manager is also the keeper of all the clients' files. These include GIC readiness certificates, GED certificates, high school diplomas, and any other educational certificates. The case plan is also kept there, as are case notes. All confidential data are kept in the ETO database, and only case managers have access to it.

GIC EMPLOYMENT PLACEMENT

There are three main types of job placement: transitional, temporary, and competitive. The teamwork among the GIC job readiness, case management, and job placement staff is particularly apparent in the job placement phase of the program.

When the job readiness counselor feels that a client is ready for job placement, the case manager is called in to decide which type of employment is most appropriate. Typically a job placement coordinator comes into the job readiness class to introduce the job placement component of the program. This usually takes place in the 4th week of the job readiness class.

While clients are still in job readiness training and sometimes when they are in a transitional work situation, the case manager continues to work with clients to tackle any other barriers to employment that might still exist. In fact, those barriers might be one reason a client goes into transitional work instead of

temporary or competitive work: they may still be in treatment, they may have never had a job before, or perhaps they are not yet as dependable as they need to be for a competitive work placement.

The case manager also works with employers. If clients are late to work, do not show up, or have any other issues that might affect job performance, employers will notify the case manager. The case manager will troubleshoot and mentor the client through any job-related issues that arise.

Typically, if a client goes to transitional work, it lasts 8 to 12 weeks. There are two main types of transitional work: custodial maintenance training at the state offices and retail experience at the Goodwill stores. The ability for GIC to employ its own clients, in transitional, temporary or competitive employment was often cited as being one of the unique aspects of the GIC program. Several of the DTC clients were able to engage in such transitional work. This is despite the fact that grant funding for the DTC-GIC collaboration does not currently include monies to pay clients for their transitional work experience.

Transitional work. GIC staff reported that several DTC clients are currently in transitional work placements at the GIC's state office. One DTC client was reportedly even offered a permanent position at the GIC state office. Another DTC client has been working in transitional work at the state office for several months rather than the usual several weeks because he has done such a great job. A GIC staff member related the story of a GIC senior vice president who oversees all the transitional work at the state office noticing this client's good work and asking the client to speak at the GIC Board of Director's meeting this year. Yet another DTC client who was virtually illiterate upon entry to the GIC program is reported to be doing very well in transitional work at the state office.

Temporary work. GIC operates a temporary work service named “Goodwill Staffing Services (GSS)” that offers the possibility of temporary work for clients who may not be able to gain permanent work right away. Potential employers contact GSS and GSS is the temporary service that finds the right person for the job. In addition to providing opportunities for clients to engage in paid work in clerical, custodial, manufacturing, food service work, etc., GSS provides perks to employers such as competitive rates, recruiting, on-the-job quality checks, and payroll and benefits management (GIC Web site).

Competitive work. GIC job placement staff is continually working with outside employers to find job placements for their ex-offender clientele. The 2006 GIC Annual Report stated that GIC was currently working with over 400 different employers in the Baltimore area to place GIC clients. Competitive job placement can be difficult to arrange given the stigma associated with people with a criminal justice background. Many of the leads on competitive jobs come from former clients who know of new job openings at their current place of employment and pass on the information to GIC staff.

In order to be sensitive to the wishes of employers not to be identified as employing DTC clients and other ex-offenders, their names are not listed here. Competitive job placements obtained by DTC clients include cashier, clerical assistant, door maker, fabric cutter, floor supervisor, prep cooks, production line worker, sales associates, and youth worker. The most common placements are custodial/maintenance jobs, which comprise about half of all DTC placements.

GIC PROGRAM COMPLETION AND AFTERCARE

The GIC program allows and encourages clients to come back if they have, for any reason, lost their job placement, or have any other issues that the GIC team might be able

to help with. At least one client has come back to GIC three times to find work.

As a testament to the program’s effectiveness, the help and support given by GIC staff is reportedly returned by former clients who come back to the job readiness class to share their stories about what worked for them and what did not—both in relation to finding employment and in their lives as a whole—as an inspiration to current GIC students.

Data Collected by GIC for Tracking and Evaluation Purposes

GIC collects an impressive amount of client and program data, both in their ETO data system and in client case notes. In addition to basic demographic information such as age, gender, race, marital status, number of children, and highest level of education achieved, there is a host of program information for each client. For example, the date of client intake to the GIC program, whether the client subsequently showed up for class, whether the client was placed and, if placed, the job title, employer, and starting and ending pay.

If fully utilized, these data provide fertile ground for further understanding how the program is working for different subsets of its client population, for example, single mothers, or older men without a high school diploma. Program staff or consultants could analyze the types of jobs, length of time between entry into the program and placement, and wages across the client demographic spectrum to further refine the programmatic needs of DTC clients.

One example how these data might inform practice is that when asked what proportion of DTC clients in the GIC program were male, respondents reported 90-95%. If one looks at actual referral and enrollment information, however, only two thirds of clients are male. If women were only 5-10% of the clientele, it might be easier to concentrate on, indeed specialize in, the needs of male clients. But since one third is female, this

proportion is substantial enough to consider further ways the GIC program could meet the needs of female clients.

Similarly, for the purposes of the DTC program collaboration, it might be useful to set up client satisfaction surveys or another regular mechanism for client feedback with current, former and non-GIC clients to get a better sense of what clients like about the program and areas they would like to see change.

GIC also has set up a collaboration with a researcher at the University of Baltimore to analyze Bureau of Labor statistics employment information for GIC clients, both one quarter previous to entering the GIC program

as well as one quarter post-entry into the program. Such data are valuable for understanding employment outcomes of DTC clients that have come through GIC, but who have not kept in touch after the program was over. Being able to look at longer term employment outcomes (e.g., 1-2 years post-GIC program completion) would be even more informative to measuring the long term effectiveness of the GIC program. Such an analysis would be even more powerful if a meaningful comparison group of DTC clients who did not participate in the GIC program were identified and outcomes for them could be contrasted to the GIC participants.

THE GOODWILL-DRUG TREATMENT COURT COLLABORATION PROCESS DESCRIPTION

Because this program is a collaboration between two complex organizations, it is important to understand who is involved in the collaboration, the various means of communication, and the main points of interaction that occur. That is the purpose of this section of the process evaluation report.

GIC-DTC Program Goals

According to the MOU that sets out the roles for both DTC and GIC, the basis of their collaboration is that “All parties recognize the importance of employment in the recovery process.”

One could add to this list the many ways that employment contributes to sobriety and decreased recidivism, the commitment staff has to working with each client on his or her individualized needs, etc. Brainstorming a shared mission for the GIC-DTC collaboration might be a useful team-building exercise.

GIC-DTC Team and Team Communications

There appears to be a tacit—though not explicit—understanding of who belongs to the GIC-DTC team: the DTC Coordinators from District and Circuit Courts, DPP agents and supervisors from both courts, and key staff from GIC. Other DTC team members such as the judges, Assistant Public Defender and Assistant State’s Attorney, and treatment providers may be at some meetings with GIC staff, but appear to play a more peripheral role. It might be useful to more fully identify who the team members are and what their roles should be, for clarity and to increase the sense of stakeholder buy-in to the GIC collaboration.

Several respondents reported that there had been regular monthly meetings of GIC, DPP agents and DTC coordinators, but that those had not been occurring regularly since March 2007. At about the same time, it was determined that DPP agents did not need to come to the team meetings. The rationale for this decision is unclear because the primary working relationships between GIC and DTC are with the agents who refer clients.

Most respondents felt that these meetings were helpful because they allowed staff to learn about each other, what happened over the past month and, for DTC staff, anything new that GIC was offering to the clients. Although staff at both DTC and GIC knew they could pick up the phone to ask questions anytime, several respondents felt it was good to have everyone around the table to hear all the questions and perspectives that others had.

Rather than disbanding the larger team meetings altogether, it might be more productive to ask staff what type of meeting would be more efficient and useful for members of the larger team. The larger team meetings were one of the main opportunities for team building and beginning to cultivate personal and professional relationships—in particular, among DPP agents and the GIC staff to whom agents are asked to refer their clients.

There are some challenges, both real and perceived, that need to be overcome with respect to DPP agents and the GIC staff serving DTC clients, not the least of which is the underlying philosophy guiding the work in each agency. Both DPP staff and GIC staff spoke about the “law enforcement perspective versus the social services/treatment perspective.” But when pursued further, both staffs share the same ultimate goal of providing each DTC client with the specific tools he or she needs to become stable, sober, and

self-sufficient. It might be useful to think of the transition from the criminal justice system back into society as a continuum upon which the law enforcement perspective is at one end while strengths-based services and personal choice are at the other end. This might be one way to meaningfully and practically unite the two perspectives.

The relationship between DPP agents who refer to the GIC program and GIC staff is solid and collaborative. More than one respondent noted that the client is well aware when the DPP agent and GIC staff are in close collaboration and that the two sides cannot be “played” off each other. At its best, the collaboration may provide the client with the feeling that he/she is truly in a supportive web leading from one agency to the other.

Administrative oversight of the DTC-GIC collaboration falls to both DTC Coordinators and the Vice President of Workforce Development at GIC. All three serve as grant administrators by their respective organizations by overseeing the functioning of the MOU and making sure that implementation is operating smoothly. This role includes monitoring how clients are referred to GIC, the number of clients to be referred to GIC, and ensuring the services provided to the clients fall within the guidelines of what the grant pays for and budget tracking. When adjustments are needed, both coordinators and the Vice President of Workforce Development from GIC work together to make any necessary addenda to MOU.

It may help staff become more invested in the collaboration to have a more inclusive group of people present for larger programmatic decisions; it is the line staff at both DTC and GIC who is ultimately implementing the program. They may have important input that would better inform some policy decisions.

Other than the team meetings, the main points of contact between GIC and DTC staff

are found in individual interactions, particularly the referral process and when GIC staff and agents are in touch about their clients in current attendance at GIC.

Participant Eligibility for, and Referral to, GIC

While all BCDTC participants are theoretically eligible for the GIC program, there are some differences of opinion about exact eligibility requirements, the proper timing of a referral, and most effective referral source for DTC participants going into the GIC program.

ELIGIBILITY

Parole and probation agents reported that determining if a supervisee is eligible for the GIC program first relies upon a participant’s progress in supervision: if the supervisee has successfully finished the most intensive phase of treatment, if they have met the requirements of DTC, and are close to graduation from DTC, then an agent may refer them to GIC. Other agents might only consider a participant eligible when he or she is doing well in supervision *and* treatment *and* is vocal about wanting to find employment.

Therefore, decisions about participant eligibility for the GIC program currently occur on a case-by-case basis by DPP agents, rather than by standardized program practice. DTC staff is fairly unified in their belief that each participant is unique, and that a “cookie cutter” approach to client eligibility is not in the best interest of the client. However, it is possible that by providing DPP staff with further information about the practices and philosophy of workforce development, agents could better identify appropriate clients for GIC. This would be an important topic to discuss in team meetings.

Challenges in Eligibility Determination

One of the biggest challenges for GIC staff was that many DTC clients referred to GIC were not ready for employment or even job training. The most common reason was that they were in the early stages of treatment and could not commit to full attendance in the job readiness program due to treatment sessions and urinalysis (UA) scheduling which interfered with clients' employment possibilities.

In fact, the document "Recruitment and Selection Procedure for Drug Court Participants Referred to Goodwill Industries of the Chesapeake, Inc. for Employment Services" contains some basic guidelines for eligibility that address the treatment issue. The document reads, "The participant will have received seven weeks of intensive treatment prior to being referred to Goodwill. Participant may also attend a one-day per week outpatient program for a 20-week period following the intensive treatment." It may be that this basic treatment period is met prior to referral to GIC, but that the client has not stabilized in his or her recovery yet or that the weekly sessions still interfere with the GIC program.

Therefore, some staff interviewed believe that the BCDTC-GIC program would be better served by having a clear written policy about eligibility which takes into account the more qualitative and cognitive aspects of a participant's readiness for the GIC program. For example, has the participant achieved some stability in his/her substance abuse recovery? Are treatment sessions completed or minimal enough so as not to interfere with the GIC program? Does the participant seem genuinely willing to make the kind of cognitive and practical changes in his or her life that will be needed to move beyond old self-destructive habits? If answers to all three questions are "yes!" then the participant would be referred to the GIC program.

One possible solution to the issue of ensuring a certain amount of stability in treatment recovery (and that of treatment interfering with

the GIC program) has been discussed and piloted. This involves asking the treatment providers—rather than the DPP agents—to gauge eligibility and refer participants directly to the GIC program.

This way, treatment professionals who are trained to recognize the signs of readiness can determine client eligibility for GIC at the appropriate time in the client's recovery. There are some communication issues that still need to be worked out if this change is going to be institutionalized. DPP agents request that treatment providers check with agents first to make sure the client is in compliance with the requirements of supervision first. GIC staff request that anyone referring a DTC client clearly identify the referral as associated with DTC.

REFERRAL TO THE GIC PROGRAM

The referral process is fairly straightforward. Once an agent decides that a particular DTC participant is eligible for the program, the agent will share information about the GIC program with the client. If the client agrees that this program would be a good fit, then the agent fills out the referral form and faxes it to GIC and/or gives a copy of the form to the client to bring with him or her to GIC for the intake process. A copy of the referral is also given to the agent's supervisor.

The agents enter referrals to GIC into the case notes of each client referred.

Challenges with Referrals

As mentioned earlier, several respondents expressed concern about the slow rate of referrals to the GIC program during 2007. Referral data provided by GIC staff confirms the low and decreasing rate. The referral rate for 2006 was about 120 DTC clients referred to GIC, but referrals do appear to have been decreasing from a high of about 10 clients per month referred in 2006 to about 6 clients per month referred in the first half of 2007.

By the third quarter of 2007, only about 3 clients per month were being referred to GIC.

Some respondents were concerned that the 200 number was high or, at the very least, not based upon analysis of client progress from DTC entry to DTC exit. Given the falling number of referrals, it would be important to conduct such an analysis, including data for the number that relapsed, were reincarcerated, were in treatment longer than expected, returned to a former job, found a job on their own, or were referred to an employment program other than GIC, etc., to determine the appropriate number of referrals.

Perhaps coincidentally, the reported slow down in referrals occurred at about the same time as the larger team meetings were disbanded. It was undetermined if the slowdown might have contributed to the disbanding or if the disbanding contributed to the slowdown, or whether there was a different cause altogether.

Several respondents expressed the belief that District Court DPP agents were not referring clients to the GIC program as often as Circuit Court agents and that this might be one reason for the shortage of referrals. This was not upheld by the data.

Respondents gave two reasons why District Court might have a lower referral rate that are structural in nature. One is that District DTC is only 9 months in duration, so that once clients have made it through treatment, it is close to graduation. Circuit DTC, on the other hand, is 18 months in duration, which means that there is more time for Circuit DTC participants to spend in a 4-week job readiness training course before they graduate.

The second structural explanation was that District DTC participants are required to have a job as a condition of their graduation. Given the shorter duration in DTC, District participants must start looking for work as soon as their treatment sessions are down to a

level that would accommodate work. Therefore, although it is somewhat counterintuitive, requiring District DTC supervisees to obtain work—combined with the short duration of District DTC—may work to prohibit participation in the GIC program.

An analysis of GIC program data that lists each client's referring agent found that District Court agents referred at a slightly lower rate, but by no means can account for the overall shortage of referrals. Since program inception in February 2006, through September 17, 2007, 37 out of 152 clients were referred from District DTC, while 116 clients were referred from Circuit DTC.¹¹ It appears at first glance that twice as many clients were referred from Circuit Court. However, when the capacity of each drug treatment court is taken into account—600 per year at Circuit Court and 300 per year at District Court—the rate of referrals from both courts differed only by 6 percentage points per annual DTC capacity.¹² In other words, proportionally speaking, District Court referred about 20 fewer people over the life of the program than Circuit Court. Therefore, despite the logical reasons behind why District DTC agents might be referring to GIC at a lower rate, the rate was actually not significantly different.

In fact, the most interesting and notable finding from an analysis of DPP agent referrals was that one agent at Circuit Court was singlehandedly responsible for 39% of all referrals to GIC! This agent referred 61 out of 157 referrals to GIC since program inception, while the next largest number of referrals by a single agent was 17. The number of referrals per agent ranged from 0 to 61, while most agents referred between 5 and 13 DTC

¹¹ There were five clients for whom this information was unavailable; therefore they are not included in the analysis.

¹² Capacity was used as the denominator because the actual number of active participants in both drug courts was not available for the same period.

clients.¹³ There were 5 clients for whom referral sources were not available; some of these clients may have been referred by their treatment provider.

Unless there is reason to believe that the DTC clients assigned to this one high-referring DPP agent are in some way extremely different from those assigned to other agents, which seems unlikely, the obvious question arises: why were such a high proportion of this agent's clients determined to be eligible for the GIC program, while such a low proportion of the other agents' clients were not? It is also interesting to note that if this one agent referred only the next highest number of clients (17) instead of 61, then the rate for Circuit Court referrals would drop to below the referral rate for District Court.

An analysis of those 61 clients also demonstrated no notable differences in rates of appearing at GIC or employment placements than with clients referred by other agents. No-show rates per referring agent ranged from 0 (all the clients the agent referred showed up at GIC) to 60% of an agent's clients were no-shows. Placement rates ranged from 0 to 100% of an agent's clients being placed in transitional, temporary or competitive work positions. The agent with 61 clients falls in the middle of both ranges with a 15% no-show rate and a 48% placement rate.

The logical conclusion is that DPP agents are either not referring DTC clients to job training and job placement programs at all, are referring to other programs seen as similar to (or better than) GIC, or both. Without access to agent referrals to other programs, it is not possible to say which is true. If agent supervisors have access to these referrals, it would be useful for them to be analyzed to help answer this important question.

Those staff interviewed for this report had a wide variety of suggestions about what to do about low referral rates, though they did not have access to the data presented above. It would be very useful for the DTC team to review these data and discuss it how it might inform future referral practice.

There was some interest expressed in making employment part of graduation requirements for the Circuit Court program, in which case the longer period until graduation would make the Goodwill program an ideal referral choice for both agents and participants.

Some of those individuals interviewed for this report believed that referrals to the Goodwill program should be a mandatory part of the BCDTC program for anyone looking for work, while others felt that this standardized approach would not serve clients with differing circumstances well. For example, many DTC clients have ample skills and job experience, so to require them to sit through a job readiness program would be counterproductive.

A further suggestion by some respondents was that if the Goodwill program were to become a mandatory part of the BCDTC program, sanctions for poor performance at GIC should be imposed by the DTC judge. The reasoning is that structure is sometimes needed to prompt people to actually get job training and find a job. Others felt that this standardized approach and/or the sanctioning that might result from poor attendance or not meeting GIC requirements would not serve clients with differing circumstances well.

Some respondents felt that if a client was doing well in treatment and meeting DTC supervision requirements, requiring them to go to GIC might be a good idea, but only if the final decision to refer and require a particular client rested with DPP agents. Because some of the clients are fearful about trying something new and some clients simply might not have the motivation to do it voluntarily, *requiring* GIC participation could

¹³ This was from program inception until mid-September, 2007.

be in the long-term best interest of the client. By making the GIC program mandatory, clients who otherwise might not have the foresight or will to participate in GIC would have a strong incentive to do so. Thus, the GIC program would be parallel to the treatment requirement in DTC.

There was one respondent who was concerned about making the GIC program mandatory, for two main reasons. First, requiring people to go to what has been a voluntary program contradicts the GIC mission of providing services in a dignified, respectful manner. This assumes that most, if not all, clients who are required to participate would not be voluntarily participating in the program, thus violating the GIC core value of respect for the individual. The second issue is more practical: having clients join the program against their will might prove to be disruptive in job readiness classes or other GIC program activities. Related to both of these concerns is a third possible result: that the very mandatory nature of participations, and any sanctions for poor client attendance or behavior that might result from it, might turn the supportive role of the GIC staff into an adversarial role with clients. Again, that would be inconsistent with the spirit and goals of the GIC program.

However, when seen in tandem with treatment—which is not always completely voluntary and for which poor performance results in sanctions—it may be that such concerns may not play out in practice as often as some might fear. If referral to GIC was seen as a way to help clients meet their supervision requirements, they may be less apt to blame GIC staff. Furthermore, given the GIC mission to treat each person with respect, the GIC program should theoretically speak for itself and win clients over precisely because of how they are treated.

These are complicated issues and should be seriously considered by everyone who might be impacted by implementing some or all of

the possible changes laid out above in a full and frank discussion.

Another option raised was that if GIC was being funded for services and not enough clients were being referred of their own volition, then perhaps it would make sense to have all clients with job training and placement needs sent exclusively to GIC, rather than any other programs that might provide similar services.

This suggestion leads to the core set of issues facing the DTC team: how well do the other job readiness and employment placement programs serve clients over both the short and long term? Under what circumstances are short-term positions such as day labor positions the best option for a client? Does it make sense to cultivate strong relationships with one or more employment enhancement programs or keep all options open without a clear sense of the efficacy or accountability to DTC? Without a clear consensus on these types of questions, it will be difficult for DTC to move forward with recommendations or policy for agent referrals and for GIC to know how much it needs to revise its program to accommodate DTC.

There were two second-hand—and as yet unconfirmed—reports that an unspecified number of clients were going through the GIC program, being placed in jobs and then after 3 months being fired by the employer. One of the respondents said that it was possible that GIC did not even know about this, that the employer was essentially fulfilling its obligation to GIC and then moving on. This respondent also said that although this allegation may not be true, clients reportedly have been spreading this story among themselves. It was posed that some clients may have chosen not to participate in GIC due to this story.

There may be another explanation for the possible firings after 3 months described above. Reviewing the MOU between DTC and GIC (see Appendix D), it is very clear

that there are some clients for whom permanent employment may not be realistic and that short term temporary employment may be the only real option until barriers to permanent employment are addressed. Perhaps the reality of the potential employment placements has not been adequately communicated to supervisees or their agents.

In sum, four main conclusions can be made about the perceived referral gap: 1) there is reason to believe that an as yet undetermined subset of the DTC participant population will either not be eligible for the GIC program, or will not be interested in volunteering for it, 2) real or perceived failures of the GIC program to result in employment may be interfering with referral rates, 3) the rates for both Circuit and District Court referrals are about the same, especially when the one agent with a high referral rate is factored into the equation, and 4) given the high number of referrals by that one agent, it can only be assumed that more DTC clients are eligible, but are not being referred to the GIC program.

Incentives for DTC Participants to Enter (and Complete) the Goodwill Program

In addition to the obvious need that participants have to support themselves, there are many practical incentives to join the GIC program, including skill-building, resume crafting and typing, breaking down barriers to obtaining or retaining employment, opportunities for transitional work at one of GICs many sites, and bus passes. Less tangible, but just as important, is the social support network provided by the GIC staff, especially the case managers, who are there with participants during both the good times such as a successful job placement, as well as the more difficult times, such as a relapse, or family or health crises.

One question that could not be answered adequately in this evaluation is whether DPP agents and drug court participants are actual-

ly given a full description of the types of services and supports that GIC offers. As of the writing of this report, no brochures or descriptions of the services the GIC program provides were being given to either the agents or the DTC participants, although there was reportedly a flier provided by GIC early on in the collaboration. Without that type of information, it would be difficult for participants to make an informed decision about whether to join the GIC program. Anecdotally, a DTC client reportedly told one of the respondents recently, "if I'd known what this program [GIC] was about, I'd have come a long time ago."

One issue common to re-entry programs for ex-offenders is that employers are hesitant to hire individuals with criminal backgrounds. One respondent noted that GIC is unique in that it has not only developed relationships with employers who understand at the outset that the clients may have criminal charges, but that GIC has the capacity to hire DTC clients as well, thus creating more opportunities for clients.

The case management staff at GIC can provide referrals for services that the case management through the DPP does not have the capacity to offer. An example provided by a DTC respondent is this: if a client comes to GIC and presents for training and is ready to go for an interview, but they have never written a resume nor do they have the right clothes, then GIC will take them to get the appropriate clothing and help them build and type a resume. In this way, the respondent concluded, GIC can take clients a step further than any other resource at DTC.

In addition to incentives for DTC clients, a few DTC staff reported there being an incentive for agents if their supervisees were at GIC. Primarily, GIC is much more communicative with agents about clients than other programs. One respondent reported being in daily contact with GIC staff about a few particularly needy clients while those clients

were at GIC daily for job readiness training. Also, prior to disbanding larger team meetings, GIC staff came to see agents monthly, something that none of the other programs do.

In sum, the level of individual attention given to DTC clients in the GIC program, GIC's unique relationships with employers who are supportive of employing ex-offenders and GIC's own institutional capacity to employ clients in transitional, temporary and competitive work at GIC sets this program apart from other, similar programs that DTC works with.

Alternatives to the GIC Program

There are many programs providing both job readiness training and placement assistance in the Baltimore City area. Some respondents noted that some DPP agents have strong positive relationships with other job readiness and employment placement programs in the Baltimore area and, therefore, rarely refer eligible DTC participants to the GIC program.

GIC staff is not aware of other programs offering clients the following continuum of services within the context of a single program: cognitive restructuring (Thinking for a Change Curriculum), customized case management, and “learn how to work” opportunities in a transitional/temporary work assignment.

A few BCDTC participants have been referred to the Jericho Project, a job training and placement program serving offenders released from jail in the past 12 weeks. The program also requires that participants not have a violent felony conviction on their records, are male, and are over 18. Staff from the Jericho Project attend court every week and set up an informational table in the lobby to catch people who are just coming out of prison. One agent reported that this program provides “basically the same thing that GIC

does: job training, job placement, and GED classes.”

Other employment training and/or placement providers mentioned by DPP agents as common referrals for DTC participants are The Re-Entry Center, Our Daily Bread, The Caroline Center (which is for women and trains them to be nurses aids or teaches them reupholstery and culinary skills); and Christopher's Place.

One of the advantages of the Re-Entry Center is that they reportedly send clients right out to jobs, unlike the GIC program that has a fairly intensive process of getting to know the client before sending them out. The Re-Entry Center also helps clients get birth certificates and Social Security cards, works with clients on child support, and helps with housing. Another much-needed service they provide is offering free voicemail services for their clients without their own phones (Ex-Offender Initiative Web site).¹⁴

Because there are many choices available to both agents and supervisees, and the advantages of one program over the other are not always clear, it may be beneficial to compile a list of the services available. Furthermore, the presence of and continued referral to these various programs raises the question about the DTC MOU with GIC. What should the relationship look like? Should all agents refer exclusively to GIC? These are questions that must be addressed—and some consensus arrived at—prior to trying to address the question of low referral rates to GIC.

During one of the special DTC-GIC meetings called in August 2007, GIC staff (and some agents, too) were surprised to find out that some treatment providers offer job readiness programs similar to those at GIC. Sometimes providers were holding their clients to finish

¹⁴ Baltimore City Mayor's Office of Employment Development, Ex-Offender Initiative
<http://www.oedworks.com/exoffender.htm>

the job readiness programs provided by the treatment provider and not working with agents to send referrals to Goodwill until clients were really in need of a job.

The GIC program is not a job placement-only program. Instead, it is a comprehensive program of assessment, training, case management and, ultimately, job placement that is designed to meet the needs of the entire person by building a trusting, supportive relationship with caring and experienced staff. If a client desperately wants work, but they have unmet housing or mental health issues, the client will most likely be unsuccessful in a job placement.

GIC staff were quick to point out that GIC protocols for serving clients can be adapted to better meet the needs of clients, but not to the point of only offering employment placement.

In sum, there appears to be a lack of understanding on the part of some treatment providers—and perhaps some agents and clients—

about exactly what the GIC program involves. This misunderstanding may result in referrals of people who do not really belong in the GIC program or the lack of referral of appropriate clients.

Funding and Future of the GIC-DTC Program

The Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) made grant monies available for the GIC employment enhancement services to BTDC clients for a two year period that was completed on June 30, 2007, with a 3-month extension until the end of September 2007.

GIC has been working to secure continued funding to provide GIC services to clients at BCDTC as well as other similar programs at other locations in the state.

It is likely that there will be some program changes in conjunction with this new opportunity and it is hoped that this report will be a constructive contribution to these new efforts.



SUGGESTIONS FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

Step One. Primary

Recommendation for the DTC

Before thinking about how the DTC-GIC collaboration could be improved, there is a larger set of issues facing the DTC team, such as:

- How well do the other job readiness and employment placement programs that DPP agents currently refer clients to work over both the short and long term?
- Are there advantages to the other programs for some groups of clients? If so, what are they?
- Under what circumstances are short-term positions such as day labor positions the best option for a client? When should more long-term options be considered?
- Does it make sense to cultivate strong relationships with one or more employment enhancement programs (such as GIC) or keep all options open?
- Should DTC establish communication/accountability expectations with each program it refers to? If so, how would that look?

Without a clear consensus on the part of DTC staff at all levels on these types of questions, it will be difficult for DTC to move forward with recommendations or policy decisions guiding DPP agent referrals, not to mention how GIC should revise its program to accommodate DTC's needs or interests. Once information about these questions has been gathered and discussed, the DTC team should plan next steps in enhancing its use of GIC services.

Step Two. Recommendations for Improving the DTC-GIC Collaboration

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE DTC-GIC TEAM:

- Reinstate the monthly DTC-GIC meetings for GIC staff, treatment providers and agents who have referred clients in the previous month with a focus upon strengthening the collaboration, sharing concrete information about challenges and successes, questions and answers and strategic problem-solving around both client monitoring issues and program-based issues.
- Fully identify who the DTC-GIC team members are and what their roles should be, both for clarity and to increase the sense of stakeholder buy-in to the GIC collaboration. Having a more inclusive group of people present for the programmatic decisions specific to the Goodwill program will increase awareness and understanding that all parties share a common mission: to facilitate the recovery, stability and independence of each client. .
- Discuss what type of meeting would be more efficient and useful for members of the DTC-GIC larger team. These meetings had been the one regular opportunity for team building - in particular, among DPP agents and the GIC staff who serve their clients.
- Use the monthly and/or quarterly meetings to educate each collaborating partner about the roles, purposes and outcomes each collaborating partner plays. Discuss how the work of each partner supports the overall mission: enhancing the clients' ability to meet all of their

goals, with respect to compliance with DPP/DTC requirements, treatment stability, and employment.

- Consider hiring a facilitator to ensure that all staff and stakeholders understand the compatibility of accountability and service provision models in transitioning offenders from the criminal justice system into the community.
- Brainstorm a shared mission statement for the GIC-DTC collaboration. This useful team-building exercise will further clarify the goals of the collaboration for DTC-GIC team members.
- Explore the issue of what an appropriate number of referrals is by analyzing program data about the progress of clients from DTC entry to exit, including the number that relapsed, were reincarcerated, were in treatment longer than expected, returned to a former job, found a job on their own, or were referred to an employment program other than GIC, etc.
- Set guidelines in writing to guide practice around treatment providers making referrals of DTC clients to GIC and other employment programs. At least, treatment providers need to be in communication with agents prior to making the referral. This will ensure that a supervisee is doing well, both in treatment and in other areas of supervision prior to entering the Goodwill program.
- Discuss what types of information would be useful to share among DTC-GIC staff. For example, reports that detail the numbers of DTC participant referrals to GIC from each agent on a quarterly basis. Field supervisors and GIC both have access to this information. It might be an impetus for some agents to try referring (or referring more) to GIC. The same information could also be compiled by DPP supervisors who are given a copy

of each referral an agent makes. Another example of a useful report might be one that provides each agent with a monthly summary of their respective supervisees' progress, including participation rates, program completion, job interviews arranged, etc. This would potentially be beneficial to agents who may not have daily contact with their supervisees. It would also help agents determine why a particular client did not obtain a job placement: was it due to GIC not being able to find a placement or did the client not show up to the interview?

- Conduct an outcome study of the various job training and employment programs to see whether client outcomes are different in each program.
- Review the results of the GIC-DTC cost and outcome study to be completed in June 2008. This will help address staff concerns about making sure that the funds targeted for DTC clients are used wisely.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GIC:

- Attend drug court sessions for exposure to both DTC staff and clients as well as to help GIC staff further understand DTC processes, and to share information about GIC services with interested clients and families.
- Discuss the utility of GIC staff attending graduations (if the other recommendations to require GIC/employment support involvement are not implemented).
- Arrange a GIC open house for DTC staff and treatment providers that provides a hands-on look at services for DTC clients and introduces the philosophy of workforce development. Include some former DTC clients who have found and maintained a job through GIC.

- Make occasional trips to District Court to meet with prospective clients and inform them about the GIC program. Because District Court is in a different area of town than both GIC and Circuit Court, it might be more convenient for GIC staff to do this than to have agents and clients meet at GIC.
- Develop informational fliers or brochures detailing the range and depth of GIC services. These should be made available to all DPP agents, supervisees and treatment providers to ensure proper understanding of the GIC program. A similar idea might be for GIC to publish an informative monthly newsletter about GIC program successes and new features of the GIC program.
- Collect client satisfaction information that is specific to DTC clients to better identify program strengths and possible program improvements.
- Encourage DTC agents to meet their supervisees periodically at GIC. This strategy has apparently been tried successfully once or twice and has helped prospective clients become familiar with the GIC location, staff and programming which might take away some of the apprehension that supervisees report about going to GIC.
- Analyze DPP agent referrals of DTC clients to other employment programs (if this information is available) to help answer the important questions of whether clients are being referred to other employment enhancement programs. If clients are being referred to other employment programs, then the questions that need to be answered are: What type of programs are they? What types of clients are best served by them? Answers to these questions will further inform the discussion about what to do about the low rate of referrals to GIC.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DTC:

- Discuss the possible referral to GIC as part of the supervisee's plan for employment during District Court DTC staffing prior to drug court sessions.
- Routinely consider GIC in relationship to all clients once treatment stability has been attained at Circuit Court DTC.
- Develop more specific guidelines to help agents identify appropriate clients for GIC.
- Decide whether to implement a graduation requirement that participants at Circuit DTC need to be employed and have completed 20 hours of community service. (This is already a requirement of the District Court program.) If this does become a Circuit Court requirement, the Goodwill program is very well placed to provide services to participants with several areas of need: job readiness, wrap-around case management services, transitional work and, ultimately, competitive employment placement.



SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The GIC program is not simply a job placement program. It is a comprehensive program of assessment, training, case management and, ultimately, job placement that is designed to meet the needs of the entire person by building a trusting, supportive relationship with caring and experienced staff. The philosophy behind this “whole person” approach is that if a client desperately wants work, but he or she has unmet housing or mental health issues, the client will most likely be unsuccessful in a job placement.

The DTC-GIC collaboration has successfully served many DTC clients who have determined that the extra time it might take to go through this program is worthwhile in the long run. Clients with a need to find work immediately may not have the patience for the GIC program—at least at first—unless the longer term benefits are fully communicated and understood.

An analysis of the DTC referral rates to GIC clearly show that DPP agents refer clients at widely varying rates. Reasons for this may be as simple as agents not being fully informed about what the GIC program actually offers or that a few clients and/or agents are dissatisfied with the program because it was not what they were expecting—and this affected subsequent program participation. Such issues are fairly easy to resolve with

improved communications strategies and activities.

The more complicated issues of agents having prior relationships with other employment enhancement programs and/or not having full buy-in to the GIC program are less easy to resolve. It would be beneficial for BCDTC to begin broad internal discussions about its expectations of service, accountability, and communications for all employment services. Once that has been done, it will be much clearer how to move forward with improvements to the GIC-DTC collaboration.

The primary recommendations of this report for the collaboration revolve around enhancing and diversifying DTC-GIC communications.

Future outcome and cost studies of the GIC program have already begun and will be beneficial in determining the long term impact of the GIC program, assessing which components of the program are most effective, and identifying the characteristics of participants who are most likely to benefit from this program.

Adding employment enhancements to the BCDTC program is in the best interests of clients, their families and the city. We hope that this report will be a constructive contribution to the efforts to improve and expand such services.

**APPENDIX A: DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE BALTIMORE CITY
DISTRICT AND CIRCUIT DRUG TREATMENT COURTS**

Differences between Baltimore City Circuit and District Court Drug Court Programs

Major differences between the Circuit and District Court drug court programs are:

1. Following arrest, individuals enter the BCDTC-District program more quickly (approximately 6 to 8 weeks) than individuals entering the BCDTC-Circuit program, many of whom have to wait in jail for 3 to 5 months prior to entering the program.
2. Individuals on probation with the BCDTC-Circuit are there on felony charges; as such, they expect more severe sentences than those in District Court, who are there on misdemeanor charges. Many of those individuals interviewed felt that the severity of the sentence is a greater motivator for individuals in Circuit Court to enter the drug treatment court program (and to ultimately graduate) than it is for offenders in District Court, who would receive lesser sentences.
3. The BCDTC-District program has pre-court team meetings, while the Circuit Court's program does not (preferring, instead, to address participant issues/concerns from the bench).
4. Unlike District Court, drug court staff reported that there is no applause during the Circuit Court session for those participants who are doing well.
5. Participants who are not doing well in the BCDTC-Circuit program are more apt to "disappear" (abscond) than participants in the District Court program. It was reported that this was because Circuit Court participants know they will be given considerable jail time if they are removed from the drug court program.
6. BCDTC-District requires participants to be employed and to perform 20 hours of community service before graduation, while Circuit Court does not have these requirements. However, the Circuit Court does support its participants by providing referrals to job training/placement programs after individuals are stabilized, including the Goodwill Jobs Program (funded through a BJA Grant). When appropriate, they will also encourage volunteering for community service.

APPENDIX B: PARTICIPANT FEEDBACK

Goodwill Employment Enhancement to the Baltimore City Adult Drug Treatment Court Client Interview Summary

What did you like most about the Goodwill program/What worked?

- It helped me with learning how to structure my time. I really needed to get some structure in my life.
- It has been teaching me how to find a job. I always knew to just go and put an application here and there, but this program helps you learn how to do it right.
- This program has taught me how to present myself when I go to look for a job.
- The program has taught me how to write a resume. I never really knew what a resume was before now. It helps to open more doors up for me.
- I am about to be placed in a job setting. Everything that I have learned here will help me be a better employee than in my past.
- I have been in and out of jail most of my life and this is the longest period that I have been clean. I think this program helps to give us hope.

What do you dislike about the Goodwill Program?

- There has not been anything that I do not like about this program. It only helps me. It has only been positive and forced me to stay focused.
- Everything has worked so I can't say that anything has not worked well for me.

How were you treated by the Goodwill (GIC) staff to include Counselors, Case Managers, Trainers, Receptionist?

- The staff has treated me very good. Everyone has been really nice.
- Everyone has been very helpful.
- Ms. Gwen Nelson has been most helpful. She keeps us pointed in a positive direction. She also keeps me focused on recovery.

Why did you decide to participate in the Goodwill (GIC) program?

- The case manager from my treatment program referred me.
- I did hear about the program from a friend of mine. He had a past like mine and he told me that the program really helped him. They helped him get a job and everything. There has been no turning back for him. He said that they could do the same for me. Then my case manager from treatment referred me. He has been out of the program and working for a while now. He told me how the program really helped him. He keeps encouraging me. Now, he and I go to NA meetings together. He is doing really well and helps me stay on the right track.

- Getting into the Goodwill program was totally voluntary for me.
- Yes, I do feel that I made a good decision to participate in the program. It can only help me.
- I have been in Drug Court since May 2007. Once this program was offered to me, it seemed to bring everything together.
- Yes, there were a few other employment training program choices. I don't really remember the names of them. But I was told that the Goodwill program would be the best fit based on my individual needs.
- I am not really sure why some other clients do not take advantage of this program. Maybe they don't feel that they need it.

Were there any things about the program (or your own situation) that made your progress in the Goodwill (GIC) program more difficult?

- Not really. The staff gives you everything you need to make you successful.
- They give me a bus pass so that I can get to and from all of my meetings and things. You can't ask for more than that.
- The only thing that I can think of that was a little bit tough was that sometimes the time in between classes is really short. I am rushed getting from one class to the other on time.

Do you have any suggestions to improve the Goodwill (GIC) Employment Enhancement Program?

- I can't really think of anything to improve the program. It has been better than I thought and I have learned more than I expected to learn. I can't think of anything the program has not offered or given me thus far.
- I think I was prepared okay to start the Goodwill program. My Counselor had told me all about it and how it could help me if I made the effort.
- I would not change anything about the program.
- I would tell a friend to definitely come to the Goodwill program. Especially if they need job training and need to know how to get better prepared.

APPENDIX C: KEY STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEW GUIDE

Key Stakeholder Interview Questions

The interview questions are modified slightly to fit the role of each key stakeholder interviewed.

1. What is your role in relation to the GIC-DTC collaboration?
2. Is your role in the GIC-DTC employment enhancement different from your role in drug court only (or for non-drug court GIC programs)? If so, how?
3. How much time do you spend on GIC enhancement activities?
4. Who else is involved in GIC program activities at your organization? What do they do?
5. What would you say are the main goals of the GIC program at drug court?
6. How does what you daily do relate to these goals?
7. What do you think would be good measures for whether the program has reached the goals?
8. Describe the case referral process. How are eligible participants identified?
9. Can you describe the eligibility criteria for the GIC program?
10. What are the criteria that would exclude someone from the GIC program?
11. Are any assessments are performed in determining eligibility for the GW program?
12. Do you think that everyone who is eligible is always referred to the GIC program?
13. Are there ever exceptions to the eligibility restrictions?
14. Who is responsible for final determination about GIC program entry?
15. How is the GIC program offered to each potential participant?
16. What is the alternative to the GIC program? What are the incentives to decide in favor of the GIC program?
17. Do some people refer to the GIC program more than others? If so, why might this be the case?
18. Can you describe GIC participants? How, if at all, do they differ from DTC clients not in the GIC program?
19. How much do you interact with GIC staff?
20. Does GIC staff attend drug court sessions? Graduations?
21. How are GIC employment enhancement program policy decisions generally made?
22. What is the role of the Probation Department in general in the GIC program? What do they do differently with GIC participants vs. drug court-only cases?
23. Does the drug court team receive any training or continuing education regarding employment and/or job training for participants?
24. How well do you feel that Drug Court, Probation and GIC work together in this program?
25. What specific services does GIC offer?
26. Does DTC staff refer DTC participants to other job training or employment enhancement programs? If so, which? What are the benefits of those programs over the GIC program?
27. Is GIC staff required to report to DTC staff on progress/compliance? If so, how often?
28. Have the services GIC provides changed since the program was implemented?
29. What type of information does GIC share with DTC staff and how is it shared?
30. Is there anything that would prompt removing someone from participation in the GIC-DTC program?
31. What works best about the GIC-DTC collaboration?
32. Are there any changes you would like to see happen that you think would improve the program? What do you think would make the program more effective?
33. What are the main barriers in getting drug court participants to volunteer for and engage meaningfully in the GIC program?

**APPENDIX D: SERVICES TO BE PROVIDED BY GOODWILL
INDUSTRIES OF THE CHESAPEAKE, INC., AS DETERMINED BY
THE MOU WITH BALTIMORE CITY DRUG TREATMENT COURT**

Services to Be Provided By Goodwill Industries of the Chesapeake, Inc. As Determined By the MOU with Baltimore City Drug Treatment Court

Goodwill agrees to provide the following services to the clients of the DTC:

- All clients will be given the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE) to determine reading and math levels, and the Barriers to Employment Success Inventory. For defendants with little or no paid workforce experience, Goodwill will also administer additional vocational interest inventories to determine vocational interests, training needs, and strategies for overcoming barriers to employment.
- All clients will have an individual, written employment plan developed by a case manager, to include background demographic information, paid employment experience (if any), vocational interests, reading ability, and the specific steps the defendant needs to take to become employed and to ultimately reach unsubsidized, competitive employment.
- Goodwill will help at least 80 DTC clients per year gain unsubsidized, competitive employment. For some clients, the initial employment period may be on a part-time basis, with the longer-range goal of full time employment. Goodwill will strive to have the people it serves gain employment on a permanent basis starting on the first day of employment. For some DTC clients, it may be necessary to use Goodwill Staffing Services (GSS) and to start the client as a temporary employee with the goal of having the client go from temporary to permanent employment.
- Goodwill will work with clients for as long as they remain DTC participants. Goodwill will also extend the time to help clients prepare for employment as long as necessary. For clients who gain employment and relapse, Goodwill will help them prepare for and get a second or subsequent job.
- Goodwill will provide DTC participants with access to needed resources and programs. Goodwill will refer participants for needed services that could include supportive housing, adult basic education services, pre-GED and GED classes, financial literacy training, and access to low-cost check cashing services and to the SSA credit union that allows low-balance accounts, legal assistance and parent support groups.
- Goodwill's existing career development centers will serve family members of participants who are unemployed or who are working but without a career plan. Goodwill anticipates serving at least 100 family members a year.
- Goodwill will provide job retention and job placement services to those clients who gain employment. Clients who gain employment will be encouraged to stay connected with Goodwill staff, who will help with finding better paying employment, gaining access to occupational skills training programs, and linking clients to other resources (e.g. housing, education) as needed.

APPENDIX E: GLOSSARY

Glossary of Terms and Acronyms

AOC: Administrative Office of the Courts of the State of Maryland

APD: The Assistant Public Defender (defense counsel)

ASA: The Assistant State's Attorney (prosecutor)

BCDTC: Baltimore City Drug Treatment Court, for adult offenders. This includes both Circuit (felony) Court and District Court (addressing misdemeanors)

BSAS: Baltimore Substance Abuse Systems, Inc.

DPP: Maryland Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services, Division of Parole and Probation, provides case management and supervision services for the Baltimore City Drug Treatment Court

DTC: Drug Treatment Court

GIC: Goodwill Industries of the Chesapeake

GSS: Goodwill Staffing Services

HATS: State drug court data system

IOP: Intensive Outpatient treatment (3 hours per day, 3 times per week, usually lasting 2 months)

ISP: Individual service plan

NPC: NPC Research (Northwest Professional Consortium, Inc.), contracted evaluation/research company hired to conduct this process evaluation

OP: Outpatient treatment (2 hours of treatment once a week, usually lasting 4 months)

OPD: Office of the Public Defender (provides legal advocacy and defense for offenders who cannot afford to hire a private attorney to represent them)

SAO: State's Attorney's Office (prosecuting attorney for the state)

SEETTS: Supporting Ex-Offenders in Employment Training & Transitional Services – this is the GIC program offered to DTC clients

STEP: Substance Abuse Treatment and Education Program, model for the Baltimore City Drug Treatment Court, similar to “phases”