

Program Performance Report

Second Chance Act—Adult Mentoring Grant Program

July 2011–June 2012



This report was prepared by Lindsey Devers, Ph.D., CSR, Incorporated, under contract number GS-10F-0114L from the Bureau of Justice Assistance.

Second Chance Act— Adult Mentoring Grant Program

Program Performance Report (July 2011–June 2012)

In 2007, the Second Chance Act was signed into law. It was created to help break the cycle of criminal recidivism; improve public safety; and help states, units of local government, and American Indian tribes better address the growing population of offenders who return to their communities. The Second Chance Act provides grants to state, local, and tribal governments to promote the safe and successful reintegration of individuals into the community after they are released from incarceration. Second Chance Act grantees are committed to help those in the reentry process by appropriately assessing risk and need and by offering individualized case plans and services.

The goal of the Second Chance Act is to implement reentry programs that do the following:

- Use validated assessment instruments to screen and identify offenders for participation in reentry programs;
- Implement a transition plan for offenders, incorporating both pre- and post-release services;
- Provide treatment services (including substance abuse and mental health) to offenders;
- Offer additional services (including pro-social, educational, vocational, employment, and housing) to offenders;
- Support offenders with case management to monitor reintegration; and
- Reduce recidivism.¹

In fiscal year (FY) 2009, Congress appropriated \$25 million for Second Chance Act grant programs. This initial round of funding was divided among four grant programs—Adult Mentoring, Adult Demonstration (hereafter reentry), Juvenile Mentoring, and Juvenile Demonstration—and established the National Reentry Resource Center. In FY 2010, Congress appropriated \$100 million in Federal funding for the implementation and administration of additional sections authorized by the Second Chance Act. FY 2010 awards were divided among the four existing grant programs noted above, and the legislation authorized four other adult grant programs: the Family-Based Prisoner Substance Abuse Treatment Grant Program, the Targeting Offenders with Co-occurring Substance Abuse and Mental Health Grant Program, the Reentry Court Grant Program, and the Technology Careers Grant Program. In FY 2011, all Second Chance Act grant programs were re-appropriated. This report covers four quarters of data collected from July 2011 to June 2012 for the adult Mentoring Second Chance Act grantees.² Data from October 2009 to June 2011 were analyzed and will be published on BJA’s Web site.

Key Findings During the Reporting Period

- Grantees, on average, admitted 66% of those deemed eligible for mentoring programs.
- 3,188 participants were enrolled in adult mentoring pre-release services, and 2,432 were enrolled in post-release services.
- Out of the total number of mentors recruited to provide mentoring services, 81%, on average, were successfully trained.
- 1,038 mentors provided services for pre-release mentees and 1,443 mentors provided services for post-release mentees.
- The average rate across grantees of moderate- and high-risk participants admitted to the program was about 72%.
- The successful completion rate for participants exiting pre-release services averaged 78% across grantees and was 41% for those exiting post-release services.

¹ Recidivism information is not available at this time. Recidivism performance data will be provided once a large enough sample size has been established. In addition, more robust recidivism information will be provided upon the completion of the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) outcome evaluation.

² This report is based on self-reported data reported by grantees in the Performance Measurement Tool (PMT). Data are validated through analysis and through data validation rules that are entered into the PMT. Values and “N” sizes for specific reporting periods may change over time as grantees are contacted periodically to validate inaccurate data.



Key Performance Measures

Measure	Data Elements Used to Calculate Measure	Definition	Interpretation
Program Capacity	A. Number of new participants admitted B. Number of eligible offenders % Admitted of Eligible = A/B	Admitted participants compared with the total number who were eligible.	Assesses the intake and screening process—specifically, how many participants the program can serve compared with the need in that area.
Percent New Admissions	A. Number of new participants/mentors admitted B. Number of participants/mentors enrolled in the reentry program % New Participants = A/B	Number of new participants admitted divided by the total number of participants enrolled to the reentry program.	Assesses the capacity of the program by tracking the percentage of new participants admitted and the number of mentors participating.
Percent of New Mentors Successfully Trained	A. Number of mentors successfully trained B. Number of mentors recruited % Trained= A/B	Percentage of mentors that were trained and who are active participants in the program.	The higher the percentage, the more effectively grantees are recruiting and training mentors who are appropriate for the program.
Percent of Mentors Matched to Mentees	A. Number of participants who need to be matched to a mentor B. Number of new matches that were made between mentors and mentees	Percentage of actual matches completed out of the total that needed to be made.	The more matches that are made, the more reentry participants will have access to pro-social peers.
Percent High, Moderate, and Low Risk	A. Number of high risk B. Number of moderate risk C. Number of low risk % High Risk = A/(A+B+C) % Moderate Risk = B/(A+B+C) % Low Risk = C/(A+B+C)	Percentage of participants who had a new assessment and their subsequent risk level.	Assesses the target population for percentages of participants who are considered high and moderate risks, the two groups targeted by Second Chance Act funding.
Employment and Housing Outcomes	A. Number of participants who obtained employment/housing B. Number of participants who obtained employment/housing % Obtained Employment/Housing = A/B	Number of participants who obtained housing and employment since release.	Based on research showing that ex-offenders need housing and employment for successful reintegration.
Percent Successfully Completing Program	A. Number of successful completers B. Number who failed the program C. Number who failed due to court criminal involvement D. Number who failed due to lack of engagement E. Number who absconded F. Number of other failures % Completed = A/(A+B+C+D+E+F)	Percentage of participants who successfully completed the program.	Assesses how many participants have successfully reintegrated into society.

Graphs of Performance Measures

Program Capacity

Grantees, on average, admitted 66% of those deemed eligible for mentoring programs from April to June 2012. Grantees are serving a large portion of offenders eligible within their target populations.




Quarterly Participant Enrollment

In this reporting period, 3,188 participants were enrolled in adult mentoring pre-release services and 2,432 were enrolled in post-release services. New participants represented 43% of those enrolled in pre-release services and 31% of those enrolled in post-release services (not shown).


Percent of Mentors Successfully Trained

Out of the total number of mentors recruited to provide mentoring services, 81%, on average, were successfully trained.





Mentors Providing Services

From April to June 2012, 1,038 mentors provided services for pre-release mentees and 1,443 mentors provided services for post-release mentees. A moderate proportion of new mentors were enrolled in this reporting period—30% in pre-release and 25% in post-release (not shown).



Mentors Matched to Mentees

Out of the total number of mentees who needed to be matched to mentors, 59%, on average, were matched in the April to June 2012 reporting period. Match rates have remained relatively stable across reporting periods.





Risk Assessment Level

During the reporting period, the average rate across grantees of moderate- and high-risk participants admitted to the program was about 72%. The average rate of low-risk participants admitted to the program remained moderate.

Post-release Services Utilized Most Often³

From April to June 2012, pro-social services were the most utilized service type, followed by cognitive-based services and employment services.




Post-release Service Outcomes⁴

From April to June 2012, 928 participants were enrolled in post-release employment services and 328 participants were enrolled in housing services (not shown). Out of the total number enrolled in services, the average participant employment rate across grantees was 58%, and the average participant housing rate was 82%.

Successful Completion Rates

From April to June 2012, 864 participants completed pre-release program requirements and 397 completed post-release requirements. The successful completion rate for participants exiting pre-release services averaged 78% across grantees and was 41% for those exiting post-release services. Moreover, 62% of participants who successfully completed post-release program requirements also completed those for pre-release services.



³ Pro-social services can include programs such as anger and stress management, faith-based services, family counseling services, life skills training, and any other type of structured activities. Each individual may receive one or more services.

⁴ Participants who did not find employment/housing in this reporting period may have either obtained those service outcomes in a prior reporting period and they are still enrolled in services or they are seeking employment/housing. It should also be noted that grantees have reported difficulty in tracking outcomes for participants who are referred out to services. Thus, data are only collected on participants who are directly provided with services.