

Ventura Project to Support Reentry

Project Learnings Report

September 2023

Executive Summary & Overview

Report Contents

This report summarizes key operational and evaluation results from the Ventura Project to Support Reentry (the “Project”). It also includes reflections from Project partners, best practices, and lessons learned.

Project Overview

The Ventura County Project to Support Reentry was a collaborative Pay for Success (PFS) Project between Ventura County, Interface Children & Family Services (Interface), as the service provider, and Social Finance, Inc. as the intermediary (Social Finance). A total of \$2.59 million in funds from private sector lenders were mobilized to serve 346 medium-to-high risk adult probationers from 2017 to 2021.

The Project used a PFS mechanism in which repayment by Ventura County to lenders was based on the achievement of outcomes, as measured by UCLA (Evaluator). Two outcomes were measured: (1) the extent to which Interface clients achieved Clean Quarters,¹ as measured using administrative data from the Ventura County Probation Agency (VCPA); and (2) the level of reduction in total rearrests between a service group and a control group, determined by a Randomized Controlled Trial (RCT).² Due to the impacts of Covid-19 on the Project’s operations and evaluation, the Project’s governance committee implemented Project changes, including updating the analytical approach for the evaluation and the outcome payment structure, which are further described in this report.

Policy Goals

This Project supported the Ventura County Executive Office (VCEO)’s goals of reducing recidivism, improving public safety, and promoting family stability and economic opportunity for those on formal probation in Ventura County. It also expanded access to high-quality services for a target

¹ Each 90-day period in which an enrolled service group member is not rearrested

² A study design that randomly assigns participants into an experimental group which receives or has the possibility to receive a treatment (“service group”) or a group which does not (“control group”)

population that is currently excluded from other funding sources. Finally, the Project aligned with the policy priorities of the California Board of State and Community Corrections—a state government entity that provided grant funding towards the Project’s outcome payments. In addition to achieving its stated goals, this Project helped to develop stronger relationships and communication between government and service provider partners and embedded a focus on data into existing processes, all in service of better outcomes for Ventura County probationers and their families.

Learning Agenda

As part of the Project’s design and implementation, the County was interested in advancing a learning agenda through the evaluation of outcomes. The County sought to:

- Understand the efficacy of an individualized approach to reentry service delivery relative to Probation as Usual
- Value the relative reduction in re-arrests rather than a nominal number of avoided arrests
- Value learnings associated with differences in the efficacy of service delivery approach between Cohort 1 (primarily in-person) and Cohort 2 (fully remote), to the extent that they were made available by the Evaluator

This learning agenda reflects updates made due to the impact of Covid-19. As detailed in the report below, the RCT evaluation was ultimately unable to help illuminate efficacy of in-person vs remote service delivery, but the supplemental analysis began to shed light on how an individualized approach may contribute to reducing recidivism.

Operational and Evaluation Results

Operational Results³

Over the course of the Project, VCPA randomized 737 individuals into the RCT across the service and control groups, which was about 87% of the Project’s target study size. Of these individuals, 388 service group members were referred to Interface, and 346 ultimately enrolled into services. This reflects a conversion rate of almost 90% into Interface services, far higher than anticipated, due to Interface’s commitment to educating eligible clients about the benefits of enrolling into services.

Overall, the Project reached 346 individuals, representing 86% of target size for individuals served. This was lower than the anticipated 400 due to the impact of Covid-19, which modified the in-person nature of the referral-to-enrollment pipeline. Within the context of the pandemic, the Project partners consider this enrollment result a major success.

³ See Appendix for further information on participant demographics

Interface’s reentry services provide a highly individualized service mode: all clients receive case management services and beyond that can engage in a wide variety of other clinical and therapeutic services. Over half of the enrolled clients participated in Moral Reconciliation Therapy (MRT), an evidence-based cognitive-behavioral treatment program for substance abuse and offender populations. Another 7% engaged in “Staying Quit,” a relapse prevention program from the creators of MRT. Trauma therapy, relationship skill building, parenting support, and employment support and placement were also offered. 113 clients eventually graduated from the Interface program, which meant they met all the standards outlined in their treatment plan. Many others received successful services from Interface but ended services before official graduation, including if their probation sentence ended prior to graduation.

Impact of Covid-19

The Project’s operations and results were subject to impacts of -Covid-19, including (1) modifications to service delivery, (2) changes in the criminal justice policy environment, and (3) individual safety concerns and behavioral changes. The Project period impacted by Covid-19 (Covid-19 Impact Period) began on March 12, 2020 and continued through the end of the project. Social Finance provided quarterly updates to the Project partners over this time, highlighting key impacts along the three dimensions above. An example of a major impact: due to CA state policy changes like Zero-Bail⁴, there was a 43% decrease in Ventura County’s jail population from the beginning of the Covid-19 Impact Period to the lowest population point on May 14, 2020. By the end of August 2021, there was still a net 17% decrease from the beginning of the Covid-19 Impact Period. Practically, this had implications on the number of available referrals from the jail; it also suggests changes in arrest patterns given sheltering-in-place orders for the community, including public safety officers.

Evaluation

Randomized Controlled Trial

The Project’s evaluation measured whether Interface’s reentry services had an impact on recidivism, as compared to Probation as Usual. Recidivism was measured through both reduction in the mean number of arrests⁵ and the number of unique individuals arrested between the service group and the control group.

Cohort 1 saw positive relative reductions in the recidivism metrics during their first year; it was largely unaffected by Covid-19. Cohort 2, however, was subject to several changes brought on by the pandemic. For example, the majority of these clients received virtual service delivery (vs in

⁴ [California Chief Justice Issues Second Advisory on Emergency Relief Measures](#)

⁵ Includes any arrest identified as probable cause, warrant or supplemental booking but does not include any violations of probation

person), and these services were delivered against the backdrop of a global pandemic. With this in mind, the evaluation found that Cohort 2 did not show relative reductions in recidivism during the 12-month observation period in either the mean number of individuals arrested or the rate of re-arrest. In addition to the macro impact of Covid-19, the lack of differences between randomized service and control groups during the Project is difficult to interpret given the inability to account for any “exposure to treatment” of the control group. See Appendix B for the full RCT results, provided by the Evaluator.

Clean Quarters

The Project also tracked each 90-day period in which enrolled participants who are actively in the community went without an arrest—called a Clean Quarter. This served as a real-time learning for the Project on how the enrolled adults were doing on their path towards reentry. Participants achieved over 1,400 of these Clean Quarters over the life of the Project, representing value to the community. To put that in context, these clients achieved over 87% of the possible number of eligible Clean Quarters available.

Supplemental Analysis

In addition, Social Finance funded a supplemental analysis to further explore the experiences of service group members who completed enrollment at Interface. The aim of this report was to identify how participant demographic characteristics and service participation were correlated with recidivism.

Overall, 41% of the enrolled Service Group members recidivated at least one time during the first-year observation period. If arrested, the mean number of arrests during the one-year observation period was less than two. The Evaluator found that the characteristics which appear to be the most predictive of the probability to recidivate were:

- **Participation in MRT services:** Those with exposure to MRT services were less likely to recidivate
- **Extended Case Management:** Those in the “maintaining” stage were less likely to recidivate than those in the “beginning” stage
- **ORAS score:**⁶ Those with a “high” or “very-high” ORAS score were more likely to recidivate than those with a “low” or “moderate” ORAS score
- **Age:** Participants who are younger are more likely to recidivate

⁶ Ohio Risk Assessment Scale summary score assigned to each probationer as part of a standardized risk and needs assessment tool administered by VCPA to assess criminogenic needs

Gender and race were also explored but were found to be non-significant predictors. See additional information on the supplemental analysis findings in Appendix C.

There are limitations to the analyses reported, as there are many unknown and potentially confounding factors that were not measured and may or may not be related to the Covid-19 pandemic.

Project Reflections & Lessons Learned

Governance

- *Project governance structures are critical to (1) increase the focus on data-driven decision-making, (2) streamline change management, and ultimately (3) enable stronger, more transparent relationships between parties.* The Project's governance structure included an Executive Steering Committee, a Management Committee, and an Operating Committee. This structure was crucial to share updates and discuss Project challenges, allow Project partners to contextualize Project data, and help organizational leadership implement operational adjustments. The governance structure allowed the Project to pivot in response to real-time challenges, including in response to the Covid-19 pandemic. All parties cited that the Project's governance allowed them to form trusting relationships across the Project partners, resulting in an efficient change management process. Governance also increased accountability and provided a level of transparency about individuals' opinions and about how decisions were made.

Data

- *Rigorous data collection and analysis were key inputs to the Project's success.* All parties stressed the importance of data—not only the collection, but also the regular summary, analysis, and discussion in a way which facilitated real-time decision making. For example, VCPA cited that giving visibility to the probation units on the agency's performance at every stage of the referral and enrollment pipeline helped probation officers understand how they contributed at every step, resulting in a more targeted response to increase the number of probation referrals for randomization into the Project. These robust dataset and analysis procedures could set an example for future partnerships; for example, VCPA could match person-level service progression data to justice outcomes in future programs.
- *Data also enabled the success of Interface's service delivery.* Interface's internal data system, TIER, tracks a wide variety of metrics that represent clients' progression through case management and clinical services. This data enabled Interface to have a consistent story for each client and also made it easy to assess and pivot quickly when necessary. Service delivery data also allowed Project partners to understand how clients were

progressing through diverse types of treatment, and what was resonating with the population, so that Interface could alter service offerings as necessary.

Service Delivery and Operations

- *Participant and community voice could have been further highlighted.* Interface conducted surveys at least semi-annually. Clients continuously reported that they were satisfied with services offered, how they were treated by staff, and the impact that services would have on their futures. While Interface incorporated this feedback, the Project could have better engaged with participants by, for example, actively presenting findings to clients. Interface also reflected that the Project partners could have done a better job highlighting the Project to the community, which might have brought about more community support and advocacy for funding for reentry services.
- *Trust was a key element of success for clients involved in Interface services, as those who were most successful were generally able to develop trusting relationships with both case managers and probation officers.* Probation officers noted that clients who returned to custody but were involved in services seemed to have more trust in working with their PO when they were engaged in services. They also noted that clients who were the most successful in Interface services were those whose “drive came from within” because they were the most willing to take this opportunity seriously. One client reflected that the major difference in working with Interface was that Interface case managers listened but also genuinely wanted to get to the root causes of issues.
- *The ability of Interface staff to be onsite at probation, develop relationships with probation officers, and engage with in-custody clients contributed to client engagement.* Probation officers worked with Interface to coordinate opportunities for case managers to be on-site at probation offices to meet with both current and potential clients. Probation officers also allowed Interface to hold MRT and other therapy groups on-site, which increased participation. These on-site interactions increased rapport between Interface staff and probation officers, who were collectively working toward the same goal of client success. Through this Project, the County funded an in-custody focused Deputy Probation Officer for clients about to exit custody, which was crucial to facilitate a warm handoff. The ability to help clients when they were most vulnerable and at a “reset” moment enabled clients to be more engaged from the beginning. Reflecting on communication between Interface and Probation, Probation reflected that some streamlining of the data transfer processes could have been improved to allow for both groups to have a more consistent understanding of an individual’s status in Interface services and Probation.
- *The ability to pivot was crucial to client success, but the Project did not provide flexibility to fund services which are outside of those offered by Interface staff.* The Project originally anticipated that 80% of participants would engage in MRT; in reality, 52% received this treatment and only 26% moved through all steps. This was largely because the participants’ needs were different than anticipated: most did not have the “criminal thinking issues”

which MRT combats, while many had substance use issues. Interface was able to pivot services, for example, by offering “Staying Quit,” a relapse-prevention program from the makers of MRT. However, some clients needed live-in substance abuse treatment, which was outside of the Interface reentry services model, and the Project budget could not pay for that type of treatment.

- *Operations with-in probation offices (and in-custody) were generally transparent and supportive, but some technical issues could be better addressed in future programs.* Probation officers cited that updates were given periodically by management regarding operational outcomes and that they felt they had the support they needed. They also noted that in some cases, in-custody randomizations sometimes proved challenging due to having to carry a laptop and access to Wi-Fi. Additionally, having a scanner on-site, or having the ability for clients to sign the randomization paperwork electronically, would make randomization processes more efficient.

Impacts of Covid-19

- *Interface’s service model overall transitioned extremely successfully to telehealth, though clients had mixed responses to the impacts of Covid-19 on their individual experiences.* The operational and behavioral changes in response to Covid-19 had wide ranging effects on the Project, which relied heavily on in-person interactions. All services transitioned to telehealth beginning in March 2020 and remained remote through the end of the service delivery period. The reactions to these impacts were as individualized as the service model itself: some case managers noted that remote delivery limited their ability to develop relationships with clients and with probation officers, while others found that client engagement increased due to better accessibility, flexibility, and increased geographic reach.

Pay for Success Model

- *While risk transfer was an enticing factor for Ventura County to get involved in the Project, as time went on it was not the crucial point of importance.* This was impacted in large part because the payment structure needed to be updated based on the impacts of Covid-19, which right-sized the risk transferred based on the impacted environment. Project partners cited that they felt strongly that the County’s ultimate goal was the success of the Project overall and ensuring a good working partnership, rather than the financial risk transfer alone, which created trusting relationships. Project partners cited that the level of support provided by the Project was the highlight of using a Pay for Success model. This specifically became evident when there was an obstacle or setback, such as with the impacts of Covid-19 on the payment structure, and there was a team of people to resolve the issue and get the Project back on course.

- *Having a central, third-party intermediary was crucial to the success of the Project.* All parties cited that Social Finance’s work to organize the Project partners, analyze data, and direct attention as needed enabled the Project to run effectively. Social Finance brought an “arm’s length perspective” and advocated for the Project. This was especially relevant as this Project represented a major structural change in how the County works with its community-based organizations. Having a third-party intermediary allowed that relationship to move from “vendor” to “partner.”
- *The PFS model did successfully enable a transition to a focus on data and outcomes across all parties, and Ventura County is interested in continuing to explore future PFS Projects.* VCEO cited that one of the major successes of the PFS structure was that it highlighted the importance of data, which transcends all County operations. They believe that data is key to figuring out how to better direct County money toward service models that are most effective. They are also open to considering opportunities for outcomes based contracting, potentially with other funding mechanisms which do not rely on private investment.

Conclusion & Next Steps

The Ventura Project to Support Reentry was ultimately able to provide high-quality, individualized services, many delivered within the context of a global pandemic, to 346 participants on formal probation in Ventura. In doing so, the Project achieved its goals of improving public safety and promoting family stability and economic opportunity for these individuals, who were previously excluded from other funding sources.

Though the RCT results were mixed between the Cohorts and difficult to interpret given the impacts of Covid-19, the supplemental analysis did show that progression in Interface’s services, along with MRT participation, were predictive of reduced recidivism. The Project’s funders therefore received repayment, including project level accrued interest at roughly 6%, under the outcomes payment structure. The total outcome payments made were less than the maximum payment available.

Beyond the evaluation results, the Project provided valuable lessons for Ventura County or others who may want to pursue outcomes-based projects. Two of the most important takeaways we heard from Project partners were the importance of strong governance systems and partnerships, and the criticality of strong data systems and analysis procedures. Additionally, the durable relationship and engagement procedures between the Ventura County Probation Agency and the community-based service provider proved to be integral to the Project’s success.

Though the Project is not currently planning to extend services within the same capacity, VCPA and Interface have cultivated a strong working relationship through this Project and remain partners for other opportunities. The new focus on data and outcomes will also remain with all Project parties, hopefully enabling the success of many Ventura County programs in years to come.

Acknowledgements

This Project has been possible thanks to our many dedicated partners, including:

Interface Children and Family Services: The Project's success would not have been achievable without the tireless work of Interface's case managers and therapists, including their rapid adaptation to deliver services virtually due to the Covid-19 pandemic.

Ventura County: Thank you to the County representatives at both VCEO and VCPA for their leadership and the strategic direction they provided for the Project's Executive Steering Committee, Management Committee, and Operations Committee.

Funders: Thank you to our funding partners who provided the necessary funding and partnership to get this Project off the ground.

UCLA: Thank you to the evaluation team for their efforts to collect and analyze Project data, and for their critical thinking in the adaptation of their evaluation approach due to Covid-19 impacts.

About Social Finance

Social Finance is a national impact finance and advisory nonprofit. We work with the public, private, and social sectors to create partnerships and investments that measurably improve lives. Since our founding in 2011, we have mobilized over \$350 million in new investments designed to help people and communities realize improved outcomes in workforce and economic mobility, health, and housing. Learn more at socialfinance.org.

Appendix A: Participant Demographics by Cohort by Group

	Cohort 1		Cohort 2	
	Control Group N = 233	Service Group N = 226	Control Group N = 114	Service Group N = 156
Male	79.8%	79.6%	77.2%	82.7%
Female	20.2%	19.9%	22.8%	17.3%
Race/Ethnicity				
Latino/Chicano/Hispanic	62.7%	53.1%	67.5%	64.7%
White/Caucasian	28.8%	39.8%	27.2%	26.9%
Black/African American	5.6%	4.9%	1%	4.5%
Asian	0.9	0.4%	2.6%	2.6%
Native American	-	0.4%	-	-
Other/Pacific Islander	2.1%	1.3%	1.8%	1.3%
Age	32.9 (9.7)	34.0 (10.8)	34 (9.7)	32.9 (9.6)

Appendix B: Total Re-Arrest Outcomes for Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 Measured by Year

	Cohort 1 Year 1		Cohort 1 Year 2		Cohort 2 Year 1	
	12-month Observation Period Ending 5/31/2020		12-month Observation Period Ending 5/31/2021		12-month Observation Period Ending 9/30/2021	
	Control Group	Service Group	Control Group	Service Group	Control Group	Service Group
# in Sample	233	226	233	226	114	156
Aggregate # of Arrests	189	181	161	119	74	118
# of Participants Arrested 1+ times	104	96	77	74	44	69
Mean # of Arrests	0.811 (s.d. 1.24)	0.801 (s.d. 1.16)	0.691 (s.d. 1.59)	0.527 (s.d. 1.20)	0.649 (s.d. 0.93)	0.756 (s.d. 1.15)
Rates of Re-Arrest	44.6%	42.5%	33.0%	32.7%	38.6%	44.2%
Calculation 1 for Total Re-arrest Outcome: Rate of Change in Percentage of Arrests	4.7%		0.9%		-14.5%	
Calculation 2 for Total Re-arrest Outcome: Rate of Change in Mean # of Arrests	1.2%		23.7%		-16.5%	

Appendix C: Supplemental Analysis Findings

Multivariate logistic regression findings show that the odds of recidivating are <i>significantly</i> :		
Significant predictors of recidivism activity	MRT participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decreased by 38.1% for MRT participants compared with those who did not participate in MRT (p-value = 0.0599)
	Case Management Progression	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decreased by 74% for those who were in the Maintenance stage of Case Management compared to those who were in the Beginning stage (p < 0.0001)
	ORAS score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased by 343% for those with a 'high' or 'very-high' ORAS score compared to those with a low ORAS score (p-value = 0.0049) Increased by 277% for those with a 'moderate' ORAS score compared to those with a low ORAS score (p-value = 0.0122)
	Age	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decreased by 4% for each year older Participants who are younger are more likely to recidivate (p-value = 0.0024).
Non-significant predictors of recidivism activity	Gender	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gender was not a significant predictor of recidivism, as similar rates of men and women have recidivated to date (40% of women and 42% of men)
	Race	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Race was not a significant predictor of recidivism

Appendix D: Supporting Quotations

Governance

- **Project governance structures are critical to (1) increase the focus on data-driven decision-making, (2) streamline change management, and ultimately (3) enable stronger, more transparent relationships between parties.**
 - *“This structure worked well for us to increase relationships with all partners and was a familiar process. We appreciated the flexibility which allowed us to attend meetings as needed but also step back as appropriate.”*
 - *“The governance structure was key to accountability and highlighted performance against goals. In the case of underperformance, a breakdown of reasons for goals were not being met was always included, which allowed for real-time performance improvement.”*
 - *“It is a testament to the governance process that the pandemic didn’t stop the governance process, but rather, showed its strength.”*
 - *“Equally, or potentially more important, than the defined governance processes are the relationships and partnerships which allowed us all to actively participate in the problem solving of the committee, rather than just reacting.”*

Data

- **Rigorous data collection and analysis were key inputs to the Project’s success.**
 - *“More than anything, what I hope comes out of engaging in this Project is a highlight on the importance of data – that transcends all county operations. Data is key to figuring out how to better transition County money toward service models that are most effective.”*
 - *“Data was a key input to the Project’s success – the rigor of data collection and analysis was higher than any other projects we had been involved in and created an example of a robust dataset and analysis which could be mimicked for other projects.”*
 - *“Giving visibility to the probation units on the agency’s performance at every stage of the pipeline helped probation officers understand how they contributed at every step, resulting in a more targeted response to increase the number of randomizations.”*
- **Data also enabled the success of Interface’s service delivery.**
 - *“Having a robust data system enabled us to have a consistent story for each client and made it easy to assess and pivot quickly when necessary. Service delivery data also allowed us to understand how clients were progressing through diverse types of treatment, and what was resonating with the population, so that we could alter service offerings, as necessary.”*

Service Delivery and Operations

- **Participant and community voice could have been further highlighted.**
 - *“Though clients continuously reported that they were satisfied with services, and we incorporated this feedback, the Project could have better engaged with participants, for example, by actively presenting findings to clients in governance meetings.”*
- **The ability of Interface staff to be onsite at Probation, develop relationships with Probation officers, and engage with in-custody clients contributed to client engagement.**
 - *“Being onsite at Probation was critical – both visiting clients in Probation’s offices and holding groups on-site and in coordination with Probation officer meetings allowed us to engage more deeply with clients.”*
 - *“Building rapport with Probation officers was crucial to client success – by being onsite, we were able to develop better relationships with Probation officers, who were collectively working toward the same goal of client success.”*
 - *“Having an in-custody Probation Officer was essential to making warm handoff: the fact that you could walk into jail and help an individual at that ‘reset’ moment, when they are most vulnerable, ultimately increased engagement.”*
- ***The ability to pivot was crucial to client success, but the Project did not provide flexibility to fund services which are outside of those offered by Interface staff***
 - *“Through we were able to pivot services, one challenge was our inability to adjust the overall intervention because of the research and the funding mechanism.”*

Impacts of Covid-19

- **Interface's service model overall transitioned extremely successfully to telehealth, though clients had mixed responses to the impacts of Covid-19 on their individual experiences.**
 - *“Our clients had mixed responses to the impacts of Covid on the services: For some clients, Covid limited our ability to develop relationships, while with others we found that client engagement increased due to better accessibility, flexibility, and increased geographic reach.”*

Pay for Success Model

- **While risk transfer was an enticing factor to get involved in the Project, as time went on it was not the crucial point of importance for Ventura County.**
 - *“The County’s interest morphed during the project – initially it was the funding model, specifically the risk transfer, but as time went on the data piece became more important and critical to not only success of the project but being able to sell it politically and publicly.”*

- *“The impacts of Covid on the project through a wrench into the risk transfer piece – but through the governance process we were able to come up with a strategy to address it and retain an outcomes-based model.”*
- *“We could tell that the County’s ultimate goal was the success of the Project overall and ensuring a good working partnership, rather than the financial risk transfer alone, which created trusting relationships.”*
- **Having a central, third-party intermediary was crucial to the success of the Project.**
 - *“We trusted, and continue to trust, Social Finance as a leader to shepherd us through this process.”*
 - *“The level of support provided by the Project exceeded our expectations – when there was an obstacle or setback, there was a whole team of people there to resolve the issue and get the Project back on course.”*
 - *“External management of the governance process by Social Finance, including the level of transparency that provided in how decisions are made, was really beneficial.”*
 - *“The role of the intermediary is critical: Social Finance was there to champion the project and bring legitimacy, as well as an ‘arm’s length perspective’.”*
 - *“Working with the Social Finance team was a high point in the collaboration – the way Social Finance facilitated the process there was always room to problem solve and it allowed for strong relationship development which the governance structure on paper alone could not have done.”*
- **The PFS model did successfully enable a transition to a focus on data and outcomes across all parties, and Ventura County is interested in continuing to explore future PFS Projects.**
 - *“This experience has broadened my perspective on how you fund certain types of activities and programs. As a result of this Project, VCEO has continued to explore other pay for success and outcomes based contracting opportunities.”*
 - *“I would encourage other jurisdictions who are considering Pay for Success projects to forward with a project like this despite the potential challenges. No matter what the study results say, there are individuals in their homes today who would not have been if we didn’t push to do this project.”*

Quotes from Participants (Source: Interface Consumer Reviews, 2020-2022)

- *“The staff and people I’ve been in contact with are welcoming and easy to talk to.”*
- *“[Interface staff] care about our success without judging.”*
- *“I’m a better and more understanding parent and a more responsible worker. When I have a problem, I reach out for help.”*
- *“Interface cares about my well being and I get treated with respect at all times. Probation is a great opportunity to get back on track with life.”*

- *“I’ve talked to Len for a while...he is always there when I need him, someone to talk to, and if I need a shoulder to lean on, he's there. He boosts up my confidence and he gives me good advice. I think everyone needs someone like this in their lives.”*
- *“How I’m addressed verbally and I’m made to feel special, important, and the positive reinforcement I receive helps me steer clear from my old ways and continue to do what's right in my life”*
- *“Understanding our situation...and treating us with respect and not like we are nothing or someone who is lost and can’t rebuild with the mistakes and wrong choices we’ve made in life. This program is one of the few that really does want to do good and [the case managers] do not think you’re a bad person”*
- *“My counselor Len is very good at talking to people and helping me with my job, housing...he has helped me go online and look for places and all his mentoring is good. It's a good thing to keep people like me focused on my future goals and recovery”*
- *“I believe everyone needs someone to talk to, someone who doesn't know the parties involved or maybe one that is unbiased and one they feel safe telling things to. And the fact that it's free makes it even better. That's what I'm grateful for”*
- *“They are there for you when a lot of people aren’t. They give you motivation. They make you feel like someone cares for you”*
- *“If it wasn’t for the program, it would have taken me a long time to find the right path and would of lost a lot without this program! Thank you PFS for all your help!”*
- *MRT specific*
 - *“The 12 steps [of MRT] helped me to look at myself in 5 years. Saw all the negative and how it can help me make the right choices to not end back in the wrong road. When I feel like I’m going to relapse, I get my MRT book out and look at my pyramid also at my cup of blessing I received at my MRT graduation. It helps me stay on track and focus.”*
 - *“I learned a whole lot! It helped me make smarter decisions and think about consequences and find more value in life... Got to know a lot of my morals! Helped me make the right decision and trust police. Think twice before my actions.”*
 - *“[Case managers] take time to explain MRT book work and understand that I am busy with work and AA, so they give me extra time to complete the MRT book.”*