

Summary of Parole and Probation Literature

**Prepared for
Lancaster Alliance**

**Prepared by
Public Safety Research Institute**

August 2005

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	1
INTRODUCTION.....	3
POLICE/PROBATION PROGRAMS	4
Boston, Massachusetts – Operation Night Light	5
Minneapolis, Minnesota - Anti-Violence Initiative	7
Tennessee – Community Collaboration and Partnership	8
Dauphin County, Pennsylvania – Power Shift	9
Common Themes in Police and Community Corrections Partnerships	10
MODELS OF PROBATION AND EFFECTS ON OUTCOMES...	11
COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS AND RECIDIVISM	13
Populations Studied.....	14
Offender Characteristics Associated with Recidivism	15
Comparing Recidivism between Communities	16
Program Indicators	17
PROGRAM EVALUATION	18
The Evaluation of Need	19
The Evaluation of Process.....	21
The Evaluation of Outcome	22
The Evaluation of Efficiency	24
CONCLUSION	25
WORKS CITED	257
APPENDIX A: Key Definitions.....	29
APPENDIX B: History of Probation and Parole.....	30
APPENDIX C: A Measurable Mission Statement.....	32
APPENDIX D: Funding.....	334

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is 1) to provide a literature review of non-traditional community corrections models that incorporate police and 2) to identify a list of evaluative indicators to measure community corrections programs' effectiveness. This report also provides an overview of methodological considerations for studying the success of community corrections programs.

The report's major findings are presented below. A more detailed analysis is provided in the pages that follow.

- *Various types of police and community correction partnerships have developed nationwide and generally receive positive feedback from participating police and community corrections officers. Despite the testimonials of officers, there is sparse empirical data showing the effects of such programs (p 4).*
- *Despite Pennsylvania containing two large metropolitan regions and 67 counties, only one county has adopted a police/community corrections partnership. The limited use of such programs may be a result of their development in response to a clear rise in violent, gang, and/or gun-related crimes (p 10).*
- *In communities that report experiencing some degree of success, the violent crime rate was very high or rising at the time of implementation (p 10).*
- *Police/community corrections partnerships tend to be focused on surveillance. Because detection of violations and action against violators is emphasized, recidivism rates normally increase with surveillance-intensive programs. In most instances, treatment based programs lower recidivism rates because they address the client's issues, such as economic well-being, drug and alcohol treatment, education, and family services (p 11-12).*
- *Morgan (1993) found the following factors to be associated with recidivism: the kind of crime conviction and extent of prior record, income at arrest, household composition, age, and drug use (p 15). However, comparing recidivism rates across programs is difficult because of the limited community corrections population currently studied and the variability in discretion (p 16).*
- *The American Probation and Parole Association (APPA) encourages the use of multiple indicators to evaluate a community corrections*

program. They believe that the use of recidivism as an indicator of success only measures one task of community corrections. Other tasks such as presentence investigations, collecting fines and costs, monitoring community service projects and coordinating treatment services are all ignored when recidivism is the sole indicator of success (Petersilia 1997, 185) (p 17).

- *Program evaluation based upon recidivism alone will produce limited results. In order to successfully conduct a comprehensive program evaluation, adoption of a four stage process is necessary. These four stages in operational order are: 1) Evaluation of Need, 2) Evaluation of Process, 3) Evaluation of Outcome, and 4) Evaluation of Efficiency (p 18-24).*

INTRODUCTION

This report begins by detailing existing programs that incorporate partnerships between police officers and community corrections officers. The second section of the report outlines probation models and their implications on outcome measures. In particular, the effects of each program's model on recidivism rates are discussed. Next, the report discusses the usefulness of indicators, especially recidivism, to evaluate community corrections programs. Finally, this report addresses methods and processes for evaluating community corrections programs. Key definitions, the history of probation and parole, an example of a measurable mission statement, and funding sources are included in appendixes A-D.

POLICE/PROBATION PROGRAMS

Police and community correction partnerships have developed nationwide and generally receive positive feedback from participating police and community corrections officers. These officers report gaining new insights about criminals in their neighborhoods and benefiting from their increased ability to make arrests.

Despite the testimonials of officers, there is sparse empirical data showing the effects of such programs. No studies were found that address the cost effectiveness, impact on client and community attitudes, program responsiveness, program success, client recidivism rates, or the safety of the community corrections officers.

The following section provides an overview of several community corrections programs¹ that involve police and community corrections partnerships with a focus on program development and logistics.

¹ More examples of police/community corrections programs include: Operation Spotlight in Maryland, Project Spotlight in Texas, and programs in Washington, D.C., Maricopa County, AZ, Vancouver, WA, New Haven, CT, and Clark County, OR.

Boston, Massachusetts – Operation Night Light

In 1992, Boston initiated Operation Night Light, which eventually became a component of the *Boston Gun Project*. Operation Night Light is a police and community corrections response to extremely high rates of homicide and violence, especially among youth and gang members under the age of 24, in the Boston area.

Prior to the development of Operation Night Light, probation officers worked independently of police, and curfews were rarely enforced. Informally, probation officers met with police officers to develop the program model. In this model, one probation officer partners with two police officers; together they make unscheduled visits to high-risk youths' home, school, and worksites during the untraditional work hours of 7:00 pm to midnight (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention: Profile 33, Online). Today, Boston has fifty police officers and fifty community corrections officers who ride the streets together seven nights a week. Plus, all newly employed community corrections officers are required to spend 20% of their time in the community during non-traditional hours (Reichert 2002, 2).

Operation Night Light had two primary goals: 1) to intercept probationers' gang and gun related crimes and 2) to reduce youths' risk of entering into gang violence by taking them off the streets (Stewart 1997, 2-3). When police and community corrections officers worked together, law enforcement officers could arrest offenders for probation violations with the intent of reducing crime, while probation officers had police back up when enforcing curfews and other probation stipulations. The police and probation officers who initiated the program believed the

community would benefit from such a partnership and the program would result in a reduced number of violent, gun-related, youth crimes.

Unfortunately, the program's ability to achieve its goals is still undetermined. While Boston's juvenile homicides dropped from a high of 16 in 1990 to zero in 1997 (Reichert 2002, 3), a National Institute of Justice Report on the *Boston Gun Project* attributes the drop in crime to other program components, not to Operation Night Light. In fact, "no diminution in homicide is evident between 1992 and mid-1996. Had (Operation Night Light or Boston's Ten Point Coalition) had strong solo impacts on violence, those impacts should have been evident" (Braga, et al. 2001, 61). The only contributions directly attributable to Operation Night Light were to the problem-solving process (Braga, et al 2001, 61).

Minneapolis, Minnesota - Anti-Violence Initiative

In 1997 Minneapolis Minnesota designed a program similar to Boston's Operation Night Light to address escalating crime rates. The sheriff, the police, and community corrections partnered to form a new, unique department comprised of police and community corrections officers called the Minnesota Anti-Violence Initiative (MAVI). The program provides a two day training session for police and community corrections officers to learn their respective roles, with as many as 50 officers participating at any given time. MAVI deals exclusively with cases of violence, weapons possession or gang affiliation. In response to requests from other justice departments, MAVI makes unannounced visits to offenders in the evening hours. (Minnesota Anti-Violence Initiative, Online).

Homicides in Minneapolis dropped from 40 to 8 in the summer following the implementation of MAVI. Police and community corrections officers involved in the program strongly believe the decrease in homicides and more stringent court-ordered conditions can be attributed to MAVI. The Minneapolis program participants also viewed the program as a deterrent because offenders did not like being known on a personal level by both the police and their community corrections officer. Unfortunately, the program has not been evaluated formally (Minnesota Anti-Violence Initiative, Online).

Tennessee – Community Collaboration and Partnership

Focusing on offender accountability, Tennessee initiated a state-wide program called Community Collaboration and Partnership. This program focused on day-to-day information sharing, case management, and enhanced supervision between police and community corrections officers. The Community Collaboration and Partnership relies on excellent case management, unified police and probation geographic regions, policy development and community assessment. Outcomes to this program could not be assessed at the time of this report, but the website does contain an abundance of information about the particulars of the probation program.

Specifically, the goals of the partnership are:

- To establish an offender identification card process. Offenders are photographed and an identification card is made. The offender is required to carry it at all times and present it to law enforcement during any contact.
- To share information about probationers/parolees via computerized exchange between partners to assist the reintegration of offenders into the community.
- To assist in the development of progressive sanctions, including community service, for violations of probation/parole conditions and making use of alternative sanctions on an ongoing basis.
- To participate in the development and delivery of training for police and probation/parole staffs who participate in the joint supervision teams.
- To assign of probation/parole officers geographically to coincide with local law enforcement. Used in conjunction with a ride along program, this enhances inter-agency cooperation at the line level.
- To geo-map offenders to better manage the population and make threat assessments.

(Tennessee Board of Probation and Parole, *Online*).

Dauphin County, Pennsylvania – Power Shift

In 1998, the Chief of Police and the Director of Probation in Dauphin County initiated a program between police and probation based on Boston's model, called Power Shift. In this model, probation officers ride along with police to identify offenders, and the police go outside of their normal patrols to assist in home visits.

Both the police and probation officers in Dauphin carry firearms, as mandated by the President Judge. Unlike Boston, the size of this program is small, with only 10 participants; 5 from each department, respectively. As an incentive for participation, Dauphin County supplies the Power Shift crew with shift differential, and probation officers automatically receive a promotion to Probation Officer II. According to Terry Davis, Director of Dauphin County Adult Probation and Parole, this type of program must fit the needs of the area in which it is implemented, and cooperation between police and probation is absolutely necessary.

Funding for this program was obtained through the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency. Dauphin County conducted annual evaluations of the program during the three year grant period and continue to do so for their records. Despite several requests for the Power Shift Annual Reports, none have been obtained at this time. Since the program's inception, community participation and awareness has increased, and crime rates have dropped. The director of Dauphin County's program, however, does not attribute the reduction in crime to the program (Davis, Terry, e-mail 7/11/05).

Common Themes in Police and Community Corrections Partnerships

As of 2002, an estimated 20 jurisdictions in the country adopted police/community corrections partnerships (Reichert 2). From the available literature, almost all of these programs were implemented in large metropolitan areas or on a state-wide basis. Despite Pennsylvania containing two large metropolitan regions and 67 counties, only one county has adopted a police/community corrections partnership. The limited use of such programs may be because their development is typically in response to a clear rise in violence, gang, and/or gun-related crimes. To date, all partnership programs except the Tennessee Community Collaboration and Partnership, are focused and intensive enforcement programs, specifically targeting high-risk clients.

Unfortunately, scant empirical evidence exists to validate the positive effects of police/community corrections partnerships. In communities that report experiencing some degree of success, the violent crime rate was very high or rising at the time of implementation. The testimonials of officers involved in the program do attest to the benefits of a police/community corrections partnership in a community policing model, but this is the only evidence of success.

MODELS OF PROBATION AND EFFECTS ON OUTCOMES

Community corrections programs are administered in various ways, ranging from surveillance to treatment, with most programs incorporating some combination of approaches. The relative emphasis a community corrections program places on surveillance and on treatment greatly impacts the effects of its program. The surveillance model of community corrections emphasizes monitoring, compliance with the rules of supervision, and detecting violations (Seiter 2005, 100). Because detection of violations and action against violators is emphasized, recidivism rates normally increase with surveillance-intensive programs. Most police and community corrections partnership are surveillance intensive; therefore, surveillance intensive police/community corrections partnerships also result in increased recidivism.

Treatment-intensive programs focus on assisting the offender with problems, providing counseling, and ensuring that the offender successfully completes supervision (Seiter 2005, 100). The goals of this type of program are to provide the offender with the information and opportunities for rehabilitation and emphasize commitment and completion of a program as opposed to strictly monitoring for violations. Treatment based programs may have lower recidivism rates than surveillance based programs because they are focused on the client's issues, such as economic well-being, drug and alcohol treatment, education, and family services, rather than simply on monitoring adherence to conditions of probation and parole. Treatment based

programs are the only programs that appear to reduce recidivism (US Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice 1998, 2-4).

For all types of programs, recidivism rates are often used as the measure of success or failure. Unfortunately, relying solely on recidivism rates to measure program success can be misleading and may not adequately capture important programmatic information. The design of a community corrections model should be based upon the goals of the community corrections office, the needs of the community, and the outcomes they hope to achieve. If strict enforcement of probation is the goal of a program, higher recidivism rates could imply success. Alternatively, if program completion and provision of social services is the objective of the community corrections office, then a lower recidivism rate may indicate success. The effects of the probation model on rates of recidivism will vary, contingent upon many elements of the program, including the discretion of the community corrections officers, the types of clients involved, and the balance between the community corrections styles.

The measure of success based upon outcomes will vary according to the program that is implemented. For this reason, outcome measures should be clearly defined. The following section will discuss indicators used to evaluate a community corrections program, as well as the vulnerabilities and positive uses of recidivism as a measure.

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS AND RECIDIVISM

Most evaluations of community corrections programs rely exclusively on recidivism as a measure of success. For several reasons, this reliance is problematic: 1) Information regarding the recidivism rates of misdemeanor offenders is generally lacking, 2) other factors besides the type of correctional program influence recidivism and 3) there are numerous difficulties associated with comparing different correctional programs.

Populations Studied

National data about the recidivism rates of probationers and parolees is limited to persons convicted of felonies, although only 42% of the probation population is adult felons (Maguire and Pastore 1995). For example, Langan and Cunniff (1992) found that 43 percent of felony probationers were rearrested for a crime within their states while still on probation, with half arrested for violent crime or drug offenses (Petersilia 1998, 580). Bureau of Justice Statistics data show that about half (48%) of parolees return to prison during their parole period, while about half (49%) successfully complete their parole. (Petersilia 1998, 577). Because research focuses exclusively on felon probationers and parolees, the percentage of the community corrections population as a whole who get rearrested is unknown. (Petersilia 1998, 580). Community corrections programs serving many offenders convicted of misdemeanors lack baseline information regarding recidivism rates.

Offender Characteristics Associated with Recidivism

Many factors other than the type of community corrections program influence offenders' recidivism rates. In a review of literature on predicting recidivism, Morgan (1993) found the following factors to be associated with recidivism:

- **The kind of crime conviction and extent of prior record:** Offenders with more previous convictions and property offenders (burglary as compared to robbery and drug offenders) showed higher rates of recidivism.
- **Income at arrest:** Higher unemployment/lower income is associated with higher recidivism.
- **Household composition:** Persons living with spouse, children, or both have lower recidivism.
- **Age:** Younger offenders have higher recidivism rates than older offenders.
- **Drug use:** Probationers who used heroin had higher recidivism rates. (Morgan 1993, 25)

Comparing Recidivism between Communities

Methodological problems exist when trying to compare recidivism rates between community corrections departments. One problem with conducting a cross-comparison of recidivism rates is that the definition of recidivism may vary. That is, recidivism may be an arrest for a felony, misdemeanor, summary offense, or technical violation of parole or probation.

Another difficulty when comparing recidivism rates between community corrections departments is that each municipality has different criteria for introducing offenders to the community correction system, utilizes different degrees of enforcement styles, and gives community corrections' officers different levels of discretion. Much of the variability in recidivism rates can be attributed to disparities in the enforcement of court orders and probation conditions existing between community corrections programs (Petersilia 1997, 181). According to Geerken and Hayes (1993), seventeen follow-up studies of adult felony probationers found that rearrest rates ranged from 12 to 65 percent. This number is large but not unexpected given the variability in implementation of community corrections program.

Program Indicators

The American Probation and Parole Association (APPA) encourages the use of multiple indicators to evaluate a community corrections program. They believe that the use of recidivism as an indicator of success only measures one task of community corrections. The APPA recommends the collection of data on multiple outcomes such as:

- amount of restitution collected
- number of offenders employed
- amount of fines/costs collected
- hours of community service
- number of treatment sessions
- percent of the financial obligation collected
- enrollment in schools
- days employed
- educational attainment
- number of days drug-free.

Other tasks, such as conducting pre-sentence investigations, collecting fines and costs, monitoring community service projects and coordinating treatment services, are all ignored when recidivism is the sole indicator of success (Petersilia 1997, 185). Measuring overall program effectiveness may encompass much more than just assessing the recidivism of the offenders.

PROGRAM EVALUATION

For all of the aforementioned reasons, program evaluation based upon recidivism alone will produce limited results. More fundamentally, before considering changing a community corrections program and evaluating the impact of that change, it is first necessary to determine what changes are needed and feasible. Meaningful and productive programmatic changes are unlikely to occur without thorough assessment of staff, clients and community. Evaluation of changes implemented should include both an examination of the implementation process, the outcomes obtained and the costs associated with the program. The following four stage process represents a model for comprehensive evaluation of a program change. These four stages in operational order are:

1. The Evaluation of Need
2. The Evaluation of Process
3. The Evaluation of Outcome
4. The Evaluation of Efficiency

(Posovac and Carey 2003, 4)

The Evaluation of Need

In the needs evaluation stage, an assessment of the needs of the clients, community corrections employees, and the broader community should be conducted. This evaluation assists in determining the need for and feasibility of a new program. For example, before implementing a police-probation partnership, it would be appropriate to assess community corrections office employees, clients and the community according to various criteria:

Assessment of employees:

- willingness to work non-traditional and traditional shifts
- resistance or willingness to participate in the new program
- perception of new program
- shortcomings of existing program
- surveillance styles
- perceptions of mission statement
- organizational structure
- amount of restitution collected
- amount of fines/costs collected
- percent of the financial obligation collected

This assessment provides necessary information for creation of employee incentives for non-traditional work, the education needs of employees, and the internal resistance to program changes. Furthermore, this assessment helps screen for employees whose approach to community corrections is parallel with the new program (*i.e.* tendency toward surveillance or treatment).

Assessment of clients:

- dynamic risk assessment for recidivism
- comprehensive socioeconomic information

- perception of new program (essential because this program requires assertive implementation)
- develop a client education plan about program recidivism
- number of offenders employed
- number of treatment sessions
- hours of community service
- days employed
- number of days drug-free.
- enrollment in schools
- educational attainment

This assessment would help determine the characteristics of clients and their treatment needs, and therefore, better guide the type of new program.

Assessment of community:

- interest/support in program
- understanding of community corrections
- develop community education plan about program (more support, better reception – essential because the program may increase recidivism rates)
- crime rates

This assessment will provide insight into the community's support of the new program and their understanding of community correction's role. Community support for a program is essential for program funding.

The Evaluation of Process

The process evaluation stage documents the extent of implementation, determines the nature of people being served, and evaluates the degree to which the program meets operational expectations as defined by the mission statement. In this stage, not only is evaluation of the program processes under evaluation but so is the extent to which the program is meeting or addressing the needs established in stage one.

Information from this stage is generally obtained internally. Developing information systems before program implementation is important to make evaluation of this stage easy. This process includes interviews with people both in the program and those not in the program. Such interviews provide valuable information into program oversights not evident by evaluating only the program and its recipients.

The Evaluation of Outcome

While outcome evaluations are the most popular evaluation type, they do not always provide the most valuable information, particularly in the case of community corrections. This is often the case because of varying factors which influence the program and the offender.

First, evaluating behavioral changes, such as those anticipated by a community corrections program, are complicated by mediating factors (Posavac and Carey 2003, 9). For example, while offenders are participating in community corrections programs, they are simultaneously exposed to other social influences such as family and friends, and continue to live in uncontrolled environments, which can counter, mediate, or enhance any effects of the community corrections program.

Second, because behavioral modifications are difficult to achieve and sustain, the effects of programs that attempt to change long standing behaviors, such as criminality, often wear off within a short amount of time (Posavac and Carey 2003, 9). Regardless of the treatment offenders receive while under community corrections supervision, offenders tend to resort to their previous lifestyles once they have re-entered their pre-existing environments and social networks. These environments may consist of poor living conditions, poor familial relations, or affiliations with criminal networks.

Past studies on recidivism tracked offenders well beyond their community corrections period. Thus, this research often ignored mediating factors, such as the influences of social networks, and the difficulty in modifying long-term behavior, yet attributed recidivism to flaws in community corrections. Petersilia (1997) recommends that

community corrections should only be accountable for the success of program participants *while offenders are in the program*.

Finally, competing definitions of a program's success may exist. While the notion of success is often broadly and subjectively defined, the measures used to assess a program's success tend to be narrowly and objectively defined (Posavac and Carey 2003, 9). Commonly, in community corrections, the narrowly and objectively defined indicator is recidivism, with the goal of a reduction in recidivism rates. The problem with this measure is two-fold. First, exclusively using recidivism as the measure of probation and parole success ignores the multiple functions of a community corrections program (Petersilia 1997, 184). Second, a decrease in recidivism is not necessarily the sole indication of program success. A well designed outcome evaluation can minimize the problems introduced by factors outside the programs' control through the use of statistical procedures and methodological design.

The Evaluation of Efficiency

The final stage of program evaluation includes an assessment of costs. These costs are those incurred by the agency, the community, and the clients. If similar outcomes can be achieved using a more cost-effective program, then the program is deemed not efficient. The easiest way to make a judgment on program efficiency is to compare two programs attempting to affect the same outcomes with similar clients (cost effective analysis).

“Without measuring need, planning cannot be rational; without effective implementation, good outcomes cannot be expected; and without achieving good outcomes, there is no reason to worry about efficiency. A premature focus on an inappropriate evaluation question is likely to produce an evaluation with little value (Wholey 1983 as in Posavac & Carey 2003, 10).”

CONCLUSION

Reforming community corrections programs to increase their effectiveness is a complex and challenging undertaking. Community members expect these programs to protect them from criminal victimization by reducing recidivism and by imprisoning offenders who commit crimes while under supervision. However, there is only limited reliable and verifiable information to guide the selection of strategies community corrections agencies might undertake in pursuit of greater effectiveness. Police-probation partnerships and other forms of heightened surveillance are appealing, but documentation of their effectiveness is lacking. Offender characteristics greatly influence the likelihood of recidivism. However, neither the intensity of supervision nor the provision of services is able to address such predictors of recidivism as nature of offense, prior record, household composition and age. Perhaps the most important role surveillance can play is in directing offenders to treatments and community services most likely to meet their particular needs.

Before embarking on any reform of the community corrections system, it is essential to establish baseline information regarding the existing program, including a strong grasp on the types of the services currently being offered, the intensity of the supervision, the amount of discretion exercised by the probation and parole officers, the characteristics of the offenders and the rate at which they return to prison. Before reform is implemented, the willingness of the staff to embrace a new approach and the impact on other parts of the criminal justice system must also be addressed and strategies to insure cooperation must be developed. Consultation with communities claiming

success and careful examination of evaluations of new programs should guide future changes. Finally, implementation of any change should include mechanisms for independent evaluation and program revision in light of documented outcomes.

WORKS CITED

- Braga, Anthony A., et al (2001). *Reducing Gun Violence: The Boston Gun Projects' Operation Cease Fire*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Davis, Terry. Director, Dauphin County Adult Probation and Parole. Email. July 11, 2005.
- Dilulio, Jr., John J., et al (1993). *Performance Measures for the Criminal Justice System* (60-84). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Geerken, Michael and Hennessey D. Hayes. 1993. "Probation and Parole: Public Risk and the Future of Incarceration Alternatives, *Criminology*, Vol. 31, No. 4:549-564.
- Healey, Kerry Murphy (1999). *Case Management in the Criminal Justice System* (1-12). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Lagan, P. and M.A. Cunniff. 1992. *Recidivism of Felons on Probation, 1986-1989*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Maguire, Kathleen, and Ann L. Patore, eds. (1995). *Sourcebook for Criminal Justice Statistics, 1994*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Morgan, Kathryn, 1993. "Factors Influencing Probation Outcome: A Review of the Literature," *Federal Probation*, 57 (2): 23-39.
- Minnesota Anti-Violence Initiative. Online. July 5, 2005 from http://ojjdp.ncjrs.org/pubs/gun_violence/contents.html
- Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. *Profile No. 33: Operation Night Light - - Boston, MA*. Online. July 5, 2005, from http://ojjdp.ncjrs.org/pubs/gun_violence/profile33.html
- Petersilia, Joan (1998). Probation and Parole. In Michael Torny (ed), *The Handbook of Crime and Punishment* (p 563-588). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Petersilia, Joan (1997). Probation in the United States. *Crime and Justice*, 22, 149-200.
- Posavac, Emil J., and Raymond G. Carey (1989). *Program Evaluation: Methods and Case Studies* (p 2-10). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Reichert, Kent (March 2002). Police-Probation Partnerships: Boston's Operation Night Light. *Forum on Crime & Justice: Promising Approaches to Addressing Crime* (pp 1-4). University of Pennsylvania, Jerry Lee Center of Criminology.
- Seiter, Richard P. (2005). *Corrections: An Introduction* (98-129). New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.

Stewart, Bill. (August 1997). *Operation Nite Lite-How and Why it Started*. Paper presented to the Boston Graduate School for Modern Psychoanalysis, Brookline, MA.

Taxman Ph.D., Faye S. et al. (1998). *Tools of the Trade*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

Tennessee Probation and Parole Board. *Online*. June 30, 2005.
http://www2.state.tn.us/bopp/bopp_fs_subsections.htm

APPENDIX A: Key Definitions

Community Corrections: criminal sanctions that involve community supervision of offenders, use correctional and program resources available in the community, and require offenders to abide by specified conditions to remain in the community.

Law Enforcement (or Surveillance) Supervision Style: a style of supervising offenders that emphasizes monitoring and enforcing compliance with the rules of supervision and detecting violations leading to revocation and return to custody.

New-crime Violation: violations of a condition of probation that prohibits the commission of any additional crimes.

Parole: conditional release of inmates by a parole board prior to expiration of sentence.

Pre-Sentence Investigation (PSI): Information about the offender's crime and criminal background that is gathered from the time of arrest and presented to the court if the case proceeds.

Probation: a prison sentence that is suspended on the condition that the offender follow certain prescribed rules and commit no further crimes.

Technical Violation: violation of conditions of community supervision without commission of a new crime.

Treatment (or Casework) Supervision Style: a style of supervising community offenders that places emphasis on assisting the offender with problems, providing counseling, and ensuring that the offender successfully completes supervision.

APPENDIX B: History of Probation and Parole

Probation was first utilized in the United States in 1841 by a man from Boston by the name of John Augustus (1784 – 1859). In order to prevent men from being subjected to poor jail conditions, Augustus requested that the judge defer sentencing, and release charged criminals into his custody where he felt they would have a chance for rehabilitation. In addition to bailing them out, Augustus assisted men in finding work, a place of residence, investigated their history, and also reported progress to the courts. In accordance with these ideas conceived by Augustus, probation officers were, and are expected to take active interests in the lives of their probationers. For his work, Augustus became known as the “father” of probation, and many of his supervision techniques have been formalized and are now part of modern probation practices (Seiter 2005, 100-102).

Formally, probation was first recognized in the United States as an alternative to imprisonment in 1878, when Massachusetts passed the first probation statute for juveniles. In 1901, New York passed a statute authorizing the use of probation for adult felons. The term probation originated from the Latin term *probatio*, meaning “a period of proving oneself,” and can be defined as “a prison sentence that is suspended on the condition that the offender follow certain prescribed rules and commit no further crime (Seiter 2005, 101).”

Different from probation, parole is a “supervised release that follows a prison term (Petersilia 1998, 568).” Parolees release is determined by a parole board. Parole may occur through discretionary

release by the parole board through administrative or legal determination, or mandatory release in which occurs when a prisoner serves all or a portion of their sentence less any "good time." In either case, parolees are considered prisoners during the term of their parole, and parole officers have the authority to immediately incarcerate parole violators.

From its inception, probation evolved through the Rehabilitative era from a sentence known as punishment to a type of community correction. Community corrections were initiated in the 1960's as an alternative to incarceration, and exist as criminal sanctions which implement community supervision of offenders, utilize resources from correctional programs, and maintain specific guidelines for offenders to abide by (Seiter 2005, 101).

Another contributing factor to the development of community corrections was the realization that the restrictive environment of an institution did not allow correctional personnel to determine suitability of prisoners to be released back into their community. Following the deinstitutionalization period in the 1960's, community corrections came to the forefront and the following years became known as the Reintegrative Era. This is reflective of the change in the focus of community corrections which moved from offender rehabilitation to public safety. The impact of this change was significant, with the number of offenders on community supervision rising from less than 1 million in 1975 to over 4 million in 2001 (Seiter 2005, 101-102).

APPENDIX C: A Measurable Mission Statement

The cornerstone to a successful program is the development of a strong mission statement which serves as a guide for all persons and programs involved with community corrections. Dilulio (1991) recommends the mission statements of criminal justice agencies:

- include only activities that the agency can reasonably and realistically be expected to fulfill,
- be fairly narrow and consistent in scope, and
- contain activities that are unique to the justice agency, rather than include functions of other social institutions such as school and welfare agencies.

Currently, Lancaster County Adult Probation and Parole's Mission Statement contains three operational goals. These goals are:

- To provide the greatest likelihood of success for the individuals under our supervision, consistent with the safety of the community, through the use of restorative alternatives and corrective sanctions.
- To exercise authority with which we have been entrusted with equality and discretion.
- To perpetually evaluate and adjust program services to best reflect our values and achieve our mission.

Dilulio's recommendations suggest that the mission statement for Lancaster County's Adult Probation and Parole Services should be expanded or revised to include more specific, measurable goals. Tennessee's mission statement provides an example.

MISSION AND VISION

The Board of Probation and Parole has adopted the following Mission and Vision statements:

MISSION STATEMENT

Our mission is to minimize public risk and promote lawful behavior by the prudent, orderly release and community supervision of adult offenders, at the least cost to taxpayers.

VISION STATEMENT

The Board of Probation and Parole will be committed to a partnership with the citizens of Tennessee in promoting public safety and will be recognized as a leader in the area of probation and parole by:

1. Providing a continuum of services for offenders from pre-sentence investigation through the expiration of sentences.
2. Participating in cooperative efforts such as community policing, multi-purpose service centers, coordinated victim services and interagency efforts.
3. Providing employees with access to and training in the use of advanced technologies.
4. Fostering a highly professional staff that is proficient in offender management and support services.
5. Promoting effectiveness and efficiency through the use of outcome measures and innovative approaches to service delivery.

APPENDIX D: Funding

OPTION 1:

Summary of Federal Grant: 16.602 Corrections Research and Evaluation and Policy Formulation

Federal Agency: National Institute of Corrections, Federal Prisons System, Department of Justice

Objectives: To conduct, encourage, and coordinate research relating to corrections including, the causes, prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of criminal offenders. To conduct evaluation programs which study the effectiveness of new approaches, techniques, systems, programs, and devices employed to improve the corrections system.

Types of Assistance: Project Grants (Cooperative Agreements or Contracts); Provision of Specialized Services; Dissemination of Technical Information.

Uses and Use Restrictions: Provides assistance for upgrading correctional programs, services, and techniques at State and local levels. Services are available to the entire range of correctional agencies, including probation, parole, institutions, jails, and community programs.

Applicant Eligibility: States, general units of local government, public and private agencies, education institutions, organizations and individuals involved in the development, implementation or operation of correctional programs and services.

Beneficiary Eligibility: States, general units of local government involved in the development, implementation or operation of correctional programs and services.

Deadlines: Deadline for applications are given by project in agency's Annual Program Plan document.

Range of Approval/Disapproval Time: Approximately 90 days.

Formula and Matching Requirements: None

Range and Average of Financial Assistance: \$1,500 to \$200,000; \$75,000

Example of Funded Projects: Awards have been made: (1) to research and develop an information base on classification systems and methods being used in corrections; (2) to design and implement community corrections options; and (3) to conduct communication audits in State departments of corrections.

Criteria for Selecting Proposals:

(1) Relatedness of proposed project to agency's mission, mandates, and program focuses; (2) quality and feasibility of project goals and objectives, design, implementation plan, and evaluation component when applicable; (3) past experience, qualifications, and capability of applicant to perform the proposed project; and (4) appropriateness of cost to perform proposed tasks.

Website Address: <http://www.usdoj.gov>

OPTION 2:

State Agency: Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency

Agency Objectives: The Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency promotes a collaborative approach to enhance the quality of justice through guidance, leadership and resources by empowering citizens and communities and influencing state policy.

Website: <http://www.pccd.state.pa.us/pccd/site/default.asp?pccdNav=l>