

CR-Sent
9-16-88

**INTENSIVE SUPERVISION IN KENTUCKY:
PROGRAM PROCEDURES AND EVALUATION**

111554

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

Kentucky Corrections
Cabinet

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

Dr. Deborah G. Wilson, Ph.D.
School of Justice Administration
University of Louisville
Louisville, KY 40292

Accepted for publication in:

The Third Annual Correctional-Monograph

(October, 1987)

111554

ABSTRACT

Kentucky is one of a number of states which have implemented intensive supervision programs over the last five to six years. The Kentucky Intensive Supervision Program was funded by the 1984 General Assembly and received its first clients during September, 1984. The impetus for this program came from a number of factors: 1) The need for sanctions for offenders who violate the conditions of regular supervision but do not require incarceration; 2) the search for alternatives to incarceration in light of a growing institutional population; and 3) increased demands for enhanced public safety from the community.

This paper is a summary of information drawn from the annual program evaluations for the first two years of this program. During this time period 1,737 cases were supervised, 400 cases were supervised the first year and 1,337 the second year. While the number of cases supervised increased 234 percent over the two year period the percentage of cases resulting in a revocation and subsequent incarceration of the client for new convictions or violations of supervision conditions remained constant at 17 percent (15 percent for technical violations, 2 percent for new convictions). The most important factor related to this failure was client status, i.e. probationer versus parolee. Parole cases accounted for 190 of the 225 cases resulting in failure.

The failure rate of 17 percent, though higher than that for regular supervision (8 percent), is not unreasonable given that the intensive clients are "high risk" offenders and are placed in the program because they have been identified as candidates for failure or have failed under regular supervision. The findings suggest that the combination of more strict conditions, more frequent officer-client contact, and reduced officer caseload have contributed to the successful supervision of high risk offenders in the community.

Kentucky, along with a number of other states, has recently implemented an intensive supervision program within community services. This program was funded July 1, 1984 by the Kentucky General Assembly and the first offenders were placed in the program during September, 1984.

The requirements and structure of the Intensive Supervision Program in Kentucky are similar to those established in other states (see Bennett, 1987; Burkhart, 1986; Clear, Flynn and Shapiro, 1987; Cochran, Corbett and Byrne, 1986; Erwin and Bennett, 1987; Latessa, 1985 and 1987; Latessa and Vito, forthcoming; Pearson and Bibel, 1986). The goals of the program are: intermediate punishment for offenders; that is, a form of punishment that is less severe than incarceration but more restrictive than regular supervision; providing the community with minimal risks; and enhancing the rehabilitation and treatment of high-need/high-risk offenders. These goals are accomplished through the placement of high risk offenders in a community supervision program which poses minimal threats to public safety.

The impetus for intensive supervision comes from a number of needs: 1) intermediate punishment for offenders who violate the conditions of regular supervision or who do not qualify for regular supervision but do not require incarceration, 2) alternatives to incarceration in light of a growing institutional population, 3) increased community need for public safety, and 4) the increased cost of incarceration.

Intensive supervision provides an alternative to incarceration for offenders identified as too "high risk" for regular probation but who may not necessarily require incarceration. It also provides an alternative to further incarceration for potential parolees who may not qualify for regular parole but who do not require further incarceration. As an intermediate level of punishment it also provides an alternative to revocation and incarceration for

parolees and probationers who violate the conditions of their community supervision.

While probation and parole conditions have always entailed a loss of freedom, they have not been viewed by the public as restrictive enough to be a truly punitive alternative to incarceration. Intensive supervision establishes conditions which are more restrictive than traditional community supervision. These conditions are:

1. One office contact per week with the probation and parole officer.
(Regular supervision office contacts range from two per month to one per quarter.)
2. The imposition of a curfew from 10:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m. During this time the offender must be present in his/her residence. (Regular supervision does not impose a curfew.)
3. One home visit by the officer each week, two visits during curfew hours, at least one of these conducted on a weekend. (Regular supervision of maximum risk cases requires a minimum monthly home visit.)
4. A minimum of two additional contacts with the officer per month. These will include home, community, family contact and/or verification of attendance or participation in community agency programs.
5. Employment verification weekly.
6. Notification to local law enforcement agencies of offenders on intensive supervision in their jurisdiction.
7. Weekly check of arrest records.
8. Establishing a neighborhood watch by identifying and enlisting individuals' in the offenders community as monitors of the offenders' activities.

9. Continual case review to insure that the conditions and procedures are being met.
10. Special reports to the Parole Board or Court on the clients' progress.
11. Travel permits during the first four months are allowed only in special cases as approved by the District Supervisor.
12. No client shall serve on ISP longer than 12 months.

Offenders may be placed on intensive supervision in two ways. They may be directly probated or paroled to intensive supervision (new cases). They may also be moved to intensive supervision from regular probation or parole supervision (administrative movement). Administrative movement of clients may be used as an alternative to incarceration for violations of the conditions of regular supervision or a misdemeanor violation. If a client appears to be approaching revocation or preliminary violation status, the supervising officer, after review by the District Supervisor, may transfer the client to intensive supervision.

From September, 1984 to August, 1986 a total of 1,737 cases were monitored under the intensive supervision program. Because of the degree of surveillance required, the officers in the program have a maximum of twenty-five clients as their caseload.

One unique feature of this program was the implementation of an evaluation plan at its inception. Each year an evaluation was conducted. The following information was drawn from these studies. During the second year the evaluation was more comprehensive and more detailed. Therefore, comparable longitudinal information covering both years is not available in all instances. It must also be kept in mind that "cases" are not equivalent to "clients." A small percentage of clients have had more than one case during the two program years. The number, however, is relatively small and

should not prove to be problematic (N=65).

GENERAL CASELOAD CHARACTERISTICS

Of the 1,737 cases supervised over the two year period, 23 percent (400) were first year cases and 77 percent (1337) were second year cases. Therefore, from the first to the second year, the number of intensive supervision cases increased 234 percent. This increase was prompted by the expansion of the program to more sites throughout the state and a simultaneous increase in intensive supervision officers.

Place Table 1 Here

Most of the cases supervised involved whites, males, and clients who were on the average 29 years old. The average stay on ISP was 124 days. One of the most significant conditions of intensive supervision is employment. Over the two year period 72 percent of the intensive supervision clients were employed.

The first year report did not contain data on the most serious crime of conviction for the offenders placed on ISP. However, the distribution for the most serious crime of conviction for incoming cases during the second program year shows that most individuals placed on ISP had been convicted of a property crime -- 50 percent. The second largest group of offenders had a violent conviction as their most serious current conviction -- 32 percent. This was followed by drug convictions, 12 percent; sex offense convictions, 4 percent; and other convictions, 2 percent.

The violent offenders were more likely to be parolees (88 percent). Both ISP probationers and parolees were predominately property offenders (probationers -- 59 percent property offenders, parolees -- 46 percent). The greater percentage of violent offenders who were parolees reflects the tendency to incarcerate rather than probate violent offenders. The prominence

of property offenders within both the parole and probation status is a result of the higher rate of incidence of the commission of property offenses.

Place Table 2 Here

Table 2 contains data on the types of cases in the intensive supervision program during the first two program years. Overall, almost equal numbers of cases reached intensive supervision through direct placement (52 percent) as through administrative movement (48 percent). Most of the cases handled were parole cases (74 percent). Of these parole cases, 61 percent were the result of direct placement by the Parole Board. Conversely, among the probation cases, 74 percent were the result of an administrative movement.

DISTRICT VARIATION

During the second year program evaluation, the characteristics and distribution of intensive supervision cases across districts was examined. Sixty-three percent of all intensive supervision cases during the second year of the program were monitored by 4 (Louisville, Lexington, Covington, Paducah) of the 11 supervisory districts. These were the most densely populated, urban districts with the highest rate of serious crime. These districts also had the highest rate of cases directly paroled to intensive supervision and a relatively low rate of cases directly probated.

The districts varied in the rates of success/failure among ISP cases. Success is measured in three ways: successful reduction to a less restrictive level of supervision, successful release due to discharge from parole or expiration of probation and successful maintenance in the program. Failure is measured in two ways: removal due to a technical violation and removal due to a new conviction.

Tables 3 and 4 contain the success/failure rates for each district.

Place Tables 3 & 4 Here

The success/failure rates exhibit a great deal of variation across districts. Covington (27 percent), Louisville (24 percent) and Lexington (24 percent) had the highest failure rates and Whitesburg, Paducah and Monticello the lowest failure rates (2, 5 and 5 percent respectively). The relatively higher failure rate of the Covington, Louisville and Lexington districts could be attributed to the relatively high rate of serious crime in these areas. The low failure rate of districts such as Lawrenceburg and Monticello is due to their status as part of the program expansion during the second year. The greatest part of their successful cases were maintenance. This suggests that they have not supervised a full caseload long enough for cases to be transferred to regular supervision or for the cases to result in failure. During the third year of the program, these districts will probably reflect failure rates more comparable to those of other districts.

OUTCOME MEASURES FOR THE PROGRAM

Place Table 5 Here

Table 5 contains the overall success/failure rates for the second year of the program. (In this table and those that follow in this section, the total number of cases will not equal the base of 1,337. This is due to two factors: 1) missing outgoing program action data on 10 cases, 20 outgoing actions which would not reflect success or failure, i.e., death, removal by court order in 9 cases.) Based on the 1,318 cases under supervision during the evaluation year, the overall success rate was 83 percent. The greatest percentage of "successful" cases were those maintained under intensive supervision for some period of time during the evaluation year without serious violations of the supervision (55 percent). An additional 26 percent of all cases resulted in success because the level of supervision was reduced to a lower level. The final successes, 2 percent, involved cases in which the period of supervision

was successfully terminated while the offender was under intensive supervision.

The small number of cases which terminated supervision while at intensive status is to be expected given the inherent goals of this program. Supervision at the intensive level should be only one phase of the offender's time on parole or probation. Movement from intensive to regular supervision prior to release from the program should be the norm. Offenders can then show positive adjustment to the community while under less restrictive supervision conditions which are more similar to everyday life.

The percentage of cases resulting in either successful reduction of level of supervision (26 percent) or successful maintenance while under intensive supervision (55 percent) are indicative of cases which exhibited either enough prosocial behavior to be supervised at a less restrictive level or to avoid reincarceration. The enhanced conditions of intensive supervision provided an option for high risk inmates to be supervised in the community. The overall success rate of 83 percent is evidence of the effectiveness of this program.

The 26 percent of these cases which resulted in a reduction of the level of supervision (intensive to regular) also suggests that offenders are not being retained on intensive supervision to the end of their sentence. Instead, it suggests that clients are in fact being transferred to regular status when their level of risk diminishes. Therefore, intensive supervision is being used as a "temporary status" until risk diminishes

The 17 percent failure rate is low given the numbers of conditions imposed on offenders under intensive supervision and the level of risk these inmates pose in relation to public safety. The rate of failure due to technical violations (15 percent) is tolerable. In fact, given the number of restrictive conditions, it was expected to be higher. The low rate of extreme

failure (2 percent) is indicative of the success of this program. Only 2 percent of the cases involving the high risk offenders in this program resulted in convictions for criminal activity while under supervision.

The 17 percent failure rate for ISP cases is higher than that for cases under regular supervision. In Fiscal Year 1985-86 approximately 13,043 felony probation and parole cases were supervised. Approximately 8 percent of the cases resulted in a revocation and subsequent incarceration of the client. Three percent of the cases resulted in incarceration for new convictions and 5 percent for technical violations. While the rate for ISP is higher (17 versus 8 percent) it is not unexpected given the higher risk of ISP clients and the increased supervision of these clients.

The success or failure rate may be affected by two program variables: 1) type of supervision - probation or parole and 2) type of entry into the program - new cases (direct placement into the program by an agent or agency external to the Corrections Cabinet, i.e., Parole Board, judge) or administrative movement (placement into the program at the discretion of agents within the Department of Community Services.)

Place Table 6 Here

Table 6 compares the success/failure rates of probation and parole cases. Overall, the success rates for both forms of supervision are high, 80 percent for parole and 91 percent for probation. The higher success rates for probationers are predictable. Offenders placed on probation are generally less serious, lower risk offenders than those who are incarcerated and eventually paroled.

The higher rate of failure for parolees (20 percent vs. 9 percent for probationers) is accounted for by the higher rate of technical violations among parolees. Parolees are likely to be serious, repeat offenders. They

are more prone to a history of community adjustment problems and problems living within social parameters. Therefore, the likelihood of their revocation due to a technical violation is greater than that for probationers. Overall, the program within both probation and parole can be effective given the high success rates.

The success or failure of offenders under intensive supervision varied by type of entry into the program; new cases vs. administrative transfer. Table 7 contains a comparison of the success/failure rates by program entry. Cases which entered as new cases and those which were the result of an administrative movement exhibited comparable success rates (New Cases - 84 percent, Administrative Movement - 82 percent). The most apparent difference seemed to be in the type of success criteria. As expected, more cases resulted in a reduction to regular supervision when the form of entry was a new case (34 percent) than those cases which were upgraded to intensive due to an administrative decision (19 percent). This, however, is expected. New cases are placed on intensive supervision at the onset of an individual's parole or probationary period. Those offenders transferred from regular to intensive supervision were moved because they exhibited some indication of difficulties under regular supervision that meant they posed a risk of violation of the conditions of probation. Fewer of these offenders are likely to be returned to regular supervision during a year than the new cases clients. Administrative movement cases are more likely to be retained in the successful maintenance category.

Place Table 7 Here

When the failures are categorized, it would appear that the rate of failure is not related to the type of entry. Cases resulting from both types of entry were more likely to fail due to a technical violation (New Cases - 14

percent, Administrative Movement - 15 percent) than a new conviction (New Cases - 2 percent, Administrative Movement - 3 percent).

The types of failures and successes for the two modes of entry into supervision suggest that the increased level of supervision is being applied in an effective fashion. Those who enter as an administrative movement are not more likely to fail. They are, however, less likely to be returned to regular supervision as it should be since they have shown signs of pending failure under regular probation or parole.

Outcome for Type of Supervision
By Type of Program Entry

To further assess the success/failure rates of the intensive supervision program, the success/failure rates for each type of entry for parole status were compared to those for probation status. Table 8 contains the results.

Place Table 8 Here.

This table suggests that the status of the offender (probationer, parolee) and the inherent differences between offenders in these types of cases determines success or failure more than the type of entry to ISP (new case, administrative movement). Both new cases and administrative movement parole cases had a success rate in the mid-70 percent range. Both new cases and administrative movement probation cases had a success rate of 91 percent.

Within the probation and parole cases, the earlier tendency for a higher rate of successful return for new cases, especially for probationers is also evident. However, these data suggest that the difference in percentage of cases successfully maintained and percentage of cases successfully reduced is due more to the type of status, probation or parole, than type of entry. Similarly, the higher failure rate of parolees is due to their status and their rate of technical violation as a parolee rather than whether they were

paroled directly into the program or transferred by administrative decision.

The conclusions that can be drawn from this finding are multiple.

1. Overall, the rate of success for this program exceeds the rate of failure.
2. The failures are primarily among parolees who commit technical violations.
3. Whether the case resulted from a direct placement or an administrative movement is less determinant of success than whether the individual was placed on parole or probation.
4. The data also suggest that the Parole Board, judges, and community service personnel are equally accurate in their predictions of the risk posed by these offenders.
5. It would appear that the probation and parole officers are extremely effective in their placement and monitoring of the parolees who reach intensive supervision through administrative movement. The parolees moved from regular to intensive supervision are the highest risk offenders. Their incarceration is a reflection of their inability to be placed initially on community supervision. Their movement from regular to intensive supervision is an added risk factor. Comparable success/failure rates for parolees in the two entry categories is the strongest evidence for the utility of this program.

The variation in rates is then not due to who or what agency is making the determination for placement but in the risk level associated with parolees vs. probationers. The program has been successful in achieving its goal of reintegration of high risk offenders into the community while still meeting the need for public safety in that out of a total of 1,318 cases only 34 cases resulted in new felony conviction while on ISP. Additionally, this program

shows evidence that it is a viable alternative to incarceration. When cases result in failure it is due to a violation of the conditions of parole rather than a new conviction.

OUTCOME COMPARISON: YEAR 1 TO YEAR 2

The program outcomes for year 1 are compared to year 2 in Table 9.

Place Table 9 Here

Table 9 shows that the overall success rate for ISP during the second year of the program is equivalent to that of the first year. Even the distribution for types of successes and failures is comparable. This is an unexpected finding. The usual expectation is that the number of program failures during the second year will increase as the program expands to more clients. This finding means that the quality of identification and supervision of clients has been retained in the second year even with the accompanying program expansion which increased the numbers of clients supervised by more than 200 percent.

Implications and Conclusions

During the second year of the Intensive Supervision Program, the high quality of supervision instituted during the start-up year was maintained. This quality was sustained even with more than a 200 percent increase in annual ISP caseload and an expansion of ISP to additional supervisory districts. During the second year the major changes found in comparison to year one were an increase in the number of administrative movement cases and a decrease in the rate of employment among ISP clients.

The Intensive Supervision Program has two major objectives: 1) public safety through enhanced supervision of high risk offenders and 2) an alternative to reincarceration for offenders who violate some condition of regular supervision. The large number of cases supervised during the second

year (1,337) and the corresponding small number of new felony convictions for offenders on ISP (34) is evidence that ISP is providing public safety. The large number of administrative movement cases (649) are evidence of the viability of ISP as an alternative to revocation and reincarceration for offenders who violate conditions of regular parole supervision.

The attainment of these two objectives results in a number of benefits to the Commonwealth. One of these benefits is a savings in tax dollars. The average cost to incarcerate a felon in the State of Kentucky was approximately \$32.00 per day for Fiscal Year 85-86. The average cost of supervision for an ISP client was \$6.37 per day. If only those felons placed on ISP in lieu of revocation and reincarceration, administrative movement cases, are used to tabulate the savings, the cost benefits of ISP are obvious. Three-hundred and seventy-six parolees were placed on ISP by administrative movement. The average stay was 118 days. This is 44,368 supervisory days. This cost the Commonwealth \$282,642.16 ($44,368 \times \6.37). Had these parolees been reincarcerated for an average of 118 days the cost would have been \$1,419,776.00 ($44,368 \times \32.00). In addition to the parolees, 273 probationers were transferred to ISP in lieu of reincarceration. They served an average of 108 days on ISP. This is 29,484 supervisory days. This cost \$187,813.08 ($29,484 \times \6.37). Had these offenders been reincarcerated for an average of 108 days the cost would have been \$943,488.00 ($29,484 \times \32.00).

The administrative movement cases were supervised at a cost of \$470,437.24. Had these offenders been reincarcerated the cost would have been \$2,363,264.00. The Intensive Supervision Program through its monitoring of administrative movement cases alone, saved the Commonwealth \$1,892,826.80. In the future, cases directly placed on ISP should grow as judges become more familiar with the program. Similarly, the number of offenders paroled

directly to the program should increase as the Parole Board takes increased advantage of this option.

The success of this program is due to a number of factors. Primary among these factors is the clear specification of program goals; a careful articulation of these goals into clear objectives, policies and procedures; a careful monitoring of this program by community services management; and the commitment of field staff and field supervisory staff to the goals of this program.

During the third year the program will continue to be monitored and improved, if necessary. An identification of some characteristics which predict success or failure under ISP supervision is planned as a means to assist field staff. The greater detail of the second year program evaluation will be replicated in the third year report to allow for comparability in program status evaluation.

Intensive Supervision has proven to be a viable alternative within corrections. As the public's desire for enhanced safety and the need for alternatives to incarceration increase, ISP will increase in its value and utility as a correctional option.

REFERENCES

- BENNETT, L.A. (1987). A Reassessment of Intensive Service Probation. In B.R. McCarthy (Ed.) Intermediate Punishments: Intensive Supervision, Home Confinement and Electronic Surveillance (pp. 113-134). Monsey, NY: Willow Tree.
- BURKHARDT, W.R. (1986). Intensive Probation Supervision: An Agenda for Research and Evaluation. Federal Probation, 50 (2), 75-77.
- BRYNE, J.M. (1986). The Control Controversy: A Preliminary Examination of Intensive Probation Supervision Programs in the United States. Federal Probation, 50 (2), 4-16.
- CLEAR, T.R., FLYNN, S., and SHAPIRO, C. (1987). Intensive Supervision in Probation: A Comparison of Three Projects. In B.R. McCarthy (Ed.) Intermediate Punishments: Intensive Supervision, Home Confinement and Electronic Surveillance (pp. 31-50). Monsey, NY: Willow Tree.
- COCHRAN, D., CORBETT, R.P., & BYRNE, J.M. (1986). Intensive Probation Supervision in Massachusetts: A Case Study in Change. Federal Probation, 50 (2), 32-41.
- ERWIN, B.S., & BENNETT, L.A. (1987). New Dimensions in Probation: Georgia's Experience with Intensive Probation Supervision (IPS). Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- LATESSA, E.J. (1987). The Effectiveness of Intensive Supervision with High Risk Probationers. In B.R. McCarthy (Ed.) Intermediate Punishments: Intensive Supervision, Home Confinement and Electronic Surveillance (pp. 99-112). Monsey, NY: Willow Tree.
- LATESSA, E.J. and VITO, G.F. (forthcoming). The Effects of Intensive Supervision on Shock Probationers. Journal of Criminal Justice.

TABLE 1
CHARACTERISTICS OF INDIVIDUALS IN CASES SUPERVISED

White	-	67%
Male	-	93%
Age, \bar{x}	-	29

TABLE 2
TYPE OF CASE BY PLACEMENT

	PROBATION	PAROLE	TOTAL
New Cases	122	693	815
Administrative Movement	<u>283</u>	<u>447</u>	<u>730</u>
TOTAL	405	1140	1545

* This table does not include cases carried over from the first to the second year. This was done to avoid duplication of cases.

TABLE 3
 DETAILED SUCCESS/FAILURE BY DISTRICT

<u>District</u>	<u>Success</u>			<u>Failure</u>	
	<u>Successful Reduction</u>	<u>Successful Release</u>	<u>Successful Maintenance</u>	<u>Technical Violation</u>	<u>New Conviction</u>
Louisville	29%	5%	20%	22%	2%
Lexington	32%	1%	23%	20%	4%
Paducah	34%	15%	46%	5%	--
Newport/Covington	37%	3%	33%	23%	4%
Mt. Sterling	19%	--	66%	23%	4%
Whitesburg	13%	3%	82%	2%	--
Elizabethtown	22%	4%	62%	8%	4%
Hopkinsville	23%	--	69%	5%	3%
Lawrenceburg	2%	2%	86%	10%	--
Monticello	8%	5%	82%	5%	--
Bowling Green	46%	2%	35%	2%	15%
<hr/>					
TOTAL	26%	2%	55%	15%	2%
<hr/>					

TABLE 4
SUMMARIZED SUCCESS/FAILURE RATES BY DISTRICT

<u>District</u>	<u>Success</u>	<u>Failure</u>
Louisville	76%	24%
Lexington	76%	24%
Paducah	95%	5%
Newport/Covington	73%	27%
Mt. Sterling	85%	15%
Whitesburg	98%	2%
Elizabethtown	88%	12%
Hopkinsville	92%	8%
Lawrenceburg	90%	10%
Monticello	95%	5%
Bowling Green	83%	17%
<hr/>		
TOTAL	83%	17%
<hr/>		

TABLE 5
 DISTRIBUTION OF TYPES OF SUCCESSES
 AND FAILURES FOR INTENSIVE SUPERVISION CASES
 SEPTEMBER 1, 1985 TO AUGUST 31, 1986

<u>Success</u>		
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Successful Release	21	2%
Successful Reduction	348	26%
<u>Successful Maintenance</u>	<u>724</u>	<u>55%</u>
Total Success	1093	83%

<u>Failure</u>		
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Technical Violation	191	15%
<u>New Conviction</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>2%</u>
Total Failure	225	17%
TOTAL CASES	1318	100%

TABLE 6
 OUTCOME BY OFFENDER STATUS
 SUCCESS AND FAILURE RATES BY TYPE
 OF SUPERVISION FOR CASES ACTIVE
 SEPTEMBER 1, 1985 TO AUGUST 31, 1986

	Type of Supervision			
	<u>Parole</u>		<u>Probation</u>	
<u>SUCCESS</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Successful Release	15	2%	6	2%
Successful Reduction	256	27%	92	25%
<u>Successful Maintenance</u>	<u>488</u>	<u>51%</u>	<u>236</u>	<u>64%</u>
Total Success	774	80%	334	91%
 <u>FAILURE</u>				
Technical Violation	167	18%	24	6%
<u>New Conviction</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>2%</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>3%</u>
Total Failure	190	20%	133	9%
TOTAL CASES	949	100%	369	100%

TABLE 7
 SUCCESS AND FAILURE RATES BY
 TYPE OF PROGRAM ENTRY FOR CASES ACTIVE
 SEPTEMBER 1, 1985 TO AUGUST 31, 1986

	Type of Entry			
	<u>New Case</u>		<u>Administrative Movement</u>	
<u>SUCCESS</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Successful Release	4	1%	17	3%
Successful Reduction	231	34%	122	19%
<u>Successful Maintenance</u>	<u>332</u>	<u>49%</u>	<u>387</u>	<u>60%</u>
Total Success	567	84%	526	82%
 <u>FAILURE</u>				
Technical Violation	97	14%	94	15%
<u>New Conviction</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>2%</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>3%</u>
Total Failure	111	16%	114	18%
TOTAL CASES	678	100%	640	100%

TABLE 8
 TYPE OF SUCCESS/FAILURE BY
 TYPE OF CASE WITHIN SUPERVISION
 STATUS FOR CASES ACTIVE
 SEPTEMBER 1, 1985 TO AUGUST 31, 1986

	<u>Parole</u>				<u>Probation</u>			
	<u>New Cases</u>		<u>Administrative Movement</u>		<u>New Cases</u>		<u>Administrative Movement</u>	
<u>SUCCESS</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Successful Release	3	0.5%	12	3%	0	-	6	2%
Successful Reduction	182	32%	74	20%	45	46%	47	18%
<u>Successful Maintenance</u>	<u>289</u>	<u>50%</u>	<u>196</u>	<u>53%</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>45%</u>	<u>185</u>	<u>70%</u>
Total Successes	474	73%	282	76%	89	91%	238	91%
 <u>FAILURES</u>								
Technical Violations	91	16%	76	20%	5	5%	19	7%
<u>New Conviction</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>2%</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>4%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4%</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>3%</u>
Total Failures	101	18%	89	24%	9	9%	26	10%
TOTAL CASES	575	100%	371	100%	98	100%	264	100%

TABLE 9
 SUCCESS/FAILURE COMPARED, YEAR 1 TO YEAR 2
 FOR INCOMING CASES DURING PROGRAM YEAR

	<u>1985</u>		<u>1986</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>Success</u>				
Successful Reduction	97	24%	348	26%
Successful Release	1	---*	21	2%
Successful Maintenance	<u>234</u>	<u>59%</u>	<u>724</u>	<u>55%</u>
TOTAL	332	83%	1093	83%
<u>Failure</u>				
Technical Violation	65	16%	191	15%
New Conviction	<u>3</u>	<u>1%</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>2%</u>
TOTAL	68	17%	225	17%
TOTAL CASES	400		1318	

*Less than .50%

BIOGRAPHY

Deborah G. Wilson received her Ph.D. in Sociology from Purdue University in 1980. Dr. Wilson served on the faculty of Auburn University and is currently an Associate Professor in the School of Justice Administration at the University of Louisville. Dr. Wilson is the co-author of a book, The American Juvenile Justice System as well as a number of published articles on topics related to corrections. Dr. Wilson is a member of a number professional organizations including the American Correctional Association and Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences. She is also currently working as a consultant for the Kentucky State Corrections Cabinet and is Chair of the County Judge Executives' Corrections Advisory Committee. . .