



The National Association of Criminal Justice Planners

MANAGING FELONS IN THE COMMUNITY

An Administrative Profile of Probation

125030

MANAGING FELONS IN THE COMMUNITY

An Administrative Profile of Probation

by

Mark A. Cunniff

and

Ilene R. Bergsmann

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNERS
April, 1990

This publication is made possible under grant award 87BJCX005 from the Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice, to the National Association of Criminal Justice Planners. Viewpoints expressed herein do not necessarily reflect those of BJS or the Department of Justice.

125030

**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

Public Domain/BJJ

U.S. Department of Justice

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	1
I. INTRODUCTION	3
NACJP Research--The Felony Sentencing Studies	4
NACJP Research--The Probation Studies	6
II. SURVEY FINDINGS	9
A. Structure of Probation Agencies	9
Jurisdictional Placement	9
Types of Supervision	10
Staffing	11
Probation Officers	13
Staff Assignments	14
Volunteers	15
Employment and Recruitment	15
Arrest Powers	17
Staff Training	18
Unions	19
Probation Officer Salaries	19
B. Resources and Revenues	21
Personnel Expenditures	21
Fringe Benefits	22
Contracts	22
Other Budget Expenditures	23
Funding Sources	23
Fee Collections	24
Collections	25
Fee Accounting	26
Payment Priority	26
C. Probation Workload	29
Changes in Caseload	29
Probation Transfers	30
Matching Resources to Caseload	31
Supervision Levels	32
Frequency of Contact	32
Ratio of Probationers to Probation Officers	33
Distribution of Probationers	34
Treatment Services and Supervision Options	35
Treatment Programs	37
Service Delivery	37
D. Probationer Discipline	39
Absconding	39
Rearrests	40
Technical Violations	40
Disciplinary Hearings	41
Disciplinary Hearing Outcomes	41
E. Conclusion	43
REFERENCES	45

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
Table 1: Percent Distribution of Persons Who Received Probation Sentences, by Conviction Offense, 1986.....	5
Table 2: Percent of Persons Convicted of a Felony Who Were Sentenced to Probation, by Conviction Offense for 1983, 1985, and 1986.....	6
Table 3: Percent of Probation Agencies Responsible for Various Supervision Services.....	11
Table 4: Distribution of Probation Agency Staff by Function.....	12
Table 5: Distribution of Line Probation Officers by Task.....	14
Table 6: Average Line Probation Officer Salaries and Fringe Rates.....	20
Table 7: Average Probation Agency Budget by Category.....	21
Table 8: Percent of Probation Agencies Responsible for Collecting Specific Fees.....	25
Table 9: Average Amount of Money Collected, by Type of Fee.....	26
Table 10: Frequency of Contact with Probationers, by Supervision Level.....	33
Table 11: Preferred Ratios of Probationers to Probation Officers.....	34
Table 12: Distribution of Probationers Among Supervision Levels.....	34
Table 13: Percent of Agencies Offering Enhanced Supervision Programs.....	36
Table 14: Percent of Agencies Offering Treatment Services.....	37
Table 15: Methods of Delivery for Enhanced Supervision Programs.....	38
Table 16: Method of Delivery for Enhanced Treatment Programs..	38

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This Report represents an important first step in presenting a snapshot of how urban probation departments operate. With this survey information, probation administrators, judges and the public can understand the role of probation as a sanction and how it can be used to advance the interests of the community and the offenders under supervision.

Several probation administrators gave support to this project by reviewing the draft questionnaire and providing much appreciated assistance during the data collection and analysis stages. These include Donald Atkinson, executive assistant director of the Maryland Division of Probation and Parole; Malcolm McDonald, director of program services for the Texas Adult Probation Commission; John O'Sullivan, administrative services manager in Hennepin County's Bureau of Community Corrections; and Gerard Williams, assistant chief probation officer in San Diego.

The authors also wish to acknowledge the support of the staff of the Bureau of Justice Statistics, in particular, NACJP project monitor Carla Gaskins and Acting Director Joseph M. Bessette. Thanks also goes to Robyn Cohen, NACJP research assistant, for her assistance in compiling the data and to Robert Cushman, consultant to the NACJP and Mary Shilton, Assistant Director of the NACJP for their review of the report.

The National Association of Criminal Justice Planners (NACJP) would like to thank all of the many individuals who generously contributed their time and effort in completing the questionnaires on which this Report is based. We wish to acknowledge our appreciation and thanks to the following departments and individuals without whom this report could not have been written.

<u>Agency</u>	<u>Probation Director</u>	<u>Lead Person Completing Survey</u>
Baltimore City	Donald Atkinson, Acting	Julia Magruder-Mosby
Baltimore County	Donald Atkinson, Acting	Julia Magruder-Mosby
Bexar County	L. Caesar Garcia	Joe D. Pope
Cook County	John Robinson	Robin Leaf
Dade County	John H. Nichols	John H. Nichols
Dallas County	Lewis Bramblett	Roy H. Williams
Denver	Jack Lutes	Dennis A. Maes
Erie County	Mark J. Mogavero	Nicholas Ottaviani
Franklin County	Thomas B. Studebaker	Margaret Miller
Harris County	Larance Coleman	Thomas B. Studebaker
		Gerald R. Wheeler
Hennepin County	Michael Cunniff	David Gair
		Kathleen Murdock
		John O'Sullivan
Honolulu	Nathan Kim	Ronald Hajime
King County	James Crabb	James Crabb
Jefferson County	Stephen Seitz, Acting	Hazel M. Combs
		Stephen E. Seitz
Los Angeles County	Barry J. Nidorf	Robert Polakow
Maricopa County	Norman L. Helber	Mary Herzik
Milwaukee County	Allan Kasprzak	Adelaide B. Krahn
Monroe County	Robert Dunning	Margaret Henderson
Nassau County	Robert J. Bennett	William Botwinik
New York City	Kevin Smyley	Kenneth Gallagher
		Edith Lawrence
Oklahoma County	Justin Jones	Carol Robinson
Orange County	Michael Schumacher	Susan R. Collins
Philadelphia	Robert L. Williams, Jr.	Jacquelyn Manns Smalley
San Bernardino Co.	Claude T. Mangrun, Acting	Dale T. Poulsen
		Kathy Hopkins
San Diego County	Cecil Steppe	Mary V. Ramirez
San Francisco	Arlene Sauser	Katherine Hile
Santa Clara County	Pedro R. Silva	T. Job
		Robert A. Feldman
St. Louis City	Steve German	Sheila Putnam
St. Louis County	Steve German	Sheila Putnam
Suffolk County	William P. Benjamin	James J. Golbin
Ventura County	William Forden	Calvin C. Remington

I. INTRODUCTION

The purposes of this report are to: 1) describe the function of probation in order to educate the criminal justice community about probation; 2) promote dialogue among probation agencies; and 3) stimulate professional discussion within such groups as the American Probation and Parole Association about how probation can best document its role and needs. Probation agencies are becoming a larger and more important part of the criminal justice system. The workload of the nation's probation agencies grew rapidly during the 1980's. During a recent six year period, the total adult population that they serve has grown by one million clients, from 1.24 million in 1981 to 2.24 million in 1987.¹ This growth, represents an 81% increase in the number of probationers under supervision.

Probation agencies appear to be enduring even higher growth rates than other criminal justice agencies. For example, the number of persons imprisoned, grew from 369,900 in 1981 to 562,600 in 1987, which represents a 52% increase.² There is little statistical information about the nature of this increase in probation workload. There has been considerable activity within probation agencies to address the workload spiral, but there is little quantifiable data which describes how individual departments have responded to the increased demands for services. There is also little national data which documents the implementation of new initiatives within probation. Data are scarce on the number of probationers placed within these new programs. For example, many probation agencies have implemented risk and needs assessment scales³. However, there is no national data which shows the distribution of probationers assigned to the various supervision levels administered by probation agencies which are using these scales.

Information which describes the resources required to implement these initiatives is also unavailable. Programs such as restitution and community service require additional agency

¹Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin (1988). Probation and Parole 1987. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice. Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics (1983). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, page 544.

²Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin (1988). Prisoners in 1987. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.

³Much of this work was facilitated through the National Institute of Corrections, which has sponsored the transfer of the Wisconsin model throughout the country.

resources if they are to operate properly. Intensive supervision, electronic monitoring and house arrest also require staffing resources over and above those committed to traditional methods of supervising probationers. We know very little about how these new services are being financially supported.

Although probation is an integral part of the criminal justice system, many members of the criminal justice community lack a clear understanding of basic facets of probation agencies such as how departments are organized, the prevalence of various program components, and the frequency of disciplinary hearings and their outcomes.

NACJP Research--The Felony Sentencing Studies

This report is designed to provide basic descriptive information about probation agencies, the people they supervise and the services they provide. This report is a by-product of earlier research. For the past six years, the National Association of Criminal Justice Planners (NACJP) has been conducting a series of studies to provide a national picture of felony sentencing outcomes. The results of these studies show that probation is the most prevalent sanction imposed on persons convicted of a felony offense. Fifty-two percent (52%) of all felony sentences involve probation, and nearly half of these probation sentences include sentences to the local jail.⁴ Therefore, these studies provide some insights into one component of probation's workload -- the felony probationer.

Through these sentencing studies, the NACJP also collects data on conviction offense so that the rate at which probation is granted within different offense categories can be computed. Not surprisingly, probation is rarely used with such violent offenses as homicide (8%), rape (32%) and robbery (26%). Probation is more frequently relied upon for non-violent offenses such as burglary (44%), larceny (54%) and drug trafficking (62%).

The sentencing data also provide the percent distribution of persons sentenced to probation by their conviction offense. As displayed in Table 1, the majority of felons placed on probation were convicted of property or public order offenses. Only 12% of all persons sentenced to probation in 1986 were convicted of a violent offense (homicide, rape, robbery and aggravated assault).

⁴Cunniff, M. (1988). The scales of justice: Sentencing outcomes in 39 felony courts, 1986, Washington, D.C.: National Association of Criminal Justice Planners.

Table 1
Percent Distribution of Persons who Received Probation Sentences, by Conviction Offense, 1986.

Total	100%
Homicide	b
Rape	2%
Robbery	5%
Aggravated Assault	5%
Burglary	13%
Larceny	16%
Drug Trafficking	19%
Other Felony	40%

b=less than .5%

The NACJP has conducted felony sentencing studies for 1983, 1985 and 1986. Although each of these studies has included a different number of jurisdictions, each study has employed the same methodology. For the first time, these cross-jurisdictional studies provide a national description of judicial decision-making in felony sentencing.

Table 2 reveals little change in the rate at which probation was granted for major offenses between 1983 and 1986.⁵ In 1983, for example, 45% of the persons convicted of burglary received probation; in 1986, the probation rate was 44%.

However, one offense category, drug trafficking, does show a change. The probation rate for drug traffickers fell from 70% in 1983 to 62% in 1986. This decline may reflect society's growing concern about drug abuse. However, probation still remains the dominant sanction imposed on drug traffickers despite the decline in its use over the three year period.

⁵The change in the use of probation with homicide reflects a change in the definition of homicide between the 1983-1985 and 1986 studies. In 1986, negligent and involuntary manslaughter were removed from the homicide category.

Table 2

Percent of Persons convicted of a Felony Who Were Sentenced to Probation, by Conviction Offense for 1983, 1985, and 1986

	<u>1983</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1986</u>
Homicide	14%	14%	8%
Rape	28%	33%	32%
Robbery	29%	26%	26%
Aggravated Assault	50%	50%	47%
Burglary	45%	44%	44%
Larceny	55%	57%	54%
Drug Trafficking	70%	66%	62%
Other Felony	NA	NA	62%

These sentencing studies also provide the capability to conduct cohort follow-up studies on offenders who receive probation. One such study was conducted with the 1983 sentences; another is underway with the 1986 sentences. These studies permit the examination of the types of conditions imposed, compliance with these conditions and the disciplinary problems posed by probationers.

NACJP Research--Probation Studies

In 1983, the NACJP conducted an initial study of probation.⁶ The 1983 probationer study was performed without the benefit of profile information on participating agencies. Also, the 1983 data did not include information about use of supervision levels and the handling of absconders.

The most current effort, The Probation Agency Profile Report, was initiated to learn more about probation agencies, to better understand how probation departments handle these and other issues. The NACJP initially developed a list of questions to be completed by agencies participating in its current probationer follow-up study. The lack of statistical information on probation agencies led to the decision to add budget and staffing questions to the study. Because the American Probation and Parole Association was interested in promoting the collection of information on probation, representatives from that group were invited to make suggestions on the survey contents and to review the draft survey instrument and the data analysis. Thus, a separate effort emerged--a project to collect agency profile information.

⁶ Cunniff, Mark A. (1986) A Sentencing Postscript: Felony Probationers Under Supervision in the Community, Washington, D.C.: National Association of Criminal Justice Planners.

The Probation Agency Survey was limited to those counties which were among the top 75 most populous counties that participated in the NACJP 1986 felony sentencing outcomes study. Thirty-two (32) counties met these selection criteria.⁷ The NACJP then identified the agency that was responsible for supervising convicted felons in each of these counties. The time period for the survey was fiscal/calendar year 1988,⁸ although some of the data overlaps with fiscal year 1989.

Because these agencies were not randomly selected for this study, their profile cannot be said to be statistically representative of all probation agencies. Nonetheless, the findings presented here do provide useful insights about probation agencies that operate in large urban and suburban jurisdictions.

The twin purposes of the survey, therefore, are to:

- Describe what large felony caseload probation departments look like, that is, their composition, resources, workload, programs and services, and disciplinary procedures; and
- Provide operational information to enable more effective interpretation of the 1986 felony probationer data presented in : A Sentencing Postscript, Felony Probationers Under Supervision in the Community.

⁷There were two exceptions to the selection criteria. Although St. Louis City is not among the top 75 counties, it is serviced by the same state probation district office that services St. Louis County. Thus, it was included in the study. Denver, which is also not among the top 75 counties, was included because of its participation in other sentencing studies and expressed interest in being included in the current study.

These 32 counties are served by 30 probation agencies or state district offices. Two of the selected counties (New York and Kings Counties) are part of the City of New York and come under the same probation agency. In Missouri, probation is a state function which uses sub-state districts in the delivery of its services. The City of St. Louis (which is also a county) and the County of St. Louis are served by the same district.

⁸Agencies were requested to provide whichever data was most easily retrievable. For some it was calendar year data; for others, it was fiscal year data.

II. SURVEY FINDINGS

A. Structure of Probation Agencies

Probation agencies are located within one of three organizational structures -- executive branch, judicial branch or a combination of the two. While this report focuses on duties of agencies that are charged with supervising convicted felons, most probation agencies supervise a mix of clients, including sentenced and presentenced populations, adults and juveniles, felons and misdemeanants. The analysis of survey findings begins by examining how probation agencies are organized and the types of supervision responsibilities that they have.

Jurisdictional Placement

Like other criminal justice agencies, probation agencies operate at varied levels and branches within government. Of the 30 agencies included in this study, 67% are a part of local government⁹, 33% are a part of state government. Seventeen (57%) are located within the executive branch, 40% in the judiciary, and 3% in an "other" arrangement.¹⁰ State based agencies are more likely to be part of the executive branch of government (80%) than locally based agencies, where only 45% are part of the executive branch of government.

The client mix in supervision workload varies by whether the agency is state or locally based. Locally based agencies are more likely to administer both adult and juvenile probation than are state based agencies. State based agencies tend to work only with adults and are usually responsible for parole as well. Local departments also are more likely to supervise pretrial releasees and diversion cases than state based agencies. On the other hand, the responsibility for supervising misdemeanants is just as likely to reside with a local or state agency.

Nearly all of the probation offices surveyed serve felony probationers within a single county. This is the case even if the agency is state based. State agencies use regional or district offices in the delivery of their services, which for large counties tend to follow single county boundaries. The only offices surveyed

⁹The term "local" is used to designate both city and county agencies, e.g., Baltimore County, New York City, that have prescribed geographic boundaries.

¹⁰The probation agency in Hennepin County constitutes this "other" category. The Hennepin County probation agency receives policy guidance from a joint board composed of four judges and four county commissioners, but is funded by the county board.

that serve a multi-county area are under state control: Baltimore County, Oklahoma County and St. Louis City/County.¹¹

Types of Supervision

Table 3 shows the types of supervision that probation agencies provide to the adult and juvenile clients. Although responsibility for supervising felony probationers was a prerequisite for inclusion in this study, many of the agencies have responsibilities that transcend adult felony probationers. For example, pretrial services may be administered by the probation agency. In addition, the probation agency can supervise a range of clients. For example, the agency supervising sentenced felons may also be responsible for supervising juvenile probationers as well. The overwhelming majority of departments serve both adult felony and misdemeanant clients (87%).

Maricopa County is the only participating agency that supervises only felony probationers. Caseloads in King County and Honolulu are similar to Maricopa County that over 95% of all clients are adult felons.

In addition to adult probation, one-third of the responding agencies provide pretrial and preadjudication supervision. Half of the responding agencies provide other adult services, primarily parole. Other adult programs include such services as conditional release in Nassau County.

Just under half of the agencies supervise juveniles (43%). One-third provide preadjudication supervision services to juveniles, 13% offer juvenile pretrial programs and 23% engage in other juvenile programs, such as parole and aftercare. In Suffolk County, probation manages juvenile detention. In California, all of the responding probation agencies, except San Francisco, operate pretrial juvenile detention facilities and post-adjudication juvenile camps.

¹¹The probation office serving Baltimore County includes several surrounding counties. Oklahoma County, on the other hand, has two offices: one operates only in Oklahoma County, the second serves a different area of the county and a neighboring county as well. As noted earlier, St. Louis City and St. Louis County are served by a single district probation office. While New York City includes five counties, it is nonetheless a single jurisdiction.

Table 3

Percent of Probation Agencies Responsible
for Various Supervision Services*

<u>Type of Supervision</u>	<u>Adult</u>	<u>Juvenile</u>
Probation Supervision	100%	43%
Preadjudication Supervision	30	30
Pretrial Release Supervision	33	13
Other	50	23

*N = 30

Staffing

Given the variety in agency supervisory responsibilities, it is useful to develop a methodology that permits comparisons across agencies. To achieve such a common denominator, the analysis focuses on two key indicators: the percent of agency staff that are line probation officers who supervise clients and the percent of probation officers who are assigned to supervise convicted felons.

The first step in understanding how probation agencies meet the multiplicity of tasks that they must perform is to describe their staffing configuration, i.e., probation officers, supervisors and support staff. The purpose of such an exercise is to determine the percentage share of total staff who are probation officers. These staff are seen as the "key" employees responsible for meeting probation's primary objective of client supervision. Most other probation staff generally can be viewed as support staff in the delivery of agency services,¹² including the operation of secure facilities.

Just over half of the typical probation agency's staffing complement (51%) is composed of probation officers. There is, however, substantial variation among the California agencies. Five of the six California counties have significantly lower percentages for staff who are probation officers, ranging from 25% in San Bernardino to 40% in Ventura. The principal reason for this is due to the fact that these five counties operate secure adult and/or juvenile facilities.¹³

¹²The main caveat to this statement involves that circumstance wherein a probation agency operates secure facilities.

¹³ San Francisco has 62% of its staff as probation officers because it does not operate any secure facilities.

Table 4
Distribution of Probation Agency Staff by Function*

<u>Function</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Average Number of Staff</u>
Total	100%	426
Probation Officers	51	218
Supervisors	8	32
Service Support	6	26
Administrative	3	12
Clerical	24	101
Other	8	33

*N = 30

Probation officer supervisors comprise 8% of the total probation workforce. Among the responding agencies, the overall supervision ratio of supervisor to line officer is 1 to 7. The preferred ratio of supervisor to officer, as reported by the responding agencies, is 1 to 8.¹⁴

Supervisors rarely become directly involved in client supervision. Only one agency indicated that this is a normal occurrence. Of the other agencies, 17% responded that it happens rarely and 80% indicated that it never happens.

Administrative staff represent a small percentage (3%) of all probation personnel. In Dallas County, for example, 7 individuals manage 278 probation officers, their supervisors and service support staff. In Dade County, just 2 out of 203 professional staff are above the level of probation officer supervisor. Even in California, where probation is responsible for operating secure residential facilities, management staff represents less than 3% of the total staff.

¹⁴ Supervision ratios vary among the responding agencies. The range of preferred supervision ratios is narrower than the actual ratios. The preferred ratio of supervisor to line probation officers extends from a low of 1:6 to a high of 1:10. The actual ratio, on the other hand, goes from a low of 1:5 to a high of 1:14. In the 25 departments for which comparisons can be made, 12 have actual ratios that are lower than their desired ratios, 5 have the same, and 8 have actual ratios that are higher than their preferred ratios. The lowest ratio is 1:5, found in Dallas, Denver and Nassau Counties and New York City; the highest ratio is 1:14, found in Jefferson County.

There are wide variations in the use of service support staff who do not have responsibility for supervising probationers. This group includes professional staff who provide such services as family counseling and drug counseling. In Hennepin County, 39 out of 274 staff (14%) provide service support functions; in St. Louis, Bexar and Cook Counties, there are no such support staff.

The second largest pool of staff is composed of clerical workers (24%). This is not particularly surprising because much probation work involves checking files, maintaining records and typing. One agency estimates that clerical workers spend one-third to one-half of their time typing presentence investigation reports (PSIs).

The "Other" staffing category is a broad catch basin. In San Diego, for example, 217 out of 1,001 staff members are classified as "para-professionals", comprising 22% of the agency's total workforce. These individuals are designated as assistant deputy probation officers. They work as detention officers or group counselors at the juvenile facilities that the agency operates. This is the entry-level position for most probation officers coming into the San Diego Probation Department.

Probation Officers

As noted earlier, knowledge of the overall configuration of an agency's staff is the first step in understanding how a probation agency approaches its workload. The second step is to examine the deployment of line probation officers by the tasks to be performed.

Overall, 45% of all line probation officers supervise adult probationers: 34% supervise felons and the other 11% supervise misdemeanants. Twenty-two percent (22%) of all available line probation officers prepare presentence investigations (PSI's): 17% conduct felony PSIs, 5% conduct misdemeanor PSIs. Seventeen percent (17%) of all line probation officers work with juvenile probationers. The remaining 17% of line probation officers work with pretrial clients (2%) or perform "other" activities (15%). Table 5 illustrates the average distribution of full time equivalent (FTE) probation officers by task performed.¹⁵

¹⁵Many of the percents are based on the computation of full time equivalents (FTE). Because probation officers perform multiple tasks, responding agencies were asked to provide their estimates of how much effort was spent on the various activities a probation officer performs. These percents were then applied to the number of probation officers employed in order to compute FTE for particular services, i.e., the preparation of presentence investigation reports.

Table 5
Distribution of Line Probation Officers by Task*

<u>Task</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Average Number</u>
Total FTE Line Probation Officers	100%	240
Felony Supervision	34	82
Misdemeanor Supervision	11	25
Pretrial Supervision	2	4
Juvenile Supervision	17	41
Felony PSI's	17	40
Misdemeanor PSI's	5	11
Other Activities	15	36

*N = 23

Table 5 simplifies what is, in actuality, a complex deployment of staff because there tends to be little specialization by task. The typical staff deployment pattern shows line officers performing two or more tasks, such as supervising probationers and conducting presentence investigations. This mix in tasks is explored under staff assignments.

Staff Assignments

In most departments (73%), probation officers supervise a mix of felony and misdemeanant clients. Juvenile probationers and diversion or pretrial clients, on the other hand, tend to be kept as separate and distinct caseloads for designated probation officers.

Only 30% of the agencies separate probationer supervision from presentence investigation responsibilities, i.e., specific officers are assigned only to supervision and other officers are assigned only to conduct PSIs. Twenty-seven percent (27%) require line probation officers to both write PSIs and supervise probationers. The remaining agencies (43%) use a mix wherein some line probation officers only undertake presentence investigations, while other officers split their time between writing PSIs and supervising probationers.

Probation officers assigned to felony matters (supervision and PSIs) typically spend one-third of their time conducting PSIs. However, some agencies differ dramatically on their staff commitment to PSIs. New York City, for example, has the highest percentage of its probation officers working on PSIs (64%). In

Dade County, no probation officers are assigned to PSI's because the court does not order them.¹⁶

Agencies handle adult probationer supervision in a variety of ways. Some departments assign officers to one particular type of client (felons only, for example). Others assign on the basis of the geographic area in which the client resides or by specialized caseload considerations, such as mental health needs.

In agencies that supervise both felons and misdemeanants, the allocation of officer time is concentrated on supervising the felons. For example, in San Diego, 87 officers supervise approximately 12,000 felony clients for an average probation officer to probationer supervision ratio of 1 to 138. With misdemeanants, on the other hand, 10 probation officers supervise 6,000 misdemeanants for an average probation officer to probationer ratio of 1 to 600. Similarly, in Hennepin County, the supervision ratio for officer to felony probationers is 1 to 156 compared to 1 to 238 for misdemeanor probationers.

Volunteers

Four-fifths of the responding agencies use volunteers. The average number of volunteers among these agencies is 125, but the range is considerable -- from a high of 582 in San Diego to a low of 1 in San Francisco. There appears to be some correlation between the larger jurisdictions and the limited use of volunteers. Of the nine agencies that make no use of volunteers, many are from the largest jurisdictions -- Philadelphia, Cook County and Harris County. While Los Angeles uses volunteers, the number of volunteers is small (60) given the size of the agency.

One of the more innovative uses of volunteers occurs in Hennepin County. Some of its 189 volunteers supervise low risk probationers. Among the duties that these volunteers perform are one face-to-face meeting with a probationer at the start of supervision, additional meetings as needed, monthly mail reporting and a personal meeting at the termination of probation if the recommendation is for an early discharge. A full-time probation officer oversees this program.

Employment and Recruitment

Being a probation officer is a full time job. Seven out of ten agencies (70%) employ no part-time probation officers. Among the remaining agencies that do use part-time probation officers, they do so sparingly. The use of part-time probation officers

¹⁶Florida operates under sentencing guidelines. The information contained in a PSI is redundant since it is available to the judge from the information introduced in court.

ranges from a high of 12 (out of 157 probation officers) in Hennepin County to a low of 1 in Denver.

Eighty (80%) percent of the jurisdictions require a college degree in order to apply for the position of probation officer. Among those agencies that do not require a college degree, various substitutions are permitted. For example, St. Louis allows each year of related work experience to substitute for a year of college. In Orange County, a combination of job-related experience and education may also be substituted for the required college degree. San Bernardino County requires 30 semester units of related course work rather than a Bachelor's degree.

Several agencies, require an undergraduate degree plus related work experience or graduate work/degree.¹⁷ For example, Monroe County requires either a B.A. degree and two years of job-related work or a Master's degree. Agencies requiring a college or master's degree, for the most part, require between 24 and 30 credits in probation related fields, such as social work, counseling, criminal justice, sociology, psychology or criminology. Only one agency, Wisconsin's Division of Probation and Parole, has no minimal educational requirement(s), but it does require a written examination.

In 40% of the responding agencies, educational requirements have been established by agency policy. Among the remaining agencies, the educational requirements are a product of state regulation (23%), state law (23%) or other mandates (13%), the latter primarily being local civil service requirements. Among the county agencies, more than half (55%) have the autonomy to develop their own employment requirements. Only 10% of the state agencies have autonomy to develop employment requirements. State regulation or law establishes employment requirements for 80% of state-operated agencies. State mandates affect only 30% of the locally-based agencies.

Eighteen (18) departments have no minimum age requirements for applicants for the position of probation officer. The reason for this may be attributable to the educational background that this position requires. The youngest that most applicants could be is 21 years old because most departments require a four-year college degree.

Many of the job announcements for the position of probation officer require a written (60%) or an oral examination (17%) or both (13%). Nassau County requires potential probation officers to undergo a psychological examination, and in King County, all officers must become members of the union.

¹⁷Among the counties are Bexar, Dallas, Erie, Hennepin, Honolulu, Monroe, Nassau and San Francisco.

Recruitment for entry-level probation staff is accomplished through advertised job announcements in all but Bexar County. Bexar County operates a program whereby applicants wishing to become probation officers must first perform 100 hours of volunteer service in the probation work setting. The agency evaluates their performance during this volunteer service. If their performance is satisfactory, the agency then places their names on the "Eligible for Hire List" from which new probation officers are recruited.

Another variation on recruiting probation officers is available to probation agencies in New York State. These agencies may hire recruits known as "probation officer trainees" (POTs). In New York City, for example, these POTs do not enter the agency with the same level of education as regular entry-level probation officers, even though their responsibilities are similar to those of entry level officers. Under New York State regulations, the POT's receive intensive supervision, participate in on-going training and carry smaller caseloads for 6 to 12 months than the regular entry level probation officers. The POT program was designed to identify an expanded pool of qualified persons who could be hired as probation officers.¹⁸

Arrest Powers

The arrest powers of probation officers are generally restricted. Officers in only two of the responding probation agencies (8%) possess arrest powers similar to those of police officers. Three-quarters (73%) responded that their officers have modified arrest powers. State law generally restricts their authority to arresting probationers. The remaining agencies (19%) reported that their officers have no special arrest powers.

Probation officers not only have limited arrest powers, but they also are restricted in carrying firearms. Half of the agencies have outright prohibitions against carrying firearms. Among those agencies that permit the carrying of weapons, the permission is generally granted to selected officers. Forty percent (40%) of the agencies indicate that officers carry firearms only in extenuating circumstances. Only ten percent (10%) of the agencies allow officers who supervise felons to carry a firearm.

A cross-analysis of arrest powers with the carrying of firearms provides some additional insights. Of the two agencies in which officers have full arrest powers, only one allows them to carry firearms at all times. The other closely regulates when its officers may carry a weapon. Among those agencies where officers

¹⁸ The relatively low pay scale for probation officers was a major factor in developing the POT program.

have modified arrest powers, half prohibit their officers from carrying a firearm. The other half restricts the carrying of a firearm to specific circumstances. Consequently, even where the probation officers have the powers of arrest, the right to carry a gun tends to be restricted by agency policy.

Staff Training

The average number of required training hours for new probation officers is 142. The range in required training for new recruits ranges from a high of 460 hours in Oklahoma County to a low of 38 hours in New York City. In California, there is a state requirement for a minimum of 200 hours of training for new recruits.

All but one of the agencies couple on-the-job training for new employees with formal training. Many of these agencies (83%) have a designated training officer, most of whom (84%) have taken a train-the-trainers course.¹⁹

In a recently released Bureau of Justice Statistics study of 59 police departments in cities with 250,000 or more citizens,²⁰ it was reported that police recruits are required to take an average of 674 hours of classroom training and 412 hours of field training. None of the surveyed probation departments' training programs come close to these police training requirements. Perhaps this is due to the more stringent educational requirements for entry level probation officers. Nearly all of the probation agencies require a college degree from probation officer applicants, whereas law enforcement generally requires only a high school diploma from its entry level applicants. Many probation agencies also require specialized course work and/or related work experience as conditions of employment. Finally, police officers engage in a broader scope of work than probation officers. In addition to enforcing the law, police officers work in traffic and other regulatory areas (liquor laws for example), as well as provide services such as responding to traffic accidents. These broader responsibilities tend to generate greater training requirements.

¹⁹ In-service training averages 35 hours per year among these agencies ranging from a high of 72 hours in Honolulu to a low of 10 hours in Erie County.

²⁰ Crime Control Digest (1989). Violent crime rate increases, but size of major police departments stays the same. Vol. 23, No. 35, page 2.

Unions

Two-thirds (67%) of the responding agencies report that their probation officers are unionized. Only one of the agencies (King County) operates in a "closed shop" environment wherein all officers must be union members in order to be eligible for employment.

Probation Officer Salaries

The average starting salary for a probation officer among the responding agencies is \$21,800 per year. The average salary for the highest grade level of probation officer is \$33,500. Probation officers' salaries are affected by whether the agency is local or state. Locally based agencies, on average, pay more at both the entry level and the highest grade level than that found for the state based agencies.

Local departments pay entry level probation officers an average of \$23,100 per year while state departments only pay an average of \$18,700 per year. The state average is 20% less than the local average. Although the difference in average annual salary between local and state departments persists at the highest grade level as well (\$34,800 versus \$30,400), the percent of disparity decreases to 12%.

Among the local agencies, the highest paid entry-level salaries for probation officers are found in San Francisco (\$29,900) and Los Angeles (\$29,780). The counties with the lowest entry level salaries are Cook County (\$20,340) and Bexar County (\$20,448). When the focus is turned toward the salaries for the highest probation officer grade, changes occur among the counties paying the most and the least. Hennepin County pays the highest salary for the top grade of probation officer (\$42,500). At the low end of the spectrum is Harris County at \$27,000.

State probation agencies pay their officers on a statewide pay scale. This can be problematic for those officers who live in urban areas as the cost of living is generally higher there than in rural areas. The range in entry level pay goes from a low of \$15,449 in Jefferson County to a high \$21,000 in Denver. At the senior probation officer level, the highest annual salary is found in Dade County (\$36,200) and the lowest in St. Louis (\$25,400). Table 6 summarizes these findings.

Table 6
Average Line Probation Officer Salaries and Fringe Rates*

<u>Agencies</u>	<u>Entry Level P.O. Salary</u>	<u>Senior Level P.O. Salary</u>	<u>Fringe Rate</u>
All Agencies	\$21,800	\$33,500	26.8%
Local Agencies	23,100	34,800	26.8%
State Agencies	18,700	30,400	26.7%

*N = 29

Line officer salaries are generally unaffected by whether they supervise felons or misdemeanants. Only one department indicated that salary differentials exist based on the type of client supervised.

As can be observed in Table 6, there is little difference between local and state probation agencies in the employee fringe benefit rates.²¹ Most of the agencies offered the standard fringe items of retirement (93%), social security or state equivalent (73%), unemployment insurance (77%), workers' compensation (83%), along with life (63%) and medical insurance (93%).

²¹ Responding agencies either provided their established fringe rates, or the rates were computed based on budgetary data they provided. Twenty-five (25) of the 30 agencies provided the established fringe rate.

B. Resources and Revenues

The average annual budget for the responding agencies was \$22,720,000 for fiscal year 88-89. Actual appropriations ranged from a low of \$1,895,000 in Denver to a high of \$194,691,000 in Los Angeles. Orange County had the second highest budget (\$41,400,193) with New York City not far behind at \$39,981,000.²²

Table 7
Average Probation Agency Budget by Category*

<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Total	\$22,720,000	100%
Personnel	15,318,000	67%
Fringe	3,416,000	15%
Contracts	1,075,000	5%
Other	2,869,000	13%

*N = 29

Data obtained from the NACJP 1986 sentencing study indicate that California jurisdictions (on a per capita basis) rely more heavily on probation than most other jurisdictions. For example, in Los Angeles County 60% of all felony sentences involved probation in contrast to only 30% in New York County. When this factor is added to the fact that most California agencies operate adult and/or juvenile facilities, their high annual budgets are understandable. Because of the range of functions performed and types of clients served, it is problematic to present average per client costs from the available data.

Personnel Expenditures

Probation is staff-intensive. Thus, the finding that personnel costs constitute 67% of probation's budget is expected. These personnel costs averaged \$15,318,000 in fiscal year 1988. New York City and Cook County each spent 85% of their budget on personnel. At the other end of the spectrum was Los Angeles County

²²It is important to remember that budget size does not necessarily correlate with the population size of the jurisdiction that the agency is serving. Indeed, whether examining probation's or another criminal justice agency's budget, the relevant factor is to ascertain what functions an agency performs. In California, for example, probation agencies operate secure detention facilities while in New York they do not (except for Suffolk County).

with only 56% of its budget allocated to personnel.²³ Without Los Angeles, which heavily skews the personnel portion of the average budget downward, the percent of the average budget spent on personnel would rise to 72%. Because of the high personnel costs, probation agency planning should be directed at reducing labor intensive tasks, and strengthening productivity to manage the demands of an increasing caseload.

Fringe Benefits

The average amount that probation departments spent on fringe benefits was \$3,416,000 or 15% of their total budgets. Consequently, personnel and fringe costs constituted 82% of an average probation agency's budget. Fringe benefits, however, tended to be understated in many agency budgets. The average fringe benefit rate (computed as a percent of salary) is 26.8%. Yet the rate that would be computed on the basis of the probation agencies' budgets would be 22.3%.²⁴

The differential between the budgeted amount and the established fringe rate is due to the fact that some fringe benefits are paid out of other county/state accounts and thus do not appear in the probation agencies' operating budgets. Such an example occurs in New York City in which its operating budget shows only 4% or \$1.5 million spent on fringe benefits (yielding a 5% fringe rate). Yet the established fringe rate is 31% for the New York City Probation Department. Over \$12.5 million that is spent on fringe benefits does not appear in the probation budget but rather in the City of New York's Miscellaneous Budget for fringe and pension contributions.

Contracts

Contract funds are used for such purposes as residential placement in halfway houses, drug counseling and testing, and other client-related services. Contract funds make up a small portion of the average probation agency's budget (5%). The reliance on outside agencies to deliver client services may be understated by this small percentage of contract funds because probation agencies

²³ The Los Angeles budget includes construction money for a new juvenile facility and this brings down the share of the budget attributable to personnel.

²⁴ The fringe rate is computed by dividing fringe costs into personnel costs.

routinely use brokered²⁵ services and/or refer clients to other governmental agencies for such services as mental health counseling. The percent of the budget dedicated to contracts ranges from a high of 20% in King County to zero in Denver, Erie, Santa Clara, and Oklahoma Counties and New York City.

Other Budget Expenditures

"Other" expenditures cover a variety of expenses ranging from office rent and machinery to institutional costs associated with the operation of residential facilities (food, utilities and rent). In Los Angeles, for example, "Other" includes construction costs on a 750-bed juvenile facility. Overall, "Other" expenses consumed 13% of the average probation agency's budget. As with fringe, some agencies may have understated these costs. For example, the cost for office space in government-owned buildings tends not to be a budgeted item, so those costs would not be captured in this study.

Funding Sources

Probation agencies receive the bulk of their budgeted funds from their respective state and local governments (92%). The balance of their budget comes from supervision fees (4%)²⁶ and "Other" sources (4%). These "Other" funding sources are quite varied. They include federal program funds (many departments), and various fees such as alcohol assessments and mediation fees as found in Hennepin County.

Government is the major source of the typical probation agency's budget, and a significant part of that support is intergovernmental; i.e. one level of government sending money to another level. These intergovernmental transfers are generally a one-way street in that monies are transferred from the state to a locally operated probation agency. Consequently, the following section focuses on local probation agencies.

On average, local departments receive 20% of their operating budgets from the state. However, the proportion of funds that a state provides to locally based probation agencies differs widely. California's counties receive the least amount of state assistance, ranging from a low of 9% in Los Angeles, San Diego and Santa Clara Counties to a high of 14% in San Francisco. Counties in Texas, on the other hand, receive some of the largest shares of state

²⁵Brokering is defined as a probation agency's formal or informal arrangement with a service provider who is willing to work with probationers without compensation from the probation agency.

²⁶This also includes fees collected for preparing PSIs.

assistance among the responding agencies. Dallas, for example, receives 50% of its operating budget from the state. Bexar and Harris Counties receive 38% and 41%, respectively. New York State also provides substantial assistance to local probation agencies, ranging from one-third of Suffolk County's budget (34%) to nearly one-half of New York City's budget (49%). Among other local agencies that receive substantial assistance from their states are Philadelphia (32%) and Maricopa County (43%).

There is also substantial variation in agency reliance on supervision fees for operating funds. Half of the agencies (50%) collect no supervision fees. Among the other half that do collect fees, there is a substantial range in their contribution to the agency budget. The percent of the budget that is drawn from supervision fees ranges from a low of 1% in King, Orange and San Diego Counties to a high of 55% in Bexar County. The Texas agencies rely heavily on supervision fees. These fees represent 45% of Dallas County's budget, 53% of Harris County's budget, and 55% of Bexar County's budget. There is a wide gap between these Texas agencies and the agency with the next highest share of its budget attributable to supervision fees. Dade County receives 21% of its funds from supervision fees. In a similar vein, King County receives 35% of its annual budget from room and board payments made by persons on work release.

Fee Collections

Probation agencies collect a substantial amount of money. Indeed, if all collections made by probation agencies were divided into their total average budgets, these collections would constitute 18% of their budgets.²⁷ Much of this money, however, is deposited into a governmental general fund, rather than into the probation agency's account.²⁸

As shown in Table 8, most probation departments collect an array of fees, including court fees and fines, restitution, supervision fees, PSI fees and "other fees." The organizational placement of the probation agency has some effect on the types of fees collected. Overall, 63% of the agencies collect court fees. However, probation agencies that are part of the judiciary are much more likely to collect these fees (83%) than those that are part of the executive branch (52%). The same holds true for fines. The

²⁷This percent was computed from the 27 agencies that provided budget and fee collection information.

²⁸ Depositing money into the general fund, even when the money is subsequently recycled into the probation agency's account maintains legislative accountability and oversight.

overall percentage for agencies collecting fines is 77%, but for judicially-administered agencies it is 92% versus 71% for executive branch agencies.

Table 8
Percent of Probation Agencies Responsible
for Collecting Specific Fees*

<u>Types of Fees</u>	<u>Percent of Agencies</u>
Court Fees	63%
Fines	77%
Restitution Fees	93%
Supervision Fees	50%
PSI Fees	17%
Other Fees	43%

*N = 27

There are similar, but less sharp, differences with restitution and supervision fees. Overall, 28 (93%)²⁹ probation agencies collect restitution fees. Supervision fees are collected by half of the probation agencies. Judicially-administered agencies have a somewhat higher rate (58%) than executive-based agencies (47%). Supervision fees, which are particularly important to the Texas agencies, comprise over 45% of their budgets. On the other hand, supervision fees constitute, on average, less than 5% of the budgets of all of the other agencies that collect them.

Collections

Table 9 below shows that agencies collect an average of \$4 million in various fees and assessments from their clients. Court fees and fines represent 23% of these collections, restitution 33%, supervision and PSI fees 23% and "other" fees 21%. The latter includes defendant costs for public defenders and assorted other considerations such as payment to the crime victims compensation and assistance fund.

²⁹ Table 9, Average Amount of Money Collected, by Type of Fee, shows that four agencies do not collect restitution fees. Two of these agencies do collect them but cannot give dollar amounts.

Table 9
Average Amount of Money Collected, by Type of Fee*

<u>Types of Funds</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Total	\$4,036,500	100%
Court Fees & Fines	945,700	23%
Restitution	1,334,400	33%
Supervision & PSI Fees	924,600	23%
Other Fees	831,000	21%

*N = 28

Fee Accounting

Court fees and fines are usually transferred into the general fund. Supervision and PSI fees, on the other hand, are generally deposited into the probation agency's account. Restitution fees tend to be held in special accounts for victims from which the probation agency makes direct payments to them.

A few jurisdictions deposit some of their collections into a "revolving fund". In Oklahoma, these funds stay in the Department of Corrections, of which Probation and Parole is a part, and are used for special projects. In Missouri, the Inmate Revolving Fund comes back to the Board of Probation and Parole through a separate general revenue appropriation from the legislature.

Payment Priority

Fifty-three percent (53%) of the departments that collect more than one type of fee have a policy on prioritizing the allocation of probationer payments. Where such policies exist, the top priority is almost always for restitution, followed by payments to victim compensation funds. In San Diego, however, restitution is placed on a secondary footing to fines, and in Bexar County, restitution ranks fourth following supervision fees, court costs and fines.

These findings parallel those in a 1986 study³⁰ by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency. Fifty percent (50%) of the respondents to its survey indicated that restitution and fines take precedence over probation supervision fees; 40% indicated no

³⁰Ring, C.R. (1989). Probation Supervision Fees: Shifting Costs to the Offender. Federal Probation Quarterly. Vol. 53, No. 2, June 1989, pp. 43-48.

prioritization on payments. Only 10% responded that supervision fees were the top priority in receiving payment.

Probation agencies can resemble a bank in their fee collection operations. These agencies tend to handle substantial amounts of money. They also have to maintain separate accounts on the various fees collected as well as make disbursements from these accounts. In addition to these time consuming tasks, there is the effort that probation officers have to make to get their clients to pay their court ordered levies. Fee collection constitutes a significant part of most probation agencies operations and this fact should be highlighted when agencies provide an accounting of their activities.

C. Probation Workload

Having examined probation's workforce and budget, the next area of attention is caseload, specifically felony probationers who, overall, formed half of the total caseload managed by the responding agencies. There were, however, considerable variations in the percentages of felony probationers under supervision, ranging from a low of 11% in Ventura County to a high of 100% in Maricopa County. These variations reflect the types of clients that each agency supervises, i.e., adult and juvenile, pretrial and sentenced, probationers and parolees.

In over one-third (36%) of the departments, non-felony client caseloads exceed felony caseloads. New York City, on the other hand, is an example of a probation department that supervises mostly felony probationers (67%); 29% are misdemeanor probationers and 4% combined juveniles and "others."

The three Texas counties -- Bexar, Dallas and Harris -- differ widely in the numbers and types of probationers under supervision although all are responsible for the same type of clients -- adult felony and misdemeanor probationers. Bexar County's felony caseload constitutes only 37% of its total workload, while the percentage shares for Dallas and Harris Counties are substantially higher (65% and 53%, respectively). From the felony sentencing study³¹, we know that Bexar County has the highest probation rate among the three counties (56%). There may also be a high probation rate in the lower courts of Bexar County which could generate the difference noted here.

Changes in Caseload

The number of felony probationers under supervision increased by 7%³² between the beginning and the end of 1988. Of the 24 agencies providing this information, 21% experienced a slight decrease in felony workload -- between 1% and 6%. The remaining agencies reported increases ranging from a low of 1% in Harris County to a high of 30% in Franklin County.

Justice policies do have an impact on the size of the caseload of a probation agency. Policies also determine client composition; such as felony and misdemeanor probationers. For example, at the start of 1988, 20% of Ventura's caseload was composed of felony probationers. At the close of the year, felony probationers constituted just 11% of the total caseload. This development occurred primarily because the court mandated the placement of

³¹Cunniff, M. supra, footnote 4.

³²Twenty-four (24) out of 30 agencies were able to provide this information.

drunk drivers on formal probation, precipitating a tremendous growth in the number of misdemeanor probationers. The drop in the share of workload attributable to felony probationers was not the result of a decline in the number of felony probationers, but rather the result of a sharp increase in misdemeanor probationers.

On average, 39% of all felony cases are closed each year. If this held constant, it would imply a total turnover in the probation caseload every 2.5 years. The percent of cases closed, however, differs widely among the responding agencies. Santa Clara County closed 69% of its felony cases in 1988, a rate that would generate a total turnover in the felony probation caseload every 18 months. Bexar County, on the other hand, only closed 25% of its felony caseload during the same time period. With a 25% rate of closed cases, Bexar County would take four years to turn over its felony caseload. There is less cumulative growth in caseload size for those agencies in which turnover is achieved quickly. Therefore, caseload turnover rate is an important factor to be considered when examining workload.

Probation Transfers

Forty-three percent or just 13 of the agencies could provide data on the number of felony probationers transferred into and out of their jurisdictions.³³ Among these 13 agencies, slightly more cases were transferred out than were transferred in.

To render a picture of transfer activity in relation to the total felony caseload, a percent can be generated by dividing the total number of transfers into the total caseload on a particular day. Using December 31, 1988, the total number of transfers represents 7% of the total caseload. This same percent (7%) was also found for the total number of transfers out of all agencies.

Transfers among the individual agencies vary. Hennepin County showed the biggest net gain both in absolute numbers and on a relative basis. While Hennepin County transferred only 168 felony probationers to other agencies, it received more than five times as many probationers (893) from other probation agencies. The transfers into Hennepin County constituted 17% of its total felony caseload.

Maricopa County was on the opposite end of the spectrum as a net exporter of probationers: 1,514 were transferred out while only

³³ Although information was sought as to whether the transfers involved in-state or out-of-state movements, insufficient data were collected to explore this dimension of transfers. One problem in obtaining this information was the inability to separate felony from misdemeanor transfers.

607 were transferred into the county. The transfers out constituted 9% of its total felony caseload.

Matching Resources to Caseload

A probation classification system takes into account the level of control that must be exerted over a probationer, as well as the extent and type(s) of services to be offered to those under supervision. Such a system also provides a framework for deploying agency staff and for allocating limited program/service resources where they will be most beneficial.³⁴ Classification instruments, especially risk and needs assessments, have become increasingly important management tools as the influx of probationers continues to grow. Based on the scores derived from these assessments, probation agencies can make reasonably reliable decisions about the appropriate level of supervision for probationers (risk) and the type(s) of services that should be extended to them (need). Nearly all of the responding agencies (93%) use a risk assessment and 83% use a needs assessment. No department uses a needs assessment without also using a risk assessment.

The Wisconsin Assessment of Offender Risk and the Wisconsin Assessment of Clients' Needs are the most frequently adopted instruments for these assessments. Thirty-one percent (31%) of the responding probation agencies have adopted both scales in toto. Another 38% have adapted these scales with minimal changes to fit their specific requirements. Several of the agencies that developed their own scales are from New York State. All of the responding New York agencies, except New York City and Suffolk County, use an eight-question supervision classification instrument developed by the New York State Division of Probation and Correctional Alternatives.

Only two of the responding agencies indicated that they do not use a risk assessment. One of these agencies is King County. Washington State uses statewide sentencing guidelines. These guidelines, in addition to indicating who should go to prison and who should not, also provide explicit guidance on the conditions that those sentenced to probation must meet. For example, if a probationer falls within Phase 1, Level A, as determined by the sentencing guidelines, the probation officer is expected to meet with the probationer twice in the office and four times in the field per month.

³⁴Classification in Probation and Parole: A Model Systems Approach. Washington, DC: National Institute of Corrections, page 2.

Supervision Levels

Generally, probation agencies tend to employ the same terminology in classifying their supervision levels. Each agency was asked to list and define each of its supervision levels. Although the number of contacts varies among agencies for each of the supervision levels, supervision level categories do provide a rank order of importance in handling various subgroups of probationers. From the information provided by agencies, each supervision level was labeled by one of the following five categories: Intensive, Maximum, Medium, Minimum and Administrative. The practical application of these designations in terms of the degree and type of contact associated with a particular level of supervision varies among the agencies. For example, the frequency of contact between intensively supervised probationers and their probation officers differs among the responding agencies. Philadelphia is an example of an agency that requires frequent probationer/probation officer contacts -- three face-to-face contacts and two telephone contacts weekly. Jefferson County falls into the middle range of contacts. Probationers on intensive supervision meet with their probation officers once a week in the office and once a week at home. There are three additional face-to-face contacts a month: two home visits during curfew hours and one home week-end visit. At the lower end of the contact scale is Dallas County where intensively supervised probationers report to the probation office once a week, and the probation officer makes a home visit once a month.

The number of contacts between probationer and probation officer is an important indicator of intensity of supervision. Although many of the responding probation agencies operate intensive supervision programs, the actual number of contracts may vary considerably between jurisdictions. Despite the considerable variation in the frequency of contact, intensive supervision programs represent more contacts than would occur in the agency's maximum supervision level.

These broad supervision categories afford useful insights into how the responding probation departments organize their resources to meet caseload demands. Three considerations are examined: the frequency of contact with the probationer; the ratio of probationers to probation officers; and the allocation of probationers across the different levels of supervision.

Frequency of Contact

Supervision levels permit probation officers to vary their effort in supervising different classes of probationers based on their risk to the community and/or their specialized needs. When probationers are placed on intensive or maximum supervision, there is an expectation that they will have more frequent contact with probation staff than those placed on medium or minimum supervision.

As revealed in Table 10, probationers under intensive or maximum supervision do receive much more attention than the other levels of probationers.

Table 10
Frequency of Contact with Probationers, by Supervision Level*

<u>Supervision Level</u>	<u>Contact Frequency</u>
Intensive	8.8 meetings per month
Maximum	2.4
Medium	1.0
Minimum	0.4
Administrative	0.0

N = 28

Among the responding agencies, there is a substantial range in the frequency of contact within each supervision level. With intensive supervision, for example, the frequency of contact fluctuates from 16 monthly contacts to 2. Three-quarters of the responding agencies, however, indicated that 12 or more monthly meetings are required.

The range among agencies in the frequency of contact between the probationer and the probation officer continues to be fairly wide for the maximum supervision level -- 1 to 6 per month, with half of the agencies indicating that 2 to 3 contacts are expected to take place each month. Contacts with medium supervision clients range from three times a month to once every three months. Only 10% of the agencies try to meet with medium supervision level probationers more than twice a month. Finally, half of the agencies only require contact once every three months for minimally supervised probationers.

Ratio of Probationers to Probation Officers

Preferred supervision level indicates how agencies would like to supervise caseload given adequate resources. The ratio of probationers to probation officers also varies by supervision level. The analysis here is limited to the agencies' preferred ratios due to the lack of information on the actual ratios.³⁵

³⁵The analysis is further limited because, in some agencies, such as in Hennepin and Orange Counties, probation officer caseloads are mixed, that is, one officer supervises maximum, medium and minimum probationers on a single caseload. Because of the way the data were provided, it is difficult to include these mixed caseload agencies in Table 11 above.

As expected, staff resources are more concentrated on intensive and maximum supervision probationers than on those classified as medium, minimum or administrative. Probation officers are able to meet more frequently with clients in higher supervision levels because of lower ratios of probationers to officers.

Table 11
Preferred Ratios of Probationers to Probation Officers

	<u>Intensive</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Medium</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Administrative</u>
Ratio	22:1	50:1	93:1	237:1	469:1

Distribution of Probationers

Information on the distribution of probationers across the various supervision levels was provided by 59% of the agencies. Half of these provided information on the basis of their total felony caseload; the other half provided data based on the probationer's classification at intake. Although the information provided is limited, it nonetheless offers some idea of how probation's felony caseload is distributed across the various supervision levels that these agencies employ.

Intensive and maximum supervision probationers comprise a small minority of the total caseload (1% and 13%, respectively). Medium supervision probationers represent the largest share (38%). It is closely followed by those placed on administrative probation (32%). The latter have minimal contact with a probation officer, often limited to mailing a postcard once a month to the probation office. Table 12 shows the number and percent of probationers by supervision level.

Table 12
Distribution of Probationers Among Supervision Levels*

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Total	215,900	100%
Intensive	3,000	1
Maximum	28,500	13
Medium	82,200	38
Minimum	32,400	15
Administrative	69,800	32

N = 18

There are, of course, variations among the agencies. Suffolk and Bexar Counties initially place all new probationers in maximum

supervision. In Bexar County, they remain in that status for at least six months.

In Los Angeles, with an annual caseload that exceeds 55,000, more than half (55%) are placed on administrative status. In Hennepin County, on the other hand, only 12% are supervised administratively. Much of how a department operates, especially in frequency of client contact, ratio of probationers to officers and classification of probationers, is dictated by its budget. San Bernardino County provides a graphic example of how a probation agency can have its operations turned upside down because of funding constraints. As of April 1989, the probation department had to reassign its medium and minimum adult probationers to administrative status (no face-to-face contact required) because of funding constraints. Only maximum cases, which represent 10% of the adult caseload, have any face-to-face contacts with their probation officers.

Treatment Services and Supervision Options

The role of probation today includes monitoring and surveillance, as well as counseling and social work. In order to meet the safety needs of the community and the treatment needs of probationers, agencies have, during the past several years, begun to offer such supervision options as day treatment, house arrest and intensive supervision. These programs join the longstanding option of community residential facility placement. Treatment programs include those that enable clients to:

- Develop specific skills, e.g., literacy, GED proficiency and vocational training;
- Enroll in treatment programs, e.g., psychological and family counseling and substance abuse treatment;
- Find employment; and
- Be monitored for drug use.

Probation departments also monitor probationer payment of restitution and participation in community service activities.

Table 13
Percent of Agencies Offering Enhanced Supervision Programs*

<u>Programs</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Day Treatment	30%
Intensive Supervision	93%
House Arrest	77%
Residential Placement	57%
Restitution	97%
Community Service	97%

*N = 30

As is quickly apparent by looking at Table 13, most probation agencies operate enhanced supervision programs. Indeed, most of the agencies have implemented two or more such programs. Caution, however, must be exercised in looking at these numbers. The statistics presented here are only indicators of the extent to which these programs are operational. No data were collected on the number of probationers actually participating in these programs.³⁶ For example, 93% of the agencies indicate that they have an intensive supervision program, but based on information discussed earlier, only 1% of the total felony caseload is under the scope of that program.

The overwhelming majority of probation agencies conduct restitution and community service programs (97%) as well as provide intensive supervision (93%)³⁷ and house arrest (77%). Of those with house arrest programs, three-quarters use electronic monitoring in the operation of the program. Residential services are somewhat less prevalent (57%). Although treatment programs have recently been adopted as a sanction, day treatment was used in 30% of the agencies.

³⁶ Information on the extent to which probationers fall under the scope of these various programs will be collected through the NACJP sentencing outcome project that is tracking 12,500 probationers. This study will be released in late 1990.

³⁷ While 93% of the departments indicate that they provide intensive supervision, in fact, 26% (8) do so. The reason for the disparity is that the authors defined intensive supervision as face-to-face contact at least twice a week. If an agency stated that it offered intensive supervision but that contact was less than our definition, it was placed in the maximum supervision category.

Treatment Programs

Most agencies offer several types of treatment services as shown in Table 14. More than three-quarters of all agencies provide drug and alcohol treatment as well as psychological and family counseling. More than half of the agencies provide educational and vocational programs. Forty percent (40%) offer an array of "Other" treatment programs, such as family/domestic violence counseling in Harris, Orange and Suffolk Counties.

Table 14
Percent of Agencies Offering Treatment Services*

<u>Programs</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Drug Treatment	87%
Drug Testing	97%
Alcohol Treatment	83%
Psychological Counseling	87%
Family Counseling	83%
Educational Services	70%
Vocational Training	60%
Job Placement Services	90%
Other Services	40%

*N = 30

Although most agencies offer treatment services, the number of probationers actually receiving services is likely to be a minority of the probationer caseload. A look at drug and alcohol treatment services shows that 87% and 83% of the departments, respectively, offer these programs. However, in the NACJP 1983 study of felony probationers³⁸, only 23% of all probationers participated in substance abuse programs.

Service Delivery

Probation officers do not necessarily provide all of the services that the agency offers. Some specialized supervision and treatment services may be provided by a contractor paid by the probation agency. However, the more likely provider is an agency whose services probation has brokered. Many of the agencies that provide brokered services are other governmental agencies or private, non-profit community groups. Table 15 summarizes how each program is administered.

³⁸Cunniff, M. (1986). A sentencing postscript: Felony probationers under supervision in the community. Washington, DC: National Association of Criminal Justice Planners.

Table 15
Methods of Delivery for Enhanced Supervision Programs*

	<u>Probation Staff Only</u>	<u>Staff & Contract</u>	<u>Brokered Service</u>	<u>Paid Contract</u>	<u>NA</u>
Day Treatment	7%	7%	10%	7%	70%
Intensive Supervision	80%	13%	0%	0%	7%
House Arrest	73%	3%	0%	0%	23%
Residential Placement	0%	20%	30%	7%	43%
Restitution	86%	7%	3%	0%	3%
Community Service	54%	37%	3%	3%	3%

*N = 30

Probation agencies continue to rely on their own personnel to deliver enhanced supervision programs. Even in this arena, there are other agencies that probation calls upon for assistance, especially for day treatment and residential placement. None of the probation agencies attempt to staff the latter, and only one-quarter of those using day treatment use their own staff.

Unlike supervision programs, probation agencies rely extensively on outside organizations for the delivery of treatment services. Table 16 illustrates that brokering is the single most commonly used vehicle for providing drug treatment (70%) and plays a significant role in alcohol treatment as well (57%). Drug testing is the only service where paid contractors play a fairly large role (17%). Probation staff continue to be directly involved in job placement activities (34%). However, there is a heavy reliance on agencies outside of probation to assist with this service. In fact, what is observed with job placement characterizes much of the treatment delivery process: probation officers work directly with contract or brokered service providers to deliver services.

Table 16
Method of Delivery for Enhanced Treatment Programs*

<u>Treatment Services</u>	<u>Probation Staff Only</u>	<u>Staff & Contract</u>	<u>Brokered Service</u>	<u>Paid Contract</u>	<u>NA</u>
Drug Treatment	0%	7%	70%	10%	13%
Drug Testing	26%	27%	23%	17%	7%
Alcohol Treatment	7%	17%	57%	3%	17%
Psych Counseling	13%	27%	50%	0%	10%
Family Counseling	10%	37%	33%	3%	17%
Education Services	7%	20%	40%	3%	30%
Vocational Training	0%	17%	44%	0%	40%
Job Placement	34%	23%	30%	3%	10%
Other	13%	7%	10%	10%	60%

*N = 30

D. Probationer Discipline

This section explores how probation agencies respond to probationers who fail to comply with the conditions of their probation. By looking at three disciplinary problem areas -- absconding, technical violations and new arrests while under supervision -- a picture of how probation agencies handle these disciplinary problems emerges.

Absconding

Two-thirds of the responding agencies (67%) have an operational definition for absconding. Most define absconders as probationers who fail to maintain contact with their probation officer for between 30 and 90 days and whose whereabouts cannot be ascertained within that time period. A few agencies do not set time limits. They determine that probationers have absconded when they fail to report and cannot be located.

The standard response to an absconder is to obtain a bench warrant.³⁹ Two-thirds of the responding agencies automatically seek a bench warrant when a probationer has been determined to have absconded. The remaining agencies generally seek a bench warrant, but it is done selectively.

When absconders return to probation either by way of an arrest on the bench warrant or their own self surrender, more than half of the agencies (57%) always invoke a formal disciplinary hearing to determine the agency's response to the absconder. Among the remaining agencies, 27% review the circumstances of each case to determine whether or not a formal disciplinary hearing is merited, while the other 17% take some other action.⁴⁰

³⁹This term may vary among probation agencies. In Philadelphia, for example, the term used is to obtain a "detainer." The bench warrant is an arrest warrant and permits entry into law enforcement's warrants register. Consequently, if the absconder is arrested, he/she can be detained on the basis of the bench warrant (as well as on the basis of the arrest). In addition, the probation agency can be notified of the arrest and thus the absconder's whereabouts.

⁴⁰Many agencies distinguish their disciplinary hearings between those that are precipitated by a rearrest as opposed to a technical violation. Absconders can fall into either one of these two categories. Most agencies, however, consider hearings dealing with absconders to be precipitated by an arrest (83%). Only 7% designate these hearings as a being precipitated by a technical violation. Ten percent don't distinguish.

Rearrests

Most of the responding agencies (80%) are automatically notified of arrests involving probationers, usually by the state agency that maintains arrest files. In New York, for example, all of the county probation agencies are linked to the state's Probation Registrant System which automatically sends a notice to the supervising agency when a registered probationer is arrested in the state. A similar program exists in California where a "Probation Flash Notice" is used to alert probation agencies of probationer arrests. When agencies do not receive automatic arrest notifications, they usually receive sporadic rearrest information based on visual review of local law enforcement agencies' arrest sheets or from information volunteered by the probationer.

When a probationer is rearrested, 43% of the probation agencies immediately initiate a formal disciplinary hearing process.⁴¹ For 20% of the agencies, the response is to await disposition of the arrest before developing their own response. The remaining agencies (37%) have "Other" responses.

If a rearrest does not lead to a conviction, 20% of the agencies decline to invoke their disciplinary hearing process. The bulk of the agencies (80%) leave themselves the option to review the circumstances of the arrest to determine whether or not a formal disciplinary hearing is merited.

Technical Violations

When probationers fail to meet one or more conditions of probation, such as failure to pay assessments or to seek court-ordered treatment, probation officers generally use informal methods to address the noncompliance. However, there are times when the informal approach fails to achieve the desired outcome.

Policy differs among agencies in how much guidance probation officers receive in their decision to stop working with probationers informally and to proceed with a formal disciplinary hearing. Less than half (43%) of the agencies have guidelines for determining when formal investigations should be conducted. For example, in Jefferson County, investigations are immediately conducted on all technical violations. In Maricopa County, on the other hand, a formal investigation is conducted when the supervising probation officer decides that the severity of the

⁴¹However, these same 43% also indicate that while they sometimes institute hearing proceedings if there is no conviction, they also immediately invoke the disciplinary hearing process when a rearrest occurs. This information appears to be contradictory, although these agencies may initiate the process but await disposition before actually holding a hearing.

probationer's behavior negatively impacts the community and established probationer rehabilitative goals and behavioral objectives.

Disciplinary Hearings

Just about all of the agencies (97%) hold formal disciplinary hearings before a judge. In most instances, the sentencing judge (70%) presides. In most of the other jurisdictions (27%), a judge, but not necessarily the original sentencing judge, presides. Only one agency indicated that a hearing officer presides over the agency's disciplinary hearings.

Probation agencies average 23 days from the time the decision is made to file for a disciplinary hearing to the time the hearing is held. This average holds for each of the judicial proceedings, i.e., those held before the sentencing judge and those held before a judge other than the sentencing judge. However, when a hearing officer presides over the hearing, the elapsed time is only 3 days. Among all of the agencies, the average elapsed time from filing to holding the hearing ranges from 3 to 60 days.

Disciplinary Hearing Outcomes

Only one-quarter of the responding agencies (27%) were able to provide complete data on the outcomes of their disciplinary hearings. From this limited data, the following outcomes can be reported:

- Many, but nonetheless a minority, of the outcomes (43%) result in probation revocation, with the probationer sent to prison;
- 13% involve the use of jail, but with the person remaining on probation;
- 18% have their conditions of probation revised;
- 10% have no changes to the conditions of their probation; and
- 16% have "Other" outcomes.

E. Conclusion

This report represents a first step in identifying what statistical data can be obtained from probation agencies as well as identifying those data that cannot be readily obtained. Despite the complex manner in which probation is organized, especially the varied mix of clients with whom agencies work, there are methods for isolating each agency's effort expended on its various clients. Just as this report has zeroed in on felony probation, so too can similar exercises be employed with other significant probation populations, such as juveniles and misdemeanants.

Among those probation agencies charged with supervising felony probationers, this report found that just over half of the clients served by these agencies are felons. The rest of the clients come from a diverse mix including juvenile, misdemeanor and preadjudicatory populations. In isolating those probation officers who work with adult felons, this report found a substantial portion of their work to be directed at presentence report writing. In addition, probation agencies expend considerable effort in collecting the various fees levied on their clients.

The salaries for probation officers vary substantially, with notable differences between those officers who work for local units of government and state agencies. Although there are differences among agencies in the ratio of probationers to each probation officer, all of the agencies have low ratios for those probationers who are classified as needing intensive or maximum supervision. High ratios of probationers to each probation officer occur with the minimum and administrative supervision categories.

Probation is a community corrections sanction and, as such, probation draws upon community resources in meeting its objectives. This is evident from its use of volunteers as well as from its brokering of services from governmental and private agencies, especially for meeting the treatment needs of its clients.

Probation agencies have been innovative in developing programs for their clients, such as intensive supervision programs, and in rationalizing their deployment of staff to supervise ever increasing workloads as evidenced by the prevalence of risk and needs assessment scales. However, probation agencies have not positioned themselves very well for documenting their needs to elected and budgetary officials, as well as the public. Probation agencies are thwarted in their efforts to educate the public about their programs because of a lack of statistical data.

This report documents the difficulty in obtaining such basic statistics as the number of transfers in and out of the agency, the distribution of probationers by classification category and the extent of probation disciplinary hearings and their outcomes.

These basic statistics need to be available to explain to the public what the agency does.

Probation agencies have to be able to explain why so very few probationers are placed into their high supervision programs and demonstrate how additional resources would be used. High supervision programs are staff intensive and expensive. Measures need to be developed to document these facts as well as measures for assessing the effectiveness of these programs.

This study has provided new information on probation management and operations, especially felony probation. The probation community may want to expand into the other significant client groupings that probation serves.

REFERENCES

Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin (1988). Prisoners in 1987. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

_____ (1988). Probation and Parole 1987. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Byrne, J. (1988). Probation. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

Champion, D. (1988). Felony Probation: Problems and Prospects. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Erwin, B. and Bennett, L. (1987). New dimensions in probation: Georgia's experience with intensive probation supervision (ISP). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

Guynes, R. (1988). Difficult clients, large caseloads plague probation, parole agencies. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

Herrick, E. (1988). Intensive probation supervision. Corrections Compendium, 12 (12).

Immarigeon, R. (1986). Probation's uncertain mission. Corrections Compendium. 10 (9), 6-9.

Langston, D. (1988). Probation and parole: No more free rides. Corrections Today, August, 90-93.

National Institute of Corrections (no date). Classification in probation and parole: A model systems approach. Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Justice.

_____ (no date). Model probation/parole management program. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Classification in probation and parole: A model systems approach. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

O'Leary, V. (1987). Probation: A system in change. Federal Probation Quarterly. 51 (4), 8-11.

Petersilia, J. (1987). Expanding options for criminal sentencing. Santa Monica, California: The Rand Corporation.

_____ (1988). House arrest. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

Appendix A

Table A-1A

Distribution of Probation Agency Staff, by Agency

	TOTAL STAFF	PROBATION OFFICERS	SUPERVISORS	SERVICE SUPPORT	ADMINISTRATIVE	CLERICAL	OTHER
AGENCY AVERAGE	427	218	32	27	12	101	33
BALTIMORE CITY MD	82	54	7	2	2	19	0
BALTIMORE COUNTY MD	374	231	29	19	4	84	7
BEXAR COUNTY TX	199	114	17	0	13	55	6
COOK COUNTY IL	456	281	41	0	17	106	11
DADE COUNTY FL	279	182	19	2	2	74	0
DALLAS COUNTY TX	355	232	44	2	7	57	13
DENVER CO	50	31	6	1	0	12	0
ERIE COUNTY NY	131	81	12	1	2	29	0
FRANKLIN COUNTY OH	67	37	8	8	2	12	0
HARRIS COUNTY TX	397	230	25	2	8	132	0
HENNEPIN COUNTY MN	274	156	17	39	6	56	0
HONOLULU HI	63	41	7	1	3	10	0
JEFFERSON COUNTY KY	73	54	4	1	1	13	0
KING COUNTY WA	154	95	10	6	2	42	0
LOS ANGELES COUNTY CA	2105	1307	180	60	35	433	0
MARICOPA COUNTY AZ	475	268	30	12	10	129	26
MILWAUKEE COUNTY WI	240	151	23	3	4	59	0
MONROE COUNTY NY	209	121	17	6	7	58	0
NASSAU COUNTY NY	475	300	55	10	15	95	0
NEW YORK CITY* NY	1340	658	138	127	61	354	2
OKLAHOMA COUNTY OK	166	97	10	25	5	29	1
ORANGE COUNTY CA	956	273	44	337	32	219	51
PHILADELPHIA PA	358	171	24	20	40	80	23
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY CA	697	171	20	44	13	170	279
SAN DIEGO COUNTY CA	1001	391	63	25	14	291	217
SAN FRANCISCO CA	129	80	9	3	5	32	0
SANTA CLARA COUNTY CA	674	218	37	6	8	151	255
ST LOUIS** MO	268	161	25	0	1	73	8
SUFFOLK COUNTY NY	426	231	30	40	23	102	0
VENTURA COUNTY CA	320	129	20	4	10	68	89

*New York City covers Kings County (Brooklyn) and New York County (Manhattan).

**St. Louis includes the City of St. Louis and the County of St. Louis.

NOTE: Totals may not be the sum of the categories due to rounding of full time equivalent staff.

Appendix A

Table A-18

Percent Distribution of Probation Agency Staff, by Agency

	TOTAL STAFF	PROBATION OFFICERS	SUPERVISORS	SERVICE SUPPORT	ADMINISTRATIVE	CLERICAL	OTHER
AGENCY AVERAGE	100%	51%	8%	6%	3%	24%	8%
BALTIMORE CITY MD	100%	66%	9%	2%	2%	23%	0%
BALTIMORE COUNTY MD	100%	62%	8%	5%	1%	22%	2%
BEXAR COUNTY TX	100%	57%	9%	0%	7%	28%	3%
COOK COUNTY IL	100%	62%	9%	0%	4%	23%	2%
DADE COUNTY FL	100%	65%	7%	1%	1%	27%	0%
DALLAS COUNTY TX	100%	65%	12%	1%	2%	16%	4%
DENVER CO	100%	62%	12%	2%	0%	24%	0%
ERIE COUNTY NY	100%	62%	9%	1%	2%	22%	0%
FRANKLIN COUNTY OH	100%	55%	12%	12%	3%	18%	0%
HARRIS COUNTY TX	100%	58%	6%	1%	2%	33%	0%
HENNEPIN COUNTY MN	100%	57%	6%	14%	2%	20%	0%
HONOLULU HI	100%	65%	11%	2%	5%	16%	0%
JEFFERSON COUNTY KY	100%	74%	5%	1%	1%	18%	0%
KING COUNTY WA	100%	62%	6%	4%	1%	27%	0%
LOS ANGELES COUNTY CA	100%	62%	9%	3%	2%	21%	0%
MARICOPA COUNTY AZ	100%	56%	6%	3%	2%	27%	5%
MILWAUKEE COUNTY WI	100%	63%	10%	1%	2%	25%	0%
MONROE COUNTY NY	100%	58%	8%	3%	3%	28%	0%
NASSAU COUNTY NY	100%	63%	12%	2%	3%	20%	0%
NEW YORK CITY* NY	100%	49%	10%	9%	5%	26%	0%
OKLAHOMA COUNTY OK	100%	58%	6%	15%	3%	17%	1%
ORANGE COUNTY CA	100%	29%	5%	35%	3%	23%	5%
PHILADELPHIA PA	100%	48%	7%	6%	11%	22%	6%
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY CA	100%	25%	3%	6%	2%	24%	40%
SAN DIEGO COUNTY CA	100%	39%	6%	2%	1%	29%	22%
SAN FRANCISCO CA	100%	62%	7%	2%	4%	25%	0%
SANTA CLARA COUNTY CA	100%	32%	5%	1%	1%	22%	38%
ST LOUIS** MO	100%	60%	9%	0%	0%	27%	3%
SUFFOLK COUNTY NY	100%	54%	7%	9%	5%	24%	0%
VENTURA COUNTY CA	100%	40%	6%	1%	3%	21%	28%

*New York City covers Kings County (Brooklyn) and New York County (Manhattan).

**St. Louis includes the City of St. Louis and the County of St. Louis.

Appendix A

Table A-2

Preferred and Actual Ratios of Probation Officers to Their Supervisors

	Preferred Ratio	Actual Ratio
AGENCY AVERAGE	8:1	7:1
BALTIMORE CITY MD	10:1	8:1
BALTIMORE COUNTY MD	10:1	8:1
BEXAR COUNTY TX	NA	7:1
COOK COUNTY IL	7:1	7:1
DADE COUNTY FL	9:1	10:1
DALLAS COUNTY TX	10:1	5:1
DENVER CO	4:1	5:1
ERIE COUNTY NY	6:1	7:1
FRANKLIN COUNTY OH	NA	5:1
HARRIS COUNTY TX	8:1	9:1
HENNEPIN COUNTY MN	9:1	9:1
HONOLULU HI	5:1	6:1
JEFFERSON COUNTY KY	10:1	14:1
KING COUNTY WA	NA	10:1
LOS ANGELES COUNTY CA	10:1	7:1
MARICOPA COUNTY AZ	10:1	9:1
MILWAUKEE COUNTY WI	10:1	7:1
MONROE COUNTY NY	7:1	8:1
NASSAU COUNTY NY	5:1	5:1
NEW YORK CITY* NY	6:1	5:1
OKLAHOMA COUNTY OK	10:1	10:1
ORANGE COUNTY CA	8:1	6:1
PHILADELPHIA PA	6:1	7:1
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY CA	9:1	9:1
SAN DIEGO COUNTY CA	10:1	6:1
SAN FRANCISCO CA	NA	9:1
SANTA CLARA COUNTY CA	10:1	6:1
ST LOUIS** MO	7:1	6:1
SUFFOLK COUNTY NY	10:1	8:1
VENTURA COUNTY CA	NA	6:1

*New York City covers Kings County (Brooklyn) and New York County (Manhattan).

**St. Louis includes the City of St. Louis and the County of St. Louis.

NOTE: Actual was computed by dividing number of probation officers, by number of supervisors.

Appendix A

Table A-3A

Distribution of Line Probation Officers, by Activity Performed

	TOTAL PROBATION OFFICERS	FELONY SUPERVISION	MISDEMEANOR SUPERVISION	JUVENILE SUPERVISION	PRETRIAL SUPERVISION	FELONY PSI	MISDEMEANOR PSI	OTHER ACTIVITY
AGENCY AVERAGE	240	82	25	41	4	40	11	36
BALTIMORE CITY MD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BALTIMORE COUNTY MD	0	0	0	0	0	63	0	0
BEXAR COUNTY TX	131	37	62	0	0	10	12	10
COOK COUNTY IL	281	157	65	0	0	26	13	20
DADE COUNTY FL	182	175	0	0	5	0	0	2
DALLAS COUNTY TX	232	134	54	0	0	10	4	30
DENVER CO	31	21	0	0	0	7	0	3
ERIE COUNTY NY	81	24	24	3	0	16	12	0
FRANKLIN COUNTY OH	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0
HARRIS COUNTY TX	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
HENNEPIN COUNTY MN	150	28	13	26	0	18	19	47
HONOLULU HI	41	27	0	0	0	14	0	0
JEFFERSON COUNTY KY	55	21	5	0	14	10	0	5
KING COUNTY WA	95	76	2	0	0	17	0	0
LOS ANGELES COUNTY CA	1,307	333	35	613	0	213	23	90
MARICOPA COUNTY AZ	268	215	0	0	0	53	0	0
MILWAUKEE COUNTY WI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MONROE COUNTY NY	119	26	38	6	10	3	7	29
NASSAU COUNTY NY	300	40	59	16	27	18	26	114
NEW YORK CITY* NY	661	169	42	25	0	300	75	50
OKLAHOMA COUNTY OK	97	78	0	0	0	5	0	15
ORANGE COUNTY CA	250	62	26	58	4	0	0	100
PHILADELPHIA PA	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY CA	171	20	8	25	0	15	7	96
SAN DIEGO COUNTY CA	391	87	10	92	0	73	10	120
SAN FRANCISCO CA	80	36	20	0	0	22	0	2
SANTA CLARA COUNTY CA	218	41	33	38	2	44	25	36
ST LOUIS** MO	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SUFFOLK COUNTY NY	231	56	68	25	28	18	14	22
VENTURA COUNTY CA	128	16	19	9	3	27	9	45

*New York City covers Kings County (Brooklyn) and New York County (Manhattan).

**St. Louis includes the City of St. Louis and the County of St. Louis.

NOTE: Totals may not be the sum of the categories due to rounding of full time equivalent staff.

Appendix A

Table A-3B

Percent Distribution of Line Probation Officers, by Activity Performed

	TOTAL PROBATION OFFICERS	FELONY SUPERVISION	MISDEMEANOR SUPERVISION	JUVENILE SUPERVISION	PRETRIAL SUPERVISION	FELONY PSI	MISDEMEANOR PSI	OTHER ACTIVITY
AGENCY AVERAGE	100%	34%	11%	17%	2%	17%	5%	15%
BALTIMORE CITY MD								
BALTIMORE COUNTY MD								
BEXAR COUNTY TX	100%	28%	47%	0%	0%	8%	9%	8%
COOK COUNTY IL	100%	56%	23%	0%	0%	9%	5%	7%
DADE COUNTY FL	100%	96%	0%	0%	3%	0%	0%	1%
DALLAS COUNTY TX	100%	58%	23%	0%	0%	4%	2%	13%
DENVER CO	100%	68%	0%	0%	0%	23%	0%	10%
ERIE COUNTY NY	100%	30%	30%	4%	0%	20%	15%	0%
FRANKLIN COUNTY OH								
HARRIS COUNTY TX								
HENNEPIN COUNTY MN	100%	18%	9%	18%	0%	12%	12%	31%
HONOLULU HI	100%	66%	0%	0%	0%	34%	0%	0%
JEFFERSON COUNTY KY	100%	38%	9%	0%	26%	17%	1%	10%
KING COUNTY WA	100%	30%	2%	0%	0%	18%	0%	0%
LOS ANGELES COUNTY CA	100%	25%	3%	47%	0%	16%	2%	7%
MARICOPA COUNTY AZ	100%	80%	0%	0%	0%	20%	0%	0%
MILWAUKEE COUNTY WI								
MONROE COUNTY NY	100%	22%	32%	5%	8%	3%	6%	24%
NASSAU COUNTY NY	100%	13%	20%	5%	9%	6%	9%	38%
NEW YORK CITY* NY	100%	26%	6%	4%	0%	45%	11%	8%
OKLAHOMA COUNTY OK	100%	80%	0%	0%	0%	5%	0%	15%
ORANGE COUNTY CA	100%	25%	11%	23%	2%	0%	0%	40%
PHILADELPHIA PA								
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY CA	100%	11%	5%	15%	0%	9%	4%	56%
SAN DIEGO COUNTY CA	100%	22%	3%	23%	0%	19%	3%	31%
SAN FRANCISCO CA	100%	46%	25%	0%	0%	28%	0%	3%
SANTA CLARA COUNTY CA	100%	19%	15%	17%	1%	20%	11%	17%
ST LOUIS** MO								
SUFFOLK COUNTY NY	100%	24%	29%	11%	12%	8%	6%	10%
VENTURA COUNTY CA	100%	12%	15%	7%	2%	21%	7%	36%

*New York City covers Kings County (Brooklyn) and New York County (Manhattan).

**St. Louis includes the City of St. Louis and the County of St. Louis.

Appendix A

Table A-4

Number of Hours Required for Recruit and In-Service Training, by Agency

AGENCY AVERAGE	AVERAGE NUMBER OF HOURS REQUIRED	
	RECRUIT TRAINING	IN SERVICE TRAINING
	144 Hours	35 Hours
BALTIMORE CITY MD	213	40
BALTIMORE COUNTY MD	213	40
BEXAR COUNTY TX	48	20
COOK COUNTY IL	40	20
DADE COUNTY FL	356	40
DALLAS COUNTY TX	56	20
DENVER CO	40	40
ERIE COUNTY NY	105	10
FRANKLIN COUNTY OH	40	20
HARRIS COUNTY TX	40	20
HENNEPIN COUNTY MN	240	40
HONOLULU HI	NA	72
JEFFERSON COUNTY KY	40	40
KING COUNTY WA	80	20
LOS ANGELES COUNTY CA	200	80
MARICOPA COUNTY AZ	80	40
MILWAUKEE COUNTY WI	NA	NA
MONROE COUNTY NY	70	21
NASSAU COUNTY NY	200	21
NEW YORK CITY* NY	38	35
OKLAHOMA COUNTY OK	460	40
ORANGE COUNTY CA	200	40
PHILADELPHIA PA	40	40
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY CA	200	NA
SAN DIEGO COUNTY CA	200	40
SAN FRANCISCO CA	200	NA
SANTA CLARA COUNTY CA	200	40
ST LOUIS** MO	160	40
SUFFOLK COUNTY NY	70	21
VENTURA COUNTY CA	200	40

*New York City covers Kings County (Brooklyn) and New York County (Manhattan).

**St. Louis includes the City of St. Louis and the County of St. Louis.

Appendix A

Table A-5

Use of Volunteers, by Agency

		VOLUNTEERS UTILIZED	NUMBER OF VOLUNTEERS
AGENCY AVERAGE		77%	144
BALTIMORE CITY	MD	Yes	NA
BALTIMORE COUNTY	MD	Yes	240
BEXAR COUNTY	TX	Yes	55
COOK COUNTY	IL	No	
DADE COUNTY	FL	No	
DALLAS COUNTY	TX	Yes	25
DENVER	CO	No	
ERIE COUNTY	NY	No	
FRANKLIN COUNTY	OH	Yes	23
HARRIS COUNTY	TX	Yes	NA
HENNEPIN COUNTY	MN	Yes	189
HONOLULU	HI	Yes	4
JEFFERSON COUNTY	KY	No	
KING COUNTY	WA	Yes	300
LOS ANGELES COUNTY	CA	Yes	60
MARICOPA COUNTY	AZ	Yes	31
MILWAUKEE COUNTY	WI	Yes	NA
MONROE COUNTY	NY	Yes	5
NASSAU COUNTY	NY	No	
NEW YORK CITY*	NY	No	
OKLAHOMA COUNTY	OK	Yes	37
ORANGE COUNTY	CA	Yes	411
PHILADELPHIA	PA	No	
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY	CA	Yes	250
SAN DIEGO COUNTY	CA	Yes	582
SAN FRANCISCO	CA	Yes	1
SANTA CLARA COUNTY	CA	Yes	100
ST LOUIS**	MO	Yes	400
SUFFOLK COUNTY	NY	Yes	NA
VENTURA COUNTY	CA	Yes	26

*New York City covers Kings County (Brooklyn) and New York County (Manhattan).
 **St. Louis includes the City of St. Louis and the County of St. Louis.

Appendix A

Table A-6

Application Requirements for Probation Officer Recruits, by Agency

		MINIMUM EDUCATION	MINIMUM AGE	EXPERIENCE	WRITTEN EXAM	ORAL EXAM
Baltimore City	MD	B.A.	21	NA	REQUIRED	NO
Baltimore Co.	MD	B.A.	21	NA	REQUIRED	NO
Bexar Co.	TX	B.A./M.A.	NA	2 Yrs experience w/o M.A.	NO	NO
Cook Co.	IL	B.A.	NA	NA	REQUIRED	NA
Dade Co.	FL	B.A.	NA	NA	NA	NA
Dallas Co.	TX	B.A.	NA	1 year work or grad work	NO	NO
Denver	CO	B.A.	NA	NA	NA	NA
Erie Co.	NY	B.A./M.A.	NA	2 Yrs experience w/o MA	NO	NO
Franklin Co.	OH	B.A.	NA	Experience can sub for education	NO	NO
Harris Co.	TX	B.A.	NA	1 year work or grad work	NO	NO
Hennepin Co.	MN	B.A./M.A.	NA	1 year experience w/o MA	NONE	REQUIRED
Honolulu Co.	HI	B.A.	NA	NA	NA	NA
Jefferson Co.	KY	B.A.	21	NA	REQUIRED	NO
King Co.	WA	B.A.	NA	NONE REQUIRED	NO	NO
Kings Co.	NY	B.A.	NA	NA	NO	NO
Los Angeles Co.	CA	B.A.	18	NA	NA	NA
Maricopa Co.	AZ	B.A.	None	NONE REQUIRED	REQUIRED	REQUIRED
Milwaukee Co.	WI	NONE	None	NONE REQUIRED	REQUIRED	NO
Monroe Co.	NY	B.A.	NA	2 years work or M.A.	NO	NO
Nassau Co.	NY	B.A./M.A.	NA	2 Yrs experience w/o MA	REQUIRED	Psych Exam
New York Co.	NY	B.A.	NA	NA	NO	NO
Oklahoma Co.	OK	B.A.	NA	NA	NO	NO
Orange Co.	CA	B.A.	None	Experience can sub for education	REQUIRED	REQUIRED
Philadelphia	PA	B.A.	NA	NA	NO	NO
San Bernadino Co.	CA	30 Semester units	21	NONE REQUIRED	REQUIRED	REQUIRED
San Diego Co.	CA	B.A.	21	Experience can sub for education	REQUIRED	NA
San Francisco	CA	B.A.	NA	1 year work in CJS	REQUIRED	REQUIRED
Santa Clara Co.	CA	B.A.	NA	NA	NA	NA
St. Louis Co.	MO	B.A.	NA	Experience can sub for education	REQUIRED	NO
Suffolk Co.	NY	B.A.	NA	NA	REQUIRED	NO
Ventura Co.	CA	B.A.	NA	NA	NA	NA

Appendix A

Table A-7

Salary Range for Entry and Senior Level Probation Officer, by Agency

	LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	SALARY RANGE		AVERAGE SALARY
		ENTRY LEVEL	SENIOR LEVEL	
AGENCY AVERAGE		\$21,803	\$33,467	
LOCAL AVERAGE		\$23,214	\$34,833	
STATE AVERAGE		\$18,668	\$32,032	
BEXAR COUNTY TX	LOCAL	20,448	33,240	24,945
COOK COUNTY IL	LOCAL	20,340	27,864	24,612
DALLAS COUNTY TX	LOCAL	21,168	27,552	25,229
ERIE COUNTY NY	LOCAL	26,478	33,666	27,998
FRANKLIN COUNTY OH	LOCAL	17,000	35,100	19,309
HARRIS COUNTY TX	LOCAL	21,000	27,000	24,783
HENNEPIN COUNTY MN	LOCAL	20,208	42,552	40,928
LOS ANGELES COUNTY CA	LOCAL	29,780	39,108	
MARICOPA COUNTY AZ	LOCAL	21,195	36,338	24,394
MONROE COUNTY NY	LOCAL	23,091	34,440	
NASSAU COUNTY NY	LOCAL	30,889	33,663	30,522
NEW YORK CITY* NY	LOCAL	23,988	34,729	28,179
ORANGE COUNTY CA	LOCAL	21,350	38,604	33,394
PHILADELPHIA PA	LOCAL	21,984	27,506	
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY CA	LOCAL	21,050	33,509	
SAN DIEGO COUNTY CA	LOCAL	27,144	36,338	33,737
SAN FRANCISCO CA	LOCAL	29,937	39,881	35,084
SANTA CLARA COUNTY CA	LOCAL	23,557	38,388	
SUFFOLK COUNTY NY	LOCAL	21,533	41,682	
VENTURA COUNTY CA	LOCAL	22,131	35,500	
BALTIMORE** MD	STATE	16,597	29,241	
DADE COUNTY FL	STATE	20,500	36,203	
DENVER CO	STATE	21,000	37,692	33,568
HONOLULU HI	STATE	19,356	35,976	
JEFFERSON COUNTY KY	STATE	15,449	30,000	
KING COUNTY WA	STATE	18,600	31,152	
MILWAUKEE COUNTY WI	STATE	20,211	35,921	27,049
OKLAHOMA COUNTY OK	STATE	18,504	26,676	
ST LOUIS*** MO	STATE	17,796	25,428	19,312

*New York City covers Kings County (Brooklyn) and New York County (Manhattan).

**Baltimore includes both the City and County of Baltimore.

***St. Louis includes the City of St. Louis and the County of St. Louis.

NOTE: Average salary was computed where the following information was provided:
Number of probation officers and total salary expenditures for them.

Appendix A

Table A-8A

DISTRIBUTION OF TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS AMONG BUDGET CATEGORIES, BY AGENCY

		TOTAL BUDGET	PERSONNEL	FRINGE	CONTRACTS	OTHER
AGENCY AVERAGE		\$22,683,938	\$15,318,197	\$3,419,434	\$1,035,078	\$2,911,215
BALTIMORE	MD	38,364,546	33,452,070	NA	NA	4,912,476
BEXAR COUNTY	TX	5,968,671	4,373,367	918,407	273,760	403,137
COOK COUNTY	IL	12,521,753	10,680,801	1,230,000	610,952	0
DADE COUNTY	FL	7,740,647	NA	NA	NA	NA
DALLAS COUNTY	TX	13,069,166	9,187,177	1,868,615	1,316,168	697,206
DENVER	CO	1,895,875	1,518,249	322,815	0	54,811
ERIE COUNTY	NY	4,315,361	3,129,085	889,275	0	297,001
FRANKLIN COUNTY	OH	2,604,000	2,100,000	504,000	0	0
HARRIS COUNTY	TX	12,900,000	10,061,000	2,321,000	517,600	0
HENNEPIN COUNTY	MN	13,408,151	10,038,780	2,051,542	66,044	1,251,785
HONOLULU	HI	2,100,000	1,700,000	NA	400,000	NA
JEFFERSON COUNTY	KY	2,465,900	1,761,500	384,900	112,200	207,300
KING COUNTY	WA	28,262,000	15,393,000	3,417,000	5,544,000	3,908,000
LOS ANGELES COUNTY	CA	194,691,940	109,579,791	32,183,233	9,052,268	43,876,648
MARICOPA COUNTY	AZ	15,549,234	10,869,711	2,340,096	198,180	2,141,247
MILWAUKEE COUNTY	WI	5,754,700	4,000,000	1,100,000	654,700	0
MONROE COUNTY	NY	7,254,820	5,173,296	1,267,223	33,014	781,287
NASSAU COUNTY	NY	22,781,573	16,688,248	5,229,025	521,000	343,300
NEW YORK CITY	NY	39,981,808	34,034,069	1,587,724	0	4,360,015
OKLAHOMA COUNTY	OK	12,927,026	8,868,488	2,663,463	0	1,395,075
ORANGE COUNTY	CA	41,400,193	29,084,775	6,730,677	5,126,337	458,404
PHILADELPHIA	PA	14,798,481	9,708,092	3,714,449	1,175,940	200,000
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY	CA	25,780,885	16,982,803	3,598,612	660,218	4,539,252
SAN DIEGO COUNTY	CA	41,301,028	29,128,933	8,284,636	665,211	3,222,248
SAN FRANCISCO	CA	5,705,940	4,190,089	1,140,413	18,750	356,688
SANTA CLARA COUNTY	CA	31,699,976	21,176,220	5,722,984	174,500	4,626,272
ST LOUIS	MO	6,744,225	5,865,797	0	0	878,428
SUFFOLK COUNTY	NY	18,999,320	11,949,686	3,596,856	1,443,042	2,009,736
VENTURA COUNTY	CA	11,903,700	8,214,500	2,677,200	418,300	593,700

NOTE: Contract entry for Milwaukee County was inferred from state figures wherein the statewide amount was multiplied by 20% (the percentage share of Milwaukee County to the statewide amount for personnel.

The overall figures shown here were without Dade County.

Appendix A

Table A-8B

DISTRIBUTION OF TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS AMONG BUDGET CATEGORIES, BY AGENCY

	TOTAL BUDGET	PERSONNEL	FRINGE	CONTRACTS	OTHER
AGENCY AVERAGE	100%	68%	15%	5%	13%
BALTIMORE MD	100%	87%	0%	0%	13%
BEXAR COUNTY TX	100%	73%	15%	5%	7%
COOK COUNTY IL	100%	85%	10%	5%	0%
DADE COUNTY FL					
DALLAS COUNTY TX	100%	70%	14%	10%	5%
DENVER CO	100%	80%	17%	0%	3%
ERIE COUNTY NY	100%	73%	21%	0%	7%
FRANKLIN COUNTY OH	100%	81%	19%	0%	0%
HARRIS COUNTY TX	100%	78%	18%	4%	0%
HENNEPIN COUNTY MN	100%	75%	15%	0%	9%
HONOLULU HI	100%	81%	0%	19%	0%
JEFFERSON COUNTY KY	100%	71%	16%	5%	8%
KING COUNTY WA	100%	54%	12%	20%	14%
LOS ANGELES COUNTY CA	100%	56%	17%	5%	23%
MARICOPA COUNTY AZ	100%	70%	15%	1%	14%
MILWAUKEE COUNTY WI	100%	70%	19%	11%	0%
MONROE COUNTY NY	100%	71%	17%	0%	11%
NASSAU COUNTY NY	100%	73%	23%	2%	2%
NEW YORK CITY* NY	100%	85%	4%	0%	11%
OKLAHOMA COUNTY OK	100%	69%	21%	0%	11%
ORANGE COUNTY CA	100%	70%	16%	12%	1%
PHILADELPHIA PA	100%	66%	25%	8%	1%
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY CA	100%	66%	14%	3%	18%
SAN DIEGO COUNTY CA	100%	71%	20%	2%	8%
SAN FRANCISCO CA	100%	73%	20%	0%	6%
SANTA CLARA COUNTY CA	100%	67%	18%	1%	15%
ST LOUIS** MO	100%	87%	0%	0%	13%
SUFFOLK COUNTY NY	100%	63%	19%	8%	11%
VENTURA COUNTY CA	100%	69%	22%	4%	5%

NOTE: Contract entry for Milwaukee County was inferred from state figures wherein the statewide amount was multiplied by 20% (the percentage share of Milwaukee County to the statewide amount for personnel.

The overall figures shown here were without Dade County.

Appendix A

Table A-9

SOURCES OF AGENCY FUNDING, BY AGENCY

	FUNDING TOTAL	LOCAL GOVT	STATE GOVT	SUPERVISION & PSI FEES	OTHER	PERCENT OF LOCAL AGENCY BUDGET FROM THE STATE	PERCENT OF BUDGET ATTRIBUTABLE TO PSI & SUPERVISION FEES
AGENCY AVERAGE	\$21,444,382 100%	\$14,435,634 67%	\$4,974,135 23%	\$904,859 4%	\$843,811 4%	20%	4%
BALTIMORE MD	38,364,546	0	38,230,084	0	134,462	NA	0%
BEXAR COUNTY TX	5,979,577	0	2,262,000	3,281,671	435,906	38%	55%
COOK COUNTY IL	12,521,753	7,121,753	5,400,000	0	0	43%	0%
DADE COUNTY FL	7,740,647	0	7,740,647	0	0	NA	21%
DALLAS COUNTY TX	13,069,166	0	6,520,492	6,178,492	369,724	50%	45%
DENVER CO	1,895,875	0	1,895,875	66,681	0	NA	4%
ERIE COUNTY NY	4,270,154	2,573,663	1,571,163	0	116,250	37%	0%
FRANKLIN COUNTY OH	2,604,000	1,814,000	790,000	0	0	30%	0%
HARRIS COUNTY TX	12,800,000	300,000	5,300,000	6,600,000	600,000	41%	53%
HENNEPIN COUNTY MN	13,408,151	11,660,097	1,397,054	0	351,000	10%	0%
HONOLULU HI	2,185,000	0	2,100,000	0	85,000	NA	0%
JEFFERSON COUNTY KY	2,465,900	0	2,235,800	0	230,100	NA	0%
KING COUNTY WA	28,262,000	0	18,413,000	0	9,849,000	NA	1%
LOS ANGELES COUNTY CA	194,691,950	161,615,929	17,497,207	852,464	7,309,109	9%	0%
MARICOPA COUNTY AZ	15,549,234	6,276,228	6,666,826	1,818,000	728,180	43%	11%
MILWAUKEE COUNTY WI	24,471,000		24,471,000	0	0	NA	0%
MONROE COUNTY NY	7,254,820	4,393,764	2,845,056	0	1,600	39%	0%
NASSAU COUNTY NY	22,781,573	12,188,142	10,593,431	0	0	47%	0%
NEW YORK CITY NY	39,981,808	20,505,752	19,476,056	0	0	49%	0%
OKLAHOMA COUNTY OK	12,927,026	0	12,927,026	0	0	NA	10%
ORANGE COUNTY CA	41,400,193	34,581,611	5,120,790	652,282	1,045,510	12%	1%
PHILADELPHIA PA	14,798,481	9,866,439	4,719,547	0	212,495	32%	0%
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY CA	25,780,885	18,277,679	2,984,626	52,465	4,466,115	12%	0%
SAN DIEGO COUNTY CA	41,301,028	35,365,503	3,739,676	1,476,885	718,964	9%	1%
SAN FRANCISCO CA	5,726,514	4,215,321	804,193	130,000	577,000	14%	2%
SANTA CLARA COUNTY CA	31,699,976	25,613,558	2,879,327	0	3,207,091	9%	0%
ST LOUIS MO	6,744,225	0	6,744,225	0	0	NA	0%
SUFFOLK COUNTY NY	18,999,320	11,065,147	6,491,131	0	1,443,042	34%	0%
VENTURA COUNTY CA	11,903,700	7,891,900	1,552,400	2,417,400	42,000	13%	10%

Appendix A

Table A-10

Distribution of the Monies Collected for Various Assessments, by Agency

	TOTAL COLLECTIONS	COURT FEES AND FINES	RESTITUTION	SUPERVISION AND PSI FEES	OTHER FEES
AGENCY AVERAGE	\$3,913,553	\$868,940	\$1,288,212	\$924,566	\$831,836
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION	100%	22%	33%	24%	21%
BALTIMORE MD	1,641,001	860,178	780,823	0	0
BEXAR COUNTY TX	6,849,503	2,898,403	669,429	3,281,671	0
COOK COUNTY IL	1,567,267	480,259	1,087,008	0	0
DADE COUNTY FL	4,260,492	253,902	2,406,590	1,600,000	0
DALLAS COUNTY TX	8,926,660	164,000	2,676,660	5,900,000	186,000
DENVER CO	481,107	22,677	308,418	66,681	83,331
ERIE COUNTY NY	582,282	302,307	279,975	0	0
FRANKLIN COUNTY OH	525,000	295,000	230,000	0	0
HARRIS COUNTY TX	15,072,000	4,672,000	3,500,000	6,900,000	0
HENNEPIN COUNTY MN	1,340,091	0	952,316	0	387,775
HONOLULU HI	0	0	0	0	0
JEFFERSON COUNTY KY	0	0	0	0	0
KING COUNTY WA	9,999,000	0	0	194,000	9,805,000
LOS ANGELES COUNTY CA	16,260,870	2,061,250	6,038,047	852,464	7,309,109
MARICOPA COUNTY AZ	4,351,836	571,980	1,815,396	1,651,728	312,732
MILWAUKEE COUNTY WI	0	0	0	0	0
MONROE COUNTY NY	636,241	193,872	442,369	0	0
NASSAU COUNTY NY	1,500,000	0	1,500,000	0	0
NEW YORK CITY NY	65,795	0	65,795	0	0
OKLAHOMA COUNTY OK	2,558,617	0	1,236,163	1,322,454	0
ORANGE COUNTY CA	2,728,956	224,984	1,100,000	427,298	976,674
PHILADELPHIA PA	1,681,469	0	1,681,469	0	0
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY CA	6,426,063	3,880,914	975,385	24,459	1,545,305
SAN DIEGO COUNTY CA	3,362,501	716,886	1,700,656	444,959	500,000
SAN FRANCISCO CA	1,272,000	341,000	565,000	130,000	236,000
SANTA CLARA COUNTY CA	264,000	264,000	0	0	N/A
ST LOUIS MO	3,956,300	1,136,500	2,534,000	0	285,800
SUFFOLK COUNTY NY	948,019	0	948,019	0	0
VENTURA COUNTY CA	4,495,318	3,252,318	N/A	1,243,000	0

NOTE: All averages were computed on a base of 26; i.e., the number of agencies that were able to report their total collections. The averages in each of the categories are understated in that the base includes agencies that do not necessarily collect a particular fee.

A zero indicates that the information was not available.

Appendix A

Table A-11

Flow of Felony Caseload During 1988, by Agency

JURISDICTION	ACTIVE	NEW	CLOSED	ACTIVE	PERCENT CHANGE IN CASELOAD FROM 1/1 - 12/31/88	TURNOVER INDEX PERCENT OF YEAR START CASES THAT ARE CLOSED	PERCENT OF TOTAL CASELOAD THAT IS FELONY
	FELONY CASES 1/1/88	FELONY CASES 1988	FELONY CASES 1988	FELONY CASES 12/31/88			
OVERALL DISTRIBUTION	260,270	124,313	102,618	279,222	7%	39%	50%
BALTIMORE CITY MD	0	0	0	0			
BALTIMORE COUNTY MD	0	0	0	0			
BEXAR COUNTY TX	8,996	3,291	2,242	10,045	12%	25%	37%
COOK COUNTY IL	20,376	9,719	8,399	21,696	6%	41%	86%
DADE COUNTY FL	9,640	7,573	5,914	9,239	-4%	61%	
DALLAS COUNTY TX	22,087	10,672	9,250	23,509	6%	42%	65%
DENVER CO	0	0	0	0			
ERIE COUNTY NY	1,164	0	0	1,215	4%		29%
FRANKLIN COUNTY OH	1,807	1,184	641	2,350	30%	35%	88%
HARRIS COUNTY TX	14,291	8,114	8,012	14,393	1%	56%	53%
HENNEPIN COUNTY MN	4,404	2,072	1,469	5,111	16%	33%	35%
HONOLULU HI	3,822	733	629	3,926	3%	16%	96%
JEFFERSON COUNTY KY	1,683	994	1,012	1,665	-1%	60%	60%
KING COUNTY WA	5,600	0	0	5,800	4%		95%
LOS ANGELES COUNTY CA	42,459	26,744	19,010	50,193	18%	45%	52%
MARICOPA COUNTY AZ	13,487	6,458	3,779	16,166	20%	28%	100%
MILWAUKEE COUNTY WI	0	0	0	0			
MONROE COUNTY NY	1,919	746	641	2,024	5%	33%	38%
NASSAU COUNTY NY	3,430	2,772	2,369	3,833	12%	69%	7%
NEW YORK CITY* NY	35,397	15,390	13,865	36,922	4%	39%	67%
OKLAHOMA COUNTY OK	21919	0	0	20,587	-6%		
ORANGE COUNTY CA	3,163	2,386	2,289	3,260	3%	72%	17%
PHILADELPHIA PA	0	0	0	0			
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY CA	0	0	0	0			
SAN DIEGO COUNTY CA	11,786	7,823	7,213	12,396	5%	61%	54%
SAN FRANCISCO CA	4,055	2,729	2,466	4,318	6%	61%	43%
SANTA CLARA COUNTY CA	9,057	6,373	6,102	9,672	7%	67%	28%
ST LOUIS** MO	14,981	7,359	6,104	16,236	8%	41%	42%
SUFFOLK COUNTY NY	3,074	1,181	1,212	3,043	-1%	39%	34%
VENTURA COUNTY CA	1,673	0	0	1,623	-3%		11%

*New York City covers Kings County (Brooklyn) and New York County (Manhattan).

**St. Louis includes the City of St. Louis and the County of St. Louis.

NOTE: A zero indicates that the information was not available.

Percent computed by adding all active caseloads on 12/31/88 and the dividing the number of active felony cases for the same day.

Appendix A

Table A-12

TOTAL TRANSFERS INTO AND OUT OF EACH PROBATION AGENCY FOR 1988
AND
THE TOTAL NET CHANGE TO CASELOAD AND THE PERCENT OF TOTAL CASELOAD BASED ON 12/31/88 POPULATION

JURISDICTION	ACTIVE FELONY CASES 12/31/88	TOTAL TRANSFERS				NET CHANGE
		OUT OF THE JURISDICTION		INTO THE JURISDICTION		
OVERALL DISTRIBUTION	119,048	8,458	7%	8,252	7%	-206
BEXAR COUNTY TX	10,045	368	4%	525	5%	157
DADE COUNTY FL	9,239	978	11%	1,133	12%	155
DALLAS COUNTY TX	23,509	3,201	14%	2,633	11%	-568
ERIE COUNTY NY	1,215	33	3%	27	2%	-6
FRANKLIN COUNTY OH	2,350	141	6%	35	1%	-106
HENNEPIN COUNTY MN	5,111	168	3%	893	17%	725
HONOLULU HI	3,926	56	1%	38	1%	-18
JEFFERSON COUNTY KY	1,665	126	8%	122	7%	-4
MARICOPA COUNTY AZ	16,166	1,514	9%	607	4%	-907
MONROE COUNTY NY	2,024	51	3%	143	7%	92
NASSAU COUNTY NY	3,833	510	13%	250	7%	-260
NEW YORK CITY* NY	36,922	1,105	3%	1,768	5%	663
SUFFOLK COUNTY NY	3,043	207	7%	78	3%	-129

Appendix A
Table A-13

Type of Risk and needs Assessment Scales Used, by Agency

		Risk Assessment	Needs Assessment
Baltimore City	MD	Modified Wisconsin	Modified Wisconsin
Baltimore Co.	MD	Modified Wisconsin	Modified Wisconsin
Bexar Co.	TX	Modified Wisconsin	Wisconsin
Cook Co.	IL	Wisconsin	Wisconsin
Dade Co.	FL	None Used	None Used
Dallas Co.	TX	Wisconsin	Wisconsin
Denver	CO	Wisconsin	Wisconsin
Erie Co.	NY	New York State	Modified Wisconsin
Franklin Co.	OH	Modified Wisconsin	Modified Wisconsin
Harris Co.	TX	Modified Wisconsin	Wisconsin
Hennepin Co.	MN	Wisconsin	Wisconsin
Honolulu Co.	HI	Wisconsin	Modified Wisconsin
Jefferson Co.	KY	Wisconsin	Modified Wisconsin
King Co.	WA	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Kings Co.	NY	Wisconsin and	None Used
Los Angeles Co.	CA	Wisconsin	None Used
Maricopa Co.	AZ	Wisconsin	Wisconsin
Milwaukee Co.	WI	Wisconsin	Wisconsin
Monroe Co.	NY	New York State	Modified Wisconsin
Nassau Co.	NY	New York State	Modified Wisconsin
New York Co.	NY	Wisconsin and	None Used
Oklahoma Co.	OK	Wisconsin	Wisconsin
Orange Co.	CA	Modified Wisconsin	Modified Wisconsin
Philadelphia	PA	Modified Wisconsin	Wisconsin
San Bernadino Co.	CA	Modified Wisconsin	Modified Wisconsin
San Diego Co.	CA	Own Scale	Own Scale
San Francisco	CA	Wisconsin	Wisconsin
Santa Clara Co.	CA	Modified Wisconsin	Modified Wisconsin
St. Louis City	MO	Own Scale	Own Scale
St. Louis Co.	MO	Own Scale	Own Scale
Suffolk Co.	NY	Own Scale	None Used
Ventura Co.	CA	Own Scale	None Used

Appendix A

Table A-14

PREFERRED FREQUENCY OF CONTACT BETWEEN THE PROBATION OFFICER AND THE PROBATIONER, BY SUPERVISION LEVEL TO WHICH THE PROBATIONER IS ASSIGNED

JURISDICTION	INTENSIVE	MAXIMUM	MEDIUM	MINIMUM
AGENCY AVERAGE	9.8 per month	2.3 per month	0.9 per month	0.3 per month
BALTIMORE CITY MD	NA	2.0	0.5	0.3
BALTIMORE COUNTY MD	NA	2.0	0.5	0.3
BEXAR COUNTY TX	NA	1.0	0.4	0.0
COOK COUNTY IL	NA	1.0	0.1	0.0
DADE COUNTY FL	8.0	4.0	2.0	1.0
DALLAS COUNTY TX	12.0	2.0	1.0	0.3
DENVER CO	12.0	2.5	1.5	0.5
ERIE COUNTY NY	NA	2.0	1.0	1.0
FRANKLIN COUNTY OH	NA	NA	NA	NA
HARRIS COUNTY TX	NA	2.5	1.0	0.3
HENNEPIN COUNTY MN	NA	2.5	0.5	0.3
HONOLULU HI	NA	2.0	1.0	0.3
JEFFERSON COUNTY KY	NA	6.0	3.0	0.3
KING COUNTY WA	NA	NA	NA	NA
LOS ANGELES COUNTY CA	12.0	NA	0.3	0.0
MARICOPA COUNTY AZ	16.0	2.0	1.0	0.3
MILWAUKEE COUNTY WI	6.0	2.0	1.0	0.3
MONROE COUNTY NY	8.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
NASSAU COUNTY NY	NA	1.0	1.0	0.0
NEW YORK CITY* NY	NA	2.0	1.0	0.1
OKLAHOMA COUNTY OK	NA	2.0	1.0	0.3
ORANGE COUNTY CA	NA	2.0	1.0	0.3
PHILADELPHIA PA	12.0	NA	NA	NA
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY CA	NA	3.0	NA	NA
SAN DIEGO COUNTY CA	NA	NA	NA	NA
SAN FRANCISCO CA	NA	1.0	0.5	0.3
SANTA CLARA COUNTY CA	2.0	1.0	0.3	0.0
ST LOUIS** MO	NA	4.0	1.0	1.0
SUFFOLK COUNTY NY	NA	4.0	1.0	0.3
VENTURA COUNTY CA	NA	4.0	1.0	0.3

*New York City covers Kings County (Brooklyn) and New York County (Manhattan).

**St. Louis includes the City of St. Louis and the County of St. Louis.

NOTE: A fraction indicates that a meeting is to take place in a time period that exceeds one month. For example, an entry of 0.5 indicates that a meeting is to take place once every two months.

NOTE: Averages were computed based on the number of valid responses in each column.

Appendix A

Table A-15A

THE AGENCY'S PREFERRED RATIO OF PROBATIONERS TO EACH PROBATION

OFFICER, BY SUPERVISION LEVEL TO WHICH PROBATIONER IS ASSIGNED

JURISDICTION	INTENSIVE	MAXIMUM	MEDIUM	MINIMUM	ADMINISTRATIVE
OVERALL DISTRIBUTION	24 TO 1	46 TO 1	86 TO 1	213 TO 1	586 TO 1
BALTIMORE CITY MD	0	53	142	213	426
BALTIMORE COUNTY MD	0	53	142	213	426
BEXAR COUNTY TX	0	35	70	35	0
COOK COUNTY IL	0	0	0	0	0
DADE COUNTY FL	20	110	110	110	0
DALLAS COUNTY TX	30	40	50	150	0
DENVER CO	42	52.5	148	350	630
ERIE COUNTY NY	0	20	20	20	0
FRANKLIN COUNTY OH	0	0	0	0	0
HARRIS COUNTY TX	0	50	60	120	0
HENNEPIN COUNTY MN	0	5	25	35	0
HONOLULU HI	0	0	0	0	0
JEFFERSON COUNTY KY	0	25	0	0	0
KING COUNTY WA	0	0	0	0	0
LOS ANGELES COUNTY CA	25	0	200	0	1000
MARICOPA COUNTY AZ	12	35	58	82	0
MILWAUKEE COUNTY WI	20	0	0	0	0
MONROE COUNTY NY	18	0	0	0	0
NASSAU COUNTY NY	0	22.5	25	25	0
NEW YORK CITY* NY	0	25	25	25	0
OKLAHOMA COUNTY OK	0	0	60	0	0
ORANGE COUNTY CA	0	106	108	222	323
PHILADELPHIA PA	25	75	150	0	0
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY CA	0	32	60	120	480
SAN DIEGO COUNTY CA	0	50	100	236	1000
SAN FRANCISCO CA	0	0	0	0	0
SANTA CLARA COUNTY CA	0	60	100	300	0
ST LOUIS** MO	0	37	80	1400	0
SUFFOLK COUNTY NY	0	35	35	150	0
VENTURA COUNTY CA	0	50	120	240	400

*New York City covers Kings County (Brooklyn) and New York County (Manhattan).

**St. Louis includes the City of St. Louis and the County of St. Louis.

NOTE: A zero indicates that the information was not available.
Percent computed by adding all active caseloads on 12/31/88 and the dividing the number of active felony cases for the same day.

Appendix A

INCLUDES ONLY THOSE AGENCIES WHERE DATA ON PREFERRED AND ACTUAL RATIOS WERE PROVIDED

Table A-15B

PREFERRED		THE AGENCY'S PREFERRED RATIO OF PROBATIONERS TO EACH PROBATION OFFICER, BY SUPERVISION LEVEL TO WHICH PROBATIONER IS ASSIGNED				
JURISDICTION		INTENSIVE	MAXIMUM	MEDIUM	MINIMUM	ADMINISTRATIVE
AGENCY AVERAGE		22 TO 1	43 TO 1	75 TO 1	102 TO 1	800 TO 1
BEXAR COUNTY	TX	0	35	70	35	0
DADE COUNTY	FL	20	110	110	110	0
DALLAS COUNTY	TX	30	40	50	150	0
ERIE COUNTY	NY	0	20	20	20	0
HARRIS COUNTY	TX	0	50	60	120	0
HENNEPIN COUNTY	MN	0	5	25	35	0
LOS ANGELES COUNTY	CA	25	0	200	0	1000
MARICOPA COUNTY	AZ	12	35	58	82	0
NASSAU COUNTY	NY	0	22.5	25	25	0
NEW YORK CITY	NY	0	25	25	25	0
PHILADELPHIA	PA	25	75	150	0	0
SAN DIEGO COUNTY	CA	0	50	100	236	1000
SUFFOLK COUNTY	NY	0	35	35	150	0
VENTURA COUNTY	CA	0	50	120	240	400
ACTUAL		THE AGENCY'S ESTIMATED RATIO OF PROBATIONERS TO EACH PROBATION OFFICER, BY SUPERVISION LEVEL TO WHICH PROBATIONER IS ASSIGNED				
JURISDICTION		INTENSIVE	MAXIMUM	MEDIUM	MINIMUM	ADMINISTRATIVE
AGENCY AVERAGE		22 TO 1	43 TO 1	89 TO 1	154 TO 1	1050 TO 1
BEXAR COUNTY	TX	0	33	43	63	0
DADE COUNTY	FL	20	40	56	81	0
DALLAS COUNTY	TX	30	39	45	262.5	0
ERIE COUNTY	NY	0	30	40	30	0
HARRIS COUNTY	TX	0	50	60	120	0
HENNEPIN COUNTY	MN	0	23	28	43	0
LOS ANGELES COUNTY	CA	25	0	200	0	1000
MARICOPA COUNTY	AZ	12	25	60	90	0
NASSAU COUNTY	NY	0	25	30	30	0
NEW YORK CITY	NY	0	45	123	300	0
PHILADELPHIA	PA	25	100	200	0	0
SAN DIEGO COUNTY	CA	0	60	130	300	1150
SUFFOLK COUNTY	NY	0	35	70	175	0
VENTURA COUNTY	CA	0	50	160	350	1000

Appendix A

Table A-16

THE DISTRIBUTION OF PROBATIONERS ACROSS THE VARIOUS LEVELS OF SUPERVISION

JURISDICTION	TOTAL	INTENSIVE	MAXIMUM	MEDIUM	MINIMUM	ADMINISTRATIVE	BASIS of COUNT
OVERALL DISTRIBUTION	241,691 100%	1,437 1%	27,180 11%	87,538 36%	41,259 17%	84,277 35%	
BALTIMORE CITY MD	0	0	0	0	0	0	
BALTIMORE COUNTY MD	66,451	0	4,232	20,133	16,620	25,466	ALL
BEXAR COUNTY TX	3,291	0	3,291	0	0	0	NEW
COOK COUNTY IL	8,429	0	1,266	5,368	1,197	598	NEW
DADE COUNTY FL	0	0	0	0	0	0	
DALLAS COUNTY TX	23,693	129	1,956	7,943	3,964	9,701	ALL
DENVER CO	0	0	0	0	0	0	
ERIE COUNTY NY	0	0	0	0	0	0	
FRANKLIN COUNTY OH	0	0	0	0	0	0	
HARRIS COUNTY TX	22,421	0	1,950	6,972	6,407	7,092	ALL
HENNEPIN COUNTY MN	4,341	0	1,449	1,037	1,274	581	ALL
HONOLULU HI	3,868	0	281	1,076	1,338	1,173	ALL
JEFFERSON COUNTY KY	994	0	40	286	668	0	NEW
KING COUNTY WA	0	0	0	0	0	0	
LOS ANGELES COUNTY CA	55,200	200	0	25,000	0	30,000	ALL
MARICOPA COUNTY AZ	6,458	348	519	3,422	1,650	519	NEW
MILWAUKEE COUNTY WI	0	0	0	0	0	0	
MONROE COUNTY NY	0	0	0	0	0	0	
NASSAU COUNTY NY	3,631	0	363	617	2,651	0	NEW
NEW YORK CITY* NY	12,260	0	3,077	6,150	50	2,983	NEW
OKLAHOMA COUNTY OK	1,854	0	1,854	0	0	0	NEW
ORANGE COUNTY CA	6,315	0	2,257	2,571	273	1,214	ALL
PHILADELPHIA PA	0	0	0	0	0	0	
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY CA	0	0	0	0	0	0	
SAN DIEGO COUNTY CA	12,908	0	2,014	1,847	4,097	4,950	ALL
SAN FRANCISCO CA	0	0	0	0	0	0	
SANTA CLARA COUNTY CA	0	0	0	0	0	0	
ST LOUIS** MO	8,396	760	1,450	5,116	1,070	0	NEW
SUFFOLK COUNTY NY	1,181	0	1,181	0	0	0	NEW
VENTURA COUNTY CA	0	0	0	0	0	0	

*New York City covers Kings County (Brooklyn) and New York County (Manhattan).

**St. Louis includes the City of St. Louis and the County of St. Louis.

NOTE: A zero indicates that the information was not available.

Percent computed by adding all active caseloads on 12/31/88 and the dividing the number of active felony cases for the same day.

Appendix A

Table A-17

Distribution of Probation Disciplinary Hearing Outcomes

	TOTAL	NOTHING	PROBATION CONDITIONS REVISED	JAIL & PROBATION	REVOKED SENT TO PRISON	OTHER
TOTAL OUTCOMES	20,028	2,056	3,535	2,683	8,534	3,220
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION	100%	10%	18%	13%	43%	16%
DALLAS COUNTY TX	5,549	0	819	1,285	2,451	994
FRANKLIN COUNTY OH	400	190	105	20	85	0
HONOLULU HI	135	4	11	0	119	1
MARICOPA COUNTY AZ	4,177	618	395	1,378	1,511	275
NASSAU COUNTY NY	500	0	50	0	300	150
NEW YORK CITY* NY	4,722	461	977	0	2,531	753
PHILADELPHIA PA	4,083	783	1,051	0	1,239	1,010
SUFFOLK COUNTY NY	462	0	127	0	298	37

*New York City covers Kings County (Brooklyn) and New York County (Manhattan).

APPENDIX B

PROBATION AGENCY QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX B

NACJP/BJJ

PROBATION AGENCY QUESTIONNAIRE

Please provide the information requested. If you have any questions, please call Mark Cunniff at the NACJP at (202) 347-0501 for clarification. When the questionnaire is completed, please mail it to: NACJP, 1511 K Street, N.W., Suite 445, Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

1. Agency Name: _____

2. Person Completing Questionnaire:

_____ Name _____ Phone Number

3. Level of Government Administering Agency (please check one):

City County State

4. Organizational Placement of Agency (please check one):

Executive Judicial Other (Describe: _____)

5. Area of Service (please check one):

Single County More than one County (How many: _____)

6. Supervisory Functions Performed (please check each appropriate cell):

	ADULT	JUVENILE
Pretrial Release		
Preadjudication Diversion		
Probation Supervision		
Other		

7. Agency Supervises Persons Convicted of (please check each appropriate entry):

Felony Misdemeanor

B. STAFFING

1. Please provide the distribution of staff in your agency's FY88 budget among the following categories (use full time equivalent wherever parttime staff may be employed):

TOTAL STAFF. _____
Probation Officers _____
Supervisors of P.O.'s _____
Professional Staff- service support _____
Professional Staff- administrative _____
Clerical _____
Other _____

2. Please provide the number of full time and parttime probation officers:

Full time Parttime
Probation Officers = _____ Probation Officers = _____

3. If the agency supervises a variety of clients (juveniles and adults or felons and misdemeanants), please indicate how the agency assigns probation officers to supervise the different types of clients:

___ Supervising Probation Officers are assigned to one type of client only, eg.
___ felons only
___ If other than above, please briefly describe how the different types of cases
are assigned to probation officers:

4. Please indicate how the agency approaches its presentence investigation reports (PSI's) (please check all that apply):

___ Some Probation Officers are assigned to write only PSI's
___ Probation Officers have a mix of tasks: supervising probationers and writing
___ PSI's
___ Other, please describe: _____

5. Please indicate the number of Probation Officers (full time equivalent; i.e., if the agency uses part time Probation Officers add up these part time persons into full time equivalents, eg, two persons at 50% time equal one full time equivalent) assigned to the following functions as well as your best estimate of how much time the average Probation Officer (P.O.) spends on each if the P.O. performs two or more of the functions listed (see NOTE below):

	Number of Probation Officers Assigned	Percentage of time that is spent on this client group
Supervision of adult felony probationers	_____	_____ %
Supervision of adult misdemeanor probationers	_____	_____ %
Supervision of juvenile probationers	_____	_____ %
Supervision of pretrial and/or preadjudicated (diversion) persons	_____	_____ %
Preparation of Misdemeanor PSI's	_____	_____ %
Preparation of FELONY PSI's	_____	_____ %
Assigned to all other activities	_____	_____ %

NOTE: If your agency assigns 100 Probation Officers to supervise felony probationers and these same 100 officers are also expected to prepare felony PSI reports, guesstimate how much time the "average P.O." spends on each fuction, eg 60% on supervising felons and 40% on preparing the PSI. In such a circumstance the number 100 would be entered on the line "Supervision of adult felony probationers and 60% would be entered in the column with the % sign. Similarly, the number 100 would be entered in the preparation of FELONY PSI's along with 40% in the % column.

6. Are supervisors assigned to the supervision of probationers?

- Yes, it is standard practice
- Yes, but only infrequently
- No, supervisors are never required to supervise probationers

7. Does the agency have a stated goal for the ratio of supervisors to probation officers?

- No
- Yes Please indicate the desired ratio:

One supervisor to _____ P.O.s

8. What is the minimal educational level required for Probation Officer applicants?

High School College Masters
 Diploma degree degree MSW Other (Explain: _____)

9. What is the basis for the minimal educational level for Probation Officer applicants?

Agency policy State regulation State law Other

10. Please attach your agency's most recent job announcement for the position of Probation Officer to the end of this questionnaire.

11. Does your agency utilize volunteers in its direct operations?

No Yes If yes, total number of volunteers in last FY: _____

C. RESOURCES

1. Please provide the budget figures for the categories below as they are reflected in your agency's FY 88 approved budget:

\$ _____ Total Budget
 _____ Personnel
 _____ Fringe
 _____ Contracts (Including professional fees)
 _____ All Other

2. Please indicate the amount of money to be received in support of your FY 88 budget from the following sources:

\$ _____ Total Budget
 _____ Local Government
 _____ State Government
 _____ Probationer Supervision Fees
 _____ Probationer PSI Fees
 _____ Other (Identify: _____)

3. Please indicate the amount of money allocated in the FY 88 budget and where each of the following fringe items appear:

	In Probation Agency Budget	In Other Agency Budget	Not Offered
Retirement	\$	\$	
Social Security	\$	\$	
Unemployment	\$	\$	
Workman's Comp	\$	\$	
Life Insurance	\$	\$	
Medical Ins.	\$	\$	
Other	\$	\$	

4. Is there a recognized fringe rate that is expressed as a percent of salary?

No Yes What is it? _____%

5. Please indicate the FY 88 salary for the following two levels of Probation Officers (please do not include Supervisors in your responses here):

Entry Level: \$ _____ (annual)

Highest P.O. Grade: \$ _____ (annual)

6. Can you provide the total monies budgeted for Probation Officer salaries in your FY 88 budget (please do not include Supervisors in your response here) ?

No Yes (How much: \$ _____)

7. If your agency has a mix of probationers (eg. juveniles and adults), do the salaries for probation officers vary based on whom they supervise?

No, Salaries do not vary based on who is supervised.

Yes, Salaries do vary based on who is supervised.

Not applicable, agency supervises only felony probationers.

8. Please provide information on which fees your agency is responsible for collecting and whether or not these fees are shown in "Other" in question 2 above.

	Are funds collected (yes/no)	If Yes, How Much?	Where do these funds get deposited when collected:	
			Agency Budget	General Fund
Court fees				
Fines				
Restitution				
Supervision fees				
PSI Fees				
Other				

9. In those instances where the agency must collect two or more different financial assessments (eg. fines and restitution), is there a policy that directs which of the assessments have priority in the allocation of probationer payments?

No Yes If yes, please attach policy.

D. PERSONNEL RELATED ISSUES

1. Do Probation Officers have arrest powers?

- Yes, same as the police
- Yes, but with conditions
- No

2. Does your agency authorize Probation Officers to carry firearms?

- No, agency policy prohibits it
- Yes, some Probation Officers are authorized
- Yes, all Probation Officers (supervising felons) are authorized

3. Are the Probation Officers unionized?

- No
- Yes

4. Does your agency have a formal training requirement for new full-time Probation Officers?

- No
- Yes If yes, how many hours? _____

5. Do you use on-the-job training for new probation officers?

- No
- Yes

6. Do you have an in-service education and training program?

- No
- Yes If yes, the number of hours
that are required annually equals _____.

7. Do you have a designated training officer?

- No
- Yes If yes, has the officer had a formal train-the-trainers course?
 No Yes

8. Is there a state certification requirement for Probation Officers in your agency?

- No
- Yes If yes, please attach a description of the certification requirements.

E. WORKLOAD

1. Please fill in the appropriate cells in the grid below. Please include inter and intra state transfers in your entries.

	Number of active cases on Jan.1, 1988	Number of new cases during 1988	Number of closed cases during 1988	Number of active cases on Dec.31, 1988
Adult Felony Probationers				
Adult Misd Probationers				
Juvenile Probationers				
All Other Cases				

THE REMAINING QUESTIONS IN THIS SECTION SHOULD BE ANSWERED IN THE CONTEXT OF ADULT FELONY PROBATIONERS ONLY.

2. Please indicate how your agency handles the situation where a person is sentenced to probation on two different occasions and the sentences overlap?

- Each sentence is counted as a separate case
- The second (and any subsequent sentences) are combined with the already existing case.
- Other, please describe: _____

3. Of all the felony probationers under supervision during 1988, how many were transferred to another jurisdiction in 1988:

Within your State _____

To another State _____

4. Of all the new felony probationers that were referred to your agency during 1988, how many were the result of transfers in 1988:

From within your State: _____

From another State: _____

5. Does your agency use a risk assessment scale?

No Yes If yes, please attach to this questionnaire.

6. Does your agency utilize different levels of supervision based on your risk assessment scale?

No Yes If yes, please attach description of the different levels of supervision.

7. Does your agency use a needs assessment scale?

No Yes If yes, please attach a copy.

8. Does your agency use different levels of supervision based on your needs assessment scale?

No Yes

9. Please provide the name of your agency's supervision levels and the number of new FELONY probationers who were initially assigned to each one during 1988:

	Your agency's designation for:	Number of felony probationers initially assigned in 1988:
Most intensive supervision level	_____	_____
Second most intensive level	_____	_____
Third level	_____	_____
Fourth level	_____	_____
Fifth level	_____	_____
Unsupervised	_____	_____

NOTE: Please attach your agency's description for each supervision level identified above.

10. If a probationer is to be transferred from one supervision level to another, whose authorization is necessary? (Check all that apply)

- The supervising Probation Officer
- The Supervisor of the Probation Officer
- Routine case review by the agency
- Judicial order

11. Please provide the average number of FELONY probationers to one probation officer for each of the different supervision levels used by your agency (preferred and actual) as well as the preferred frequency of FACE TO FACE field contacts between the P.O. and the probationer:

	Preferred	Actual	Preferred frequency of field contact
Highest level	1 P.O. to _____ Probationers	1 to _____	
Second level	1 P.O. to _____ Probationers	1 to _____	
Third level	1 P.O. to _____ Probationers	1 to _____	
Fourth level	1 P.O. to _____ Probationers	1 to _____	
Fifth level	1 P.O. to _____ Probationers	1 to _____	

F. SERVICES

Please limit your responses to the questions in this section to services directed at felony probationers.

1. Please fill in the grid below as to which of the treatment services enumerated are afforded to some or all of the felony probationers and how these services are delivered (please check all the appropriate cells).

Service is Provided (yes/no)	SERVICE IS PROVIDED BY:			
	Probation Officer	Probation Support Staff	Contractor paid by agency	An agency whose services are Brokered
Drug treatment				
Drug testing				
Alcohol treatment				
Psych Counseling				
Family Counseling				
Education				
Vocational Training				
Job Placement				
Other				

Please describe the type of other treatment programs offered by your agency:

2. Please fill in the grid below with regard to the types of supervision services offered by your agency and how these supervision programs are provided (check each appropriate cell).

		SERVICE IS PROVIDED BY:			
		Supervising Probation Officer	Probation Support Staff	Contractor Paid by Agency	An agency whose services are Brokered
Day Treatment	Service is Provided (yes/no)				
Intensive Supervision					
House Arrest					
Residential Placement					
Restitution					
Community/ Public Service					

3. If your agency has a house arrest program, is it a program that utilizes constant electronic monitoring?

Yes No Not applicable

G. PROBATIONER DISCIPLINE

THE SCOPE OF THE INFORMATION SOUGHT HERE IS LIMITED TO FELONY PROBATIONERS

1. Does your agency have an operational definition for "absconder"?
 No Yes If yes, please attach definition to this questionnaire

2. When a probationer is found to have absconded, is a warrant sought?
 Yes, all the time
 Yes, most of the time
 No, rarely, if ever

3. When an absconder returns, what is your agency's standard response?
 A formal disciplinary hearing is always held
 The agency reviews the circumstances and then a decision is made as to whether to proceed with a formal disciplinary hearing
 Other, please describe: _____

4. If a formal disciplinary hearing is held because the probationer absconded and he is picked up on the warrant, how would your agency characterize the precipitating basis for the hearing?
 A rearrest A technical violation Agency doesn't make distinction

5. If a probationer is rearrested for a felony while under supervision, is there any formal notification process in place to inform your agency of the rearrest?
 No Yes If yes, please describe: _____

6. What is your agency's standard response to a probationer who is rearrested for a felony while under probation supervision?
 The agency immediately invokes the formal disciplinary hearing process
 The agency awaits the disposition of the arrest before invoking the formal disciplinary hearing process
 Other, please describe: _____

7. With probationers who are rearrested on a felony, will your agency invoke a formal disciplinary hearing where the rearrest results in no conviction?

No, never Yes, sometimes Yes, all of the time

8. Does your agency have written criteria that outline when a Probation Officer should seek to invoke a formal disciplinary hearing for technical violations?

No Yes If yes, please attach to this questionnaire

9. Who presides over formal disciplinary hearings?

The sentencing judge

A judge, but not necessarily the sentencing judge

A hearing officer (non-judge)

Other, please identify: _____

10. Approximately how long does it take from the decision to invoke a formal disciplinary hearing against a probationer and the actual holding of the hearing?

_____ Days

11. Please indicate the number for each of outcomes listed below associated with all of the disciplinary hearings held during 1988 (FELONY probationers only):

Outcome of Disciplinary hearing	Number of Outcomes
Nothing	
Probation conditions revised	
Probationer sent to jail, but stays on probation	
Probation REVOKED, probationer sent to prison	
Other	
Cases pending	
Total 1988 Hearings	