



INTENSIVE SUPERVISION

in the

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

137263

ry Report by Kevin Powers

2

INTENSIVE SUPERVISION

in the

NCJRS
JUN 26 1992
ACQUISITIONS

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

A Summary Report by Kevin Powers

April 1992

Financial support for this research project was provided by the U.S. Parole Commission. The opinions and conclusions expressed in the report are not necessarily those of the Parole Commission. Permission to quote is granted on condition that appropriate credit is given to the author and the Probation Office of the Northern District of Ohio. Questions or comments can be directed to Keith A. Koenning, Chief Probation Officer, 310 West Lakeside Avenue, Suite 400, Cleveland, OH 44113-1021 or 216-522-2218.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Ben Baer (1918 - 1991), while Chairman of the U.S. Parole Commission, was the Intensive Supervision Program's most ardent supporter. He provided guidance and financial support beginning in 1988. He came to Cleveland several times, and frequently called me to discuss the program.

Carol Pavilack Getty, the current Chairman, provided the funding to hire the author of this report. Chairman Getty, while Commissioner of the North Central Region and as Chairman, has maintained a constant and supportive interest in the program.

Keith A. Koenning
Chief Probation Officer
April 1992

137263

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

Keith A. Koenning/Probation Office
of the Northern Dist. of Ohio

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

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

CAPSULE SUMMARY

The Intensive Supervision Program (ISP) in the Northern District of Ohio enhances community safety through strict enforcement of the terms of supervision. The evidence shows that this goal is being achieved.

Treatment services receive emphasis in the ISP. Most of the ISP offenders participate in at least one program for alcohol or drug abuse, or mental health treatment. It is not clear what impact, if any, treatment has on offender behavior.

The Chief Probation Officer provides administrative support for the ISP. Caseloads have been maintained at a low level. ISP probation officers are paid a higher salary than other officers, and are provided with cellular phone equipped cars.

There is evidence that ISP has resulted in increased efficiency for the overall probation office operations. The data shows that after implementing ISP, more reports for all offenders were completed in fewer days, while the level of officer/offender contact for non-ISP offenders remained the same.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PURPOSE OF RESEARCH AND SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	1
Purpose of Research	1
Summary of Findings	1
Intermediate Sanctions	2
Intensive Supervision	3
ISP in the Northern District of Ohio	4
Program Goals	5
Selection Criteria	5
 THE IMPACT OF INTENSIVE SUPERVISION ON OFFENDER BEHAVIOR	7
Purpose	7
Community Safety	7
Methodology	7
Group Characteristics	8
Reasons For Closure/Removal	8
Level of Supervision	9
Conclusion	10
Types of Treatment	11
Level of Treatment	11
Impact of Treatment	12
Conclusion	13
 THE IMPACT OF ISP ON OFFICE OPERATIONS	14
Purpose	14
Methodology	14
Offender/Officer Contact	15
Impact on Reporting	16
The Officers' View of ISP	16
Conclusion	18
 THE IMPACT OF ISP ON THE OFFENDERS	19
Purpose	19
Methodology	19
Results	19
Conclusion	20
 Summary	20

PURPOSE OF RESEARCH AND SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Purpose of Research

In August of 1989 an Intensive Supervision Program (ISP) was implemented in the U.S. Probation Office of the Northern District of Ohio with the express goal of protecting society through strict enforcement of supervision conditions of high risk cases.¹ A secondary goal is to provide adequate treatment to offenders in a program tailored to the needs of the individual.

There is a large body of literature on ISP which highlights the problems involved in making a scientific analysis of individual programs. Given the limited time, budget and availability of data, this report makes no pretense of having overcome the formidable obstacles to a scientific evaluation of the program. The purpose is to provide a snapshot of ISP and determine what inferences may reasonably be drawn after two years of implementation.

The research focused on three areas:

- 1) The impact of ISP on offenders in the program versus similar offenders not in ISP,
- 2) the impact of the program on the overall operations of the office, and,
- 3) the positive and negative impact of the program as reported by offenders in the program.

This paper begins with a brief description of Intermediate Sanctions and Intensive Supervision so that the findings can be viewed in their larger context.

Summary of Findings

The high revocation rate of offenders in ISP suggests that the program is attaining its goal of enhanced community safety through strict enforcement of

¹ Probation Office Handbook, OHN. The ISP policy was written by OHN probation officers, provided in draft form to all probation office employees for comment, subsequently approved by the supervisory staff, and adopted as policy by the Chief Probation Officer on January 19, 1990.

supervision terms. The evidence on whether aftercare treatment is having any effect on offender behavior is inconclusive, but seems to suggest that treatment is a neutral factor.

There is also evidence which shows that ISP has had a favorable impact on the overall operations of the office, despite any negative perceptions of the program by the non-specialist staff. Client/offender contact for the non-specialists maintained its pre-ISP levels, and efficiency in completing reports actually increased after ISP began.

Intermediate Sanctions The term intermediate sanctions is a generic one which includes a wide variety of punishments that lie between incarceration, on the one hand, and routine probation, on the other. Examples of intermediate sanctions include house arrest, electronic monitoring and intensive supervision, among others, with these three being the most common throughout the United States. As of 1989, 48 of the 50 states had implemented programs utilizing one or more of these three forms of intermediate sanctions, with 18 states utilizing all three.²

While intermediate sanctions are not a new concept, their use nationwide has been spurred by the explosive growth in prison populations witnessed over the last decade. According to Bureau of Justice statistics, prison populations increased by 90% from 1980 to 1988.³ With prisons filled to capacity and beyond there is pressure on the criminal justice system both to divert new convicts away from prison and to provide early release to those already confined, often under pressure of court orders or consent decrees.

But even putting aside systemic pressure to reduce prison populations, there is increasing awareness both within

² General Accounting Office, "Intermediate Sanctions, Their Impacts on Prison Crowding, Costs, and Recidivism are Still Unclear," publication # PEMD-90-21, 1990, pp. 14-15

³ Id., p. 8

the criminal justice system and academia that there are a host of cases where imprisonment is inappropriate because it is too severe, while routine probation is inappropriate because it is not severe enough.⁴ Intermediate sanctions are intended to fill this void in sentencing options by providing alternatives which are less punitive than incarceration and at the same time more restrictive than routine probation or parole.

Intensive Supervision

Intensive Supervision Programs are one of the most widespread applications of intermediate sanctions in the U.S. A survey from 1988 showed 45 states already had or were developing an Intensive Supervision Program at the state or local level.⁵ As would be expected, each program is structured somewhat differently, depending on the local needs, resources and circumstances.⁶

The major difference among the various programs appears to be in the type of individual the program is designed to accommodate. For instance, some programs take in only low risk individuals while others take in only high risk individuals, using various risk indicators to select candidates for the program. This means that comparison between different programs is difficult, if not impossible, since even among "high risk" programs, the way in which risk is defined can vary significantly.

Another way of categorizing programs is whether they are "front door", i.e., diversion programs, or "back door" programs providing a higher level of supervision to parolees. On the other hand, some programs are blind to the way in which the individual enters the program,

⁴ See Between Prison and Probation, Morris and Tonry, Oxford University Press, 1990, for a fuller development of this thesis. See especially their argument that it is an "erroneous application of principles of 'just dessert'" to assume, as the conventional wisdom does, that like cases must be treated alike. p. 35+

⁵ Survey of Intermediate Sanctions, United States Department of Justice, 1990, p.9

⁶ See Survey of Intermediate Sanctions, USDOJ, for an overview of the various programs instituted nationwide.

and focus instead solely on the characteristics of the individual in relation to the selection criteria established for the program.

The essential elements of any ISP program are increased surveillance and control over the individual through more frequent client/offender contact, achieved through reduced officer caseloads.⁷ But here, too, there is tremendous variability among the various programs in both caseload size and frequency of contact. For example, in some jurisdictions a reduced caseload may consist of 25 offenders per officer, while in others it may consist of 50 offenders per officer. Obviously, the frequency of client/offender contact will be inversely proportional to the size of the caseload.

ISP in the Northern District of Ohio

The Intensive Supervision Program in the Northern District of Ohio was begun in August 1989. Initially, there was one ISP officer in the Cleveland office who managed a caseload of 25 offenders (compared to typical officer caseloads of 100 or more low-risk and high-risk offenders). Since then, the program has been expanded to the Toledo and Akron/Youngstown offices.⁸ There are currently three ISP officer specialists, one in each of the three offices, each with a caseload of 25 offenders. The ISP specialists are paid approximately 15% more than the non-specialists, and are provided a car, cellular phone and pager. The original ISP specialist was promoted to supervisor, and is responsible for the activities of the ISP specialists (as well as the home confinement/electronic monitoring team).

During the first year of the program, the U.S. Parole

⁷ For a more detailed discussion of the ways in which "intensive" supervision differs from routine supervision, see Intensive Probation Supervision in Illinois, Thomson, 1985, Chicago, IL: Center for Research in Law and Justice.

⁸ The Northern District of Ohio includes 40 counties with a total population of approximately 6 million. It is the practice of the Chief Probation Officer to provide equal services throughout the District, although providing intensive supervision in rural areas is more costly than in urban areas (due to travel costs and staff time).

Commission provided additional support by authorizing the probation office to hire a community resource specialist, whose job was to compile a Community Resource Directory and to link offenders with community treatment programs.

Program Goals and Philosophy

The overriding purpose of the program is to provide increased community protection through more effective supervision. This can work in two ways; by discouraging new criminal activity, and by detecting violations at an early stage and intervening promptly. There are no fixed standards which determine the number of contacts per month. This is decided on a case by case basis, leaving some discretion to the officer (in consultation with his supervisor) in determining how best to allocate his time to where it is most urgently needed. Contacts are most often by phone, but may also be at the office, at the offender's home, or at the offender's place of employment. Where drug use is a factor, there will also be frequent urine samples taken to ensure compliance with the terms of release. Offenders with a drug or alcohol aftercare treatment condition initially participate in four counseling sessions per month and are required to submit six urine specimens per month.

The second objective of ISP is to provide a treatment program tailored to the needs of the individual. This can take the form of drug or alcohol counseling, mental health counseling and employment counseling or job training. The probation office has authority to pay for drug, alcohol and mental health treatment services. The office has compiled a Community Resource Directory which lists the various services available (both contract providers and public agencies) throughout the Northern District, and provides the officers with a detailed description of the types of services provided so an informed decision can be made as to the type of treatment most geared to the offender's needs.

Selection Criteria

Clients for the program are selected purely on the basis

of risk assessment. Offenders with a Parole Commission Salient Factor Score of 4 or less or a Sentencing Guidelines Criminal History Category of V or VI are automatically eligible for ISP. Not all ISP offenders meet these risk profiles, but when deviations from these standards are made it is usually due to special circumstances such as acute drug or mental health problems, or because there are charges pending in another jurisdiction. These cases seem to be in keeping with the goal of increased community safety. No exclusions are made due to prior criminal history, drug use or mental health problems. In fact, the majority of ISP offenders (over 60%) have both an extensive criminal history coupled with drug and or mental health problems or other special conditions. The length of time in the program is determined on a case by case basis, with case reviews occurring twice yearly.

Offenders enter the program through probation/supervised release or parole, (including mandatory release). Typically, 70% to 75% of ISP offenders at any one time will be parolees.

THE IMPACT OF INTENSIVE SUPERVISION ON OFFENDER BEHAVIOR

Purpose

The purpose of this portion of the research was to assess what effects the Intensive Supervision Program has had in relation to the program's stated goals. Since there are two goals, community safety and offender treatment, they will be discussed separately.

Community Safety

Protecting the community from new criminal activity of offenders under supervision is undoubtedly one of the important goals of any type of supervision. What distinguishes ISP from routine supervision is that those offenders who pose the greatest risk to society are subject to much greater scrutiny than those who are deemed to pose a lower risk.

Methodology

Through August, 1991, approximately 180 offenders were assigned to ISP. Reviewing all of these cases was administratively impractical, so an initial subset of cases was selected. Through the end of January, 1991, a total of 33 cases were removed (revoked, completed supervision or reassigned to routine supervision) from ISP in the Cleveland office. Of these, one client had died and three others had transferred out of supervision in the Cleveland office, leaving a total of twenty-nine cases. Since ISP was implemented in the Cleveland office first, these cases as a group had the longest exposure to ISP. The first group was used to provide baseline statistics to compare other sample groups. A decision was made to then focus on case closings (revocations and term completions), ignoring reassigned cases.

A second group of cases was selected that had closed (revoked or supervision completed) during the time the client was in ISP. Fourteen cases were selected at random from all closed ISP cases. Eight of these happened to have closed prior to January, 1991, and were therefore included in both samples.

A third group was selected randomly from cases that had closed but were not in ISP at any time. To be included, the offenders had to meet the same risk prediction

criteria as ISP-eligible offenders. Since offenders with these characteristics after August, 1989, (ISP starting date) were either in ISP or excluded for subjective reasons, the third group was selected from cases closed prior to August, 1989. The time differential was not controlled for. A total of 15 was selected, but one was excluded because the offender's term of federal supervision was spent in state custody, leaving a sample of 14 cases.

Group Characteristics

As noted, all subjects scored within the same range on the risk prediction scale. All subjects had extensive prior criminal records, including felony and misdemeanor convictions and juvenile adjudications. The 14 closed ISP cases had an average age (at the time of their instant offense) of 31.2 years compared to an average age of 32.1 years for non-ISP closed cases.

Reasons For Closure/Removal

The original sample of 29 cases were resolved as follows:

- 55% had supervision revoked
- 24% expired (completed term of supervision)
- 21% reassigned to routine supervision

The 21% that were reassigned present somewhat of a problematic group. On the one hand, it could be inferred that these cases represent some measure of success for ISP because they completed their term in ISP with some indications of successful readjustment, for example, they had fulfilled special conditions and they had stable employment. On the other hand, these cases may only indicate that there are more ISP-eligible cases entering the system than the current staffing can accommodate. When this situation develops, in order to stay within caseload parameters, supervision staff and management must make a subjective determination as to which offenders from the total population represent the highest risk to society and place these in ISP, with the remainder assigned to routine supervision caseloads. Time did not permit an evaluation of the reassigned cases.

The two remaining sample groups were resolved as follows:

ISP Closures
57% revoked
43% expired

Non-ISP Closures
14% revoked
86% expired

It is noteworthy that the revocation rate between the two ISP samples was almost identical (55% compared to 57%) and that both were significantly higher than the non-ISP revocations (14%). When the eight cases that overlapped ISP closures/ISP removals are factored out, the revocation rate for the remaining 6 cases is even higher with 5 of the 6 being revoked. This suggests that the revocation rate of ISP offenders over a larger population will average out to better than 50% compared to the 14% rate for high-risk offenders not under intensive supervision.

**Level of
Supervision**

In order to show that ISP was responsible, at least in part, for the higher revocation rate, it must first be shown that ISP does in fact supervise at a more intensive level. The data used to make this comparison was taken directly from case reviews and chronological records for all cases in the ISP closure and non-ISP closure groups. No effort was made to verify this information independently, but rather, was accepted as accurate. The actual amount of offender/officer contact compared as follows:

	<u>ISP Closures</u>	<u>Non-ISP Closures</u>
personal:	1.8/month/offender	.7/month/offender
collateral:	2.6	.6
telephone:	2.0	.4
Total:	6.4/month/offender	1.7/month/offender

Personal contact includes any face to face contact between officer and offender. Collateral includes all contacts regarding a case with someone other than the offender (eg. family, employer, treatment provider), and telephone includes all phone contacts initiated by either the offender or the officer. The figures were derived by adding up all reported contacts and dividing by the number of offenders and dividing again by the average

number of months under supervision. Given the difference in caseload size between routine supervision and ISP (approximately 100 cases to 25, or 4 to 1) the difference in frequency of contact is within the expected range. In other words, if routine caseloads were reduced to 25, presumably the frequency of contact could be four times as great, which would be 6.8 contacts per month per offender (1.7 reported, times 4). Conversely, if ISP caseloads were increased by a factor of 4, presumably the frequency of contact would drop to 1.6 per month per offender (6.4 reported, divided by 4).

While other factors may be having an impact on revocation, there is additional evidence that suggests the level of supervision and the rate of revocation are intimately related. When ISP closures are viewed in isolation comparing frequency of contact between expired terms versus revoked terms, there is still a strong correlation. Expired cases averaged 3 total contacts per month, while revoked cases averaged 8 total contacts per month.

It is worth noting that between the two groups, ISP closures averaged 10.4 months under supervision while non-ISP closures averaged 15.1 months under supervision. This difference is most likely due to the increased likelihood of revocation rather than populational differences. ISP revocations by themselves averaged 9.2 months under supervision and were overwhelmingly revoked for technical violations, suggesting that intensive supervision does lead to early detection of deviant behavior.

Conclusion

With respect to increasing community safety through increased supervision and strict enforcement of the terms of release, the evidence strongly suggests that ISP is achieving this goal. The data shows a clear correlation between frequency of contact and the likelihood of revocation.

The fact that most revocations are for technical violations suggests that increased officer/offender

contact leads to early detection of behavior that does not conform to the terms of supervision. Whether this means that new criminal conduct is being prevented by early intervention and revocation is quite another matter, one well beyond the scope of this research.

It is difficult to measure the extent that supervision level alone contributes to revocation, since there are populational differences with respect to aftercare treatment for aggravating factors (such as history of drug, alcohol and mental health problems) that must be considered.

Types of Treatment

The second major goal of ISP is to provide adequate treatment to offenders in a program tailored to the needs of the individual. A Community Resource Directory was compiled listing all the available treatment providers in the Northern District, both public and private agencies. The directory lists and describes both in-patient and out-patient services available for drug and alcohol treatment, mental health services, and job training and employment counseling. When a offender enters ISP, the officer in charge prepares a supervision plan which includes treatment programs for the offender. The treatment program is based on court-ordered special conditions, offender history, professional evaluations, discussions with the offender family, and any other relevant factors.

Level of Treatment

All of the 14 ISP-closure cases participated in one or more treatment program. Four participated in some form of mental health counseling, 11 were involved in drug counseling, and one participated in alcohol treatment. (The total of 16 is because two of the offenders participated in more than one program).

Of the 14 non-ISP closures, four participated in drug counseling, one in mental health counseling, one in alcohol treatment and two participated in both drug and alcohol programs. Six of the offenders did not

**Impact of
Treatment**

participate in any type of treatment program.

When participation in one or more treatment programs was compared to case resolution, the results were as follows:

		<u>ISP Cases</u>	
	<u>Revoked</u>		<u>Expired</u>
Drug Program	6		3
Alcohol Program	-		1
Mental Health	-		2
Multiple Programs	2		-

		<u>Non-ISP Cases</u>	
	<u>Revoked</u>		<u>Expired</u>
Drug Program	-		4
Alcohol Program	1		1
Mental Health	-		1
Multiple Programs	-		2
No Treatment	1		4

The figures are confusing, at the very least, since the results from the two groups seem to point in opposite directions. For ISP cases, it appears that treatment increases revocation, while for non-ISP cases treatment leads to completion of the term of supervision. The reason for the contradictory results is that these figures do not show the impact of treatment in isolation, since these cases were supervised at different levels of intensity.

The impact of treatment alone would require a comparison of ISP offenders who received treatment with ISP offenders who did not. Unfortunately, the population of closed ISP cases where no treatment was provided at all is too small at this stage to provide any meaningful data. Another factor which is difficult to control is the fact that there are qualitative differences in treatment. Not only are there differences between the types of problems the programs are designed to address (mental health counseling versus drug counseling, for example,) but there are qualitative differences between different providers of the same type of service (for example, drug in-patient versus drug out-patient programs).

The available data did allow for one other comparison of some interest. There were 33 removed ISP cases where each of the offenders had participated in at least one treatment program, so treatment (though not necessarily the quality of treatment) was common to all. Of these cases, where there were court-ordered special conditions to participate in some form of treatment, the revocation rate was 66%, significantly higher than the average rate of ISP revocations (55% - 57%). The most likely explanation for this is that where special conditions are ordered it is because there is a history of substance abuse and/or mental health problems and these may have been factors in the offender's criminal conduct. The inference being that these are cases with problems of a long term and chronic nature, and those least likely to respond to treatment.

Conclusion

The data is inconclusive regarding the impact of treatment on offender behavior. Given the added cost for treatment (approximately \$2,000 per year per offender for outpatient drug and alcohol treatment, even more for inpatient treatment) it is certainly an area which invites further exploration.

The data does suggest that where substance abuse or mental health problems are of a long term or chronic nature, treatment is unlikely to have a positive impact.

THE IMPACT OF ISP ON OFFICE OPERATIONS

Purpose

When ISP was first implemented in the Cleveland office, the ISP specialist was assigned an initial caseload of 25 offenders. Since there was no immediate increase in office staffing levels, this meant that the non-specialist officers were required to manage additional cases.

It was the desire of the Chief Probation Officer to remove the high risk time consuming cases from the non-specialist caseloads, and by doing so enhance the efficiency of the overall probation office operation. No additional staff was available from the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts for a special program, so when ISP officers caseloads went down, non-specialist caseloads went up. Routine federal probation supervision costs were \$1,318 per offender per year. If the offender is in drug and alcohol treatment, the cost rises to \$3,386. The average cost of federal imprisonment was \$17,904. The cost of intensive supervision in OHN, including treatment program costs (alcohol, drug, or mental health) is approximately \$7,000 per year. The probation office operates a Home Confinement Program, with electronic monitoring, at a cost of approximately \$10,000 per year. This compares to a cost of \$11,892 per year for halfway house residency.

The purpose of this portion of the research was to try and determine what effects the ISP program has had on the overall operations of the office. Given that non-specialist caseloads increased, did this result in a reduction in work efficiency and officer/offender contact? Alternatively, because non-specialists were able to transfer some of the more troublesome cases which were assigned to ISP (presumably those cases which required an officer's most time and attention), did this result in a measurable increase in efficiency and officer/offender contact?

Methodology

A large portion of an officer's work consists of offender contact and preparing various reports. These are both

amenable to quantitative measurement. Comparing the levels of reported officer/offender contact from case files before and after implementation of ISP should provide a reasonable estimate of the impact ISP has had on routine supervision. To make this measurement, ten cases were chosen at random from cases that had closed in 1989 after the start of ISP. These were compared to the 14 cases chosen from non-ISP closures prior to August, 1989.

The next measurements made were the volume of reports assigned during the three month period prior to ISP, i.e., May, June and July of 1989, and the average number of days needed to complete the reports. These figures were compared to the same figures from the three month period after the start of ISP, August, September and October of 1989. This was to provide a measurement of office efficiency.

The final portion consisted of questionnaires sent to non-ISP officers and supervisors who had been on staff both before and after the start of ISP. This was to provide a measure, albeit subjective, of the P.O.'s own view of the impact ISP has had on their work. (See Appendices A and B for the complete questionnaires).

Offender/Officer Contact

The level of contact between routine P.O.'s and offenders was virtually the same before and after ISP. As noted previously, the average contacts (all types) per month per offender was 1.7 before ISP. After ISP the figure was 1.6 per offender per month. This difference is not significant, and may be as equally attributable to the fact that the pre-ISP closures were generally higher-risk cases than the post-ISP cases. Nor were there any significant differences in the types of contacts. The figures do not tell us, however, if there are any differences in the quality of contact between officers and offender before and after ISP. It was concluded that this was unmeasurable from the available data.

Impact on Reporting

The probation office keeps a computerized log of all types of reports assigned, the date assigned and the completion date. These figures allowed for a comparison of office efficiency before and after ISP as measured by the volume of reports assigned and the length of time needed to complete them. There are many different types of reports assigned, but the five most frequent are prerelease, presentence, collateral, supervision and violation reports. Combined, these represent 60% to 70% of the total reports assigned for a typical month.

When the reports were reviewed individually on a month by month basis, the average number of days to completion varied widely. For example, supervision reports assigned in July, 1989, took an average of 18 days to complete. In October, 1989, an even larger volume of supervision reports took an average of only 4.1 days to complete. Similar ranges were apparent for all reports when looked at month by month. Also, there was no obvious correlation between the volume of reports assigned and the days needed for completion, when looked at individually on a month by month basis.

When viewed in the aggregate, however, a striking figure emerged. In the period May, June and July, a total of 295 reports were assigned which took an average of 16.8 days to complete. During August, September and October, a total of 313 reports were assigned which took an average of only 12.1 days to complete. This increase in efficiency could not be attributed to differences in the volume of new cases received. During the three months prior to ISP, the average number of new cases received for supervision was 48 per month, and for the three months after, the average number of new cases was 51 per month. Nor were there differences in staff level during these two periods.

The Officers' View of ISP

There were a total of 13 officers and 3 supervisors who

were on staff before and after ISP.⁹ All were sent a questionnaire that they could complete and return anonymously if they chose to do so. A total of eight responded. Some of the more interesting responses were:

Six of the eight respondents indicated that their level of job satisfaction had not changed since the start of ISP. The other two indicated that job satisfaction had decreased.

Four respondents indicated that their total workload had increased, and the other four indicated that it had not changed. However, only two respondents indicated that their total caseload had increased. These results seem inconsistent with each other and counter-intuitive. It is not clear how workload can expand when caseload does not expand. Further research in this area is probably indicated.

The two response items that generated the strongest response concerned the officer's ability to better serve existing offenders, or to concentrate more of their time with offenders whom they could help to readjust. Five of the eight indicated that they were not better able to serve their offenders and two offered no opinion. Seven of the eight indicated that they did not have more time to concentrate on offenders whom they could help, and one offered no opinion. The general conclusion is that the non-specialist officers do not perceive ISP as having had a positive impact on their own jobs, but rather, a negative impact. Where they were offered positive, negative and neutral response options, they largely chose the negative. Five of the eight also seemed to feel that ISP was not supervising the most difficult to manage cases, implying that the most difficult are assigned to routine supervision.

In the space that was provided for written comments, one

⁹The number of employees in the probation office has risen from 40 in 1988 to 70 in 1991. As of the date of this report, the office is filling an additional 11 positions, bringing the number of employees to 81.

common theme was that non-specialist officers did not fully understand the goals and purpose of ISP, and that there was a lack of communication from management regarding ISP.

While the overall attitude seems to be negative toward ISP, one other factor is relevant. Of the officers who responded (excluding supervisors), not one had applied for openings in ISP, and none indicated that they would apply in the future if openings became available. It may be that those who chose to respond had low job satisfaction prior to ISP (6 of 8 indicated that job satisfaction had not changed, 2 indicated it had decreased) and used the questionnaire as a vehicle to air their dissatisfaction.

Conclusion

Despite the negative perceptions of ISP among non-specialists, the evidence suggests that ISP has resulted in increased office efficiency. At a time immediately after the start of ISP when workload dislocations would probably be most apparent, more reports were being done in a fewer number of days. The level of offender/officer contact in routine cases has not changed to any appreciable extent. The overall impact has to be viewed as positive.

THE IMPACT OF ISP ON THE OFFENDERS

Purpose

Given that ISP is a much more intrusive form of community release than most supervision programs, and since most ISP offenders have had extensive exposure to the various levels of criminal justice due to a lengthy criminal record, it was thought worthwhile to survey ISP offenders on their attitudes about the program.

The purpose of this section was to try and identify areas of strength and weakness in the intensive program as seen by those offenders who had been exposed to ISP.

Methodology

A questionnaire was mailed to approximately 140 of the offenders who had participated in ISP or were currently participating. Respondents were all assured anonymity. Only 14 chose to respond, and of those, only one was from a offender who had completed supervision, and one was from a offender who had been revoked. The remaining twelve were all currently participating in ISP for an average length of 8.3 months at the time they responded. The first four questions (omitted below) were designed to categorize the respondents by previous incarcerations and previous periods of supervision.

Results

The responses to the final ten questions were as follows:

1. Intensive supervision is significantly more restrictive on me than ordinary supervision.
I agree - 7 I disagree - 4 No opinion - 3
2. The rules and behavior expectations of Intensive Supervision were adequately explained to me when I entered the program.
I agree - 13 I disagree - 1 No opinion - 0
3. The rules and behavior expectations of Intensive Supervision are unreasonably strict.
I agree - 2 I disagree - 9 No opinion - 3
4. It is unfair that I was placed under Intensive Supervision while other offenders are not.
I agree - 2 I disagree - 7 No opinion - 5
5. The Intensive Supervision program provides adequate drug and/or alcohol treatment.

- | | | | |
|-----|--|----------------|----------------|
| | I agree - 10 | I disagree - 1 | No opinion - 3 |
| 6. | The Intensive Supervision program provides adequate job counseling. | | |
| | I agree - 5 | I disagree - 3 | No opinion - 6 |
| 7. | The Intensive Supervision program provides adequate mental health counseling. | | |
| | I agree - 5 | I disagree - 2 | No opinion - 7 |
| 8. | My Intensive Supervision officer was readily available to help me with supervision related problems. | | |
| | I agree - 12 | I disagree - 0 | No opinion - 2 |
| 9. | My Intensive Supervision officer took an active role in helping me find work or job counseling. | | |
| | I agree - 6 | I disagree - 2 | No opinion - 6 |
| 10. | My Intensive Supervision officer took an active role in helping me find drug, alcohol or mental health counseling. | | |
| | I agree - 10 | I disagree - 0 | No opinion - 4 |

Conclusion

The responses to items 5, 8 and 10, taken together suggest an overall positive reaction to the program in terms of the treatment provided and the officer's efforts on behalf of the offender. These results must be viewed with some caution, however. Given that better than half of ISP offenders will eventually be revoked, revocations are not adequately represented in the total responses. Simple logic suggests that revoked offenders will take a much more negative view of intensive supervision. Another methodology would be to institute exit interviews with all offenders leaving ISP for any reason. This has been done in other jurisdictions with better results.¹⁰

Summary

Intensive Supervision in the Northern District of Ohio is only part of a larger strategy to make use of intermediate sanctions for certain types of offenders. Intensive Supervision places the highest risk offenders in a program where they are supervised at roughly four times the level of routine supervision.

¹⁰ See, for example, Beck, Klein-Saffran and Wooten, Federal Probation, December, 1990, "Home Confinement and the Use of Electronic Monitoring With Federal Parolees."

The high revocation rate of offenders in ISP suggests that the program is attaining its goal of enhanced community safety through strict enforcement of supervision terms. The evidence of whether aftercare treatment is having any effect on offender behavior is inconclusive, but seems to suggest that treatment is a neutral factor.

There is also evidence which shows that ISP has had a favorable impact on the overall operations of the office, despite any negative perceptions of the program by the non-specialist staff. Offender/officer contact for the non-specialists maintained its pre-ISP levels, and efficiency in completing reports actually increased after ISP began.

(QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO SUPERVISORS)

For the following statements, please circle the response that best describes your feelings.

The most difficult to manage cases are assigned to ISP.

Agree

Disagree

No opinion

Since ISP began, I feel that overall, the level of job satisfaction of the officers who report to me has:

Increased

Decreased

Not changed

Since ISP began, my own level of job satisfaction has:

Increased

Decreased

Not changed

ISP should be expanded to take on more of the difficult to manage cases.

Agree

Disagree

No opinion

Since ISP began, the case load for the officers who report to me has:

Increased

Decreased

Not changed

Since ISP began, the actual amount of work necessary to manage the case load of the officers who report to me has:

Increased

Decreased

Not changed

ISP officers have an easier job than regular probation officers.

Agree

Disagree

No opinion

Since ISP began, the officers reporting to me have more time to concentrate on clients who can be helped to adjust to a law-abiding life.

Agree

Disagree

No opinion

Since ISP began, the officers reporting to me are better able to serve their existing clients.

Agree

Disagree

No opinion

Prior to ISP, the average case load of the officers reporting to me was approximately_____

The average case load now is_____

Ideally, each officer would have a case load of no more than_____

(QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO PROBATION OFFICERS)

For the following statements, please circle the response that best describes your feelings.

The most difficult to manage cases are assigned to ISP.
Agree Disagree No opinion

Since ISP began, my level of job satisfaction has:
Increased Decreased Not changed

ISP should be expanded to take on more of the difficult to manage cases.
Agree Disagree No opinion

Since ISP began, my case load has:
Increased Decreased Not changed

Since ISP began, the actual amount of work necessary to manage my case load has:
Increased Decreased Not changed

ISP officers have an easier job than regular probation officers.
Agree Disagree No opinion

Since ISP began, I have more time to concentrate on clients where my attention can help them readjust to a law-abiding life.
Agree Disagree No opinion

Since ISP began, I am better able to serve my existing clients.
Agree Disagree No opinion

My average case load at any one time prior to ISP was approximately_____

My average case load now is approximately_____

Ideally, my case load would be_____

Did you apply to become an ISP officer? Yes No

If more positions become available in ISP, would you apply?

Yes No Undecided