CR Sept
8-5-82

REPORT NUMBER 63

# INVESTIGATION AND SURVEILLANCE
# IN PAROLE SUPERVISION
# AN EVALUATION OF THE HIGH CONTROL
# PROJECT

## Deborah Star

**CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS — RESEARCH UNIT**

## May 1981

82901

---

## Assisting Bay Area Research Unit Staff

Carol Armstrong

Renee Bell

Collin Boyd

Kim Buchanan

Anna Cox

Rufus Dabney

Louise Rew

Carol Smith

Shirley Andrews

| P&CSD Project Implementation Task Force | P&CSD Issue Paper Development Committee |
|---|---|
| Cliff Cova | Tom Bazeley |
| Ron Chun | Warren Campbell |
| Pearldean Golightly | Harry Herron |
| Jackie Taylor | Manny Quevedo |
| Frank Trinkl | Mike Willis |
| Wes Young | Wes Young |

# INVESTIGATION AND SURVEILLANCE IN PAROLE SUPERVISION
## An Evaluation of the High Control Project

Deborah Star

ADMINISTRATIVE SUMMARY

## Introduction and Objectives

This study reports the results of the High Control Project, an experimental parole supervision program which operated within the Parole and Community Services Division of the California Department of Corrections between 1977 and 1980. The High Control Project was the last of several new programs implemented as part of a three year self evaluation effort undertaken by the department to determine more effective ways of running the California parole system in the future. The Project tested "control" oriented models of parole supervision where specially trained parole agents conducted intensified "investigative" and "surveillant" activities on selected high risk parolees. The objectives of the project were to: (1) identify those parolees who presented the most serious threat to public safety, (2) deter those parolees who had not returned to criminal activity but had a high potential for doing so, and (3) increase the frequency and severity of sanctions applied to those parolees verified as having returned to criminal activity.

The high control models of parole supervison differed from traditional approaches to parole supervision on several dimensions. First, it represented an exclusive control oriented, as opposed to a service or a mixed service and control orientation to supervision. Second, it placed primary emphasis on conducting pre (as opposed to post) arrest investigation activities and upon monitoring parolee activity indirectly through a variety of means (as opposed to direct agent-parolee contacts). Third, it targeted a group of parolees selected by agents as being higher risk cases. And, fourth, by using specialist (as opposed to generalist) agents working within a small team of agents (rather than independently), it utilized a different organizational and management structure.

Two types of control-oriented parole supervision models were proposed for testing in the High Control Project. The INVESTIGATION MODEL utilized high control parole agents to conduct short term investigations of the activities of parolees suspected of current involvement in illegal activities. The purposes of the investigations were to verify the parolee's involvement in illegal activities, apprehend if necessary, and work toward a successful prosecution. The INTENSIVE SUPERVISION MODEL utilized high control agents in a more traditional case-carrying role (but with smaller caseloads) to closely monitor the day-to-day activities of parolees with serious prior criminal histories. The purpose of the close monitoring was to prevent and deter parolees from returning to illegal activities.

Parolees were to be selected for placement in the project based upon a prior criminal history of, or documented information of current involvement in, one of five criminal or parole violation activities targeted by the project including: (1) assaultive or sexually deviant activity, (2) large scale narcotic sales activity, (3) large scale property or fraud crimes, (4) involvement in prison gang activities, or (5) absconding from parole supervision.

## Methodology

This study reports the results of the high control models of parole supervision as they operated at four parole unit demonstration sites between February 1, 1977 and June 30, 1979. The four parole units and sample size studied included the Stockton (N=118) and the Bakersfield (N=79) parole units which each implemented an investigation model, the Riverside/San Bernardino parole units (N=54) which implemented an intensive supervision model, and the Walnut Creek parole units which implemented both models (N=48 investigation, N=77 intensive supervision).

The purpose of the evaluation was to (1) describe the activities and operations of the two models as they were implemented at the four parole unit demonstration sites, (2) determine the extent to which higher risk parolees were selected for the project, (3) determine if the project was associated with an increase in the frequency and severity of sanctions placed upon parolees who had become reinvolved in illegal activities, and (4) determine if the project was associated with an overall, long-term reduction in the frequency and severity of crimes committed. The evaluation also sought to determine if project effectiveness was differentially associated with the various types of criminal activity targeted by the project and with the varying operational styles adopted at the four demonstration sites.

The evaluation used a quasi-experimental design. Program activities and program outcomes of project cases (i.e., the experimental group) were compared to the activities and outcomes of a similar group of high risk parolees who received only regular parole supervision (i.e., a comparison group). The comparison cases were selected from the Ventura parole district (N=21 investigation, N=27 intensive supervision) and the Redwood City parole unit (N=16 investigative, N=35 intensive supervision). Neither site implemented high control models of parole supervision.

Project activities and outcomes were measured separately for the two models implemented. As the primary goal of the investigation model was to incapacitate those parolees who had returned to illegal activities, outcome was measured by the extent to which successful verifications, and subsequent criminal and revocation sanctions received, increased for the cases investigated. As the primary goal of the intensive supervision model was preventive and deterrent, outcome was measured by the extent to which the frequency and severity of criminal activity committed during a twelve month program follow-up period was reduced for the cases intensively supervised. The extent to which either model was associated with an increase in the parole agent's contribution to the detection and criminal processing of parolees who had recidivated was also measured. The source of data for the activity and outcome measures included parole violation reports, parole agent field notes, and special investigative reports and selection forms designed for this project.

## Findings

Selecting Higher Risk Releasees. High control project staff selected higher risk releases to parole for placement in one of the two models of the project. A comparison on the criminal background characteristics of 243 parolees selected for the High Control Project (through October 31, 1978) and 784 parolees not selected (but on parole as of October 31, 1978) at the four experimental parole units showed the selected group was more likely (1) to have been committed to prison for a narcotic/drug offense, (2) to have a narcotic history and (3) to have a prior prison commitment record.

Activities and Operations of the Investigation Model. The investigation model operated as was proposed by conducting short term investigations of parolees currently suspected of being involved in illegal activities. An examination of the processing of the 245 cases investigated through June 30, 1979 showed the cases were selected based on information received from either local law enforcement or the regular supervising agent, and that the cases were currently involved in either assaultive activity or narcotic sales activity (with and without also suspected of having absconded from parole supervision). Very few cases were investigated for either of the other two targeted activities (i.e., prison gang activities or large scale property/fraud crimes). The typical investigation lasted sixty days.

Congruent with it's purpose, the evaluation found that "information gathering" comprised the major activities performed under the investigative model. The activity recordings for the 245 cases investigated were classified into ten major types and a profile was drawn. The analysis found that the most common activities included surveillance, information exchanges with law enforcement, information exchanges with collaterals (i.e., associates) of the parolee, and other miscellaneous evidence collection activities (e.g., witness interviews, record checks, etc.).

The types of activity performed under the investigation model appeared to differ significantly from the types of activity performed under regular supervision. A comparison of the types of activity performed on the 245 investigations and the types of activity performed on six comparison cases with available activity data showed that the activities which typified regular supervision (i.e., face-to-face check-up contacts and required administrative processing tasks) were not frequently performed by investigative agents, and vice versa for the activities which typified investigative supervision.

Activities and Operations of the Intensive Supervision Model. Under intensive supervision agents maintained full caseload responsibilities, each agent supervising between 10 and 15 cases at a time. An examination of the processing of the 131 cases placed under intensive supervision through December 31, 1978 showed that most were placed immediately upon release from prison or soon thereafter and they remained under intensive supervision an average of eleven months. Four-fifths of the 131 intensive supervision cases were selected because of a prior criminal history involving various kinds of violent or sexually deviant activity. Very few cases were selected for intensive supervision under any of the other four criminal and violational activity areas targeted by the project.

The activities performed under intensive supervision were congruent with it's purpose to "closely monitor" the parolees activities. The number of activities performed was large, averaging ten per thirty day period on parole. Approximately one-third of the total activities performed were direct check-up contacts with the parolee, and ten percent were contacts with collaterals of the parolees. Information exchanges with law enforcement, evidence collection activities and required administrative processing activities each occupied another ten percent of the total number of activities performed.

Many of the same types of activity performed under regular supervision were also performed under intensive supervision, except more frequently and with a different emphasis. The activities performed on 111 of the 131 experimental cases were compared to the activities performed for 44 of the 62 comparison cases (Note: 38 study cases were eliminated due to missing data). The findings showed that intensive supervision nearly tripled the number of activities performed under regular supervision (10 activities/30 days vs. 4 activities/30 days), showed that a larger proportion of intensive than regular supervision activities comprised "indirect" monitoring activities (i.e., law enforcement and collateral exchanges) as opposed to "direct" monitoring (i.e., face-to-face check-up contacts with the parolee).

Outcome of the Investigation Model: Increased Verification and Sanctions. The investigation model was found to be associated with an increase in case verifications of suspected criminal and parole violation activity. The findings indicated that the 245 cases investigated experienced significantly more successful verifications and placements in custody (as opposed to investigations where no evidence or insufficient evidence was available) for suspected types of criminal and violational activity than 37 comparison cases also suspected of illegal activity involvement but not investigated.

The investigation model was also associated with an increase in the sanctions applied to parolees suspected of being reinvolved in illegal activities, however the increase occurred only in parole revocation dispositions. An analysis of the charges filed in connection with the investigation showed that a larger proportion of the 245 cases investigated as compared to 37 comparison cases not investigated had revocation charges filed. Also a significantly larger proportion of the most serious dispositions received in connection with the investigation purposes were "board-ordered" returns-to-custody. No significant difference was found between the two study groups on the proportion of cases with criminal charges filed and on the proportion of cases whose most serious disposition was a new court commitment to prison.

Finally, the investigation model was associated with an increase in the contribution made by parole agents to the detection and processing of new charges, although law enforcement rather than parole agent activities continued to account for the major contribution. The analysis provided evidence that parole agents (1) were a source of activity or information leading to the most serious disposition, (2) provided assistance in the criminal prosecution, and (3) confiscated contraband (i.e., weapons, narcotics and stolen property) slightly more often for the 245 investigated cases than for the 37 comparison cases.

Outcome of the Intensive Supervision Model: Prevention and Deterrence. The intensive supervision model was not associated with a reduction in the frequency and severity of subsequent criminal activity during either a six or a twelve month program follow-up period. Counter to the deterrent effect of intensive supervision hypothesized by project planners, a comparison of the six month outcomes for 129 of the 131 experimental and 61 of the 62 comparison cases (Note: three study cases were eliminated due to missing data) showed that intensive supervision cases experienced a higher: (1) proportion of cases whose parole status had unsuccessfully terminated early as of the end of the follow-up period, (2) proportion of cases with criminal charges filed, (3) average severity of the new criminal charges filed, (4) proportion of cases with the more serious types of criminal dispositions received, and (5) number of days expended in custody during the follow-up period. An identical analysis based on an 80% sub-sample of the study cases (117 experimental and 37 comparison cases) with sufficient elapsed time to conduct a longer term twelve month follow-up analysis showed similar results.

Differential Effectiveness Across Parole Units.
Comparisons across the three units implementing the investigation model and the two units implementing the intensive supervision model showed the parole units were associated with different outcomes. The Bakersfield unit project was associated with higher rates of successful outcomes than the investigative projects conducted at either the Stockton unit or the Walnut Creek unit. Several explanations for the outcome variance including differences in the types of activities performed at each unit and differences in the types of cases selected at each unit were explored. Neither interpretation was conclusively ruled out. The Walnut Creek unit project was associated with a larger increase in sanctions received than the intensive supervision project conducted at the Riverside/San Bernardino unit. However, differences in the types of cases selected at the two units were found to totally account for this particular outcome variance.

Interpretation of Findings. Based upon the higher rate of successful verifications and higher rate of revocations sanctions applied to cases investigated under the High Control Project, coupled with an increase in the agents contribution to the detection and processing of new charges, it was concluded that pre-arrest investigative activities "may" increase illegal activity verification and sanctioning rates. Further research was found necessary before other possible explanations for the outcome differences found could be conclusively ruled out.

Selection factor differences were found to at least partially account for the higher recidivism rates of parolees in the intensive supervision model of the High Control Project. Therefore, no conclusions were reached regarding the preventive or deterrent effect of the model's more frequent check-up contacts. The few preventive-oriented activities conducted under the model, coupled with prior research on earlier intensive supervision models tested in California which found violation rates increased as a result of the closer watch provided, indicated prevention/deterrence may have been an inappropriate objective.

If as it appears the effect of high control models of parole supervision is to increase the number of parolees sanctioned for returning to criminal activity, then it next remains to be demonstrated that the incapacitative effect of such sanctions is to reduce parolee crime levels in the long run.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

B·16

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

This is a study of high control models of parole. Supervision based on intensified surveillant and investigative activities was delivered to selected high risk parolees in an attempt to reduce the likelihood of their returning to or continuing criminal activity. Known as the "High Control Project", it's purpose was to:

- identify parolees who presented the most serious threat to public safety

- increase the controls and sanctions for parolees who had returned to criminal activity

- deter those parolees who had not returned to criminal activity but had a high probability of doing so

To test the impact of this model, projects were implemented in four parole unit demonstration sites in California-- Walnut Creek, Stockton, Bakerfield and Riverside/San Bernardino. The sites varied in the type of high control model implemented - investigation or intensive supervision - and to a lesser degree in their organizational and management structure. However, they were all similar in that selected high risk parolees were targeted for intensified surveillance and/or investigation by specially trained parole agents. This report examines the activities and outcomes of the High Control Project as it operated between February 1977, when the first of the four demonstration sites became operational, and June 30, 1979, the study period cut-off date.

The purpose of the evaluation reported here is to:

- describe the activities and organization of the high control model as implemented at the four demonstration sites

- determine the extent to which higher risk cases were selected and placed in the project

- determine if a high control model of supervision is associated with an increase in the controls and sanctions placed upon parolees for their criminal activities

- determine if a high control model of supervision is associated with an overall reduction in the frequency and severity of criminal activity committed

- determine if effectiveness is related to a) the different control models implemented b) the different organizational structures of the demonstration sites and c) the different types of cases targeted for the project

The control activities examined in this project are not new to parole supervision. Watching the activity of inmates released to the community has always been a function of parole supervision. However, this role has been criticized for being secondary to, and conflicting with, the helping function of supervision. Furthermore, the effectiveness of those routine supervision activities commonly associated with the control function, including making check-up contacts and revoking parole when violations of parole conditions have occurred, have been recently questioned.

What was new in the high control approach to parole supervision examined in this report was it's intensive

utilization of the surveillance and investigation strategies commonly identified with a law enforcement approach to identifying and apprehending offenders. Furthermore, the organizational structures of the participating parole units represented an attempt to separate control activities from helping activities by using specialist parole agent positions. And finally, the project was unique in that it targeted a highly select group of parolees seen as presenting a more serious threat to public safety.

Description of High Control Supervision

The high control model of supervision represented a law enforcement approach to the supervision of inmates released to parole status in the community. As opposed to the second major function of parole, i.e. providing services and easing the inmate's transition from prison to the community, the emphasis here is on control and community protection. To accomplish this the High Control Project placed primary attention upon the tasks of (1) surveillance and (2) investigation.

"Surveillance" refers to the checking and verification of the parolee's behavior in the community. In routine parole supervision this primarily occurs through the agent's conducting mandatory contacts with either the parolee or with the parolee's family and associates (i.e., collaterals). In the high control approach, the parolee is watched more often. More importantly, information is gathered on the parolee's status primarily from "indirect" sources (rather than directly from the parolee),

including the use of undercover surveillance, informants, and collateral contacts.

"Investigation" refers to the gathering of specific criminal activity information, usually from victims, witnesses, informants and collaterals. As with surveillance, investigations are conducted under traditional forms of supervision too, usually for the purpose of providing evidence and documentation in violation reports and at revocation hearings. It typically occurred _after_ an arrest or _after_ a parole violation is known to have occurred. In contrast, investigation activity under the High Control Project takes place _before_ an arrest has occurred or violation of a parole condition has been verified. The purpose of investigation under high control is to link the parolee with the "suspected" criminal activity. Thus, the high control approach to investigation typically leads to an arrest, rather than follows up an arrest.

To accomplish the tasks of surveillance and investigation, the following "specific" kinds of activities were performed in the High Control Project:

- conducting interviews with victims, witnesses
- conducting searches and seizing evidence
- exchanging current parolee activity information with local law enforcement agencies
- apprehending and placing under arrest
- conducting undercover surveillance
- gathering information and evidence from official records and police resource materials
- verifying parolee activity with collaterals

Thus, the high control approach included both a shift in emphasis from a mixture of helping and controlling tasks to total control activities, and the introduction of new specific tasks and activities commonly conducted by police agencies.

The high control model is also different from traditional supervision on two other dimensions: (1) the targeting of selected offenders and (2) the organizational and management structures used.

Selected Target Population

The high control model of supervision targeted a select group of releases to parole. Routine supervision models also vary the level of supervision according to the type of case; but the variation is based upon a limited range of mandatory check-up contacts. Furthermore, few guidelines are available in traditional parole to assist in selecting the more serious from the less serious case. The high control approach was slightly more systematic than the traditional parole classification effort.

The high control project staff developed a set of five selection criteria to identify the more serious parolees for high control attention. While essentially the decision to place in high control was clinically made, using the collective judgements of several agents and parole supervisors, a loose set of selection guidelines were applied. Parolees with either a) a prior criminal history or b) current suspected activity in one of the following

five activity areas were targeted for the project:

1. prison gang affiliated activities
2. large scale narcotic sales activity
3. violent/aggressive or sexually deviant activity
4. large scale property thefts
5. absconders from parole supervision or other difficulty in contacting

Many factors other than those listed above entered into the final case selection decision. In addition, exceptions to the above criteria allowed other cases to be placed in the project. The extent to which these criteria were applied and the priorities placed upon them are examined later in Chapter V.

The five selection criteria were developed by the participating demonstration units/districts, and the exact rationale for their selection is unknown. However they appear to encompass several, rather than any one, rationale including:

- activities indicating a high probability of returning to such criminal activity
- activities involving violent or aggressive activity of high public dislike
- activities reflecting extensive criminal careers
- activities functioning as early detection clues
- activities which are known to be impacted by police activities (i.e., suppressible crimes)

The targeting of parolees with a history of or current suspected involvement in "violent or sexually deviant" activity likely reflects the seriousness placed by the public on crimes involving injury or potential injury to persons. The targeting of parolees involved in large scale " narcotic sales" and "property theft" activities reflects the concern with offenders who have a greater likelihood of returning to criminal activity and also offenders who are known to have extensive and prolonged

involvement in these activities (i.e., career criminals). Finally, the remaining two high control criteria, "prison gang affiliation" and "parole absconders", targets activities which are not criminal in and of themselves but rather are "clues" indicating a potential for criminal involvement and allows early detection or prevention of actual criminal activities.

A final rationale which could possibly explain the high control selection criteria used in this project is the police concept of "suppressible crimes". Suppressible crimes are those which can be impacted by police activities. That is, the circumstances and locations under which they are committed provide the police a greater chance to deter crime or apprehend offenders. The police categories of suppressible crimes vary from department to department but usually include the following offense types: robbery, burglary, thefts, assaults and sex crimes. All of these offense types are encompassed by the five high control selection criteria listed above.

As the selection guidelines for the high control model were unique to this project and appear to be based on a variety of "seriousness" rationales and indicators rather than any one, their validity will be examined in this report. Later chapters will attempt to provide more definition to each of the high control selection criteria by examining their application across the four demonstration sites, and the outcomes of cases selected under each category.

## Organization and Management Structure

The high control model operated with an organizational and management structure different from that of traditional parole supervision models. First the high control agent role was one of a "specialist" rather than the more traditional "generalist" agent. Agents in the project primarily performed the control-oriented activities; they either deemphasized or excluded the performance of helping activities. The high control agent either referred the parolee to another agent in the unit for service delivery or responded with services only upon the parolee's request.

Second, the high control specialist agent worked within a small team of control specialists, ranging from one other agent to three other agents. Decisions were made and many activities (particularly undercover surveillance tasks) were conducted by the team of agents. Additional coordination of the team was possible through the use of mobile radio equipment. In contrast, the agent under traditional parole usually worked alone and had total responsibility for a case. Only arrests and major decision-making tasks regarding changes in the parolee's status (e.g., adding special conditions, returning to prison) were made in collaboration with another staff member.

Third, the high control function was carried out in a special sub-unit within a larger parole unit or district. The sub-unit was authorized to conduct special activities (e.g., undercover surveillance), use special equipment (e.g., mobile

radio equipment), and maintain variable working schedules (e.g., work in the evening). The amount of coordination with the larger unit/district (of which the high control staff was a part) varied depending upon the model implemented (extensive coordination for the investigation model, little coordination for the intensive supervision model). In contrast, the agent under traditional supervision models worked independently of the other agents in the office and used none of the special tactics and equipment of the high control agent.

Finally the high control agent handled a smaller number of cases than is traditionally assigned to one agent. As the time necessary to perform intensive surveillant and investigative activities was greater, the number of cases assigned to an agent was lowered to between 10 - 15 cases. In contrast, traditional supervision models have always been based on a larger caseload ratio which is currently averaging between 50 and 60 cases per agent.

## Two Models of High Control: Investigation and Intensive Supervision

Two different models of high control supervision were tested. One was an "intensive supervision" model which maintained close, frequent contacts with parolees in a small caseload structure. The second was an "investigative" model which conducted short term investigations of parolees suspected

of involvement in criminal activity. The basic premises upon
which each model was derived are briefly described below.
(Actual differences in the kinds of activities occurring under
each model is described later in the report).

Investigation. The purpose of the investigative model was
to collect information in order to verify or clear the parolee of
suspected involvement in criminal activity. An investigation was
initiated only when current criminal activity was suspected. It
was short in duration, generally lasting between 10 and 120 days.
In addition to the tasks of evidence collection, apprehension and
support for subsequent criminal court or revocation processing
also occurred. All regular caseload responsibilities (e.g.,
mandatory contacts, service delivery, violation report writing)
remained with another, traditional parole, supervising agent.

Intensive Supervision. The purpose of the intensive
supervision model was to monitor closely the parolee's activity.
It was essentially a high contact model with emphasis placed on
collecting information regarding the case through collaterals,
informants, and undercover surveillance. Intensive supervision
generally begins early in the parole period and may if necessary
last the full period the case is under parole status. Placement
was based primarily upon the prior criminal history of the case.
The intensive supervision agent maintained full caseload
responsibilities on each case.

The general differences between the two models are summarized
below:

| | | Intensive Supervision | Investigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | FOCUS: | monitoring parolee's general activity | verification of specific parolee activity |
| 2. | PLACEMENT INITIATED BY: | history of criminal activity | current suspected criminal activity |
| 3. | PURPOSE: | deterrence/prevention | verification/clearance, leading to apprehension and/or prosecution |
| 4. | CASELOAD RESPONSIBILITY: | full | none |
| 5. | DURATION: | long term, permanent | short term, temporary |

The investigation model was implemented at two of the four
demonstration sites. The intensive supervision model was
implemented at one of the four demonstration sites. One demonstration
site implemented both models. How each of the four demonstration
sites implemented the high control models is described next.

## CHAPTER II

### DEMONSTRATION SITES

Four parole units/districts within the State of California were selected to implement the High Control Project. All four sites were in basic agreement as to the objectives of the project, and the major program activities to be conducted.

It was up to each site to select which of the two high control models (investigation or intensive supervision) it would implement. Also each site developed it's own organizational and management structure. As a result of this self-selection process, each of the four demonstration sites operated differently. It was also expected that each site would vary somewhat in the kinds and frequency with which they performed various high control activities and in the types of cases each addressed. The exact extent to which these differences occurred will be examined in subsequent chapters. A brief description of how each of the four sites organized themselves is given below and is summarized in Figure 1.

Walnut Creek

The Walnut Creek High Control Project operated in two of the three parole units in the North Bay District of Parole Region II. The Walnut Creek Felon Unit and the Walnut Creek Non-Felon Unit (for civilly committed narcotic addicts on parole), which

both served the Contra Costa County area, were located in a single building in the city of Walnut Creek. (A third unit in the North Bay District and located in the city of Santa Rosa, did not participate in the project). During the progress of the project, the non-high control staff in the two units totaled 17, eleven of which were case-carrying agents (Parole Agents I and II's) and six of which were supervisorial and clerical staff.

The Walnut Creek site was the only one of the four sites to elect to implement both the investigative model and the intensive supervision model. Two agents were assigned to conduct intensive supervision, carrying approximately fifteen cases each; and two agents (one of whom also functioned as the "agent-in-charge" of the project) were assigned to an investigative approach conducting approximately ten to fifteen investigations at a time. With a clerk, the total staff in the Walnut Creek High Control Project was five.

The rationale behind implementing both models was to allow maximum flexibility. An immediate information follow-up on cases suspected of current criminal involvement (investigative model), as well as on-going close monitoring of cases with serious criminal histories (intensive supervision model) were seen as needed. In addition, it was seen as valuable to transfer cases from one model to the other, particularly cases whose investigations did not verify current criminal activity but whose past history indicated a strong likelihood of returning and a need for close monitoring.

Some dissatisfaction with the investigative model occurred midway during the study period. As a result of this dissatisfaction, the investigative model was dropped in October 1978, twenty months after starting. The switch coincided with a change of supervisors for the Walnut Creek Project and was intended to maximize the high control agent's responsibility for the case. That is, project staff felt that the intensive supervision model in contrast to the investigation model had the advantage of having current case activity information available to allow early detection. In February, 1979 four months after dropping the investigations model, Walnut Creek reinstituted it after the need for some short term investigations had arisen.

The Walnut Creek unit was the first of the four sites to implement the project, beginning on February 15, 1977. It terminated March 31, 1980. However, only case intake through December 31, 1978 for the intensive supervision model and June 30, 1979 for the investigation model, is examined here.

The High Control Project serviced both the Walnut Creek felon and the Walnut Creek non-felon units which together averaged 465 cases (326 felons and 139 non-felons) during the study period. While occupying office space in the same building as the felon and non-felon units, the High Control Unit operated as a separate but allied unit which reported directly to the North Bay District Administrator.

Cases for the High Control Project were selected primarily from referrals. Agents and supervisors in the participating two units, as well as outside law enforcement agencies, referred cases which met the selection criteria. In addition, an ongoing screening of new cases (pre-releasees and parole unit transfers) by the two unit supervisors also helped to identify project cases. All cases were screened by the High Control Project staff prior to final acceptance.

Stockton

The Stockton High Control Project operated within the Stockton Unit of the Central Valley District in Parole Region I. The Stockton Unit serviced areas surrounding the cities of Stockton, Manteca, Tracy, and Lodi. During the progress of the project the unit had eleven non-high control staff including eight supervising agents and three supervisorial and clerical staff members.

The Stockton Project implemented an investigative model. Two agents worked as a team investigating between ten and twenty cases at any one time. Supervision of the team was provided by the unit supervisor who also supervised the non-high control parole agent staff. No separate office space or clerical support staff was utilized.

The Stockton Project was the second of the four sites to implement and began operation January 1, 1978, approximately

eight months after the Walnut Creek Project. The project
terminated June 30, 1979, eighteen months later due to an
administrative reallocation of the unit's staff resources. All
cases placed under investigation during this eighteen month
period are examined here.

Cases placed under investigation were drawn from the
caseloads of the eleven non-high control agents. During the
eighteen month study period, the Stockton parolee population
averaged 255 cases, including 201 felons and 54 non-felons. Case
selection was primarily initiated by referrals from the regular
supervising agent, although referrals from outside law
enforcement agencies also occurred. An ongoing screening of the
unit's cases also took place via case conferences between the
regular supervising agents and the unit supervisor. The High
Control agents screened all referrals prior to final acceptance.

## Bakersfield

The Bakersfield High Control Project operated in the
Bakersfield Unit of the Southern District in Parole Region I
(formerly part of Parole Region III). The non-high control staff
in the unit totaled twelve, eight supervising agents and four
supervisorial and clerical staff members. The Bakersfield unit
services the city of Bakersfield and it's surrounding area.

The Bakersfield Project implemented an investigative model
utilizing three high control agents (one of which also functioned
as an agent-in-charge). Overall supervision was provided by the

unit supervisor who also supervised the twelve non-high control
staff members. The three high control agents worked as a team on
each case. No separate office space or clerical staff was
utilized.

Bakersfield was the third of the four demonstration sites
to implement the High Control Project. Case intake started July
1, 1978, sixteen months after the Walnut Creek Project was
implemented and six months after the Stockton Project was
implemented. The project terminated March 31, 1980. However,
only cases taken in through June 30, 1979 are examined here.

Cases for the Bakersfield Project were drawn from the
caseloads of the eight regular agents in the unit. During the
twelve month study period, the parolee population averaged 297
cases, 169 felons and 128 non-felons. Selection was primarily
initiated by referrals from the regular supervising agents,
although ongoing screening took place by the unit supervisor
during routine case conferences. The high control agents
reviewed the cases prior to final acceptance.

## Riverside/San Bernardino

The Riverside/San Bernardino High Control Project operated
in two of the four parole units in the Riverside District in
Parole Region IV. The Riverside Unit and the San Bernardino Unit
participated; the two Ontario Parole Units also in the Riverside
District did not. In the two participating units there were
twenty non-high control staff members including 14 supervising
agents and six supervisorial and clerical staff members.

The Riverside/San Bernardino project implemented an intensive supervision model. Five agents were assigned to the project, four case-carrying agents and one agent-in-charge. Each agent was responsible for approximately fifteen cases. Although both the Riverside Unit and the San Bernardino Unit were serviced by the project, all five project staff members occupied separate office space at the Riverside Unit. The project staff reported to the District Administrator.

The Riverside/San Bernardino units were the last of the four sites to implement the project. Furthermore the project started in two phases, begining first with the selection of cases from San Bernardino on June 1, 1978 and, second, with the selection of Riverside cases on October 1, 1978. The project terminated October 1, 1979 in the San Bernardino Unit and October 15, 1979 in the Riverside Unit due to an administrative reallocation of each unit's staff resources. Only cases selected through December 31, 1978 are examined here.

Cases for the Riverside/San Bernardino Project were drawn from those under the supervision of the two participating units. During the six month study period, the parolee population averaged 564 cases, including 370 felons and 194 non-felons. Unlike the other demonstration sites, cases were identified by routine periodic screenings of all caseloads in the unit. The screenings were conducted by the unit supervisor, regular supervising agent, and the agent-in-charge of the high control project. The project did not use a referral process and was therefore less dependent upon the other agents in the unit for the selection of it's caseloads.

-18-

Figure 1
Organizational Characteristics of Participating Units

| Organizational characteristics | High Control Project at | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Walnut Creek | Stockton | Bakersfield | Riverside/ San Bernardino |
| Parole Region ............ | II | I | I | IV |
| Participating Units ...... | 1.W.C./ felon 2.W.C./ NAOP | 1. Stockton | 1. Bakersfield | 1. Riverside 2. San Bernardino |
| High Control Project Staff[1] | 5 | 2 | 3 | 5 |
| High Control agents ..... | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Agent-in-charge ......... | 1 | - | 1 | 1 |
| Clerical ................ | 1 | - | - | - |
| Other Unit Staff[1] | 17 | 11 | 12 | 20 |
| PA I/II-felon ........... | 4 | 5 | 4 | 8 |
| PA I/II-nonfelon ........ | 5 | 2 | 4 | 5 |
| PSA/CCWT ................ | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Clerical ................ | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Unit Supervisior ........ | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Parole Population[2] ........ | 465 | 255 | 297 | 564 |
| Felons .................. | (326) | (201) | (169) | (370) |
| Male ................ | 315 | 190 | 161 | 345 |
| Female .............. | 11 | 11 | 8 | 25 |
| Non-felons ............. | (139) | (54) | (128) | (194) |
| Male ................ | 110 | 42 | 80 | 157 |
| Female .............. | 29 | 12 | 48 | 37 |
| Type of model ............ | Combination | Investi/ gation | Investi/ gation | Intensive Supervision |
| Project Start Date ........ | 2-15-77 | 1-1-78 | 7-1-78 | 6-1-78 (SB) 10-1-78 (RIV) |
| Project Termination Date | 3-31-80 | 6-30-79 | 3-31-80 | 10-1-79 (SB) 10-15-79 (RIV) |
| Study Period Intake Starting ........... | 2-15-77 to | 1-1-78 to | 7-1-78 to | 6-1-78 (SB) to 10-1-78 (RIV) |
| Intake Ending ........... | 12-31-78 (I.S.) 6-30-79 (INV.) | 6-30-79 | 6-30-79 | 12-31-78 (SB) 12-31-78 (RIV) |
| Total Months of Intake Studied | 22½ (I.S.) 28½ (INV.) | 18 | 12 | 7 (SB) 3 (RIV) |

1/ Unit staff as of 12-31-78

2/ Average of parole population at first of each month during study period

-19-

Summary. Of the four demonstration sites, the
Riverside/San Bernardino Project was the largest in scope but the
shortest in study period length. The Riverside/San Bernardino
Project had more high control agents and serviced units with the
largest parole population. However it was the last project to
implement therefore, allowing only a short intake period for
examination. The Walnut Creek Project followed Riverside/San
Bernardino in size by implementing in two units and utilizing
four high control agents. The Walnut Creek Project was the first
to implement, thereby permitting a longer intake period for
examination. As both project sites implemented intensive
supervision models where agents had full responsibility for the
cases, each tended to operate somewhat independently of the non-
high control staff in the parent units.

In contrast, the two sites implementing the investigative
model were smaller in scope. The Stockton and Bakersfield
Projects operated within a single unit and utilized only two and
three (respectively) high control agents who worked in teams
rather than independently. The selection process, office
structure and supervisorial arrangements of the Stockton and
Bakersfield units generally reflected the greater dependence upon
and interaction with the non-high control agents at each site.

# CHAPTER III

## BACKGROUND

The field of corrections is currently experiencing a shift
away from the goals of rehabilitation toward goals of equitable
punishment. Several states including California have abandoned
traditional indeterminate sentencing structures based upon the
concept of changing the offender (rehabilitation) and adopted
determinate sentencing systems based upon the concept of
punishing the offender.

The shift has also been evident in recent program
planning and evaluation efforts. A large part of federal funds
for planning and testing criminal justice programs have recently
been expended for programs which identify and punish the serious
offender. The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration
(L.E.A.A.) of the Department of Justice is in the process of
developing a comprehensive integrated career criminal program
involving the police, prosecutors, courts, and corrections.
Program development first began with the establishment of Career
Criminal Prosecution (C.C.P.) units in several states. This was
followed by the Integrated Criminal Apprehension Programs
(I.C.A.P.) in police agencies. Both nationally funded programs
target the more serious repeat offender. And now RAND
Corporation under a federal grant is exploring the feasibility of
expanding these programs to the correctional field, including the
parole system (Petersilia and Lavin, 1978). According to the

RAND Corporation parole is a place where career criminals are likely to end up and the parole system presents a unique opportunity to control crime. The recommended career criminal program expansion to the parole system has been supported by data from the initial Career Criminal Prosecution programs which showed that nearly half of the defendents prosecuted in these programs were on some form of conditional release at the time they were arrested for their presently prosecuted crimes (National Legal Data Center, 1977).

Accompanying the shift toward punishment goals and programs has been an increasing examination of the role of the parole system which was largely built upon the treatment and rehabilitative goals now deemphasized. The body of arguments challenging the equities and effectiveness of the parole system has grown (see Von Hirsch, 1978; Stanley, 1976; Fogel, 1975; the Citizens Inquiry on Parole and Criminal Justice, 1975 and Social Issues Research Associates, 1974). Some states have curtailed the role of the parole system and a few have abolished it altogether. As the arguments increase so do efforts to study alternative models of supervision (e.g., Rutgers University, 1978;, Connecticutt Department of Corrections, 1977).

The High Control Project arose out of one such effort to develop alternative parole models in California. But clearly it's goals also reflect the larger shift that is occurring in the field of corrections away from rehabilitation and toward punishment. And, it coincides with the federal interest expressed by L.E.A.A. in extending career criminal programs into

the field of corrections. The development of the High Control Project within California's own recent effort to identify alternative models of parole supervision, and the small body of research to which this project relates to, is described in this chapter.

## Development

The High Control Project developed as a part of a two year self-evaluation effort undertaken by the Parole and Community Services Division (parole division) of the California Department of Corrections. In 1975, the Director of the Department of Corrections was concerned over the critical questions then being asked regarding the function of parole and was interested in determining more effective ways of running the parole system in the future. To do this the parole division developed alternative models and systems, and initiated demonstration projects to test their effectiveness.

In April 1976, several demonstration projects were implemented. Most of the projects aimed at intensifying the services delivered to parolees. The High Control Project was developed to balance the effort initially expended on the service projects. Two other, smaller scale projects with a control focus were also tested during this period. The Enzyme Multiplying Immuassay Technique (E.M.I.T.) Urine Testing Project was developed to increase the identification rate for assessing drug usage among the addict parole population. And the Parole Outpatient Clinic (P.O.C.) Project was designed to increase the

availability of psychiatric services to parolees at the local level. In both these projects the programs were existing prior to their implementation and the project primarily involved a "restructuring" of the existing organization. Relative to these projects the High Control Project was the "major" demonstration project with a control focus implemented during this two year self-evaluation effort. That is, it represented an "alternative" model built on new program <u>activities</u> as well as new ways of <u>organizing</u> supervision activities. It was also the last project to be implemented in the two year plan and for several reasons was also the most difficult to implement. The first of the four demonstration sites began operation in February, 1977. The last site began operation in June 1978, twenty-four months after the original July 1976 concept paper was prepared.

To develop the control-oriented supervision models a special task force composed of parole agents and parole administrators was established. They proposed three alternatives including team, investigator, and high contact approaches. While only the latter two alternative models were eventually implemented, the participating parole staff at each of the demonstration sites had the opportunity to select any one of the three alternatives proposed.

<u>Demonstration site selection</u>. The four demonstration sites were selected primarily on a volunteer basis, one within each of four geographic regions in the state. Parole units

-24-

interested in high control demonstration projects were asked to submit plans for implementation. Final site selections were made by the parole administrators of each of the four geographic parole regions in the state. Some factors taken into consideration in the site selection was the organizational suitability of the site and the possibility of conflict with other experimental demonstration projects going on at that time.

The original number of sites designated for implementation totaled five across the state, the four sites included in this evaluation and a project proposed by the Eagle Rock Parole Unit. However, Eagle Rock selected to withdraw from participation due to it's rising caseload size and a loss of staff resources.

Parole division planning staff were initially concerned that the final four sites selected were heavily weighted toward "rural" and "suburban" locations. An urban site, where the need for high control supervision was felt to be the greatest, was not among the four sites selected. The interest of the two parole units in the West Los Angeles area was solicitated in order to test the project in a major urban area; however, their participation in the project never materialized. As a result the project was tested in what are primarily smaller urban and suburban areas.

Finally, it is noted that at one point during the project's planning stages parole units in San Diego, San Jose and Sacramento were also designated as demonstration sites, contingent upon the receipt of additional state funding; however, the additional funds were never secured and the proposed expansion did not occur. Thus, several efforts were made to

-25-

expand the test sites, however a combination of a lack of resources, funds, and interest eventually limited the project to the four sites studied in this report.

Delays in implementation. The implementation period for the four demonstration sites spanned nearly two years with the first site (Walnut Creek) beginning operation in February, 1977 and the last site (Riverside) in October, 1978. Several problems contributed to the slow start. Major among these was the request by project staff to arm themselves. Because of the increased danger to parole agents involved in working more closely with dangerous parolees, project plans called for the high control agents to carry weapons. Although today parole agents in California can be armed if they so choose, in late 1976 when this project was being planned, the policy was that agents could be armed only temporarily when there were direct threats to their lives. The High Control Project proposals designated the fulltime arming of their agents with guns. There was hesitation to approve the gun proposals by some correctional administrators. Final dissapproval was given by the Secretary of the Health and Welfare Agency, the official to whom the Director of the Department of Corrections reported to at that time. Field interest in conducting the project diminished after the "no gun" decision, and some of the sites considered not implementing the project at all. Eventually the designated project staff moved ahead with implementation, but only after qualifying their project's statement of expected effectiveness, and after

-26-

declaring problems of increased dependence upon law enforcement agencies for the performance of certain high control activities.

Additional causes for the slow start were more technical in nature. In addition to guns, the project called for radios in the autos or on the person of the high control agent. This was seen as essential to the coordination and response time of the staff. Some of the units started the project without radios, others waited until the equipment was rented, bought, or loaned by law enforcement agencies. Delays were also caused by the time necessary to realign staff and their caseloads at each of the four sites. Finally, administrative concerns over safety issues required a series of rewrites in the four project implementation plans. To assure the agent's safety and to assure no violations of the parolees rights, legal opinions on the conduct of various activities were secured and several administrative checks were built into the plans (including management approval prior to the performance of certain high control activities).

The development of the High Control Project was further complicated by the size of the project and by the decentralized local approach to the planning effort. Aside from a minimum supervision project and a social development project also implemented in multiple sites throughout the state, the High Control Project was the largest. It was implemented at four different sites, one in each of the four geographic parole regions, and involved six of California's fifty parole units.

-27-

The number of experimental cases examined in the study (475 cases) exceeded all other demonstration projects tested during the two year self-evaluation period.

Unlike most of the projects tested in the two year self-evaluation effort, the High Control Project involved major changes in parole agents jobs. "New" activities typically performed by law enforcement personnel were introduced and became the major tasks of the high control agents. The majority of the other projects tested did not involve such new activity but rather an organizational or technical change only. For this reason the High Control Project presents itself as an "alternative" to rather than simply a "reorganization" of traditional parole supervision activities.

This project was the last of the demonstration projects implemented and tested during the two year self-evaluation effort to close. An in-house examination of these many projects has been made (California Department of Corrections, 1977), and a new differential supervision model of parole proposed (California Department of Corrections, 1978). The new model is now operational statewide. The future of the high control models as part of this new model remains to be seen. While control-oriented supervision has been outlined as one function to be handled by specialist agents in the new California parole model, the substance of that approach has yet to be defined.

## Prior Research

The High Control Project crosses three areas of existing criminal justice research on parole supervision. It is in one sense an expansion of traditional control strategies used in parole including mandatory check-up contacts and parole agent arrests and revocations. In another sense, it represents an alternative approach to organizing casework including small caseload and team supervision structures. And, lastly, it represents the introduction of law enforcement (police) strategies such as patrol and investigation in to parole supervision activities. As the High Control Project crosses all three areas, it is necessary to examine the research in each separately. The purpose of the brief examination is to relate the control strategies used in this project to those control strategies which have so far been shown to have an impact on crime reduction goals.

Traditional parole approaches. The status of being on parole is in and of itself a control mechanism. The parolee is released to the community on the condition that he/she abides by the conditions of parole. If not the parolee can be returned to prison. The threat of revocation of parole can function as a deterrent to returning to criminal activity.

It should be noted here that at one time the possible deterrent effect that revocation had for the parolee may have been even stronger. Prior to the enactment of the Determinate Sentencing Law in July, 1977 revocation rescinded the parolee's sentence (as set by the parole board) and it automatically reverted to the statutory maximum. This meant that the

parolee could serve the rest of the maximum sentence in prison. In actuality the parolee was returned to prison for a period which usually averaged between twelve and eighteen months, at which time the sentence was reset at a new date and the inmate was re-released. As part of the determinate sentencing legislation parole revocation time was reduced to a maximum of six months (and later increased to a maximum of twelve months). With such a change the threat of the "overhanging sentence" (i.e. that portion of the original sentence which could be served back in prison) was diminished. However, even under the reduced revocation period, as long as the possibility of a sanction for violations exists, then the individual under parole supervision may be deterred.

Some evidence questioning the impact of the revocation sanctions on subsequent parolee criminality is available from a study by Miller (1972). Miller identified a group of parole violators who were continued on parole by a lenient parole board and found no difference in outcomes between that group and a group of new releases. The study provided weak evidence that sanctioning parolees by returning them to prison for violations may not be impacting subsequent criminal activity levels. Even with these findings it is still possible that the "threat" of being revoked, rather than it's enforcement or sanction, is holding down the criminal activity levels of parolees. The conclusive test condition, removing the possibility of revocation altogether, has yet to be examined.

The other supposed major control strategy which is a part of routine parole supervision is mandatory contacts between the parolee and the parole agent. Parole agents are required to have a minimum number of contacts with parolees. The deterrent impact of these check-up contacts is theoretically accentuated by the fact that they may be "surprise" visits, "field" visits outside the parole office, or visits to gather information from collaterals (i.e., friends and relatives) of the parolee. The impact that mandatory contacts has on subsequent parolee criminal activity was recently examined in the California Summary Parole Project (Star, 1979). The project tested the impact of a reduced supervision model where mandatory check-up contacts were waived. The study found no difference in one year outcomes between cases with contacts and cases without mandatory contacts. Contradictory findings were recently provided in a Connecticut study comparing cases paroled with similar cases directly discharged from prison (therefore no mandatory contacts) by a court order (Sacks and Logan, 1979). That project found lower recidivism rates for the cases experiencing parole supervision contacts. Obviously more occurs under parole than just mandatory contacts and it is difficult to attach the favorable outcomes found by Sacks and Logan to the absence of check-up contacts alone. Based on the study by Star and another study in Finland (Antilla, 1975) both which do isolate their impact, check-up contacts alone do not appear to reduce the criminal activity levels of parolees.

The above studies indicate that two major control strategies available in traditional supervision activities - the revocation sanction and mandatory contacts - have yet to be shown to clearly reduce parolee criminal activity. It is noted that the control strategies tested in this project, i.e. surveillant and investigative activities, are also performed in traditional parole supervision. The difference between the models tested in this study and regular parole is the "degree" to which these activities occupy supervision time. The few studies describing the control activities of parole agents are field observational studies such as the major work by Studt in 1970. Studt described the control activities conducted by agents as being random, undirected, and indistinquishable from the helping/service activities also performed by parole agents. Parole supervision has typically been reactive rather than proactive to occurrances of criminal activity by pursuing a parole revocation after an arrest has occurred. In fact, the sources of most information leading to parole revocations, has been shown to be from individuals and activities other than the agent's (Studt, 1970, p. 145; Star, Berecochea, and Petrocchi 1978, p. 17; both studies show the primary source is the police).

Organizational approaches. Some projects attempted to intensify their routine control methods by reorganizing the supervision system. The largest and most well known of these projects are the intensive supervision projects which were based on reduced caseloads. This concept has been tested in California as part of the Special Intensive Parole Unit Project (S.I.P.U.) and the Work Unit Project. The basic premise in each was to reduce caseload size in order to allow more intensive monitoring of high risk parolees. It was proposed that the close watch would reduce parolee incidents of crime, particularly aiming at violent crime. Clear findings of a crime reduction impact have not been observed from those reviewing such projects (e.g., See Neithercutt and Gottfredson, 1973). In fact, in the Work Unit Project closer watch increased rather than decreased board ordered returns to prison. Furthermore, the thrust of such intensive supervision models has oftentimes been described as more service than control oriented.

A second more recent group of organizational approaches tested are the team supervision models. Under the team approach, a group of supervising agents assume responsibility for the total requirements of a caseload. Included in the team, are agents who specialize in surveillant activities for the team's caseload. The basic premise is that the specialization and focus of effort possible under the team approach would increase effectiveness. This model has been implemented in several western states as the Community Release Management Team (C.R.M.T.). Follow-up evaluation on the impact of these teams are not available.

However, descriptive material (Dell'Apa, Adams, Jorgensen and Sigurdson, 1976) indicates that, like the intensive supervision models mentioned above, their major focus appears to be service, with a particular emphasis on brokering with the community for parole services, rather than control.

Another kind of team supervision approach which is more control oriented is being tested in Clark County, Nevada (Nevada Department of Parole and Probation, 1978). The program uses a two person team and targets both hard-core narcotic users and "sophisticated" criminals. Their objective is to deter offenders and return to prison those unwilling to change. The evidence available so far (based on some weak comparative data) is that the program is experiencing both a higher success rate and a higher revocation rate than non-team caseloads in similar geographic areas. The problem with generalizing too far from the Clark County team is that the program addressed narcotic users (who were diverted to drug programs in the community), a category of parolees with special needs who were not included in the California High Control Project.

Police approaches. The kinds of activities incorporated into the California High Control Project are some of the same routine control approaches utilized by the police. Whether or not parole agents should adopt a law enforcement approach to supervision is the subject of a long-standing controversy (see Abadinsky, 1977 for a review of the arguments and literature). The purpose of this brief review of police studies is not to debate the merits of a law enforcement approach but rather to identify those general police strategies adopted in this project

and examine the potential for impact they may have within a parole supervision model. Only a selected few, recent, large scale, studies are described.

It is first necessary to qualify the interpretation of findings from police studies. Police and parole systems work from different bases. The police focus upon the criminal "incident". That is, they examine law-breaking incidents in a large population. In contrast the parole agents work from the base of the "offender". They gather information on select individuals over time. Because of this essential difference, different measures of effectiveness are applied (crime clearance rates for police versus successful case adjustment for paroles). As a result direct comparison between studies of the two systems cannot be made. However, reviewing studies of police control strategies should provide clues as to their potential for impact within a parole system.

Police studies can be divided according to the two major activities that police perform -- patrolling and investigation. The High Control Project contains aspects of each. High control agents increased parolee contacts and thereby made themselves more visible. Police patrolling is also based upon visibility and is also supposed to operate as a deterrent to criminal activity. High control agents conducted an investigation to verify a parolee's suspected return to criminal activity. Police investigation shares a similar purpose, i.e. verifying and sanctioning the return to criminal activity.

Of the two police activities studied, intensified patrol studies have been least promising. For example, the Kansas City Preventive Parole Experiment (Kelling, Pate, Dieckman and Brown, 1974) which tested three levels of patrol ("reactive", where only calls for assistance were responded to; "routine", using the usual level of one car per beat; and "proactive", using several cars per beat) showed only small differences across the test conditions on offense rates reported in victimization surveys.

Three recent large studies provide clues regarding the impact of police investigation activities. RAND Corporation (Greenwood and Petersilia, 1975) found that variations in the way investigators organize themselves and their workload did not affect arrest and clearance rates. However, a study by Bloch and Bell in Cincinnati, Ohio (1976) and a study by Schwartz and Clarren in Rochester, New York (1977) showed that detectives and patrol officers working as teams and enabling immediate on-the-scene investigations to be done, had higher arrest and clearance rates than non-team approaches tested. Findings of a reduction in the overall crime rates were not demonstrated with the weak data available in either study.

The weak evidence from these police studies suggests that parole agents conducting immediate follow-up investigations of any suspected criminal activity by a parolee could possibly increase parolee arrests or parolee crime clearance rates; while control strategies based upon increased agent visibility would not be expected to reduce parolee crime levels.

Summary. The few variations in control-oriented parole supervision tested (i.e., reduced caseloads, team supervision) have also been treatment oriented or so diffused with service delivery activities as to make generalizations to this project inappropriate and conclusions on control activity impact impossible. And, a review of current routine control strategies and mechanisms (i.e., mandatory contacts and revocations) has shown that their impact on reducing parolee criminal activity levels may be negligible. It was necessary to look to police studies to identify control strategies similar to those used in this project. Here the research reviewed showed police team approaches to investigative activities that may be impacting police arrest and clearance rates. But we must be cautious in generalizing from these latter studies due to the different base (i.e., incidents as opposed to offenders) from which the police system functions.

The High Control Project examined here is at the same time duplicative and different from the crime control strategies tested thus far in the parole system. The increased monitoring contacts in reduced caseload sizes under the intensive supervision model is in a sense a replication of earlier intensive supervision studies, particularly the Work Unit Project which targeted violent offenders. On the other hand, the exercise of police-oriented surveillant and investigative activities in the high control models is a more crime discovery-oriented approach than that taken traditionally. Also important

is that the high control models attempted to separate more clearly the control activities performed from the service and treatment activities performed in parole supervision. An evaluation of the High Control Project should add considerably to the research on crime controlling approaches within parole supervision; for, as the above review has shown, there is both a lack of evidence supporting the traditional approaches and a lack of innovative approaches tested elsewhere in the parole system.

CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY

Project Objectives

The goals of the California High Control Project were to:

-identify parolees who presented the most serious threat to public safety

-increase the controls and sanctions for those parolees who had returned to criminal activity

-deter those parolees who had not returned to criminal activity but had a high probability of doing so.

The extent to which these goals were emphasized differed across the two models tested. Cases placed in the investigation model were selected because some type of current involvement in criminal activity was suspected. The purpose of the investigation was to "verify" or clear the parolee of such involvement and if verified arrest and prosecute (i.e., sanction) the offender. Therefore, for the investigation model, an increase in the controls and sanctions applied to these parolees was hypothesized by program planners. Deterrence, both specific deterrence (aimed at the individual parolee) and general deterrence, (aimed at other parolees in the unit or state) was a long term goal but not the immediate objective of the investigation model.

For the intensive supervision model, the purpose is primarily preventive. Cases placed under intensive supervision were selected because of an extensive "prior" criminal history. Furthermore, the cases were generally placed in the model early in the parole period, or as soon after release from prison as possible. Here the objective was to monitor closely the

parolee's activity and hopefully prevent or deter the case from returning to criminal activity while on parole. Therefore, for the intensive supervision model, program planners hypothesized a reduction in the frequency and severity of returns to criminal activity. Apprehending and returning parolees under the intensive supervision model who had returned to crime (i.e., increasing the controls and sanctions) was also possible (particularly if the deterrent value of the close watch did not work) but was secondary to the preventive goal.

Because of the different focuses of the two high control models, two different types of data and two different forms of data analysis were conducted. For the investigation model, the immediate outcomes of the investigation were measured by determining whether or not evidence was collected that resulted in either charging with, or clearing the parolee of the suspected criminal activity. The seriousness of the criminal court and administrative revocation dispositions for any charges connected to the investigation was also measured. And, finally, the contribution of the parole agent (as opposed to other sources such as the police) to the detection and processing of any new charges was measured. As investigative success was likely to differ according to it's purpose, and as some cases had more than one investigative purpose, outcomes were codified for each specific type of purpose the investigation served, as well as an overall outcome for the case investigated.

-40-

For the intensive supervision model, overall criminal activity was measured for a period up to twelve months following placement in the high control project. The frequency and severity of various criminal and parole condition charges and their dispositions were measured during the first twelve months following high control placement.

Thus, for the investigative model, outcome was measured by the extent to which new criminal activity was successfully verified and led to an increase in arrests and successful prosecutions. For the intensive supervision model, outcome was measured by the extent to which the frequency and severity of criminal activity during a twelve month program follow-up period was reduced.

Research Design and Comparison Base

A type of quasi-experimental design known as a "non-equivalent control group with post-test measurement only" was used to evaluate the effectiveness of the High Control Project. The outcomes of High Control Project cases (i.e., the experimental group) were compared to outcomes of a similar group of high risk cases in somewhat similar parole units who had not received high control supervision (i.e., the comparison group). The key variables identifying and defining the experimental group were ascertained and used to identify a comparison group with similar characteristics. Then, the performance of both groups was compared on equivalent post program outcome measures.

To identify a matching comparison group three successive procedures were used:

-41-

- parole units similar to each of the four
  demonstration sites on various demographic,
  background and outcome characteristics were
  identified and their interest in participating in
  the study solicited

- parole agents in each of the comparison sites were
  instructed on the High Control Project selection
  criteria (i.e., the five activity areas targeted)
  and requested to apply the criteria to their
  caseloads. Cases meeting the criteria were referred
  as High Control Project Comparison Cases (FIRST
  SCREENING)

- High Control Project supervisorial staff at each of
  the four demonstration sites were asked to review
  and judge the acceptability of each of the "first
  screening" High Control Project comparison cases
  (SECOND SCREENING)

As the pool from which experimental cases were drawn was

the parent parole unit or district of which the High Control

Project staff was a part, comparison cases had to be drawn from

parole units and districts outside the four demonstration sites.

To minimize the possibility of dissimilar experimental and

comparison groups, comparison sites which were similar to the

four experimental sites on various demographic characteristics of

the unit (e.g., size of staff, density of area serviced, etc.),

parole population characteristics (e.g., felon and non-felon

population mix, race, etc.), and parole performance variables

(e.g., twelve month case outcomes) were identified. From the

list of eight identified units, three were selected to function

as comparison units - the Redwood City Unit and two of the three

Parole Units in the Fresno District. The Fresno site was later

replaced with three of the four parole units in the Ventura

Parole District (including the San Luis Obispo Unit, the Ventura

Unit, and the Santa Barbara Unit).

Once identified, the supervising agents at each of the two

comparison sites were instructed in the definitions of the five

activity areas (i.e., selection criteria) utilized in the project

and asked to conduct an initial as well as an ongoing screening

of their caseloads for subjects which met such criteria. The

Redwood City comparison site commenced screening in June 1977 and

terminated screening in December 1978. The Ventura District

began screening in August 1978 and terminated screening in

December 1978.

To assure that the comparison site agents had referred

cases who would be selected by the High Control Units had they

been assigned to those units, the comparison cases underwent a

second screening by the supervisorial staff at each of the

experimental demonstration sites. (Actually only three of the

four experimental sites participated in this second screening;

Stockton was unable to participate in the review due to lack of

resources). The High Control Project staff who screened each of

the experimental cases prior to final project acceptance were

asked to review the 139 comparison cases, using the same criteria

they applied in their program to identify 1) overall

acceptability and 2) appropriateness for the intensive

supervision versus the investigation model. Cases found

acceptable by at least two of the three experimental site reviews

were included in the final comparison group.

Several problems were encountered during the comparison
group selection phase, some of which seriously weakened the study
design. One major problem was the low priority placed upon the
comparison case identification process by staff at the comparison
sites. Although caseload review was suppose to be ongoing for a
set period of time, the staff at one of the sites conducted a
single one-time review, and the staff at the other site
fluctuated, stopping referrals totally in some months. Second,
follow-up reports were not always forwarded to the research unit
and had to be requested sometimes too late (i.e., records were
transferred or destroyed). Third and finally, the comparison
sites failed to identify sufficient numbers of cases similar to
the investigative model experimental cases. That is, only a
small proportion of the cases were referred because of currently
suspected criminal involvement which needed verification and
sanctioning. As a result, the investigative model comparison
group was small in size. The extent to which these various
limitations caused problems in interpretation of the findings is
discussed in subsequent chapters.

To check the similarity of the experimental group to the
comparison group, a sample of cases in each group was compared on
several background characteristics known to be associated with
parole performance. That analysis is presented in the next
chapter.

Data Types and Sources (See Figure 2)

Three general types of data were collected for the
evaluation:

-Case Background Characteristics

-Project Operations and Activity Data

-Outcome Data

Background characteristics. The primary purpose of
characteristics data was to determine whether the High Control
Project identified parolees who presented the most serious risk
to public safety. Cases selected for high control through
October 1978 are compared to cases not selected and actively on
parole as of October 1978 at the experimental sites on ten
background characteristics known to be associated with successful
outcomes on parole. The variables include commitment offense,
prior commitment record, race, escape history, age, narcotic
history, prison time served, admission type, aggravated sentence
and grade placement. This information is routinely collected by
the California Department of Corrections at prison admission and
was available from the departmental computer files. Cases not
selected for the High Control Project, were expected to possess a
greater degree of those characteristics known to be associated
with successful outcomes on parole.

Operations and activity. The second type of data on the
project's operations and activities described the manner in which
the project staff performed it's tasks. The primary purpose of

this data was to test whether the high control project activities were different from those case activities performed under regular supervision. A second purpose was to describe the project in enough detail to enable project replication and comparisons to other similar program efforts. Supervision activities (as recorded in parole agent field notes) for experimental cases were compared to the recorded supervision activities for comparison cases. Case activity was defined by the frequency with which ten major types of supervision activity (See Appendix B) occurred. As differences in activity were expected across the two high control models and across the four demonstration sites, the activity data was also compared across units and models.

The data was collected for both experimental and comparison cases. The total time period under high control was surveyed for the experimental cases and a comparable period was surveyed for the comparison cases, using the full parole period for the intensive supervision type of comparison cases and an 120 day period for the investigative type comparison case. The failure of the comparison units to forward copies of agent field notes limited the activity data available on the comparison group, particularly the investigative model comparison cases.

Additional operational data was collected on the experimental cases regarding the selection process and movement in and out of the project. As with the above activity information, the purpose here was to describe the project in sufficient detail to allow replication or comparison to similar

-46-

supervision programs elsewhere. The source of this information was the Case Conferences which recorded all major case decisions. In addition project operational data was collected from two forms developed especially for this project -- The Selection and Referral Form, a checklist screening document used to place the case in the project, and the Investigative (or Emergency) Report, a narrative describing the findings of individual case investigations.

Outcome. The third general type of data on "outcomes" varied across the two models. For the investigative model, three different sets of indicators were used. First the immediate outcome of the investigation was measured. As the purpose of most of the investigations was to verify some kind of suspected criminal activity, a successful outcome was defined as the "arrest, charging and conviction for that suspected criminal activity" (or the exoneration of the parolee from any suspected guilt). The second piece of outcome data measured the contribution made by the agent to the detection and processing of the new charges. Included in this set of data was a variety of measures such as the "means" leading to the investigation's most serious disposition, the extent of prosecution assistance provided, and the amount of contraband confiscated. The third piece of data gathered measured the type and seriousness of the criminal and/or parole revocation charges and dispositions made in connection with the investigation. If the High Control Project is suppose to increase the controls and sanctions for parolees reinvolved in criminal activity, the number and

-47-

seriousness of such charges and dispositions resulting from the
investigations were expected to be higher than those which occur
under regular supervision.

The above three pieces of investigative outcome data were
collected for both experimental and comparison cases. The time
period surveyed for the investigative cases was the time under
investigation. Outcome constituted that known at the termination
of the investigation; and the charges and dispositions measured
were only those connected to the investigation activities. The
sources of the charge and dispositional data were parole
violation reports documenting all parole condition charges and
criminal arrests, and the Board of Prison Terms' Hearing Reports
showing the revocation hearing dispositions of those charges.
Investigation outcome information was also gathered from special
"Investigation" (also called "Emergency") Reports written by the
high control agents at the close of the investigation. (These
reports, written in narrative style, were primarily for the use
of the regular supervising agent who at the termination of the
investigation had the responsibility of preparing a parole
violation report to the parole board).

For the intensive supervision model, outcome was measured
by the frequency and severity of total criminal activity
committed over a set follow-up period. Several measures were
applied including the parole status of cases as of the end of the
follow-up period, the frequency and severity of the total
criminal and the total revocation charges and dispositions, the

Figure 2
Data Types and Sources

| | DATA TYPE | SOURCE | CASES ANALYZED | TIME PERIOD SURVEYED |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| I. | Selected Criminal and Demographic Background Characteristics | 1. CDC Computer Files | Selected and Not Selected cases at Experimental and Comparison Sites | Cases on Parole at Experimental and Comparison Sites as of October, 1978 |
| II. | Project Operations and Activity<br>A. Case Movements<br>B. Selection Process<br>C. Types of Activity Performed | 1. Selection & Referral Form<br>2. Cases Conferences<br>3. Investigation Reports<br>4. Agent Field Notes | Experimental Cases only | Time Period each case was under High Control (and comparable period for comparison cases) |
| III. | Outcomes<br>A. Investigation<br>   1. Outcome by Specific Purpose<br>   2. Criminal and Revocation Charges and Dispositions filed in connection with investigation<br>   3. Agent Contribution to Detection and Charge Processing | 1. Investigation Reports<br>2. Violation Reports<br>3. BPT Hearing Reports<br>4. Case Conferences | Experimental and Comparison Groups (Investigation Type only) | Outcome at case's termination from project |
| | B. Intensive Supervision<br>   1. Parole Status at End of Follow-up Period<br>   2. Criminal and Revocation Charges and Dispositions<br>   3. Most Serious Disposition Received<br>   4. Custody-Free Days<br>   5. Agent Contribution to Detection and Processing | 1. Violation Reports<br>2. BPT Hearing Reports<br>3. Case Conferences | Experimental and Comparison Groups (I.S. types only) | Criminal Activity for case within 6 and 12 months following placement in project |

-49-

most serious disposition received, and the custody-free days spent in the community. Intensive supervision was expected to operate as a specific deterrent to returning to criminal activity and a reduction in the frequency and severity of returns to crime was expected. A six and a twelve month follow-up analysis commencing from the day of placement in intensive supervision was conducted. As cases with good adjustment were transfered back to regular supervision, the period surveyed sometimes included parole time not under intensive supervision. The sources of charge and dispositional data were the same as that utilized for the investigative model including violation reports and parole board hearing reports.

## Measuring General Deterrence

A hardline approach to parole supervision such as the High Control Project presumably has some deterrent value. It has already been stated that the primary objective of the intensive supervision model is "specific" deterrence, that is, to reduce the likelihood that the individual high control case will return to crime. While not it's immediate objective (and not measured here) some specific deterrence may be associated with the investigative model too. (To have measured specific deterrence for investigation cases, criminal activity for a set period in the community after the apprehension, disposition, sentencing and release resulting from the investigation would have to be determined). It was also proposed that the two high control models might have some "general" deterrent value. That is, the

high control project would presumably deter other parolees (non-high control cases) from committing new crimes. If there is such an effect, general deterrence would be expected to be greatest for the other non-high control parolees in the high control parent units and somewhat less for parolees in the non-participating parole units across the state.

It can be considered that general deterrence, or the reduction in crime committed by parolees in California, is the bottom-line goal of the High Control Project. It is also a goal which is most difficult to measure. There are so many factors which may effect crime rates of parolees (e.g., employment) and which vary geographically that it would be difficult to conclude that the supervision change represented by the High Control Project was the causal factor for any change in the overall crime rates of parolees in California for this period.

The minimum design necessary to measure the impact of the High Control Project on parolee crime rates would necessitate determining parolee crime rates in the parent high control units before and after the project and comparing these rates to similar before and after measures in comparable parole units. Such an analysis, however, was not possible here. Parolee crime rate data by parole unit was not available and missing data would likely prevent it from being collected retrospectively (i.e., for the "before" period). Even if the design had been possible, the findings would be inconclusive as any discovered change in crime rates could still be due to a number of other changes in the

system (e.g., court conviction rates), differences in units compared (e.g., employment rate for community) and differences in clients (e.g., high narcotic user population serviced). Because of these problems this evaluation design does not measure the project's general deterrence value, but recognizes that it's conclusions are limited by that omission.

Design Limitations and Evaluation Problems

The High Control Project evaluation suffered from three different types of limitations:

-limitations generally associated with a quasi-experimental design

-technical limitations associated with data collection

-programmatic limitations confounding the design

Design limitations. As stated earlier, this study used a quasi-experimental design or more specifically a "non-equivalent control group post-test design". Conclusions are limited in such designs by threats to internal validity (i.e., the extent to which the project can be said to have effected the discovered outcome), and to external validity (i.e., the extent to which generalizations of the results of this project can be made to other parole settings).

The major threat to internal validity lies in pre-selection case factor differences. Although efforts were made to recruit a comparison group which was similar to the experimental group in terms of their criminal background and their risk of

returning to crime, differences between the groups were likely particularly in light of the subjective basis upon which case selection was made and the small size of the investigative model comparison group. As a test of selection factor differences comparisons between the experimental and comparison groups on various background characteristics associated with successful outcomes on parole are made in the next chapter. Despite the study's efforts at matching and the subsequent tests of the quality of this effort, it is recognized that such procedures generally "undermatch" and do not adequately control the likely selection differences between the experimental and comparison group.

Other possible threats to internal validity include historical changes occurring during the progress of the study. One such major change in the correctional system during the implementation of the High Control Project was the enactment of the Determinate Sentencing System in July, 1977. One of the observed outcomes of this piece of legislation has been an increase in the rate of commitment to California prisons. It is possible that some portion of the change in dispositions associated with this project may be due to changes in the sentencing system. Another change was the lengthening of the parole period (from twelve to thirty-six months) and the parole

revocation time (from a possible maximum of six to twelve months) with the passage of Senate Bill 1057 (effective January 1, 1979). Hopefully these system changes effected the experimental and the comparison group equally.

A third possible threat to internal validity is sometimes called "experimental mortality", or the differential loss of study cases from the experimental as compared to the comparison group. To avoid the hardline supervision delivered under the High Control Project, parolees could request a transfer to another parole unit or district not involved with the experiment. This avenue for opting out of the project would reduce the size of the experimental group and introduce a self-selection bias which was not likely to occur for the comparison group. The extent to which this occurred is unknown as the reasons for case transfers were not always recorded.

Threats to external validity include those design elements which limited generalization of the study results to other parole units, parolees, or projects. The somewhat atypical nature of the four demonstration sites limited the generalizations possible from this project. For example, The Stockton and Bakersfield Units represented isolated valley area parole units with proportionately larger parolee populations involved in narcotic trafficking and/or prison gang activities. In contrast, the Walnut Creek Units and the Riverside/San Bernardino Units serviced larger suburban areas closely located to large

metropolitan areas. Furthermore, a parole unit servicing a large metropolitan area was not included among the four demonstration sites, and it would be difficult to generalize the results of this study to parole units servicing the inner cities.

Finally, each demonstration site varied, emphasizing the performance of some activities to the exclusion of others, and making a description of the overall project complex. Due to the numerous idiosyncrasies of each site it was difficult to identify those project components which may have caused the differences in outcome discovered across units, although an analysis of unit-by-unit project activity is conducted later in the report in hopes of generally identifying those project elements.

Technical limitations. The major technical problem experienced was caused by agent overreporting for the experimental group. Due to a stronger commitment on the part of agents in the experimental units, case follow-up data was received by the evaluation office in a timely manner and in great detail. This was particularly true for the activity logs (a.k.a, parole agent field notes) where care was taken in recording time spent and individuals involved in various types of activity. This was not true for the comparison units where activity information was either not received or received in abbreviated form. It was not possible to estimate the extent to which certain activities were performed but not reported by the comparison unit.

Programmatic limitations. The project was limited by having multiple, confounding program objectives. The project proposed to both increase and to reduce returns to custody. The investigation model primarily sought to increase sanctions for parolees who at the point of referral to high control were already suspected of returning to criminal activity. In contrast, the intensive supervision model primarily sought to reduce that likelihood by closely watching high risk parolees who at the point of referral were not involved in criminal activity. While, generally speaking, this separation of goals by high control model held true, there were exceptions. For example it was learned that some cases were placed under intensive supervision to permit early detection of current suspected criminal activity, which would place the goal of the investigation model (i.e., increasing sanctions for returning to criminal activity) upon the intensive supervision model.

The problem of confounding objectives was particularly acute at the Walnut Creek demonstration site. Originally the unit chose to operate both high control models, utilizing investigation for those cases currently suspected of criminal involvement and intensive supervision for those not currently involved in criminal activity. Midway during the study period the Walnut Creek Unit dropped the investigation model and utilized an intensive supervision model exclusively. Project staff at Walnut Creek felt the intensive supervision model allowed the high control agent to maintain updated case

information, while the investigation model was too dependent upon the regular agent for such information. As a result, cases previously placed under investigation were being placed under intensive supervision even when it's purpose was a quick apprehension and return to prison. The confounding of the two models and their separate goals is known to have only occurred at the Walnut Creek site, although it possibly occurred at the Riverside/San Bernardino site too. The extent to which this limitation and the other design limitations described above affected the results will be returned to at various points in the analysis of project outcomes.

Organization of Analysis

Due to the different goals attached to each of the two high control models, the analysis is separated according to the type of model. The outcome analysis for each model is preceeded by a description of the types of activities occurring under each model. Chapter VI describes the activities conducted under the investigation model followed by an analysis of the outcome of the investigation model in Chapter VII. Chapter VIII describes the activities of the intensive supervision model followed by an analysis of six and twelve month follow-up data for the cases placed under intensive supervision in Chapter IX. Subanalysis of the outcomes across the four demonstration sites and across the types of cases targeted is also presented within the outcome chapters for each model.

The next chapter, Chapter V, describes the extent to which
a higher risk group of parolees were selected for the project;
and it presents the tests of the comparability of the
experimental cases across the demonstration sites and across the
two models tested, and to the comparison group.

# CHAPTER V

## SELECTION OF CASES AND BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS

The High Control Project was designed to target the "more
serious" releases to parole. Seriousness appeared to be defined
by a number of elements (see introductory chapter) including
violent crime history and high recidivism probability. Prior
criminal history and sometimes current case factors were reviewed
by parole agents and supervisors involved in the project to reach
a final selection judgement. No standardized selection scales
were applied. To focus the selection effort however, five
"activity areas" in which the parolees had previously taken part
in, or were currently suspected of participating in, were
targeted. They included:

     -prison gang affiliated activities
     -large scale narcotic sales activity
     -violent/aggressive or sexually deviant activity
     -large scale property thefts
     -absconding from parole supervision

Application of the above selection criteria would hopefully
identify those parolees at each of the demonstration sites who
presented the most serious risk to public safety.

The purpose of this chapter is to test the project's
ability to identify parolees who presented the most serious
threat to public safety by comparing the cases selected to the
cases not selected on a number of background characteristics
known to be associated with differing probabilities of success on
parole. In addition the analysis should help to further define

the selected population (beyond the five targeted activity areas)
by presenting a "profile" of the cases selected based on the ten
characteristics examined. Variations in the background of cases
selected across the four parole unit demonstration sites are also
examined. Finally, the background characteristics will be
analyzed as a methodological check of the equivalency of the
selected experimental and the selected comparison groups.

Study Sample For Characteristics Analysis

For this analysis, only cases selected for the High
Control Project through October 31, 1978 are compared to cases
not selected and actively on parole at each of the experimental
units as of October 31, 1978. A total of 1,027 selected and not
selected felon parolees were identified - 330 from Walnut Creek,
215 from Stockton, 168 from Bakersfield and, 314 from
Riverside/San Bernardino (Table 1). Excluded from this study
sample were felons released to hold status and felons paroled out
of state who were ineligible for the project. Also excluded were
non-felon parolees (i.e., cases whose commitment offense was
related to narcotic addiction and who were civilly committed to
the Civil Addict Program within the Department of Corrections) as
data on their characteristics was not available. However, as
only a very small proportion of the non-felon parole population
was expected to fall within the project selection criteria, their
omission should not severely affect the following analysis which
compares felons selected with felons not selected at the
experimental units.

Data collected at prison admission on ten background
characteristics -- commitment offense, time served, admission
type, aggravated sentence, narcotic history, prior commitment
record, escape record, ethnic group, grade placement, and age --
was available from the computerized information systems
maintained by the Department of Corrections. The statistical
significance of the difference in the mix of each characteristic
across the selection groups (Selected vs. Not selected), the
parole units (Walnut Creek vs. Stockton vs. Bakersfield vs.
Riverside/San Bernardino) and the study groups (Experimental vs.
Comparison) was determined using the non-parametric chi square
test at the .05 probability level.

Initially, project staff proposed that regular parole
agents refer all cases meeting the selection criteria to the High
Control Project staff who would in turn conduct a review and
either accept or reject the case. A number of "rejected" cases
(i.e., cases which did not meet the selection criteria or which
were low priority) was therefore expected. In practice, however,
very few rejections occurred. A total of ten cases were referred
and formally rejected by High Control staff through October 31,
1978 (Table 1). This low number of rejections was likely due to
a combination of two factors. One factor is the more "informal"
manner in which selections occurred. Essentially decisions to
accept the case were being made before a "Selection and Referral
Form" was formally completed by the regular agent. It is likely
that more than ten cases were rejected as not meeting the
selection criteria but such rejections were not recorded in the

formal referral process designed for the project. Second, the number of high risk parolees referred for the project was actually smaller than expected. Instead of relying upon the referral process, project staff and unit supervisorial staff resorted to screening existing caseloads for possible project cases. Consequently, it is impossible to accurately identify the number of rejections that took place, or conversely to estimate the amount of "agreement" which occurred between regular parole agents and high control agents on the kinds of cases which should be placed in the High Control Project.

The ten rejected cases which were recorded were included with another 774 felon cases actively on parole in the experimental units as of October 31, 1978 and not referred for a total "Not selected" felon study group of 784 cases. The "Selected" group which comprised all felon cases referred and accepted for High Control through October 31, 1978 (including 18 cases later deleted due to change of release plans) totaled 243 cases. The largest proportion of this selected group was derived from the Walnut Creek site (N=111) which had the longest period of project experience (Start date: 2-15-77). Relatively fewer "Selected" cases were derived from the Bakersfield Unit (N=25) and the Riverside/San Bernardino Units (N=46) both of whom had experienced relatively short intake periods at the time this study sample was drawn (Table 1).

Table 1

Selection Actions for Felon Parole Population
At Each Experimental and Comparison Unit Through October 31, 1978

(STUDY SAMPLE FOR CHARACTERISTICS ANALYSIS)

| Case selection actions | Total | Experimental units | | | | | Comparison units | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Sub Total | Walnut Creek (2-15-77) | Stock-ton (1-1-78) | Bakers-field (7-1-78) | Riverside/ San Bernardino (6-1-78) | Sub total | Redwood City (6-1-77) | Ventura (8-1-78) |
| Total felons | 1,491 | 1,027 | 330 | 215 | 168 | 314 | 464 | 215 | 249 |
| Selected........ [a] | 361 | 243 | 111 | 61 | 25 | 46 | 118 | 58 | 60 |
| Not deleted | (335) | (225) | (99) | (61) | (25) | (40) | (110) | (52) | (58) |
| Deleted [b] | (26) | (18) | (12) | (0) | (0) | (6) | (8) | (6) | (2) |
| Not selected.... [c] | 1,130 | 784 | 219 | 154 | 143 | 268 | 346 | 157 | 189 |
| Not referred | (1,120) | (774) | (213) | (151) | (143) | (267) | (346) | (157) | (189) |
| Referred & Rejected [d] | (10) | (10) | (6) | (3) | (0) | (1) | – | – | – |

[a] All cases selected for project from project start date to October 31, 1978.

[b] Selected for project but subsequently removed from sample due to change of release plans.

[c] All cases actively on parole as of October 31, 1978 and never selected for project.

[d] Rejected as not meeting selection criteria or as a low priority case.

## Identifying High Risk Parolees: Selected versus Not Selected

Cases selected in the four experimental sites were systematically compared to the cases not selected at these sites on ten background characteristics (Table 2). The direction of the differences found were examined for evidence of a "more serious" selected group. A brief profile of the selected group is given first followed by an analysis of the selected versus not selected group differences.

Profile of selected cases. Almost one-half (46.8%) of the selected group had been committed to prison for a person type of offense (including homicide, robbery, assault, rape and other sex offenses) and served a median of 31 months in prison before release to parole, which for the majority of cases (68.3%) was the first release on this commitment. One fifth (20.7%) of the cases had received prison sentences which were "aggravated" types involving similar prior convictions, use of a weapon, or other concurrent or consecutive sentences. Most of the selected cases had a history of either narcotic use (53.9%) or non-narcotic drug use (25.5%); over one-third (37.4%) had a prior prison record, and one-quarter (25.5) had a prior escape record. Demographically, the selected group was typically non-white (54.7%), 31 years old, and possessed an eighth grade level education (Table 2).

Selected versus not selected. There was a statistically significant difference between the selected and not selected group on five of the ten characteristic examined. Two other

characteristics showed smaller differences which almost reached statistical significance. Altogether, the kinds of differences found showed the selected group had more serious types of commitment offenses and more extensive criminal histories than the group not selected. It is concluded that the High Control Project staff was successful in selecting the more serious releases to parole for the project.

There was no large and statistically significant difference between the selected and not selected groups on the three characteristics of ethnic group, grade placement, and escape history. The large differences in the remaining seven variables were statistically significant, or almost statistically significant, and also highly interrelated. The commitment offenses for the selected group comprised more narcotic/drug types (21.4% Selected vs. 14.4% Not Selected) and less property type offenses (26.7% Selected vs. 37.3% Not Selected) than the not selected population. Consequently a slightly larger proportion of the sentences for the selected group were aggravated types (20.7% Selected vs. 14.6% Not Selected) for which the selected group served a much longer period of time in prison (31.4 median months, Selected vs. 24.7 median months, Not Selected). The selected group also included a larger proportion of cases who had a prior prison commitment record (37.4% Selected vs. 33.4% Not selected). Consequently, a larger proportion of the selected group were re-released to parole (as opposed to a first release) after a board or a court-ordered return (31.7%

Selected vs. 19.5% Not Selected) and a slightly larger proportion
had a narcotic history (53.9% Selected vs. 47.3% Not Selected).
With the more extensive prison record for the selected group, it
was not surprising to find that the selected group was
significantly older (31.2 median years) than the group not
selected (29.4 median years).

The longer, aggravated, commitment sentences indicate the
cases selected represented the more serious commitment offense
types although not all such cases were being selected for High
Control Supervision. The larger proportion of cases who had
previously failed parole, had a prior prison commitment, and had
a history of narcotic use together indicate the cases selected
had more extensive criminal histories. Therefore, it is
concluded that the project was successful in selecting more
serious parolees from the parent parole unit population, at least
as defined by the ten criminal and demographic variables examined
here. This analysis has also identified "severity of commitment
offense" and "extensiveness of criminal record" as two dimensions
implicitly weighed by project staff during the selection process.

Ethnic group representativeness. The preceeding analysis
showed no statistically significant difference between cases
selected and cases not selected on their ethnic group
distribution. However, as some concern was expressed during the
project's developmental phase that it may disproportionately
target more non-white than white parolees, a supplemental
analysis by parole unit on the variable of race was conducted.

Table 2

Selected Background Characteristics of the Total Felon
Population Selected and Not Selected at the Experimental Units

| Selected background characteristic | Selection action | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | | Selected | | Not Selected | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| Commitment offense | 1,027 | 100.0 | 243 | 100.0 | 784 | 100.0 |
| Homicide, manslaughter.... | 101 | 9.8 | 19 | 7.8 | 82 | 10.5 |
| Robbery................... | 220 | 21.4 | 56 | 23.0 | 164 | 20.9 |
| Assault.................. | 75 | 7.3 | 21 | 8.6 | 54 | 6.9 |
| Burglary.................. | 221 | 21.5 | 44 | 18.1 | 177 | 22.6 |
| Other property............ | 136 | 13.2 | 21 | 8.6 | 115 | 14.7 |
| Rape, other sex........... | 59 | 5.7 | 18 | 7.4 | 41 | 5.2 |
| Narcotics, drugs ......... | 165 | 16.1 | 52 | 21.4 | 113 | 14.4 |
| Other.................... | 50 | 4.9 | 12 | 4.9 | 38 | 4.8 |
| Months served in prison | 1,027 | 100.0 | 243 | 100.0 | 784 | 100.0 |
| 17 or less............... | 193 | 18.8 | 41 | 16.9 | 152 | 19.4 |
| 18-29.................... | 403 | 39.2 | 70 | 28.8 | 333 | 42.4 |
| 30-41.................... | 217 | 21.1 | 58 | 23.9 | 159 | 20.3 |
| 42-53.................... | 98 | 9.5 | 34 | 14.0 | 64 | 8.2 |
| 54-65.................... | 34 | 3.3 | 7 | 2.9 | 27 | 3.4 |
| 66-77.................... | 25 | 2.4 | 12 | 4.9 | 13 | 1.7 |
| 78 or more............... | 57 | 5.5 | 21 | 8.6 | 36 | 4.6 |
| Median months........... | | | (31.4) | | (24.7) | |
| Admission type | 1,027 | 100.0 | 243 | 100.0 | 784 | 100.0 |
| New admission............. | 797 | 77.6 | 166 | 68.3 | 631 | 80.5 |
| Returned by court......... | 155 | 15.1 | 50 | 20.6 | 105 | 13.4 |
| Returned by board......... | 75 | 7.3 | 27 | 11.1 | 48 | 6.1 |

Table 2- continued

| Selected background characteristic | Total | | Selection action Selected | | Not Selected | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| Aggravated sentence | 1,027 | – | 243 | – | 784 | – |
| Unknown.................... | 221 | – | 74 | – | 147 | – |
| Total less unknown......... | 806 | 100.0 | 169 | 100.0 | 637 | 100.0 |
| Not aggravated.......... | 678 | 84.1 | 134 | 79.3 | 544 | 85.4 |
| Aggravated............. | 128 | 15.9 | 35 | 20.7 | 93 | 14.6 |
| Narcotic history | 1,027 | 100.0 | 243 | 100.0 | 784 | 100.0 |
| No use.............. | 262 | 25.5 | 50 | 20.6 | 212 | 27.0 |
| Narcotic use............ | 502 | 48.9 | 131 | 53.9 | 371 | 47.3 |
| Drugs/marijuana use...... | 263 | 25.6 | 62 | 25.5 | 201 | 25.6 |
| Prior commitment record | 1,027 | 100.0 | 243 | 100.0 | 784 | 100.0 |
| No prior commitment..... | 113 | 11.0 | 16 | 6.6 | 97 | 12.4 |
| Prior jail/juvenile only. | 561 | 54.6 | 136 | 56.0 | 425 | 54.2 |
| Prior prison commitment.. | 353 | 34.4 | 91 | 37.4 | 262 | 33.4 |
| Escape record | 1,027 | 100.0 | 243 | 100.0 | 784 | 100.0 |
| No record of escape...... | 800 | 77.9 | 181 | 74.5 | 619 | 78.9 |
| Prior record of escape... | 227 | 22.1 | 62 | 25.5 | 165 | 21.0 |
| Ethnic group | 1,027 | 100.0 | 243 | 100.0 | 784 | 100.0 |
| White................ | 491 | 47.8 | 110 | 45.3 | 381 | 48.6 |
| Mexican-American........ | 208 | 20.2 | 61 | 25.1 | 147 | 18.8 |
| Black................ | 314 | 30.6 | 69 | 28.4 | 245 | 31.2 |
| Other................ | 14 | 1.4 | 3 | 1.2 | 11 | 1.4 |

Table 2- continued

| Selected background characteristic | Total | | Selection action Selected | | Not Selected | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| Grade placement | 1,027 | – | 243 | – | 784 | – |
| Unknown................. | 43 | – | 11 | – | 32 | – |
| Total less unknown....... | 984 | 100.0 | 232 | 100.0 | 752 | 100.0 |
| Illiterate.............. | 29 | 2.9 | 8 | 3.4 | 21 | 2.8 |
| Grades 3-6............. | 255 | 25.9 | 59 | 25.4 | 196 | 26.1 |
| Grades 7-8............. | 288 | 29.3 | 62 | 26.7 | 226 | 30.0 |
| Grades 9-11............ | 353 | 35.9 | 91 | 39.2 | 262 | 34.8 |
| Grades 12 and over..... | 59 | 6.0 | 12 | 5.2 | 47 | 6.2 |
| Median grade......... | | | | (8.1) | | (7.9) |
| Age in years as of December 31, 1978 | 1,027 | 100.0 | 243 | 100.0 | 784 | 100.0 |
| Under 29................. | 464 | 45.2 | 90 | 37.0 | 374 | 47.7 |
| 30-39................... | 373 | 36.3 | 111 | 45.7 | 262 | 33.4 |
| 40-49................... | 133 | 12.9 | 34 | 14.0 | 99 | 12.6 |
| 50 and over............. | 57 | 5.5 | 8 | 3.3 | 49 | 6.2 |
| Median age........... | | | | (31.2) | | (29.4) |

| Background Characteristic | $X^2$ | df | p |
|---|---|---|---|
| Commitment offense | 16.465* | 7 | $p < .050$ |
| Months served in prison | 24.703*** | 6 | $p < .001$ |
| Admission type | 16.211*** | 2 | $p < .001$ |
| Aggravated sentence | 3.731 | 1 | $p \cong .060$ |
| Narcotic history | 4.686 | 2 | $p \cong .100$ |
| Prior commitment record | 6.627* | 2 | $p < .050$ |
| Escape record | 2.150 | 1 | $p \cong .150$ |
| Ethnic group | 4.663 | 3 | $p \cong .200$ |
| Grade placement | 2.248 | 4 | $p > .500$ |
| Age in years as of 12-31-78 | 15.541** | 3 | $p < .010$ |

Table 3 compares the ethnic distribution of the felon cases selected to that of the total active felon population for each experimental unit individually.

Only the Stockton unit showed a ethnic group mix of selected cases disproportionate (by greater than ten percent) to it's total felon population ethnic mix. The other units (Walnut Creek and Riverside/San Bernardino) showed smaller differences of only five to ten percent; and there were too few selected cases (N=25) to permit a conclusion regarding the Bakersfield Unit. The ethnic group difference at the Stockton Unit is due to the overrepresentation of Mexican-Americans in the selected group (26.2% among total felon population vs. 37.7% among selected population). As a latter analysis will support, this difference is likely related to the high priority that particular unit placed on selecting cases under the "prison gang affiliation" selection criterion. Of the four experimental units, only the Stockton unit chose to investigate the prison gang activities of parolees. In that geographic area the gangs were largely Mexican-American. Other than the difference found at the Stockton unit, there is no strong evidence to support the conclusion that the experimental units disproportionately selected more non-whites than whites for this project.

Uniformity of Case Selection:  Comparisons Across Units

The five targeted activity areas were guidelines to aid in the selection of similar high risk cases across units. While

# CONTINUED

## 1 OF 4

Table 3

Ethnic Group Distribution for Total Active Felons Compared to
Felons Selected for High Control at Each Demonstration Site

| Ethnic group | Walnut Creek | | Stockton | | Bakersfield | | Riverside/ San Bernardino | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total felons[a] (N=228) | Felons selected[b] (N=111) | Total felons[a] (N=160) | Felons selected[b] (N=61) | Total felons[a] (N=148) | Felons selected[b] (N=25) | Total felons[a] (N=341) | Felons selected[b] (N=46) |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| White............ | 48.2 | 51.4 | 48.7 | 41.0 | 52.7 | 40.0 | 46.0 | 39.1 |
| Mexican-American.. | 5.2 | 9.9 | 26.2 | 37.7 | 25.0 | 40.0 | 32.5 | 37.0 |
| Black............ | 46.1 | 36.9 | 23.7 | 21.3 | 20.9 | 16.0 | 20.8 | 23.9 |
| Other............ | 0.4 | 1.8 | 1.3 | 0 | 1.3 | 4.0 | 0.6 | 0 |

[a] Felons actively on parole in unit as of December 31, 1978; taken from Management Information Statistic "Parole Balance Sheet", Table 20, "Active Paroles By Ethnic Group and Type within Unit and Region".
[b] Male felons selected for High Control through 10-31-78; see Table | in this report.

uniformity was hoped for, differences in the kinds of cases selected for the High Control Project across the four experimental units were likely without objective selection criteria and a systematized selection process. Cases selected at each of the four experimental units were distributed across the same set of ten background characteristics analyzed above; and statistically significant differences in the mix of these characteristics were identified. The analysis showed the units selected different commitment offense type cases (person vs. narcotics) which largely corresponded to the type of high control model (intensive supervision vs. investigation) each unit operated.

There were large, statistically significant differences on four of the ten characteristics examined including commitment offense type, prison time served, aggravated sentence and ethnic group (Table 4). There were only small statistically insignificant differences on the remaining six background characteristics. Three of the four characteristics with large differences were interrelated. Together they showed that the Walnut Creek Unit selected cases more likely committed to prison on "person" type offenses (53.2%) for which they served longer (35.5 months) and more aggravated (31.9%) prison sentences than the cases selected in the other units. The Riverside/San Bernardino Units, like Walnut Creek, also selected more cases committed on person type offenses (63.0%) than the other two units. The concentration on serious person offenders for

Walnut Creek and Riverside/San Bernardino is in strong contrast to the larger proportion of "narcotic/drug" offenders who served short, non-aggravated, prison sentences in both the Stockton and Bakersfield Units.

The units selecting similar prison offense types also operated the same type of high control model; i.e., Bakersfield and Stockton both operated an investigation model while Walnut Creek and Riverside/San Bernardino operated an intensive supervision model. What differences in outcome exist across the demonstration sites are likely due to the targeting of different offense types by each of the models (violent/assaultive offenders for the intensive supervision model and large scale narcotic offenders for the investigation model). In fact, a later analysis of outcome differences for cases selected under each of the five selection criterion within each unit supported this relationship. It is further justification for the separate analysis of outcome for each model conducted in this evaluation.

The fourth characteristic with a large difference, ethnic group, showed Walnut Creek selected significantly more Blacks (36.9%) and fewer Mexican-Americans (9.9%) than either of the other units. However, as Table 4 and the previous analysis illustrates this difference is due to the different ethnic mix of parolees released to the geographic areas serviced by the units, rather than to any differential race-related selection process.

Based upon these obvious model differences, an inspection was made of the distribution of characteristics between the pairs of units operating each model type (Stockton vs. Bakersfield for

## Table 4

### Selected Background Characteristics of the Selected Population At Each Experimental Parole Unit

| Selected background characteristics | Total selected No. | Total selected Pct. | Walnut Creek No. | Walnut Creek Pct. | Stockton No. | Stockton Pct. | Bakersfield No. | Bakersfield Pct. | Riverside/San Bernardino No. | Riverside/San Bernardino Pct. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Commitment offense** | 243 | 100.0 | 111 | 100.0 | 61 | 100.0 | 25 | 100.0 | 46 | 100.0 |
| Person | 114 | 46.9 | 59 | 53.2 | 19 | 31.1 | 7 | 28.0 | 29 | 63.0 |
| Property | 65 | 26.7 | 31 | 27.9 | 20 | 32.8 | 8 | 32.0 | 6 | 13.0 |
| Narcotics | 52 | 21.4 | 15 | 13.5 | 19 | 31.1 | 9 | 36.0 | 9 | 19.6 |
| Other a/ | 12 | 4.9 | 6 | 5.4 | 3 | 4.9 | 1 | 4.0 | 2 | 4.3 |
| **Months served in prison** | 243 | 100.0 | 111 | 100.0 | 61 | 100.0 | 25 | 100.0 | 46 | 100.0 |
| 17 or less | 41 | 16.9 | 18 | 16.2 | 11 | 18.0 | 8 | 32.0 | 4 | 8.7 |
| 18-29 | 70 | 28.8 | 24 | 21.6 | 17 | 27.9 | 9 | 36.0 | 20 | 43.5 |
| 30-41 | 58 | 23.9 | 26 | 23.4 | 17 | 27.9 | 3 | 12.0 | 12 | 26.1 |
| 42-53 | 34 | 14.0 | 17 | 15.3 | 10 | 16.4 | 1 | 4.0 | 6 | 13.0 |
| 54 and over | 40 | 16.5 | 26 | 23.4 | 6 | 9.8 | 4 | 16.0 | 4 | 8.7 |
| Median months | | (31.4) | | (35.5) | | (31.2) | | (23.5) | | (30.7) |
| **Admission type** | 243 | 100.0 | 111 | 100.0 | 61 | 100.0 | 25 | 100.0 | 46 | 100.0 |
| New admission | 166 | 68.3 | 71 | 64.0 | 39 | 63.9 | 20 | 80.0 | 36 | 78.3 |
| Returned by court | 50 | 20.6 | 24 | 21.6 | 13 | 21.3 | 3 | 12.0 | 10 | 21.7 |
| Returned by board | 27 | 11.1 | 16 | 14.4 | 9 | 14.8 | 2 | 8.0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Aggravated sentence** | 243 | – | 111 | – | 61 | – | 25 | – | 46 | – |
| Unknown | 74 | – | 39 | – | 22 | – | 5 | – | 8 | – |
| Total less unknown | 169 | 100.0 | 72 | 100.0 | 39 | 100.0 | 20 | 100.0 | 38 | 100.0 |
| Not aggravated | 134 | 79.3 | 49 | 68.1 | 33 | 84.6 | 17 | 85.0 | 35 | 92.1 |
| Aggravated | 35 | 20.7 | 23 | 31.9 | 6 | 15.4 | 3 | 15.0 | 3 | 7.9 |
| **Narcotic history** | 243 | 100.0 | 111 | 100.0 | 61 | 100.0 | 25 | 100.0 | 46 | 100.0 |
| No use | 50 | 20.6 | 28 | 25.2 | 12 | 19.7 | 3 | 12.0 | 7 | 15.2 |
| Narcotic use | 131 | 53.9 | 53 | 47.7 | 35 | 57.4 | 18 | 72.0 | 25 | 54.3 |
| Drug/marijuana use | 62 | 25.5 | 30 | 27.0 | 14 | 22.9 | 4 | 16.0 | 14 | 30.4 |
| **Prior commitment record** | 243 | 100.0 | 111 | 100.0 | 61 | 100.0 | 25 | 100.0 | 46 | 100.0 |
| No prior commitment | 16 | 6.6 | 9 | 8.1 | 4 | 6.5 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6.5 |
| Prior jail/juvenile only | 136 | 56.0 | 61 | 55.0 | 30 | 49.2 | 18 | 72.0 | 27 | 58.7 |
| Prior prison commitment | 91 | 37.4 | 41 | 36.9 | 27 | 44.3 | 7 | 28.0 | 16 | 34.8 |

## Table 4 - continued

| Selected background characteristics | Total selected No. | Total selected Pct. | Walnut Creek No. | Walnut Creek Pct. | Stockton No. | Stockton Pct. | Bakersfield No. | Bakersfield Pct. | Riverside/San Bernardino No. | Riverside/San Bernardino Pct. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Escape record** | 243 | 100.0 | 111 | 100.0 | 61 | 100.0 | 25 | 100.0 | 46 | 100.0 |
| No record of escape | 181 | 74.5 | 83 | 74.7 | 41 | 67.2 | 21 | 84.0 | 36 | 78.3 |
| Prior escape record | 62 | 25.5 | 28 | 25.2 | 20 | 32.8 | 4 | 16.0 | 10 | 21.7 |
| **Ethnic group** | 243 | 100.0 | 111 | 100.0 | 61 | 100.0 | 25 | 100.0 | 46 | 100.0 |
| White | 110 | 45.3 | 57 | 51.4 | 25 | 41.0 | 10 | 40.0 | 18 | 39.1 |
| Mexican-American | 61 | 25.1 | 11 | 9.9 | 23 | 37.7 | 10 | 40.0 | 17 | 37.0 |
| Black | 69 | 28.4 | 41 | 36.9 | 13 | 21.3 | 4 | 16.0 | 11 | 23.9 |
| Other a/ | 3 | 1.2 | 2 | 1.8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4.0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Grade placement** | 243 | – | 111 | – | 61 | – | 25 | – | 46 | – |
| Unknown | 11 | – | 6 | – | 2 | – | 1 | – | 2 | – |
| Total less unknown | 232 | 100.0 | 105 | 100.0 | 59 | 100.0 | 24 | 100.0 | 44 | 100.0 |
| Grade 6 and under | 67 | 28.9 | 30 | 28.6 | 13 | 22.0 | 8 | 33.4 | 16 | 36.4 |
| Grade 7-8 | 62 | 26.7 | 22 | 20.9 | 21 | 35.6 | 6 | 25.0 | 13 | 29.5 |
| Grade 9 and over | 103 | 44.4 | 53 | 50.5 | 25 | 42.4 | 10 | 41.7 | 15 | 34.1 |
| Median grade | | (8.1) | | (8.5) | | (8.1) | | (7.5) | | (7.4) |
| **Age in years, as of December 31, 1978** | 243 | 100.0 | 111 | 100.0 | 61 | 100.0 | 25 | 100.0 | 46 | 100.0 |
| 29 and under | 90 | 37.0 | 35 | 31.5 | 18 | 29.5 | 11 | 44.0 | 26 | 56.5 |
| 30-39 | 111 | 45.7 | 54 | 48.6 | 31 | 50.8 | 9 | 36.0 | 17 | 37.0 |
| 40 and over | 42 | 17.3 | 22 | 19.8 | 12 | 19.7 | 5 | 20.0 | 3 | 6.5 |
| Median age | | (31.2) | | (31.5) | | (31.9) | | (31.5) | | (29.0) |

a/ Due to large number of cells with expected frequencies of 5 or less, this category was not included in the statistical significance test.

| Background Characteristic | $x^2$ | df | p |
|---|---|---|---|
| Commitment offense | 21.417** | 6 | $p < .010$ |
| Months served in prison | 21.960* | 12 | $p < .050$ |
| Admission type | 4.688 | 6 | $p > .500$ |
| Aggravated sentence | 10.405* | 3 | $p < .050$ |
| Narcotic history | 6.736 | 6 | $p \cong .350$ |
| Prior commitment record | 5.223 | 6 | $p > .500$ |
| Escape record | 3.238 | 3 | $p \cong .350$ |
| Ethnic group | 26.193*** | 6 | $p < .001$ |
| Grade placement | 7.196 | 6 | $p \cong .350$ |
| Age in years, as of 12-31-78 | 12.532 | 6 | $p \cong .060$ |

the investigation model, and Walnut Creek vs. Riverside/San
Bernardino for the intensive supervision; note that Walnut Creek
actually implemented both models and cases under each model were
not separated for this particular analysis.) Based upon
percentage differences (statistical tests were not applied),
there were a few differences between the units operating the
investigation model. A larger proportion of cases at Stockton
compared to Bakersfield had prior prison records, served more
time, and were being re-released to parole after a return to
prison. Together these differences indicate Stockton cases had
slightly more serious criminal histories and would likely
experience more parole failures than Bakersfield cases. Between
the two units operating a intensive supervision model (Walnut

Creek and Riverside/San Bernardino) there were no large
differences in the characteristics which would indicate one unit
was predisposed to a higher rate of failures than another.

It is concluded from the above analysis that the four
experimental units selected different offense type cases.
However, the unit differences were largely related to the type of
high control model each operated. The separate outcome analysis
conducted for each model should control for the commitment
offense differences found.

### Research Design Check: Experimental versus Comparison Group

This study used a quasi-experimental design with a non-
equivalent control group to test project effects. Several steps
were undertaken to assure that a comparison group was similar to
the experimental group with respect to their potential for
returning to serious types of criminal activity (see
"Methodology" chapter). However, as the quasi-experimental
research design involved (1) non-probability sampling methods,
(2) problems in the comparison case identification process, and
(3) vague selection criteria to match upon, comparability of the
two study groups could not be guaranteed. To check their
equivalency, the 243 selected experimental and 118 selected
comparison cases were compared on the ten background
characteristics analyzed in the preceeding section and known to
be associated with differing parole outcome probabilities (Table
5).

Statistically significant differences were found on five
of the ten background characteristics examined. No significant
differences between the experimental and comparison groups
existed on time served in prison, admission type, aggravated
sentence, escape history and grade placement.

Those variables showing a difference indicated the
comparison group contained a larger proportion of cases committed
on person type offenses (fewer for narcotic and property
offenses), a smaller proportion with prior jail and juvenile
commitments and a smaller proportion with narcotic histories than
was found in the experimental group. Also the comparison group
was more likely than the experimental group to be white and
older.

At least one of the differences can be explained by the

different offense types targeted by each model. At the time this special "Characteristics" study sample was drawn (cases selected through October 31, 1978 only), not all the comparison cases used in the final outcome analysis had been identified; and, more importantly, the comparison group had not been screened and divided into the "investigation" model comparison group versus the "intensive supervision" model comparison group. When this did occur later, it was discovered that the majority (69%) of the comparison group were intensive supervision types of comparison cases while a minority (31%) of the comparison group were the investigation model type. Consequently, in this analysis where they are all lumped together, it is not surprising to find the overall comparison group characterized by more person offenders than the experimental group which is equally mixed with investigative and intensive supervision type cases. In fact, when the comparison group is compared only to the intensive supervision experimental cases, the difference in offense type distribution is considerably reduced.

There were other significant differences found including a smaller proportion of cases with narcotic histories and a larger proportion with prior prison commitments in the comparison as opposed to experimental group. These differences may also be due to the disproportionate mix of "investigative vs. intensive supervision" model cases in the comparison group. They may also be due to overall differences in the kinds of cases released to the parole units from which the comparison and experimental

Table 5

Selected Background Characteristics
of the Selected Experimental and Selected Comparison Groups

| Selected background characteristics | Total experimental | | Experimental Intensive supervision | | Investigation | | Comparison | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| Commitment offense | 243 | 100.0 | 122 | 100.0 | 121 | 100.0 | 118 | 100.0 |
| Homicide, manslaughter... | 19 | 7.8 | 9 | 7.4 | 10 | 8.2 | 15 | 12.7 |
| Robbery................. | 56 | 23.0 | 36 | 29.5 | 20 | 16.5 | 25 | 21.2 |
| Assault................. | 21 | 8.6 | 15 | 12.3 | 6 | 5.0 | 17 | 14.4 |
| Burglary................ | 44 | 18.1 | 19 | 15.6 | 25 | 20.7 | 17 | 14.4 |
| Other property.......... | 21 | 8.6 | 5 | 4.1 | 16 | 13.2 | 4 | 3.4 |
| Rape, other sex......... | 18 | 7.4 | 12 | 9.8 | 6 | 5.0 | 20 | 16.9 |
| Narcotics, drugs........ | 52 | 21.4 | 20 | 16.4 | 32 | 26.4 | 14 | 11.9 |
| Other................... | 12 | 4.9 | 6 | 4.9 | 6 | 4.9 | 6 | 5.1 |
| Months served in prison | 243 | 100.0 | 122 | 100.0 | 121 | 100.0 | 118 | 100.0 |
| 17 or less.............. | 41 | 16.9 | 15 | 12.3 | 26 | 21.5 | 14 | 11.9 |
| 18-29................... | 70 | 28.8 | 33 | 27.0 | 37 | 30.6 | 29 | 24.6 |
| 30-41................... | 58 | 23.9 | 33 | 27.0 | 25 | 20.7 | 27 | 22.9 |
| 42-53................... | 34 | 14.0 | 16 | 13.1 | 18 | 14.9 | 21 | 17.8 |
| 54-65.................. | 7 | 2.9 | 2 | 1.6 | 5 | 4.1 | 8 | 6.8 |
| 66-77.................. | 12 | 4.9 | 10 | 8.2 | 2 | 1.6 | 7 | 5.9 |
| 78 or more............. | 21 | 8.6 | 13 | 10.7 | 8 | 6.6 | 12 | 10.2 |
| Median months.......... | (31.4) | | (33.5) | | (29.3) | | (36.0) | |
| Admission type | 243 | 100.0 | 122 | 100.0 | 121 | 100.0 | 118 | 100.0 |
| New admission.......... | 166 | 68.3 | 87 | 71.3 | 79 | 65.3 | 87 | 73.7 |
| Returned by court...... | 50 | 20.6 | 25 | 20.5 | 25 | 20.7 | 23 | 19.5 |
| Returned by board...... | 27 | 11.1 | 10 | 8.2 | 17 | 14.0 | 8 | 6.8 |
| Aggravated sentence | 243 | – | 122 | – | 121 | – | 118 | – |
| Unknown | 74 | – | 33 | – | 41 | – | 31 | – |
| Total less unknown | 169 | 100.0 | 89 | 100.0 | 80 | 100.0 | 87 | 100.0 |
| Not aggravated......... | 134 | 79.3 | 70 | 78.7 | 64 | 80.0 | 70 | 80.4 |
| Aggravated............. | 35 | 20.7 | 19 | 21.3 | 16 | 20.0 | 17 | 19.5 |
| Narcotic history | 243 | 100.0 | 122 | 100.0 | 121 | 100.0 | 118 | 100.0 |
| No use................. | 50 | 20.6 | 30 | 24.6 | 20 | 16.5 | 49 | 41.5 |
| Narcotic use........... | 131 | 53.9 | 66 | 49.2 | 71 | 58.7 | 42 | 35.6 |
| Drugs/marujuana use.... | 62 | 25.5 | 32 | 26.2 | 30 | 24.8 | 27 | 22.9 |

Table 5 - continued

| Selected background characteristics | Total experimental | | Experimental Intensive supervision | | Investigation | | Comparison | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| Prior commitment record | 243 | 100.0 | 122 | 100.0 | 121 | 100.0 | 118 | 100.0 |
| No prior commitment..... | 16 | 6.6 | 11 | 9.0 | 5 | 4.1 | 17 | 14.4 |
| Prior jail/juvenile only.................. | 136 | 56.0 | 67 | 54.9 | 69 | 57.0 | 48 | 40.7 |
| Prior prison commitment. | 91 | 37.4 | 44 | 36.1 | 47 | 38.8 | 53 | 44.9 |
| Escape record | 243 | 100.0 | 122 | 100.0 | 121 | 100.0 | 118 | 100.0 |
| No record of escape..... | 181 | 74.5 | 96 | 78.7 | 85 | 70.2 | 95 | 80.5 |
| Prior record of escape.. | 62 | 25.5 | 26 | 21.3 | 36 | 29.8 | 23 | 19.5 |
| Ethnic group | 243 | 100.0 | 122 | 100.0 | 121 | 100.0 | 118 | 100.0 |
| White................... | 110 | 45.3 | 54 | 44.3 | 56 | 46.3 | 75 | 63.6 |
| Mexican-American........ | 61 | 25.1 | 27 | 22.1 | 34 | 28.1 | 16 | 13.6 |
| Black................... | 69 | 28.4 | 39 | 32.0 | 30 | 24.8 | 22 | 18.6 |
| Other................... | 3 | 1.2 | 2 | 1.6 | 1 | 0.8 | 5 | 4.2 |
| Grade placement | 243 | – | 122 | – | 121 | – | 118 | – |
| Unknown | 11 | – | 8 | – | 3 | – | 2 | – |
| Total less unknown | 232 | 100.0 | 114 | 100.0 | 118 | 100.0 | 116 | 100.0 |
| Illiterate............. | 8 | 3.4 | 6 | 5.3 | 2 | 1.7 | 3 | 2.6 |
| Grades 3-6............. | 59 | 25.4 | 30 | 26.3 | 29 | 24.6 | 28 | 24.1 |
| Grades 7-8............. | 62 | 26.7 | 27 | 23.7 | 35 | 29.7 | 34 | 29.3 |
| Grades 9-11............ | 91 | 39.2 | 46 | 40.3 | 45 | 38.1 | 40 | 34.5 |
| Grades 12 and over..... | 12 | 5.2 | 5 | 4.4 | 7 | 5.9 | 11 | 9.5 |
| Median grade......... | | (8.1) | | (8.1) | | (8.1) | | (8.1) |
| Age in years as of December 31, 1978 | 243 | 100.0 | 122 | 100.0 | 121 | 100.0 | 118 | 100.0 |
| under 29................ | 90 | 37.0 | 49 | 40.2 | 41 | 3.3 | 31 | 26.3 |
| 30-39.................. | 111 | 45.7 | 53 | 43.4 | 58 | 14.9 | 55 | 46.6 |
| 40-49.................. | 34 | 14.0 | 16 | 13.1 | 18 | 47.9 | 21 | 17.8 |
| 50 and over............ | 8 | 3.3 | 4 | 3.3 | 4 | 33.9 | 11 | 9.3 |
| Median age........... | | (31.2) | | (30.5) | | (31.6) | | (33.0) |

Table 5 - continued

| Background Characteristic | $X^2$ | Intensive supervision vs. Investigation df | p | $X^2$ | Experimental vs. Comparison df | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Commitment offense | 19.827** | 7 | p < .010 | 19.280** | 7 | p < .010 |
| Months served in prison | 12.206 | 6 | p =.060 | 5.871 | 6 | p > .500 |
| Admission type | 2.196 | 2 | p =.350 | 1.316 | 2 | p ≤ .400 |
| Aggravated sentence | 0.047 | 1 | p > .500 | 0.048 | 1 | p > .500 |
| Narcotic history | 3.172 | 2 | p ≤ .250 | 18.495*** | 2 | p < .001 |
| Prior commitment record | 2.374 | 2 | p ≤ .350 | 10.070** | 2 | p < .010 |
| Escape record | 2.277 | 1 | p ≤ .150 | 1.601 | 1 | p ≤ .200 |
| Ethnic group | 2.013 | 2 | p ≤ .400 | 16.376*** | 3 | p < .001 |
| Grade placement | 1.681 | 3 | p > .500 | 3.056 | 4 | p > .500 |
| Age in years as of 12-31-78 | 1.027 | 2 | p > .500 | 9.003* | 3 | p < .050 |

groups were derived. With the kind of information available for the special sample used in this study of characteristics, it is impossible to conclude firmly that the comparison group had a probability for returning to serious types of criminal activity equal to that of the experimental group; although the increased size of the comparison group, and the separation of the comparison group into model types in the final study sample used in the activity and outcome analysis in subsequent chapters should enhance the comparability of the two study groups.

Chapter summary. This chapter tested the High Control Project's ability to select the more serious parolees from the parent unit for project attention. As illustrated by the more serious commitment offense types and the more extensive criminal histories of the selected as compared to the not selected populations in the experimental units, the project successfully met this objective. The analysis also helped to define "severity of commitment offense" and "extensiveness of criminal history" as at least two key factors implicitly weighed in the selection decisions made, two factors which could easily be objectified to systematize the more clinically based selection process used for this project.

This chapter also checked for uniformity in the kinds of cases selected across the four experimental units. It found that the units differentially selected cases from the major types of commitment offenses depending upon which of the two high control models the unit operated. For the units operating the same

model, there were no large differences in the kinds of cases selected (with the exception that cases selected at Stockton had slightly more extensive prior criminal histories). Lastly, experimental and comparison cases were compared on the distribution of background characteristics as a check of the research design. A few differences were found; however, the type of analysis conducted was too limited to draw any conclusions.

# CHAPTER VI

## OPERATIONS AND ACTIVITIES
## OF THE INVESTIGATION MODEL

This chapter describes the operations and activity of the investigation model of the High Control Project as it was implemented at three demonstration sites. Hopefully, enough detail and substance is provided to permit either replication or comparisons to other similar programs conducted elsewhere. In addition to it's descriptive purpose this chapter also tests the experimental variable. That is, it determines whether the activities performed under the investigative model were in fact different from those activities normally performed under regular parole supervision.

### Study Sample for Activity and Outcome Analysis

To maximize each site's experience with the project and to increase unit/district sample sizes, intake beyond the October, 1978 cutoff date of the special sample used in the study of group characteristics (described in the preceeding chapter) was employed in the activity and outcome analysis of this and subsequent chapters. For the investigation model, an intake cut-off date of June 30, 1979 was used. For the intensive supervision model cases (allowing for at least six months outcome to elapse after the last case was selected) an intake cutoff date of December 31, 1978 was used (see Figure 1).

The longer study period allowed the number of referrals to the High Control Project to increase substantially beyond the

numbers analyzed in the preceding chapter. By June 30, 1979 the number of referrals totaled 582 cases - 121 in Stockton, 80 in Bakersfield, 72 in the Walnut Creek investigative model, 100 in the Walnut Creek intensive supervision model, 70 in Riverside/San Bernardino, 69 in Redwood City and 70 in Ventura (Table 6).

The 582 referrals during this extended study period were reduced by a small number of cases "rejected" by the High Control Project staff and by a small number of cases "deleted" due to release plan changes. The "rejections" totaled 45 (7.5%). The primary reason for rejection by the High Control Project staff was that the case did not meet the selection criteria. A very few cases were rejected because they met the selection criteria but were of very low priority. Table 6 shows rejections only occurred at the Walnut Creek and Stockton experimental sites as the selection process operated somewhat differently at the Bakersfield and Riverside/San Bernardino sites. The higher proportion of rejections which occurred at the comparison sites (20 of 139 or 14.4%) is attributable to the special "Comparison Case Review" by High Control Project supervisors which was conducted to ensure an equivalent comparison group (see "Methodology" chapter). By design the rules for rejecting a comparison case were more stringent (i.e., each case referred from the comparison units also had to be found acceptable by the staff of at least two of three high control sites conducting the the review), thereby producing the higher rejection rate.

A total of 62 of the 582 referrals (8.0%) met the High
Control selection criteria but later had to be deleted from the
study sample. The primary reason for the deletions was a change
of release plans (e.g., released to another parole district or
released-to-hold), thereby preventing the case's participation in
the project.

After the deletions and rejections were removed, the final
study sample for the activity and outcome analysis totaled 475
cases - 125 from Walnut Creek, 118 from Stockton, 79 from
Bakersfield, 54 from Riverside/San Bernardino, 51 from Redwood
City and 48 from Ventura. Regrouped by type of high control
model, the final study sample sizes are 282 investigation cases
(245 from the experimental sites and 37 from the comparison
sites) and 193 intensive supervision model cases (131 from the
experimental sites and 62 from the comparison sites). This
chapter examines the operations and activities performed on the
245 cases investigated at the experimental units including 48
from Walnut Creek, 118 from Stockton, and 79 from Bakersfield.

Table 6

Referral Actions
by Parole Unit Within Study Group
(STUDY SAMPLE FOR OUTCOME ANALYSIS)

| Referral actions | Total | Parole unit/district within study group | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Experimental group | | | | | | Comparison group | | | | |
| | | Sub-total | Stockton (1-1-78) Inv. | Bkfld. (7-1-78) Inv. | W. C. (2-15-77) | | Riv./SB (6-1-78) I.S. | Sub-total | R. C. (6-1-77) | | Ventura (8-1-78) | |
| | | | | | Inv. | I.S. | | | I.S. | Inv. | I.S. | Inv |
| Total referrals[a] .......... | 582 | 443 | 121 | 80 | 72 | 100 | 70 | 139 | 69 | | 70 | |
| Rejected[b] .......... | 45 | 25 | 3 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 20[e] | 7 | | 13 | |
| Deleted[c] .......... | 62 | 42 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 12 | 16 | 20 | 11 | | 9 | |
| Accepted[d] .......... | 475 | 376 | 118 | 79 | 48 | 77 | 54 | 99 | 35 | 16 | 27 | 21 |

a/ Intensive supervision models – referrals thru 12-31-78, Investigation Models – referrals thru 6-30-79 and completed investigations by 8-31-79.

b/ Did not meet high control selection criteria or meets criteria with very low priority.

c/ Includes cases released to hold, released to another parole unit, with rescinded parole dates; and cases either discharged, transfer or recommitted immediately following (i.e. within 60 days of) referral to High Control Project.

d/ Final study sample.

e/ Rejected during a special "Comparison Case Review" by High Control Project supervisors conducted to ensure equivalent comparison group.

between pairs of the three demonstration sites.

As case turnaround under the investigation model was relatively quick, some cases were investigated more than once during their parole period. Almost ten percent (9.4%) of the investigation model study cases were placed in the project more than once (Table 9). Such successive investigations were slightly more common at the Stockton site (13.5% cases investigated twice or more during the study period) than at either the Walnut Creek site (6.2%) or the Bakersfield site (5.1%). Applying the "z" test the difference between proportions was just short of statistical significance at the .05 level. Even when the differing project lengths studied (28 1/2 months for Walnut Creek, 18 months for Stockton and 12 months for Bakersfield) are taken into consideration, Stockton conducted multiple investigations of the same case more often than the other two sites, particularly Walnut Creek. (It should be noted that each investigation on a single case was counted separately rather than treated as one continuous investigation, due to the different purpose each held. Therefore the data base used in this evaluation is more accurately "total case investigations undertaken", rather than the "total number of cases investigated").

If, because the Walnut Creek site uniquely operated a combination of an investigation and an intensive supervision model, the Stockton and Bakersfield sites can be considered more "typical" of how an investigative model operated, then some factors previously unspecified about how the project worked can now be identified as a result of this brief case movement

## Table 7

### Case Intake
### by Parole Unit Within Study Group
### (INVESTIGATION MODEL)

| Date of case intake | Total N=282 | Experimental Sub-total N=245 | Walnut Creek N=48 | Stockton N=118 | Bakersfield N=79 | Control Sub-total N=37 | Redwood City N=16 | Ventura N=21 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total case intake for 1977 | 43 | 34 | 34 | - | - | 9 | 9 | - |
| January | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| February | 1 | 1 | 1* | - | - | - | - | - |
| March | 7 | 7 | 7 | - | - | - | - | - |
| April | 8 | 8 | 8 | - | - | - | - | - |
| May | 3 | 3 | 3 | - | - | - | - | - |
| June | 3 | 3 | 3 | - | - | - | - | - |
| July | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - |
| August | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - |
| September | 6 | 3 | 3 | - | - | 3 | 3* | - |
| October | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| November | 4 | 4 | 4 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| December | 8 | 2 | 2 | - | - | 6 | 6 | - |
| Total case intake for 1978 | 178 | 150 | 11 | 96 | 43 | 28 | 7 | 21 |
| January | 26 | 26 | 3 | 23* | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| February | 9 | 9 | 1 | 8 | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| March | 5 | 5 | 2 | 3 | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| April | 11 | 9 | 2 | 7 | - | 2 | 2 | - |
| May | 16 | 15 | 0 | 15 | - | 1 | 1 | - |
| June | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| July | 24 | 23 | 0 | 6 | 17* | 1 | 0 | 1* |
| August | 17 | 11 | 1 | 8 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 6 |
| September | 24 | 20 | 2 | 7 | 11 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| October | 11 | 6 | -a/ | 3 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 5 |
| November | 14 | 12 | -a/ | 8 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| December | 18 | 11 | -a/ | 5 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 4 |
| Total case intake for first half 1979 | 61 | 61 | 3 | 22 | 36 | - | - | - |
| January | 22 | 22 | -a/ | 7 | 15 | - | - | - |
| February | 10 | 10 | 1 | 6 | 3 | - | - | - |
| March | 9 | 9 | 1 | 5 | 3 | - | - | - |
| April | 8 | 8 | 1 | 3 | 4 | - | - | - |
| May | 10 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 9 | - | - | - |
| June | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | - | - | - |

\* Project start date
a/ Four month period during which investigation model was terminated at Walnut Creek; The use of the model was reinstated in February, 1979.

## Table 8

### Days In Project
### by Parole Unit
### (INVESTIGATION MODEL)

| Days in project | Total No. | Total Pct. | Walnut Creek No. | Walnut Creek Pct. | Stockton No. | Stockton Pct. | Bakersfield No. | Bakersfield Pct. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total, all cases | 245 | 100.0 | 48 | 100.0 | 118 | 100.0 | 79 | 100.0 |
| 001-030 days | 70 | 28.6 | 24 | 50.0 | 34 | 28.8 | 12 | 15.2 |
| 031-060 days | 52 | 21.2 | 8 | 16.7 | 17 | 14.4 | 27 | 34.2 |
| 061-090 days | 41 | 16.7 | 2 | 4.2 | 22 | 18.6 | 17 | 21.5 |
| 091-120 days | 18 | 7.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 13 | 11.0 | 5 | 6.3 |
| 121-150 days | 27 | 11.0 | 4 | 8.3 | 13 | 11.0 | 10 | 12.6 |
| 151-180 days | 9 | 3.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 6 | 5.1 | 3 | 3.8 |
| 181-210 days | 13 | 5.3 | 2 | 4.2 | 6 | 5.1 | 5 | 6.3 |
| 211-240 days | 5 | 2.0 | 3 | 6.2 | 2 | 1.7 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 241-270 days | 4 | 1.6 | 2 | 4.2 | 2 | 1.7 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 271-300 days | 2 | 0.8 | 1 | 2.1 | 1 | 0.8 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 301-330 days | 1 | 0.4 | 1 | 2.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 331-365 days | 1 | 0.4 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 0.8 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 366 days and over | 2 | 0.8 | 1 | 2.1 | 1 | 0.8 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Median | 60.5 | | 30.0 | | 71.9 | | 61.9 | |
| Mean | | 81.8 | | 81.9 | | 85.5 | | 76.3 |
| S.D. | | 75.4 | | 105.4 | | 74.0 | | 51.5 |
| N | | 245 | | 48 | | 118 | | 79 |

|  | t | df | p |
|---|---|---|---|
| Walnut Creek vs. Stockton | -0.247 | 164 | p>.500 |
| Walnut Creek vs. Bakersfield | 0.400 | 125 | p>.500 |
| Stockton vs. Bakersfield | 0.958 | 195 | p=.340 |

Table 9

Number of Times Each Case Placed in Project
by Parole Unit
(INVESTIGATION MODEL)

| No. of times each case placed in project | Total | | Parole unit | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Walnut Creek | | Stockton | | Bakersfield | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| Total, all cases | 245 | 100.0 | 48 | 100.0 | 118 | 100.0 | 79 | 100.0 |
| Once | 222 | 90.6 | 45 | 93.7 | 102 | 86.4 | 75 | 94.9 |
| More than once | 23 | 9.4 | 3 | 6.2 | 16 | 13.5 | 4 | 5.1 |

| | $z$ | $P$ |
|---|---|---|
| Walnut Creek vs. Stockton: | 1.339 | p = .180 |
| Walnut Creek vs. Bakersfield: | 0.262 | p > .500 |
| Stockton vs. Bakersfield: | 1.931 | p = .054 |

analysis. Utilizing two parole agents working as a team of investigators within an approximately 250-300 case parole unit, the investigation model was able to accept approximately six or seven cases a month and conclude their investigations in sixty days. These findings were congruent with how the investigation model was proposed to operate, that is, short-term and with a rapid turnover of cases handled.

Selection Process

Cases for the investigation model (as well as the intensive supervision model) were to be referred primarily by the regular parole agent supervising the case. Referral was to be based upon an immediate need to verify or disclaim some kind of suspected criminal or violational activity. To guide the referral and selection process five criminal and violation activity areas were targeted as high priority and used as selection criteria. Referrals were to be well documented with prior or current information that the parolee was or is involved in at least one of these targeted activities. After a referral, the project staff reviewed the documented material and either accepted or rejected the case for investigation. No guidelines were established as to when a case investigation would be terminated. Data on the source of referral, time of referral (i.e., days on parole before project placement), reason for referral and documenting information was collected for the 245 experimental cases to describe more specifically how this selection process actually worked.

Profile of the selection process. Overall, the selection
process was implemented as proposed. Referrals for investigation
primarily came from the parolees' regular supervising agent
(70.6%, Table 10). A case was referred at any point in time
during it's one year or more parole period, although a majority
(59.2%) of the cases had been on parole for over six months at
the time they were investigated (Table 11).

While some cases were referred under each of the five
targeted criminal/violational activity areas, high priority was
given to selecting cases involved in (1) violent or sexually
deviant activity (primarily weapon use and possession), (2)
narcotic sales (primarily repetitive, large scale, sales), (3)
absconding from parole supervision and (4) combinations of the
preceding three reasons. Only a small proportion of cases were
selected because of suspected involvement in prison gang activity
or large scale property and fraud activity (Table 12).

Half of the study cases (49.0%, Table 13) were referred
for two or more reasons which were combinations of the above
three major selection criteria (Table 12). To capture the
relative contribution of each selection criterion, the reasons
were "ranked" by frequency of referral and the case counted in
the highest ranking category, regardless of the presence or
absence of other reasons for referral (Table 12A). Analyzing the
combinations of reasons from this perspective showed that almost
one-half (44.5%) of the cases investigated were selected for
suspected violent or sexual deviant activity, followed by another
one quarter of the cases (24.5%) selected for suspected narcotic
sales activity.

Table 10

Source of Case Referral
by Parole Unit

(INVESTIGATION MODEL)

| Source of case referral | Parole unit | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | | Walnut Creek | | Stockton | | Bakersfield | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| Total, all cases | 245 | 100.0 | 48 | 100.0 | 118 | 100.0 | 79 | 100.0 |
| Supervising agent........ | 173 | 70.6 | 22 | 45.8 | 86 | 72.9 | 65 | 82.3 |
| Unit supervisor/ D.A......... | 21 | 8.6 | 17 | 35.4 | 3 | 2.5 | 1 | 1.3 |
| Law enforcement agency...... | 22 | 9.0 | 3 | 6.2 | 17 | 14.4 | 2 | 2.5 |
| Other......... | 29 | 11.8 | 6 | 12.5 | 12 | 10.4 | 11 | 13.9 |
| Pre-release/ transfer | (7) | | (0) | | (6) | | (1) | |
| CDC staff/ outside unit | (16) | | (4) | | (4) | | (8) | |
| High control agent | (6) | | (2) | | (2) | | (2) | |

$x^2 = 64.580^{***}$, df=6, p < .001

## Table 11

### Days On Parole Before Project Placement
### by Study Group
### (INVESTIGATION MODEL)

| Days on parole before project placement | Experimental | | | | | | | | Comparison | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | | Walnut Creek | | Stockton | | Bakersfield | | | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| Total, all cases | 245 | 100.0 | 48 | 100.0 | 118 | 100.0 | 79 | 100.0 | 37 | 100.0 |
| None, new releasee | 6 | 2.4 | 1 | 2.1 | 4 | 3.4 | 1 | 1.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 001-060 days..... | 44 | 17.9 | 6 | 12.5 | 22 | 18.6 | 16 | 20.2 | 7 | 18.9 |
| 061-120 days..... | 29 | 11.8 | 4 | 8.3 | 12 | 10.2 | 13 | 16.4 | 7 | 18.9 |
| 121-180 days..... | 19 | 7.7 | 5 | 10.4 | 10 | 8.5 | 4 | 5.1 | 6 | 16.2 |
| 181-240 days..... | 28 | 11.4 | 5 | 10.4 | 15 | 12.7 | 8 | 10.1 | 4 | 10.8 |
| 241-300 days..... | 25 | 10.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 15 | 12.7 | 10 | 12.6 | 3 | 8.1 |
| 301-365 days..... | 22 | 9.0 | 5 | 10.4 | 7 | 5.9 | 10 | 12.6 | 1 | 2.7 |
| 366 days and over | 70 | 28.6 | 22 | 45.8 | 33 | 28.0 | 15 | 19.0 | 7 | 18.9 |
| Unknown.......... | 2 | 0.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 2.5 | 2 | 5.4 |
| Mean......... | | 293.1 | | 354.3 | | 301.9 | | 241.5 | | 217.4 |
| S.D.......... | | 254.4 | | 245.8 | | 281.5 | | 200.0 | | 208.9 |
| N............ | | 243 | | 48 | | 118 | | 77 | | 35 |

| | t | df | p |
|---|---|---|---|
| Walnut Creek vs. Stockton | 1.119 | 164 | p=.265 |
| Walnut Creek vs. Bakersfield | 2.779 ** | 123 | p<.010 |
| Stockton vs. Bakersfield | 1.623 | 193 | p=.107 |
| Experimental vs. Comparison | 1.675 | 276 | p=.096 |

## Table 12

### Reason Selected
### by Study Group
### (INVESTIGATION MODEL)

| Type of reason for selection a/ | Experimental | | | | | | | | Comparison | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | | Walnut Creek | | Stockton | | Bakersfield | | | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| Total, all cases | 245 | 100.0 | 48 | 100.0 | 118 | 100.0 | 79 | 100.0 | 37 | 100.0 |
| **One type of reason only** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Prison gang affiliation... | 14 | 5.7 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 10.2 | 2 | 2.5 | 2 | 5.4 |
| Narcotic sales activity...... | 38 | 15.5 | 2 | 4.2 | 19 | 16.1 | 17 | 21.5 | 6 | 16.2 |
| Violence/sexual deviance...... | 62 | 25.3 | 16 | 33.3 | 20 | 16.9 | 26 | 32.9 | 13 | 35.1 |
| Property/fraud... | 18 | 7.3 | 5 | 10.4 | 9 | 7.6 | 4 | 5.1 | 2 | 5.4 |
| Absconding....... | 23 | 9.4 | 6 | 12.5 | 13 | 11.0 | 4 | 5.1 | 0 | 0 |
| **Combination of two or more types** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Narcotic sales & absconding.... | 12 | 4.9 | 1 | 2.1 | 7 | 5.9 | 4 | 5.1 | 0 | 0 |
| Violence and absconding... | 16 | 6.5 | 3 | 6.3 | 6 | 5.1 | 7 | 8.9 | 7 | 18.9 |
| Violence & gang.. | 10 | 4.1 | 2 | 4.2 | 8 | 6.8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2.7 |
| Violence & narcotic sales......... | 15 | 6.1 | 7 | 14.6 | 4 | 3.4 | 4 | 5.1 | 2 | 5.4 |
| Other combinations........ | 37 | 15.1 | 6 | 12.5 | 20 | 16.9 | 11 | 13.9 | 4 | 10.8 |

a/ Based upon five selection criteria for project (i.e., five targeted criminal activity areas).

## Table 12A

### "Ranked" Reason Selected
### by Study Group

### (INVESTIGATION MODEL)

| "Ranked" reason selected [a] | Experimental | | | | | | | | Comparison | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | | Walnut Creek | | Stockton | | Bakersfield | | | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| Total, all cases | 245 | 100.0 | 48 | 100.0 | 118 | 100.0 | 79 | 100.0 | 37 | 100.0 |
| Violence/sexual deviancy | 109 | 44.5 | 31 | 64.6 | 39 | 33.1 | 39 | 49.4 | 23 | 62.2 |
| with absconding..(16) | (3) | | | | (6) | | (7) | | (7) | |
| with narcotic sales........(15) | (7) | | | | (4) | | (4) | | (2) | |
| with gang affiliation....(10) | (2) | | | | (8) | | (0) | | (1) | |
| with property/fraud.........(6) | (3) | | | | (1) | | (2) | | (0) | |
| no other reason..(62) | (16) | | | | (20) | | (26) | | (13) | |
| Narcotic sales activity | 60 | 24.5 | 3 | 6.3 | 32 | 27.1 | 25 | 31.6 | 7 | 18.9 |
| with absconding..(12) | (1) | | | | (7) | | (4) | | (0) | |
| with gang affiliation...(6) | (0) | | | | (6) | | (0) | | (6) | |
| with property/fraud.........(4) | (0) | | | | (0) | | (4) | | (1) | |
| no other reason..(38) | (2) | | | | (19) | | (17) | | (0) | |
| Absconding | 28 | 11.4 | 7 | 14.6 | 17 | 14.4 | 4 | 5.1 | 1 | 2.7 |
| with gang affiliation...(5) | (1) | | | | (4) | | (0) | | (1) | |
| no other reason..(23) | (6) | | | | (13) | | (4) | | (0) | |
| Other reason(s) | 48 | 19.6 | 7 | 14.6 | 30 | 25.4 | 11 | 13.9 | 6 | 16.2 |

[a] Ranked by frequency of referral; case counted in highest rank category referred under, regardless of presence or absence of other reasons referred.

Experimental/Comparison Groups: $X^2 = 5.224$ ***, df=3, p=.250
Walnut Creek/Stockton/Bakersfield: $X^2 = 24.846$ ***, df=6, p<.001

---

## Table 13

### Number of Specific Reasons for Selection Cited
### by Study Group

### (INVESTIGATION MODEL)

| Number of specific reasons for selection cited [a] | Experimental | | | | | | | | Comparison | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | | Walnut Creek | | Stockton | | Bakersfield | | | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| Total, all cases | 245 | 100.0 | 48 | 100.0 | 118 | 100.0 | 79 | 100.0 | 37 | 100.0 |
| One reason.... | 125 | 51.0 | 16 | 33.3 | 67 | 56.8 | 42 | 53.2 | 9 | 24.3 |
| Two reasons... | 94 | 38.4 | 24 | 50.0 | 42 | 35.6 | 28 | 35.4 | 23 | 62.2 |
| Three reasons or more [b]. | 26 | 10.6 | 8 | 16.7 | 9 | 7.6 | 9 | 11.4 | 5 | 13.5 |

[a] Counts separately two or more reasons of the same type (e.g., two types of "Violent" types = current possession of weapons plus prior commitment for assault on peace office)
[b] One case cited four reasons

Experimental/Comparison group: $X^2 = 9.455$ **, df=2, p< .010
Walnut Creek/Stockton/Bakersfield: $X^2 = 8.582$ , df=4, p≅.100

Although some variation existed across the units, the findings clearly indicated that the investigative model placed high priority on investigating these two types of criminal activity.

As the selection criteria established for the project were somewhat general, an attempt was made to capture the specific types of criminal activity suspected. This analysis counted two or more reasons of the same general type separately and shows "sexually deviant" activity separately from "other violent activity". An inspection of Table 14 shows no single specific type of offense occurring in the majority of cases, however weapon use (which includes the offense of robbery) and weapon possession occurred most often under the general category of "Violence"; and "repeat sales for profit" and "sales combined with use" was most often cited under the general category of "Narcotic Sales".

The source of the information leading to the referral for investigation came equally from two main sources (Table 15)-- a local law enforcement agency (40.4%) or the regular supervising agent (19.6%, with, plus 20.8% without, reference to criminal history records). When the local law enforcement agency was the source, the information documenting the referral was usually special intelligence information collected by that agency. When the source of information was that known by the regular agent on the case, the agent most often cited "suspicious leisure time activities" and "difficulty in contacting" the case as evidence of suspected criminal activity. In contrast to the method of operating proposed for the intensive supervision model, the

Table 14
Frequency of Selected Specific Kinds
of Reasons for Selection Cited
(INVESTIGATION MODEL)

| Reason Selected | No.[a] | Pct. |
|---|---|---|
| Total violence reasons for selection cited | 174 | 100.0 |
| Assault with injury | 16 | 9.2 |
| Murder (including attempted) | 20 | 11.5 |
| Threat of violence | 25 | 14.4 |
| Robbery or other use of a weapon | 35 | 20.1 |
| Possession of a weapon | 47 | 27.0 |
| Using a weapon with injury | 6 | 3.4 |
| Other violent behavior | 25 | 14.4 |
| Total sexual deviancy reasons for selection cited | 30 | 100.0 |
| Child molestation | 6 | 20.0 |
| Rape (including attempted) | 15 | 50.0 |
| Other sexual deviant behavior | 9 | 30.0 |
| Total narcotic sales reasons for selection cited | 95 | 100.0 |
| Sales of an unknown dollar amount | 16 | 16.8 |
| Repeat sales for profit | 34 | 35.8 |
| Possession for sale | 11 | 11.6 |
| Possession for manufacturing | 2 | 2.1 |
| Transporting | 2 | 2.1 |
| Using only | 4 | 4.2 |
| Sales and use | 26 | 27.4 |
| Total absconding reasons for selection cited | 75 | 100.0 |
| Absconding, no other circumstances | 15 | 20.0 |
| Absconding with outstanding felony warrant | 14 | 18.7 |
| Absconding and suspected of possessing weapon | 6 | 8.0 |
| Repeat absconder | 1 | 1.3 |
| Potential absconder (Pre - PAL/RAL) | 8 | 10.7 |
| Absconding and other circumstantances | 31 | 41.3 |

[a] Includes both experimental and comparison cases

## Table 15

Source and Kind of Documenting Information Leading to Case Referral
by Study Group
(INVESTIGATION MODEL)

| Source and kind of documenting information leading to case referral | Experimental | | | | | | | | Comparison | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | | Walnut Creek | | Stockton | | Bakersfield | | | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| Total, all cases | 245 | 100.0 | 48 | 100.0 | 118 | 100.0 | 79 | 100.0 | 37 | 100.0 |
| Law enforcement agency information | 99 | 40.4 | 22 | 45.8 | 40 | 33.9 | 37 | 46.8 | 11 | 29.7 |
| Recent arrest or warrant issued | (26) | | (8) | | (4) | | (14) | | (8) | |
| Recent crimes reported matching criminal history record information ............... | (19) | | (2) | | (12) | | (5) | | (2) | |
| Special intelligence information | (54) | | (12) | | (24) | | (18) | | (1) | |
| Supervising agent information | 48 | 19.6 | 9 | 18.7 | 33 | 28.0 | 6 | 7.6 | 4 | 10.8 |
| Parolees leisure time activities | (8) | | (3) | | (4) | | (1) | | (2) | |
| Parolee difficult to contact ... | (14) | | (2) | | (11) | | (1) | | (0) | |
| Leisure activity and difficult to contact ..................... | (10) | | (4) | | (4) | | (2) | | (1) | |
| Parolee's family criminal involvement ................. | (5) | | (0) | | (5) | | (0) | | (0) | |
| Other community adjustment factors | (11) | | (0) | | (9) | | (2) | | (1) | |
| Record of criminal history (only) | 11 | 4.5 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3.4 | 7 | 8.9 | 8 | 21.6 |
| Record of criminal history and supervising agent information | 51 | 20.8 | 8 | 16.7 | 24 | 20.3 | 19 | 24.0 | 14 | 37.8 |
| Parolee's leisure time activities | (9) | | (1) | | (4) | | (4) | | (2) | |
| Parolee difficult to contact .... | (20) | | (5) | | (8) | | (7) | | (5) | |
| Parolee's means of support ...... | (5) | | (0) | | (2) | | (3) | | (1) | |
| Narcotic test results .......... | (4) | | (0) | | (1) | | (3) | | (3) | |
| Other community adjustment factor | (13) | | (2) | | (9) | | (2) | | (3) | |
| Other sources | 36 | 14.6 | 9 | 18.7 | 17 | 14.4 | 10 | 12.7 | 0 | 0 |
| Family/associate of parolee information ................. | (12) | | (5) | | (4) | | (3) | | (0) | |
| Informant information .......... | (11) | | (2) | | (3) | | (6) | | (0) | |
| Unknown source information ...... | (13) | | (2) | | (10) | | (1) | | (0) | |

Experimental/Comparison: $x^2 = 25.762$***, df = 4, p < .001
Walnut Creek/Stockton/Bakersfield $x^2 = 19.289$* , df = 8, p < .050

investigative model relied heavily upon "current" (as opposed to prior history) information.

The final stage of the selection process -- the screening of the referred cases by the High Control staff -- was empirically described for a subsample of these cases in Chapter V. Table 6 showed that almost all of the cases referred for investigation were subsequently accepted and investigated. It is believed that informal screening of cases occurred before referrals were made which produced a very low case rejection rate by the High Control Project staff.

Comparisons across units. Several differences existed between the demonstration sites on how they implemented the investigation model. Those key differences in the selection process which may be related to some of the outcome differences discovered across units are described here.

Statistically significant differences (as determined by either a chi square test or a "t" test, and using a .05 probability level) existed across the three demonstration sites on all four selection process variables examined in this section. First, the three sites differed on the source of referral. A larger proportion of the case referrals at Walnut Creek originated with the unit supervisors or the district administrator at the site (35.4%) than at either of the other two sites (2.5% Stockton, 1.3% Bakersfield). The Stockton site on the other hand investigated a larger proportion of cases referred by a local law enforcement agency (14.4%) than either of the

other two sites (6.2% Walnut Creek, 2.5% Bakersfield) (Table 10).
Second, there was a statistically significant difference in the
source of information leading to the referral. The Stockton site
used agent information more and police information less than the
other two sites (Table 15). Third, a statistically significant
difference was found between the Walnut Creek site and the
Bakersfield site on the average days on parole before a case was
placed in the project (Table 11). The Bakersfield site selected
cases who had been on parole an average of eight months while the
Walnut Creek site selected cases on parole an average of twelve
months. The exact meaning of these several differences, and the
direction of the effect they may have on outcome differences
across the sites, are unknown. The data is clear evidence,
however, that the investigative model was implemented differently
at the three sites.

One difference which is likely to affect outcomes was that
found on the fourth variable analyzed -- reason for selection.
It has been shown that different kinds of criminal activity are
associated with differing clearance rates for police
investigators (see discussion of suppressible crime types,
Chapter I). Therefore, it seems likely that concentrating on
different types of cases for investigative attention would
produce differing successful outcome rates.

Table 12A shows that the three sites disproportionately
selected cases from among the three major reasons selected. The
Walnut Creek site investigated cases referred for
violent/sexually deviant activity and almost none for narcotic

sales activity. The Stockton site selected cases from all three
major types but also investigated a significant proportion of
cases referred for reasons of prison gang affiliations (tabulated
under "other reasons" in Table 12A). Finally Bakersfield
primarily selected cases referred for violent activity and
narcotic sales activity but very few cases referred for
absconding from parole supervision.

These differences correspond to some of the differences in
background characteristics discovered in the Chapter V analysis
(particularly the larger proportion of cases with narcotic
histories and narcotic commitment offenses at Stockton and
Bakersfield than at Walnut Creek), and to an earlier finding of
slightly more extensive criminal backgrounds of cases selected at
the Stockton site. These significant differences in the kinds of
cases investigated at each site (as reflected here in the "Reason
for Referral", earlier in the analysis of background
characteristics, and later in this report in an analysis of the
purposes of the investigations) will be taken into consideration
in the analysis of outcome differences across sites.

## Types of Activity Performed

A general set of activities which high control agents
would engage in were established at the project's onset. (see
listing in Chapter I). The purpose of this section is to
describe in detail "which", and "to what degree" these activities
(and other types of activities commonly conducted during regular
parole supervision) occurred during the operation of the
investigation model.

A set of thirty exhaustive and mutually exclusive specific types of parole agent activities were developed from lists of proposed activities set forth by project planners and from those activities known by the author to be conducted under regular supervision (Appendix C). The categories reflect the intended goal or purpose of each activity. Other dimensions of the activity such as the time spent in that activity or the success of the activity, were not measured. Activities performed on each case investigated, as recorded in agent field notes, were classified into one of the thirty categories and their frequency tabulated. (It is noted that agent "activities" rather than agent "contacts", or recordings, were counted. As two or more different types of activities are often performed during one agent/parolee contact, the frequencies discussed in this section are larger than the number of agent contacts recorded in the field notes.)

To reduce the amount of analysis necessary and for descriptive purposes, the thirty specific types of activities tabulated were collapsed into nine major types. Although the tables which follow report the findings for both the thirty specific avtivity types and the nine major activity types, the statistical tests and discussion to follow are based on the major categories only. They include:

-106-

1. Evidence Collection Activities
2. Surveillance (Undercover)
3. Information Exchanges With Law Enforcement
4. Information Exchanges With CDC Staff
5. Information Exchanges With Other Individuals
6. Arrest and Charge Processing Activities
7. Check-up Contacts
8. Required (per P&CSD Policy) Activities
9. Assistance Activities

The frequency with which each type of activity occurred was analyzed three different ways:

1. Proportion of cases with one or more of each type of activity (Table 17).
2. Average frequency of each type of activity (Table 19).
3. Average percent of the total activities for each type of activity (Table 21).

The first measure, proportion of cases with one or more of each type of activity, determines which type(s) of activity were the most commonly occurring across all the cases. The second measure, average frequency of each type of activity, reflects how often each type of activity generally occurred on a case (regardless of the length of time under investigation). The third and final measure, average percent of the total activities for each type of activity, identifies those activities which occupied most of the investigative time spent on a case.

Profile of investigation model activities. The total number of activities performed on a case averaged nine per thirty days under investigation. Actually the distribution of total activities performed is skewed toward the lower end of the range (median of six activities per 30 days) and slightly bi-modal with another smaller peak at the high end (ten percent of the cases averaging twenty or more activities in a thirty day period, Table

-107-

16). Although the indication is that several activities were being performed during a relatively short period of time, the total number varied widely across the cases investigated.

Of the nine major types of activities tabulated, three were found as commonly occurring across two-thirds or more of the cases investigated (Table 17). "Information exchanges with law enforcement agencies" occurred at least once in over eighty percent of the cases (81.6%); some type of "Evidence collection" activity (e.g., searches, interviews, etc.) occurred at least once in three-fourths of the cases (76.6%); and "Information exchanges with other individuals" (i.e., collaterals of the parolee) occurred at least once in two-thirds of the cases (62.0%). Two types of activities, "Required (per P&CSD policy) Activities" (e.g., processing parolee travel requests, delivering prison release money or conducting early discharge reviews) and "Assistance Activities" (e.g., making cash assistance, referring to an employment service), almost never occurred as they were the responsibility of the regular parole agent who maintained these routine "case-carrying" responsibilities during the investigation. The remaining four major types of activities occurred in roughly fifty percent of the total cases investigated.

The types of activities occurring with the greatest frequency (Table 19) were "Information exchanges with other individuals" (5.20) and "Information exchanges with law enforcement agencies" (3.84). Performance of various "Evidence

collection" activities (2.46) occurred on the average of two times during an investigation. The remaining six major types of activities occurred on the average once or less during the investigation.

The greatest proportion of the total activities performed during an investigation (Table 21) was expended on "Exchanging information with other individuals" (35.8% of total activities), "Exchanging information with law enforcement" (28.9%), or directly "Collecting some piece of evidence" (20.8%). The activities of "Surveillance", "Information exchanges with correctional staff", "Arrest and charge processing", and making "Check-up contacts" each comprised on the average ten percent of the total activities. As stated above, required administrative processing activities and assistance activities were almost non-existent.

Thus, the investigation model operated by collecting and integrating current available information (largely from collaterals of the parolee and local law enforcement staff). Direct efforts at collecting evidence (i.e. from primary sources) such as victim interviews surveillance also frequently occurred, although not as often as the information exchanges. Together these measures showed the high control investigative model operated as proposed and performed those kinds of activities congruent with it's purpose to "gather information". Noteworthy here is that information was more often gathered from secondary sources (e.g., law enforcement) or sources often used under

## Table 16
### Average Number of Activities Per Thirty Days In Project
### by Study Group
### (INVESTIGATION MODEL)

| Average number of activities per thirty days in project | Experimental | | | | | | | | Comparison | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | | Walnut Creek | | Stockton | | Bakersfield | | | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| Total, all cases | 245 | 100.0 | 48 | 100.0 | 118 | 100.0 | 79 | 100.0 | 6 | 100.0 |
| 0.1 to 2.0 activities .. | 51 | 20.8 | 5 | 10.4 | 37 | 31.3 | 9 | 11.4 | 2 | 33.3 |
| 2.1 to 4.0 activities .. | 45 | 18.4 | 6 | 12.5 | 24 | 20.3 | 15 | 19.0 | 1 | 16.7 |
| 4.1 to 6.0 activities .. | 31 | 12.6 | 5 | 10.4 | 12 | 10.2 | 14 | 17.7 | 1 | 16.7 |
| 6.1 to 8.0 activities .. | 25 | 10.2 | 3 | 6.2 | 14 | 11.9 | 8 | 10.1 | 1 | 16.7 |
| 8.1 to 10.0 activities .. | 25 | 10.2 | 4 | 8.3 | 4 | 3.4 | 17 | 21.5 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 10.1 to 12.0 activities. | 10 | 4.1 | 2 | 4.2 | 5 | 4.2 | 3 | 3.8 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 12.1 to 14.0 activities. | 8 | 3.3 | 2 | 4.2 | 4 | 3.4 | 2 | 2.5 | 1 | 16.7 |
| 14.1 to 16.0 activities. | 6 | 2.4 | 1 | 2.1 | 2 | 1.7 | 3 | 3.8 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 16.1 to 18.0 activities. | 7 | 2.8 | 4 | 8.3 | 2 | 1.7 | 1 | 1.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 18.1 to 20.0 activities. | 6 | 2.4 | 4 | 8.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 2.5 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 20.1 and over .......... | 26 | 10.6 | 11 | 22.9 | 12 | 10.2 | 3 | 3.8 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Unknown b/ | 5 | 2.0 | 1 | 2.1 | 2 | 1.7 | 2 | 2.5 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Mean .......... | | 9.2 | | 16.3 | | 7.4 | | 7.8 | | 4.6 |
| S.D. .......... | | 11.0 | | 16.3 | | 9.1 | | 7.2 | | 4.1 |
| N .......... | | 240 | | 47 | | 116 | | 77 | | 6 |

a/ Excludes 31 comparison cases for whom field notes were not available.
b/ Cases with missing data items; excluded from mean and t test calculation.

| | t | df | P |
|---|---|---|---|
| Walnut Creek vs. Stockton | 4.396*** | 161 | p < .001 |
| Walnut Creek vs. Bakersfield | 3.930*** | 122 | p < .001 |
| Stockton vs. Bakersfield | 0.351 | 191 | p > .500 |
| Experimental vs. Comparison | 1.046 | 244 | p = .297 |

## Table 17
### Proportion of Cases With One or More of Each Type of Activity
### by Study Group
### (INVESTIGATION MODEL)

| Type of activity | Experimental units | | | | Comparison units N=6 a/ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total N=245 | Walnut Creek N=48 | Stockton N=118 | Bakersfield N=79 | |
| EVIDENCE COLLECTION ACTIVITIES: | 76.6 | 79.2 | 74.6 | 81.0 | 50.0 |
| Interviews ......... | 36.8 | 35.4 | 46.6 | 22.8 | 16.7 |
| Pretext Interviews and Representation . | 0.4 | 0 | 0.9 | 0 | 0 |
| Informant Interviews and Usages ....... | 10.6 | 4.2 | 6.8 | 20.3 | 0 |
| Resource Material Checks ............. | 31.8 | 54.2 | 17.8 | 39.2 | 0 |
| Evidence Processing .................. | 5.7 | 8.3 | 2.5 | 9.9 | 0 |
| Anti-Narcotic Testing ................ | 19.6 | 4.2 | 14.4 | 36.7 | 33.3 |
| Search and Seizure of Evidence ........ | 40.8 | 16.7 | 47.0 | 45.6 | 16.7 |
| SURVEILLANCE: | 46.9 | 18.8 | 42.4 | 70.9 | 0 |
| Fixed Surveillance ................... | 28.2 | 4.2 | 26.3 | 45.6 | 0 |
| Spot Surveillance ................... | 32.2 | 16.7 | 27.1 | 49.4 | 0 |
| Tailing Surveillance ................. | 15.9 | 0 | 9.3 | 35.4 | 0 |
| INFORMATION EXCHANGES WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT: | 81.6 | 89.6 | 81.4 | 77.2 | 33.3 |
| Current Suspected Criminal Involvement/ Parole Violation ................... | 73.5 | 70.8 | 79.7 | 65.8 | 16.7 |
| Recent Arrest and After-Arrest Processing | 36.3 | 54.2 | 28.0 | 38.0 | 33.3 |
| General Background or Non-Criminal Status Factors ................... | 6.1 | 6.4 | 7.6 | 3.8 | 16.7 |
| INFORMATION EXCHANGES WITH CDC STAFF: | 53.5 | 70.8 | 42.4 | 59.5 | 16.7 |
| Current Suspected Criminal Involvement/ Parole Violation ................... | 33.9 | 47.9 | 23.7 | 40.5 | 16.7 |
| Recent Arrest and After-Arrest Processing | 19.6 | 33.3 | 12.7 | 21.5 | 0 |
| General Background or Non-Criminal Status Factors ................... | 20.8 | 22.9 | 17.8 | 24.0 | 0 |
| INFORMATION EXCHANGES WITH OTHER INDIVIDUALS: | 62.0 | 47.9 | 52.5 | 84.8 | 50.0 |
| Current Suspected Criminal Involvement/ Parole Violation ................... | 22.9 | 18.7 | 14.4 | 38.0 | 0 |
| Recent Arrest and After-Arrest Processing | 5.3 | 8.3 | 3.4 | 6.3 | 33.3 |
| General Background or Non-Criminal Status Factors ................... | 49.8 | 25.0 | 45.8 | 70.9 | 33.3 |
| ARREST AND CHARGE PROCESSING ACTIVITIES: | 44.9 | 27.1 | 39.0 | 64.6 | 33.3 |
| Apprehension ......................... | 34.3 | 6.3 | 32.2 | 54.4 | 16.7 |
| Required After-Arrest Processing ...... | 23.9 | 18.8 | 6.8 | 49.4 | 33.3 |
| Prosecution Assistance ................ | 6.1 | 2.1 | 7.6 | 6.3 | 16.7 |

Table 17 - continued

| Type of activity | Experimental units | | | | Comparison units N=6[a] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total N=245 | Walnut Creek N=48 | Stockton N=118 | Bakersfield N=79 | |
| CHECK-UP CONTACTS BY PAROLE AGENT: | 48.6 | 16.7 | 54.2 | 59.5 | 83.3 |
| Attempted Check-up Contacts ......... | 25.7 | 12.5 | 32.2 | 24.1 | 50.0 |
| Actual Check-up Contacts ........... | 35.1 | 10.4 | 39.0 | 44.3 | 66.7 |
| REQUIRED (PER P&CSD POLICY) ACTIVITIES: | 19.2 | 22.9 | 20.3 | 15.2 | 33.3 |
| Required Permission or Notification . | 0.4 | 0 | 0 | 1.3 | 0 |
| Required Release Matters ........... | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Required Administrative Processing .. | 19.2 | 22.9 | 20.3 | 15.2 | 33.3 |
| ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES: | 0.4 | 2.1 | 0 | 0 | 16.7 |
| Direct Services ..................... | 0.4 | 2.1 | 0 | 0 | 16.7 |
| Referral to Community Service ....... | 0.4 | 2.1 | 0 | 0 | 16.7 |
| Counseling .......................... | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16.7 |

[a] Excludes 31 comparison cases for whom field notes were not available

Table 18

z   Tests Between Parole Units and Study Groups

on
Proportion of Cases With One or More of Each Type of Activity
(INVESTIGATION MODEL)

| Proportion of cases with one or more of each type of activity | Walnut Creek vs. Stockton | | Walnut Creek vs. Bakersfield | | Stockton vs. Bakersfield | | Experimental vs. Comparison | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | z | p | z | p | z | p | z | p |
| Evidence Collection | 0.626 | p >.500 | -0.114 | p >.500 | -1.053 | p =.294 | 2.157* | p <.050 |
| Surveillance | -2.882** | p <.010 | -5.682*** | p <.001 | -3.953*** | p <.001 | 3.221** | p <.010 |
| Information Exchanges With Law Enforcement | 1.297 | p =.193 | 1.754 | p =.080 | 0.720 | p =.472 | 4.175*** | p <.001 |
| Information Exhanges with CDC Staff | 3.326*** | p <.001 | 1.288 | p =.197 | -2.349* | p <.050 | 2.522* | p <.050 |
| Information Exchanges With Other Individuals | 0.504 | p >.500 | -2.322* | p <.050 | -3.405*** | p <.001 | 1.612 | p =.107 |
| Arrest and Charge Processing Activities | -1.453 | p =.147 | -4.089*** | p <.001 | -3.516*** | p <.001 | 0.798 | p =.424 |
| Check-up Contacts by Parole Agent | -4.417*** | p <.001 | -4.724*** | p <.001 | -0.735 | p =.465 | -2.378* | p .050 |
| Required (Per P&CSD Policy) Activities | 0.371 | p >.500 | 1.089 | p =.276 | 0.901 | p =.368 | -1.218 | p =.222 |
| Assistance Activities | 1.489 | p =.136 | 0.012 | p >.500 | 0 | — | -6.174*** | p <.001 |

a Corrected for continuity due to small N for comparison group.

## Table 19

### Average Frequency of Each Type of Activity
#### by Study Group
(INVESTIGATION MODEL)

| Type of activity | | Experimental units | | | Comparison units N=6[a] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Total N=245 | Walnut Creek N=48 | Stockton N=118 | Bakersfield N=79 |
| EVIDENCE COLLECTION ACTIVITIES: | $\bar{X}$ | 2.46 | 2.79 | 2.10 | 2.80 | 2.00 |
| | (S.D.) | (2.63) | (3.19) | (2.34) | (2.59) | (3.21) |
| Interviews .......................... | | 0.75 | 0.98 | 0.84 | 0.47 | 0.17 |
| Pretext Interviews and Representation .. | | 0 | 0 | 0.01 | 0 | 0 |
| Informant Interviews and Usages ........ | | 0.16 | 0.06 | 0.09 | 0.33 | 0 |
| Resource Material Checks ............... | | 0.69 | 1.40 | 0.32 | 0.82 | 0 |
| Evidence Processing .................... | | 0.07 | 0.08 | 0.03 | 0.13 | 0 |
| Anti-Narcotic Testing .................. | | 0.24 | 0.04 | 0.19 | 0.44 | 1.67 |
| Search and Seizure of Evidence......... | | 0.55 | 0.23 | 0.63 | 0.61 | 0.17 |
| SURVEILLANCE: | $\bar{X}$ | 2.13 | 0.54 | 1.34 | 4.29 | 0 |
| | (S.D.) | (4.15) | (1.94) | (2.41) | (5.94) | (0) |
| Fixed Surveillance ..................... | | 0.53 | 0.04 | 0.53 | 0.82 | 0 |
| Spot Surveillance ...................... | | 1.32 | 0.50 | 0.64 | 2.84 | 0 |
| Tailing Surveillance ................... | | 0.28 | 0 | 0.16 | 0.63 | 0 |
| Mean Hours | | 2.04 | 0.18 | 1.80 | 3.58 | 0 |
| S.D. | | 5.00 | 0.63 | 4.26 | 6.78 | 0 |
| INFORMATION EXCHANGES WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT: | $\bar{X}$ | 3.84 | 8.62 | 2.92 | 2.30 | 3.67 |
| | (S.D.) | (5.86) | (10.38) | (3.45) | (2.37) | (5.68) |
| Current Suspected Criminal Involvement/ Parole Violation ..................... | | 2.94 | 6.52 | 2.30 | 1.72 | 0.50 |
| Recent Arrest and After-Arrest Processing .......................... | | 0.82 | 2.04 | 0.50 | 0.54 | 3.00 |
| General Background or Non-Criminal Status Factors ..................... | | 0.08 | 0.06 | 0.12 | 0.04 | 0.17 |
| INFORMATION EXCHANGES WITH CDC STAFF: | $\bar{X}$ | 1.27 | 2.06 | 0.86 | 1.39 | 0.33 |
| | (S.D.) | (1.88) | (2.75) | (1.45) | (1.60) | (0.74) |
| Current Suspected Criminal Involvement/ Parole Violation ..................... | | 0.62 | 1.06 | 0.41 | 0.68 | 0.33 |
| Recent Arrest and After-Arrest Processing .......................... | | 0.29 | 0.48 | 0.16 | 0.35 | 0 |
| General Background or Non-Criminal Status Factors ..................... | | 0.36 | 0.52 | 0.30 | 0.35 | 0 |

## Table 19 - continued

| Type of activity | | Experimental units | | | Comparison units N=6[a] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Total N=245 | Walnut Creek N=48 | Stockton N=118 | Bakersfield N=79 |
| INFORMATION EXCHANGES WITH OTHER INDIVIDUALS: | $\bar{X}$ | 5.20 | 6.10 | 3.90 | 6.60 | 9.00 |
| | (S.D.) | (9.44) | (12.06) | (7.68) | (9.73) | (12.26) |
| Current Suspected Criminal Involvement/ Parole Violation ..................... | | 0.51 | 0.46 | 0.29 | 0.87 | 0 |
| Recent Arrest and After-Arrest Processing .......................... | | 0.09 | 0.17 | 0.06 | 0.08 | 0.50 |
| General Background or Non-Criminal Status Factors ..................... | | 4.60 | 5.48 | 3.55 | 5.65 | 8.50 |
| ARREST AND CHARGE PROCESSING ACTIVITIES: | $\bar{X}$ | 0.79 | 0.35 | 0.51 | 1.48 | 1.50 |
| | (S.D.) | (1.15) | (0.66) | (0.79) | (1.49) | (2.14) |
| Apprehension ........................... | | 0.36 | 0.06 | 0.33 | 0.58 | 0.17 |
| Required After-Arrest Processing ....... | | 0.35 | 0.27 | 0.09 | 0.80 | 1.17 |
| Prosecution Assistance ................. | | 0.08 | 0.02 | 0.09 | 0.10 | 0.17 |
| CHECK-UP CONTACTS BY PAROLE AGENT: | $\bar{X}$ | 1.17 | 0.33 | 1.42 | 1.32 | 7.17 |
| | (S.D.) | (1.79) | (0.92) | (1.98) | (1.74) | (9.32) |
| Attempted Check-Up Contacts ........... | | 0.58 | 0.19 | 0.73 | 0.58 | 2.50 |
| Actual Check-Up Contacts .............. | | 0.60 | 0.15 | 0.69 | 0.73 | 4.67 |
| REQUIRED (PER P&CSD POLICY) ACTIVITIES: | $\bar{X}$ | 0.25 | 0.27 | 0.29 | 0.19 | 1.00 |
| | (S.D.) | (0.59) | (0.53) | (0.66) | (0.51) | (1.16) |
| Required Permission or Notification.... | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.01 | 0 |
| Required Release Matters .............. | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Required Administrative Processing..... | | 0.25 | 0.27 | 0.29 | 0.18 | 1.00 |
| ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES: | $\bar{X}$ | 0.01 | 0.08 | 0 | 0 | 1.17 |
| | (S.D.) | (0.26) | (0.57) | (0) | (0) | (2.61) |
| Direct Services ....................... | | 0.01 | 0.06 | 0 | 0 | 0.17 |
| Referral to Community Service ......... | | 0 | 0.02 | 0 | 0 | 0.17 |
| Counseling ............................ | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.83 |

[a] Excludes 31 comparison cases for whom field notes were not available

Table 20

t-Tests Between Units and Study Groups

on

Average Frequency of Each Type of Activity
(INVESTIGATION MODEL)

| Average frequency for each type of activity | Walnut Creek vs Stockton (df = 164) | | Walnut Creek vs Bakersfield (df = 125) | | Stockton vs Bakersfield (df = 195) | | Experimental vs Comparison (df = 249) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | t | p | t | p | t | p | t | p |
| Evidence Collection ................... | 1.531 | p=.128 | -0.011 | p>.500 | -1.946 | p=.054 | 0.420 | p>.500 |
| Surveillance ......................... | -2.024* | p<.050 | -4.206*** | p<.001 | -4.811*** | p<.001 | 1.255 | p=.211 |
| Information Exchanges With Law Enforcement ...................... | 5.259*** | p<.001 | 5.155*** | p<.001 | 1.385 | p=.168 | 0.072 | p>.500 |
| Information Exchanges With CDC Staff . | 3.627*** | p<.001 | 1.721 | p=.088 | -2.389* | p<.050 | 1.214 | p=.227 |
| Information Exchanges With Other Individuals ...................... | 1.397 | p=.165 | -0.249 | p>.500 | -2.155* | p<.050 | -0.963 | p=.337 |
| Arrest and Charge Processing Activities | -1.188 | p=.237 | -4.909*** | p<.001 | -5.918*** | p<.001 | -1.438 | p=.152 |
| Check-up Contacts by Parole Agent .... | -3.615*** | p<.001 | -3.591*** | p<.001 | 0.359 | p>.500 | -6.341*** | p<.001 |
| Required (Per P&CSD Policy) Activities | -0.160 | p>.500 | 0.853 | p=.396 | 1.110 | p=.269 | -2.937* | p<.050 |
| Assistance Activities ............... | 1.575 | p=.118 | 1.286 | p=.201 | 0 | — | -5.830*** | p<.001 |

Table 21

Average Percent of Total Activities for Each Type of Activity
by Study Group

(INVESTIGATION MODEL)

| Type of activity | | Experimental units | | | | Com-parison units N=6[b] |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | Total N=244 | Walnut Creek N=48 | Stock-ton N=117[a] | Bakers-field N=79 | |
| EVIDENCE COLLECTION ACTIVITIES: | X̄ | 20.8 | 20.7 | 22.6 | 18.1 | 5.1 |
| | (S.D.) | (18.6) | (20.5) | (20.4) | (13.8) | (6.6) |
| Interviews ......................... | | 6.2 | 7.2 | 8.3 | 2.6 | 0.8 |
| Pretext Interviews and Representation.. | | 0.1 | 0 | 0.1 | 0 | 0 |
| Informant Interviews and Usages ........ | | 1.0 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 1.9 | 0 |
| Resource Material Checks .............. | | 4.1 | 8.3 | 2.5 | 4.0 | 0 |
| Evidence Processing .................. | | 0.8 | 1.5 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 0 |
| Anti-Narcotic Testing ................ | | 2.2 | 0.3 | 1.9 | 3.8 | 3.7 |
| Search and Seizure of Evidence......... | | 6.4 | 3.3 | 8.8 | 4.9 | 0.6 |
| SURVEILLANCE: | X̄ | 11.7 | 1.7 | 9.9 | 20.5 | 0 |
| | (S.D.) | (16.0) | (4.5) | (14.5) | (17.8) | (0) |
| Fixed Surveillance ................... | | 3.5 | 0.1 | 4.0 | 4.9 | 0 |
| Spot Surveillance ................... | | 6.6 | 1.6 | 4.6 | 12.6 | 0 |
| Tailing Surveillance ................. | | 1.6 | 0 | 1.3 | 3.0. | 0 |
| INFORMATION EXCHANGES WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT: | X̄ | 28.9 | 46.4 | 30.1 | 16.3 | 14.8 |
| | (S.D.) | (24.8) | (26.0) | (24.7) | (15.7) | (21.9) |
| Current Suspected Criminal Involvement/ Parole Violation ................. | | 21.6 | 31.6 | 24.4 | 11.3 | 1.9 |
| Recent Arrest and After-Arrest Processing ...................... | | 6.7 | 14.4 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 12.3 |
| General Background or Non-Criminal Status Factors ................. | | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 0.2 | 0.6 |
| INFORMATION EXCHANGES WITH CDC STAFF: | X̄ | 10.6 | 14.7 | 9.5 | 9.7 | 1.2 |
| | (S.D.) | (15.4) | (16.3) | (15.6) | (14.1) | (2.8) |
| Current Suspected Criminal Involvement/ Parole Violation ................. | | 5.1 | 8.6 | 4.3 | 4.1 | 1.2 |
| Recent Arrest and After-Arrest Processing ...................... | | 2.6 | 3.7 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 0 |
| General Background or Non-Criminal Status Factors ................. | | 2.9 | 2.4 | 3.3 | 2.7 | 0 |

Table 21 - continued

| Type of activity | Experimental units | | | | Comparison units N=6b |
| | Total N=244 | Walnut Creek N=48 | Stock-ton N=117a | Bakers-field N=79 | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| INFORMATION EXCHANGES WITH OTHER INDIVIDUALS: X̄ | 35.8 | 36.6 | 33.5 | 38.7 | 25.4 |
| (S.D.) | (64.3) | (84.3) | (64.5) | (47.7) | (33.2) |
| Current Suspected Criminal Involvement/ Parole Violation .................. | 3.6 | 3.0 | 2.4 | 5.7 | 0 |
| Recent Arrest and After-Arrest Processing ...................... | 0.5 | 1.4 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 2.2 |
| General Background or Non-Criminal Status Factors .................... | 31.7 | 32.2 | 30.9 | 32.5 | 23.2 |
| ARREST AND CHARGE PROCESSING ACTIVITIES: X̄ | 8.6 | 3.1 | 6.0 | 15.7 | 6.4 |
| (S.D.) | (14.9) | (8.0) | (9.9) | (20.6) | (9.4) |
| Apprehension .......................... | 4.0 | 0.4 | 4.6 | 5.2 | 0.6 |
| Required After-Arrest Processing ...... | 4.0 | 2.6 | 0.7 | 9.7 | 5.2 |
| Prosecution Assistance ................ | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.6 |
| CHECK-UP CONTACTS BY PAROLE AGENT: X̄ | 9.5 | 2.9 | 13.2 | 8.2 | 45.5 |
| (S.D.) | (13.6) | (9.3) | (16.3) | (8.8) | (42.5) |
| Attempted Check-Up Contacts ........... | 4.5 | 1.7 | 6.8 | 2.9 | 6.3 |
| Actual Check-Up Contacts .............. | 5.0 | 1.2 | 6.4 | 5.2 | 39.2 |
| REQUIRED (PER P&CSD POLICY) ACTIVITIES: X̄ | 2.0 | 2.3 | 2.2 | 1.7 | 19.4 |
| (S.D.) | (4.9) | (5.1) | (5.0) | (4.9) | (36.4) |
| Required Permission or Notification ... | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.1 | 0 |
| Required Release Matters .............. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Required Administrative Processing .... | 2.0 | 2.3 | 2.2 | 1.6 | 19.4 |
| ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES: X̄ | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0 | 0 | 2.4 |
| (S.D.) | (1.8) | (4.1) | (0) | (0) | (5.3) |
| Direct Services ....................... | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0 | 0 | 0.3 |
| Referral to Community Service ......... | 0 | 0.2 | 0 | 0 | 0.3 |
| Counseling ............................ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.7 |

a/ Excludes 1 case which could not be calculated
b/ Excludes 31 comparison cases for whom field notes were not available.

Table 22

t Test Between Parole Units and Study Groups

on

Average Percent of Total Activities For Each Type of Activity
(INVESTIGATION MODEL)

| Average percent of total activities for each type of activity | Walnut Creek vs. Stockton (df = 163) | | Walnut Creek vs. Bakersfield (df = 125) | | Stockton vs. Bakersfield (df = 194) | | Experimental vs. Comparison (df = 248) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | t | p | t | p | t | p | t | p |
| Evidence Collection ..................... | -0.560 | p .500 | 0.830 | p=.409 | 1.713 | p=.089 | 2.050* | p<.050 |
| Surveillance .......................... | -3.783*** | p<.001 | -7.105*** | p<.001 | -4.559*** | p .001 | 1.794 | p=.075 |
| Information Exchanges With Law Enforcement | 3.759*** | p<.001 | 8.056*** | p<.001 | 4.367*** | p .001 | 1.363 | p=.175 |
| Information Exchanges With CDC Staff ... | 1.904 | p=.059 | 1.805 | p=.074 | -0.101 | p .500 | 1.482 | p=.140 |
| Information Exchanges With Other Individuals | 0.252 | p>.500 | -0.177 | p>.500 | -0.605 | p .500 | 0.395 | p>.500 |
| Arrest and Charge Processing Activities. | -1.748 | p=.083 | -4.023*** | p<.001 | -4.398*** | p .001 | 0.350 | p>.500 |
| Check-up Contacts by Parole Agent ...... | -4.074*** | p<.001 | -3.157** | p<.010 | 2.476* | p .050 | -5.798*** | p<.001 |
| Required (Per P&CSD Policy) Activities . | 0.133 | p>.500 | 0.703 | p=.484 | 0.733 | p=.465 | -5.582*** | p<.001 |
| Assistance Activities ................. | 1.568 | p=.119 | 1.286 | p=.201 | 0 | - | -2.752*** | p<.010 |

regular supervision (e.g., collaterals of the parolee), than from primary sources such as victims, witnesses, and residence searches.

Comparison to regular supervision activities. Investigation activities (i.e., gathering information) also occur under regular supervision. The difference between the high control approach to investigation and the regular susupervision approach to investigation, as previously noted in Chapter I, was "when" it occurred (i.e., before or after an arrest). It is also likely that the investigative model tested here differed from regular supervision investigative activities in the "methods" used to collect information and in the proportion of the total supervision activity expended investigating.

To determine whether the investigation model was different from regular supervision, this evaluation proposed to compare the activities performed on the 245 experimental cases to the activities performed by regular supervision agents on the comparison cases. However, as described in the "Methodology" chapter, the comparison units failed to identify a large number of high risk cases which needed investigation (i.e., cases for whom a need existed to verify or disclaim suspected criminal involvement). Only 37 of the total 120 comparison cases referred could serve as a comparison for the investigative model. Furthermore, agent field notes on only six of the 37 cases were available and usable for this analysis. With such a small sample, it is questionable whether the activity data tabulated is

representative of supervision activities performed on most high risk cases receiving regular supervision.

The activity frequency data for these six comparison cases are shown in the last column in Table 17 (showing the most common activities engaged in across cases), Table 19 (showing the most frequently conducted activity types) and Table 21 (showing the most characteristic activity done on a case). These calculations were compared to the activity type distribution in each table for the "total experimental group" (N=245). Statistical tests of the significance of these differences, using either a test of the difference between proportions (z) or a test of the difference between means (t), were calculated and are reported in the "Experimental vs. Comparison" column of Tables 18, 20 and 22. An adjustment (i.e., correction for continuity) in the non-parametric "z" test was made to allow for the small sample size. The large variances associated with some of the means upon which a parametric "t" test was calculated indicates that the assumptions of homogeneity of variance and normality requisite to the application of the "t" test were sometimes not met. Although there is some evidence that large departures from normality will not seriously affect the estimation of probabilities for the two-tailed "t" test conducted here (Ferguson, 1976, p. 157), the results from these parametric "t" tests were more cautiosly interpreted.

The profile of the activities performed on the six comparison cases presents a sharp contrast to the profile of the investigation model. The only type of activity common to most of the comparison cases were "Check-up contacts" (Table 17, 83.3% of cases with one or more) and "Information exhanges with other individuals" (50.0% of cases with one or more). None of the other seven types of activities occurred on a majority of the cases. Check-up activities and collateral information exchanges also occurred with the greatest average frequency (means of 7.17 check-up contacts and 9.00 information exchanges with other individuals, Table 19), and comprised the largest average proportion of total activities performed under regular supervision (45.5% check-up contacts and 25.4% information exchanges with other individuals, Table 21).

Differences between investigation activity types and regular supervision activity types on all three measures consistently showed more of the total cases involved (Table 17), and more of the total activities (Tables 19 and 21) comprised "Check-up", "Required per P&CSD policy" and "Assistance" contacts under regular parole than occurred in the investigative model. The information gathering activities which characterized the investigative model including "Evidence collection", "Surveillance", "Information exchanges with law enforcement", and "Information exchanges with correctional staff" did not commonly occur across regular supervision cases (Table 17). Two types of activities were found to be equally characteristic of both

supervision types -- "Information exchanges with other individuals" and "Arrest and charge processing" activities.

In summary, if the six comparison cases can be considered representative of the high risk cases under regular supervision, this analysis has shown that the frequency and type of activities performed under the investigation model were different from those traditionally performed under regular supervision. Investigation activities comprised efforts to collect information from various primary and secondary sources. In contrast, regular supervision comprised those activities which agents often call administrative "case-carrying responsibilities," including making check-up contacts, fulfilling various administrative policy requirements on the case, and gathering information from collaterals of the parolee. (Note that the collection of information from collaterals was the one type of activity highly characteristic of both regular and investigative parole).

Comparison across units. An examination of the types of activities performed at each site showed that the three sites differed on the methods used to conduct their investigations. Table 17 (showing the most common activities engaged in across cases), Table 19 (showing the most frequent activities conducted), and Table 21 (showing the most characteristic activity performed during an investigation) were examined for differences across the three parole unit demonstration sites. Statistical tests of the significance of the differences between pairs of the units (Walnut Creek vs. Stockton, Walnut Creek vs.

Bakersfield, and Stockton vs. Bakersfield) were calculated using either a "z" test or a "t" test. These values are summarized in tables following each measure (Tables 18, 20, and 22).

The types of activity common to most cases at WALNUT CREEK were "Information exchanges with law enforcement" (89.6% of the total cases), and "Evidence collection" activities (70.8%) (Table 17). The most frequently occurring activities (Table 19) which also accounted for most of the activities performed on a case (Table 21) were "Information exchanges with others" (36.6%), "Evidence collection" activities (20.7%), and "Information exchanges with correctional staff" (14.7%). Thus, the Walnut Creek site primarily collected and integrated information available from a number of outside sources.

The types of activity common to most cases at the STOCKTON site also included "Information exchanges with law enforcement" (81.4% of the total cases) and "Evidence collection" activities (74.6%). The most frequently occurring activities which also accounted for the majority of investigative work done on a case included "Information exchanges with others" (33.5% of the total activities), "Information exchanges with law enforcement (30.1%), "Evidence collection" activities (22.6%) and "Check-up contacts" (13.2%). Thus, information gathering was also a major part of the activities of the Stockton unit, but to a lesser extent as it also frequently conducted direct check-up contacts with the parolee.

The types of activity common to most cases at the BAKERSFIELD site included "Information exchanges with others" (84.8% of the total cases), "Evidence collection" activities (81.0%), "Information exchanges with law enforcement" (77.2%), "Surveillance" (70.9%), "Arrest and charge processing" activities (64.6%), and "Check-up contacts" (59.5%). The most frequently occurring activities which also accounted for most of the investigative work done on a case included "Information exchanges with others" (38.7% of the total activities), "Surveillance" (20.5%), "Evidence collection" activities (18.1%), and "Arrest and charge processing" activities (15.7%). The Bakersfield site was the most diversified, i.e., it applied a variety of investigative type activities to each of it's cases and apparently actively participated in the arrest and charge processing stages.

Comparing all three sites on each of the nine major activity types for each of the three measures showed several large, statistically significant differences. As stated earlier, "Required per P&CSD policy" activities and "Assistance" activities almost never occurred in the investigative model, and this was true across all three sites. Also no difference was found in the "Evidence collection activities" which occurred for most of the cases investigated and with equal frequency across all three sites. However, on the remaining six activity types there were several large differences which were statistically significant. Together these differences indicate that the Walnut

Creek site used a more restrictive, passive, information gathering approach and the Bakersfield site used a more diversified and assertive information gathering approach. The approach used at Stockton with a few distinctions resembled the approach used at Bakersfield.

This general difference is illustrated by a number of findings. For example, the Walnut Creek site more frequently engaged in law enforcement information exchanges (46.4% of total activities) than either of the other two sites (30.1% Stockton, 16.3% Bakersfield). Also the Walnut Creek site more frequently engaged in information exchanges with other correctional staff (14.7% of total activities) than either of the other two sites (9.5% Stockton, 9.7% Bakersfield). In the opposite direction, Walnut Creek engaged in less surveillant activities and conducted fewer direct check-up contacts with the parolee than either of the other two sites.

In strong contrast to the Walnut Creek model was the Bakersfield site. The Bakersfield unit more frequently engaged in undercover surveillance activity (20.5% of the total activities) than the other two sites (9.9% Stockton, 1.7% Walnut Creek); and more frequently engaged in making arrests and processing charges (15.7% of the total activities) than the other two sites (6.0% Stockton, 3.1% Walnut Creek). Finally, Bakersfield attempted to develop collateral information (i.e., "Information exchanges with other individuals") on almost all of it's cases (84.8% of total cases) while the other sites used this

source on only half of it's cases (52.5% Stockton, 47.9% Walnut Creek).

The Stockton site fell inbetween the Walnut Creek and Bakersfield sites in the mix and frequency of activity types it engaged in, but most closely resembled the Bakersfield site.

It is also noted that the Walnut Creek site averaged over twice as many total activities for each thirty day period a case was under investigation (16.3 activities per 30 days, Table 16) than either Stockton (7.4) or Bakersfield (7.8). The difference is likely attributable to the larger number of "Information exchanges with law enforcement" which are less time consuming than the more frequently occurring surveillant activities of both the Stockton and Bakersfield sites.

It is clear from the evidence presented that the three demonstration sites performed a different mix of investigation activities. In an attempt to further (and more generally) describe the obviously different operational styles of each parole unit, comparisons were also made on five organizational variables describing the project including (1) integration with the parent parole unit, (2) team approach to conducting investigations, (3) planning of investigation activities, (4) visibility to the community, and (5) coordination with law enforcement. The findings of that special analysis, reported in a separate paper (see Buchanan and Star, 1980), were congruent with the empirical differences in activities described above. A brief, overall description of the operation of each unit was developed as a conclusion to that special analysis. It is presented below for the purpose of summarization.

Walnut Creek:    single agent performing "staff
                 like" function of collecting and
                 integrating information available
                 from secondary sources (primarily
                 law enforcement).

Stockton:        team of assertive, highly visible,
                 field agents collecting information
                 from primary data sources and highly
                 integrated with law enforcement
                 activities.

Bakersfield:     team of assertive field agents,
                 moderately independent of law
                 enforcement, collecting information
                 from a variety of primary data
                 sources and highly integrated with
                 the activities of regular agents in
                 the parent parole unit.

Chapter Summary.  This chapter described the operations
and activities of the investigative model of the High Control
Project. Two investigative agents working as a team within a 250-
300 mixed felon/non-felon parole unit typically completed their
investigations in sixty days and were able to take in six or
seven new cases for investigation per month. Cases taken under
investigation had been on parole for several months, and there
was current information either from a local law enforcement
agency or the regular supervising agent that the case was
reinvolved in criminal activity. The investigative model placed
high priority upon investigating three of the five kinds of
criminal/violational activities targeted -- violent/sexually
deviant activity (primarily weapon use and possession), narcotic
sales activity and absconding from parole supervision (only if
either of the two preceeding activities were also suspected).
The types of activities most often performed (including
surveillance, information exchanges with law enforcement and
collaterals, and other evidence gathering activities.) showed the
model to be congruent with its planned purpose of "gathering
information".

The types of activity performed in the investigation model
were found to differ significantly from those performed under
regular supervision. The information gathering activities which
characterized the investigation model including surveillance,
evidence collection and information exchanges with law
enforcement were not found to commonly occur under regular
supervision which was in contrast characterized by routine check-
up, administrative processing, and collateral contact activities.

Finally, several differences were identified across the
three demonstration sites which implemented the investigation
model in the manner of operation and the types of activity
performed. The Walnut Creek site primarily investigated cases
under the "violent/sexually deviant" selection criterion while
Stockton and Bakersfield were found to investigate a mix of the
targeted activities including "narcotic sales" and "absconding"
activity as well as "violent/sexually deviant" activity. Also
the Walnut Creek site in contrast to the Bakersfield and Stockton
sites engaged more frequently in information exchange (primarily
with law enforcement) activities, while the Bakersfield and
Stockton units which were more diversified in their approaches
more frequently performed surveillance, evidence collection, and
arrest activities.

# CHAPTER VII

## OUTCOME OF THE INVESTIGATION MODEL

The _first_, immediate, objective of the investigation model was to increase the parole agent's capability of verifying or disclaiming a parolee's involvement in one of several targeted criminal or violational activity areas. A _second_ objective was to increase the frequency and severity of the controls and sanctions applied to those parolees whose return to criminal activity was verified. A _third_, more intangible, objective was to increase the contribution of parole agents to the detection and prosecution of the suspected criminal or violational activity. This chapter empirically examines the effectiveness of the investigation model in achieving each of these three objectives by comparing the outcomes for the cases investigated to the outcomes for a similar group of cases not investigated.

The outcome of the 245 experimental cases investigated at the three demonstration sites through June 30, 1979 was compared to the outcome of 37 similar cases (the comparison group) also suspected of current re-involvement in a targeted criminal activity but not formally investigated under the project (see Table 6 for study group derivation; see Chapter V for test of comparability between study groups).

Outcome was calculated at the point of termination of the investigation. The charges and dispositions measured were those directly connected with the purpose of, and activities conducted

during, the investigation. (Note that the charges tabulated were those filed at the conclusion of the investigation; their dispositions were generally handed down some time after the termination of the investigation. All charges were followed until a known disposition could be tabulated). For the comparison group, outcomes and charges connected with the stated investigative purpose and occurring within 120 days following referral for investigation were determined. (Note that the 120 days was selected as a comparable follow-up period as the majority of the experimental case investigations were also completed within that period; see Table 8).

## Investigation Outcomes by Purpose

The "outcome of the investigation" reflects the extent to which the investigator agents were successful in collecting evidence which verifies (or disclaims) the type of criminal or violational activity suspected. It was then determined whether they were more successful at such verification than regular parole supervision agents were for the comparison group when using the more traditional investigative means and resources of regular parole.

To define and classify the various outcomes achieved at the end of the investigation, it was first necessary to define and classify the various "purposes" of the investigation. The major overall purpose of most of the investigations (Table 23) was to "verify or disclaim" one of the targeted types of criminal

or violational activity (43.3% of the total cases). For another one-quarter of the cases (24.1%) the purpose was to "locate and apprehend" the parolee, in addition to verifying any suspected criminal activity. Together, the proportion of cases requiring some kind of evidence to be collected for verification purposes amounted to over two-thirds of the cases (67.4%). The purpose of the remaining one-quarter (24.9%) of the cases was simply to locate and apprehend the parolee (i.e., no evidence needed to be collected). The same mix of investigative purposes also held for the 37 comparison cases as indicated by the lack of large and statistically significant differences between the two groups on this variable (chi square test, Table 23).

The measurement of investigation outcomes was complicated by the fact that 61.6% of the total experimental cases were investigated for two or more different purposes (Table 24). That is, either two or more different types of criminal activity needed verification; or (as the preceding table illustrated) "locate and apprehension", in addition to "verification", was also a purpose of the investigation. Because most of the investigations were for more than one purpose and because differing success rates were likely to be associated with the various different types of criminal activity investigated, it was important to tabulate and analyze outcomes by the various specific purpose designated for the investigation, in addition to measuring the overall outcome.

Table 23

Major Purpose of Investigation
by Study Group

(INVESTIGATION MODEL)

| Major purpose of investigation | Experimental | | | | | | | | Comparison | |
| | Total | | Walnut Creek | | Stockton | | Bakersfield | | | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total, all cases | 245 | 100.0 | 48 | 100.0 | 118 | 100.0 | 79 | 100.0 | 37 | 100.0 |
| Collect specific kind of evidence [a] | 7 | 2.8 | 3 | 6.2 | 4 | 3.4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Verify general activity | 12 | 4.9 | 1 | 2.1 | 7 | 5.9 | 4 | 5.1 | 2 | 5.4 |
| Locate and apprehend only | 61 | 24.9 | 12 | 25.0 | 29 | 24.6 | 20 | 25.3 | 6 | 16.2 |
| Verify/disclaim involvement in | 106 | 43.3 | 26 | 54.2 | 53 | 44.9 | 27 | 34.2 | 23 | 62.2 |
| Drug trafficking....... | (30) | | (2) | | (20) | | (8) | | (7) | |
| Property/fraud crime... | (8) | | (3) | | (3) | | (2) | | (2) | |
| Assault/robbery........ | (17) | | (8) | | (6) | | (3) | | (1) | |
| Sexually deviant activity............ | (7) | | (1) | | (4) | | (2) | | (3) | |
| Weapons use or possession.......... | (5) | | (2) | | (2) | | (1) | | (2) | |
| Prison gang activity... | (12) | | (0) | | (11) | | (1) | | (1) | |
| Combination of criminal activity............. | (27) | | (10) | | (7) | | (10) | | (7) | |
| Verify/disclaim and apprehend/locate for | 59 | 24.1 | 6 | 12.5 | 25 | 21.2 | 28 | 35.4 | 6 | 16.2 |
| Drug trafficking....... | (23) | | (2) | | (9) | | (12) | | (0) | |
| Property/fraud crime... | (9) | | (0) | | (5) | | (4) | | (1) | |
| Assault/robbery........ | (2) | | (0) | | (0) | | (2) | | (0) | |
| Sexually deviant activity............ | (1) | | (0) | | (1) | | (0) | | (0) | |
| Weapons use or possession.......... | (3) | | (0) | | (0) | | (3) | | (0) | |
| Prison gang activity... | (3) | | (0) | | (3) | | (0) | | (1) | |
| Combination of criminal activity............. | (18) | | (4) | | (7) | | (7) | | (4) | |

[a] Due to small expected frequencies associated with cells, the "Collect specific evidence" and "Verify general activity category were combined into an "Other" category for $X^2$ test

Experimental/Comparison group: $X^2$= 4.629, df=4, p= .250
Walnut Creek/Stockton/Bakersfield: $X^2$=11.362, df=6, p= .100

To conduct that analysis, outcomes for "locate" and "apprehension" purposes and outcomes for verifying each of the different types of criminal activity were separately tabulated, in addition to an "overall", most severe, outcome for the entire investigation. The large, general, "violent/sexually deviant" category of criminal activity was separated into "Assaults", "Sexual deviant activity", "Robbery", and "Weapon use/possession". The "Property/fraud" category of criminal activity was separated into "Property" offenses and "Forgery/check" offenses. Finally, investigating "General, non-criminal activity" and "Drinking Excessively" were additional purposes separately tabulated as they were sometimes cited as the purpose of the investigation. After sub-dividing the purposes in this manner outcomes for a total of thirteen specific types of purposes were tabulated; however, only eight of the thirteen were applicable to a sufficient number of cases (i.e., 25 or more of the total experimental and comparison cases, Table 25) to warrent analysis. The eight investigative purposes analyzed included:

-verify narcotic sales
-verify assaults
-verify property/thefts
-verify prison gang affiliation
-verify weapon use or possession
-verify general (non-criminal) activity
-locate subject
-apprehend subject

The outcome of the investigation was defined by five exhaustive and mutually exclusive categories including:

Table 24

Number of Investigation Purposes Per Case
by Study Group

(INVESTIGATION MODEL)

| Number of investigation purposes per case | Experimental | | | | | | | | Comparison | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | Total | | Walnut Creek | | Stockton | | Bakersfield | | | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| Total, all cases | 245 | 100.0 | 48 | 100.0 | 118 | 100.0 | 79 | 100.0 | 37 | 100.0 |
| One purpose............. | 94 | 38.4 | 21 | 43.7 | 53 | 44.9 | 20 | 25.3 | 18 | 48.6 |
| Two purposes............ | 112 | 45.7 | 23 | 47.9 | 48 | 40.7 | 41 | 51.9 | 15 | 40.5 |
| Three purposes.......... | 29 | 11.8 | 2 | 4.2 | 13 | 11.0 | 14 | 17.7 | 2 | 5.4 |
| Four purposes.......... | 8 | 3.3 | 1 | 2.1 | 4 | 3.4 | 3 | 3.8 | 2 | 5.4 |
| Five purposes........... | 2 | 0.8 | 1 | 2.1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1.3 | 0 | 0 |

a] Due to large number of cells with small expected frequencies, "three", "four" and "five" purposes categories were combined into a "three or More" category for significance test.

Experimental/Comparison groups: $X^2 =$ 1.595, df=2, p $\cong$ .500

Walnut Creek/Stockton/Bakersfied units: $X^2 =$ 10.799*, df=4, p. $<$ .050

Table 25

Number of Cases Investigated For Each Specific Type of Purpose
by Study Group

(INVESTIGATION MODEL)

| Specific type of investigation purpose | Total study cases N=282 | | Experimental units N=245 | | Comparison units N=37 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Purpose includes | Not a purpose | Purpose includes | Not a purpose | Purpose includes | Not a purpose |
| 1. Verify Narcotic Sales Activity | 83 | 199 | 75 | 170 | 8 | 29 |
| 2. Verify Non-Sexual Assault Activity | 27 | 255 | 23 | 222 | 4 | 33 |
| 3. Verify Sexually Deviant Activity | 16 } 57 | 266 | 13 } 48 | 232 | 3 } 9 | 34 |
| 4. Verify Robbery Activity | 14 | 268 | 12 | 233 | 2 | 35 |
| 5. Verify Property/Theft Activity | 29 } 31 | 253 | 26 } 28 | 219 | 3 } 3 | 34 |
| 6. Verify Forgery/Checks Activity | 2 | 280 | 2 | 243 | 0 | 37 |
| 7. Verify Prison Gang Activity | 32 | 250 | 29 | 216 | 3 | 34 |
| 8. Verify Excessive Drinking Activity | 2 | 280 | 1 | 244 | 1 | 36 |
| 9. Verify Weapon Use/Possession | 42 | 240 | 31 | 214 | 11 | 26 |
| 10. Verify General (non-criminal) Activity | 33 | 249 | 27 | 218 | 6 | 31 |
| 11. Locate Subject | 125 | 157 | 113 | 132 | 12 | 25 |
| 12. Arrest Subject | 98 | 184 | 89 | 156 | 9 | 28 |
| 13. Other purpose | 6 | 276 | 6 | 239 | 0 | 37 |

1. In custody for suspected criminal activity
2. In custody for other, non-suspected, criminal activity
3. Other successful outcomes
   (includes case located, apprehended, evidence collected to disclaim criminal involvement, informant purpose achieved and gang involvement verified)
4. Purpose not achieved
   (includes no evidence available and evidence insufficient to substantiate)
5. Terminated before completion
   (includes transfers, early discharge, discharge at end of term, discharge to relinquish jurisdiction, project terminated)

"Overall" outcomes for the 245 investigations are examined first, followed by a sub-sample analysis of the outcomes associated with the eight specific investigative purposes.

Table 26 shows the overall investigative outcome for the 245 investigations conducted. The high control agents successfully verified the suspected criminal or violational involvement (leading to placement in custody) for thirty percent of the cases investigated (30.2%). Another one-fourth (26.5%) of the cases were also placed in custody but for a type criminal or violational activity other than that targeted by the investigation. Thus, while the high control agents were able to gather evidence of illegal activities for the majority of cases, it was not always for the type of activity suspected at the onset of the investigation. The most common example of this was investigations for the purpose of verifying narcotic "sales" which instead often resulted in an arrest for narcotic "possession". Another ten percent of the cases experienced a miscellaneous but successful type of outcome. Unsuccessful

outcomes due to lack of available evidence or insufficient evidence accounted for one-quarter (24.1%) of the investigation outcomes. Finally almost ten percent (9.0%) of the investigations had to be prematurely terminated before completion because of either case transfer or termination of parole status.

Compared to the outcomes of the 37 comparison cases, Table 26 shows the experimental group experienced significantly more successful types of investigation outcomes. The difference between the experimental and comparison group on the five category outcome variable was statistically significant at the .01 level using a chi square test. Collapsing the variable into a dichotomized successful versus unsuccessful comparison showed 66.9% of the experimental group compared to 35.1% of the comparison group experienced a "successful" outcome (defined as placement in custody for some type of criminal or violational activity or other miscellaneous successful outcome).

Table 27 shows the outcomes associated with eight of the more frequently occurring specific types of investigative purposes. First, it is noted that the high control agents were almost always successful in locating (92.0%) or apprehending (88.8%) a suspect. This high success rate should be interpreted cautiously as not all the cases located or apprehended were either absconders or otherwise missing at the start of the investigative period. Instead, "locate and apprehend" was often added as a purpose of the investigation when the high control agent judged the seriousness of the suspected activity warranted

Table 26

Overall Outcome of Investigation
by Study Group

(INVESTIGATION MODEL)

| Overall outcome of investigation | Experimental | | | | | | | | Comparison | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | Total | | Walnut Creek | | Stockton | | Bakersfield | | | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| Total, all cases | 245 | 100.0 | 48 | 100.0 | 118 | 100.0 | 79 | 100.0 | 37 | 100.0 |
| **In custody for suspected criminal activity** | 74 | 30.2 | 17 | 35.4 | 27 | 22.9 | 30 | 38.0 | 7 | 18.9 |
| Charges pending......(11) | | | (3) | | (7) | | (1) | | (0) | |
| Jail sentence (only). (5) | | | (2) | | (1) | | (2) | | (1) | |
| Board-ordered return to prison..........(37) | | | (5) | | (15) | | (17) | | (2) | |
| New court commitment to prison..........(21) | | | (7) | | (4) | | (10) | | (4) | |
| **In custody for non-suspected criminal activity** | 65 | 26.5 | 6 | 12.5 | 35 | 29.7 | 24 | 30.4 | 5 | 13.5 |
| Charges pending...... (9) | | | (0) | | (8) | | (1) | | (1) | |
| Jail sentence (only).(20) | | | (1) | | (17) | | (2) | | (1) | |
| Board ordered return to prison..........(22) | | | (4) | | (3) | | (15) | | (2) | |
| New court commitment to prison..........(14) | | | (1) | | (7) | | (6) | | (1) | |
| **Other successful outcomes** | 25 | 10.2 | 4 | 8.3 | 16 | 13.6 | 5 | 6.3 | 1 | 2.7 |
| Located/apprehended..(13) | | | (2) | | (6) | | (5) | | (1) | |
| Informant purpose achieved.......... (5) | | | (2) | | (3) | | (0) | | (0) | |
| Evidence collected to negate criminal activity........... (5) | | | (0) | | (5) | | (0) | | (0) | |
| Prison gang involvement verified...... (2) | | | (0) | | (2) | | (0) | | (0) | |

Table 26 - continued

| Overall outcome of investigation | Experimental | | | | | | | | Comparison | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | | Walnut Creek | | Stockton | | Bakersfield | | | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| Investigation purpose not achieved (unsuccessful outcome) | 59 | 24.1 | 16 | 33.4 | 29 | 24.6 | 14 | 17.7 | 18 | 48.6 |
| Evidence collected was insufficient to substantiate........... | (21) | | (9) | | (8) | | (4) | | (5) | |
| No evidence available (all leads exhausted)........ | (29) | | (4) | | (17) | | (8) | | (6) | |
| Other unsuccessful outcome | (9) | | (3) | | (4) | | (2) | | (7) | |
| Terminated before investigation completed | 22 | 9.0 | 5 | 10.4 | 11 | 9.3 | 6 | 7.6 | 6 | 16.2 |
| Transferred............... | (6) | | (3) | | (0) | | (3) | | (2) | |
| Discharged early.......... | (3) | | (1) | | (2) | | (0) | | (0) | |
| Discharged at end of term. | (6) | | (1) | | (3) | | (2) | | (2) | |
| Discharged to relinquish jurisdiction........... | (1) | | (0) | | (0) | | (1) | | (1) | |
| Project terminated........ | (5) | | (0) | | (5) | | (0) | | (0) | |
| Other.................... | (1) | | (0) | | (1) | | (0) | | (1) | |

Experimental/Comparison groups: $X^2 = 14.379^{**}$, df=4, p<.010
Walnut Creek/Stockton/Bakersfield units: $X^2 = 14.513$, df=8, p= .075

placement in custody as a precautionary measure. Also, this high success rate should not be interpreted to mean that the agents are more successful than the police in locating and arresting suspects. A police detective attempts to attach a known criminal incident with a large citizen population, while the parole agent attempts to attach a known suspect with any illegal incident. As the suspect is already known, it is to be expected that agents would be more successful at making an arrest. Second, it is noted that the high control agents were usually successful (66.6%) in verifying the non-criminal general activity of the parolee (e.g., residence and employment) as such information is oftentimes known before the investigation.

Of the various types of criminal activity investigated, the high control agents were most successful in verifying property/theft activity (34.6% placed in custody for that activity); and next most successful in verifying narcotic sales activity (17.3%) and weapon use or possession (25.8%). Small sample sizes prevented an analysis of the comparison group outcomes on the eight specific types of investigative purposes.

It can be concluded from this analysis that the investigation model is associated with significantly more successful attempts to verify and place cases in custody for suspected illegal activities than occurs under regular supervision. The implication is that high control agents using special investigative techniques can collect evidence which will increase the verification of returns to criminal or violational

## Table 27
### Outcome for Selected Specific Types of Investigation Purposes by Study Group
(INVESTIGATION MODEL)

| Outcome for selected specific types of investigation purposes a/ | Total study cases | | Experimental units | | Comparison units | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| **VERIFY NARCOTIC SALES ACTIVITY** | 83 | 100.0 | 75 | 100.0 | 8 | 100.0 |
| In custody for suspected criminal activity... | 13 | 15.7 | 13 | 17.3 | 0 | 0 |
| In custody for non-suspected criminal activity | 18 | 21.7 | 16 | 21.3 | 2 | 25.0 |
| Other successful outcome..................... | 2 | 2.4 | 2 | 2.7 | 0 | 0 |
| Evidence insufficient to substantiate........ | 21 | 25.3 | 18 | 24.0 | 3 | 37.5 |
| No evidence available (all leads exhausted).. | 24 | 28.9 | 21 | 28.0 | 3 | 37.5 |
| Terminated before investigation completed.... | 5 | 6.0 | 5 | 6.7 | 0 | 0 |
| **VERIFY NON-SEXUAL ASSAULT ACTIVITY** | 27 | 100.0 | 23 | 100.0 | 4 | 100.0 |
| In custody for suspected criminal activity... | 10 | 37.0 | 8 | 34.8 | 2 | 50.0 |
| In custody for non-suspected criminal activity | 2 | 7.4 | 2 | 8.7 | 0 | 0 |
| Other successful outcome..................... | 3 | 11.1 | 3 | 13.0 | 0 | 0 |
| Evidence insufficient to substantiate........ | 8 | 29.6 | 6 | 26.1 | 2 | 50.0 |
| No evidence available (all leads exhausted).. | 4 | 14.8 | 4 | 17.4 | 0 | 0 |
| **VERIFY PROPERTY/THEFT ACTIVITY** | 29 | 100.0 | 26 | 100.0 | 0 | 100.0 |
| In custody for suspected criminal activity... | 9 | 31.0 | 9 | 34.6 | 0 | 0 |
| In custody for non-suspected criminal activity | 5 | 17.2 | 4 | 15.4 | 1 | 33.3 |
| Other successful outcome..................... | 3 | 10.3 | 3 | 11.5 | 0 | 0 |
| Evidence insufficient to substantiate........ | 6 | 20.7 | 5 | 19.2 | 1 | 33.3 |
| No evidence available (all leads exhausted).. | 6 | 20.7 | 5 | 19.2 | 1 | 33.3 |
| **VERIFY PRISON GANG ACTIVITY** | 31 | 100.0 | 28 | 100.0 | 3 | 100.0 |
| Informant purpose achieved................... | 1 | 3.2 | 1 | 3.6 | 0 | 0 |
| Gang involvement verified.................... | 11 | 35.5 | 11 | 39.3 | 0 | 0 |
| Informant purpose not achieved............... | 1 | 3.2 | 1 | 3.6 | 0 | 0 |
| Gang involvement not verified................ | 15 | 48.4 | 12 | 42.8 | 3 | 100.0 |
| Terminated before investigation completed.... | 3 | 9.7 | 3 | 10.7 | 0 | 0 |
| **VERIFY WEAPON USE/POSSESSION** | 42 | 100.0 | 31 | 100.0 | 11 | 100.0 |
| In custody for suspected criminal activity... | 10 | 23.8 | 8 | 25.8 | 2 | 18.2 |
| In custody for non-suspected criminal activity | 2 | 4.8 | 2 | 6.4 | 0 | 0 |
| Evidence insufficient to substantiate........ | 11 | 26.2 | 10 | 32.3 | 1 | 9.1 |
| No evidence available (all leads exhausted).. | 19 | 45.2 | 11 | 35.5 | 8 | 72.7 |

Table 27 - continued

| Outcome for selected types of investigation purposes | Total study cases | | Experimental units | | Comparison units | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| **VERIFY GENERAL (NON-CRIMINAL) ACTIVITY** | 33 | 100.0 | 27 | 100.0 | 6 | 100.0 |
| In custody for suspected activity......... | 10 | 30.3 | 8 | 29.6 | 2 | 33.3 |
| In custody for non-suspected activity..... | 6 | 18.2 | 6 | 22.2 | 0 | 0 |
| Information collected to update status.... | 4 | 12.1 | 4 | 14.8 | 0 | 0 |
| Evidence insufficient to substantiate..... | 3 | 9.1 | 2 | 7.4 | 1 | 16.7 |
| No evidence available..................... | 8 | 24.2 | 5 | 18.5 | 3 | 50.0 |
| Terminated before investigation completed. | 2 | 6.1 | 2 | 7.4 | 0 | 0 |
| **LOCATE** | 125 | 100.0 | 113 | 100.0 | 12 | 100.0 |
| Located................................... | 110 | 88.0 | 104 | 92.0 | 6 | 50.0 |
| Not located............................... | 15 | 12.0 | 9 | 8.0 | 6 | 50.0 |
| **APPREHEND** | 98 | 100.0 | 89 | 100.0 | 9 | 100.0 |
| Arrested.................................. | 84 | 85.7 | 79 | 88.8 | 5 | 55.5 |
| Not arrested.............................. | 14 | 14.3 | 10 | 11.2 | 4 | 44.4 |

a/ Types of purposes selected for this sub-analysis includes those occurring in at least 25 or more cases (see Table 25)

activity, and relatedly increase the number of cases placed in custody for such activity. Whether this increased verification is associated with more frequent or more serious criminal and/or revocation charges is examined next.

## Criminal and Revocation Charges, Dispositions

A second objective of the investigation model was to increase the frequency and severity of the sanctions applied to parolees whose return to criminal or violational activity had been verified. This section assesses the achievement of that objective by comparing the frequency and severity of the charges and dispositions received in connection with the investigation purpose by the 245 experimental cases to the charges and dispositions received by the 37 comparison cases.

Four related measures were applied. First comparisons were made between the experimental and comparison group on the proportion of cases with a) criminal charges filed and b) revocation charges filed to determine if the frequency of charges increased under the investigation model. Second, the two groups were compared on the most serious disposition received to determine if the investigation model was associated with more serious types of final dispositions for their charges. Third, comparisons on offense types and offense severity were made to test whether the investigation model was associated with "more serious" types of criminal charges. Fourth, and finally, the two groups were compared on the days to arrest for the most serious

disposition to measure if the investigation model was associated with a shorter and thus quicker time to apprehension.

A larger proportion of the experimental group (49.8%) had criminal charges filed in connection with the investigation purpose than occurred for the comparison group (40.5%, Table 28). However, this difference of nine percent was not statistically significant (as measured by a "z" test at the .05 significance level). A larger percentage point difference of 14.9% was found between the two groups on the proportion of cases with revocation charges filed in connection with the investigation purpose (60.8% experimental vs. 45.9% comparison), however, again the difference was not quite statistically significant (Table 28).

Differences between the two groups in the mix of dispositions received for these various charges was calculated by tabulating the "most serious" disposition received. The categories of dispositions applied are those routinely used by the California Department of Corrections as part of it's Parole Follow-up System (Appendix C). The statistical significance of the differences between the experimental and comparison group on pairs of categories within this variable including "Returned to Prison versus Not Returned to Prison", "Court Ordered Returns to Prisons versus Board Ordered Returns to Prison", and "Favorable versus Unfavorable" outcomes were calculated using a difference of proportion test (z) at the .05 significance level.

Table 29 shows the experimental group differed from the comparison group on the mix of dispositions received for charges

Table 28

Criminal and Revocation Charges Filed
In Connection With Investigation Purpose
by Study Group

(INVESTIGATION MODEL)

| Criminal and parole revocation charges filed | Experimental | | | | | | | | Comparison | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | | Walnut Creek | | Stockton | | Bakersfield | | | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| CRIMINAL CHARGES | 245 | 100.0 | 48 | 100.0 | 118 | 100.0 | 79 | 100.0 | 37 | 100.0 |
| None filed | 123 | 50.2 | 25 | 52.1 | 60 | 50.8 | 38 | 48.1 | 22 | 59.5 |
| Charges filed | 122 | 49.8 | 23 | 47.9 | 58 | 49.2 | 41 | 51.9 | 15 | 40.5 |
| One charge | (57) | | (10) | | (29) | | (18) | | (6) | |
| Two charges | (33) | | (6) | | (15) | | (12) | | (5) | |
| Three charges | (17) | | (5) | | (7) | | (5) | | (2) | |
| Four or more charges | (15) | | (2) | | (7) | | (6) | | (2) | |
| PAROLE REVOCATION CHARGES | 245 | 100.0 | 48 | 100.0 | 118 | 100.0 | 79 | 100.0 | 37 | 100.0 |
| None charged | 96 | 39.2 | 25 | 52.1 | 50 | 42.4 | 21 | 26.6 | 20 | 54.1 |
| Charges filed | 149 | 60.8 | 23 | 47.9 | 68 | 57.6 | 58 | 73.4 | 17 | 45.9 |
| One charge | (44) | | (8) | | (22) | | (14) | | (10) | |
| Two charges | (50) | | (7) | | (19) | | (24) | | (2) | |
| Three charges | (32) | | (4) | | (14) | | (14) | | (3) | |
| Four or more charges | (23) | | (4) | | (13) | | (6) | | (2) | |

CRIMINAL CHARGES

Experimental/Comparison:     $z = 1.056$, p=.289
Walnut Creek/Stockton/Bakersfield:   $X^2 = 0.227$, df=2, p > .500

REVOCATION CHARGES

Experimental/Comparison:     $z = 1.716$, p=.095
Walnut Creek/Stockton/Bakersfield:   $X^2 = 9.120^*$, df=2, p < .050

connected to the investigation purpose. A significantly higher proportion of experimental cases received board ordered return to prison dispositions (28.2%) than the comparison group (13.5%). The difference of 14.7% was significant at the .01 level after a correction for continuity was made to adjust for the small cell sizes. Related to this difference was the larger proportion of cases with "Return to prison" dispositions (42.4% experimental vs. 27.0% comparison) which includes the category of court ordered returns (no difference found) as well as board ordered returns (significant difference found).

On the other hand, when the data is analyzed using the "Favorable versus Unfavorable" dichotomized definition, the difference between the experimental and comparison group is considerably reduced and not statistically significant (45.7% experimental vs. 56.8% comparison; "Favorable" includes cases with no arrests or violations, arrests and release; parole absconders for less than six months and dispositions of ninety jail days or less in severity). The preceding "most serious disposition" category analysis indicates that the increase in official sanctions received for the experimental group is totally attributable to a higher revocation rate (i.e., board ordered returns to prison) rather than to any difference in felony or misdemeanor court dispositions received.

Evidence to support increased seriousness in the types of criminal charges brought against the experimental group was not found. Table 30 shows the criminal charges filed for the

Table 29

Most Serious Disposition Received
In Connection With Investigation Purpose
by Study Group

(INVESTIGATION MODEL)

| Most serious disposition received | Experimental | | | | | | | | Comparison | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | | Walnut Creek | | Stockton | | Bakersfield | | | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| Total, all cases | 245 | 100.0 | 48 | 100.0 | 118 | 100.0 | 79 | 100.0 | 37 | 100.0 |
| Not returned to prison | 141 | 57.6 | 32 | 66.7 | 78 | 66.1 | 31 | 39.2 | 27 | 73.0 |
| Favorable........... | 112 | 45.7 | 28 | 58.3 | 58 | 49.2 | 26 | 32.9 | 21 | 56.8 |
| Miscellaneous unfavorable...... | 20 | 8.2 | 2 | 4.2 | 15 | 12.7 | 3 | 3.8 | 3 | 8.1 |
| Pending............ | 9 | 3.7 | 2 | 4.2 | 5 | 4.2 | 2 | 2.5 | 3 | 8.1 |
| Returned to prison | 104 | 42.4 | 16 | 33.3 | 40 | 33.9 | 48 | 60.8 | 10 | 27.0 |
| Board ordered....... | 69 | 28.2 | 8 | 16.7 | 26 | 22.0 | 35 | 44.3 | 5 | 13.5 |
| Court ordered....... | 35 | 14.3 | 8 | 16.7 | 14 | 11.9 | 13 | 16.4 | 5 | 13.5 |

Experimental/Comparison

| | $z$ | $p$ |
|---|---|---|
| Proportion with "Return to prison" outcome | 2.524* | $p < .050$ |
| Proportion with "Favorable" outcome | 1.260 | $p = .208$ |
| Proportion with "Board ordered" return to prison | 2.679** | $p < .010$ |
| Proportion with "Court ordered" return to prison | 0.178 | $p > .500$ |

Walnut Creek/Stockton/Bakersfield

Component of $X^2$ due to:

| | $X^2$ | df | p |
|---|---|---|---|
| A. Difference between "Returned" and "Not Returned" | 15.219*** | 2 | $p < .001$ |
| B. Difference within Not Returned (Favorable vs. Misc. unfavorable and pending) | 2.877 | 2 | $p = .250$ |
| C. Difference within "Returned" (Board vs. Court) | +2.875 | +2 | $p = .250$ |
| D. Total or overall $X^2$ | 20.971** | 6 | $p < .010$ |

experimental group comprised a smaller proportion of person type offenses (murder, assaults, robbery, and sex offenses) (20.5% emperimental vs. 60.0% comparison) and a larger proportion of narcotic and drug offenses (24.1% experimental vs. 0% comparison). The criminal charges filed for the experimental group had a lower average severity score (33.4) than the charges filed on the comparison group (50.3) as measured by the California Offense Severity Index (Appendix D, range 01 to 99). However, the small sample for the comparison group (only 10 of the 37 cases had criminal charges filed) prevents these findings from being considered conclusive. Rather the differences discovered in offense type are likely attributable to selection factor differences between the two groups (see Table 12A showing a higher proportion of the comparison group fell in the "violent/sexual deviant" selection category) rather than to the project itself.

Only a small statistically insignificant difference was found on the fourth and final measure, "Days to criminal/ technical arrest" (Table 30). The experimental group was arrested slightly sooner (mean of 35.8 days from date of referral for investigation) than the comparison group (mean of 42.6 days).

It can be concluded from this analysis that the controls and sanctions for parolees who had returned to criminal or violational activity increased under the investigation model; however, the difference was attributable to the significant increase in prison return sanctions ordered by the parole board,

## Table 30
### Offense Type, Offense Severity and Days to Arrest
### For Most Serious Disposition Charge
### by Study Group
### (INVESTIGATION MODEL)

| Offense type, offense severity and days to arrest | Experimental | | | | | | | | Comparison | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | | Walnut Creek | | Stockton | | Bakersfield | | | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| Offense Type | 245 | – | 48 | – | 118 | – | 79 | – | 37 | – |
| Not arrested/charged | 80 | – | 20 | – | 41 | – | 19 | – | 20 | – |
| Technical violation charge/arrest.... | 82 | – | 9 | – | 33 | – | 40 | – | 7 | – |
| Criminal charge/arrest | 83 | 100.0 | 19 | 100.0 | 44 | 100.0 | 20 | 100.0 | 10 | 100.0 |
| Homicide, manslaughter | 3 | | 0 | | 3 | | 0 | | 0 | |
| Robbery | 9 | | 1 | | 3 | | 5 | | 2 | |
| Assault | 4 | 20.5 | 2 | 15.8 | 2 | 18.2 | 0 | 30.0 | 1 | 60.0 |
| Rape, other sex | 1 | | 0 | | 0 | | 1 | | 3 | |
| Burglary | 6 | | 3 | | 3 | | 0 | | 1 | |
| Other property | 14 | 24.1 | 3 | 31.6 | 6 | 20.4 | 5 | 25.0 | 0 | 0 |
| Narcotics, drugs | 30 | 36.1 | 3 | 15.8 | 19 | 43.2 | 8 | 40.0 | 1 | 20.0 |
| Other | 16 | 19.3 | 7 | 36.8 | 8 | 18.2 | 1 | 5.0 | 2 | 20.0 |
| Offense Severity [a] | 245 | – | 48 | – | 118 | – | 79 | – | 37 | – |
| Not arrested/charged | 80 | – | 20 | – | 41 | – | 19 | – | 20 | – |
| Technical violation charge/arrest....... | 82 | – | 9 | – | 33 | – | 40 | – | 7 | – |
| Criminal charge/arrest. | 83 | 100.0 | 19 | 100.0 | 44 | 100.0 | 20 | 100.0 | 10 | 100.0 |
| 20 and under | 35 | 42.2 | 8 | 42.1 | 23 | 52.3 | 4 | 20.0 | 2 | 20.0 |
| 21 – 40 | 21 | 25.3 | 3 | 15.8 | 9 | 20.4 | 9 | 45.0 | 1 | 10.0 |
| 41 – 60 | 9 | 10.8 | 5 | 26.3 | 2 | 4.5 | 2 | 10.0 | 4 | 40.0 |
| 61 – 80 | 4 | 4.8 | 2 | 10.5 | 2 | 4.5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10.0 |
| 81 – 99 | 14 | 16.9 | 1 | 5.3 | 8 | 18.2 | 5 | 25.0 | 2 | 20.0 |
| Mean | 33.4 | | 34.2 | | 31.2 | | 37.6 | | 50.3 | |
| S.D. | 30.1 | | 26.8 | | 32.2 | | 27.9 | | 24.4 | |
| N | 83 | | 19 | | 44 | | 20 | | 10 | |

## Table 30 – continued

| Offense type, offense severity and days to arrest | Experimental | | | | | | | | Comparison | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | | Walnut Creek | | Stockton | | Bakersfield | | | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| **Days to criminal/ technical arrest** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mean | 35.8 | | 34.7 | | 45.5 | | 23.9 | | 42.6 | |
| S.D. | 49.1 | | 54.0 | | 55.3 | | 32.9 | | 35.5 | |
| N | 165 | | 28 | | 77 | | 60 | | 17 | |

[a] as measured by the "California Offense Severity Index"

Offense Type $X^2$ = not calculable due to large number of cells with small expected frequencies.

| Mean Offense Severity | t | df | p |
|---|---|---|---|
| Experimental vs. Comparison | 1.689 | 91 | p=.095 |
| Walnut Creek vs. Stockton | 0.350 | 61 | p>.500 |
| Walnut Creek vs. Bakersfield | 0.376 | 37 | p>.500 |
| Stockton vs. Bakersfield | 0.754 | 62 | p=.454 |

| Mean Days to Arrest | t | df | p |
|---|---|---|---|
| Experimental vs. Comparison | 0.552 | 180 | p>.500 |
| Walnut Creek vs. Stockton | 0.876 | 103 | p=.384 |
| Walnut Creek vs. Bakersfield | 1.151 | 86 | p=.254 |
| Stockton vs. Bakersfield | 2.659** | 135 | p<.010 |

rather than to any large significant increase in criminal court charges and dispositions. Evidence to support more severe criminal charging or a quicker apprehension of cases placed under investigation was not found or ran contrary to the expected direction.

## Agent Contribution to Detection and Charge Processing

A third objective of the investigation model was to increase the contribution parole agents make to the detection and prosecution of cases who were suspected of returning to criminal or violational activity. Three measures were applied to test this somewhat intangible goal -- none of which "exactly" or "fully" captures the contribution of parole agents to criminal and revocation charge processing and all of which may be biased by the more detailed activity recordings produced by the high control agents who had a greater vested interest in receiving such activity credits than the regular agents for the comparison group.

The first measure compares the experimental and comparison group on the major source and kind of information or activity which led to the most serious disposition received. It examines the relative contribution of parole agents as opposed to law enforcement in reaching the most serious criminal or revocation disposition. The second measure compares the two groups on the proportion of cases where some assistance in the criminal prosecution of a case was provided. The third measure compares the proportion of cases with contraband (i.e., illegal material including weapons, narcotics and stolen property) confiscated by parole agents.

The overall contribution of parole agents to the final criminal or revocation disposition was measured by a set of categories (called the "means" variable) which describe both (a) the major source (i.e. parole agent, law enforcement or both) of the information/activity which led to that disposition and (b) within that source, the exact kind of activity conducted or information collected (Table 31). The "means" leading to the most serious disposition received was tabulated and compared for the two study groups. Table 31 shows that the high control agents were the major source of the activity or information which led to the most serious disposition in one fifth (22.4%) of the experimental cases; and simultaneously responsible with law enforcement in another one-fifth of the cases (20.6%). Law enforcement agency staff (alone) were the major source for the remaining half of the experimental cases (49.7%). Regular parole agents within the comparison group were so rarely the primary source of information leading to the most serious disposition that the few cases where this occurred are shown under the "other means" category in Table 31. Law enforcement was almost always (88.2%) the source of the activity or information which led to the most serious disposition received for the comparison group. Note, however, that this data reports the contribution of agents to both criminal and revocation dispositions. The increased contribution of agents in the investigation model is likely in the processing of revocation (rather than criminal) charges as they increased the most under the investigation model. The next

-153-

Table 31

"Means" Leading To Most Serious Disposition
by Study Group

(INVESTIGATION MODEL)

| "Means" leading to most serious disposition [a] | Experimental | | | | | | | | Comparison | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | Total | | Walnut Creek | | Stockton | | Bakersfield | | | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct |
| Total, all cases | .245 | – | 48 | – | 118 | – | 79 | – | 37 | – |
| Not arrested/charged | 80 | – | 20 | – | 41 | – | 19 | – | 20 | – |
| Charged/arrested | 165 | 100.0 | 28 | 100.0 | 77 | 100.0 | 60 | 100.0 | 17 | 100.0 |
| ACTIVITY CONDUCTED/INFORMATION SECURED BY HIGH CONTROL AGENTS | 37 | 22.4 | 3 | 10.7 | 14 | 18.2 | 20 | 33.3 | – | – |
| Attempts to contact ...................... | 1 | | 0 | | 1 | | 0 | | – | |
| Witness, victim statement or identification | 6 | | 1 | | 3 | | 2 | | – | |
| Associate, informant statement or identification | 2 | | 0 | | 2 | | 0 | | – | |
| Confession of parole ..................... | 7 | | 1 | | 3 | | 3 | | – | |
| Physical evidence obtained during search .. | 9 | | 1 | | 2 | | 6 | | – | |
| Behavior observed during surveillance ..... | 4 | | 0 | | 1 | | 3 | | – | |
| Test results (incl. narcotics, gun, alcohol) | 8 | | 0 | | 2 | | 6 | | – | |
| ACTIVITY CONDUCTED/INFORMATION SECURED BY LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY | 82 | 49.7 | 21 | 75.0 | 35 | 45.4 | 26 | 43.3 | 15 | 88.2 |
| Witness, victim statement or identification | 17 | | 4 | | 6 | | 7 | | 6 | |
| Associate, informant statement or identification .......................... | 3 | | 1 | | 2 | | 0 | | 1 | |
| Confession of parolee ................... | 3 | | 2 | | 1 | | 0 | | 0 | |
| Physical evidence obtained during search .. | 3 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 0 | |
| Test results (incl. narcotic, gun, alcohol) | 12 | | 0 | | 9 | | 3 | | 3 | |
| Other .................................... | 20 | | 7 | | 4 | | 9 | | 2 | |
| Behavior observed during routine patrol [b] .. | 7 | | 1 | | 5 | | 1 | | 0 | |
| Identified as wanted after patrol stop [b] .. | 4 | | 2 | | 0 | | 2 | | 0 | |

Table 31 - continued

| "Means" leading to most serious disposition | Experimental | | | | | | | | Comparison | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | | Walnut Creek | | Stockton | | Bakersfield | | | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| Search conducted after patrol stop [b] ...... | 4 | | 1 | | 3 | | 0 | | 1 | |
| Response to citizen's call for assistance. [a] | 9 | | 2 | | 4 | | 3 | | 2 | |
| ACTIVITY CONDUCTED/INFORMATION SECURED SIMULTANEOUSLY BY HIGH CONTROL AGENTS AND LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY | 34 | 20.6 | 3 | 10.7 | 21 | 27.3 | 10 | 16.7 | - | - |
| Attempts to contact ...................... | 3 | | 0 | | 2 | | 1 | | - | |
| Witness, victim statement or identification ... | 4 | | 0 | | 3 | | 1 | | - | |
| Associate, informant statement or identification | 1 | | 0 | | 1 | | 0 | | - | |
| Confession of parolee ....................... | 4 | | 0 | | 3 | | 1 | | - | |
| Physical evidence obtained during search ...... | 14 | | 3 | | 6 | | 5 | | - | |
| Behavior observed during surveillance ......... | 1 | | 0 | | 1 | | 0 | | - | |
| Test results (incl. narcotics, gun, alcohol) .. | 7 | | 0 | | 5 | | 2 | | - | |
| OTHER MEANS | 12 | 7.2 | 1 | 3.6 | 7 | 9.1 | 4 | 6.7 | 2 | 11.8 |

[a] The "Means" measure reflects both the major activity or information leading to the most serious disposition charges and the major individual or agency responsible for conducting the activity or securing the information.

[b] Activities (e.g., street patrolling) not encorporated into the High Control Model and performed only by law enforcement agencies.

Experimental/Comparison: $X^2$ = not calculable due to large number of cells with small expected frequencies

Walnut Creek/Stockton/Bakersfield: $X^2$ = 14.240 *, df = 6, p .05

measure addresses the contribution of agents to the prosecution of "criminal" charges specifically.

Table 32 provides some evidence that the investigation model was able to increase the contribution that agents made to the criminal prosecution of parolees (62.7% experimental vs. 10.0% comparison with some kind of assistance provided in the criminal prosecution). The various kinds of assistance provided are listed in Table 32.

The final measure (Table 33) showed a larger proportion of the investigation cases had contraband (i.e., 11.0% for weapons, 13.1% for narcotics/drugs and 7.3% stolen property) confiscated than occurred for the comparison group (only one of the 37 cases had stolen property confiscated by the agent).

It is "suggested" from this analysis that the investigation model was able to increase the contribution that parole agents make to the detection and prosecution of charges by uncovering more relevant evidence. However, as the preceding analysis showed this evidence is likely to have led to more revocation than criminal dispositions. The analysis is hindered and qualified by the small number of comparison cases with criminal charges and by the likely underreporting of such activity information by regular agents for the comparison cases.

## Outcome Differences Between Demonstration Sites

Differences discovered across the three demonstration sites in the background characteristics of the cases selected

Table 32

Parole Agent Assistance With Prosecution
of Most Serious Disposition Criminal Charges
by Study Group

(INVESTIGATION MODEL)

| Parole agent assistance with criminal charge prosecution | Experimental | | | | | | | | Comparison | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | | Walnut Creek | | Stockton | | Bakersfield | | | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| Total, all cases | 245 | – | 48 | – | 118 | – | 79 | – | 37 | – |
| Not arrested/charged | 80 | – | 20 | – | 41 | – | 19 | – | 20 | – |
| Technical violation charge only | 82 | – | 9 | – | 33 | – | 40 | – | 7 | – |
| Criminally charged | 83 | 100.0 | 19 | 100.0 | 44 | 100.0 | 20 | 100.0 | 10 | 100.0 |
| No assistance in prosecution ........... | 31 | 37.3 | 12 | 63.2 | 19 | 43.2 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 90.0 |
| Assisted prosecution.... | 52 | 62.7 | 7 | 36.8 | 25 | 56.8 | 20 | 100.0 | 1 | 10.0 |
| Assist/victim/witness prepare statement | (5) | | (0) | | (4) | | (1) | | (0) | |
| Turn over evidence | (8) | | (0) | | (4) | | (4) | | (0) | |
| Testifying in court | (1) | | (0) | | (1) | | (0) | | (1) | |
| Securing parolee confession | (7) | | (0) | | (4) | | (3) | | (0) | |
| Assisting in evidence search activity | (31) | | (7) | | (12) | | (12) | | (0) | |

Experimental/Comparison:   $X^2$ = not calculable due to large number of cells with small expected frequencies

Walnut Creek/Stockton/Bakersfield:   $X^2$ = not calculable due to large number of cells with small expected frequencies

Table 33

Contraband Confiscated
by Study Group

(INVESTIGATION MODEL)

| Contraband confiscated | Experimental | | | | | | | | Comparison | |
| | Total | | Walnut Creek | | Stockton | | Bakersfield | | | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Weapons | 245 | 100.0 | 48 | 100.0 | 118 | 100.0 | 79 | 100.0 | 37 | 100.0 |
| None.......... | 218 | 89.0 | 44 | 91.7 | 103 | 87.3 | 71 | 89.9 | 37 | 100.0 |
| One or more.... | 27 | 11.0 | 4 | 8.3 | 15 | 12.7 | 8 | 10.1 | 0 | 0 |
| Narcotics/drugs | 245 | 100.0 | 48 | 100.0 | 118 | 100.0 | 79 | 100.0 | 37 | 100.0 |
| None.......... | 213 | 86.9 | 46 | 95.8 | 101 | 85.6 | 66 | 83.5 | 37 | 100.0 |
| Some.......... | 32 | 13.1 | 2 | 4.2 | 17 | 14.4 | 13 | 16.5 | 0 | 0 |
| Stolen property | 245 | 100.0 | 48 | 100.0 | 118 | 100.0 | 79 | 100.0 | 37 | 100.0 |
| None.......... | 227 | 92.7 | 45 | 93.7 | 109 | 92.4 | 73 | 92.4 | 36 | 97.3 |
| Some.......... | 18 | 7.3 | 3 | 6.3 | 9 | 7.6 | 6 | 7.6 | 1 | 2.7 |

| Walnut Creek/Stockton/Bakersfield: | $X^2$ | df | p |
|---|---|---|---|
| Weapons | 0.762 | 2 | $p > .500$ |
| Narcotics/drugs | 4.334 | 2 | $p \cong .100$ |
| Stolen property | 0.105 | 2 | $p > .500$ |

(Chapter V), the reason the cases were selected (Chapter VI), and the activities/operations of the unit (Chapter VI) all suggested that each unit may be associated with differing outcome rates. The measures reported in Table 26, and 28 through 33, were re-examined comparing outcomes across the three parole units within the experimental group. When sample sizes permitted, the statistical significance of discovered differences were measured by the non-parametric chi square test ($X^2$).

An inspection of these tables consistently showed that the Bakersfield unit was associated with a larger proportion of cases 1) with successful overall, immediate outcomes of the investigation, 2) receiving revocation sanctions for their illegal activities, and 3) where the high control agent investigator was a major contributor to the detection and prosecution of the suspected criminal or violational activity -- than found in either of the other two units examined. The Stockton site ranked second and the Walnut Creek site ranked third in terms of the proportion of successful investigation outcomes experienced and in terms of the more frequent and severe sanctions received.

The degree to which the three demonstrations sites were successful in meeting their first goal of verifying suspected criminal or violational activity is shown in Table 26. A larger proportion of the cases at the Bakersfield unit (74.7%) experienced overall successful investigative outcomes (i.e., evidence was collected warranting placement in custody, or other

miscellaneous successful outcome) than either the Stockton
(66.2%) or the Walnut Creek unit (56.2%). The Walnut Creek unit
experienced a larger proportion of cases with unsuccessful
outcomes (33.4%) (i.e., evidence was unavailable or insufficient
for verification) than either Stockton (24.6%) or Bakersfield
(17.7%). However, the overall difference across the three
demonstration sites in the five outcome categories of Table 26
did not quite reach statistical significance at the .05 level
using a chi square test.

The degree to which the three demonstration sites were
successful in increasing the frequency and severity of charges
filed against parolees who had returned to criminal activity is
examined in Table 28-30. There was no difference across the
three units in the proportion of cases who had criminal charges
filed in connection with the investigation. There was a large,
statistically significant difference across the units on the
proportion of cases with revocation charges filed. Bakersfield
almost always charged the cases investigated (73.4%) with parole
condition violations, while Stockton (57.6%) and Walnut Creek
(47.9%) did so only half the time (Table 28). It is therefore
not surprising that the three units differed on the mix of most
serious disposition received (Table 29). Here, a "component" ch
square analysis (Maxwell, 1961, pp 11-62) was conducted on the
"Most Serious Disposition" categories for the three units. The
component chi square allows a test of the significance of the
difference within various categories of the outcome variable as

well as an overall test. The test results showed a large,
statistically significant difference across the three units on
the "Returned to prison vs. Not returned to prison" categories.
Bakersfield returned 60.8% of it's cases while Stockton and
Walnut Creek returned 33.9% and 33.3% respectively. The
difference across the units within the category of returns to
prison (board vs. court) and within the category of those not
returned (favorable vs. miscellaneous unfavorable vs. pending)
did not reach statistical significance. The chi square for the
total most serious disposition categories (which is equal to the
sum of the component chi-squares) was significant indicating that
the units did differ significantly on the mix of dispositions
received. There is also an indication that the Bakersfield unit
was associated with slightly more criminal charges for person
offenses which resulted in a slightly higher average severity
score than the other two units (Table 30). And, finally, the
average time to apprehension for the most serious disposition was
shorter for Bakersfield (23.9 days) than the other two units
(34.7 days at Walnut Creek, 45.5 days at Stockton). However,
these differences are based on an extremely small numbers of
cases and should not be considered conclusive.

On the third set of measures identifying the agent's
contribution to detection and charge processing, the Bakersfield
high control agents were able to make a major contribution on a
larger proportion of cases investigated than either of the other
two units. The Bakersfield high control agents were the major

source of activity or information leading to the most serious disposition received in 33.3% of it's cases, compared to 10.7% at Walnut Creek and 18.2% at Stockton. (Table 31; Note that the Stockton high control agents were also often the major source of information leading to the most serious disposition, however their information was generally collected with law enforcement staff rather than alone). Finally, the Bakersfield unit assisted in the prosecution for all (100%) of it's cases criminally prosecuted compared to only 56% of the cases at Stockton and 39% of the cases at Walnut Creek. On the final measure, a slightly higher proportion of cases at Bakersfield and at Stockton compared to Walnut Creek involved the confiscation of contraband (weapons, narcotics or stolen property). These small differences however were not statistically significant.

## Interpretation of Findings

The differences described above between the experimental and comparison groups showed the investigation model was associated with more frequent successful verifications of criminal and violational activity, more frequent and severe sanctions for returns to illegal activity, and a greater contribution by agents to the detection and processing of such activity, than occurred for similar high risk cases under regular supervision. The analysis furthermore found that the Bakersfield demonstration site was associated with a larger proportion of the more successful investigation outcomes than either the Stockton or the Walnut Creek site. The differences found can be

-162-

attributed to one or a combination of several factors. The quasi-experimental design used and type of data collected does not allow the kind of controls necessary to explain the variance in outcome found.

The most logical explanation for the outcome variance is that the more frequent and intense evidence collection activities conducted by high control agents in the investigation model as compared to regular parole supervision activities led to the detection and verification of more criminal and violational activity. The significant increase found in the contribution by high control agents to detection and charge processing supports this interpretation. The same explanation can be used to explain the differences found between the three demonstration sites. The analysis of the types of activities performed in the invest-igation model in Chapter VI showed that the Bakersfield site engaged in more frequent evidence collection activities using primary as well as secondary information sources than either of the other two demonstration sites. These increased evidence collection activities may have led to the significantly greater rate of verification and revocation sanctions for cases investigated at the Bakersfield unit. In fact, police detective studies (Greenwood and Petersilia, 1975; Bloch and Bell, 1976; Schwartz and Clarren, 1977) have indicated that it is the evidence collected immediately after a criminal incident, on the scene of the crime, by the responding police officer, which generally leads to verification and arrest. The activities conducted at Bakersfield may have increased it's on the scene response capabilities for incidents committed by parolees.

-163-

A second possible explanation for the study group as well as demonstration site differences found is selection factor differences. This interpretation was partially tested in Chapter V when background characteristics for a sample of cases from each study group and demonstration site were compared. A few differences were found, including a higher proportion of cases with prior criminal histories selected from the Stockton site; however, the analysis was considered too weak to rule out this interpretation conclusively (a more adequately selected sample and a multivariate analysis would have been more desireable). Selection factor differences between study groups and demonstration sites were further tested in Chapter VI when the reason for selection and prior days on parole were examined. Small statistically insignificant differences were found between the experimental and comparison groups on these variables. A few larger, significant, differences were found between the three demonstration sites (e.g., cases selected at Walnut Creek had experienced more time on parole prior to selection and a larger proportion had been selected under the "Violence/sexual deviancy" criterion than occurred at the other two sites); however, these differences were not in the direction or of the type which would explain Bakersfield's higher rate of verification and revocation sanctions.

At least three other explanations for the study group and demonstration site differences deserve mention, although none of them were expirically examined in this evaluation. First,

differences across the sites in the community support, primarily local law enforcement support, may explain outcome differences. For example, Bakersfield's higher rate of verification and sanctions received may be attributable to a greater material as well as philosophical support provided the high control agents by local law enforcement than was present in the other demonstration sites or comparison units. Also, the smaller number of local law enforcement agencies servicing the Bakersfield area, as compared to the larger number connected to the metropolitan area serviced by the Walnut Creek unit, may have allowed a closer, more efficient, and therefore more productive working relationship. A second possible explanation is pre-project differences which existed across the demonstration sites and comparison units in parole agent work standards and supervisorial decision-making practices. Prior research has demonstrated the strong effect that the parole agent's recommendation has in determining the final revocation action. For example, it is possible that the increased revocation sanctions received for experimental over comparison cases, and Bakersfield over the other demonstration sites, may be due to the greater emphasis placed on return to prison over continue on parole disposition recommendations for a parole violation already existing at that unit. Finally, a third possible explanation is the different types of illegal activity investigated across the experimental and comparison units. For example the narcotic sales and property theft crimes investigated at Bakersfield may be more "suppressible" (i.e., impacted by agent activity), thereby increasing the verification and arrest rate, than the "violence/sexually deviant" activities investigated at Walnut Creek.

The quasi-experimental design used and small sample sizes prevents the kind of analysis necessary to explain the variance found between the experimental and comparison units, and across demonstration sites, in outcomes. A three way analysis comparing the investigative outcomes across units while controlling for the "purpose" of the investigation does appear to rule out the last possible explanation. Table 34 provides some weak evidence that the Bakersfield site was associated with a higher proportion of successful investigation outcomes than found at the other two sites regardless of the types of criminal and non-criminal activity investigated. Further analysis, beyond the scope and quality of this evaluation design, is necessary before the other possible interpretations of outcome variance can be ruled. For now we can only conclude that the increased investigation activities of the high control agents "may" be associated with an increased rate of verification and sanctions applied to selected parolees who have returned to illegal activities.

Chapter Summary. This chapter examined the effectiveness of the investigation model of the High Control Project as implemented at three different demonstration parole units. Several measures were applied to test it's success in 1) verifying suspected criminal or violational activity, 2) increasing the frequency and severity of the controls and sanctions applied to parolees who had returned to such activity, and 3) increasing the parole agent's contribution to the detection and processing of charges. The immediate outcomes of

Table 34

Overall Outcome For Selected Specific Types of Investigation Purposes
by Parole Unit

| [a] Overall outcome for selected [b] specific types of investigation purpose | Parole Unit | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | | Walnut Creek | | Stockton | | Bakersfield | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| Verify Narcotic Sales | 75 | 100.0 | 12 | 100.0 | 37 | 100.0 | 26 | 100.0 |
| Successful outcome | 30 | 40.0 | 4 | 33.3 | 11 | 30.0 | 15 | 57.7 |
| Unsuccessful outcome | 45 | 60.0 | 8 | 66.6 | 26 | 70.0 | 11 | 42.3 |
| Verify Assault Activity | 48 | 100.0 | 15 | 100.0 | 18 | 100.0 | 15 | 100.0 |
| Successful outcome | 24 | 50.0 | 4 | 26.7 | 13 | 72.2 | 7 | 46.6 |
| Unsuccessful outcome | 24 | 50.0 | 11 | 73.3 | 5 | 27.8 | 8 | 53.3 |
| Verify Property Activity | 28 | 100.0 | 7 | 100.0 | 11 | 100.0 | 10 | 100.0 |
| Successful outcome | 15 | 53.6 | 5 | 71.4 | 2 | 18.2 | 8 | 80.0 |
| Unsuccessful outcome | 13 | 46.4 | 2 | 28.6 | 9 | 81.8 | 2 | 20.0 |
| Verify Prison Gang Activity | 29 | 100.0 | 3 | 100.0 | 23 | 100.0 | 3 | 100.0 |
| Successful outcome | 13 | 44.8 | 1 | 33.3 | 11 | 47.8 | 1 | 33.3 |
| Unsuccessful outcome | 16 | 55.2 | 2 | 66.6 | 12 | 52.2 | 2 | 66.7 |
| Verify Weapon Use/Possession | 31 | 100.0 | 9 | 100.0 | 11 | 100.0 | 11 | 100.0 |
| Successful outcome | 10 | 32.3 | 3 | 33.3 | 3 | 27.3 | 4 | 36.4 |
| Unsuccessful outcome | 21 | 67.7 | 6 | 66.7 | 8 | 72.7 | 7 | 63.6 |
| Verify General Activity | 27 | 100.0 | 3 | 100.0 | 13 | 100.0 | 11 | 100.0 |
| Successful outcome | 18 | 66.7 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 76.9 | 8 | 72.7 |
| Unsuccessful outcome | 9 | 33.3 | 3 | 100.0 | 3 | 23.1 | 3 | 27.3 |
| Locate Subject | 113 | 100.0 | 18 | 100.0 | 48 | 100.0 | 47 | 100.0 |
| Successful outcome | 104 | 92.0 | 14 | 77.8 | 45 | 93.7 | 45 | 95.7 |
| Unsuccessful outcome | 9 | 8.0 | 4 | 22.2 | 3 | 6.3 | 2 | 4.3 |
| Apprehend Subject | 89 | 100.0 | 10 | 100.0 | 41 | 100.0 | 38 | 100.0 |
| Successful outcome | 79 | 88.8 | 8 | 80.0 | 36 | 87.8 | 35 | 92.1 |
| Unsuccessful outcome | 10 | 11.2 | 2 | 20.0 | 5 | 12.2 | 3 | 7.9 |

[a] Outcome refers to the immediate outcome associated with the purpose of the investigation; "Successful" is defined as the "verification and placement in custody for criminal or violational activity" and other miscellaneous successful outcomes.

[b] Investigative purposes selected for analysis includes those which applied to at least 25 cases in the experimental group.

the investigations themselves and the charges filed in connection with the investigation purpose were analyzed for 245 experimental cases investigated in the project through June 30, 1979 and compared to like data collected on 37 similar cases not investigated. The results showed the investigation model was associated with significantly more successful verifications of criminal or violational activity than occur under regular supervision. The investigation model was also associated with an increase in the controls and sanctions applied to parolees who had returned to criminal activity, however the increase was largely in board-ordered return to prison dispositions. The investigation model was not associated with a significantly large change in the frequency and severity of criminal charges and dispositions. Finally, the analysis provided some limited and qualified evidence that high control agents increased the contribution that regular supervision agents make to the detection and processing of charges. An analysis of the outcome differences across the demonstration sites showed that the Bakersfield unit was associated with the highest proportion of successful investigation outcomes followed by the Stockton unit and lastly the Walnut Creek unit. Several possible explanations for the study group and demonstration site outcome differences were explored including the model's more intense investigative activities, a selection of higher risk cases, a greater degree of community support from local law enforcement and more control-oriented decision-making practices at the experimental sites; however, the exact extent to which the outcome variance was explanable by these factors could not be determined with the data available.

## Chapter VIII

### OPERATIONS AND ACTIVITIES OF
### THE INTENSIVE SUPERVISION MODEL

This chapter describes the operations and activity of the intensive supervision model of the High Control Project as it was implemented at two demonstration sites. In addition to it's descriptive purpose this chapter also tests the experimental variable by determining whether the activities performed by agents under the intensive supervision model were in fact different from the activities normally performed under regular supervision.

### Study Sample For Activity and Outcome Analysis

To allow for a minimum six months follow-up analysis, an intake cutoff date of December 31, 1978 was used in drawing the intensive supervision model study cases. A total of 170 cases were referred for intensive supervision through that date. After a small number of the referrals were rejected by the High Control staff (N=11) and a number were deleted due to change of release plans (N=28), the final study sample totaled 131 cases (see Table 6 in Chapter VI). Therefore, the analysis in this chapter is based on 131 experimental cases (77 from the Walnut Creek site and 54 from the Riverside/San Bernardino site) which received high control intensive supervision, in addition to 62 comparison cases (35 drawn from the Redwood City Unit and 27 drawn from the Ventura District) which received only regular supervision. When, due to missing data, measures were calculated to a base "less than" the total 131 experimental and 62 comparison group samples, it was noted.

## Case Movement

The Walnut Creek site of the intensive supervision model began operations first (February, 1977) with two agents carrying 10-15 cases each. The Riverside/San Bernardino demonstration site implemented the project over a year (June, 1978) after Walnut Creek started and involved four agents also carrying 10-15 cases each. After initially large intake numbers in the early months, placement into the Intensive supervision model averaged two cases per agent per month. The Walnut Creek site placed an average of four cases per month with two working agents, and the Riverside site placed an average of eight cases per month with four working agents (Table 35).

Cases remained in the intensive supervision model for an average of eleven months (334 days, Table 36). There was no large difference on the average number of days cases spent in the project between the two demonstration sites, although for some reason project days varied more at the Walnut Creek site.

Thus, from the experiences of the two intensive supervision model demonstration sites, the intensive supervision model admitted an average of two new cases per month and carried each case for an average of eleven months. These findings present a strong contrast to the case movement under the investigation model, which was short term in length (60 days) and involved a rapid turnover of cases (3-4 cases per month per agent). The movement of cases in the intensive supervision model closely resembled that experienced under regular supervision

Table 35
Case Intake
by Parole Unit Within Study Group
(INTENSIVE SUPERVISION MODEL)

| Date of case intake | Total N=193 | Experimental | | | Comparison | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Sub total N=131 | Walnut Creek N=77 | River side N=54 | Sub total N=62 | Redwood City N=35 | Ventura N=27 |
| Total case intake for 1977 | 63 | 44 | 44 | – | 19 | 19 | – |
| January | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| February | 7 | 7 | 7* | – | – | – | – |
| March | 10 | 10 | 10 | – | – | – | – |
| April | 3 | 3 | 3 | – | – | – | – |
| May | 4 | 4 | 4 | – | – | – | – |
| June | 6 | 5 | 5 | – | 1 | 1* | – |
| July | 3 | 3 | 3 | – | 0 | 0 | – |
| August | 2 | 1 | 1 | – | 1 | 1 | – |
| September | 11 | 2 | 2 | – | 9 | 9 | – |
| October | 6 | 4 | 4 | – | 2 | 2 | – |
| November | 8 | 4 | 4 | – | 4 | 4 | – |
| December | 3 | 1 | 1 | – | 2 | 2 | – |
| Total case intake for 1978 | 130 | 87 | 33 | 54 | 43 | 16 | 27 |
| January | 3 | 2 | 2 | – | 1 | 1 | – |
| February | 3 | 2 | 2 | – | 1 | 1 | – |
| March | 6 | 6 | 6 | – | 0 | 0 | – |
| April | 3 | 0 | 0 | – | 3 | 3 | – |
| May | 5 | 4 | 4 | – | 1 | 1 | – |
| June | 15 | 14 | 3 | 11* | 1 | 1 | – |
| July | 11 | 9 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 2 | – |
| August | 15 | 11 | 3 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 3* |
| September | 13 | 11 | 1 | 10 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| October | 12 | 9 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| November | 21 | 12 | 3 | 9 | 9 | 3 | 6 |
| December | 23 | 7 | 2 | 5 | 16 | 1 | 15 |

* Project start date for unit

Table 36
Days In Project by Parole Unit
(INTENSIVE SUPERVISION MODEL)

| Days in project | Parole unit | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | Total | | Walnut Creek | | Riverside/ San Bernardino | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| Total, all experimental cases | 131 | 100.0 | 77 | 100.0 | 54 | 100.0 |
| 001 - 060 days .......... | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 061 - 120 days .......... | 12 | 9.2 | 9 | 11.7 | 3 | 5.6 |
| 121 - 180 days .......... | 17 | 13.0 | 14 | 18.2 | 3 | 5.6 |
| 181 - 240 days .......... | 15 | 11.4 | 9 | 11.7 | 6 | 11.1 |
| 241 - 300 days .......... | 22 | 16.8 | 14 | 18.2 | 8 | 14.8 |
| 301 - 360 days .......... | 12 | 9.2 | 4 | 5.2 | 8 | 14.8 |
| 361 - 420 days .......... | 20 | 15.3 | 1 | 1.3 | 19 | 35.2 |
| 421 - 480 days .......... | 9 | 6.9 | 4 | 5.2 | 5 | 9.2 |
| 481 - 540 days .......... | 7 | 5.3 | 5 | 6.5 | 2 | 3.7 |
| 541 - 600 days .......... | 4 | 3.0 | 4 | 5.2 | 0 | 0 |
| 601 - 660 days .......... | 4 | 3.0 | 4 | 5.2 | 0 | 0 |
| 661 - 720 days .......... | 4 | 3.0 | 4 | 5.2 | 0 | 0 |
| 721 and over days ....... | 5 | 3.8 | 5 | 6.5 | 0 | 0 |
| Mean ................. | | 334.4 | | 344.6 | | 319.7 |
| S.D. ................. | | 177.4 | | 214.8 | | 101.0 |
| N. ................. | | 131 | | 77 | | 54 |

|  | t | df | p |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Walnut Creek vs. Riverside/San Bernardino | 0.789 | 129 | p = .432 |

-172-

(i.e., a long period of supervision with a slow turnover of cases), with the exception that agents carried significantly smaller caseloads.

Selection Process

The selection process for the intensive supervision model was designed to operate as it did in the investigation model. That is, cases were to be referred for intensive supervision by the regular agents in the unit who periodically reviewed their existing caseloads, using the five targeted criminal and violation activity areas as screening criteria. However, unlike the investigation model, the intensive supervision model was designed to begin "early" in the parole period and the high control agents were to assume total caseload responsibilities on the cases.

In actuality the selection process worked differently at the two demonstration sites. The Riverside site chose to do it's own screening. Table 37 shows that 98.1% of the Riverside cases were identified by the high control agents themselves. Most (Table 38, 68.5%) were pre-releasees at the time of selection who were placed under intensive supervision on the first day of parole. The Walnut Creek site on the other hand used a combination of "agent referrals" (Table 37, 39.0%) and "pre-release file screening" (46.7%) to identify most of it's cases. Only one-third (Table 38, 35.1%) were pre-releasees at the time of selection; one quarter had been on parole for six months or more at the time of placement.

-173-

Table 37

Source of Case Referral
by Parole Unit

(INTENSIVE SUPERVISION MODEL)

| Source of case referral | Parole unit | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | | Walnut Creek | | Riverside/ San Bernardino | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct |
| Total, all cases | 131 | 100.0 | 77 | 100.0 | 54 | 100.0 |
| Supervising parole agent ....... | 30 | 22.9 | 30 | 39.0 | 0 | 0 |
| Unit supervisor or district administrator ............... | 4 | 3.0 | 4 | 5.2 | 0 | 0 |
| Law enforcement agency ......... | 1 | 0.8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1.9 |
| Pre-release file screening ..... | 36 | 27.5 | 36 | 46.7 | 0 | 0 |
| High Control agent ............. | 54 | 41.2 | 1 | 1.3 | 53[a] | 98.1 |
| Other[b] ....................... | 6 | 4.6 | 6 | 7.8 | 0 | 0 |

[a] A "referral system" was not used at the Riverside Unit/S.B. (only). Instead the high control agents selected project cases directly by conducting periodic screening of the pre-release files and the unit's existing caseloads.

[b] Includes CDC staff in the prisons, other parole units, and the Special Service Unit staff.

Table 38
Days On Parole Before Project Placement
by Parole Unit Within Study Group

(INTENSIVE SUPERVISION MODEL)

| Days on parole before project placement | Parole unit within study group | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Experimental | | | | | | Comparison | | | | | |
| | Sub-total | | Walnut Creek | | Riverside/ San Bernardino | | Sub-total | | Redwood City | | Ventura District | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| Total, all cases | 131 | 100.0 | 77 | 100.0 | 54 | 100.0 | 62 | 100.0 | 35 | 100.0 | 27 | 100.0 |
| None, new releasee .......... | 64 | 48.9 | 27 | 35.1 | 37 | 68.5 | 25 | 40.3 | 22 | 62.9 | 3 | 11.1 |
| 001 - 060 days .............. | 25 | 19.1 | 12 | 15.6 | 13 | 24.1 | 10 | 16.1 | 6 | 17.1 | 4 | 14.8 |
| 061 - 120 days .............. | 17 | 13.0 | 14 | 18.2 | 3 | 5.6 | 9 | 14.5 | 3 | 8.6 | 6 | 22.2 |
| 121 - 180 days .............. | 4 | 3.1 | 4 | 5.2 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 11.3 | 2 | 5.7 | 5 | 18.5 |
| 181 - 240 days .............. | 7 | 5.3 | 6 | 7.8 | 1 | 1.9 | 1 | 1.6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.7 |
| 241 - 300 days .............. | 3 | 2.3 | 3 | 3.9 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 9.7 | 1 | 2.9 | 5 | 18.5 |
| 301 - 360 days .............. | 3 | 2.3 | 3 | 3.9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1.6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.7 |
| 361 days and over .......... | 8 | 6.1 | 8 | 10.4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4.8 | 1 | 2.9 | 2 | 7.4 |
| Mean ................. | | 81.9 | | 128.9 | | 15.1 | | 102.0 | | 49.7 | | 169.8 |
| S.D. ................. | | 160.3 | | 193.6 | | 35.9 | | 159.3 | | 130.1 | | 167.8 |
| N ................. | | 131 | | 77 | | 54 | | 62 | | 35 | | 27 |

| | $t$ | $df$ | $p$ |
|---|---|---|---|
| Walnut Creek vs. Riverside/San Bernardino | 4.237*** | 129 | p < .001 |
| Redwood City vs. Ventura District | 3.122 ** | 60 | p < .010 |
| Experimental vs. Comparison | 0.810 | 191 | p = .419 |

The two demonstration sites were in agreement on the reasons for selecting cases for intensive supervision. The majority (57.2%) of the 133 experimental cases were placed under intensive supervision because of a prior criminal history that involved violence or sexual deviancy (Table 39A). Only a very few cases were placed under intensive supervision for any of the other five criminal/violational activity areas targeted in the project including prison gang affiliation (4.6%), narcotic sales activity (10.7%), property/fraud activity (2.3%) and parole absconding (0.%).

The above proportions do not include the cases referred under more than one category, and Table 39A shows that one quarter of the 131 experimental cases were referred for a "combination" of the five selection criteria. To capture the relative contribution of each criterion and yet include those cases referred under two or more categories, the reasons were "ranked" by the frequency of referral and each case counted in the "highest" ranking category, regardless of the presence or absence of other reasons referred under. The results of the ranked tabulation are shown in Table 39B. They more dramatically show the priority the project placed on selecting cases in the violence/sexual deviancy category. Over four-fifths of the 133 experimental cases (81.3%) were selected for a prior criminal history involving violence or sexual deviancy.

As the selection criterion was somewhat general, an attempt was made to capture the specific type of prior

violent/sexual deviant criminal offenses which led to the placement under intensive supervision. Table 39C (calculated to the base of "total reasons cited" rather than "total cases") shows robbery and other weapon use (31.2%), weapon possession (12.1%), murder/manslaughter (12.8) and rape (12.1%) were the major specific types of violent/sexually deviant offenses which led to the case's placement in the intensive supervision model. Less often selected were cases which had committed an assault (with injury 5.4%, without injury 1.3%), threatened violence (5.4%) or who had committed a sexual offense other than rape (child molestation 5.0%, other sexual offense 4.4%).

The major source of the information which led to the referral was the case's prior criminal history records (63.4%, Table 40). However, as the Walnut Creek site selected cases with varying lengths of prior time, they also tended to base their referrals on other more current information available from either local law enforcement (10.4%) or the prior regular supervising agent (22.1%), in addition to the criminal history records.

Comparisons across units. Generally speaking the two demonstration sites operated in similar manners. Both units selected cases who were new releases or who had been on parole for only a couple of months, and both units selected the majority of their cases because of their prior violent or sexually deviant criminal histories. Also both units kept their cases under intensive supervision for an average of eleven months. Although the two units did select cases differently (regular agent referrals vs. high control agent screening), there was no significant difference between the units in the reasons cases were selected.

Table 39A

Reason Selected
by Parole Unit Within Study Group

(INTENSIVE SUPERVISION MODEL)

| Type of reason for selection [a] | Parole unit within study group | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Experimental | | | | | | Comparison | | | | | |
| | Sub-total | | Walnut Creek | | Riverside/ San Bernardino | | Sub-total | | Redwood City | | Ventura District | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| Total, all cases | 131 | 100.0 | 77 | 100.0 | 54 | 100.0 | 62 | 100.0 | 35 | 100.0 | 27 | 100.0 |
| **One type of reason only** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Prison gang affiliation ..... | 6 | 4.6 | 5 | 6.5 | 1 | 1.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Narcotic sales activity ..... | 14 | 10.7 | 6 | 7.8 | 8 | 14.8 | 4 | 6.4 | 2 | 5.7 | 2 | 7.4 |
| Violence/sexual deviance .... | 75 | 57.2 | 41 | 53.2 | 34 | 63.0 | 49 | 79.0 | 29 | 82.9 | 20 | 74.1 |
| Property/fraud .............. | 3 | 2.3 | 1 | 1.3 | 2 | 3.7 | 2 | 3.2 | 2 | 5.7 | 0 | 0 |
| Absconding .................. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Combination of two or more types** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Violence/sexual deviancy + gang | 12 | 9.2 | 9 | 11.7 | 3 | 5.6 | 1 | 1.6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.7 |
| Violence/sexual deviancy + narcotics ................. | 11 | 8.4 | 9 | 11.7 | 2 | 3.7 | 2 | 3.2 | 2 | 5.7 | 0 | 0 |
| Violence/sexual deviancy + property ................. | 4 | 3.0 | 3 | 3.9 | 1 | 1.8 | 3 | 4.8 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11.1 |
| Other combinations ......... | 6 | 4.6 | 3 | 3.9 | 3 | 5.6 | 1 | 1.6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.7 |

[a] Based upon five selection criteria for project

Table 39B

"Ranked" Reason Selected
by Study Group

(INTENSIVE SUPERVISION MODEL)

| "Ranked" Reason selected [a] | Study Group | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | | Experimental | | Comparison | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| Total, all cases | 193 | 100.0 | 131 | 100.0 | 62 | 100.0 |
| Violence/sexual deviancy | 157 | 81.3 | 102 | 77.9 | 55 | 88.7 |
| with gang affiliation ....... | (13) | | (12) | | (1) | |
| with narcotics sales ........ | (13) | | (11) | | (2) | |
| with property/fraud ......... | (7) | | (4) | | (3) | |
| no other reason ............. | (124) | | (75) | | (49) | |
| Narcotic sales activity | 19 | 9.8 | 15 | 11.5 | 4 | 6.4 |
| with gang affiliation ........ | (1) | | (1) | | (0) | |
| no other reason ............. | (18) | | (14) | | (4) | |
| Other reasons | 17 | 8.8 | 14 | 10.7 | 3 | 4.8 |

[a] Ranked by frequency of referral; case counted in the highest rank
category referred under, regardless of presence or absence of other reasons
referred.

$x^2 = 3.305$, df = 2, p = .200

Table 39C

Frequency of Specific Kinds of
"Violence/Sexual Deviancy" Reasons for Selection Cited

(INTENSIVE SUPERVISION MODEL)

| Specific kind of violence/sexual deviancy behavior cited as reason for selection | No. [a] | Pct. |
|---|---|---|
| Total violent/sexual deviant reasons cited [a] | 298 | 100.0 |
| Assault without injury ............................. | 4 | 1.3 |
| Assault with injury ................................ | 16 | 5.4 |
| Murder, attempted murder, manslaughter ............. | 38 | 12.8 |
| Threats of violence ................................ | 16 | 5.4 |
| Robbery or other use of weapon .................... | 93 | 31.2 |
| Possession of weapon .............................. | 36 | 12.1 |
| Other violent behavior ............................ | 31 | 10.4 |
| Child molestation ................................. | 15 | 5.0 |
| Rape .............................................. | 36 | 12.1 |
| Other sexual deviant behavior ..................... | 13 | 4.4 |

[a] Calculated to the base of total reasons cited rather than total cases as in preceeding tables.

Table 40

Source of Documenting Information Leading to Case Referral
by Parole Unit Within Study Group

(INTENSIVE SUPERVISION MODEL)

| Source of documenting information to case referral | Parole unit within study group | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Experimental | | | | | | Comparison | | | | | |
| | Sub-total | | Walnut Creek | | Riverside/ San Bernardino | | Sub-total | | Redwood City | | Ventura District | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| Total, all cases | 131 | 100.0 | 77 | 100.0 | 54 | 100.0 | 62 | 100.0 | 35 | 100.0 | 27 | 100.0 |
| Law enforcement agency information | 4 | 3.0 | 3 | 3.9 | 1 | 1.9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Supervising agent information .... | 2 | 1.5 | 2 | 2.6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1.6 | 1 | 2.8 | 0 | 0 |
| Prison or other CDC staff information ................... | 3 | 2.3 | 3 | 3.9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Prior criminal history records ... | 83 | 63.4 | 36 | 46.8 | 47 | 87.0 | 55 | 88.7 | 31 | 88.6 | 24 | 88.9 |
| Other sources ..................... | 2 | 1.5 | 2 | 2.6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Prior history records and law enforcement information ........ | 8 | 6.1 | 8 | 10.4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1.6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.7 |
| Prior history records and supervising agent information .. | 19 | 14.5 | 17 | 22.1 | 2 | 3.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Prior history records and other sources ...................... | 10 | 7.6 | 6 | 7.8 | 4 | 7.4 | 5 | 8.1 | 3 | 8.6 | 2 | 7.4 |

One significant difference which may be related to outcomes was the fact that the Walnut Creek site selected some cases who had been on parole for long periods of time before placement; and they cited law enforcement information, or the regular supervising agent information on current community adjustment, as the basis for some of their referrals. In other words, "current" suspected criminal involvement may have been the basis for selecting some of the Walnut Creek cases. If so the Walnut Creek cases would be expected to have higher recidivism rates in the follow-up analysis as they may already have returned to crime. Because of these differences, the Walnut Creek site appears to have operated as a cross between the "investigation model" described previously and the Riverside/San Bernardino "intensive supervision model" described here, although it appears more similar to the latter than the former.

Experimental versus comparison cases. Although tests for the comparability of the experimental to the comparison cases using selected background characteristics was done in Chapter an analysis of the data described in the preceding section provides a further check. As with the 133 experimental cases, the majority of the 62 comparison cases were new releasees, or had been on parole for only a few months, at the time they were selected (Table 38). However, these findings are questionable as large statistically significant differences between the parole units comprising each study group were also found. Also, like the 133 experimental cases, the majority of the 62 comparisons

were selected because of a prior criminal history (Table 40) involving violent or sexually deviant crimes (Table 39B); although some differences were found between the two units comprising the experimental group. While the experimental and comparison groups appear similar in terms of these selection variables, the within group differences may be masking the between group differences. The effect of "within study group" differences on outcome is examined further in Chapter IX.

## Types of Activity Performed

This section describes the kinds of parole supervision activities performed by agents (and the extent to which each kind was performed) under the intensive supervision model. Each supervision activity recorded in the agent field notes for each case was classified into one of thirty specific types which reflected the intended goal or purpose of that activity. Definitions of the thirty activity types are given in Appendix C. To reduce the amount of analysis, the thirty specific activities were later collapsed into nine major activity types which are here analyzed three different ways:

1. Proportion of cases with one or more of each type of activity (Table 42).

2. Average frequency of each type of activity (Table 44).

3. Average percent of the total activities for each type of activity (Table 46).

The above three measures are first used to present a profile of the types of activities characterizing the intensive

supervision model. _Second_, the intensive supervision model cases
are compared to the regular supervision cases on the above three
measures to test whether the intensive supervision model was in
fact different. _Third_, and finally the two experimental
demonstration sites are compared to each other on the above three
measures to see if the intensive supervision model was uniformly
implemented. The statistical significance of the differences in
the last two sets of comparisons was examined using either a
difference of proportions test (z) or a difference of means test
(t), the results of which are summarized in a table following
each of the three activity type measures (Tables 43,45 and 47).

It is noted that the following analysis of types of
activities performed is not based on the entire sample of study
cases. The parole agent field notes necessary for the analysis
were not available for twenty of the 131 experimental cases and
eighteen of the 62 comparison cases. Therefore, the analysis is
based upon 85% of the experimental cases and 71% of the
comparison cases. There was no reason to expect that the missing
cases biased the analysis in any way.

Profile of intensive supervision activities. The number
of activities performed on a case averaged ten per thirty day
period under intensive supervision (Table 41). Two-thirds of the
cases ranged between six and fourteen activities per thirty day
period under intensive supervision.

Three of the nine major types of activities occurred
across _every_ case; and the remaining six types occurred for well

-184-

over the majority of cases (Table 42). All the intensive
supervision cases had at least one "Check-up Contact", at
least one "Required (per P&CSD Policy) Activities" (e.g.,
processing travel requests), and at least one "Information
Exchanges With Other Individuals" (i.e., collateral
contacts). "Evidence Collection Activities", "Information
Exchanges with Law Enforcement", and "Assistance Activities"
also occurred for over four-fifths of the cases. A slightly
smaller and yet a majority proportion of the cases had at
least one "Surveillance" and "Arrest and Charge Processing
Activities".

One type of activity was the most frequent (Table 44)
and also occupied the greatest percentage of the total
activities performed (Table 46). "Check-up Contacts by the
Parole Agent" occurred an average of thirty times during the
project and on an average comprised over one-third (35.5%)
of the average total activities performed. Four other types
of activities occurred an average of 10-12 times and
occupied 10-12% of the total activities conducted under
intensive supervision. These four included "Evidence
Collection", "Information Exchanges With Law Enforcement",
"Information Exchanges With Other Individuals", and
"Required Per P&CSD Policy" activities.

Thus, the activities of the intensive supervision
model were congruent with it's purpose of closely monitoring
the parolee's activity. Behavior was primarily monitored

-185-

Table 41
Average Number of Activities Per Thirty Days In Project
by Parole Unit Within Study Group

(INTENSIVE SUPERVISION MODEL)

| Average number of activities per thirty days in the project | Parole unit within study group | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Experimental | | | | | | Comparison | | | | | |
| | Sub-total | | Walnut Creek | | Riverside/San Bernardino | | Sub-total | | Redwood City | | Ventura District | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| Total, all cases | 131 | – | 77 | – | 54 | – | 62 | – | 35 | – | 27 | – |
| Unknown ................. | 20 | – | 15 | – | 5 | – | 18 | – | 14 | – | 4 | – |
| Total less unknown ...... | 111 | 100.0 | 62 | 100.0 | 49 | 100.0 | 44 | 100.0 | 21 | 100.0 | 23 | 100.0 |
| 0.1 to 2.0 activities | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 22.7 | 3 | 14.3 | 7 | 30.4 |
| 2.1 to 4.0 activities | 3 | 2.7 | 1 | 1.6 | 2 | 4.1 | 14 | 31.8 | 10 | 47.6 | 4 | 17.4 |
| 4.1 to 6.0 activities | 11 | 9.9 | 9 | 14.5 | 2 | 4.1 | 13 | 29.5 | 7 | 33.3 | 6 | 26.1 |
| 6.1 to 8.0 activities | 20 | 18.0 | 12 | 19.4 | 8 | 16.3 | 7 | 15.9 | 1 | 4.8 | 6 | 26.1 |
| 8.1 to 10.0 activities | 26 | 23.4 | 10 | 16.1 | 16 | 32.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10.1 to 12.0 activities | 19 | 17.1 | 10 | 16.1 | 9 | 18.4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12.1 to 14.0 activities | 12 | 10.8 | 7 | 11.3 | 5 | 10.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14.1 to 16.0 activities | 12 | 10.8 | 8 | 12.9 | 4 | 8.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16.1 to 18.0 activities | 2 | 1.8 | 2 | 3.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 18.1 to 20.0 activities | 3 | 2.7 | 2 | 3.2 | 1 | 2.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20.0 and over | 3 | 2.7 | 1 | 1.6 | 2 | 4.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mean ............... | | 10.3 | | 10.4 | | 10.3 | | 3.9 | | 3.7 | | 4.0 |
| S.D. .............. | | 4.5 | | 4.9 | | 4.1 | | 1.9 | | 1.6 | | 2.1 |
| N .................. | | 111 | | 62 | | 49 | | 44 | | 21 | | 23 |

| | t | df | p |
|---|---|---|---|
| Walnut Creek vs. Riverside/San Bernardino | 0.152 | 109 | p > .500 |
| Redwood City vs. Ventura District | 0.543 | 42 | p > .500 |
| Experimental vs. Comparison | 9.092 *** | 153 | p < .001 |

Table 42

Proportion of Cases With One or More of Each Type of Activity
by Parole Unit Within Study Group

(INTENSIVE SUPERVISION MODEL)

| Type of activity | Parole unit within study group | | | | | |
| | Experimental | | | Comparison | | |
| | Sub-total | Walnut Creek | Riverside/San Bernardino | Sub-total | Red-wood City | Ventura District |
| | N=111 | N=62 | N=49 | N=44 | N=21 | N=23 |
| EVIDENCE COLLECTION ACTIVITIES: | 85.6 | 83.9 | 87.8 | 45.5 | 52.4 | 39.1 |
| Interviews ...................... | 32.4 | 33.3 | 32.7 | 13.6 | 9.5 | 17.4 |
| Pretext Interviews and Representation | 0.9 | 0 | 2.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Informant Interviews and Usages .. | 16.3 | 12.9 | 20.4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Resource Material Checks ......... | 29.7 | 32.3 | 26.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Anti-Narcotic Testing ............ | 66.6 | 72.6 | 59.2 | 38.6 | 47.6 | 30.4 |
| Search and Seizure of Evidence ... | 32.4 | 32.3 | 32.7 | 6.8 | 9.5 | 4.4 |
| SURVEILLANCE: | 52.3 | 45.2 | 61.2 | 13.6 | 4.8 | 21.7 |
| Fixed Surveillance ............... | 15.4 | 19.4 | 10.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spot Surveillance ................ | 49.6 | 40.3 | 61.2 | 13.6 | 4.8 | 21.7 |
| Tailing Surveillance ............. | 5.4 | 1.6 | 10.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| INFORMATION EXCHANGES WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT: | 84.7 | 83.9 | 85.7 | 52.3 | 57.1 | 47.8 |
| Current Suspected Criminal Involvement/ Parole Violation .............. | 61.3 | 64.5 | 57.1 | 36.4 | 23.8 | 47.8 |
| Recent Arrest and After-Arrest Processing .......................... | 58.6 | 67.7 | 46.9 | 22.7 | 28.6 | 17.4 |
| General Background or Non-Criminal Status Factors ............... | 48.7 | 51.6 | 44.9 | 15.9 | 28.6 | 4.4 |
| INFORMATION EXCHANGES WITH CDC STAFF: | 71.2 | 69.4 | 73.5 | 63.6 | 71.4 | 56.5 |
| Current Suspected Criminal Involvement/ Parole Violation ............. | 27.9 | 32.3 | 22.5 | 4.5 | 9.5 | 0 |
| Recent Arrest and After-Arrest Processing .......................... | 33.3 | 40.3 | 24.5 | 9.1 | 9.5 | 8.7 |
| General Background or Non-Criminal Status Factors ............... | 46.9 | 41.9 | 53.1 | 63.6 | 71.4 | 56.5 |
| INFO. EXCHANGES WITH OTHER INDIVIDUALS: | 98.2 | 98.4 | 98.0 | 81.8 | 85.7 | 78.3 |
| Current Suspected Criminal Involvement/ Parole Violation .............. | 37.8 | 51.6 | 20.4 | 25.0 | 28.6 | 21.7 |
| Recent Arrest and After-Arrest Processing .......................... | 53.2 | 54.8 | 51.0 | 25.0 | 33.3 | 17.4 |
| General Background or Non-Criminal Status Factors ............... | 96.4 | 95.2 | 98.0 | 77.3 | 81.0 | 73.9 |
| ARREST AND CHARGE PROCESSING ACTIVITIES: | 65.8 | 66.1 | 65.3 | 36.4 | 47.6 | 26.1 |
| Apprehension .................... | 31.5 | 25.2 | 30.6 | 9.1 | 14.3 | 4.3 |
| Required After-Arrest Processing. | 64.0 | 64.5 | 63.3 | 36.4 | 47.6 | 26.1 |
| Prosecution Assistance .......... | 11.7 | 14.5 | 8.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table 42 - continued

| Type of activity | Parole unit within study group | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Experimental | | | Comparison | | |
| | Sub-total | Walnut Creek | Riverside San Bernardino | Sub-total | Redwood City | Ventura District |
| | N=111 | N=62 | N=49 | N=44 | N=21 | N=23 |
| CHECK-UP CONTACTS BY PAROLE AGENT: | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Attempted Check-up Contacts ...... | 96.4 | 95.2 | 98.0 | 77.3 | 85.7 | 69.6 |
| Actual Check-up Contacts ......... | 98.2 | 96.8 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| REQUIRED (PER P&CSD POLICY) ACTIVITIES: | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Required Permission or Notification | 84.7 | 79.0 | 91.8 | 88.6 | 95.2 | 82.6 |
| Required Release Matters ......... | 57.7 | 51.6 | 65.3 | 36.4 | 61.9 | 13.0 |
| Required Administrative Processing | 97.3 | 96.8 | 98.0 | 97.3 | 95.2 | 100.0 |
| ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES: | 87.4 | 85.5 | 89.8 | 70.5 | 57.1 | 82.6 |
| Direct Services ................. | 46.0 | 38.7 | 55.1 | 36.4 | 4.8 | 65.2 |
| Referral to Community Service .... | 50.5 | 53.2 | 46.9 | 22.7 | 33.3 | 13.0 |
| Counseling ...................... | 66.7 | 64.5 | 69.4 | 47.7 | 47.6 | 47.8 |

Table 43

z Tests Between Parole Units and Study Groups

on

Proportion of Cases With One or More of Each Type of Activity

(INTENSIVE SUPERVISION MODEL)

| Proportion of cases with one or more of each type of activity | Walnut Creek vs. Riverside/ San Bernardino | | Redwood City vs. Ventura District | | Experimental vs. Comparison | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | z | p | z | p | z | p |
| Evidence Collection ........ | 0.588 | p>.500 | 0.887 | p=.373 | 5.174*** | p<.001 |
| Surveillance ............... | 1.667 | p=.095 | 0.063 | p>.500 | 4.438*** | p<.001 |
| Information Exchanges with Law Enforcement........... | 0.265 | p>.500 | 0.619 | p>.500 | 4.252*** | p<.001 |
| Information Exchanges with CDC Staff ................. | 0.477 | p>.500 | 1.028 | p=.303 | 0.928 | p=.350 |
| Information Exchanges with Other Individuals ........ | 0.163 | p>.500 | 0.637 | p>.500 | 3.761*** | p<.001 |
| Arrest and Charge Processing Activities ............... | 0.088 | p>.500 | 1.484 | p=.139 | 3.352*** | p<.001 |
| Check-up Contacts by Parole Agent ................... | 0 | — | 0 | — | 0 | — |
| Required (Per P&CSD Policy) Activities ............... | 0 | — | 0 | — | 0 | — |
| Assistance Activities ...... | 0.680 | p=.497 | 1.855 | p=.063 | 2.519* | p<.050 |

Table 44 - continued

## Table 44
### Average Frequency of Each Type of Activity
### by Parole Unit Within Study Group
### (INTENSIVE SUPERVISION MODEL)

| Type of activity | Parole unit within study group | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Experimental | | | Comparison | | |
| | Sub-total N=111 | Walnut Creek N=62 | Riverside/ S. B. N=49 | Sub total N=44 | Redwood City N=21 | Ventura District N=23 |
| EVIDENCE COLLECTION ACTIVITIES: $\bar{X}$ | 11.38 | 12.44 | 10.04 | 4.73 | 5.43 | 4.09 |
| (S.D.) | (12.17) | (13.28) | (10.46) | (7.41) | (6.72) | (7.93) |
| Median | 7.00 | 9.50 | 6.00 | 0 | 3.00 | 0 |
| Interviews .......................... | 0.95 | 1.15 | 0.71 | 0.27 | 0.19 | 0.35 |
| Pretext Interviews and Representation | 0.01 | 0 | 0.02 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Informant Interviews and Usages ... | 0.29 | 0.31 | 0.27 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Resource Material Checks .......... | 0.85 | 1.13 | 0.51 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Anti-Narcotic Testing ............. | 8.69 | 9.16 | 8.10 | 4.32 | 5.05 | 3.65 |
| Search and Seizure of Evidence .... | 0.59 | 0.71 | 0.43 | 0.14 | 0.19 | 0.09 |
| SURVEILLANCE: $\bar{X}$ | 2.85 | 3.58 | 1.98 | 0.14 | 0.05 | 0.22 |
| (S.D.) | (10.85) | (14.31) | (2.44) | (0.34) | (0.21) | (0.41) |
| Median | 1.00 | 0 | 1.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Fixed Surveillance ................ | 0.25 | 0.36 | 0.12 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spot Surveillance ................. | 2.50 | 3.18 | 1.63 | 0.14 | 0.05 | 0.22 |
| Tailing Surveillance .............. | 0.10 | 0.05 | 0.16 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mean Hours | 0.82 | 1.10 | 0.46 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (S.D.) | (3.52) | (4.59) | (0.75) | (0) | (0) | (0) |
| N | 105 | 60 | 45 | 44 | 21 | 23 |
| INFO. EXCHANGES WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT: $\bar{X}$ | 10.67 | 15.48 | 4.57 | 1.86 | 1.62 | 2.09 |
| (S.D.) | (17.13) | (21.41) | (4.21) | (3.56) | (2.48) | (4.30) |
| Median | 5.00 | 7.50 | 4.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0 |
| Current Suspected Criminal Involvement/Parole Violation .......... | 5.15 | 7.65 | 2.00 | 0.91 | 0.38 | 1.39 |
| Recent Arrest and After-Arrest Processing ..................... | 4.04 | 5.97 | 1.59 | 0.66 | 0.81 | 0.52 |
| General Background or Non-Criminal Status Factors ................. | 1.48 | 1.87 | 0.98 | 0.30 | 0.43 | 0.17 |
| INFORMATION EXCHANGES WITH CDC STAFF: $\bar{X}$ | 2.77 | 3.15 | 2.29 | 1.66 | 2.23 | 1.13 |
| (S.D.) | (3.93) | (4.50) | (2.98) | (1.92) | (2.22) | (1.39) |
| Median | 2.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 |
| Current Suspected Criminal Involvement/Parole Violation ......... | 0.78 | 1.02 | 0.49 | 0.07 | 0.14 | 0 |
| Recent Arrest and After-Arrest Processing ..................... | 0.78 | 0.98 | 0.53 | 0.16 | 0.19 | 0.13 |
| General Background or Non-Criminal Status Factors ................. | 1.20 | 1.15 | 1.27 | 1.43 | 1.91 | 1.00 |

| Type of activity | Parole unit within study group | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Experimental | | | Comparison | | |
| | Sub-total N=111 | Walnut Creek N=62 | Riverside/ S. B. N=49 | Sub-total N=44 | Redwood City N=21 | Ventura District N=23 |
| INFORMATION EXCHANGES WITH OTHER INDIVIDUALS: $\bar{X}$ | 11.46 | 11.10 | 11.92 | 4.66 | 6.52 | 2.96 |
| (S.D.) | (9.60) | (10.31) | (8.60) | (5.30) | (6.37) | (3.25) |
| Median | 9.00 | 9.00 | 9.00 | 3.00 | 4.00 | 2.00 |
| Current Suspected Criminal Involvement/Parole Violation ................. | 1.58 | 2.45 | 0.47 | 0.68 | 1.14 | 0.26 |
| Recent Arrest and After-Arrest Processing ......................... | 2.60 | 3.27 | 1.75 | 0.68 | 1.00 | 0.39 |
| General Background or Non-Criminal Status Factors ..................... | 7.28 | 5.37 | 9.69 | 3.30 | 4.38 | 2.30 |
| ARREST AND CHARGE PROCESSING ACTIVITIES: $\bar{X}$ | 6.09 | 7.98 | 3.69 | 1.36 | 1.67 | 1.09 |
| (S.D.) | (8.77) | (10.80) | (4.04) | (2.60) | (2.12) | (2.95) |
| Median | 4.00 | 5.00 | 2.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Apprehension ....................... | 0.49 | 0.58 | 0.37 | 0.11 | 0.19 | 0.04 |
| Required After-Arrest Processing ..... | 5.30 | 7.00 | 3.14 | 1.25 | 1.48 | 1.04 |
| Prosecution Assistance .............. | 0.31 | 0.40 | 0.18 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CHECK-UP CONTACTS BY PAROLE AGENT: $\bar{X}$ | 30.63 | 25.60 | 37.00 | 16.30 | 20.86 | 12.13 |
| (S.D.) | (19.05) | (18.04) | (18.37) | (10.58) | (11.44) | (7.63) |
| Median | 28.00 | 23.00 | 37.00 | 13.50 | 21.00 | 10.00 |
| Attempted Check-Up Contacts ......... | 12.05 | 9.29 | 15.56 | 3.32 | 4.19 | 2.52 |
| Actual Check-Up Contacts ............ | 18.58 | 16.31 | 21.45 | 12.98 | 16.67 | 9.61 |
| REQUIRED (PER P&CSD POLICY) ACTIVITIES: $\bar{X}$ | 10.17 | 10.81 | 9.36 | 8.02 | 8.71 | 7.39 |
| (S.D.) | (6.18) | (7.18) | (4.48) | (4.74) | (5.08) | (4.31) |
| Median | 9.00 | 10.00 | 9.00 | 7.00 | 7.00 | 7.00 |
| Required Permission or Notification .. | 3.44 | 3.45 | 3.43 | 4.09 | 5.14 | 3.13 |
| Required Release Matters ............ | 1.06 | 1.00 | 1.14 | 0.61 | 1.05 | 0.22 |
| Required Administrative Processing ... | 5.67 | 6.36 | 4.80 | 3.32 | 2.52 | 4.04 |
| ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES: $\bar{X}$ | 4.31 | 4.58 | 4.00 | 2.61 | 1.62 | 3.52 |
| (S.D.) | (3.83) | (4.00) | (3.59) | (3.01) | (1.79) | (3.57) |
| Median | 3.00 | 4.00 | 3.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 |
| Direct Services ..................... | 1.16 | 1.03 | 1.33 | 1.21 | 0.05 | 2.26 |
| Referral to Community Service ........ | 1.05 | 1.05 | 1.06 | 0.46 | 0.71 | 0.22 |
| Counseling .......................... | 2.09 | 2.50 | 1.57 | 0.96 | 0.86 | 1.04 |

## Table 45
## t Tests Between Units and Study Groups
## on
## Average Frequency For Each Type of Activity
## (INTENSIVE SUPERVISION MODEL)

| Average frequency for each type of activity | Walnut Creek vs. Riverside/San Bernardino (df=109) t | p | Redwood City vs. Ventura District (df=42) t | p | Experimental vs. Comparison (df=153) t | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Evidence Collection | 1.025 | p=.308 | 0.589 | p >.500 | 3.362*** | p <.001 |
| Surveillance | 0.797 | p=.428 | -1.653 | p = .106 | 1.647 | p = .102 |
| Information Exchanges with Law Enforcement | 3.482*** | p<.001 | -0.427 | p >.500 | 3.359*** | p <.001 |
| Information Exchanges with CDC Staff | 1.142 | p=.256 | 1.952 | p = .058 | 1.776 | p = .078 |
| Information Exchanges with Other Individuals | -0.444 | p >.500 | 2.316* | p <.050 | 4.412*** | p <.001 |
| Arrest and Charge Processing Activities | 2.614* | p<.050 | 0.725 | p =.473 | 3.491*** | p <.001 |
| Check-up Contacts by Parole Agent | -3.250** | p<.010 | 2.931** | p <.050 | 4.681*** | p <.001 |
| Required (Per P&CSD Policy) Activities | 1.215 | p=.227 | 0.912 | p =.367 | 2.063* | p <.050 |
| Assistance Activities | 0.843 | p=.402 | -2.151* | p <.050 | 2.607* | p <.0 |

-192-

## Table 46
## Average Percent of Total Activities for Each Type of Activity
## by Parole Unit Within Study Group
## (INTENSIVE SUPERVISION MODEL)

| Type of activity | Parole unit within study group Experimental Sub-total N=111 | Walnut Creek N=62 | Riverside/ S.B. N=49 | Comparison Sub-total N=44 | Redwood City N=21 | Ventura District N=23 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| EVIDENCE COLLECTION ACTIVITIES: $\bar{X}$ (S.D.) | 12.1 (9.6) | 12.6 (9.5) | 11.5 (9.8) | 7.8 (11.2) | 9.2 (11.6) | 6.4 (10.5) |
| Interviews | 1.0 | 0.9 | 1.2 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.6 |
| Pretext Interviews and Representation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Informant Interviews and Usages | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Resource Material Checks | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Anti-Narcotic Testing | 9.4 | 9.9 | 8.7 | 7.1 | 8.7 | 5.7 |
| Search and Seizure of Evidence | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.1 |
| SURVEILLANCE: $\bar{X}$ (S.D.) | 2.0 (4.1) | 1.9 (5.0) | 2.0 (2.4) | 0.8 (2.2) | 0.3 (1.4) | 1.1 (2.7) |
| Fixed Surveillance | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spot Surveillance | 1.8 | 1.8 | 1.7 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 1.1 |
| Tailing Surveillance | 0.1 | 0 | 0.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| INFORMATION EXCHANGES WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT $\bar{X}$ (S.D.) | 9.9 (9.3) | 13.3 (10.6) | 5.7 (4.8) | 3.4 (4.8) | 2.7 (3.5) | 3.9 (5.6) |
| Current Suspected Criminal Involvement/ Parole Violation | 4.4 | 6.0 | 2.5 | 1.8 | 0.6 | 2.9 |
| Recent Arrest and After-Arrest Processing | 3.9 | 5.4 | 2.1 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 0.8 |
| General Background or Non-Criminal Status Factors | 1.6 | 2.0 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 1.2 | 0.2 |
| INFORMATION EXCHANGES WITH CDC STAFF: $\bar{X}$ (S.D.) | 3.1 (3.9) | 3.2 (4.0) | 2.9 (3.8) | 4.2 (4.1) | 4.5 (3.5) | 4.0 (4.5) |
| Current Suspected Criminal Involvement/ Parole Violation | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0 |
| Recent Arrest and After-Arrest Processing | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| General Background or Non-Criminal Status Factors | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.3 | 3.9 | 4.1 | 3.7 |

-193-

Table 46 - continued

| Type of activity | | Parole unit within study group | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Experimental | | | Comparison | | |
| | | Sub-total N=111 | Walnut Creek N=62 | Riverside S.B. N=49 | Sub-total N=44 | Redwood City N=21 | Ventura District N=23 |
| INFORMATION EXCHANGES WITH OTHER INDIVIDUALS: | $\bar{X}$ | 12.5 | 11.9 | 13.2 | 9.3 | 11.5 | 7.3 |
| | (S.D.) | (6.4) | (6.4) | (6.3) | (7.6) | (7.9) | (6.7) |
| Current Suspected Criminal Involvement/ Parole Violation.................... | | 1.4 | 2.0 | 0.6 | 1.3 | 1.9 | 0.8 |
| Recent Arrest and After-Arrest Processing......................... | | 2.5 | 2.7 | 2.2 | 0.8 | 1.1 | 0.5 |
| General Background or Non-Criminal Status Factors..................... | | 8.6 | 7.1 | 10.5 | 7.2 | 8.5 | 6.1 |
| ARREST AND CHARGE PROCESSING ACTIVITIES: | $\bar{X}$ (S.D.) | 7.0 (8.2) | 8.3 (9.3) | 5.3 (6.1) | 2.1 (4.2) | 2.5 (3.1) | 1.8 (5.0) |
| Apprehension...................... | | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.1 |
| Required After-Arrest Processing........ | | 6.2 | 7.4 | 4.5 | 1.9 | 2.2 | 1.7 |
| Prosecution Assistance............... | | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CHECK-UP CONTACTS BY PAROLE AGENT: | $\bar{X}$ (S.D.) | 35.5 (15.6) | 30.0 (15.1) | 42.4 (13.4) | 42.0 (12.9) | 45.7 (10.2) | 38.7 (14.2) |
| Attempted Check-Up Contacts............ | | 13.7 | 10.7 | 17.5 | 7.3 | 7.6 | 6.9 |
| Actual Check-Up Contacts.............. | | 21.8 | 19.3 | 24.9 | 34.8 | 38.1 | 31.8 |
| REQUIRED (PER P&CSD POLICY) ACTIVITIES: | $\bar{X}$ (S.D.) | 12.3 (6.1) | 12.7 (6.6) | 11.7 (5.2) | 23.0 (11.6) | 20.1 (8.6) | 25.7 (13.2) |
| Required Permission or Notification..... | | 3.9 | 3.8 | 4.1 | 10.5 | 11.9 | 9.3 |
| Required Release Matters.............. | | 1.6 | 1.4 | 1.8 | 1.2 | 2.0 | 0.6 |
| Required Administrative Processing...... | | 6.8 | 7.5 | 5.8 | 11.3 | 6.3 | 15.8 |
| ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES: | $\bar{X}$ (S.D.) | 5.0 (4.0) | 5.3 (3.8) | 4.6 (4.2) | 6.5 (7.1) | 2.4 (2.4) | 10.3 (7.8) |
| Direct Services...................... | | 1.5 | 1.2 | 1.7 | 3.4 | 0.1 | 6.4 |
| Referral to Community Service........... | | 1.4 | 1.5 | 1.3 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.9 |
| Counseling.......................... | | 2.2 | 2.6 | 1.6 | 2.2 | 1.3 | 3.0 |

Table 47
t Tests Between Parole Units and Study Groups
on
Average Percent of Total Activities For Each Type of Activity
(INTENSIVE SUPERVISION MODEL)

| Type of activity | Walnut Creek vs. Riverside/ San Bernardino (df=109) | | Redwood City vs. Ventura District (df=42) | | Experimental vs. Comparison (df=153) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | t | p | t | p | t | p |
| Evidence Collection.............. | 0.637 | p>.500 | 0.798 | p=.430 | 2.411* | p<.050 |
| Surveillance.................... | 0.023 | p>.500 | -1.233 | p=.225 | 1.877 | p=.063 |
| Information Exchanges With Law Enforcement................... | 4.605*** | p<.001 | -0.806 | p=.425 | 4.403*** | p<.001 |
| Information Exchanges With CDC Staff.......................... | 0.433 | p>.500 | 0.438 | p>.500 | -1.638 | p=.104 |
| Information Exchanges With Other Individuals.............. | -1.112 | p=.269 | 1.840 | p=.073 | 2.608* | p<.050 |
| Arrest and Charge Processing Activities.................... | 1.985* | p<.050 | 0.518 | p>.500 | 3.755*** | p<.001 |
| Check-up Contacts By Parole Agents........................ | 4.476*** | p<.001 | 1.835 | p=.074 | -2.449* | p<.050 |
| Required Per (P&CSD Policy) Activities.................... | 0.875 | p=.384 | -1.063 | p=.117 | -7.501*** | p<.001 |
| Assistance Activities............ | 0.894 | p=.374 | -4.366*** | p<.001 | -1.608 | p=.110 |

"directly" by making check-up contacts, and secondarily monitored "indirectly" by information exchanges with either local law enforcement or collaterals of the parolees. Also, as the high control agents assumed full caseload responsibilities for an intensive supervision model case (but not on the investigation model cases), the findings showed that certain required administrative activities (e.g., case conferences, conducting discharge reviews, delivering release monies) also occupied a part of the agent's time.

Comparison to regular supervision activities. Intensive supervision was designed to operate like regular supervision in terms of the agent's maintaining full caseload responsibilities for each case. The major proposed difference was in the greater frequency of contacts and in the greater emphasis which would be placed on monitoring the case's activity indirectly through collaterals and other information sources. To test this expectation, the number and types of activities occurring for the intensive supervision cases were compared to the numbers and types occurring for the comparison cases who received regular supervision.

The average number of contacts occurring under intensive supervision was two and one-half times larger than the average number occurring under regular supervision. Table 41 shows that the comparison cases averaged four

contacts per thirty day period while the experimentals averaged ten contacts per thirty day period. The difference using a difference between means test was statistically significant.

Several statistically significant differences were also found between intensive supervision and regular supervision cases on the specific types of activities performed. The types of activity equally common to most cases (i.e., the proportion of cases with one or more occurrences of each type of activity, Table 42) under both regular and intensive supervision were "Check-up Contacts", "Required Activities" and "Information Exchanges With Other CDC Staff". The remaining six types of activities showed statistically significant differences. A larger proportion of the intensive supervision cases than the comparison cases experienced at least one "Evidence Collection", "Surveillance", "Information Exchanges With Law Enforcement", "Information Exchanges With Other Individuals", "Arrest", and "Assistance" activity. Also, the intensive supervision model agents engaged in a higher average frequency of every single activity type than the regular supervision agents (Table 44; 7 of the 9 differences were statistically significant, Table 45).

Differences between intensive and regular supervision are best highlighted by examining which types of activities occupied the largest proportion of the total activities

performed (Tables 46 and 47). For regular supervision an average of 42.0% of the total activities involved check-up contacts, followed by 23.0% required administrative activities, 9.3% collateral contacts and only 7.8% evidence collection activities and 3.4% law enforcement information exchanges. In contrast, intensive supervision involved an average of 35.5% check-up contacts, 12.3% required administrative activities, 12.5% collateral contacts, 12.1% evidence collection activities and 9.9 % law enforcement information exchanges. Clearly the intensive supervision model not only increased activity levels but shifted the expenditure of staff time away from "direct" check-up contacts and administrative processing to "indirect" monitoring through various evidence collection activities, law enforcement information exchanges and collateral contacts. It was very similar to regular supervision in terms of the diversity and range of activity types the agents performed. In contrast to the types of activities performed by high control agents in the investigation model it was far less specialized.

Comparison across units. There was no difference between the two demonstration sites in the total number of activities agents performed on each case. Each unit averaged ten activities per case per thirty day period in the project (Table 41). There was also no difference between units on the most commonly occurring types of

activities across cases (Table 42 and 43). Both Walnut Creek and Riverside/San Bernardino performed at least one of each of the nine major type of activities on a majority of it's cases. Thus, both sites performed mixed but comprehensive sets of activities.

A few differences did exist between the units on which of the nine major activity types each emphasized. A significantly larger average frequency (Table 46 and 47) at Walnut Creek were expended on "Information Exchanging With Law Enforcement" (average frequency: 15.5 vs 4.6; average percent of total aactivities: 13.3% vs. 5.7%) and in "Arrest and After-Arrest Processing" (average frequency: 8.0 vs 3.7; average percent of total activities: 8.3% vs. 5.3%) than was expended at Riverside/San Bernardino. On the other hand, the Riverside/San Bernardino site placed more emphasis on making "Check-up Contacts" than did the Walnut Creek site (average frequency: 25.6 vs. 37.0; average percent of total activities: 30.0% vs. 42.4%).

Thus, relative to each other, the Riverside/San Bernardino site represented more of a "high contact" supervision model than Walnut Creek. And Walnut Creek, with it's more frequent law enforcement information exchanges and arrest activity represented more of an "investigative" model approach to supervision than the intensive supervision model operated by Riverside/San Bernardino.

These features correspond with two earlier findings on operational differences between the two sites. A higher

proportion of Walnut Creek as opposed to Riverside/San Bernardino referrals were based on law enforcement information (Table 40) and included cases who had been on parole for some time prior to placement under intensive supervision (Table 38). Together the differences suggest that a proportion of the Walnut Creek cases were already suspected of being reinvolved in criminal activity at the time of placement under intensive supervision. If true, we would expect higher, rather than lower, recidivism rate during the follow-up period for the Walnut Creek cases.

Discussions with staff at the Walnut Creek site also support this interpretation. The researcher was informed midway during the project that cases suspected of being reinvolved in criminal activity were sometimes placed under the intensive supervision model instead of the investigation model which was also operational at the Walnut Creek site (Note: Walnut Creek was the only demonstration site to operate both models) because of the increased control over caseload information it offered the high control agents. For such cases a more realistic goal would be "verification and apprehension" rather than the "deterrence and prevention" goal assigned the intensive supervision model. On the other hand, for the Riverside/San Bernardino project where all cases were placed under intensive supervision at release from prison (with no current criminal involvement suspected), the goal of "deterrence and prevention" is more appropriate.

Whether these few but significant differences between the operations of the Walnut Creek project and the Riverside/San Bernardino project differentially affected outcomes will be examined in the next chapter. Based on their potential impact on outcome, outcomes for the two experimental sites are examined separately as well as on a combined basis.

Chapter summary. This chapter described the operations and activities of the intensive supervision model of the High Control Project. The intensive supervision model operated by selecting approximately two new cases per agent per month. Cases were selected primarily because they had prior criminal histories involving a violent or sexually deviant offense. Cases were placed under intensive supervision immediately upon release or within a few months after release from prison and remained in the project an average of eleven months. The total number of activities performed on a case averaged ten per case per thirty day period in the project and included at least one of each of nine major types of supervision activities examined. The type of activity representing the largest proportion of total activities performed was check-up contacts by the parole agent. Monitoring the parolees' activities through information exchanges with law enforcement and collaterals of the parolees and other evidence collection techniques were also frequently performed. Thus, as indicated by it's

high frequency of both direct and indirect monitoring contacts, the intensive supervision model was shown to have generally operated as proposed.

This chapter has also shown that intensive supervision was significantly different from regular supervision. Aside from the high risk cases supervised in small 10-15 man caseloads, intensive supervision differed from regular supervision by it's almost tripling the total number of activities performed. A more frequent number (and greater proportion of the total number of activities) comprised contacts to monitor the parolees' activities indirectly through law enforcement, collaterals and other information sources.

Finally, this chapter has shown that the two experimental demonstration sites operated similarly with a couple of major exceptions. A more extensive prior parole time before placement on intensive supervision and a higher frequency of subsequent arrest and law enforcement exchange activities by the high control agents was found for the Walnut Creek site as compared to the Riverside/San Bernardino site. These findings suggest that the Walnut Creek model may have been used to investigate parolees already suspected of reinvolvement in criminal activity. If so it's parole violation rate would be expected to be higher than the rate for the model implemented at the Riverside/San Bernardino site.

OUTCOME OF THE INTENSIVE SUPERVISION MODEL

The objective of the Intensive Supervision Model was to prevent and deter high risk parolees from returning to criminal activity by closely monitoring their activities in the community. Program planners hypothesized a "reduction" in returns to illegal activity during and after the period of intensive supervision. To determine the extent to which this objective was achieved, the frequency and severity of returns to criminal activity during a six and a twelve month follow-up period were tabulated for the 131 intensive supervision cases and compared to the outcomes of a similar group of 62 high risk, "intensive supervision type", parolees who received only regular supervision. This chapter summarizes the findings of that analysis. In addition, differences in outcome between the two experimental demonstration sites are examined.

Several quantitative and qualitative indicators of returns to illegal activity were used in the analysis to follow. Those measures have been grouped into four types including: (1) parole status (as of the end of the follow-up period), (2) the total criminal and the total revocation charges and dispositions received during the follow-up period, (3) the most serious disposition and associated charge received by the end of the follow-up period, and (4) the custody-free days experienced during the follow-up period.

All 193 study cases had experienced sufficient post-selection time in the community to measure their six month outcomes; however, the necessary follow-up data documents could not be retrieved for three study cases and they had to be ommitted from the outcome analysis. Therefore, the six month outcomes are calculated to the base of 190 (rather than 193) study cases including 75 Walnut Creek, 54 Riverside/San Bernardino and 61 comparison cases.

Several study cases (particularly the more recently drawn comparison group) had not experienced sufficient post-selection time in the community to measure twelve month outcomes. And yet, due to the unreliability of short term follow-up analysis such as six months, twelve month outcomes were seen as very desirable. Twelve month follow-up data was collected for 154 (or 79.8%) of the 193 study cases (including 117 of the 131 experimental cases and 37 of the 62 comparison cases) with sufficient post-selection parole time and with available follow-up data. Therefore, the twelve month outcomes are calculated to the base of 154 cases, including 65 Walnut Creek, 52 Riverside/San Bernardino, and 37 comparison cases. Findings on the four sets of recidivism measures are reported first for the six month follow-up period (Table 48-56) and then for the longer twelve month follow-up period (Table 57-65).

## Six Month Outcome

Parole status. The first outcome criterion is the supervision status of study cases at the end of the follow-

up period. If intensive supervision deters parolees from returning to criminal activity we would expect a larger proportion of experimental as opposed to comparison cases to still be on parole at the end of the follow-up period. Table 48 shows the opposite is true. Almost all of the comparison cases (91.8%) were still on parole while a little less than three-quarters, (72.1%) of the experimental cases were still on parole (i.e., under either intensive (60.5%) or regular supervision after transfer from intensive supervision (11.6%)) at the end of the six month follow-up period. Over one-quarter of the experimentals were "inactive" after having their parole revoked (18.6%) or receiving a new court commitment (7.8%), compared to less than ten percent of the comparison cases. Thus, contrary to the prediction, fewer intensive than regular supervision cases were still on parole at the end of the follow-up period.

Criminal and revocation charges, dispositions. The first of the second set of measures compares the experimental to the comparison cases on the total criminal and the total revocation charges filed throughout the follow-up period. If intensive supervision deters parolees from returning to illegal activities we would expect a lower frequency of charges and/or charges of a less serious nature for high risk cases under intensive as opposed to regular supervision.

Table 48
Program Status
At End of Six Month Follow-up Period
by Study Group

(INTENSIVE SUPERVISION MODEL)

| Program status at end of six month follow-up period | Experimental | | | | | | Comparison | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | Total | | Walnut Creek | | Riverside/ San Bernardino | | | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| Total all cases | 131 | – | 77 | – | 54 | – | 62 | – |
| Unknown follow-up | 2 | – | 2 | – | 0 | – | 1 | – |
| Total less unknown | 129 | 100.0 | 75 | 100.0 | 54 | 100.0 | 61 | 100.0 |
| Under Intensive Supervision | 78 | 60.5 | 40 | 53.3 | 38 | 70.4 | 0 | 0 |
| Active, with no charges | (36) | | (16) | | (20) | | (0) | |
| Active after an arrest or violation | (27) | | (15) | | (12) | | (0) | |
| Active with charges pending | (15) | | (9) | | (6) | | (0) | |
| Transfer to/or remaining under regular supervision | 15 | 11.6 | 13 | 17.3 | 2 | 3.7 | 56 | 91.8 |
| Active, with no charges | (10) | | (9) | | (1) | | (42) | |
| Active after an arrest or violation | (2) | | (2) | | (0) | | (11) | |
| Active with charges pending | (3) | | (2) | | (1) | | (3) | |
| Inactive, parole revoked | 24 | 18.6 | 16 | 21.3 | 8 | 14.8 | 4 | 6.6 |
| Parole terminated after new court commitment | 10 | 7.8 | 4 | 5.3 | 6 | 11.1 | 0 | 0 |
| Parole terminated due to discharge | 2 | 1.6 | 2 | 2.7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1.6 |

| | z | p |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Walnut Creek vs. Riverside/San Bernardino | | |
| Proportion Under Intensive Supervision: | 1.960 * | p < .050 |
| Proportion Transferred to Regular Supervision: | Not calculated – Small N | |
| Proportion Terminated Due to New Court Commitment: | 1.325 | p = .184 (Corrected for Continuity |
| Proportion Terminated Due to Discharge From Parole: | Not calculated – Small N | |
| Experimental vs. Comparison | Not calculated – Small N | |

Examining criminal charges first, we find a larger proportion of the intensively supervised cases (38.8%) than the regularly supervised cases (18.0%) had criminal charges filed against them during the six month follow-up period (Table 49). The difference in proportions was statistically significant. Not only were more cases charged but each case also received more charges. The intensive supervision group averaged 2.70 charges per case versus only 1.90 charges per case for the regular supervision study group.

Whether or not the higher frequency of criminal charges received by the intensive supervision cases were of a more or less serious nature than those received by the regular supervision cases can be answered by examining the type of offense charged (Table 50) and the type of disposition received (Table 51) for the total criminal charges filed. Intensive supervision was associated with a higher proportion of felony level charges than occurred for regular supervision cases (85.6% intensive vs. 28.6% regular). The majority of the charges filed against the comparison group were at the less serious misdemeanor level.

Differences between the two study groups on the mix of dispositions received for the total criminal charges are less clear because of the large proportion of comparison cases (23.8%, N=5) with dispositions pending. The larger number of unresolved dispositions for the comparison group is an artifact resulting from the fact that some of the

## Table 49
### Criminal and Revocation Charges Filed During A Six Month Follow-up Period by Study Group
#### (INTENSIVE SUPERVISION MODEL)

| Criminal and revocation charges filed during a six month follow-up period | Experimental | | | | | | Comparison | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | | Walnut Creek | | Riverside/ San Bernardino | | | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| CRIMINAL CHARGES | 129 | 100.0 | 75 | 100.0 | 54 | 100.0 | 61 | 100.0 |
| None filed | 79 | 61.2 | 43 | 57.3 | 36 | 66.7 | 50 | 82.0 |
| Charges filed | 50 | 38.8 | 32 | 42.7 | 18 | 33.3 | 11 | 18.0 |
| One charge ............ | (20) | | (10) | | (10) | | (7) | |
| Two charges ........... | (7) | | (3) | | (4) | | (0) | |
| Three charges ......... | (8) | | (5) | | (3) | | (2) | |
| Four charges .......... | (6) | | (5) | | (1) | | (2) | |
| Five or more charges ... | (9) | | (9) | | (0) | | (0) | |
| Total charges .. | | 135 | | 104 | | 31 | | 21 |
| Mean charges/case charged | | 2.70 | | 3.25 | | 1.72 | | 1.90 |
| PAROLE REVOCATION CHARGES | 129 | 100.0 | 75 | 100.0 | 54 | 100.0 | 61 | 100.0 |
| None filed | 49 | 38.0 | 27 | 36.0 | 22 | 40.7 | 42 | 68.9 |
| Charges filed | 80 | 62.0 | 48 | 64.0 | 32 | 59.3 | 19 | 31.1 |
| One charge ............ | (27) | | (14) | | (13) | | (10) | |
| Two charges ........... | (18) | | (9) | | (9) | | (4) | |
| Three charges ......... | (20) | | (14) | | (6) | | (2) | |
| Four charges .......... | (7) | | (5) | | (2) | | (2) | |
| Five or more charges ... | (8) | | (6) | | (2) | | (1) | |
| Total charges | | 205 | | 137 | | 68 | | 37 |
| Mean charges/case charged | | 2.56 | | 2.85 | | 2.13 | | 1.95 |

| CRIMINAL CHARGE (Filed vs. Not Filed) | z | p |
|---|---|---|
| Walnut Creek vs. Riverside/San Bernardino: | 1.085 | p =.276 |
| Experimental vs. Comparison: | 2.885** | p <.010 |

| REVOCATION CHARGES (Filed vs. Not Filed) | | |
|---|---|---|
| Walnut Creek vs. Riverside/San Bernardino: | 0.546 | p >.500 |
| Experimental vs. Comparison: | 3.981*** | p <.001 |

## Table 50
### Type of Criminal Offenses Charged During A Six Month Follow-up Period by Study Group
#### (INTENSIVE SUPERVISION MODEL)

| Type of criminal offenses charged during a six month follow-up period | Experimental | | | | | | Comparison | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | | Walnut Creek | | Riverside/ San Bernardino | | | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| Total criminal charges | 135 | – | 104 | – | 31 | – | 21 | – |
| Unknown type | 3 | – | 3 | – | 0 | – | 0 | – |
| Total less unknown | 132 | 100.0 | 101 | 100.0 | 31 | 100.0 | 21 | 100.0 |
| Felony level charges | 113 | 85.6 | 87 | 86.1 | 26 | 83.9 | 6 | 28.6 |
| Person ................ | (32) | | (24) | | (8) | | (3) | |
| Property ............. | (40) | | (37) | | (3) | | (2) | |
| Narcotics/drugs ....... | (22) | | (9) | | (13) | | (0) | |
| Other felony ......... | (19) | | (17) | | (2) | | (1) | |
| Misdemeanor level charges | 19 | 14.4 | 14 | 13.9 | 5 | 16.1 | 15 | 71.4 |

| Proportion with Felony Level Charges | z | p |
|---|---|---|
| Walnut Creek vs. Riverside/San Bernardino | 0.432 | p >.500 |
| Experimental vs. Comparison: | 7.489*** | p <.001 |

Table 51

Type of Disposition
For Each Criminal Charge Received During A Six Month Follow-up
by Study Group

(INTENSIVE SUPERVISION MODEL)

| Type of disposition for each criminal charge received during a six month follow-up period | Experimental | | | | | | Comparison | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | | Walnut Creek | | Riverside/ San Bernardino | | | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| Total criminal charges | 135 | 100.0 | 104 | 100.0 | 31 | 100.0 | 21 | 100.0 |
| Charges dropped, dismissed or aquitted........ | 57 | 42.2 | 43 | 41.3 | 14 | 45.2 | 5 | 23.8 |
| Convicted, sentenced to jail............... | 22 | 16.3 | 16 | 15.4 | 6 | 19.4 | 10 | 47.6 |
| Convicted, sentenced to prison .......... | 44 | 32.6 | 37 | 35.6 | 7 | 22.6 | 1 | 4.8 |
| Disposition pending .... | 12 | 8.9 | 8 | 7.7 | 4 | 12.9 | 5 | 23.8 |

| | $x^2$ | df | p |
|---|---|---|---|
| Walnut Creek vs. Riverside/ San Bernardino: | 2.281 | 3 | $p > .500$ |
| Experimental vs. Comparison: | 18.835*** | 3 | $p < .001$ |

comparison group cases were drawn from a more recent cohort of releases to parole. If the five pending dispositions result in the charges being dropped (the "least" serious of the possible dispositions), then intensive supervision appears to be associated with a large increase in dispositional severity (32.6% intensive vs. 4.8% regular, committed to prison). If these five pending charges for the comparison group all resulted in commitments to prison (the "most" serious of the possible dispositional categories), intensive supervision would still be associated with a slightly higher proportion of the more serious type of criminal dispositions (32.6% intensive vs. 28.6% regular). Therefore, given either resolution of the pending dispositions, it appears that intensive supervision is associated with a higher frequency of felony level charges which resulted more often in sentences to state prison.

One other finding on type of dispositions received is particularly noteworthy. Not only does intensive supervision appear associated with more serious court sentences, but it is also associated with a higher proportion of charges which are eventually dropped or dismissed, or for which the case is acquitted (42.2% intensive vs. 23.8% regular). The implication of the finding is that while intensive supervision is associated with more cases being criminally charged for serious offenses, it also associated with a higher risk of having

more of the filed charges eventually dropped. As with the above analysis, this finding is limited by the large proportion of comparison cases whose dispositions were still pending at the time this data was collected. For further evidence, we will examine this association again in the twelve month outcome analysis.

Table 49 shows that revocation charges increased. A larger proportion of intensive supervision cases (62.0%) had violations of the conditions of parole filed against them than occurred for the regular supervision cases (31.1%). The difference in proportions was statistically significant. Furthermore, each case averaged a slightly larger number of revocation charges (2.56 intensive vs. 1.95 regular).

Differences in the severity of these revocation charges were examined by analyzing the types of violations of parole conditions charged in all revocation actions (Table 52) and the type of revocation dispositions received on these charges (Table 53). Of the four major types of parole conditions governing the release to parole status, the majority of charges for both the experimental and comparison groups was for violations of the "Criminal Conduct" condition (which specifies that parolees must obey all laws). However, a significantly larger proportion of the parole condition charges for the intensive supervision group were "Criminal Conduct" charges (79.0% intensive vs. 59.4% regular). Regular cases were charged with a higher

Table 52

Type of Parole Conditions
Charged During A Six Month Follow-up Period
by Study Group

(INTENSIVE SUPERVISION MODEL)

| Type of parole conditions charged during a six month follow-up period | Experimental | | | | | | Comparison | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | | Walnut Creek | | Riverside/ San Bernardino | | | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| Total, all revocation charges | 205 | 100.0 | 137 | 100.0 | 68 | 100.0 | 37 | 100.0 |
| a/ Release, reporting and travel | 22 | 10.7 | 16 | 11.7 | 6 | 8.8 | 2 | 5.4 |
| a/ Parole agent instructions | 4 | 2.0 | 3 | 2.2 | 1 | 1.5 | 0 | 0 |
| Criminal conduct | 162 | 79.0 | 105 | 76.6 | 57 | 83.8 | 22 | 59.4 |
| Special conditions | 17 | 8.3 | 13 | 9.5 | 4 | 5.9 | 13 | 35.1 |

a/ Categories were combined for $X^2$ significance test (below) due to small expected cell frequencies associated with one of the categories.

| | $X^2$ | df | p |
|---|---|---|---|
| Walnut Creek vs. Riverside/ San Bernardino | 4.442 | 2 | $p \doteq .200$ |
| Experimental vs. Comparison: | 21.228*** | 2 | $p < .001$ |

Table 53

Type of Disposition
For Revocation Charges Received During A Six Month Follow-up Period
by Study Group

(INTENSIVE SUPERVISION MODEL)

| Type of disposition for revocation charges received during a six month follow-up period | Experimental | | | | | | Comparison | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | | Walnut Creek | | Riverside/ San Bernardino | | | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| Total revocation dispositions[a]/ | 118 | – | 72 | – | 46 | – | 23 | – |
| Dispositions pending | 2 | – | 2 | – | 0 | – | 1 | – |
| Total minus pending | 116 | 100.0 | 70 | 100.0 | 46 | 100.0 | 22 | 100.0 |
| Continued on parole ........ | 63 | 54.3 | 34 | 48.6 | 29 | 63.0 | 15 | 68.2 |
| (by U.S. or DA.) [b]/ | (56) | | (27) | | (29) | | (13) | |
| (by parole board) | (7) | | (7) | | (0) | | (2) | |
| Returned to custody by board. | 53 | 45.7 | 36 | 51.4 | 17 | 37.0 | 7 | 31.8 |

[a]/ Dispositions number less than total revocation charges as several charges may be disposed of with one action.

[b]/ U.S. = parole Unit Supervisor; D.A. = parole District Administrator; Disposal of charges at these levels generally occurs for the less serious and/or first time charges.

Proportion Returned to Custody by Board

| | z | p |
|---|---|---|
| Walnut Creek vs Riverside/San Bernardino | 1.527 | p =.126 |
| Experimental vs. Comparison: | 1.707 | p =.087 (Corrected for Continuity) |

---

proportion of "Special Condition" violations (e.g., not to drink alcohol or to attend psychiatric outpatient clinics) than occurred for the experimental group (8.3% intensive vs. 35.1% regular).

Finally there was also a difference in how these revocation charges were disposed of. Violations of the conditions of parole can result in either a "continue on parole" or a "return to custody" (served either back in prison or in local jail, and for a varying period of time up to twelve months) disposition. A larger proportion of intensive supervision cases were ordered returned to custody by the parole board for their parole condition violations than occurred for the regular supervision cases, although the difference in proportions did not quite reach statistical significance (45.7% intensive vs. 31.8% regular). (Note: The number of dispositions received during the six month follow-up period total less than the number of revocation charges filed as several charges were often disposed of by one revocation action).

Most serious disposition received. The third set of measures compares experimental and comparison cases on the "most serious" disposition received during the six month follow-up period. The various criminal and revocation dispositions received for each case were ranked (see Appendix C) and each case was coded for it's most serious disposition. The "most serious disposition" variable not

only constitutes a single measure of the severity of recidivism during the six month period but it also permits comparisons to other California Department of Corrections parole outcome data where the most serious disposition categories employed here are routinely used. The statistical significance of the differences between the study groups on the major categories of the most serious disposition variable were examined using a difference of proportions test ($z$).

Corresponding to the preceding findings for the total criminal and the total revocation charges and dispositions, Table 54 shows that a significantly larger proportion of the intensive supervision cases received the more serious dispositions than the regular supervision cases. Larger proportions of experimental than comparison cases were returned to prison either by the board (18.6% intensive vs. 9.8% regular) or a court (15.5% intensive vs. 1.6% regular); and, vice versa, smaller proportions of the experimentals had "clean" records or "other favorable" dispositions (which include "arrest and release", "less than ninety day jail sentences" and "parole absconding for less than six months") during the six month follow-up period (62.0% intensive vs. 88.5% regular).

When the type of offense and severity of the offense charged in the most serious disposition are examined (Table 55), we find intensive supervision cases were also charged with more serious types of offenses than were regular supervision cases, although these findings are limited by the small number of

Table 54
Most Serious Disposition Received
During A Six Month Follow-up Period
by Study Group

(INTENSIVE SUPERVISION MODEL)

| Most serious disposition received during a six month follow-up period | Experimental | | | | | | Comparison | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | Total | | Walnut Creek | | Riverside/ San Bernardino | | | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| Total, all cases | 129 | 100.0 | 75 | 100.0 | 54 | 100.0 | 61 | 100.0 |
| Not returned to prison | 85 | 65.9 | 47 | 62.7 | 38 | 70.4 | 54 | 88.5 |
| Clean/other favorable ... | 80 | 62.0 | 43 | 57.3 | 37 | 68.5 | 54 | 88.5 |
| Miscellaneous unfavorable | 1 | 0.8 | 1 | 1.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pending ................. | 4 | 3.1 | 3 | 4.0 | 1 | 1.9 | 0 | 0 |
| Returned to prison | 44 | 34.1 | 28 | 37.3 | 16 | 29.6 | 7 | 11.5 |
| Board ordered ........... | 24 | 18.6 | 15 | 20.0 | 9 | 16.7 | 6 | 9.8 |
| Court ordered ........... | 20 | 15.5 | 13 | 17.3 | 7 | 13.0 | 1 | 1.6 |

| Measure | Walnut Creek vs. Riverside/ San Bernardino | | Experimental vs. Comparison | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | z | p | z | p |
| Proportion with "Return to prison" outcome | 0.911 | p =.363 | 4.647*** (corrected for continuity) | p <.001 |
| Proportion with "Clean/other favorable" outcome | 1.293 | p =.197 | 3.741*** | p <.001 |
| Proportion with "Board ordered" returns to prison | 0.673 (corrected for continuity) | p >.500 | 2.199* (corrected for continuity) | p <.050 |
| Proportion with "Court ordered" returns to prison | 0.942 | p =.347 | Not calculated - small N | |

comparison cases (N=10) with a most serious disposition involving a criminal charge during the six month follow-up period. Dichotomizing the most serious disposition offenses into felonies or misdemeanors, we find a significantly higher proportion of felony charges for the experimentals (85.7%) than the comparison cases (40.0%). When the most serious disposition criminal charges were scored using the California Offense Severity Index (Appendix D, scale range = 01 to 99), the intensive supervision group had a higher average score (indicating more serious offenses) than the regular supervision group (43.8 intensive vs. 27.9 regular), although this difference was not statistically significant. Thus, using the most serious disposition categories as an index of the severity of recidivism during the six month follow-up period, we again find that intensive supervision was associated with more serious types of returns to illegal behavior than occurred in a similar group of high risk cases receiving only regular supervision.

Custody-free days. The fourth and final measure is the number of non-custody days experienced by the study groups during the six month follow-up period. The findings from Table 56 are congruent with the higher recidivism rates discovered for intensively supervised cases in the preceding measures. The intensive supervision cases average less than five of the six month follow-up period in custody-free status as compared to the full six month period in custody-free status for the regular supervision cases (141.8 days intensive vs. 170.2 days regular). The difference in mean days was statistically significant.

Table 55

Offense Type and Severity
For Most Serious Disposition Charge During A Six Month Follow-up Period
by Study Group

(INTENSIVE SUPERVISION MODEL)

| Offense type and severity for most serious disposition charge | Experimental | | | | | | Comparison | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | | Walnut Creek | | Riverside/ San Bernardino | | | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| Offense Type | 129 | – | 75 | – | 54 | – | 61 | – |
| Not arrested or charged (clean) | 47 | – | 26 | – | 21 | – | 42 | – |
| Technical parole condition charge only | 33 | – | 17 | – | 16 | – | 9 | – |
| Criminally charged | 49 | 100.0 | 32 | 100.0 | 17 | 100.0 | 10 | 100.0 |
| Felony level offense | 42 | 85.7 | 27 | 84.4 | 15 | 88.2 | 4 | 40.0 |
| Person offense .......... | (12) | | (8) | | (4) | | (2) | |
| Property offense ........ | (15) | | (13) | | (2) | | (2) | |
| Narcotic/drug offense ... | (13) | | (5) | | (8) | | (0) | |
| Other felony offense .... | (2) | | (1) | | (1) | | (0) | |
| Misdemeanor level offense | 7 | 14.3 | 5 | 15.6 | 2 | 11.8 | 6 | 60.0 |
| Offense Severity a/ | | | | | | | | |
| Mean ...................... | 43.8 | | 42.8 | | 45.8 | | 27.9 | |
| S.D. ...................... | 30.5 | | 29.6 | | 31.8 | | 34.7 | |
| N ......................... | 49 | | 32 | | 17 | | 10 | |

| Offense Type (Felony vs. Misdemeanor) | z | p |
|---|---|---|
| Walnut Creek vs. Riverside/ San Bernardino: | Not calculated – small N | |
| Experimental vs. Comparison: | 4.503*** | p < .001 (corrected for continuity) |

| Mean offense Severity | t | df | p |
|---|---|---|---|
| Walnut Creek vs. Riverside/ San Bernardino: | -0.313 | 47 | p > .500 |
| Experimental vs. Comparison: | 1.448 | 57 | p = .154 |

Table 56

Custody – Free Days
During A Six Month Follow-up Period
by Study Group

(INTENSIVE SUPERVISION MODEL)

| | Experimental | | | | | | Comparison | |
| Custody-free days | Total | | Walnut Creek | | Riverside/ San Bernardino | | | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total, all cases | 129 | 100.0 | 75 | 100.0 | 54 | 100.0 | 61 | 100.0 |
| 001 – 030 days .......... | 7 | 5.4 | 5 | 6.7 | 2 | 3.7 | 2 | 3.3 |
| 031 – 060 days .......... | 9 | 7.0 | 6 | 8.0 | 3 | 5.6 | 0 | 0 |
| 061 – 090 days .......... | 11 | 8.5 | 8 | 10.7 | 3 | 5.6 | 1 | 1.6 |
| 091 – 120 days .......... | 14 | 10.8 | 7 | 9.3 | 7 | 13.0 | 2 | 3.3 |
| 121 – 150 days .......... | 9 | 7.0 | 6 | 8.0 | 3 | 5.6 | 1 | 1.6 |
| 151 – 180 days .......... | 15 | 11.6 | 9 | 12.0 | 6 | 11.1 | 8 | 13.1 |
| 180 and over days ........ | 64 | 49.6 | 34 | 45.3 | 30 | 55.6 | 47 | 77.0 |
| Mean ............. | | 141.8 | | 136.8 | | 148.8 | | 170.2 |
| S.D. ............. | | 55.0 | | 56.9 | | 51.3 | | 36.7 |
| N ............... | | 129 | | 75 | | 54 | | 61 |

| Mean Custody Free Days | $t$ | $df$ | $p$ |
|---|---|---|---|
| Walnut Creek vs. Riverside/San Bernardino | −1.222 | 127 | $p = .225$ |
| Experimental vs. Comparison | −3.647*** | 188 | $p < .001$ |

Thus, the four sets of measures examined all showed that the intensive supervision model cases experienced less successful outcomes during a six month follow-up period than a similar group of high risk cases which received regular supervision. However, findings based on short follow-up periods are sometimes considered unreliable, and could be interpreted as showing that intensive supervision cases failed earlier but not necesarily more often. It is necessary to examine the findings associated with a longer one year follow-up period before drawing any conclusions.

Twelve Month Outcome

Twelve month outcomes were examined for an 80% subsample of the study cases, including 117 of the 131 experimentals and 37 of the 62 comparison cases. (Inadequate time had elapsed, or follow-up data was unavailable, for 14 experimental and 25 comparison cases.) The same set of four outcome measures used in the preceding analysis were used to analyze the twelve month recidivism activity. The findings are presented in Tables 57-65 and are briefly summarized below.

Parole status. By the end of the twelve month follow-up period, almost half of both the intensive (47.9%) and the comparison cases (40.5%) were still under supervision. Also approximately equal proportions were inactive after having their parole revoked by the parole board (13.7% intensive vs. 13.5% regular). However, a significant difference did exist in the proportions terminated after a new court commitment to prison

(23.1% intensive vs. 2.7% regular) and the proportions terminated after a discharge from parole (15.4% intensive vs. 43.2% regular). Thus, approximately equal proportions of both experimentals and comparisons remained under supervision by the end of the twelve month follow-up period but for those cases where parole was terminated the two groups differed significantly on the means of termination (Table 57).

Criminal and revocation charges, dispositions. A larger proportion of the experimental group had criminal charges filed against them than occurred for the comparison group (61.5% intensive vs. 40.5% regular), and they also averaged more charges per case (2.86 intensive vs. 1.87 regular; Table 58). The charges filed were more likely to be felony level charges than misdemeanors (86.6% intensive vs. 63.0% regular, Table 59); and they were more likely to result in the more serious criminal court dispositions (Table 60). (As in the six month analysis the interpretation of the differences in dispositions was hindered by a larger number of comparison cases with "pending" and therefore unknown dispositions. However, even if the "pending" charges resulted in new prison commitments, the mix of comparison group dispositions would still be less serious than the experimental group dispositions.) Thus, it appears that intensive supervision was associated with a greater frequency of felony level charges which resulted more often in sentences to prison.

It is noted that the earlier difference found in the six month analysis showing more aborted (i.e., dropped, dismissed or

Table 57

Program Status
At End of Twelve Month Follow-up Period
by Study Group
(INTENSIVE SUPERVISION MODEL)

| Program status at end of twelve month follow-up period | Experiment | | | | | | Comparison | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | | Walnut Creek | | Riverside/ San Bernardino | | | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| Total all cases | 131 | -- | 77 | - | 54 | - | 62 | - |
| Unknown follow-up | 14 | - | 12 | - | 2 | - | 25 | - |
| Total, less unknown | 117 | 100.0 | 65 | 100.0 | 52 | 100.0 | 37 | 100.0 |
| Under Intensive Supervision | 25 | 21.4 | 15 | 23.1 | 10 | 19.2 | 0 | 0 |
| Active, with no charges | (2) | | (2) | | (0) | | | |
| Active after an arrest or violation | (11) | | (6) | | (5) | | | |
| Active with charges pending | (12) | | (7) | | (5) | | | |
| Transfer to regular supervision | 31 | 26.5 | 20 | 30.8 | 11 | 21.2 | 15 | 40.5 |
| Active, with no charges | (11) | | (10) | | (1) | | (4) | |
| Active after an arrest or violation | (11) | | (5) | | (6) | | (10) | |
| Active with charges pending | (9) | | (5) | | (4) | | (1) | |
| Inactive, parole revoked | 16 | 13.7 | 11 | 16.9 | 5 | 9.6 | 5 | 13.5 |
| Parole terminated after new court commitment | 27 | 23.1 | 17 | 26.2 | 10 | 19.2 | 1 | 2.7 |
| Parole terminated due to discharge | 18 | 15.4 | 2 | 3.1 | 16[a] | 30.8 | 16[a] | 43.2 |

a/ Includes one case which died

| Walnut Creek vs. Riverside/San Bernardino | z | p |
|---|---|---|
| Proportion Under Intensive Supervision: | 0.512 | p · .500 |
| Proportion Transferred to Regular Supervision: | 1.169 | p =.246 |
| Proportion Inactive, Parole Revoked: | 1.616 | p =.105 (Corrected for Continuity) |
| Proportion Terminated Due to New Court Commitment: | 0.893 | p =.373 |
| Proportion Terminated Due to Discharge From Parole: | | Not calculated - small N |
| Experimental vs. Comparison | | |
| Proportion Under Intensive or Regular: | 0.787 | p =.430 |
| Proportion Inactive, Parole Revoked: | 0.031 | p > .500 |
| Proportion Terminated Due to New Commitment: | | Not calculated - Small N |
| Proportion Terminated Due to Discharge From Parole: | 3.352*** | p < .001 |

## Table 58

Criminal and Revocation Charges Filed During A Twelve Month Follow-up Period by Study Group

(INTENSIVE SUPERVISION MODEL)

| Criminal and revocation charges filed during a twelve month follow-up period | Experimental | | | | | | Comparison | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | | Walnut Creek | | Riverside/ San Bernardino | | | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| CRIMINAL CHARGES | 117 | 100.0 | 65 | 100.0 | 52 | 100.0 | 37 | 100.0 |
| None filed | 45 | 38.5 | 21 | 32.3 | 24 | 46.2 | 22 | 59.5 |
| Charges filed | 72 | 61.5 | 44 | 67.7 | 28 | 53.8 | 15 | 40.5 |
| One charge .............. | (25) | | (12) | | (13) | | (8) | |
| Two charges ............. | (11) | | (2) | | (9) | | (3) | |
| Three charges .......... | (15) | | (11) | | (4) | | (2) | |
| Four charges .......... | (6) | | (4) | | (2) | | (2) | |
| Five or more charges ... | (15) | | (15) | | (0) | | (0) | |
| Total charges ....... | | 206 | | 155 | | 51 | | 28 |
| Mean charges/case charged | | 2.86 | | 3.52 | | 1.82 | | 1.87 |
| REVOCATION CHARGES | 117 | 100.0 | 65 | 100.0 | 52 | 100.0 | 37 | 100.0 |
| None filed | 25 | 21.4 | 13 | 20.0 | 12 | 23.1 | 15 | 40.5 |
| Charges filed | 92 | 78.6 | 52 | 80.0 | 40 | 76.9 | 22 | 59.5 |
| One charge .............. | (18) | | (7) | | (11) | | (7) | |
| Two charges ............. | (17) | | (7) | | (10) | | (5) | |
| Three charges .......... | (21) | | (12) | | (9) | | (6) | |
| Four charges .......... | (13) | | (9) | | (4) | | (1) | |
| Five or more charges ... | (23) | | (17) | | (6) | | (3) | |
| Total charges | | 321 | | 210 | | 111 | | 56 |
| Mean charges/case charged | | 3.49 | | 4.03 | | 2.78 | | 2.54 |

| CRIMINAL CHARGES (Filed vs. Not filed) | z | p |
|---|---|---|
| Walnut Creek vs. Riverside/ San Bernardino: | 1.544 | p = .124 |
| Experimental vs. Comparison: | 2.248* | p < .050 |

| REVOCATION CHARGES (Filed vs. Not Filed) | z | p |
|---|---|---|
| Walnut Creek vs. Riverside/ San Bernardino: | 0.407 | p > .500 |
| Experimental vs. Comparison: | 2.312* | p < .050 |

## Table 59

Type of Criminal Offenses Charged During Twelve Month Follow-up Period by Study Group

(INTENSIVE SUPERVISION MODEL)

| Type of criminal offenses charged during a twelve month follow-up period | Experimental | | | | | | Comparison | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | | Walnut Creek | | Riverside/ San Bernardino | | | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| Total criminal charges | 206 | – | 155 | – | 51 | – | 28 | – |
| Unknown type | 4 | – | 2 | – | 2 | – | 1 | – |
| Total less unknown | 202 | 100.0 | 153 | 100.0 | 49 | 100.0 | 27 | 100.0 |
| Felony | 175 | 86.6 | 133 | 86.9 | 42 | 85.7 | 17 | 63.0 |
| Person ................... | (48) | | (37) | | (11) | | (8) | |
| Property ................ | (60) | | (54) | | (6) | | (6) | |
| Narcotics, drugs ........ | (34) | | (15) | | (19) | | (2) | |
| Other felony ............ | (33) | | (27) | | (6) | | (1) | |
| Misdemeanor | 27 | 13.4 | 20 | 13.1 | 7 | 14.3 | 10 | 37.0 |

| Proportion With Felony Level Charges | z | p | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Walnut Creek vs. Riverside/San Bernardino: | 0.304 | p > .500 | (Corrected for |
| Experimental vs. Comparison: | 3.911*** | p < .001 | Continuity) |

Table 60

Type of Disposition
For Each Criminal Charge Received During A Twelve Month Follow-up Period
by Study Group

(INTENSIVE SUPERVISION MODEL)

| Type of disposition for each criminal charge received during a twelve month follow-up period | Experimental | | | | | | Comparison | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | | Walnut Creek | | Riverside/San Bernardino | | | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| Total criminal charges | 206 | 100.0 | 155 | 100.0 | 51 | 100.0 | 28 | 100.0 |
| Charges dropped, dismissed or acquitted .................. | 81 | 39.3 | 62 | 40.0 | 19 | 37.3 | 12 | 42.9 |
| Convicted, sentenced to jail .. | 32 | 15.5 | 22 | 14.2 | 10 | 19.6 | 8 | 28.6 |
| Convicted, sentenced to prison. | 76 | 36.9 | 62 | 40.0 | 14 | 27.5 | 1 | 3.6 |
| Disposition pending .......... | 17 | 8.3 | 9 | 5.8 | 8 | 15.7 | 7 | 25.0 |

|  | $x^2$ | df | p |
|---|---|---|---|
| Walnut Creek vs. Riverside/San Bernardino: | 6.974 | 3 | p = .100 |
| Experimental vs. Comparison: | 17.587*** | 3 | p < .001 |

acquitted) charges for the experimentals did not hold up in this longer twelve month analysis (Table 60) and was therefore considered a chance finding.

Examining revocation charges and dispositions after twelve months, we find a higher proportion of the intensive supervision cases had charges filed (78.6% intensive vs. 59.5% regular) and averaged more charges per case (3.49 intensive vs. 2.54 regular) (Table 58). The nearly 20 percentage point difference between experimental and comparison cases on the proportion of cases with revocation charges filed was statistically significant but represented a reduction from the larger 30 percentage point difference discovered after only six months (Table 49). The two groups also differed on which of four major types of parole conditions were charged (Table 61). Experimentals were more frequently charged with violating the "Criminal Conduct" condition (77.9% intensive vs. 66.1% regular) and less frequently charged with violating the "Special" conditions (8.7% intensive vs. 28.6% regular). Finally, only a small, non-significant difference was found after twelve months in the proportion ordered returned to custody by the parole board (49.4% intensive vs. 41.2% regular, Table 62). Thus, counter to the weaker finding based on the shorter term six month outcome the intensive supervision model does not appear to be associated with more serious revocation dispositions during a twelve month follow-up period. Violations of the conditions of parole were charged to more cases and were charged more often, but they did not result in significantly greater proportions of "return to custody"

## Table 61

### Type of Parole Conditions
### Charged During A Twelve Month Follow-up Period
### by Study Group

#### (INTENSIVE SUPERVISION MODEL)

| Type of parole conditions charged during a twelve month follow-up period | Experimental | | | | | | Comparison | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | | Walnut Creek | | Riverside/San Bernardino | | | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| Total, all revocation charges | 321 | 100.0 | 210 | 100.0 | 111 | 100.0 | 56 | 100.0 |
| a/ Release, reporting and travel | 39 | 12.1 | 25 | 11.9 | 14 | 12.6 | 2 | 3.6 |
| a/ Parole agent instructions | 4 | 1.2 | 3 | 1.4 | 1 | 0.9 | 1 | 1.8 |
| Criminal conduct | 250 | 77.9 | 163 | 77.6 | 87 | 78.4 | 37 | 66.1 |
| Special conditions | 28 | 8.7 | 19 | 9.0 | 9 | 8.1 | 16 | 28.6 |

a/ Categories were combined for $X^2$ significance test (below), due to small expected cell frequencies associated with one of the categories.

| | $X^2$ | df | p |
|---|---|---|---|
| Walnut Creek vs. Riverside/San Bernardino: | 0.080 | 2 | p > .500 |
| Experimental vs. Comparison: | 19.493*** | 2 | p < .001 |

## Table 62

### Type of Disposition
### For Revocation Charges Received During A Twelve Month Follow-up Period
### by Study Group

#### (INTENSIVE SUPERVISION MODEL)

| Type of disposition for revocation charges received during a twelve month follow-up period | Experimental | | | | | | Comparison | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | | Walnut Creek | | Riverside/San Bernardino | | | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| Total revocation dispositions a/ | 185 | – | 111 | – | 74 | – | 35 | – |
| Dispositions pending | 9 | – | 5 | – | 4 | – | 1 | – |
| Total minus pending | 176 | 100.0 | 106 | 100.0 | 70 | 100.0 | 34 | 100.0 |
| Continued on parole ........... | 89 | 50.6 | 47 | 44.3 | 42 | 60.0 | 20 | 58.8 |
| (by U.S. or D.A.) b/ | (73) | | (34) | | (39) | | (19) | |
| (by parole board) | (16) | | (13) | | (3) | | (1) | |
| Returned to custody by board... | 87 | 49.4 | 59 | 55.7 | 28 | 40.0 | 14 | 41.2 |

a/ Dispositions number less than revocation charges as several charges may disposed of with one parole board action

b/ U.S. = parole Unit Supervisor; D.A. = parole District Administrator: Disposal of charges at these levels generally occurs for the less serious and/or first time charges

#### Proportion Returned to Custody by Board

| | z | p |
|---|---|---|
| Walnut Creek vs. Riverside/San Bernardino: | 2.044* | p < .050 |
| Experimental vs. Comparison: | 0.879 | p =.379 |
| Walnut Creek vs. Comparison: | 1.481 | p =.139 |
| Riverside/San Bernardino vs. Comparison: | 0.118 | p > .500 |

actions taken by the parole board. There was an increase in legal sanctions imposed on the intensive supervision cases, but the increase was in criminal rather than revocation dispositions.

Most serious disposition received. Examining the most serious of the total criminal and revocation dispositions received during the twelve month follow-up period, (Table 63), we find essentially the same difference noted above. A significantly larger proportion of the experimentals received a court-ordered return to prison disposition (29.1% intensive vs. 2.7% comparison), and a smaller proportion had "clean" records or "other favorable" disposition (35.8% intensive vs. 64.9% regular). The charges filed for those cases whose most serious dispositions involved a criminal charge were more often at the felony (as opposed to misdemeanor) level and averaged a significantly higher score on the California Offense Severity Index (Table 64) for experimental as opposed to comparison cases.

Custody-free days. The average number of custody-free days in the twelve month follow-up period was significantly lower for the experimental as opposed to the comparison group (238.7 days intensive vs. 305.4 days regular, Table 65).

Thus, like the six month follow-up analysis, twelve month findings show that cases intensively supervised were associated with more frequent and more serious returns to criminal activity than a similar group of high risk cases which received only regular supervision. According to the twelve month outcomes, intensive supervision cases were more likely and more often

Table 63

Most Serious Disposition Received
During A Twelve Month Follow-up Period
by Study Group

(INTENSIVE SUPERVISION MODEL)

| Most serious disposition received during a twelve month follow-up period | Experimental | | | | | | Comparison | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | | Walnut Creek | | Riverside/ San Bernardino | | | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| Total, all cases | 117 | 100.0 | 65 | 100.0 | 52 | 100.0 | 37 | 100.0 |
| Not returned to prison | 52 | 44.4 | 25 | 38.5 | 27 | 51.9 | 26 | 70.3 |
| Clean/other favorable .... | 42 | 35.8 | 21 | 32.3 | 21 | 40.4 | 24 | 64.9 |
| Miscellaneous unfavorable | 5 | 4.3 | 2 | 3.1 | 3 | 5.8 | 0 | 0 |
| Pending ................. | 5 | 4.3 | 2 | 3.1 | 3 | 5.8 | 2 | 5.4 |
| Returned to prison | 65 | 55.6 | 40 | 61.5 | 25 | 48.1 | 11 | 29.7 |
| Board ordered ........... | 31 | 26.5 | 17 | 26.2 | 14 | 26.9 | 10 | 27.0 |
| Court ordered ........... | 34 | 29.1 | 23 | 35.3 | 11 | 21.2 | 1 | 2.7 |

| | Walnut Creek vs. Riverside/San Bernardino | | Experimental vs. Comparison | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | $z$ | $p$ | $z$ | $p$ |
| Proportion with "Return to prison" outcome | 1.449 | p =.147 | 2.747** | p <.010 |
| Proportion with "Clean/other favorable" outcome | 0.908 | p =.363 | 3.118*** | p <.001 |
| Proportion with "Board Ordered" returns to prison | 0 | p =.500 | 0.060 | p >.500 |
| Proportion with "Court Ordered" returns to prison | 1.670 | p =.095 | Not calculated—Small N | |

## Table 64

### Offense Type and Severity
For Most Serious Disposition Charge During A Twelve Month Follow-up Period by Study Group

(INTENSIVE SUPERVISION MODEL)

| Offense type and severity for most serious disposition charge | Experimental | | | | | | Comparison | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | | Walnut Creek | | Riverside/San Bernardino | | | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| Offense Type | 117 | – | 65 | – | 52 | – | 37 | – |
| Not arrested or charged (clean) | 24 | – | 13 | – | 11 | – | 15 | – |
| Technical parole condition charge only | 22 | – | 9 | – | 13 | – | 8 | – |
| Criminally charged | 71 | 100.0 | 43 | 100.0 | 28 | 100.0 | 14 | 100.0 |
| Felony offense | 59 | 83.1 | 37 | 86.0 | 22 | 78.6 | 9 | 64.3 |
| Person offense ...... | (24) | | (17) | | (7) | | (4) | |
| Property offense .... | (13) | | (10) | | (3) | | (5) | |
| Narcotic/drug offense | (17) | | (6) | | (11) | | (0) | |
| Other felony offense. | (5) | | (4) | | (1) | | (0) | |
| Misdemeanor offense | 12 | 16.9 | 6 | 14.0 | 6 | 21.4 | 5 | 5.7 |
| Offense Severity | | | | | | | | |
| Mean .................. | | 50.7 | | 53.1 | | 47.1 | | 31.7 |
| S.D. .................. | | 30.8 | | 30.0 | | 31.6 | | 27.? |
| N .................... | | 71 | | 43 | | 28 | | 14 |

| Offense Type (Felony vs. Misdemeanor) | z | p |
|---|---|---|
| Walnut Creek vs. Riverside/San Bernardino: | 1.150 | p =.250 (Corrected for Continuity) |
| Experimental vs. Comparison: | 2.737** | p <.010 (Corrected for Continuity) |

| Mean Offense Severity | t | df | p |
|---|---|---|---|
| Walnut Creek vs. Riverside/San Bernardino: | 0.785 | 69 | p =.435 |
| Experimental vs. Comparison: | 2.128* | 83 | p <.050 |

-232-

## Table 65

### Custody-Free Days
During A Twelve Month Follow-up Period by Study Group

(INTENSIVE SUPERVISION MODEL)

| Custody-free days | Experimental | | | | | | Comparison | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | | Walnut Creek | | Riverside/San Bernardino | | | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| Total, all cases | 117 | 100.0 | 65 | 100.0 | 52 | 100.0 | 37 | 100.0 |
| 001 – 030 days ....... | 3 | 2.6 | 3 | 4.6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 031 – 060 days ....... | 9 | 7.7 | 6 | 9.2 | 3 | 5.8 | 2 | 5.4 |
| 061 – 090 days ....... | 6 | 5.1 | 4 | 6.2 | 2 | 3.8 | 0 | 0 |
| 091 – 120 days ....... | 12 | 10.3 | 8 | 12.3 | 4 | 7.7 | 1 | 2.7 |
| 121 – 150 days ....... | 7 | 6.0 | 5 | 7.7 | 2 | 3.8 | 2 | 5.4 |
| 151 – 180 days ....... | 4 | 3.4 | 4 | 6.2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2.7 |
| 181 – 210 days ....... | 8 | 6.8 | 3 | 4.6 | 5 | 9.6 | 1 | 2.7 |
| 211 – 240 days ....... | 6 | 5.1 | 4 | 6.2 | 2 | 3.8 | 1 | 2.7 |
| 241 – 270 days ....... | 5 | 4.3 | 1 | 1.5 | 4 | 7.7 | 0 | 0 |
| 271 – 300 days ....... | 6 | 5.1 | 3 | 4.6 | 3 | 5.8 | 0 | 0 |
| 301 – 330 days ....... | 3 | 2.6 | 1 | 1.5 | 2 | 3.8 | 5 | 13.5 |
| 331 – 360 days ....... | 11 | 9.4 | 5 | 7.7 | 6 | 11.5 | 3 | 8.1 |
| 361 and over days .... | 37 | 31.6 | 18 | 27.7 | 19 | 36.5 | 21 | 56.8 |
| Mean custody-free days | | 238.7 | | 216.5 | | 266.5 | | 305.4 |
| S.D. | | 120.8 | | 124.1 | | 110.4 | | 97.0 |
| N | | 117 | | 65 | | 52 | | 37 |

| | t | df | p |
|---|---|---|---|
| Walnut Creek vs. Riverside/San Bernardino | -2.254* | 115 | p <.050 |
| Experimental vs. Comparison | -3.040** | 152 | p <.010 |
| Walnut Creek vs. Comparison | 3.717*** | 100 | p <.001 |
| Riverside/San Bernardino vs. Comparison | 1.703 | 87 | p =.093 |

-233-

criminally charged for the more serious types of offenses.
Furthermore, intensively supervised cases were more likely to
receive new court commitments to prisons and to serve more time
in custody than regularly supervised high risk cases. Six month
outcome differences showing more board ordered returns to custody
for the experimentals did not hold in the twelve month outcome
analysis.

## Alternative Objectives:  Increase Verification and Sanctions

The preceding analysis has examined the effectiveness of
the intensive supervision model as a preventive/deterrent
influence. Project planners hypothesized that placing a close
watch on the activities of high risk parolees early in the parole
period would reduce the opportunities for parolees to become
reinvolved in illegal activity and encourage them to remain crime
free. At the same time project planners stated that once a
parolee was discovered as having returned to criminal activity
(i.e., deterrence had failed), they would work to increase the
frequency and severity of the legal sanctions placed on such
cases. Essentially, two different sets of goals were
established.

Methodologically, this created a problem for the
evaluation. The measures for these two sets of objectives would
be expected to move in opposite directions with decreased
recidivism rates expected for the deterrence objective and
increased recidivism rates and/or increased severity of

dispositions for the control objective. And, other than a case
study approach there was no easy way to separate cases involved
in illegal activities from those not suspected of involvement as
such reinvolvement not only varied on a case-by-case basis but
also on a day-by-day basis for each case. The features of the
intensive supervision model which made it different from the
investigation model were that cases were supposed to be placed
under intensive supervision early in the parole period (before
criminal activity had a chance to occur) and the agent was
suppose to assume full caseload responsibilities on the case
which included the delivery of various services to the parolee.
For these reasons, the decision was made to examine the outcome
data first from a prevention and deterrence perspective. If
deterrence in fact failed, then the outcome data would be
examined from an increased controls and sanctions perspective.
Therefore, the six and twelve month outcome findings were
reexamined in terms of the increased controls and sanctions
objective. That is, given that intensive supervision failed to
reduce returns to criminal activity, the question became "can it
increase the frequency and severity of the controls and sanctions
placed on high risk parolees which do return to illegal
activities?"

Significant differences were found between experimentals
and comparisons, after both six and twelve months, on the
proportions criminally charged, the number of criminal charges
per case, the severity of the criminal charges, the severity of

the criminal dispositions received, and the days expended in custody. The direction of the differences showed that intensive supervision cases were more frequently and severely sanctioned for their criminal activity (Table 48-65) than high risk cases under regular supervision. If the intensive supervision model did produce the increase in criminal charges and sanctions found then we would expect that intensive supervision agents accomplished this by increasing the contribution that regular agents normally make to the "detection" and "processing" of new charges. This causal link between the model's supervision activities and the outcomes is examined next.

Agent Contribution to Detection and Processing

Three measures were used in an attempt to capture the intensive supervision agents' contribution to new charge detection and processing, none of which "exactly" or "fully" captures their activity and all of which were biased by the greater tendency of the high control as opposed to regular supervision agents to record such information. The three measures include: (1) the major source and kind of information or activity which led to the most serious twelve month disposition received (called the "means" variable, see page 156 for derivation), (2) the proportion of cases where the parole agent provided assistance in the criminal prosecution of the most serious criminal disposition received during a twelve month follow-up period, and (3) the proportion of cases where contraband (weapons, narcotics or stolen property) was confiscated by the agent during the supervision period.

An examination of the "Means" variable shows that the high control agents were the major source of the information or activity leading to the verification of the most serious disposition charges in 17.2% of the cases, and worked with local law enforcement in another 12.9% of the cases, for a combined total of 30.1% of the cases. However, this combined total was the same as that found for the comparison group where regular supervision agents were the major source of information and activity leading to the most serious disposition in 31.8% of their cases. For both study groups law enforcement officials working alone were the major source of information and activity leading to the most serious disposition in a majority of the cases (57.0% intensive vs. 68.2% regular). Thus, the intensive supervision agents appeared to work more closely with law enforcement than regular agents in verifying parolee criminality (i.e., confirming criminality by demonstration, evidence or testimony) but they did not on their own appear to verify more criminality than is ordinarily verified by regular agents (Table 66).

A slightly higher proportion of the experimental group's most serious criminal disposition (19.7%) than the comparison group's most serious criminal disposition (14.3%) involved the parole agent providing some kind of assistance (e.g., assisting in evidence search, securing parolee confession) in the criminal court prosecution process (Table 67), but the difference was not large.

Table 66

"Means" Leading To Most Serious Disposition
Received During A Twelve Month Follow-up Period
by Study Group
(INTENSIVE SUPERVISION MODEL)

| "Means" leading to most serious disposition a/ | Experimental | | | | | | Comparison | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | Total | | Walnut Creek | | Riverside/San Bernardino | | | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| Total, all cases | 117 | – | 65 | – | 52 | – | 37 | – |
| Not arrested or charged with a violation | 24 | – | 13 | – | 11 | – | 15 | – |
| Charged/arrested | 93 | 100.0 | 52 | 100.0 | 41 | 100.0 | 22 | 100.0 |
| ACTIVITY CONDUCTED/INFORMATION SECURED BY HIGH CONTROL AGENTS | 16 | 17.2 | 6 | 11.5 | 10 | 24.4 | – | – |
| Attempts to contact ......................... | 10 | | 3 | | 7 | | – | |
| Witness, victim statement or identification .............. | 1 | | 1 | | 0 | | – | |
| Associate, informant statement or identification.......... | 1 | | 0 | | 1 | | – | |
| Physical evidence obtained during search ................. | 2 | | 0 | | 2 | | – | |
| Tests results (incl. narcotics, alcohol, gun) ........... | 2 | | 2 | | 0 | | – | |
| ACTIVITY CONDUCTED/INFORMATION SECURED BY LAW ENFORCEMENT | 53 | 57.0 | 32 | 61.5 | 21 | 51.2 | 15 | 68.2 |
| Witness, victim statement or identification .............. | 21 | | 16 | | 5 | | 2 | |
| Physical evidence obtained during search .................. | 2 | | 0 | | 2 | | 1 | |
| Behavior observed during surveillance ..................... | 1 | | 1 | | 0 | | 0 | |
| Other ...................................................... | 3 | | 2 | | 1 | | 0 | |
| Behavior observed during routine patrol................... | 10 | | 3 | | 7 | | 3 | |
| Identified as wanted after patrol stop ,................... | 2 | | 2 | | 0 | | 1 | |
| Search conducted after patrol stop ....................... | 5 | | 3 | | 2 | | 2 | |
| Response to citizen's call for assistance ................. | 5 | | 3 | | 2 | | 6 | |
| Decoy or fence operation .................................. | 4 | | 2 | | 2 | | 0 | |
| ACTIVITY CONDUCTED/INFORMATION SECURED BY HIGH CONTROL AGENTS AND LAW ENFORCEMENT SIMULTANEOUSLY | 12 | 12.9 | 7 | 13.5 | 5 | 12.2 | – | – |
| Witness, victim statement or identification .............. | 1 | | 0 | | 1 | | – | |
| Confession of parolee .................................... | 2 | | 2 | | 0 | | – | |
| Physical evidence obtained during search .................. | 8 | | 4 | | 4 | | – | |
| Test results (incl. narcotics, alcohol, gun) ............ | 1 | | 1 | | 0 | | – | |

Table 66 — continued

| "Means" leading to most serious disposition | Experimental | | | | | | Comparison | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | | Walnut Creek | | Riverside/ San Bernardino | | | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| ACTIVITY CONDUCTED/INFORMATION SECURED BY REGULAR SUPERVISION AGENT | 3 | 3.2 | 2 | 3.8 | 1 | 2.4 | 7 | 31.8 |
| Attempts to contact ........................................ | 2 | | 2 | | 0 | | 4 | |
| Witness, victim statement or identification ............... | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 1 | |
| Associate, informant statement or identification .......... | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 1 | |
| Confession of parolee ..................................... | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 1 | |
| Other ..................................................... | 1 | | 0 | | 1 | | 0 | |
| OTHER MEANS | 9 | 9.7 | 5 | 9.6 | 4 | 9.8 | 0 | 0 |

a/ The "Means" measure reflects both the major activity or information leading to the most serious disposition charges and the major individual or agency responsible for conducting the activity or securing the information

b/ Activities (e.g., street patrolling) not encorporated into the High Control Model and performed only by law enforcement agencies

Walnut Creek vs. Riverside/San Bernardino $x^2$ not calculated due to large number of cells with small expected frequencies.

Experimental vs. Comparison: $X^2$ not calculated due to large number of cells with small expected frequencies.

Table 67

Parole Agent Assistance With Prosecution of Most Serious Disposition Criminal Charges
During A Twelve Month Follow-up Period
by Study Group

(INTENSIVE SUPERVISION MODEL)

| Parole agent assistance with criminal charge prosecution | Experimental | | | | | | Comparison | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | Total | | Walnut Creek | | Riverside/ San Bernardino | | | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| Total, all cases | 117 | – | 65 | – | 52 | – | 37 | – |
| Not arrested or charged | 24 | – | 13 | – | 11 | – | 15 | – |
| Technical parole violation charge only | 22 | – | 9 | – | 13 | – | 8 | – |
| Criminally charged | 71 | 100.0 | 43 | 100.0 | 28 | 100.0 | 14 | 100.0 |
| No assistance with prosecution.. | 57 | 80.3 | 37 | 86.1 | 20 | 71.4 | 12 | 85.7 |
| Assisted with prosecution ...... | 14 | 19.7 | 6 | 13.9 | 8 | 28.6 | 2 | 14.3 |
| Turn over evidence | (3) | | (1) | | (2) | | (0) | |
| Secure parolee confession | (2) | | (2) | | (0) | | (0) | |
| Assist with evidence search | (7) | | (2) | | (5) | | (2) | |
| Other | (2) | | (1) | | (1) | | (0) | |

Proportion "Assisted With Prosecution"     $z$     $p$

Walnut Creek vs Riverside/San Bernardino:  0.029    $p > .500$ (Corrected for Continuity)

Experimental vs Comparison:      Not calculated – Small N

The final indicator, contraband confiscated (Table 68), shows that a small number of the experimental cases involved the confiscation of some kind of contraband by the supervising agent and, proportionately, this number was slightly higher than that found for comparison cases. A higher proportion of the experimental than comparison cases had weapons (11.5% intensive vs. 1.6% regular), narcotics (11.5% intensive vs. 3.2% regular) or stolen property (3.8% intensive vs. 0% regular) confiscated.

The above analysis showed that the intensive supervision agents only slightly increased the agent's contribution to the detection and processing of new charges and dispositions. It appears to have done so largely by working with rather than independently of law enforcement. As under regular supervision, law enforcement continues to be the major source of information and activity leading to the new criminal charges and dispositions. The increase in the agents' contribution to criminal activity detection and charge processing appears too small to account for the large differences found between experimentals and comparisons in recidivism rates. An examination of outcome differences across the two experimental demonstration sites suggests yet another possible explanation for the outcome variance found.

Outcome Differences Between Demonstration Sites

An earlier analysis of differences between the two demonstration sites in the operations and activities conducted (Chapter VIII) indicated a few significant differences which

CONTINUED

3 OF 4

Table 68

Contraband Confiscated
by Study Group
(INTENSIVE SUPERVISION MODEL)

| Contraband Confiscated | Total | | Experimental | | | | Comparison | |
| | | | Walnut Creek | | Riverside/ San Bernardino | | | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Weapons | 131 | 100.0 | 77 | 100.0 | 54 | 100.0 | 62 | 100.0 |
| None ........................ | 116 | 88.5 | 66 | 85.7 | 50 | 92.6 | 61 | 98.4 |
| One or more ................. | 15 | 11.5 | 11 | 14.3 | 4 | 7.4 | 1 | 1.6 |
| Narcotics/drugs | 131 | 100.0 | 77 | 100.0 | 54 | 100.0 | 62 | 100.0 |
| None ........................ | 116 | 88.5 | 69 | 89.6 | 47 | 87.0 | 60 | 96.8 |
| One or more ................. | 15 | 11.5 | 8 | 10.4 | 7 | 13.0 | 2 | 3.2 |
| Stolen property | 131 | 100.0 | 77 | 100.0 | 54 | 100.0 | 62 | 100.0 |
| None ........................ | 126 | 96.2 | 73 | 94.8 | 53 | 98.1 | 62 | 100.0 |
| One or more ................. | 5 | 3.8 | 4 | 5.2 | 1 | 1.9 | 0 | 0 |

| | z | p |
|---|---|---|
| Weapons | | |
| Walnut Creek vs. Riverside/San Bernardino: | Not calculated - Small N | |
| Experimental vs. Comparison: | Not calculated - Small N | |
| Narcotics/drugs | | |
| Walnut Creek vs Riverside/San Bernardino: | Not calculated - Small N | |
| Experimental vs. Comparison: | Not calculated - Small N | |
| Stolen Property | | |
| Walnut Creek vs. Riverside/San Bernardino: | Not calculated - Small N | |
| Experimental vs. Comparison: | Not calculated - Small N | |

could affect outcome. Specifically, the analysis of Chapter VIII showed a larger proportion of the Walnut Creek than the Riverside/San Bernardino cases were law enforcement referrals and were cases that had been on parole for some time before placement. These two findings suggested that Walnut Creek was placing cases already suspected of (or known to be) reinvolved in crime, and that the objective of these cases was to verify and apprehend rather than deter. The preceding activity analysis also showed that Walnut Creek spent more of it's time than Riverside/San Bernardino exchanging information with law enforcement and making arrests -- activities more typical of the investigation rather than intensive supervision model.

These pre-project selection factor differences suggest that the Walnut Creek study cases would experience higher recidivism rates than the Riverside/San Bernardino study cases during the follow-up period as some already appeared to be reinvolved in criminal activity at the time of placement. This section compares outcome differences across the two sites. Outcomes by units are reported in the same set of tables used to analyze six month (Tables 48-56) and twelve month (Table 57-68) experimental versus comparison differences. The statistical significance of the outcome difference between units was also tested (when sample size permitted) and is shown at the bottom of each table.

An inspection of those tables shows three statistically significant differences and several large but non-significant differences of ten percentage points. In all instances the

differences indicate higher recidivism rates in both the six and the twelve month outcome periods for the Walnut Creek as opposed to the Riverside/San Bernardino cases. For example, the twelve month outcomes show Walnut Creek had a larger proportion of cases with criminal charges filed (67.7% Walnut Creek vs. 53.8% Riverside/San Bernardino), a larger proportion of the criminal charges were disposed of with new convictions to prison (40.0% Walnut Creek vs. 27.5% Riverside/San Bernardino), a larger proportion of revocation dispositions resulted in returns to custody (55.7% Walnut Creek vs. 40.0% Riverside/San Bernardino), a larger proportion of cases received new court commitments to prison (35.3% Walnut Creek vs. 21.2% Riverside/San Bernardino), and cases experienced a lower average number of custody-free days (216 Walnut Creek vs. 266 Riverside/San Bernardino).

### Interpretation of Findings

The increase found in the high controls agents' contribution to criminal activity detection and charge processing appeared too small to account for the large recidivism rates differences found between the experimental and comparison groups, and between the Walnut Creek and Riverside/San Bernardino demonstration sites. Rather the likely explanation suggested by the preceding analysis is selection factor differences. That is, the cases receiving intensive supervision, particularly those at the Walnut Creek site, had a greater propensity to recidivate than the cases in the comparison group at the point of selection.

This interpretation was partially tested earlier in Chapter V when background characteristics for a sample of cases from the experimental and comparison groups, were compared, including a comparison of Walnut Creek to Riverside/San Bernardino cases. However, that analysis was considered too weak to rule out this interpretation conclusively (a more adequately selected sample and a multivariate analysis would have been more desireable). Some support for the selection factor differences interpretation was provided in Chapter VIII. That analysis showed that the cases selected for intensive supervision at the Walnut Creek site had experienced significantly more time on parole prior to high control placement than cases selected at the Riverside/San Bernardino site. Differences in "prior parole time" were also found between cases selected from the two parole units which comprised the comparison group (i.e., the majority of Redwood City cases were new releasees while the majority of Ventura District cases had been on parole for over sixty days at the time of selection, Table 38). As the longer a case is on parole before selection the more likely the case is known or suspected of recidivating, these differences in prior parole time could account for the higher recidivism rates found for the experimental over comparison group and for the Walnut Creek over the Riverside/San Bernardino demonstration site.

A special analysis shown in Table 69 directly tests the effect of selection factor differences on outcome. The relationship between recidivism (measured three ways including percent of cases with (a) criminal charges, (b) revocation charges and (c) a return to prison disposition twelve months after selection) and the study groups (experimental versus comparison and Walnut Creek versus Riverside/San Bernardino) was examined while controlling on selection factor differences (i.e., prior parole time dichotomized into those cases with sixty or less and those with sixty-one or more days on parole prior to selection). The method used was test factor standardization. It makes the outcomes across the study groups mathematically equivalent to each other on the variable of prior parole time by weighting each outcome according to the distribution of the prior parole time variable for the "total sample". This standardized relationship (controlling on prior parole time) is then compared to the original relationship (not controlling on prior parole time) to determine if the originally large differences in recidivism rates are reduced.

The analysis shows that the higher recidivism findings for the Walnut Creek over the Riverside/San Bernardino site totally dissappears when prior parole time differences are controlled for. Selection differences appear to totally account for the higher recidivism rates found for Walnut Creek as compared to Riverside/San Bernardino.

The relationship between the experimental and comparison group stays the same when controlling on prior parole time but may be "masked" by collapsing and thereby neutralizing differences (which go in opposite directions) in prior parole time for the parole units within the experimental and within the comparison group. Because of the possibility of this masking effect, a better test of the affect of prior parole time is to analyze outcome differences between one unit within the experimental group which selected cases with extensive prior parole time and one unit within the comparison group which selected new releasees; and to standardize each units' outcome on the prior parole time distribution of the other (as opposed to standardizing on the total sample, as was done in the above analysis).

In Table 70, Walnut Creek is compared to Redwood City's recidivism rate first when standardizing the outcomes on the "prior parole time" distribution of the Redwood City Unit. The question addressed is, if Walnut Creek had primarily selected new releasees for intensive supervision as did Redwood City, would their recidivism rates be lower? In each of the three outcome

Table 69

Twelve Month Outcome Measures by Study Group

For the Original Relationship and the Relationship Standardized on Prior Time On Parole

(INTENSIVE SUPERVISION MODEL)

| Twelve Month Outcome Measures | ORIGINAL RELATIONSHIP | | | | | | STANDARDIZED RELATIONSHIP | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Experimental | | | Comparison | | | Experimental | | | Comparison | | |
| | Sub-total | Walnut Creek | Riverside/San Bernardino | Sub-total | Redwood City | Ventura District | Sub-total | Walnut Creek | Riverside/San Bernardino | Sub-total | Redwood City | Ventura District |
| | (N=117) | (N=65) | (N=52) | (N=37) | (N=25) | (N=12) | (N=117) | (N=65) | (N=52) | (N=37) | (N=25) | (N=12) |
| CRIMINAL CHARGES | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| None filed | 38.5 | 32.3 | 46.2 | 60.5 | 53.8 | 75.0 | 38.5 | 36.3 | 36.1 | 59.6 | 51.7 | 66.3 |
| Charges filed | 61.5 | 67.7 | 53.8 | 39.5 | 46.2 | 25.0 | 61.5 | 63.7 | 63.9 | 40.4 | 48.3 | 33.7 |
| PAROLE REVOCATION CHARGES | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| None filed | 21.4 | 20.0 | 23.1 | 42.1 | 36.0 | 50.0 | 21.4 | 22.5 | 18.1 | 40.6 | 29.5 | 44.2 |
| Charges filed | 78.6 | 80.0 | 76.9 | 57.9 | 64.0 | 50.0 | 78.6 | 77.5 | 81.9 | 59.4 | 70.4 | 55.8 |
| MOST SERIOUS DISPOSITION | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Not returned to prison | 44.4 | 38.5 | 51.9 | 70.3 | 64.0 | 83.3 | 44.4 | 42.1 | 40.7 | 70.3 | 61.5 | 81.4 |
| Returned to prison | 55.6 | 61.5 | 48.1 | 29.7 | 36.0 | 16.7 | 55.6 | 57.9 | 59.3 | 29.7 | 38.5 | 18.6 |

measures the recidivism rate differences between the two units were reduced. In the second distribution also shown in Table 70, Walnut Creek is compared to Redwood City outcomes when standardizing the outcomes on the prior parole time distribution of the Walnut Creek Unit. In that comparison we are asking whether the Redwood City recidivism rates would have been higher had they selected cases with more extensive prior parole time. While some reduction occurred, Table 70 shows it was smaller and inconsistant across the three measures. Thus, it appears that differences in outcome between the Walnut Creek experimental unit and the Redwood City comparison unit are due more to the fact Walnut Creek cases had experienced more time on parole (i.e., were higher risks) than to the fact that Redwood City cases had not experienced substantial time on parole prior to selection. More importantly, the above analysis demonstrates that at least part of the outcome difference between experimental and comparison cases in the intensive supervision model is due to selection factors.

Based upon the outcome effects that selection factor differences had, and upon the small increase in agent contribution to crime detection and processing it is difficult to determine conclusively that the close watch provided under intensive supervision led to an increase in controls and criminal sanctions. Rather it appears that the cases selected for intensive supervision, particularly those at the Walnut Creek site, had a higher propensity to recidivate at the point of selection than the high risk cases selected for the comparison

## Table 70

### Twelve Month Outcome Measures by Selected Unit
### For the Original Relationship and Standardizing Each Unit on the Other
#### (INTENSIVE SUPERVISION MODEL)

| Twelve Month Outcome Measures | "STANDARDIZED ON REDWOOD CITY UNIT" | | | | "STANDARDIZED ON WALNUT CREEK UNIT" | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | ORIGINAL RELATIONSHIP | | STANDARDIZED RELATIONSHIP | | ORIGINAL RELATIONSHIP | | STANDARDIZED RELATIONSHIP | |
| | Walnut Creek | Redwood City | Walnut Creek | Redwood City | Walnut Creek | Redwood City | Walnut Creek | Redwood City |
| CRIMINAL CHARGES | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| None filed | 32.3 | 53.8 | 40.2 | 52.0 | 32.3 | 53.8 | 32.3 | 51.3 |
| Charges filed | 67.7 | 46.2 | 59.8 | 48.0 | 67.7 | 46.2 | 67.7 | 48.7 |
| PAROLE REVOCATION | 100.0 | 100.0n | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| None filed | 20.0 | 36.0 | 25.1 | 36.0 | 20.0 | 36.0 | 20.0 | 22.9 |
| Charges filed | 80.0 | 64.0 | 74.9 | 64.0 | 80.0 | 64.0 | 80.0 | 77.1 |
| MOST SERIOUS DISPOSITION | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Not returned to prison | 38.5 | 64.0 | 45.7 | 64.0 | 38.5 | 64.0 | 38.5 | 58.9 |
| Returned to prison | 61.5 | 36.0 | 54.3 | 36.0 | 61.5 | 36.0 | 61.5 | 41.1 |

group. If the increased law enforcement information exchanges, evidence collection activities and collateral contacts which occurred under intensive supervision; and if the small increase in the agents contribution to detection and criminal charge processing, did lead to more criminal sanctions for illegal activity, the effect is likely small. The selection factor differences also prevents conclusions from being reached regarding the deterrent effect of close watch; although previous experimentation with other intensive supervision models such as the California Work Unit Project show that close watch of parolee activity generally leads to "increased detection" of parole violations, thereby increasing rather than decreasing parolee recidivism rates.

Chapter summary. This chapter examined the effectiveness of the intensive supervision model in reducing returns to criminal activity. To measure this objective the six and twelve month outcomes for 131 intensive supervision cases were compared to the outcomes of a similar group of 62 high risk cases which received only regular supervision. Outcome was measured several ways including (1) the parole status at the end of the follow-up period, (2) the total criminal and the total revocation charges and dispositions received during the follow-up period, (3) the most serious disposition received and the severity of the charges underlying that disposition, and (4) the custody-free days experienced during the follow-up period.

The findings show the intensive supervision model was not associated with a reduction in the frequency and severity of

subsequent criminal activity as was hypothesized by program planners. Rather, the close watch of parolee activity provided under the intensive supervision model was associated with an increase in the proportion of cases with criminal charges, the average number of charges per case, the severity of those charges, the severity of the criminal dispositions received and the days in custody. The analysis also provided some evidence that supervision instances where the high control agents contributed to the detection and processing of charges was numerically small and only slightly greater under intensive than regular supervision. Selection factor differences between the cases comprising the experimental and the comparison groups were found to at least partially account for the increase in criminal sanctions found. An analysis of outcome differences across the two demonstration sites showed that the Walnut Creek site experienced a greater increase in the criminal sanctions received by it's cases than occurred at the Riverside/San Bernardino site; however, the outcome difference was totally accounted for by case selection factor differences existing between the two sites.

# CHAPTER X

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This evaluation has empirically examined the activities and outcomes associated with two different control-oriented models of parole supervision. In this concluding chapter the implications of the findings in terms of it's intended objectives are discussed. In addition, the project's impact on several objectives not measured and on some longer range objectives are explored. Finally, the place of high control supervision within California's recently implemented "New Model of Parole" is discussed.

## Summary of Findings for Each Model

The investigation model was intended to increase the criminal activity verification and sanctions received for parolees suspected or known to be reinvolved in illegal activities. A comparison of the immediate outcomes of cases investigated to similar cases not investigated showed the investigation model was associated with (1) significantly more successful verifications of criminal and violational activity and (2) an increase in the revocation sanctions applied to parolees who were verified as returning to criminal activity. There was also some limited evidence that the investigation model was associated with an increase in the parole agent's contribution to the detection and processing of the new parole violation charges.

Several explanations were considereed in Chapter VII to account for the increase rate of successful verifications and

revocation sanctions associated with the investigation model, including the more intensive evidence collection activities which distinguished investigative supervision from regular supervision. However, weaknesses of the quasi-experimental design used and the small comparison group sample size prevented the type of analysis necessary to conslusively rule out several other possible explanations for the outcome variance including case selection factor differences, community law enforcement support differences, and likely revocation decision-making practice differences existing across the experimental and comparison units.

The _intensive supervision model_ of the High Control Project was intended to prevent and deter parolees with serious prior criminal histories from returning to criminal activity. Project planners hypothesized lower recidivism rates one year after placement under intensive supervision than similar high risk cases receiving regular supervision. Six and twelve month follow-up findings showed intensive supervision was associated with (1) an increase in criminal charges filed, (2) more serious types of criminal dispositions, (3) an increase in the severity of the criminal charges, (4) an increase in custody time and (5) an increase in unsuccessful premature types of terminations from parole. Thus, counter to the hypothesized direction, intensive supervision was associated with an increase in the frequency and severity of returns to illegal activity.

Several explanations were considered. _First_, the close watch of parolees under intensive supervision and the increase in

evidence collection activities may have led to an increase rate of detection and verification of illegal activities. This interpretation is partially supported by other California studies of intensive supervision models such as the Work Unit Project where the close watch increased the detection of technical violations of the conditions of parole and increased the revocation rate. However, the increase associated with the intensive supervision model was in new "criminal" charges and sentences to prison, rather than in technical violations and administrative returns to prison. Furthermore, additional findings showed that the intensive supervision model was associated with only a small increase in the agent's contribution to the detection and processing of charges. Thus, there was nothing apparent about the intensive supervision model activities which would account for the increased number of criminal charges and new court commitments found. The _second_ major explanation of outcome variance considered and positively supported by an additional control variable analysis was selection factor differences. Differences in the background of cases selected for intensive supervision particularly in the time on parole prior to selection, were shown at least partially to account for the outcome differences found between intensively and regularly supervised cases. Given this finding it was not possible to reach conclusions regarding the effect of intensive supervision in either reducing returns to illegal activities or increasing the verification and sanctions applied to those who did return.

## Conclusions and Implications of Findings

While selection factor differences and design weakness have prevented this evaluation from reaching the kind of conclusive findings desired, a few implications of the findings can be drawn including:

-the two high control models are likely one model with different organizational structures.
-supervision models based upon a close watch of parolees are more likely to lead to increased detection and therefore increased recidivism.
-parole agents engaging in pre-arrest evidence collection activities "may" increase the successful verification of suspected illegal activities but further research is needed.

One or two high control models. An analysis of the activities and operations of the two high control models suggests that the two models may be one model, sharing the same "increased controls and sanctions" objective, except operating under different organizational structures. All ten categories of supervision activity types were found to characterize both high control models. The frequent evidence collection activities, and law enforcement and collateral information exchanges which highly characterized the investigation model occurred often (although not as frequently) under the intensive supervision model. The major difference in activity type frequencies between the two models was in the "Check-up Contacts" and "Required Administrative" activities. The many similarities in activities suggest that the models both performed activities conducive to the purpose of verifying illegal activities and increasing sanctions. The fewer types of differences found suggest that the

intensive supervision model verified parolee activity while maintaining full caseload responsibilities while the investigation model did so by sharing caseload responsibilities with other agents in the unit.

"Deterrence", an inappropriate objective. There was nothing readily apparent about intensive supervision which would suggest that a close watch may deter parolees from returning to criminal activity and thereby reduce parolee recidivism rates. Rather the activities conducted under the intensive supervision model were more detection than prevention oriented. The kinds of "Assistance Activities" which are typically considered more preventative oriented such as referrals to alcohol programs, crisis intervention, counseling, etc. comprised only five percent of the total activities conducted under the intensive supervision model and was equal to that also found for the regular supervision model. Also prior research of intensive supervision models premised on an increased number of check-up contacts such as California's Work Unit Project have demonstrated an increased rate of recidivism as a result of the increased rate of violation detection associated with the close watch. Thus, the types of activities conducted under the intensive supervision model combined with experience of other close contact parole models suggest that unless specific preventative strategies are also incorporated into intensive supervision models, then deterrence as reflected by reduced parolee recidivism rates is perhaps an inappropriate objective.

Further research needed on effectiveness of pre-arrest
investigations. This evaluation could not determine conclusively
whether agent's conducting pre-arrest investigations of selected
parolees can increase the rate of successful verifications and
the frequency and severity of the sanctions applied to parolees
who have returned to illegal activities. Evidence found in
support of this relationship was an increase in the agent's
contribution to the detection and processing of new charges under
the investigation model, and the lack of identifiable selection
factor differences which could account for the outcome variance.
However, the quasi-experimental design used does not allow the
controls necessary to totally rule out selection factor
differences and other possible explanatory variables. The small
sample size of the comparison group used for this analysis (N=37)
reduces the likelihood of comparability between the experimental
and comparison group. Also the findings are more suspect as an
increase was found only in the more policy-controlled board-
ordered return to prison dispositions; no corresponding increase
was found in court ordered dispositions. Thus, while there is
evidence to suggest that increased pre-arrest investigative
activity "may" increase verification and sanctioning rates, more
conclusive research is needed.

## Longer Term Effects of Increased Sanctions

This evaluation does not assess the longer term impact of
the increased frequency and severity of sanctions applied to
selected parolees. The longer range goal of a hardline approach

that increases sanctions received for returns to illegal activity
is to control crime committed by parolees while they are in the
community. One way it may accomplish this is through "specific
deterrence". For example, the increased certainty of sanctions
applied to cases under investigation might operate as a
disincentive to future criminality for such cases. To measure
such an effect would require evaluating the "post-sentence"
community performance of those high control cases revoked or
returned to prison with new commitments. Even then it would be
difficult to control for the effects of other factors such as
sentence length variations which would also effect these post-
sentence outcomes. Another way through which the increased
frequency and severity of sanctions of the High Control Project
may control parolee crime levels in the long run is through
"incapacitation". Returning parolees to custody denies the
parolees access to victims, thereby preventing those crimes which
would have been committed had the parolees been free to do so.
Although the research on incapacitative effects is continuing,
one such study on the effect of longer prison sentences
(Petersilia and Greenwood, 1978) has found crime rate reductions
unlikely and quite costly. Any incapacitative effects of the
investigation model where the increase. is not in sentence length
but in sentence frequency, and where the dispositions received
were primarily short term board ordered returns to custody
(maximum twelve month sentence), remains to be demonstrated.

## Effects Not Measured

The High Control Project had other effects not addressed by this evaluation but which would likely enter into an overall assessment made of the project. It was hoped that the High Control Project would increase "public confidence" in the role of the parole agent by convincing the citizenry that the parole division does offer protection to the public. Related, although secondary to this objective, was a desired improvement in relationships with it's allied law enforcement agencies (local police departments and sheriff's offices). To have assessed the achievement of either of these goals was well beyond the scope of this evaluation; and even if an attempt were made to assess it, the impact was probably too localized to be systematically measured. However, some comments can be made regarding the project's possible impact in this area.

The sheer "implementation" of the High Control Project was a symbolic expression by the parole division of a high priority concern it maintained for the protection of the public. It is known that various letters of support from police departments and sherriff's offices in the geographic areas served by the high control units were written. Also, as evidenced by newspaper coverage, more publicity was received for this particular experimental project than any of the others implemented in the three year parole division self-evaluation effort of which this project was a part. Also, the great deal of interaction which occurred between the high control agents and law enforcement

staff made the parole division activities more visible to local law enforcement agencies, and helped to reduce some of law enforcement's confusion over the "service-plus-control" role that agents have traditionally served in the community. Thus, it would appear from these indicators that the High Control Project succeeded in making at least, if not more, a "symbolic" expression to law enforcement agencies and to the community of the parole division's concern for public protection.

Two additional, possibly negative, spillover effects of the High Control Project were also not measured in this evaluation. The hardline approach to parole supervision adopted in the high control models could increase the risks to agent safety on the job and could increase the violations of the limited civil rights that inmates in parole status maintain. Initially agents in the project proposed to carry weapons and the concern with agent safety and parolee rights was high. However, a policy decision not to allow weapons (except under emergency conditions) was made and such concerns were reduced. Nonetheless, threats to agent safety and violations of parolee rights were still a possibility.

The resources to make on-site observations which may detect either of these negative effects, and the legal perspective necessary to assess them, were not available. Some indirect observations from case file material (Buchanan and Star, 1980) did indicate that one of the three investigative units experienced threats and a few actual assaults on the high control

agents lives. Relatedly, the same unit experienced a number of requests from the parolees to transfer out of that unit. The other two investigative units did not experience such problems and the difference appeared to be a result of the particular operational style (i.e., visibility and assertiveness of the agents) used at that particular unit, rather than associated with the project in general. Without adequate information and controls it is impossible to objectively assess whether that unit's problems were any greater or less than the agent-parolee confrontations experienced in regular parole supervision. Should projects such as this be implemented on a large scale, agent-parolee confrontations are surely an area for monitoring.

## High Control and The New Model of Parole

Beginning in July, 1979 (before the completion of this project) the Parole and Community Services Division of the Department of Corrections implemented a "New Model of Parole". The basis for the new model was the findings of a three-year evaluation which the parole division undertook in 1976 to discover more effective ways of running the parole system (California Department of Corrections, 1978). The High Control Project was the last major field demonstration project implemented under that three-year study and it's findings were not available at the time the New Model was planned. Other research studies were used to plan the "control" component of the new model with the intention of incorporating the findings of the High Control Project into the new model at a later point in time.

The "New Model of Parole" has been defined by several features, but two elements characterize it best and involved major changes from the operations of the old model. First the new model introduced "needs and risk assessment scales" to more rigorously determine the kind of supervision needed for different cases and at different time periods on parole. Second, to implement this "differential supervision" model it redefined the role of field personnel from the "generalist" approach (where one agent is responsible for all aspects of supervision for a case throughout it's entire parole period) to the "functional specialist" approach (where one agent specializes in one aspect of supervision and performs this task at any time on any case within the agents jurisdiction, again depending upon that case's needs).

To implement the new "differential supervision" model field agents were reassigned into teams to conduct one of three forms of supervision specialties for which each case would be assigned, depending upon an assessment of his needs and risks: control emphasis, services emphasis, and minimum supervision. The "Control emphasis" was defined by new model planners as follows:

> Controls emphasis stresses programs intended to prevent, detect, or interrupt actions and situations by which adult offenders are endangering or are likely to endanger the community or themselves. Such programs may include but are not limited to closer observation, investigation, substance abuse detection, and intervention. Although priority is placed on controls programs in this supervision mode, services also will be secured as needed.

The controls emphasis form of supervision should
in no way be confused with the several experimental
"high control" projects currently being operated
by the division. Following completion of the high
control projects, some features of these projects
may be included in the range of allowable controls
activities. (California Department of Corrections,
1979).

The above definition emphasized the fact that "control emphasis"
was not to be considered synonymous with "high Control", but at
the same time suggested that certain features of the latter might
be incorporated in the new model.

Lacking in the above definition, and in the new model in
general, is a definition of the functions or the "technology"
which comprise the "control emphasis". For example, it has not
yet been determined whether control emphasis should

- Use direct face-to-face check-up contacts
  (as under regular supervision but occurring
  more frequently) or use indirect monitoring
  strategies such as contacts with collaterals
  or undercover surveillance.

- Utilize evidence collection techniques
  commonly used by law enforcement (e.g.,
  witness interviews, residence searches)
  or simply maintain a liaison with local
  law enforcement who will perform such
  tasks.

- Maintain an integrated, liaison only or
  distant relationship with law enforcement
  (i.e., define the lines and extent of inter-
  action).

- Include the performance of administrative
  case management functions (as in the in-
  tensive supervision model) or only the
  performance of control tasks (as under
  the investigation model).

- Invoke an arrest when illegal activity is
  suspected or attempt some other preventive
  measure.

- Investigate only certain categories of sus-
  pected criminal activities, particularly in
  light of evidence that certain crimes are
  more suppressible than others.

Neither the New Model of Parole nor the original proposal
for the high control model has defined and developed the
"strategies" or "technology" which would make up control-oriented
supervision. The High Control Project evaluation, by relating
the differential outcomes discovered across units to the
different control strategies and operational styles each
operated, suggested some strategies which "may" show promise for
the control-emphasis component of the new model, although further
more definitive research on the effects of these strategies is
needed.

Preliminary reviews of the operations of the New Model
have identified potential problems with the control-emphasis
component of the differential supervision scheme. Large
proportions of the control activities performed in the new model
are check-up contacts (with either the parolee or a collateral of
the parolee) and anti-narcotic testing. These two types of
activities were the major component of the old model of parole
and therefore do not represent new strategies. Furthermore, the
differential outcome analysis across units in this study and
prior research has suggested that check-up contacts relative to
other types of control activities do not prevent criminal
activity and may not be the most effective way to increase crime
detection and sanctions applied. If the "control emphasis"
component is to be shown as more effective than old model control
techniques, then new control strategies will need to be adopted
and tested in the new model.

REFERENCES

ABADINSKY, H.
    1977    Probation and Parole, Theory and Practice
            New Jersey:   Prentice-Hall, Inc.

ANTILLA, I.
    1975    "Probation and Parole:   Social Control or Social
            Service?"   International Journal of Criminology and
            Penology.   3:   79-84.

BLOCH, P. and BELL, J.
    1976    Managing Investigations:   The Rochester System.
            Washington, D.C.:   The Urban Institute, Police
            Foundation.

BUCHANAN, K. and STAR, D.
    1980    Comparative Observations On The Operational Styles
            Implemented At three Investigation Model
            Demonstration Sites.   Unpublished Manuscript.
            Oakland, California:   Bay Area Research Unit,
            California Department of Corrections.

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, PAROLE AND COMMUNITY
SERVICES DIVISION
    1977    A Comparative Appraisal of Selected
            Parole and Community Services Division
            Field Demonstration Projects.   Sacramento:
            Author.

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, PAROLE AND COMMUNITY
SERVICES DIVISION
    1978    Parole In California:   A Three-Year Evaluation
            and Development of a New Model.   Sacramento:
            Author.

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, PAROLE AND COMMUNITY
SERVICES DIVISION
    1979    The New Model of Parole, A Description of the
            Model and Guildelines for the Development of
            District Level Implementation Plans.   Sacramento:
            Author.

CITIZENS' INQUIRY ON PAROLE AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE, INC.
    1974    Report on New York Parole.   New York:
            Author.

CONNECTICUTT DEPARTMENT OF ADULT PROBATION
    1977    Differential Caseload Management By Objectives.
            Unpublished manuscript. Hartford:   Author.

DELL'APA, F.: ADAMS, W.: JORGENSEN, J. and SIGURDSON, H.
    1976    "Advocacy, Brokerage, Community:
            The ABC's of Probation and Parole"
            Federal Probation.   40:   37-44.

FERGUSON, G.
    1972    Statistical Analysis In Psychology and
            Education.   New York:   McGraw-Hill
            Book Company.

FOGEL, D.
    1975    We Are the Living Proof.   New York:
            W.H. Anderson, Co.

GREENWOOD, P. and PETERSILIA, J.
    1975    The Criminal Investigation Process,
            Volume 1:   Summary and Policy.   Santa Monica:
            The Rand Corporation.

KELLING, G.; PATE, T.; DIECKMAN, D. and BROWN, C.
    1974    The kansas City Preventive Parole Experiment,
            a Summary Report.   Washington, D.C.:   Police
            Foundation.

MAXWELL, A.
    1961    Analysing Qualitative Data.   London:
            Methuen and Co. Ltd.

MILLER, D.
    1972    Parole Decision-Making and Its Consequences, A One
            Year Follow-up of Region III Parole Violator's
            Continued on Parole.   Unpublished Manuscript.   Los
            Angeles:   California Department of Corrections, Los
            Angeles Research Unit.

NATIONAL LEGAL DATA CENTER
    1977    The Verdict (April/May)

NEITHERCUTT, M. and GOTTFREDSON, D.
    1973    Caseload Size and Difference In Probation/Parole
            Performance.   Davis, California:   National Council
            on Crime and Delinquency.

NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF PAROLE AND PROBATION
    1978    Final Report and Evaluation, Intensive
            Supervision Unit, Las Vegas, Nevada.
            Unpublished paper.   Las Vegas, Nevada:   Author.

PETERSILIA, J. and LAVIN, M.
    1978    Targeting Career Criminals - A Developing
            Criminal Justice Strategy.   Santa Monica,
            California:   The Rand Corporation.

PETERSILIA, J. and GREENWOOD, P.
    1978  "Mandatory Prison Sentences:  Their Projected
          Effects on Crime and Prison Populations"
          The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology.
          69: ____ .

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY
    1978  Improved Correctional Field Services
          Project Evaluation.  Unpublished
          Manuscript.  New York:  Author.

SACKS, H. and LOGAN, C.
    1979  Does Parole Make a Difference?.
          Connecticutt:  The University of
          Connecticutt School of Law Press.

SCHWARTZ, A. and CLARREN, S.
    1977  The Cincinatti Team Policing Experiment,
          A Summary Report.  Washington, D.C.:
          The Urban Institute, Police Foundation.

SOCIAL ISSUES RESEARCH ASSOCIATES
    1974  Alternative Parole Models and
          Rehabilitating Parole.  Unpublished
          Manuscript.  Berkeley:  Author

STANLEY, D.
    1976  Prisoners Among Us, The Problem of
          Parole.  Washington, D.C.:  The
          Brookings Institute.

STAR, D.
    1979  Summary Parole, A Six and Twelve Month
          Follow-up Evaluation.  Research Report
          No. 60.  Sacramento:  California Department
          of Corrections.

STAR, D., BERECOCHEA, J. and PETROCCHI, D.
    1978  Return to Prison Ordered:  Policy In Practice and
          Change.
          Unpublished Manuscript. Sacramento:  California
          Department of Corrections.

STUDT, E.
    1970  Parolees and Agents In Interaction.  Berkeley:
          Center for The Study of Law and Society.

VON HIRSCH, A. and HANRAHAN, K.
    1978  Abolish Parole? Washington. D.C.:
          National Institute of Law Enforcement
          and Criminal Justice.

APPENDICES

## Appendix A

### Selection Criteria Definitions*

Prison Gang Affiliation: A case in this category will be eligible if there is documentation of prison gang activities or verification of such activity has been obtained from the institution of release, Special Services Unit, or by case conference.

Large-Scale Drug Involvement: A case in this category will be eligible if there is a conviction for sales or for possession for sales, or if the parolee's file should contain information that reflects involvement in sales of narcotics and/or drugs for profit rather than to support a habit, or he was arrested and found in possession of a sufficient quantity of narcotics that would exceed the amount necessary for personal use.

The criteria for application of tests to determine what is possessed for profit will vary in each case. One guideline is the quantity of narcotics which the person is caught with as compared to the size of the individual's narcotic habit. Even though the person may only be dealing enough to support a habit, if the habit is large, this may mean the addict is dealing in fairly large quantities. So even though a case like this might not qualify for high control on a test of "profit," it would qualify because of the capability of making that kind of a "connection." A judgment on this criteria must be based on the locale, the state of affairs in that local drug market, the role of the person in that market, as well as the estimated size of the individual's habit or currently validated information which indicates the probability of large-scale drug involvement.

Violent Behavior or Sexual Deviancy: Cases in these categories would be eligible if there is (1) an arrest for possession, control of or access to any firearm, explosives, or dangerous weapon, or a threat of, or (2) an arrest for child molesting or other serious deviant sexual behavior.

If there has been no arrest, there should be specifically cited information and current case dynamics which corroborate the likelihood of future misconduct.

PAL and RAL: Cases to be included if it has been designated PAL or RAL. For those offenders not in PAL/RAL status, there should be documentation of the reasons for the conclusion that the case is a potential PAL or RAL.

Property/Fraud Offenders: Offenders involved in property offenses (either current or prior to release from prison) where the estimated property value was in excess of $1,000 per occurence.

*Taken from the High Control Project Implementation Plan, Section IX.C.2, Parole and Community Services Division, California Department of Corrections, 1976.

## Appendix B

### Activity Type Categories

Interviews - formal meetings arranged by the parole agent with individuals to gather and document information by asking questions.

Individuals questioned include victims or witnesses to a crime, or the family or associates of the parolee. Interrogation, or the formal questioning of the parolee as a suspected offender, is also included in this category. The informal questioning of the parolee at a jail regarding arrest circumstances and for the administrative purpose of completing required activity/violation reports or revocation papers are coded under the "Required After-Arrest Processing" category rather than here. Excluded from this category are special "pretext" and "informant" interviews which were tabulated separately (see categories below).

Pretext Interviews and Representation - a special means of obtaining information where the real intent or mission of the interview is concealed by the parole agent who assumes a fictitious identity and purpose.

Pretext representation could not be used for the purpose of obtaining a confession or gaining entry. Pretext occurred whenever the name or trademark of another agency, organization or company (other than the California Department of Corrections) was used by the parole agent to gain information. Not included in this category are information exchanges where the parole agent simply failed to identify their position or purpose.

Informant Interviews and Usages - obtaining information by asking questions of individuals who by virtue of their surroundings and associates have access to information and by various arrangements are predisposed to provide the information to the parole agent.

This category includes direct questioning of informants by the parole agent and indirect information exchanges with an informant via a law enforcement agency. The source of information must be labeled an "informant" or otherwise "confidential" to be included in this category.

Resource Material Checks - efforts by the parole agent to gather information by checking in standardized public, private and government data banks.

Included in this category is checking of city directories for house addresses and resident names, the Department of Motor Vehicles for auto registration, postmaster for resident names and addresses, police files for crime details or offender identification, Department of Corrections files for case background, and business records such as those of a bank for circumstantial information.

Anti-Narcotic Testing - an examination made by the parole agent to proof the recent use of narcotics or drugs.

The major activity included in this category is the taking of urine samples to test for narcotic usages. Skin checks for evidence of narcotic use were also included, but occurred less frequently. Unsuccessful attempts to test (i.e., collect urine) and the scheduling of another appointment to take a urine test were also counted as an anti-narcotic test activity.

Evidence Processing - steps or operations taken on an object or information by the parole agent in order to establish a point in question.

The major activity included in this category is the laboratory testing of urine samples for narcotic and drug use. As little direct testing is done by parole agents, this category tabulates the sending of such tests to the lab and the reviewing of the lab results. Also included in this category is the inventorying, marking, and storing of evidence obtained during a search (e.g.,weapons and stolen property).

Searches and Seizure of Evidence - the examination of an individual's person, residence or vehicle by the parole agent to gain knowledge, establish facts and collect evidence.

Includes formal planned searches conducted with a law enforcement agency as well as alone, and those spontaneous unplanned, exploratory searches for evidence.

Surveillance - parole agent keeping watch over an individual or a set of activities for the purpose of detecting some kind of illegal activity or collecting evidence to establish the fact.

Three specific kinds of surveillance are tabulated:

Fixed Surveillance - watching an individual or set of activities from one location for an extended period of time. Includes "stakeouts" which are special forms of fixed surveillance whose end objective is to make an arrest.

Spot Surveillance - the brief observation of a location by conducting an emergent or one-time checks.

Tailing Surveillance - observations made of an individual by following them from place-to-place to gain information regarding the individual's movements and contacts.

Information Exchanges With Law Enforcement - parole agent gives knowledge to, or receives knowledge from, an agency of the criminal justice system.

Such exchanges include telephone calls regarding the parolee in question as well as attending police intelligence meetings regarding a set of criminal activities the parolee may be involved in. The criminal justice agencies primarily include local police department, sheriff's office, jail, court or probation staff, and sometimes included state and federal agencies such as the Highway Parole, and Federal Bureaus of Information (FBI) or Narcotics (BN).

The exchange of three different kinds of information are tabulated including information regarding:

- Current Suspected Criminal Involvement or Parole Violation - information exchanged on a specific kind of illegal activity for which the parolee is suspected of involvement.

- Recent Arrest and After-Arrest Processing- information exchanged on a recent apprehension, and incarceration of the parolee, and the court processing of those arrest charges.

- General Background and Non-Criminal Status Factors- information exchanged on the parolee's prior criminal history or current social adjustment in the community (e.g., residence, employment, etc.).

Information Exchanges With CDC - parole agent gives knowledge to, or receives knowledge from, another staff member of the California Department of Corrections.

The most common exchanges occurred with another parole agent in the unit or the unit's supervisor or district administrator. Some exchanges also occurred with parole staff outside the unit or with prison staff.

The exchange of three different kinds of information are tabulated including information regarding:

- Current Suspected Criminal Involvement or Parole Violation - see definition under Law Enforcement Exchanges.

- Recent Arrest and After-Arrest Processing - see definition under Law Enforcement Exchanges.

- General Background and Non-Criminal Status Factors - see definition under Law Enforcement Exchanges.

Information Exchanges With Other Individuals - parole agent gives knowledge to or receive knowledge from, individuals not affiliated with either a law enforcement agency or the Department of Corrections.

These other individuals generally comprise "collaterals" of the parolee such as a wife, girlfriend, family member employer, or associate. Information exchanges with such individuals often occurred in conjunction with actual or attempted "check-up contacts" (see definitions below).

The exchange of three different kinds of information are tabulated including information regarding:

- Current Suspected Criminal Involvement or Parole Violation - see definition under Law Enforcement Exchanges.

- Recent Arrest and After-Arrest Processing - see definition under Law Enforcement Exchanges.

- General Background and Non-Criminal Status Factors- see definition under Law Enforcement Exchanges.

Apprehension - parole agent takes parolee into custody by authority of the law.

Includes arrests made by the parole agent, either alone or with a law enforcement agency's assistance. Arrests made by law enforcement alone are generally communicated to the parole agent by telephone and would be tabulated as a "Law Enforcement Information Exchange Regarding a Recent Arrest". Only arrests made by the agent or with the agents involvement are tabulated here.

Required After-Arrest Processing - performing those tasks required of the parole agent for administrative processing of the arrest information through the California Department of Corrections and to the Board of Prison Terms.

Activities in this category include securing a copy of the arrest report, interviewing the parolee regarding the arrest circumstances, placing and lifting holds, serving revocation hearing forms, attending a revocation hearing and confirming hearing/court dates and final sentences.

-274-

Prosecution Assistance - parole agent performing tasks which assist in the criminal court proceedings against the parolee.

Activities in this category include having a victim sign a complaint, assisting witnesses to appear in court, testifying in court, preparing an indictment, and transfering evidence to the prosecutor.

Attempted Check-up Contacts - routine contacts by the parole agent to check-up on the status of the parolee and which are unsuccessful due to the unavailability of the parolee.

Activities in this category include failed attempts to contact by mail or telephone as well as field visits to the parolee's residence.

Actual Check-up Contacts - routine meeting between the parolee and the agent for the purpose of checking the current general status of the parolee.

Activities in this category primarily include prearranged face-to-face field visits to the parolee's residence or the parolee reporting to the parole unit as instructed by the agent; although unannounced field visits and unscheduled calls or drop-ins initiated by the parolee are also tabulated here. The initial purpose of the meetings are non-specific although other specific activities (which are tabulated separately) such as obtaining cash assistance or taking an anti-narcotic test often occur inconjunction with the check-up contact.

Required Permission or Notification - parole agent granting of approval or acknowledging notification of certain parolee activities which, according to the California Conditions of Parole or per parole division policy, require some form of certification.

Activities in this category include the parole agents granting approval for the parolee to travel (in-state or out-of-state), approval to visit a prison and acknowledgements of the parolee having changed employment, changed residence or returned from an approved trip.

Required Release Matters - parole agent activities required by parole division policy to facilitate the transistion from prison to parole status.

Two major kinds of release activities are included in this category - the conducting of the initial interview (which serves many purposes such as explaining the conditions of parole and discussing police registration requirements) and the delivery of prison release money.

-275-

Required Administrative Processing - a conglomerate of administrative activities required of the parole agent and governed by parole division policy which assure that internal casework standards and legal sentencing mandates or court decisions are being met.

Common activities in this category include notifying other agents or units and the parolee of case transfer, conducting early-discharge-from-parole reviews, conducting case conferences or audits with the unit supervisor, and notifying the parolee of term recalculation or other court dicisions affecting the parolee's sentence.

Direct Service - the direct furnishing by the parole agent of some kind of assistance which will benefit the parolee.

The kinds of services included in this category include providing emergency cash assistance, a job lead, material goods such as tools or clothes, medical aid, or transportation. Only those services directly supplied by the parole agent are tabulated; brokering with another agency to provide the service are tabulated separately under the "Referral to Community Service" category below.

Referral to Community Service - parole agent directing the parolee to an individual or another agency which will provide assistance to benefit the parolee.

The kinds of assistance the community services provide include the same types identified under the "Direct Service" category defined above.

Counseling - discussion of potential problems of the parolee and the offering of advise by the parole agent on their resolution.

Areas generally forming the topic of such counseling activities include drug use, attitude, cooperation with the agent, leisure time activities and associates and general parole program compliance.

Other - activities by the parole agent which are not classifiable by the above categories or were undecipherable from the information available.

Appendix C

PAROLE OUTCOME CATEGORIES
(Most Serious Disposition)

Favorable

Clean

- No record of arrests or other parole violations.

Other Favorable

- Arrests and release (with or without trial).
- Parolee-at-large, with no known violation and for less than six months.
- Jail sentence of less than 90 days, or any jail sentence totally suspended or misdemeanor probation, or fine only, or bail forfeited.

Unfavorable

Pending

- Parole violation occurred but disposition was pending at the termination of the follow-up period.

Miscellaneous Unfavorable

- Parolee-at-large with a felony warrant, or parolee-at-large for more than six months.
- Declared by court as criminally insane.
- Arrested on felony charge and released, but guilt admitted and restitution provided.
- Death in the commission of a crime.
- Death from a drug overdose.
- Jail sentence of more than 89 days.
- Felony probation of 5 years or more.
- Suspended prison sentence.
- Civil commitment for narcotic addiction to the California Rehabilitation Center.

Return to Prison

Board Ordered

- Any return to a California prison by order of the Adult Authority and without a new court commitment to prison.
- Return to prison by the Adult Authority for a short term, including narcotic treatment-control unit and short-term return unit.

Court Commitment

- Any return to prison in California or other jurisdiction by order of a court as a result of a criminal conviction.

Appendix D

Offense Severity Scale

The offense severity scale used in this study is a modified application of the "California Offense Severity Index" developed by David Brewer, Ph.D., California Department of Corrections for the Community Based Corrections Evaluation Project (C.B.C.E.P.).

The index is derived from the bail schedules for the counties of Alameda, San Diego, and Sacramento. The dollar value of the bail for each offense was averaged across the three counties using weights to equalize the relative contribution of each schedule. Bails averaging over 10,000 were set at 9,999 and the last digit in the average ommitted to reduce the index to a three digit score ranging from 001 (or $10) to 999 (or 10,000 and over). Thus, each offense severity score represents the dollar value of bail assigned and therefore reflects the court determined seriousness generally associated with that offense type.

Application of the scale was modified for this study by dropping the third digit of the index value for each offense thereby utilizing a range of scores between 00 and 99 (rather than 001 to 999).

The California Severity Index which follows on the attached pages was taken from Appendix C of Evaluation of Adult Diversion Projects, Community Based Corrections Evaluation Project Report, Part One, California Department of Corrections, Sacramento, California, February, 1976.

CALIFORNIA OFFENSE SEVERITY INDEX

| CALIF. NUMBER | CALIF TYPE | DESCRIPTION | SEVERITY | CATEG |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 22450 A | V | RUN STOP SIGN (M) | 001 | 7 |
| 24252 A | V | MAINTENANCE OF LIGHTS | 001 | 7 |
| 647 F | P | UNDER INF. OF NARC., ALCOHOL (M) | 013 | 8 |
| 415 | P | DISTURBING THE PEACE (M) | 014 | 7 |
| 23110 A | V | THROW AT VEHICLE (M) | 015 | 2 |
| 25658 B | B | PURCHASE OF LIQUOR BY MINOR (M) | 016 | 6 |
| 14610 | V | UNLAWFUL USE OF LICENSE (M) | 017 | 7 |
| 23103 | V | RECKLESS DRIVING (M) | 017 | 7 |
| 23109 A | V | SPEED CONTEST (M) | 017 | 7 |
| 647 E | P | LOITERING (M) | 021 | 7 |
| 602.5 | P | UNAURHOTIZED ENTRY (M) | 022 | 2 |
| 330 | P | GAMING (M) | 023 | 2 |
| 537 | P | NON-PAYMENT HOTEL, ETC. (M) | 023 | 2 |
| 602 | P | TRESPASS (M) | 023 | 2 |
| 2800 | V | OBEDIENCE TO OFFICERS (M) | 023 | 7 |
| 2801 | V | OBEDIENCE TO FIREMAN (M) | 023 | 7 |
| 12500 | V | DRIVE W/O LICENSE, EXPIRED L YR. (M) | 023 | 7 |
| 10852 | V | TAMPERING W/AUTO | 027 | 2 |
| 25661 | B | FALSE I.D., MINOR BUY ALCOHOL (M) | 027 | 6 |
| 25662 | R | POSSESSION OF ALCOHOL BY MINOR (M) | 027 | 6 |
| 416 | P | REFUSAL OF COMMAND TO DISPERSE (M) | 029 | 7 |
| 594 | P | MALICIOUS MISCHIEF (M) | 029 | 2 |
| 597 B | P | KILL, MAIM ANIMALS, COCK FIGHT (M) | 029 | 8 |
| 484 | P | PETTY THEFT (M) | 031 | 2 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 488 | | P | PETTY THEFT (M) | 031 | 2 |
| 14601.1 | | V | DRIVE W/O LICENSE, OTHER REASON (M) | 031 | 7 |
| 240 | | P | ASSAULT (M) | 036 | 1 |
| 242 | | P | BATTERY (M) | 036 | 1 |
| 20002 | | V | HIT AND RUN (M) | 036 | 2 |
| 653 | K | P | SWITCH BLADE | 037 | 1 |
| 14601 | | V | DRIVE W/O LICENSE; SUSP./REVOKED (M) | 038 | 7 |
| 381 | | P | SNIFFING GLUE (M) | 039 | 3 |
| 647 | | P | SOLICITING (M) | 039 | 5 |
| 647 | G | P | LOITER, PROWL (M) | 041 | 2 |
| 650 | 1/2 | P | INJURIES TO PERSONS/PROPERTY (M) | 041 | 8 |
| 12031 | | P | LOADED FIREARM (M) | 041 | 1 |
| 23101 | | V | DRUNK DRIVING (M) | 041 | 6 |
| 23104 | | V | RECKLESS DRIVING, PERS. INJURY (M) | 041 | 1 |
| 290 | | P | SEX OFFENDERS MUST REGISTER (M) | 044 | 5 |
| 311 | | P | INDECENT PICTURES (M) | 044 | 5 |
| 314 | | P | INDECENT EXPOSURE (M) | 044 | 5 |
| 647 | B | P | PROSTITUTION (M) | 044 | 5 |
| 12025 | | P | CONCEALED WEAPON (M) | 044 | 1 |
| 148 | | P | RESISTING ARREST (M) | 046 | 1 |
| 573 | E | P | SERIAL NO. CHANGED (M) | 050 | 2 |
| 499 | B | P | TAKE AUTO TEMPORARILY (M) | 056 | 2 |
| 409 | | P | REFUSE TO DISPERSE FROM RIOT (M) | 060 | 7 |
| 476 | A, B | P | NON-SUFFICIENT FUNDS CHECK (M) | 061 | 2 |
| 315 | | P | KEEP OR LIVE IN BAUDY HOUSE (M) | 071 | 5 |
| 192.3 B | | P | MANSLAUGHTER (M) | 072 | 1 |
| 272 | | P | CONTRIBUTING (M) | 072 | 1 |
| 417 | | P | EXHIBIT FIREARM (M) | 072 | 1 |
| 11364 | | H | OPIUM PIPES, PARAPHENALIA (M) | 077 | 3 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11365 | | H | PRESENCE IN RM. W NARC. OR MARIJUANA | 077 | 4 |
| 337 | A | P | BOOKMAKING | 079 | 2 |
| 314.1 | | P | INDECENT EXPOSURE W/PRIOR | 089 | 5 |
| 11357 | | H | POSSESS MARIJUANA | 089 | 4 |
| 11550 | | H | UNDER INFL. CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE (M) | 094 | 3 |
| 405 | | P | RIOT (M) | 115 | 7 |
| 11377 | | H | POSSESS DANGEROUS DRUGS | 132 | 3 |
| 11358 | | H | CULTIVATE MARIJUANA | 144 | 4 |
| 219.1 and 219.2 | | P | THROW AT COMMON CARRIER, VEHICLE | 158 | 2 |
| 476 | A | P | NON-SUFFICIENT FUNDS CHECK | 173 | 2 |
| 270 | | P | CHILD NEGLECT | 178 | 1 |
| 496 | | P | STOLEN PROPERTY (M) | 178 | 2 |
| 11483 | | W | FRAUD IN OBTAINING AID | 178 | 2 |
| 484 | | P | PETTY THEFT W/PRIOR | 196 | 2 |
| 496 | | P | RECEIVE STOLEN PROPERTY | 197 | 2 |
| 4390 | | B | FORGERY PRESCRIPTION | 197 | 2 |
| 470 | | P | FORGERY | 212 | 2 |
| 20001 | | V | HIT AND RUN | 212 | 1 |
| 23101 | | V | DRUNK DRIVING | 212 | 6 |
| 273 | A | P | ENDANGER HELATH OF CHILD | 213 | 1 |
| 484 | E | P | CREDIT CARD (THEFT) | 213 | 2 |
| 484 | F | P | CREDIT CARD (FORGERY) | 213 | 2 |
| 484 | G | P | CREDIT CARD (USE OF) | 213 | 2 |
| 23106 | | V | DRIVE UNDER INF. DRUGS, W/INJURY | 213 | 1 |
| 667 | | P | PETTY THEFT W/PRIOR FELONY | 215 | 2 |
| 192.3 | | P | MANSLAUGHTER W/VEHICLE | 223 | 1 |
| 487.1 | | P | GRAND THEFT (OVER $200) | 234 | 2 |
| 487.3 | | P | GRAND THEFT (AUTO, ETC.) | 234 | 2 |
| 503 | | P | EMBEZZLEMENT | 234 | 2 |

| Code | | Type | Offense | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 591 | | P | DESTRUCTION TEL AND TEL LINE | 234 | 2 |
| 10851 | | V | GRAND THEFT AUTO | 234 | 2 |
| 11350 | | H | POSSESSION OF CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE | 234 | 3 |
| 12020 | | P | MANF., SALE, POSS., OF ILL. WEAPON | 259 | 1 |
| 286 | | P | CRIME AGAINST NATURE | 260 | 5 |
| 487.2 | | P | GRAND THEFT (FROM A PERSON) | 278 | 2 |
| 11359 | | H | POSSESS MARIJUANA FOR SALE | 278 | 4 |
| 11355 | | H | AGREE TO SELL NARCOTICS | 292 | 3 |
| 241 | | P | ASSAULT AGAINST POLICE | 303 | 1 |
| 243 | | P | ASSAULT, BATTERY AGAINST POLICE | 303 | 1 |
| 266 | H | P | PIMPING | 333 | 5 |
| 266 | I | P | PANDERING | 333 | 5 |
| 11378 | | H | POSSESSION FOR SALE, DANG. DRUGS. | 333 | 3 |
| 182.1 | | P | CONSPIRACY | 373 | 7 |
| 459 | | P | BURGLARY 2ND (HOUSE) | 401 | 2 |
| 273 | D | P | CORP. INJURY WIFE | 410 | 1 |
| 273 | D | P | CORP. INJURY CHILD | 410 | 1 |
| 118 to 129 | | P | PERJURY | 414 | 7 |
| 11360 | | H | TRANS. FOR SALE OF MARIJUANA | 420 | 4 |
| 11361 | | H | SELL MARIJUANA TO MINOR, BY ADULT | 420 | 4 |
| 288 | | P | CHILD MOLESTING | 467 | 5 |
| 220 | | P | ASSAULT TO RAPE | 500 | 1 |
| 211 | | P | ROBBERY 2ND | 522 | 1 |
| 245 | A | P | ASSAULT, DEADLY WEAPON | 549 | 1 |
| 11379 | | H | SALE OF DANGEROUS DRUGS | 598 | 3 |
| 518 | | P | EXTORTION | 602 | 2 |
| 261 | | P | SEX (UNLAWFUL, UNDERAGE) | 615 | 5 |
| 23110 | B | V | TRHOW AT VEHICLE, INTENT GR. INJURY | 653 | 1 |
| 11351 | | H | POSS. FOR SALE OF CONT. SUBS. | 719 | 3 |
| 261 (3) | | P | RAPE W/THREAT | 746 | 5 |
| 245 | B | P | ASSAULT AGAINST POLICE, FIREMAN | 774 | 1 |
| 452 | | P | ARSON (POSS. OF FLAMMABLE SUB.) | 782 | 2 |
| 459 | | P | BURGLARY 1ST (1ST SPECIFIED) | 803 | 2 |
| 192.3 | | P | MANSLAUGHTER W/O VEHICLE | 829 | 1 |
| 211 | | P | ROBBERY 1ST | 829 | 1 |
| 207 | | P | KIDNAP | 836 | 1 |
| 11352 | | H | TRANS., SALE OF CONT. SUBS. | 938 | 3 |
| 11353 | | H | INDUCE MINOR, BY PERSON 18 OR OVER | 938 | 3 |
| 11354 | | H | INDUCE MINOR, BY PERSON UNDER 18 | 938 | 3 |
| 217 | | P | ASSAULT TO MURDER | 998 | 1 |
| 447 | A | P | ARSON | 998 | 2 |
| 187 | | P | MURDER 1ST | 999 | 1 |

END