An Assessment of Texas Juvenile Intensive Supervision Programs

Darryl Beatty

Spring 2002

Table of Contents

Chapter One: Introduction and Research Purpose

Introduction

Probation occupies a unique and special place in the criminal justice system. By definition probation allows an offender the opportunity to remain in the community in lieu incarceration on the premise of good behavior (Dobbert, 1987, p. 30). The purpose of this chapter is to discuss probation with emphasis on the juvenile justice system. Specifically, the following topics will be discussed: 1) the concept of probation, 2) definitions of intensive supervision probation and 3) the purpose for this research.

The Concept of Probation

The "get tough" on crime attitude on crime attitude has led to a trend toward enactment of legislation providing for harsher treatment for juvenile offenders (Sharp and Moore, 1988). Despite the legislative trend toward harsher treatment of juvenile offenders, probation continues to be widely used as a program alternative in the disposition of cases. The fact that juvenile courts have experienced significant increases in the number of referrals will lead to the inevitable result that a substantial proportion of these offenders will remain in the community. As Romig (1988) states, there simply is not sufficient space in institutions to accommodate the increased referral, even if it was though wise to do so. The issue of overcrowded institutions alone will continue to encourage the use of probation alternatives for children (Burkhart, 1986).

The inability and undesirability to incarcerate the majority of juvenile offenders presents the problem of what to do with the increased number of serious offenders. In answer, the juvenile courts are already being called upon to provide a variety of program

responses (Byrne, 1986). Among the variety of responses available are probation programs tailored to meet the individual needs of the offender. Intensive supervision probation (ISP) is examined in the following section as one alternative for individualized treatment that is intended to reduce the likelihood of recidivism among juvenile offenders.

Intensive Supervision Defined

ISP is described as a dispositional (sentencing) alternative used by juvenile courts to provide increased monitoring of those youth for whom traditional probation has failed and for whom institutional commitment is a imminent possibility (National Center for Juvenile Justice, 1988). Characteristics of intensive supervision probation include: reduced caseload size, increased probation officer-client contact and enhanced delivery of comprehensive treatment services (Byrne, 1986). Thus Intensive supervision probation (ISP) is characterized by the utilization of a more intensive application of the traditional concept and practice of probation supervision (Enos, Holman, & Carroll, 1999, p27). This is accomplished by imposing stricter reporting standards by probationers and by allowing the probation officer to have a smaller caseload.

Research Purpose

The purpose of this applied research project is to identify effective practices for Juvenile Intensive Supervision Probation (ISP) programs and assess the extent to which Texas Juvenile ISP programs include those practices.[1] The research will assess the

---

[1] It should be noted that this research is a replication of Christine McCormick's' SWT ARP "Intensive Supervision Probation: Assessing Texas Programs" (1999) where she examined adult ISP programs.

findings of the ISP programs against the practical ideal type classification of the conceptual framework. The conceptual framework was developed through a literary research. Practical ideal types can be viewed as standards or points of reference (Shields, 1998, p.219). Shields (1998, p. 207) points out that the practical ideal type applies when the research purpose is to understand something, the research questions ask how close a process is to the ideal or standard, multiple methods of data collection are used and the statistics are descriptive.

The following chapter presents the literature review as well as the conceptual framework section. That section discussed in detail the criteria that make up the practical ideal type. Chapter three describes the county juvenile probation departments that operate the ISP programs in Texas and the relationship between the state and local agencies. Chapter four discusses the methods used to gather data and the samples presented. Chapter five presents the assessment of how close the Texas juvenile ISP programs are to the practical ideal type identified in the literature review. A summary of the results and recommendations can be found in chapter six.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

Purpose

The purpose of this chapter is to review criminal/juvenile justice literature on intensive supervision probation (ISP) in order to develop a theoretical framework for future study. This review includes literature that discusses the historical evolution of juvenile intensive supervision probation, describes intensive supervision probation, evaluates intensive supervision probation programs, ISP mission and goal statements, and suggests ways to overcome appropriate ISP shortcomings. The conceptual framework section of this chapter provides a detailed discussion of each category in the practical ideal type.

Probation's Impact on Juvenile Justice

Probation has long served as the backbone of the juvenile justice system with national statistics showing almost all youths referred to the juvenile courts coming into contact with a probation department at one time during their case processing. In addition to the pre-adjudicatory functions of juvenile probation, the court-ordered probation supervision of a youth is the most frequently utilized disposition option in family and juvenile courts today (Clouser, 1996, p.1). Youths placed on probationary supervision are typically those juveniles for whom residential placement is not warranted, yet who would most likely continue down the path of delinquency if not provided with some additional guidance. Such supervision may include contact with the probation officer once a week or once a month depending on the assessed needs of the juvenile. In

addition, probation officers may monitor youths outside activities such as school attendance and may refer juveniles to outside services if determined necessary.

In the everyday practice of juvenile justice, policymakers recognized the demand for intermediate service options to meet the needs of those juveniles for whom neither conventional probation nor residential placement services offered the appropriate level of supervision. Thus, the idea of intensive supervision probation was conceived as a community-based alternative to conventional probation interventions. Intensive supervision probation has been marketed in the United States as both a solution to our current prison crowding problem and the central component of a new ('get-tough') surveillance-oriented probation image. ISP's are the central component of intermediate sanctions that has captured the attention of both liberal and conservative policymakers across the United States. To liberals, intensive supervision represents a strategy for diverting offenders form prison and jail without appearing 'soft on crime.' To conservatives, it provides an opportunity to get tough with and increase control over— offenders without adding to the overall cost of corrections (Byrne, 1990).

 Intensive supervision probation (ISP) is characterized by the utilization of a more intensive application of the traditional concept and practice of probation supervision (Enos, Holman, & Carroll, 1999, p27). This is accomplished by imposing stricter reporting standards by probationers and by allowing the probation officer to have a smaller caseload.

Implementation of Juvenile ISP programs started in the 1980's. One of the more interesting aspects of the development of the programs was the ability of program developers to integrate the primary concerns of both groups—diversion, punishment, and

control into their program models (Byrne, 1990). Joan Petersilia (1990) reveals in her research that ISP's like other innovative programs, survive and flourish only under certain conditions. Byrne goes on to assert that unless these conditions are understood and imposed by jurisdictions instituting these programs, ISP's are likely to share the fate of many of their innovative predecessors--- at great waste of public resources.

Evolution of Juvenile Intensive Supervision Probation

For much of correctional history, the criminal justice community has relied upon various programs designed to serve as alternatives to incarceration. With the exploding correctional population and prison crowding, a wave of non-custodial sanctions swept through the country including such alternatives as intensive supervision, shock incarceration, and house arrest (Petersilia, 1990). As the central component of these intermediate sanctions, intensive supervision probation has been widely implemented as a community-based alternative (Petersilia and Turner 1990). Thus intensive supervision probation programs were designed to reduce prison crowding and place more restrictions on prison bound offenders who would otherwise receive routine probation.

If alternative sanctions are to become reality they must gain public, legislative, and judicial support, and be perceived as reasonably safe; address the public's desire for punishment through community control, and victim restitution (Haas and Latessa 1995, p.154). Intensive supervision is one alternative that meets the above criteria. ISP is not an entirely new intervention. Previous experiments with adult intensive supervision carried the common goal of maintaining public safety, but differed from the new generation of adult as well as juvenile intensive supervision programs in fundamental ways (Latessa, 1986).

9

The 10 years between 1985 and 1995 could best be described as the period of intensive supervision probation implementation and evaluation. Hundreds of programs were started, often with a great deal of ceremony. During this period, virtually every large probation or parole agency developed programs of intensive surveillance, electronic monitoring, house arrest, drug testing and, to a lesser extent, boot camps and day reporting centers (Petersilia 1998). In the 1980s, punishments emerged that addressed offenses where incarceration was unnecessarily severe and ordinary probation was inappropriately light. According to Petersilia, three converging conditions and events drove the development of this aforementioned position:

1. Crowded Southern prisons and poor economy – Prison crowding in the Southern United States, coupled with a poor regional economy, created early pressures for tough community-based options.

2. First in-depth study of U.S. felony probation –Research evidence produced at that time showed that the existing felony probation system was a failure in large urban areas.

3. Morris and Tonry's book on the polarization of sentencing – The study provided the needed conceptual framework for a more graduated sanctioning system that relied upon a range of sentences including fines, community service, house arrest, intensive probation, and electronic monitoring.

Since the first juvenile court was established in 1899, many strategies have been developed to address the particular issues posed by young offenders (Bilchik, 1998). Serious and violent juvenile crime has increased dramatically over the past few years, straining America's juvenile justice system. Violent offenses adjudicated in juvenile courts have risen 31% since 1986. Juvenile detention and correctional populations have grown significantly, as have the number of juveniles waived or transferred to the adult criminal justice system (Wilson and Howell 1993, p.1). In the past 30 years, a number of studies have explored the relative effectiveness of community-based alternatives for juvenile offenders (Barton and Butts 1990). The results of the studies have been mixed.

Wilson and Howell (1993) state that an effective model for the treatment and rehabilitation of delinquent offenders must combine accountability and sanctions with increasingly intensive treatment and rehabilitation. Barton and Butts (1990) point out that more recent studies have provided at least suggestive evidence for the effectiveness of particular rehabilitation programs and intermediate sanctions such as intensive probation supervision, offender tracking home detention, electronic monitoring, and vocational training to be used in the juvenile system. Although intensive supervision probation (ISP) is more prevalent in the adult system, ISP's programs targeted at serious offenders are gaining popularity in the juvenile justice systems throughout the country.

Description of ISP Programs

Intensive Supervision Programs (ISP) have been hailed by many as the 'new wave' in corrections (Petersilia and Turner, 1990) Research indicates that virtually every state has instituted some version of a ISP or community –based program. ISPs have changed with the prevailing societal norms, rather than because of lessons learned through the systematic evaluation of practices (Stone and Fulton 1995, p. 115). Current ISPs are based on the premises of punishment and 'just deserts."   What ISPs provide is in-program crime control and an intermediate punishment (Tonry1990). Program designers have attempted to establish 'prison-like controls' over offenders within the community.

ISP personnel are directed to increase the level of supervision and to respond quickly to violations. It should not come as any surprise that both the number of contacts and the number of technical violations have increased (Baird and Wagner, 1990). Intensive supervision programs encompass a wide variety of programs and strategies.

11

The Tennessee intensive supervision program and community corrections program are both part of a recent national trend to attempt to relieve prison overcrowding by initiating new programs of intermediate sanctions. (Whitehead 1995) Offenders in the general supervision population in Dade County who test positive for cocaine or marijuana, are placed in intensive supervision programming. The offender is instructed to report to the office twice per week for drug testing, and is required to report for a 16 – 20 hour drug abuse education program (Freburger and Almon 1994).

Juvenile Intensive Probation Supervision programs are generally designed to divert juvenile offenders who are in need of a highly structured, closely supervised program form out-of –home placement or overcrowded institutions (JIPS 1999). Characteristics common to ISP programs include of frequent contact, small caseloads, curfews, electronic monitoring, urinalysis, community service restitution, graduated sanctions, treatment, required employment, and education classes (Mcormick 1999, p.9)

Development of ISP Models

The Office on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) (Krisberg and Wiebush 1994) has developed an ISP model that recognizes that youth identified as serious or high-risk offenders come from troubled backgrounds and have already established rather lengthy or serious delinquent histories. Stone and Fulton (1995;27) have described key elements of an ISP model which they regard as critical to the success of ISPs when managing high-risk/high-need offenders within the community. Both models have rehabilitative and reintegrative purposes, concurrently, increased public safety is the ultimate goal. See Table 2.1 for a comparison the OJJDP and Stone and Fulton model of ISPs.

Table 2.1 Key Elements of Two Model ISPs

Office of Juvenile Justice & Delinquency (OJJDP)		Model ISP (Stone & Fulton 1995)
Program context		Objective-Based Management
Client identification		ISP officers as facilitators and advocates
Intervention strategy		Small Caseloads
Contextual and implementation issues		System of rewards
Goals and evaluation		System of Sanctions
		Victim Restitution
		Community Involvement

Key elements of the program models are briefly summarized below:

OJJDP Key Elements: (Krisbert and Wiebrush, 1994)

Program Context—Policies and procedures for ISPs are to be guided by the risk control philosophy, which incorporates rehabilitation and incapacitative goals. Although the model addressed other correctional goals, such as accountability, the approach focuses primarily on risk control and rehabilitation rationales.

Client Identification—The target population for the ISP model is a post-adjudication delinquent who would be otherwise be in a state or local juvenile correctional institutions for the seriousness of their offenses or their risk of continued delinquent activity.

Intervention Strategy—Given the troubled youth that this program intends to serve, the model requires a comprehensive effort that encompasses highly structured supervision and a broad array of treatment alternatives. The strategy should provide for direct external control over the offender; mitigate the effects of inadequate socialization and social disorganization; address strain and self-esteem issues; provide a consistently applied system of reinforcements to support desirable behaviors.

Contextual and Implementation Issues—External and internal factors influence how successfully the model can be implemented. Understanding the importance of these contextual factors can increase the likelihood that policymakers and administrators can plan properly for the program implementation.

Goals and Evaluation—Each agency implementing ISPs should articulate program goals and establish proper client tracking, program monitoring, and process evaluation procedures.

Stone and Fulton Model (Stone and Fulton, 1995)

Objectives-based management—The objectives-based case plan provides concrete, attainable milestones for the offender and guides the supervision process towards goals and purpose of the organization. This allows for continued organizational feedback, evaluation, and planning.

ISP officers as facilitators and advocates—The proposed shift in focus requires that ISP officers act as facilitators and advocates. In addition to performing surveillance-type duties, their role is to see that offenders receive the services they need.

Small Caseloads—Agencies should base their caseload sizes as their basis for classification (risk, needs, offense); contact standards; hours of work, leave policies; and collateral duties.

System of Rewards—Token systems and behavioral contracts are effective positive reinforcement strategies. A reward can be something as simple as attention and praise from the probation or parole officer.

System of Sanctions—Agencies need to clearly define technical violations and new arrests, and the appropriate responses to both.

Victim Restitution—Victim restitution is generally seen as a punitive condition of probation or parole. Agencies considering restitution as an element of ISP need to examine their ability to enforce restitution conditions.

Community Involvement—Once offenders are returned to, or allowed to remain in the community they become both a potential asset and a potential liability to the community. Communities have the ability to either positively or negatively impact their inhabitants through such factors as physical structure and social interaction.

ISP models as shown in Table 2.1 indicate the important factors that need to be addressed in establishing a conceptual framework for ISPs.

Prominent ISP Models

ISP programs implemented in Georgia, New Jersey and Massachusetts represent three prominent models: front door, back door, and caseload management (Tonry, 1990,

p.176). Table 2.2 demonstrates differences and similarities in the three programs'
goals, target populations and program requirements. Front door design, the most
common, places offenders in the program directly from court. Most front door programs
claim to divert offenders from prison. Back door programs provide early release from
prison to intensive probation, reducing prison populations. Caseload management design
targets offenders already on probation and does not claim diversion as a goal. Placement
decisions are usually made by probation staff or may occur as a court ordered
intermediate sanction in response to an alleged violation (Tonry 1990)

Table 2.2: Three Model ISP Programs of the 80's

	Georgia (Erwin 1986)	New Jersey (Pearson1988;Pearson and Harper 1990)	Massachusetts (Cochran et al. 1986)
Design (Tonry 1990)	Front Door: Participants are new intakes direct from court.	Back Door: Participants are released from prison to the program.	Caseload Management: Participants are selected from offenders already on probation.
Mission, goals, and Objectives	• Divert from prison • Save money • Deter crime • Be tough • Increase public safety	• Divert from prison • Save money • Deter crime • Serve as an intermediate punishment	• Deter crime • Save money • Address offender needs related to criminal behavior • Strictly enforce condition violation
Target Population	• High risk • Non-violent	• Low risk • Non-violent • Incarcerated at least 60 days	• High risk • On probation
Program Requirements	• Face-to-face contacts • Community service restitution • Weekly local arrest record check • Employment • Curfew • Routing urinalysis	• Fact-to-face contacts • Community service restitution • Employment • Monetary restitution • Substance abuse counseling • Community sponsor	• Fact-to-face contacts • Monthly local arrest record check • Mandatory referrals based on needs

These models include elements that are regarded as critical to the success of ISPs as they offer the best possible means of managing high-risk/high-need offenders within the community.[2]

ISP Mission and Goal Statements

The standard mission of probation and parole is to protect society and to rehabilitate the offender (Stone and Fulton 1995, p.117). Krisberg and Wiebush (1994;66) suggest that within the context of the overall ISP goals, agency-specific goals should address local needs and have the necessary political and community support to achieve them. Also that the compelling problems leading to the creation of the ISP should be reflected in the programs goals, and should specify the condition to be altered—that is, lower cost alternative to long-term institutional placement with no greater risk to the community and the target population of the program.

The goals of most modern ISP programs are indicative of the political environment at the time (Tonry 1990) Although programs vary, typical stated goals of ISP programs are to: reduce correctional budgets; divert offenders from prison; decrease prison crowding; decrease recidivism through close supervision; rehabilitate offenders; increase public safety; and punish offenders with strict supervision (Fulton and Stone 1992). ISP's stated goals are typically large in scope and difficult to measure. Cost savings, diversion, rehabilitation, and public safety are broad concepts with unclear measures. Cost savings can be calculated a number of ways that is seldom comparable from one jurisdiction to another. It is difficult to know whether an offender was truly diverted from prison. Rehabilitation can occur over a lifetime and may be impossible to

---

[2] It should be noted that the Georgia, New Jersey and Massachusetts ISP model studies are of adult ISP programs.

16

track. Public safety is a perception of each citizen and difficult to define (Fulton et al.1997). The next section will review ISP as diversion from prison incarceration.

Diversion from Prison Incarceration

At first, ISP participants, by and large were not prison-bound but rather were high-risk probationers. In state after state, well-meaning program developers wrote guidelines for prison 'diversions'(Pertersilia, 1998). Arguments supporting ISP's diversion function's can be found throughout the research literature. The National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD) (cited in Stone and Fulton 1995;125) argues that based on available data, 'ISP holds its most promise when designed as an alternative to incarceration.' NCCD bases this argument on research findings that show ISP has the potential for improved outcomes at a lower overall cost.

ISP theoretically reduces correction budgets by diverting offenders from more costly incarceration to supervision in the community. Diversion occurs when a convicted offender is given a non-prison sentence in lieu of incarceration. Most ISP programs are designed as diversionary programs.(Fulton and Stone 1992). Diversionary ISP programs claim to serve offenders that would have gone to prison were it not for the existence of the program, thereby reducing prison crowding and corrections budgets.

Critics of diversion programs argue that the goal of diversion causes programs to fall short of reaching their other goals. For example, most ISP programs strive to reduce recidivism and increase public safety (Fulton and Stone, 1995). Tonry (1990, p.180) makes a strong point that "any prison diversion program results in more crimes that would have occurred otherwise." If a person is not incarcerated, the likelihood of

17

committing a crime is higher than if he/she were behind bars. Thus, diversionary programs may actually increase recidivism and decrease public safety.

It is difficult to determine whether a program is actually serving to divert offenders from incarceration because sentencing authority rests outside program control (in the hands of the judges). In most state, judges have some discretion in choosing sentencing options, and it is difficult to prove that a judge decided to place an offender in a program in lieu of incarceration (Tonry 1990). Georgia's 'front door ISP program attempted to ensure diversion by screening cases immediately after a prison sentence was handed down and filing a motion to modify the sentence to ISP. In these cases, offenders would have gone to prison, so diversion was achieved. Nevertheless, not all judges were cooperative with post-sentence modifications. Usually, judges receive pre-sentence recommendations from court or probation staff. Many judges in Georgia didn't want to change their procedures so that ISP evaluators could ensure a truly diverted population. So, about half of the ISP participants were recommended to the program before any sentence was handed down. Prison diversion couldn't be ensured most cases (Erwin 1986, p 19).

Programs have made attempts through data analyses to prove diversion. Georgia researchers attempted to prove diversion ex post facto by profiling the prison and the probation populations. Using discriminant analyses, they concluded that the ISP group resembled the prison population more than the probation population (Erwin 1990, p. 19). Georgia also monitored statewide sentencing data that showed a 10% reduction in prison sentences accompanied by a 10% increase in probation sentences after ISP was implemented. The evaluation concluded that this was further evidence of diversion from

18

prison to ISP. This conclusion can not be supported because there is no evidence that relates the decrease in prison sentences to diversions to the ISP program (Erwin 1990, p.18).

Strict sentencing guidelines are one way states attempt to ensure offenders are actually diverted (Tonry 1990). Sentencing guidelines are usually created by an appointed legislative or administrative body and list a range of possible punishments for each crime in the penal code. In the case of diversion programs, sentencing guidelines can provide an option to divert a prison sentence to diversionary program. If the judge chooses the diversionary program, it is difficult to prove that, if the ISP program didn't exist the judged wouldn't have used another option, (regular probation, residential treatment center). Because most judges advocate autonomy in their decision making, gaining support for strict guidelines may prove difficult.

In sum, diversion is a concept that theoretically curtails prison population growth by placing offenders in the community who otherwise would have been incarcerated. Judges make fair sentencing decisions most of the time. It would take radical education efforts to convince judges to change a sentence from prison to a diversion program like ISP, and to record that decision as evidence of diversion. It is far more likely that judges will continue to sentence offenders to options they feel are appropriate punishment for each offender. The implementation of an ideal program, one that theoretically would influence diversion, would incorporate judges' willingness to buy into the diversionary goal. Judges by nature are and should be independent (Tonry 1990).

Offender Assessment and Participant Selection

Ensuring selection of the proper target population for the ISP is the single most important element in program implementation. When done accurately, selecting the appropriate target group assists ISP programs in achieving successful probation outcomes (Clear and Hardyman 1990). Further, ISP may not be as effective as regular probation for low-risk offenders. A study of the Second District Juvenile Court of Utah suggested that more intensive supervision for low-risk offenders didn't produce better results than regular probation (Krisberg and Wiebush, p.10). Although ISP is more successful than regular probation for high-risk offenders, some studies have shown that low-risk offenders actually fare worse in ISP than regular probation. Risk classification systems allow departments to estimate an offender's likelihood to re-offend and then assign appropriate level of supervision. Most probation departments use a system that places offender in to high, medium, and low risk groups. Some instruments also measure a 'maximum' risk category. Offenders with higher risk scores are provided more supervision and services. The risks level is determined by scoring factors related to criminal behavior. High risk can be defined as " a person whose characteristics including the length and diversity of criminal record, indicate that he or she has a high probability of some future, serious law violation." (McCormick, 1999, p. 15). [3]

According to McCormick (1999, p. 15) risk classification is usually accompanied by 'needs' classification, which employs similar strategies to determine an offender's high need areas. Need areas usually include categories such as substance abuse, family relationships, employment, and education. High need areas are used to determine which

---

[3] For information see also Clear and Hardeman, 1990.

20

services the offender should receive while under supervision. ISP programs may target specific risk or need areas like drug and alcohol offenders, gang members, sexual offenders, or youthful offenders. Categories of target populations may not be mutually exclusive. For example, a program can specifically target high-risk drug and alcohol offenders.

As shown in Table 2.3, Georgia's ISP evaluation used risk-based analysis and found that low risk offenders did worse on ISP than on regular probation (Erwin 1986). This finding is attributed to the ' interaction effect' that occurs when participation in a program actually increases the chance of failure. For some low risk offenders, increased controls cause behavior that wold not have occurred under regular probation (Clear and Hardyman 1990). Placing lower risk offenders in an intensive supervision program may inadvertently increase failure rate and waste resources better spent on higher risk and higher need offenders.

According to Stone and Fulton (1995) ISPs should target high-risk offenders using accurate assessment instruments (Fulton and Stone 1995). The targeting of high-risk offenders is encouraged in spite of null results from most evaluations comparing outcomes between high-risk ISP and regular supervision groups. (Fulton et al. 1997) Null results may be attributed to bad evaluation or program design, but others attribute them to the 'masking effect.' The masking effect suggest that results similar to regular probation demonstrate success (Travis 1984).

Recidivism

21

Recidivism is the most common outcome measure for corrections programs and is generally defined as a return to criminal behavior. Criminal behavior can be measured at various points in the criminal justice system. Most programs use violation of probation, arrest for a new offense, or incarceration for a new offense as recidivism measures. Multiple measures of recidivism are desirable in criminal justice program evaluations for a comprehensive picture of offender behavior. (Lauen 1997, p. 176 as cited in McCormick, 1999, p. 16)

A technical violation is a violation of a condition of probation supervision that is not a new offense. A probation court order includes a list of conditions that the offender must follow while on probation. Common conditions consist of: commit no new offense, pay fines, fees, and restitution; submit to urinalyses; complete a certain number of community service hours; and attend support groups. When an offender violates a condition of supervision, the officer may file a motion to revoke probation. Then, the court may decide to continue the offender on probation or order additional conditions. When reporting violations, the correction field commonly differentiates between a new arrest and other violations (McCormick, 1999, p. 17). Other violations are termed 'technical violations.' Intensive supervision programs usually record more technical violations than does regular supervision. More frequent contacts and tighter controls, such as urinalyses and curfews, will inevitably lead to catching more violations (Turner et al. 1992). The review of the literature reveals that ISP programs take many forms with different policies and procedures according to the jurisdiction; making it difficult to make broad brush statements regarding ISPs.[4]

---

[4] It should be noted that though McCormick writing about adults, this passage a applicable to the juvenile probation field as well.

More technical violations are not necessarily correlated with higher revocation or recidivism rates. Some programs choose to respond to technical violations with revocation and others use a system of graduated sanctions. If an ISP program filed a motion to revoke for every technical violation, then the program would probably increase prison crowding and correctional costs. Most departments cannot complete the paperwork involved in filing motions on every violation. According to Clear and Hardyman (1990), placing too much emphasis on revoking technical violators may ignore the needs of the offender and have no impact on long-term behavior. Using a continuum of graduated sanctions that responds to the needs of the offender is more likely to impact long-term crime related behavior (Petersilia 1998).

Table 2.3: Recidivism Results for Three ISP Programs

Front Door: Georgia (Clear and Hardyman 1990; Erwin 1986)	Back Door: New Jersey (Pearson 1988; Pearson and Harper 1990: Fulton 1994)	Caseload Management: Massachusetts (Byrne and Kelly 1989)
• ISP group had significantly more technical violations. • For high-risk cases, there was no significant difference in recidivism of ISP and regular supervision groups. • For low risk cases, recidivism increased as intervention increased. • Drug and alcohol offenders did the best, with a 90% success rate. • Participant selection criteria could not be documented.	• ISP participants had statistically significant lower recidivism rates than the comparison group. • There was no random assignment, so the difference can not be attributed to the program • Finally concluded that at least ISP 'did not increase recidivism."	• No significant difference in the recidivism rates for the ISP and regular supervision groups. • For both groups, recidivism decreased as intensity increased. • Treatment had a direct effect on recidivism while the program had an indirect effect • Process evaluation found that staff was not supervising offenders in the manner the original model intended. The program was not fully implemented

Table 2.3 summarizes recidivism outcomes for three types of ISP programs. In Georgia, the program had no documented procedure for selecting participants. Staff screened cases that 'looked like' they would go to prison. Because the program was

poorly targeted, it served low, medium and high-risk levels. Because prison-bound offenders are usually high risk, evaluators were unable claim that all of the participants were diverted from prison. Higher levels of supervision resulted in more technical violations than a similar group on regular probation. Evaluators argued that the program served as a diversion form prison. Risk-based analysis showed that high-risk ISP offender's recidivated at the same rate as high-risk probationers (Erwin 1986). The program experienced an interaction effect where low risk offenders had higher recidivism rates as program intensity increased (Clear and Hardyman, 1990).

In New Jersey, where offenders were selected from a pool of applicants soon to be released for incarceration, ISP participants had statistically significant lower recidivism rates than the comparison group. Because offenders were selected for the program, rather than randomly assigned, differences in the treatment and comparison groups were unable to attribute the program. Differences between the groups may account for different outcomes. The evaluator notes that, even with this fault in program design, it can be concluded that the program experienced null results in increased recidivism (Fulton 1994). Note that for ethical and process reasons, most criminal justice program evaluations cannot randomly assign offenders to programs. The program was well documented and 'operations closely matched program design (Fulton 1994).'

According to McCormick (1999, p. 19) evaluators must document that a program is actually delivering planned services before the services can be attributed to outcomes. Usually, this is referred to as process evaluation. A process evaluation employs multiple data collection methods to document the strategies, processes, and activities used to convert activities into outputs and outcomes. In the Massachusetts study, Byrne and

Kelly (1989) found that, although some components of the program appeared to have an effect on recidivism, the staff did not deliver services as the program intended. No significant differences were found between the treatment and control groups.

Research Design

To demonstrate that the ISP model can manage offenders at no greater risk and at lower cost to the community than long term institutional placement, information must be available to measure the objectives related to this goal. Most ISP research failed to meet criteria for matched comparison groups or random program assignment (Turner 1992). An experimental design with random assignment is the most desirable because it allows differences in the experimental and comparison groups to be attributed to the program rather than to differences in the groups. For ISP in particular, it is difficult to match a comparison group because ISP programs target offenders that are supposed to be different from those on regular supervision. It is also difficult to randomly assign offenders when court orders usually direct an offender to a program. Providing, and not providing, services randomly also raises ethical issues. Some program evaluations used quasi-experimental design, which attempts to match study groups with similar offenders on regular probation. A shortcoming of quasi-experimental design is that differences in outcomes may be caused by differences between the groups rather that participation in the program (McCormick 1999).

In 1986, the United States Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA), responded to the call for experimental design ISP evaluation. The BJA sponsored the development of 11 new ISP programs. The programs were all designed locally based

on the Georgia ISP model and all agreed to randomly assign sentenced offenders form court. They were to target drug-involved offenders, but local jurisdictions could tailor the program and the definition of 'drug-involved' to meet local needs. This was the first large-scale randomized experiment in criminal justice program evaluation (Petersilia and Turner 1990).

The evaluators tested the implementation of the programs by determining whether ISP clients were seen more often, were drug tested more often, or had higher levels of employment than the comparison group on regular probation. Results indicated that ISP participants received more contacts than those on regular supervision, but ISP participants did not receive more services even though they were serious offenders that had 'high drug treatment needs' (Petersilia and Turner 1990). The evaluators tracked outcomes including re-arrest, re-incarceration, and technical violations. Results showed that there was no significant difference in arrest or incarceration rates, but ISP offenders were more likely to have technical violations (Petersilia and Turner 1990). This finding was attributed to the higher number of contacts with ISP participants.

Continued Need of ISPs

Fulton and Latessa et. al (1997), state that the blanket conditions placed on ISP offenders and the stringent response to technical violations compound prison crowding and increase costs, therefore subverting the commonly stated goals that are often the impetus of ISPs. The literature suggests that there are four very pragmatic reasons for continuing the operation of ISPs. First, probation and parole agencies need a method for handling high-risk and high-need offenders. An analysis of current probation and parole populations indicates the presence of these individuals whether or not they are diverted

from prison. The additional staff and resources available to ISP provide probation and parole agencies with the opportunity to develop ISPs that incorporate the program components and dosages necessary for achieving stated goals. Caseloads exceeding100 restrict traditional supervision programs in most jurisdictions from providing the level of services or surveillance needed to protect from providing the level of services for surveillance needed to protect the public from this population. Second, ISPs provide a much needed sentencing option for the courts. As stated previously, the "risk principle" suggest that offenders should be matched to programs that provide a level of intensity commensurate to their level of risk (Andres and Bonta, 1994). The extremes of the continuum, probation and prison, do not account for all possible offender groups. Therefore, intermediate options are needed, not necessarily for "just deserts," but as a mechanism for matching the goals of sentencing with the risks and needs of offenders. Third, abandoning the intensive the intensive concept altogether may jeopardize the support and the resources that ISPs have generated for probation and parole. ISPs provided policy makers with a means to reduce correctional budgets without appearing easy on crime (Gendreau, Cullen and Bonta, 1994). As such, they have gained support from a broad constituency and channeled resources into probation and parole agencies responsible for their implementation.

Conceptual Framework

This research uses a practical ideal type conceptual framework. Recent research on correctional interventions has found that participation in rehabilitative programming

does reduce recidivism. McCormick (1999) researched Texas adult ISP programs assessing their effectiveness compared to a practical ideal type. McCormick's (1999) study found that Texas adult ISP's needed to concentrate more on developing sound mission statements that can be clearly stated and understood. ISP specific research also suggest a possible relationship between rehabilitative programming and recidivism reduction (Petersilia, 1998).These recommendations are summarized in to categories and are listed in Table 2.4. The categories listed in Table 2.4 comprise the practical ideal type elements for a successful ISP program.

A. Goals and Purpose Statements

Program purpose and goal statements are a major area of focus for program critics. Krisberg and Wiebush (1994, p.66) state that each agency implementing ISP must articulate program goals and establish proper client tracking, program monitoring, and process evaluation procedures. Goals are broad statements of purpose, and as such, are general statements of what a program should accomplish. Within the context of the overall ISP goals, agency-specific goals should address local needs and have the necessary political and community support to achieve them (Krisberg and Wiebush, 1994, p67). Although programs vary in emphasis typical purposes and goals include: reduce correctional budgets; divert offenders from prison; decrease prison crowding; decrease recidivism through close supervision; rehabilitate offenders; increase public safety; and punish offenders (Fulton and Stone 1995). These are large in scope and difficult to measure. ISP's are encouraged to examine their purpose and goal statements to ensure that they are clearly stated and realistic to the given target population and

budget (Byrne 1990). One long-term goal of ISP should be to 'promote long-term behavioral change and reduced recidivism (Fulton et al. 1995).

Fulton et al. (1995) recommend that programs should not serve to divert offenders from incarceration, but rather to enhance supervision for the high risk and high need offenders already on probation. Programs often exclude high risk and violent offenders because program promised the public that not allowing offenders in their programs would force such offenders to prison. In reality, overcrowded prison conditions resulted in many high risk and violent offenders serving probation sentences. Clear and Hardyman (1990) argue that ISP should not exclude high- risk cases because such exclusions leave high-risk offenders without needed programs.

Research has determined that the offender's risk level is one of the most important determinants of successful outcome (Erwin 1986, p.23). Further, ISP may not be as effective as regular probation for low-risk offenders. A study of the Second District Juvenile Court of Utah suggested that more intensive supervision for low-risk offenders did not produce better results than regular probation (Krisberg and Wiesbush, 1994, p.10). Because risk level is an important indicator of success and there are many high-risk probationers on regular supervision, high risk and high need offenders are the most desirable candidates for ISP programs (Stone and Fulton, 1995)

B. Target Population/Selection Process

Offender selection is 'one of the most problematic areas of ISP (Fulton and Stone, 1995). Most ISP operations manuals clearly define their offender selection criteria as including high risk (Stone and Fulton 1995, p. 117). Under the rubric of serious offenders are two types that should be targeted for ISP participation—chronic offenders and those who

have committed serious but nonviolent crimes (Krisberg and Wiebush 1994.). Even when ISP programs are designed to serve specific offender groups, they may often have little control over which offenders were sentenced to their programs. For many probation departments, the decision about which offenders belong in ISP often resides with sentencing judges rather than probation staffs (McCormick 1999). Literature recommends that the responsibility for referring and selecting participants should lie primarily with probation staff who are familiar with the program rather than solely with the court (Fulton et al. 1995; Clear and Hardyman 1990).

C. Control over Treatment

Most ISP programs emphasize 'control' over 'treatment' (Byrne 1990). Control activities can include face-to-face contacts, electronic monitoring and curfews. Treatment activities can include drug/alcohol treatment, support groups, stress/anger management classes, education classes, and community mentors. Treatment components are important to successful outcomes. Cumulative results from criminal justice program evaluations over the last two decades document that there is a correlation between treatment program participation and recidivism reduction (Fulton et al. 1997). Therefore, ISP programs that strive to have an impact on recidivism and high-risk behaviors must integrate control and treatment activities (Petersilia, 1998). These activities should be integrated using a 'balanced approach.' While the long –term goals of ISP's include long –term behavioral change, the importance of treating and controlling the symptoms is not forgotten. By encompassing a balanced approach, ISP's can achieve both short and long – term goals (Stone and Fulton, 1995, p. 121). This approach calls for equal attention to intervention, surveillance and enforcement in the adult system (McCormick 1999), however in the

juvenile system the balanced approach is defined as accountability, competency

development and community protection. Stating that these three areas needed to be given

equal attention during case planning.

Table2.4: Conceptual Framework Sources for a Practical Ideal Type Juvenile ISP Program

Category and Ideal Type Concepts	Source(s)
Goals/Purpose Statements • Clearly stated • Short and long-term goals • Diversion from incarceration should not be a purpose • Enhancement to regular probation should be a purpose • Reducing recidivism should be a goal • Affecting long-term offender behavior should be a goal	Byrne 1990 Krisberg and Wiebush 1994 Stone and Fulton 1995 Fulton et al. 1997 McCormick 1999
Target Population/Selection Process • Already on probation • Referred by probation staff • High risk • High need • Specifically excluded populations	Clear and Hardyman 1990 Krisberg and Wiebush 1994 Stone and Fulton 1995 McCormick 1999 Wiebush et al. 2000
Treatment versus Control	Sarnoff 2001 Fulton et al. 1995 Petersilia 1998 Stone and Fulton 1995 McCormick 1999
Integrity • Program evaluation • Program audits • Staff training • Program manuals • Need-based program referral	Fulton et al. 1997 Krisberg and Wiebush 1994 McCormick 1999
Community Involvement • Community and multi-agency involvement is important to make long term solutions to crime work.	Petersilia 1998 Byrne 1990 Stone and Fulton 1995 McCormick 1999

D. Integrity

In order to ensure a program has integrity certain safeguards should be in place. Programs designed using sound research-based recommendations can be enhanced by activities that increase program integrity. Program evaluation methods such as evaluability assessment, process evaluation, validated assessment indexes, performance measures, and outcome monitoring can ensure that a program is implemented as designed and has the desired impact(s) on participant behavior (McCormick 1999). Program audits must also be conducted to ensure that a program follows mandated standards, guidelines, and laws. Providing special training to all ISP staff and developing and distributing operation manuals that are specific to the ISP program can also enhance program integrity. This separates the program from 'regular' probation and increases staff motivation (Fulton et al. 1997).

E. Community Involvement

Stone and Fulton, (1995, p133) maintain that in order to truly become 'community based,' ISP's need to assume a more comprehensive approach to offender treatment that places them in a community context. Educational and other community services are key requirements in the program model, and support from these sectors must be generated during program development (Krisberg and Wiesbush 1994). As Dr. Patricia Shields (Director, SWT MPA Program) stated, " the primary and secondary school system evident in all areas is evidence and testimony to the community commitment and involvement in raising our youth, ISP programs should tap into this established commitment. Early this decade, literature called on ISP programs to go beyond traditional measures of success and incorporate measures of community context into their designs (Byrne 1990). Support from other community programs and groups are beneficial.

Most ISP youth and their families receive services from other community resources. Informing and involving these agencies about the program will assist ISP staff in coordinating services and making appropriate referrals (Krisberg and Wiebush, 1994, p.57). At the individual case level, interagency cooperation is needed for effective program implementation. Outside agencies can consist of: the Independent School District, Family Counseling Center, Mental Health and Mental Retardation Dept., or any other social service agency that your program participants will interact with. Thus, formal cooperative interagency agreements that spell out the relationships between agencies are important tools in accomplishing program goals (Wiesbush 2000, p.8). The effective use of program linkages is an often-overlooked strategy for program development and implementation. ISP is part of a broader network of community resources over which ISP does not have total control. If ISP is to thrive, linkages must be developed and maintained.

Examples of ways in which probation programs have included a community justice component include partnerships with police and community members. Community members can include individual citizens, citizen groups, churches, private industry, or non-profit organizations (Petersilia 1998). Support form the community at large- those outside the juvenile justice system- must be generated as well. Community linkages are important. Krisberg and Wiebush (1994, p.59), state that support systems can include local YMCA's, Boys Clubs, scouting, church groups, or other community organizations. The effective use of program linkages is an often overlooked strategy for program development and implementation.

Conclusion

ISP has held its ground as a key element of probation programming since its reemergence in the 1980's. Given the research finding, it would appear the ISPs have not achieved their stated goals of prison diversion, cost reduction, and public safety through intense watching an incapacitation. They have, however, 'satisfied', and as Petersilia and others have found, provided an intermediate punishment for offenders that can be used as a sentencing option between prison and probation. Intensive supervision is a viable option that practitioners should consider. States that rely heavily on incarceration could reallocate resources from institutional beds to in-home programs and provide more cost-effective services to more offenders.

The summary of literature presented in this paper provides the current framework for ISP programs:

- ISP goals should be clearly defined, measurable, and aligned with the stated goals of the agency. (Fulton and Stone 1995).

- Short and long term goals
- Diversion should not be a goal of ISP
- Client identification is crucial to who is successful on ISP
- Community Involvement is needed.

Using various alternative sanctions, correctional systems have been 'turning up the heat on probationers. The development of an effective model of intensive supervision for high-risk offenders has significant ramifications. Krisberg and Wiebush suggest that society gains on three fronts from a successful ISP: the offender remains in the environment in which they must learn to live, cost of care is contained, and unnecessary facility construction is avoided.

Chapter Three: Research Setting

Purpose

This chapter will describe the county juvenile probation departments that operate the ISP programs in Texas. It will also provides a general description of ISP, how programs operate in Texas, and presents genera statistics about the number juveniles involved with the ISP programs. Thus this chapter provides relevant background information regarding the setting in which this research project was conducted.

Overview of the Texas Juvenile Justice System

The Juvenile Justice System in the State of Texas can best be described as consisting of two major components: a state-level component and a local-level component. Each component has distinct functions, duties, and responsibilities. Together these components make up one of the most progressive and modern juvenile justice systems in the nation. The system emphasizes protection for the state's citizens and holds juvenile offenders, and frequently parents, accountable for their actions, while efforts are made to rehabilitate the child to be a productive member of society.

The Texas juvenile justice system consists of two primary state-level agencies devoted to the juvenile justice functions. These agencies are the Texas Juvenile Probation Commission (TJPC) and the Texas Youth Commission (TYC). The local level agencies (the county juvenile probation departments) are operated by County Juvenile Boards (made of district judges and the county judge).

Texas Juvenile Probation Commission

The Texas Juvenile Probation Commission (TJPC) was created in 1981 by the Texas Legislature to bring consistency and quality to juvenile probation services in the state. [5] The creation and purpose of TJPC is 1) to make probation services available to juvenile throughout the state; 2) to improve the effectiveness of juvenile probation services; 3) to provide alternatives to the commitment of juveniles by providing financial aid to juvenile boards to establish and improve probation services; 4) to establish uniform standards for the community-based juvenile justice system; 5) to improve communications among state and local entities with the juvenile justice system; and 6) to promote delinquency prevention and early intervention programs and activities for juveniles.

County Juvenile Probation Department

The local juvenile probation department is the entity that deals with 97% of the juvenile who commit crimes in the community. The Texas Youth Commission handles only 3% of those juveniles who are committing offenses. There are 168 juvenile probation departments in the state of Texas. Juvenile probation departments implement the policies of the juvenile boards and deliver services to juveniles referred to juvenile courts. There are 119 singe-county departments and 45 multi-county departments in Texas. Multi-county departments range from two to six counties. While seventeen departments served both adult and juvenile probationers, 13 of these combined departments used separate juvenile probation officers. There are approximately 2,205

certified juvenile probation officers in Texas and 248 certified ISP officers. According to TJPC data reports in calendar 2000 there were 9,603 juveniles who were served in probation department operated ISP programs, while there were a total of 49,636 total active juvenile caseloads across the state.

Funding

The state-level component and the local-level component of the juvenile justice system are funded individually by the state legislature and the local county commissioner's courts, respectively. Additionally, some probation departments may receive federal grant monies for juvenile services and programs.

The Texas Juvenile Probation Commission (TJPC) was appropriated $107,885,022 for FY2000 and $108,864,559 for FY2001. Of the amounts appropriated, approximately 96% of the funds are passed through to the local juvenile probation departments to provide juvenile services in the communities. The funds received by local juvenile boards from TJPC constitute 40% of the total funding that operates the local juvenile probation departments. Local county contributions constitute the bulk of funding going into the state juvenile justice system.

Juvenile Departments Operating ISP's

In 1988, the Texas Juvenile Probation Commission (TJPC) offered funding to twelve county juvenile probation departments for the implementation of ISP programs. These programs were created to expand local supervision and disposition options in

---

[5] Unless otherwise noted information in this chapter came for the Texas Juvenile Probation Commission web-site www.tjpc.state.tx.us … The Texas Juvenile Justice System and The State of Juvenile Probation

juvenile probation departments across the state. At that time, the pilot ISP programs looked the same in each county. In a survey conducted by TJPC (1999) relating to ISP programs in the state findings show that since 1988, the programs have evolved differently in each county across the state (in counties that operate ISP programs). The survey indicates this variance is due to departments responding to differences in client population, availability of resources, and county philosophies regarding when and how to target services. According to TJPC calendar year 2000 state of juvenile probation activity in Texas report, 83 juvenile probation departments operate ISP programs

The following chapter provides the methodology for collecting data on these various county programs and summarizes descriptive information about the programs.

Chapter Four: Methodology

Purpose

This chapter describes the methodology used to assess Texas Juvenile ISP programs. A discussion about the population describes its characteristics. Survey research, and content analysis along with telephone interviews were used to collect evidence for the assessment. An explanation of these methods is included in this chapter. The chapter concludes by demonstrating how the practical ideal type is operationalized into measurable items for assessment.

Population

The calendar year 2000 TJPC activity report listed 83 (out of 164) Texas juvenile probation departments that operate ISP programs. Among the eighty-three participating county juvenile probation department programs there is some diversity as to communities served. The counties ranged from having one to as many as eighteen ISP officers. Juvenile population in the participating counties ranged from 1,001 to 333,463 juveniles, using Texas State Daate Center projections. All 83 counties were included in the study (though all 83 did not respond) and sent a survey questionnaire.

Data Collection Methods

Survey research was used to gather data on Texas Juvenile ISP program elements, and content analysis will be used to verify the survey information. Surveys were mailed, along with a cover letter and self addressed stamped envelope, to the Chief Juvenile Probation Officers

(CJPO) of all 83 Juvenile ISP programs being operated by county juvenile probation departments throughout Texas. The survey was pre-tested by distributing it to select staff at Travis County and the Texas Juvenile Probation Commission with knowledge about ISP programs. The initial return produced 33 completed survey questionnaires. One-week later follow up letters and survey were mailed to non-respondents original response deadline. This procedure produced an additional 18 questionnaires, making a total of 51 completed mail surveys. Through telephone interviews an additional 11 surveys were completed (total 62). The above procedures produced a 75 percent return rate for the 83 juvenile ISP probation departments in the State of Texas. Survey research is appropriate for this project because individual CJPO's are the unit of analysis (Babbie 1995, p257). Mailing surveys and following up by telephone is the most efficient means of gathering data. One strength of survey research is the ability to standardize responses into easily measured categories; this may however fail to capture important information (Babbie 1995, p. 273). The categories of the practical ideal type are defined within the literature to collect the data through surveys should not weaken the data.

Content analysis will be used as a secondary method to verify the survey data. The evaluations of five of the largest county's ISP programs will be used as artifact information, this will allow for the opportunity to review funding levels, program effectiveness, and differences of implementation of ISP programs, along with program milestones, and description throughout these counties.

Table 4.1 shows how the categories in Table are operationlized in to survey questions and measurable response categories (McCormick 1999). Some questionnaire items required coding prior to analysis. As with McCormick's study for example, the respondents were asked to list the program's mission statement and goals. The responses will be analyzed to determine

whether the stated mission and goals meet the criteria for a practical ideal type JISP (i.e., clearly

stated, not include diversion, do include enhancement, etc.). Utilization of a code sheet was used

for every program surveyed. Discrepancies were eliminated through follow-up phone calls with

survey respondents and all data was consolidated on one code sheet for each program. This final

code sheet was used for data entry in to an Excel spreadsheet (McCormick 1999).

Descriptive summary statistics for each category will be derived from the data. For each

category, the percentage of programs that meet each criterion for the practical ideal type will be

presented. A summary of the results will explain the extent to which Texas Juvenile ISP programs meet

the criteria specified by the practical ideal type.

Linking the Conceptual Framework to the Assessment[6]

The ideas in the literature are developed in to measurable items for analysis. The following is

greater detail of how the literature and framework are utilized for measurement purposes.

The survey item for the 'Goals/Mission Statement' category is an open-ended question. It is

designed to determine whether the ISP programs have specific statements and, if so, collect the actual

mission and goal statements of the ISP program. The responses were analyzed to determine whether they

included the criteria from the conceptual framework.

Several questions were asked in order to determine the programs' target populations and selection

processes. Some questions were directly related to the ideal type recommendations. For example, one

question specifically asks whether the program targets high risk and high need offenders. An open-ended

question allowed respondents to provide other target population characteristics that were not specified in

the framework but exist in the actual programs. This category also includes questions related to the

referral origin of clients and whether programs exclude any type of offenders.

41

The conceptual framework calls for using a validated risk assessment instrument to determine the risk level of offenders. All probation departments in Texas are required to use such an instrument for every person placed on probation. The state audits adult and juvenile probation departments for compliance with this policy. This item was not included in the survey because of this policy.

The 'Treatment versus Control" category attempted to capture all required components of each ISP program. The survey instrument provided an exhaustive list of possible program requirements. Respondents were instructed to place a check next to each required component and were provided space to write any other requirements not listed. Each requirement was coded as 'control' or 'treatment' oriented. The number of control activities was compared to the number of treatment activities for a broad picture of program emphasis.

The 'Integrity' category was very straightforward. All information was collected with close-ended questions that related directly to each conceptual framework item.

---

[6] This linking section is consistent with the Concepts utilized within the McCormick ARP (1999).

Table 4.1: Operationalizing the Conceptual Framework

Category	Survey Item	Survey response categories/code sheet
Purpose Statements	Write the mission statement and three most important goals of the ISP program	Clearly stated Diversion not a purpose Enhancement is a purpose Short and long term goals Reducing recidivism is a goal Affecting long-term offender behavior is a goal Support agency mission statement
Target Population/ Selection Process	To enter the program are offenders required to have a 'high' risk score? Other requirements? What percentage of current participants was court ordered to the ISP? What percentage was referred directly from the Juvenile Probation staff to the ISP program? Are any cases specifically excluded from participation in the ISP program?	1. High risk 2. High need 3. Referral origin 4. Excluded populations
Treatment versus Control	Place a check next to each activity that is required of all ISP participants.	1. Total 'intervention' activities required 2. Total 'enforcement' activities required 3. Total 'surveillance' activities required
Integrity	Place an 'N' next to each activity that is provided based on offender need. (using the list above in "Treatment-Control Balance category) What is the completion date of the most recent program evaluation? (process or outcome) What is the date of the most recent program audit? Does the ISP program have its own manual of policies and procedures?	1. Number of need-based services 2. Date of last program evaluation 3. Date of last program audit 4. Special training for ISP staff 5. Manual for ISP program
Community Involvement	Does the program routinely work with non-profit, church, or other community organizations to fulfill its mission? If so, how? Does the program have any other 'community justice' components (e.g., neighborhood policing, community meetings)? If so, what are they	1. Partnerships with other government agencies (police, sheriff, human services) 2. Partnerships with non-profit or private sector 3. Partnerships with local churches/clergy 4. Community meetings for input into program design or operation 5. Community/citizen sponsors for the program and participants 6. Program located in high need areas

The 'Community Involvement' category was operationalized with large scope open-ended questions. Community involvement can be interpreted in different ways, so the questions were formulated to collect information on what the respondents felt their programs' community involvement activities were. For example, community involvement activities may consist of patrolling with police officers, using local church resources, and providing opportunities for community member to provide input to program operations. The category required broad open-ended question because of the wide variety of possible responses.

The next chapter will present the findings from the survey data.

Chapter Five: Results

Purpose

This chapter will present the findings from the survey data. The Texas Juvenile ISP programs are assessed in using the conceptual framework developed within the paper. A discussion of the unique characteristics of the sample will be presented. This chapter will deal with response rate, description of the sample, and the categories set out in the conceptual framework.

Response Rate

The intent of the research design was to obtain more than one source of evidence for at least the higher juvenile population ISP programs. Using multiple sources of evidence can increase the validity of study findings (Babbie 1995, p. 106). However multiple sources were not obtained. Table 5.1 provides a breakdown of the response rate by the data sources. At least one source of data was obtained for 62 (75%) of the 83 programs. The overall response rate for surveys, the primary data source in the research design, was 61% (i.e., 51 of the 83 were returned). Thirty telephone interviews were attempted with each of the 32 counties that had not completed a survey. Interviews were completed with 11 of the 32 programs.

Table 5.1 Response Rate and Data Sources

More than One Source	Survey Only	Telephone Survey	Total ISP Programs with Data	No Data	Total ISP Programs
0	51 (61%)	11 (34%)	62 (75%)	21 (25%)	83

Description of the Sample

Sixty-two of the eighty-three ISP programs were included in the final sample. Table 5.2 provides descriptive information about the programs. Program size ranged from very small to very large. The smallest program had a total of one ISP officer, whereas the largest program had 19 certified ISP officers.

Table 5.2: Description of the ISP Sample				Total	Average	Range	
Officer Information							
	Total Number of JPOs (N=62)			1044	17	2-124	
	Total ISP Officers (N=57)*			185	3	1-19	
	Average Caseload Per ISP Officer (N=56)			na	13	3-45**	
Face-to-Face Contact Information							
	Required Number of Office Visits per month (N=62)			na	4	1-12	
	Required Number of Other contacts per month (N=62)			na	6	2-27	

*N = actual number of participant responses to the question answered in the survey.
** Some of the smaller county departments had officers who carried a regular caseload as well as their ISP caseload.

Programs ranged from serving only 3 ISP juveniles on their caseload to as many as 45 at any given time. In the smaller programs, ISP officers often supervised non-ISP offenders in addition to the ISP placed juvenile.

Program intensity, when measured by the number of required face to face contact each month, varied within the sample. Most programs required a minimum of 2-3 (the average was 4) contacts a month while one program only required one monthly face to face contact and another required as many as 12.

The rest of this chapter is organized by the categories identified in the conceptual framework: mission and goal statements; target population and selection process;

treatment and control; program integrity; and community involvement. Each subheading contains a brief synopsis of the elements of the category, a table that presents results related to the category, and a discussion of the findings.

Purpose and Goal Statements

Program purpose and goal statements are a major area of focus for program critics. Krisberg and Wiebush (1994, p.66) state that each agency implementing ISP must articulate program goals and establish proper client tracking, program monitoring, and process evaluation procedures. Goals are broad statements of purpose, and as such, are general statements of what a program should accomplish. Within the context of the overall ISP goals, agency-specific goals should address local needs and have the necessary political and community support to achieve them (Krisberg and Wiebush, 1994, p67). Although programs vary in emphasis typical purposes and goals include: reduce correctional budgets; divert offenders from prison; decrease prison crowding; decrease recidivism through close supervision; rehabilitate offenders; increase public safety; and punish offenders (Fulton and Stone 1995).

Table 5.3: Mission and Goal Statements					Met Criteria	Percent
Mission and Goals Clearly Stated (N=62)					39	62%
Diversion Should not be a Purpose (N=62)					50	80%
Enhancement is a purpose (N=62)					9	14%
Programs should have short- and long-term goals (N=62)					18	29%
Affecting long-term offender behavior should be a goal (N=62)					44	70%
Reducing recidivism should be a goal (N=62)					52	84%

Table 5.3 presents the criteria and results for this category. Over half (39) of the departments had clearly written mission and goals. The majority of the departments that did not have clearly written mission and goals had appeared to utilize the departmental mission for the ISP mission and goals. Other noticeable characteristics were departments defining what their ISP program provides instead of what the actual mission and goal of the program is.

One long-term goal of ISP should be to 'promote long-term behavioral change and reduced recidivism (Fulton et al. 1995). Forty-four (70%) programs met the criteria for long term behavioral change for offenders. While fifty-two (84%) stated that reducing recidivism should be a goal.

The majority of the mission and goal statements carried a consistent tune of providing an increased level of service to those probationers who require a higher level of supervision. The writing of goals and mission statements was different, however the focus was primarily the same (To meet the need of a high level of supervision, with more constraints).

Target Population and Selection Process

Offender selection is 'one of the most problematic areas of ISP (Fulton and Stone, 1995). Most ISP operations manuals clearly define their offender selection criteria as including high risk (Stone and Fulton 1995, p. 117). Under the rubric of serious offenders are two types that should be targeted for ISP participation—chronic offenders and those who have committed serious but nonviolent crimes (Krisberg and Wiebush 1994.). Table 5.4 shows that programs should not exclude high risk offender and

indicated by 100% of the respondents stating that offenders should continue to be eligible for ISP regardless of past referrals.

The majority (63%) of the ISP programs required probationers to have a high-risk score when being considered for ISP; this met the practical type criteria. Though high risk is considered when placing a juvenile on ISP the departments failed to meet the criteria of considering the juveniles needs, with on 33% requiring a high needs score.

Table 5. 4: Target Population and Selection Process Results						Met Criteria	Percent
Require High Risk Score (N=62)						39	63%
Required High Need Score (N=62)						21	33%
Court Ordered (N=62)*						53	87%
Referred by JPO (N=50)**						3	6%
Programs should not exclude high risk offenders (N=60)						62	100%

*Met criteria include those counties where greater than 50% of the participants were formally ordered by the court to participate in the ISP program.

**Met criteria include those counties where greater than 50% of the participants were referred at the discretion of the JPO.

Even when ISP programs are designed to serve specific offender groups, they may often have little control over which offenders were sentenced to their programs. For many probation departments, the decision about which offenders belong in ISP often resides with sentencing judges rather than probation staffs (McCormick 1999). Literature recommends that the responsibility for referring and selecting participants should lie primarily with probation staff who are familiar with the program rather than solely with the court (Fulton et al. 1995; Clear and Hardyman 1990). Table 5.4 indicates that only 6% of the county departments are included in the ordering of juveniles to ISP programs.[7]

---

[7] This may be misleading as in juvenile probation departments the probation officer is the person who makes the recommendation to the court to place a child on ISP programming. In most instances however the judge must court order the juvenile to the ISP program.

Treatment and Control

This section discusses control-oriented activities, treatment-oriented activities, and balancing services. Control activities can include face-to-face contacts, electronic monitoring and curfews. Treatment activities can include drug/alcohol treatment, support groups, stress/anger management classes, education classes, and community mentors. Treatment components are important to successful outcomes. Cumulative results from criminal justice program evaluations over the last two decades document that there is a correlation between treatment program participation and recidivism reduction (Fulton et al. 1997). Therefore, ISP programs that strive to have an impact on recidivism and high-risk behaviors must integrate control and treatment activities (Petersilia, 1998). These activities should be integrated using a 'balanced approach.'

Table 5.5 below indicates that all 62 programs displayed information that they use treatment with control. Most programs utilizing the best methods of treatment and control that best meet the need of the individual probationer.

Table 5.5: Requirements Treatment and Control Program

Activities		Participation Required (N=62)	
		Number	**Percent**
Treatment			
	AA/NA	2	3%
	Group Counseling	11	18%
	Family Counseling	11	18%
	Individual Counseling	14	23%
	Residential Treatment	3	5%
	Stress/Anger Management Class	12	20%
	Substance Abuse Education Class	14	23%

	Community Mentor/Sponsor	4	7%
	Cognitive Training Class	15	25%
	Victim Impact Panels	3	5%
Control			
	More Office Visits	57	95%
	More Home Visits	53	88%
	More Work Visits	20	33%
	Community Service	32	53%
	More Frequent Urinalysis	33	55%
	Curfew	58	97%
	Electronic Monitoring	25	42%

The research showed that 95% of the departments use additional office visits as a control tool for ISP juveniles, along with 88% checking on juveniles more at home as well. Most departments (97%) imposed stricter curfew guidelines on their clients as well. Cognitive skills training rated highest (25%) as a treatment intervention being used by departments. With 14 (23%) departments indicating that the have their ISP juvenile attend substance abuse education classes. The findings are not clear as to the number of probation departments that incorporate a true 'balanced approach' when implementing case plans of ISP program youth; there is evidence that departments with 53% requiring community service, 97% enforcing stricter curfew requirements, 23% requiring individual counseling and 20% requiring anger management classes that there is a balance within some agencies.

Program Integrity

Programs designed using sound research-based recommendations can be enhanced by activities that increase program integrity. Program evaluation methods such as evaluability assessment, process evaluation, validated assessment indexes, performance measures, and outcome monitoring can ensure that a program is

implemented as designed and has the desired impact(s) on participant behavior (McCormick 1999).). Program audits must also be conducted to ensure that a program follows mandated standards, guidelines, and laws. Providing special training to all ISP staff and developing and distributing operation manuals that are specific to the ISP program can also enhance program integrity. This separates the program from 'regular' probation and increases staff motivation (Fulton et al. 1997). The results for this category are presented in Table 5.6

Table 5.6: Program Integrity Results			
		Number	Percent
Date of Last Program Audit* (N=30)		24	80%
Date of Last Program Evaluation* (N=25)		21	84%
Conduct Program Audits** (N=34)		26	76%
Conduct Program Evaluations** (N=34)		27	79%
Special Training for ISP Staff (N=59)		50	85%
Manual for ISP Program (N=59)		34	58%

*Number represents number of responding counties in which the last program audit or evaluation was conducted less than two years ago.

**Number represents counties who did not respond with a specific date, but indicated that program audits or evaluations are conducted.

As shown in Table 5.6, the date of the last program audit was either unknown or had not be conducted in the last two years in 32 of the 62 programs responding. Of the thirty that did respond 80% have had a program audit within the last two years. The majority of departments that had program audits and evaluations were those county

departments considered large to medium in size (7,001 to 333,463 total juvenile populations).

Most (85%) programs do require special training for their ISP officers. Survey comments showed that some ISP officers carry specialized caseload like sexual offenders or gang affiliated juveniles. These types of caseload require special training. Only 58% of the counties had an ISP policy and procedure manual.

Community Involvement

In order to truly become 'community based,' ISP's need to assume a more holistic approach to offender treatment that places them in a community context (Stone and Fulton, 1995, p133). Educational and other community services are key requirements in the program model, and support form these sectors must be generated during program development (Krisberg and Wiesbush 1994). Early this decade, literature called on ISP programs to go beyond traditional measures of success and incorporate measures of community context into their designs (Byrne 1990). Table 5.7 analyzes the ISP programs participation with the community.

Table 5.7: Community Participation		
	Number	**Percent**
Program work with non-profit, church, or community organizations (N=62)	35	56%
Program have other 'community involvement' components (N=58)	35	60%
Any Community Involvement* ((N=62)	52	84%
*Counties responding to either of the above questions		

Most (56%) of the respondent counties indicated that their programs work with non-profit church or community organizations. Community activity involvement

included some community service restitution by clients, however some comments stated that if the juvenile was not involved with ISP programming those community hours would not be fulfilled. In Table 5.8 the number of departments seeking community input into program design and or operation is only 13% (6 out of 45 respondents). Cooperation with other government agencies was reported at 46% response rate. Several counties are

Table 5.8: Community Involvement Results		
(N=45)		
	Number	**Percent**
Cooperation with other government agencies (police, sheriff, constable, human services)	21	46%
Cooperation with non-profit or private sector	22	49%
Cooperation with local churches/clergy	6	13%
Community meetings for input into program design or operation	6	13%
Community/citizen sponsors for the program and participants	8	17%
Community Service Projects*	29	64%
Program located in high need areas	0	0%
*Includes CSR		

Participating in a federal/state program titled Project Spotlight, where the juvenile probation department, adult probation department and the local police department are working side by side in the community with high-risk juveniles and adults.

The following chapter will summarize this applied research project, and discuss how the findings relate to the practical ideal type.

Chapter Six: Conclusion

Purpose

This chapter summarizes the applied research project, discusses how the finding relate to the research question, and makes recommendations based on the findings.

Research Summary

This section summarizes the assessment's major findings.

Purpose and Goal Statements

Programs scored high and low in areas. Overall only 62% of departments had clearly defined mission and goals and a weak 14% considered enhancement important enough to include in their mission and goal statements. The departments did score high in the areas of diversion not being a purpose of ISP programming with 80% of the departments meeting that criteria. Reducing recidivism was stated 84% of the time and appeared to be the backbone of what departments programs are based.

Recommendation: Programs must have clearly written mission and goal statements. Input should be gathered from ISP staff and those who will work closely with the program.

Target Population and Selection Process

Over half (63%) of the respondent departments stated that a high risk score is required for a juvenile to be ordered in to ISP programming. Though this is over half the research would suggest that for a juvenile to be successful on ISP it is advantageous that

they be a high-risk juvenile.   The findings also pointed out that an overwhelming majority of departments (87%) have little say as to who is ordered to ISP, as the judge in 53 out of 62 departments has discretion of placing a juvenile into ISP.   The literature suggest the probation officers are more knowledgeable regarding the ISP program and would be better fit to have a voice as to what juvenile is placed into the program.   All 62 departments agreed that programs should not exclude high-risk offenders.

Recommendation: All participants should have a high-risk score. Judges should allow ISP management to have more participation in the selection process when considering who is eligible for the ISP program.

Treatment and Control

The findings showed that departments utilize more control measures in implementing ISP programming than treatment oriented interventions.   95% of departments increased office visits, 88% increased juvenile probationers home visits and tighter curfews were shown to be a requirement from 97% of the departments.   While treatment modalities can be seen in the reporting, clearly treatment is not being utilized as much as control. Control requirements reached as high as 97% in one category while the highest treatment category (Cognitive Training Classes) was listed required by 25% of the departments.

Recommendation: Departments should attempt to address more treatment type issues with their clients. Cognitive skills training is good, it would probably be great if it was coupled with individual or family counseling.

Program Integrity

While the number of departments who responded to the series of program evaluation and audit is high, [21 of 25] (80%)programs reported having a program evaluation within the last two years] 37 of those programs did not have an evaluation within the last two years. Due to the vagueness of the evaluation question and some department indicating that they are audited by the state each year, the ability to draw conclusions from the evaluation component is indecisive. Specialized training is being conducted for ISP officers as shown by 85% of departments reporting training specifically for the ISP officer.

Recommendation: Juvenile ISP programs must incorporate an evaluation mechanism into their respective ISP programs. This will allow for an honest assessment of what is needed to enhance the program where needed.

Community Involvement

Community involvement is shown to be an afterthought in ISP programming. 56% of the respondents indicated some form of community participation. This ranged for community service restitution (CSR) to taking life skills training at the Masonic Lodge.

Recommendation: ISP programs must venture out into the community and allow for input into ways the community can help effect that juveniles life. Churches, schools, neighborhood associations need to and are willing to help support that youth who needs more than just one probation officer to help lead the way.

Conclusion

Although the organizations operating juvenile ISP's vary considerably in terms of size, complexity and available resources, the also have in common several program components and services. This would suggest that comprehensive ISP programming is

not restricted by agency size or jurisdiction, and that some degree of replication can occur.

Bibliography

Andrews, D., and Bonta, J. "The Psychology of Criminal Conduct," Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Press. 1994.

Baird, Christopher and Wagner, Dennis. "Measuring Diversion: The Florida Community Control Programs." *Crime and Delinquency.* January 1990, Volume 36. (Page numbers not available.)

Barajas, Eduardo. "NIC Focus: High-Risk Offenders in the Community." National Institute of Corrections (1992). Pg. 1-19.

Barton, William H. and Butts, Jeffrey. "Viable Options: Intensive Supervision Programs for Juvenile Delinquents." *Crime and Delinquency*. April 1990, Volume 36 (page numbers not available.)

Bilchick, Shay. "A Juvenile Justice System for the 21st Century." *Crime and Delinquency.* January 1998, Volume 44, Issue 1. (Page numbers not available.)

Byrne, James M. "The Control Controversy: A Preliminary Examination of Intensive Probation Supervision Programs in the United States." *Federal Probation.* 1986, Volume 50; pg. 4-16.

Clark, Michael. "Influencing Positive Behavior Change, Increasing the Therapeutic Approach of Juvenile Courts." *Federal Probation.* June 2001, Volume 65. (Page numbers not available.).

Clear, Todd R. and Hardyman, Patricia L. "The New Intensive Supervision Movement." *Crime and Delinquency.* 1990, Volume 36; pg. 42-60.

Clear, T.R., Flynn, S., Shapiro, C and Latessa, Edward. "Intensive Supervision in Probation: A Comparison of Three Projects." Intermediate Punishments. Morsey, NY: Willow Tree Press. (1987). Pg. 31-50.

Clouser, Megan. "Intensive Probation: An Alternative to Placement," *Pennsylvania Progress*, (1996). Pg. 31-50.

English, Kim , Pullen, Suzanne and Colling-Chadwick, Susan. "Report of Findings: Comparison of Intensive Supervision Probation and Community Corrections Clientele." 1996, Pg. 1-71.

Enos, Richard, Holmes, John E. and Conoll, Marnie E. *Alternative Sentencing,* Library of Congress Cataloging In Publications. (1999). Pg. 27.

Erwin, Billie. "Old and New Tools for the Modern Probation Offices." *Crime and Delinquency.* January 1990, Volume 36, Issue 1. (Page numbers not available.)

Freburger, Carol and Almon, Marci B. "Intensive Supervision: A New Way to Connect with Offenders." *Federal Probation.* September 1994. Volume 58 (Page numbers not available.)

Fulton, B. Latessa, E., et. al, "A Review of Research for Practitioners," *Federal Probation* December 1997., Volume 61. (Page numbers not available.)

Gemdreau, P., Cullen, F., and Bonta, J. "Intensive Rehabilitation Supervision: The Next Generation in Community Corrections? *Federal Probation.* 1994 Volume 58 (Page numbers not available.)

Glich, Barry and Goldstein, Arnold. "Managing Delinquency Programs that Work." Library of Congress Cataloging. 1995.

Haas, Stephen and Latessa, Edward. "Intensive Supervision in a Rural County: Diversion and Outcome; Intermediate Sanctions: Sentencing in the 1990's." Pg. 153-169.

Krisberg, Bany and Wiebrush Richard. "Juvenile Intensive Supervision" *Planning Guide; Program Summary.* Office of Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention.1994. Pg. 1-80

Lawrence, Richard. "Reexamining Community Corrections Models." *Crime and Delinquency.* October 1991, Volume 37. (page numbers not available.)

McCormick, Christine. Intensive Supervision Probation: Assessing Texas Programs, 1999. Pp1-75, Southwest Texas State University Applied Research Project.

Morrison, Richard D. "The Risks of Intensive Supervision." *Corrections Today*, July 1994, Vol. 56 Issue 4. Pg. 118-121.

Palmer, Ted. "A Profile of Correctional Effectiveness and New Directions for Research." State University of New York Press. 1994. Pg. 3.

Pearson, Frank and Harper Alice: Contingent Intermediate Sentences: New Jersey's Intensive Supervision, *Crime and Delinquency,* Jan90, Vol.36. Page #'s unavailable.

Petersilia, Joan. "A Decade of Experimenting with Intermediate Sanctions: What Have We Learned?" *Federal Probation.* December 1998, Volume 62, Issue 2.

Petersilia, Joan. "Conditions that Permit Intensive Supervision Programs to Survive." *Crime and Delinquency.* 1990. Vol. 36 Issue 1, Pg. 126-146

Petersilia, Joan and Turner, Susan. "Comparing Intensive and Regular Supervision for High-Risk Probationers: Early Results from an Experiment in California." *Crime and Delinquency.* January 1990, Volume 36. (page numbers not available.)

Ryan, James E. "Who Gets Revoked? A Comparison of Intensive Supervision Successes and Failures in Vermont." *Crime and Delinquency.* Jan. 1997, Vol. 43 Issue 1, Pg. 104-119.

Sieh, Edwards W. "From Augustus to the Progressives: A Study of Probations Formative years." *Federal Probation.* Sept. 1993, Vol. 57. Pg. 67-73.

Stone, Susan and Fulton, Betsy. "Achieving Public Safety through Rehabilitation and Reintegration: The Promise of a new ISP." Intermediate Sanctions: Sentencing in the 1990's. Anderson Publishing Company (1995). Pg. 115-134.

Thomson, Douglas, "How Plea Bargaining Shapes Intensive Probation Supervision Policy Goals." *Crime and Delinquency.* January 1990, Volume 36, Issue 1. (Page numbers not available.)

Tonry, Michael. "Stated and Latent Functions of ISP." *Crime and Delinquency.* (1990). Volume 36, Issue 1, Pg. 174-192.

Wiebush, Richard G. "Juvenile Intensive Supervision: The Impact on Felony Offenders Directed from Institutional Placement." *Crime and Delinquency.* (1993). Volume 39, Issue 1, Pg. 68-90.

Wilson, John J. and Howell, James,PHD. "Serious, Violent and Chronic Juvenile Offenders: A Comprehensive Strategy." Fact Sheet #4, (1993). Pg. 1-3.

http://ojjdp.ncjrs.org/PUBS/implementing/safety.html. Guide for Implementing the Balanced and Restorative Justice Model. "Balanced and Restorative Justice Practice: Community Safety."

www.dwidata.org/sanctions/intense_super_prob.cfm. National Hardcore Drunk Drivers Project. "Sanctions: Intensive Supervision Probation." (1997). Pg. 1-3.

Submitted by Darryl Beatty
For: 5397 POSI

Appendix A

Survey of Texas Juvenile Intensive Supervision Probation Programs

County JPD _____

1. Total # of Juvenile Probation Officers _____   Total ISP officers:_____
2.   Average caseload per ISP officer:_____
3. Required number of office visits with each offender per month_____
4. Required number of other face-to-face contacts (home, work, etc.) per month_____
5. Write the mission statement and three most important goals of the ISP program.
     Mission:

     Goal 1:

     Goal 2:

     Goal 3:

6. To enter the program, are offenders required to have a 'high' risk score? ☐ Yes ☐No
     a 'high' need score?   ☐ Yes ☐No

     Other requirements?:_____

7. What percentage of current participants were formally ordered by the court to participate in
     the ISP program?_____

8. What percentage were referred to the ISP program at the discretion of the JPO?_____

9. Are any cases specifically excluded from participation in the ISP program? (e.g., gang
     members, sex offenders, violent offenders)   ☐ Yes ☐No

     If so, which type of cases?_____

10. Place a check next to each activity that is required for all ISP participants.

☐ More office visits than regular supervision   ☐ Family Counseling
☐ More home visits than regular supervision   ☐ Individual counseling
☐ More work visits than regular supervision   ☐ Residential treatment
☐ Urinalysis more often than regular supervision   ☐ Stress/anger management class
☐ Community service   ☐ Substance abuse education class
☐ Curfew   ☐ Community mentor/sponsor
☐ Electronic monitoring   ☐ Cognitive training class
☐ Alcoholics/Narcotics Anonymous   ☐ Victim impact panels
☐ Group counseling (not AA/NA)   ☐ Other_____

11. Place a check next to each activity that is required needed for ISP participants.
☐ More office visits than regular supervision   ☐ Family Counseling
☐ More home visits than regular supervision   ☐ Individual counseling
☐ More work visits than regular supervision   ☐ Residential treatment
☐ Urinalysis more often than regular supervision   ☐ Stress/anger management class
☐ Community service   ☐ Substance abuse education class
☐ Curfew   ☐ Community mentor/sponsor
☐ Electronic monitoring   ☐ Cognitive training class
☐ Alcoholics/Narcotics Anonymous   ☐ Victim impact panels
☐ Group counseling (not AA/NA)   ☐ Other_____

12. Does the program routinely use a system of graduated sanctions?   ☐ Yes ☐ No

13. What is the completion date of the most recent program evaluation?_____

14. What is the date of the most recent program audit?_____

15. Do ISP officers complete training that other probation officers do not?

16. Does the ISP program have its own written policies and procedures?

17. Does the program routinely work with non-profit, church, or community organizations to fulfill its mission? If so, how?

18. Does the program have any other 'community involvement' components (e.g., neighborhood policing, community meetings)? If so, what are they?

19. Provide any other information about your ISP program that is important or unique:

20. Comments:

Appendix B

County JPD Name: _____

Content Analysis _____   Survey _____   Consolidated Code Sheet _____

General Descriptive	
Total ISP Officers	_____ #
Average caseload per ISP officer	_____ #
Required office visits per month	_____ #
Required other face-to-face visits per month	_____ #
Purpose Statements	_____ Yes _____ No
Clearly stated?	_____ Yes _____ No
Diversion not a purpose	_____ Yes _____ No
Enhancement is a purpose	_____ Yes _____ No
Short and long term goals	_____ Yes _____ No
Reducing recidivism is a goal	_____ Yes _____ No
Affecting long-term offender behavior is a goal	
Target Population/Offender Selection	
High risk	_____ Yes _____ No
High need	_____ Yes _____ No
Referral origin	_____ % Court _____ % non-court
Excluded populations	List: _____

Treatment/Control Balance	
Total 'intervention' activities	_____ #
Total 'enforcement' activities required	_____ #
Total 'surveillance' activities required	_____ #
	Comments/observations: _____
	_____
Integrity	
Number of need-based services	_____ #
Date of last program evaluation	_____ date
Date of last program audit	_____ date
Special training for ISP staff	_____ Yes _____ No
Manual for ISP program	_____ Yes _____ No
Community Involvement	
Cooperation with other government agencies (police, sheriff, constable, human services)	_____ Yes _____ No
Cooperation with non-profit or private sector	_____ Yes _____ No
Cooperation with local churches/clergy	_____ Yes _____ No
Community meetings for input into program design or operation	_____ Yes _____ No
Community/citizen sponsors for the program and participants	_____ Yes _____ No
Program located in high need areas	_____ Yes _____ No