

COMMUNITY SERVICE RESTITUTION VOLUNTEERS:
A VIABLE SOURCE OF LABOR FOR MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENTS

BY

VICKI SKINNER

An Applied Research Project
(Political Science 5397)
Submitted to the Department
of Political Science
Southwest Texas State University
In Partial Fulfillment for the
Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Public Administration

Fall 1982

Faculty Approval:

Departmental Review:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Scope and Purpose	1
	Definition and Historical Development of Community Service Restitution	2
II.	OVERVIEW OF FUNCTIONING PROGRAMS IN THE UNITED STATES	6
	California	6
	Minnesota	8
	Oregon	9
	Arizona	11
	Texas	13
III.	MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT USE OF TRADITIONAL VOLUNTEERS	23
	Parks	23
	Libraries	25
IV.	TRADITIONAL VOLUNTEER USAGE COMPARED TO COMMUNITY SERVICE RESTITUTION VOLUNTEER USAGE	28
	Problems Associated With Traditional Volunteers	28
	Limitations of Community Service Restitution Volunteers	33
	Advantages of Community Service Restitution Volunteers	35
V.	CONCLUSION	39
	
	END NOTES	41
	APPENDIX	45
	SOURCES CONSULTED	52

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Scope and Purpose

The need for municipal administrators to investigate alternative means of providing community services will continue to increase during the 1980's. Rising operational costs, citizen revolts against tax increases, major reductions in federal support, and growing demands for wider and more effective distribution of city services are among the factors contributing to municipal budgetary constraints. Gaining approval from governing bodies to add personnel to the work force at any governmental level is particularly difficult under such conditions. President Reagan has presented the use of volunteers as a feasible alternative and his emphasis on this solution is demonstrated in the following excerpt from a September, 1981 televised speech:

I believe the spirit of volunteerism lives in America...We see examples of it on every hand: the community charity drive, the rallying around whenever disaster strikes. The truth is we've let Government take away many things we once considered were really ours to do voluntarily, out of the goodness of our hearts and a sense of neighborliness. I believe many of you want to do these things again. 1

Reagan has continued to stress the importance of volunteering in speeches he has given to business and governmental leaders around the country. In addition, he has appointed a Task Force on Private Sector Initiatives for the purpose of developing methods for stimulating partnerships between the public and private sectors and en-

couraging the American public to get directly involved in the provision of services. 2

The message has reached local levels of government and elected officials in many areas are championing volunteer usage. However, Reagan's traditional concept of voluntarism has not been perceived as a plausible solution to the problem of service provision by municipal public administrators due to its inherent problems. A variation of voluntarism, that of the utilization of community service restitution "volunteers", is an alternative which has been successful as a partial solution in an increasing number of communities in the United States. The following discussion will include a description of the historical development of community service restitution, an overview of various programs currently in operation, a survey of municipal departments that tend to be most actively involved in traditional volunteer usage and an examination of the possible reasons behind the reluctance of other departments to use them. The purpose of this paper is to demonstrate that community service restitution volunteers are a source of labor that should be more actively investigated and pursued by local governments because their usage incorporates many of the advantages but eliminates a majority of the disadvantages associated with traditional volunteers.

Definition and Historical Development of Community Service Restitution

Restitution, in connection with sentencing, may be defined as "a sanction imposed by an official of the criminal justice system requiring the offender to make a payment of money or service to either the direct or substitute victim". 3 Interest in restitution as a sentencing alternative has risen because of such factors tied to con-

ventional sentencing as rising incarceration costs, overcrowded jails and prisons, the effect of imprisonment on juveniles and first-time offenders, and the realization that imprisonment contributes little to, and in fact may detract from, the rehabilitation of the offender, Community service restitution, or court-referral community service, is a form of restitution in which the offender is sentenced to make reparation for her/his offense to society by performing assigned tasks in a governmental department or non-profit social agency within the community.⁴

The historical development of community service restitution as a sentencing alternative began in England during the 1960's. Investigations into the various sentencing alternatives culminated in the Report of the Home Office Working Group on Community Service and the Wooten Report on Non-custodial and Semi-custodial Penalties which recommended bringing offenders into direct contact with social needs in the community. It was hoped that sentences consisting of community service work would not only assist in alleviating overcrowding in jails but would also instill continued interest in volunteerism in the offenders after completion of their sentences. As a result, The Criminal Justice Act of 1972 included the Community Service Order in the various types of sentences it introduced.

This British law allows for community service sentencing in lieu of imprisonment if the offender is at least seventeen years old and if he/she consents to the alternative. The court considers the probation officer's report before deciding that an offender is eligible for community service work. The court's order must specify the number of hours to be worked which must fall in the range of 40 to 240 hours and it also usually stipulates that the sentence must be

completed within one year. The probation officers make the arrangements needed to locate work in the offenders community in voluntary agencies or governmental operations and they also ensure that offenders comply with the court order. Effort is made to arrange the community service work around the offender's family, work and religious commitments. 6

In 1973 the Home Office Research unit established an experimental, pilot project in London and five others in the provinces for the purpose of testing community service sentencing. The results of the experiment were positive and the majority of the agencies utilizing the offenders were enthusiastic about continuing the program. Work performed by the offenders was basically divided into two categories: tasks that did not involve direct contact with persons other than other offenders (such as park maintenance, cleaning up beaches or canals, and painting churches) and work providing direct services to individuals and groups (such as the work volunteers typically provide in hospitals, homes for the mentally or physically handicapped, and churches).7

Further analysis of the Home Office Study revealed that ninety-eight percent of the offenders were male and that they basically ranged from seventeen to twenty-four years of age. An average of forty-four percent of the offenders given a community service sentence had served a criminal sentence before. The crime most often committed by those convicted was in the property offense category, although traffic violations and crimes committed against other persons were also common. Seventy-five percent of the recommendations made by probation officers to give community service sentences were accepted by the courts. As a result of these and other findings, community service

sentencing was considered to be successful enough as an alternative for more traditional methods that by April of 1975, the Home Office had authorized its use in all of the fifty-five probation areas in Great Britain. 8

CHAPTER 11

OVERVIEW OF FUNCTIONING PROGRAMS IN THE UNITED STATES

A significant number of programs began developing during the late 60's and early 70's in the United States and are currently operating successfully. The majority of those programs may be classified as one, or a combination of, the following types: direct referrals from the judges to either the agencies where the volunteers are assigned or programs which are administered by the probation department, a volunteer bureau or agency, an independent public agency, an independent private non-profit agency, or court personnel.⁹ Although the various programs may differ administratively and the criteria used for accepting offenders into them may vary, the basic concept of community service sentencing is common to all.

California

One of the oldest and most widely publicized programs is the Court Referral Program in Alameda County, California which was established in October, 1966 by the Volunteer Bureau of Alameda County. Instigated by the bureau's executive director and Municipal Judge Jacqueline Taber, it was initially directed toward the placement of female traffic offenders who were not able to pay fines and who could not be given jail sentences without causing family hardships. Male offenders were later added to the project and more recently an increasing number of persons convicted of drunk driving, robbery, ex-

tortion, arson and other felonies have been included.¹⁰

This particular project is not considered part of the criminal justice system and is administered as only one part of Alameda's community service volunteer program. Offenders are not required to accept this alternative to the more traditional fine or jail sentence. The court consults with the offender, determines the number of hours to be assigned as the sentence and then refers the volunteer to the Court Referral Program where he/she is interviewed before being placed in an agency whose needs match the abilities and interests of the participant. Because approximately one-half of the participants are involved in minor traffic offenses, the most frequently assigned community work sentences total forty hours or less. However, with the addition of participants convicted of more serious offenses to the program, some assignments in excess of four hundred hours have been made.

Between July 1, 1976 and June 30, 1977 court-referred volunteers provided over 400,000 hours of service in approximately six hundred different agencies within Alameda County. Sixty percent of the work performed involved either clerical tasks, such as typing, filing, collating and addressing envelopes or skilled and unskilled maintenance jobs, including recycling, janitorial tasks, carpentry, repairs and animal care. The participating agencies include clinics, rest homes, multi-purpose social service agencies, parks, libraries, churches and various organizations that provide informational and referral consumer services. 11

California's Orange County Court Referral Program is structured similarly to Alameda's program. However, the Orange County Project is noted for the systematic contact it maintains with the offenders

and recipient agencies. Half-way through an offender's sentencing period, Court Referral checks to see if the client is performing satisfactorily and if there are any problems between the client and the recipient agency. Clients who are not progressing well are notified by Court Referral that they are not fulfilling their responsibilities and are reminded of the consequences if they do not complete the sentence. At the assigned completion date, a status report on the client is sent by Court Referral to the court of jurisdiction. The court then issues a bench warrant for any client who has not successfully completed the community service work, unless he/she has been granted an extension for completion of the sentence or has paid a fine in lieu of service.¹²

More than forty-five community service restitution programs are currently in operation throughout California. During 1981, an average of three thousand community service orders were being channelled each month through these programs.¹³ The Association of California Court Referral Programs was formed to "act as a central voice for all California court referral programs". Its major activities have included facilitation of inter-county referrals, publication of a registry of all court referral programs in the state and preparation of uniform guidelines for counties to use in forming new referral programs.¹⁴

Minnesota

The Win-onus Restitution Program is another successful community service restitution project. It was begun in the fall of 1972 in Winona County, Minnesota and was designed to provide alternative sentences for nonviolent, first-time misdemeanants that would repay

the victim and/or the community, as well as create a positive impact on the offender. The restitution process consists of seven steps beginning with the judge determining whether the program is appropriate for the offender. The offender is then referred to a court service officer who discusses the offender's problems and goals with her/him, describes the program and gives the offender a list of community service options to select from. At step three a proposed sentence is determined. The offender and the court service officer next return to court to submit the proposed sentence to the judge for approval. Step five involves the judge's acceptance, modification or rejection of the sentence. After sentencing is imposed at step six, the Court Services Department becomes responsible for the supervision of the sentence.¹⁵

Win-onus Program Staff members contribute the success of the project to the following factors: sentences are imposed that should be beneficial in improving the offender's self-image and responsibility toward society; offenders choose restitution and participate in the sentencing process; and negative or degrading restitution is avoided if possible.¹⁶

Oregon

Multnomah County, Oregon's Alternative Community Service Program (ACSP) was instigated in December, 1972 by the Multnomah County District Court presiding judge. Judge Richard L. Unis stated that the purpose of the program is to "offer the court a sentencing mechanism for distinguishing between the lawbreaker and the criminal while providing much needed and appreciated help to the community (which) repays the community for the expense it incurred as a

result of the wrong doing".17

Like the Win-onus Program, Multnomah's ACSP is considered part of the criminal justice system and it is coordinated by a supervisor who is employed by the court. The number of volunteer hours (ranging from a minimum of twenty-four to a maximum of eighty) is agreed upon by the court and the offender, and the offender is then sent to ACSP to be interviewed before placement. In order to match the volunteer with an appropriate agency, the interviewer considers the volunteer's abilities, state of health, interests, hobbies, attitude, work and family scheduling priorities, means of transportation and previous criminal record. Unless the court has indicated a specific agency, the volunteer may suggest an agency which ACSP will contact to determine if it is willing to accept restitution volunteers, if it is non-profit and if it meets the standards required by the program. A list of agencies already participating in the program is also available to select from. After an appropriate agency is chosen, the interviewer calls that agency's contact person to find out if a job is available that matches the volunteer's skills and schedule. The volunteer is given written notification of the agency's name, address, phone number, contact person and the assigned work schedule. In addition, the volunteer is advised that it is her/his responsibility to complete the service hours agreed upon and that he/she must call the agency's contact person to make other arrangements if scheduling conflicts arise. The community service hours must be completed by the assigned date unless an extension is approved by the District Court Program Coordinator.18

ACSP encourages any non-profit agency to participate in the

program "whose services are provided to the general public and are designed to enhance the social welfare, physical or mental stability, environmental quality or general well-being of the community".¹⁹ The number of participating agencies has grown from fifteen in the beginning stages to more than three hundred.²⁰ During the first twenty-two months of ACSP's operation, 2,668 volunteers contributed 54,437 hours to the participating agencies. By August, 1977, 225,305 community service hours had been completed by 8,661 individuals.²¹

Arizona

Pima County, Arizona's Community Restitution in Service Program (CRISP) is based on the concept that offenders who are financially unable to make monetary restitution to the community can fulfill their obligation by providing community service. Other purposes of the program include giving the offender the opportunity to develop a sense of responsibility, to learn and improve work habits and to learn job skills. It was begun in September, 1975 as the result of a specific case involving a drunken driver convicted of vehicular manslaughter. He had previously been in jail but the jail sentence did not have enough of an impact on him to prevent him from returning to excessive drinking and driving. He could not afford to pay a fine, or standard restitution to the taxpayers, so the probation officer recommended to the sentencing court that the offender be required to donate service to the community. He was assigned to work for an alcohol counselling program in the County Hospital where he would be directly involved with observing the severe problems resulting from excessive drinking.

Before an offender is assigned to community service restitution, an investigation probation officer determines the degree of loss incurred by the individual victim and/or the community, ascertains the offender's financial status and her/his capability of paying fines, court costs, and monetary restitution, and examines the offender's ability to participate in community service. The probation officer presents the information collected in a report to the sentencing court and may recommend community service as a condition of probation. If probation is granted at the time of sentencing, the court imposes the conditions. After the hearing is over the probationer meets with the field probation officer who will be responsible for supervision and both individuals sign the probation conditions agreement. If a CRISP assignment is made, the majority of the cases are directed by the court but approximately twenty-five percent are directed by the probation officer.

In some instances CRISP assignments are made that are related to the crime that was committed. Two examples include a barber who was convicted of stealing from Salvation Army drop boxes and was instructed to give free haircuts at the Tucson Salvation Army Men's Social Service Center one night a week, and several young men who were convicted of arson and were assigned to donate service to the Tucson Fire Department. In most cases after the probationer has been assigned community service as a term of probation, he/she is referred to the departmental training officer who coordinates the program. A CRISP assignment is made that will not interfere with the probationer's work or school schedule or family responsibilities. The CRISP coordinator and/or the probation officer contact the participating agency periodically to ensure that the probationer

is progressing satisfactorily on the community service assignment.

Between January 1, 1976 and June 30, 1977, 15,136 community service hours were completed by probationers, with an average 121.5 hours completed per person. Only three participants failed to fulfill their CRISP assignments. Forty-two agencies participated in the program during this period. Ten of the agencies included the following government departments: County Hospital, County Juvenile Court Center, County Health Department, County Parks and Recreation Department, County Nursing Home, County Animal Control Center and the Tucson Fire Department. ~ ~

Texas

The Community Service Restitution (CSR) Program in Travis County, Texas is of particular interest to this student who is a supervisor in one of its participating municipal departments, the Austin Public Library. According to Jim Donahue, Travis County Adult Probation Department, attention to community service as a sentencing alternative was stimulated because of the increasing numbers of women being placed on probation for welfare fraud. Like the initial participants in the Alameda County Court Referral Program, these offenders were not able to pay fines and the imposition of jail sentences would have caused severe family hardships.²³

Upon the instigation of Judge Mary Pearl Williams, Travis County was selected as one of two Community Resource Program pilot projects in the United States. The Community Resource Program project staff and Giles Garmon, Travis County Probation Department Director, recommended that a citizens' advisory board be formed to study the feasibility of a program in Travis County and, **if** the

group favored such a program, to determine guidelines for establishment and to provide assistance in implementation. The twenty-four member board, appointed by the three Travis County judges in the fall of 1978, examined how misdemeanor cases were being processed in the County-Courts-at-Law and also followed the progress of the other CSR pilot program in its first year in the misdemeanor court system in Tacoma, Washington. In March, 1979, the board presented a position paper to the county judges and to Giles Garmon which included a listing of the benefits of a CSR program, a description of the proposed structure and implementation procedures for the program, and a discussion of the probation department's responsibilities for administration. The board's recommendations were approved and a letter signed by the three county judges was sent to the local bar association to inform them about CSR's inception.24

The following excerpt from the letter soliciting lawyers' interest in client participation summarizes the Citizens Advisory Board's plans for the program:

The Board is of the view that a program of Community Service Restitution for Travis County should have the following characteristics: (1) A specified number of hours of work for a specified community service agency should be required as a part of the disposition of each case involving community service restitution. (2) The number of hours and the agency involved should be specified before the case is disposed of so that participation in the program can be made an enforceable condition of the disposition of the case with least possible disruption of the court process. (3) A rate of exchange should be established to value the hours of community service work in terms of fines and jail sentences. The Board recommends a rate of exchange of \$3.00 per hour for fines and 4 hours per day for jail time. (4) The Board believes that the program should have minimum and maximum periods of participation. A minimum period is necessary to assure that the work is of real benefit to the host agencies and a maximum period to assure that the program not extend beyond that which is of real benefit to the offender. For clients participating in the Community Service Restitution Program in Travis County, the Board recommends a minimum period of 24 hours and a maximum period of 200 hours. The Board wishes to emphasize that the minimum and maximum periods are guidelines only and may be departed from in extraordinary cases. (5) The Board believes

that the program should be available only to public or not-for-profit private social agencies and should not be available to a private business or other profit-making operations. (6) The Board believes that the work required in the program should not include work that may pose a danger to the public, such as providing transportation in an automobile or other vehicle, and work that may endanger the participant, such as construction work or maintenance work that involves a significant risk of injury. (7) The Board believes that the dispositional order in which the community service work is specified should clearly provide the sanctions for failure to perform the work as required and, when appropriate, should specify that the individual may terminate work by paying that portion of the fine remaining or by surrendering himself or herself for service of the remainder of the jail sentence.

Offenders selected to participate in the program are those that have not established a criminal lifestyle that would cause them to be a danger to society. It was also the recommendation of the Board that the offenders who had developed an established criminal pattern such as hard core alcohol offenders, the drug abuser, and the sex offender, be excluded from the program.²⁴

Currently over forty agencies are actively participating in the CSR program, including three municipal departments: Libraries, Parks and Recreation, and Health. By April, 1982, approximately 1,300 persons had been assigned to community service restitution and almost half of them had completed their sentences. All but about eighty of the remaining number were still progressing toward completion. Those offenders who had been dropped from the program were dismissed for varying reasons including not being physically capable of performing the assigned duties, being sentenced in Travis County but actually residing in a county that has no community restitution opportunities, committing additional offenses which resulted in probation being revoked, and when given the choice, opting to pay a fine in lieu of completing the remainder of the sentence.

Based on the minimum hourly wage, over \$175,000 in services have been contributed to Travis County's participating agencies. Jim Donahue contends that this estimate is very low because pro-

fessionals and paraprofessionals are also performing work in the program and the minimum wage does not accurately represent their contributions. The Probation Department has recently asked the participating agencies to report how much they would have included in their operating budgets for a permanent employee to perform the same tasks that were assigned to the CSR volunteer. 26

According to Gene Oakes, Travis County Adult Probation Officer, the majority of CSR volunteers have been convicted of driving while intoxicated, but other offenses have included misdemeanor thefts, resisting arrest, and committing criminal mischief which resulted in property damage. All persons convicted of driving while intoxicated must complete an alcohol education program before they are allowed to begin their community service assignments. The average community service sentence tends to average one hundred hours and most volunteers complete their sentences in approximately six months. The longest sentence Oakes has supervised was for four hundred hours, in which the offender was actually sentenced in Harris County but was allowed to transfer the assignment to the county of residence, Travis.

Oakes commented that the tendency to stereotype offenders involved in the program has caused some initial concern in participating agencies. The volunteers assigned to CSR are actually on probation, but many persons have the misconception that probation and parole are synonymous. Offenders placed on probation cannot be characterized by a standard profile, but instead represent a true cross section of society. He stressed that adequate screening of CSR volunteers by the probation officers before placement is essential in the successful operation of the program. Probation officers attempt to utilize the expertise and interests of the offenders

when offering them a choice of approximately three agencies in which to work. Oakes cited examples of a painter assigned to the County's print shop, an attorney who was appointed to handle four misdemeanor cases at no charge to the clients, a person interested in plant care was assigned to Parks and Recreation, and a volunteer that liked animals worked at the Humane ~ o c i e t ~ . ~ 7

The CSR coordinators in Travis County's three participating municipal departments all advocate the use of these volunteers in community service work. James Rodgers, Zilker Park Manager in Austin's Parks and Recreation Department is particularly enthusiastic about the success of the program, estimating that through April, 1982 over 17,000 hours of work had been performed by CSR volunteers in his department. Of the more than one hundred CSR volunteers that have been assigned to Parks and Recreation, only two have not been satisfactory. The use of these volunteers has greatly reduced the amount of over-time pay for the regular staff and has allowed the department to complete or begin projects that had been indefinitely delayed because of personnel shortages. Utilization of these volunteers has enabled Rodgers to have Austin's largest and most popular park staffed eight hours each day, seven days a week. CSR workers are primarily scheduled during the weekend shifts and one staff member serves as a crew leader assuming responsibility for the tools and equipment. They have performed such duties as raking, sweeping, picking up litter, repairing picnic tables and playground equipment, and assisting with activities associated with the various special events that are frequently held. Rodgers acknowledges that **it** is difficult recruiting and retaining other types of volunteers to do this type of work. 28

Wendy Biro, Volunteer Coordinator in the Austin-Travis County Health Department, has also been pleased with the results of CSR volunteer usage. Supervisors within the Health Department did not expect restitution workers to be committed to performing their assigned duties but they have been surprised at the level of interest the majority of volunteers has exhibited. Some persons have even expressed the desire to continue working after their restitution sentences have been completed, although none to date have actually done so. The Health Department would like to receive more CSR volunteers than it has had but, because its hours of operation are basically 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. Monday through Friday, it is somewhat handicapped. Many volunteers who might be interested in fulfilling their sentence requirements in that agency need to report to their regular jobs during that time period.

Biro indicated that volunteers are carefully matched to jobs and intermingled with the regular staff. Many workers are assigned to clerical tasks that are always present, such as typing and filing of medical records, or operating the switchboard. More individually tailored jobs have included an architectural student with graphics experience who prepared a volunteer orientation packet with the volunteer coordinator, a nurse who worked in her area of specialty in one of the clinics and a student with weight problems who assisted in the weight reduction clinic and lost ten pounds in the process.²⁹

The Austin Public Library has been a convenient agency in which to place CSR volunteers because its public service hours extend into the evenings and weekends. Stephanie Allen, former Volunteer Coordinator, and her replacement, Elaine Byrne, view the

assistance from these volunteers as beneficial during a time when demands for library service are increasing but budgetary allocations are not. Many of them are assigned to such tasks as shelving books, preparing and boxing library materials for storage, mending damaged books, and staffing the security check at the Central Library's exit. Two of the volunteers who were particularly effective at the security check were security guards in their regular jobs. Other volunteers have had special skills which have been utilized: an employee in a local television station produced an orientation slide show for library patrons; a graphics student assisted with the volunteer training manual; a person with handicraft abilities made puppets to be used in children's storyhours, and a data entry operator assisted in the library's data processing section. 30

The volunteer coordinator checks periodically with the supervisor of the section where the CSR person is assigned to ensure that the work performance and attendance record is satisfactory. If a problem occurs, the coordinator counsels the volunteer and if the situation does not improve immediately, the volunteer's probation officer is notified. In the majority of the jobs, the adherence of the volunteers to a strict time schedule is not critical to the satisfactory performance of the work but it is important when they are scheduled to staff an area in one of the public service departments. As a supervisor in one of these departments, this student had experienced problems with inadequate public service coverage because some of the CSR volunteers have not been reliable. However, in most cases their reliability records have improved after counselling. Only one person was removed from the public service area because of unacceptable work performance.

Wes Hudson, Travis County Adult Probation Department, was instrumental in the development and implementation of the CSR program. He is pleased with its progress in Travis County and would like to see it expanded into a statewide system. He advises governmental officials interested in developing such a program to form a citizen's advisory board to assist in planning and promoting its usefulness in the community, to recruit a system of participating agencies and to ensure that adequate supervision of the probationer is provided for in the agencies. 31

The second restitution program to become operational in Texas was Harris County's Community Service Option Program (CSOP). According to Gene Gundersen, Executive Director, interest developed in beginning a program after volunteers who made jail visits for the Houston Metropolitan Ministries became disturbed by the manpower that was being wasted in the jails. The Program was instituted by the community on a limited basis in October, 1979 and by November, 1980 it was operating as a private, non-profit organization funded through contributions from citizens, churches, and corporations; contractual agreements with Harris County; and various fund-raising efforts. One-fourth to one-third of the total funding is currently supplied by the county. CSOP is independent of the probation department and it serves as a clearing agency for offenders sentenced by the federal, state, and county courts. The office is staffed by the executive director, an administrative coordinator, a part-time interviewer, a secretary and several students.

Unlike many other programs, CSOP will accept felons placed on probation. However, unlike probation departments, CSOP is not required to accept any persons the staff considers unsuitable for

community service. CSOP volunteers have typically been convicted of committing such crimes as driving while intoxicated, embezzling, smuggling illegal aliens, shoplifting and engaging in burglaries without the use of weapons. County court sentences have averaged one hundred hours per person; state court sentences tend to be in the 150 hour range; and the federal sentences average 250 hours, but can be as high as one thousand hours. The largest percentage of offenders channelled through CSOP have been male, blue-collar workers that have been assigned to agencies where they have performed plumbing, carpentry, various types of repair and maintenance work, and janitorial tasks. If offenders do not complete their community service sentences, their probation is revoked.

The only Houston city departments currently utilizing CSOP volunteers are libraries and parks and recreation, but Ms. Gundersen is hoping that more municipal departments will agree to become involved when she begins additional site recruitment later in the year. The CSOP staff maintains a job description file for available volunteer positions in the participating agencies. Prospective volunteers are screened and then matched with available jobs to be performed, taking into consideration the participant's regular employment schedule, geographic location and access to transportation. All volunteers are required to attend a general orientation session which is counted as one hour toward the completion of their community service sentences. During the orientation, the concept of voluntarism is explained and its importance in today's society is stressed.

Participating agencies and Harris County probation officers have been very satisfied with the Community Service Option Program.

Through April, 1982, 140 persons had completed the program and contributed 15,800 hours of community service. Thirty percent of the volunteers continued to contribute work to their participating agencies even after they had completed their sentences. 32

CHAPTER III

MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT USE OF TRADITIONAL VOLUNTEERS

Parks

As evidenced in the preceding descriptions, very few of the participating agencies in community service restitution programs are municipal departments. The departments that are most receptive to using restitution volunteers tend to be the same departments that have most actively used traditional volunteers: parks and libraries. Both departments have historically ranked toward the bottom in the funding priorities of most municipalities and have been affected greatly in most areas of the country by budgetary constraints in the past five years.

At the national level, volunteers are encouraged to assist with the various activities of the National Park Service. In 1970, Volunteers in Parks (VIP) was formed in order to recruit, train and retain volunteers for that purpose.³³ Volunteers have been used in local park departments, such as in Kettering, Ohio since their inception. The Kettering Parks and Recreation Department has begun to more actively promote volunteerism, however, with the encouragement of the city's mayor and council. In the areas of both program-related and park maintenance assistance, volunteers have contributed more than 68,000 hours annually.³⁴ In Colorado Springs thousands of citizens volunteered to assist with city services, allowing a savings in more than one million dollars in 1981 in personnel costs

without eliminating programs. A large percentage of those services were under the jurisdiction of the Park Department: the Special Olympics Program, the municipal greenhouse and gardens, fitness and crafts classes, day camp for the handicapped and the city's athletic program. Joan Vermaire, Park and Recreation Department Volunteer Coordinator, commented that almost everyone in the community is interested in participating.³⁵

After the passage of Proposition 13 in 1978, volunteers became essential for the continuance of many programs in parks and recreation departments throughout California. Citizens are encouraged to contact their local park departments to volunteer for an activity that would match their backgrounds and interests. Selected examples of the many types of activities being performed by volunteers in California parks and recreation departments include litter pick-up campaigns in San Mateo, assistance in drama production and art scholarship programs in San Diego, feeding and maintenance of animals in Berkeley's Tilden Park, restoration of historical buildings and operation of a softball league in Sylmar, and development of guides and brochures and operation of a new nature center in Orange County.³⁶ The prevalent attitude toward volunteers by most municipal parks departments tends to be extremely positive. Shivers and Halper in The Crisis in Urban Recreational Services state that the use of volunteers in parks may also have wider reaching benefits:

The utilization of volunteers to expand existing or potential services for local recreational agencies may influence additional efforts on the part of volunteers to take a more active interest in the concerns of other governmental enterprises. The social services directly produced thereby can have an immediate effect on governmental operations at all levels. To the extent that citizens begin to volunteer their time and effort to instigate needed changes in governmental operations and to the degree that volunteer-led efforts contribute to public support of public

programs, the greater the probability of gaining the desired objective of increased public service and an enhanced living environment. 37

Libraries

In recent years city and county libraries of all sizes have also become more dependent upon volunteers for assistance in service provision. In 1979, the first full-time volunteer coordinator in any of Chicago's city departments was appointed in the Chicago Public Library. Formerly Chicago's volunteers came primarily from a one thousand-member Friends group and RSVP, a senior citizen volunteer program, but the coordinator has begun recruiting volunteers of all ages to assist in children's storyhours, adult cultural programming, production of recordings for the blind, delivery of books to shut-ins, development of exhibits and mending books.³⁸ Janesville, Wisconsin also hired a volunteer coordinator in 1979 to recruit and train volunteers to work in public services, perform clerical tasks, shelve books, deliver library materials to the homebound, assist in public relations and process and mend materials. Interested persons are interviewed individually and sign formal work agreements.³⁹ In Ventura, California, after the passage of Proposition 13, Library Director, Bill Sannwald, was told by the Board of Supervisors, who were well aware of the political impact of library service cuts, to keep all branches open even if he had to use volunteers to do it. A branch head was given the appointment of Coordinator of Volunteers and began the job of recruiting and training persons to staff circulation desks, mend and shelve books, assist in children's and adult programming and perform a variety of other jobs. During the first year, 440 residents contributed 13,170 hours to the library.⁴⁰

Some library systems are totally operating selected branches with volunteers, as demonstrated by reports from Alabama and Maryland. The Huntsville-Madison County Public Library is staffing its first branch outside the city limits with forty-four individuals who volunteered for regular schedules and were trained by the library's Extension Department.⁴¹ Three of Baltimore County's minilibraries are totally staffed by volunteers. These minilibraries contain collections similar to other branches but are much smaller in size and do not include reference books. When volunteers need assistance, they can use a hotline which connects the minilibrary to a reference desk in one of the larger branches.⁴²

During 1979, volunteers contributed 17,569 hours of services in Oklahoma's Tulsa City-County Library.⁴³ Five hundred volunteers performed various services in The Public Library of Columbus and Franklin County that same year. The sixteen thousand hours they donated represented a forty percent increase over 1978.⁴⁴ The Metropolitan Library System of Oklahoma City received the equivalent of 5.13 staff members in volunteer time during 1981: 561 persons contributed 10,671 hours.⁴⁵

Selected examples of various other city departments successfully using volunteers can also be found around the country, but not to the extent that libraries and parks departments are involved. Fire departments in smaller communities tend to be fairly heavy users of volunteers. City Manager of Urbandale, Iowa, Stribling Boynton, states that volunteers are interested in contributing service hours to fire departments because they prefer to work on tangible projects where they can see immediate results. Many police departments also use volunteers in widely ranging capacities. Kansas City, Missouri

has a very sophisticated training program for its volunteers who participate one night a week in a police reserve unit. Citizens from a variety of professions receive twenty-one weeks of instruction at the regional police academy and three hundred hours of on-the-job training. Captain John Bartlett, commander of the reserve unit, reports that the volunteers must be able to contend with any situation a salaried officer might be exposed to and their training includes such areas as making arrests, first aid, city ordinances and court appearances. 46

CHAPTER IV

TRADITIONAL VOLUNTEER USAGE COMPARED TO COMMUNITY SERVICE RESTITUTION VOLUNTEER USAGE

Problems Associated With Traditional Volunteers

The majority of departments within most municipalities are still reluctant, however, to pursue the use of volunteers. A recent survey of volunteer usage within Austin, Texas city departments revealed that out of thirty-two departments, only eight were involved in some level of volunteer usage: Emergency Medical Services, Fire, Health, Hospital, Human Services, Libraries, Parks and Recreation, and Police. Two additional departments, Municipal Court and Human Relations, indicated that they had duties suitable for volunteers to perform if persons were recruited. The remaining twenty-two departments did not use any volunteers and did not foresee any possibilities for incorporating them into their operations.⁴⁷

Many departments are not interested in investigating volunteer possibilities because of the various problems normally associated with traditional volunteer recruitment and usage. The location of persons willing to make a regular commitment of time and service to an agency has routinely required more time and effort than the salaried staff is willing or able to expend. The problem has become more critical as increasing numbers of women are entering the work force. A report on voluntary action in urban communities states:

Traditional volunteer sources are drying up. We no longer can

depend as heavily as we did on the middle-class, middle-aged white lady from the suburbs to do it all, although she still accounts for a majority of America's volunteer force.⁴⁸

The 1981 Gallup Survey on Volunteering revealed that there was a much greater increase in volunteer hours contributed among full-time employed people than any other group during the past three years. Pollsters attributed this phenomenon to the fact that more women are employed full-time and still constitute the backbone of the volunteer community.⁴⁹

The feminist movement has also had an effect through its negative reaction to women engaged in volunteer work. In 1974 the National Organization for Women (NOW) passed a resolution expressing the sentiment that almost all of the volunteer work performed by women is actually exploitation and that if a job is worth doing, the worker should be paid for her/his efforts.⁵⁰ During the 1980's NOW relaxed its stance on volunteer service and many women leaders began to acknowledge that women who volunteer can gain valuable work experience that can be beneficial if they later seek employment for pay. Even Betty Friedan, one of NOW'S founders, in April, 1981, expressed the view that the times call for "a passionate voluntarism - we cannot rely on the federal government, Congress or the courts".⁵¹

Labor unions and various other worker groups also resent the use of volunteers to perform jobs when unemployed workers need to have those jobs for pay. professionals in such fields as hospital work have been vocal in their opposition to volunteers who they feel are taking jobs away from them.⁵² Kevin Russell, head of Flint, Michigan's unit of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFL-CIO) expressed the view that:

Tax-paying citizens, who moved into this community partly to

get the services provided by our people are now asked to do the work themselves. The city is laying off people and putting the money elsewhere, and the citizens are being duped.

Russell's unit picketed Flint's volunteer workers during the ~~summer~~ of 1981.⁵³

Union resistance to volunteer usage in California increased after the passage of Proposition 13. Special interest groups such as California's Coalition to Restore Quality Library Service joined union opposition. The following letter to the editor which appeared in Library Journal summarizes the professional anti-volunteer faction's view:

Shame on the librarians and other professionals who are making use of volunteers to do work that voters specifically refused to fund. Let them do without! It seems that only librarians, otherwise known as "the housewives of the professional world", have so little self-esteem that they are anxious to prove how supine they can be. Catch business executives, lawyers, accountants, engineers, etc. using volunteers to do their "important" work. That librarians would allow former library employees (including nonprofessionals) to go hungry while eagerly using scabs is a scandal.⁵⁴

Locating persons with available time they are willing to spend doing volunteer work is a major problem in recruitment. In addition to more women becoming employed full-time, many men and women are taking second jobs in order to pay their bills. In the 1981 Gallup Survey one person out of five had been asked to become involved in some type of volunteer work and refused. In that group of persons, **the** most frequently mentioned reason for not volunteering was lack of time (forty-six percent of respondents). Fourteen percent listed health problems as an excuse, eighteen percent were not interested in volunteer work and eight percent were working during the times they were asked to contribute time.⁵⁵

The clerical and maintenance types of tasks which are normally

assigned to volunteers contribute to the difficulty in recruitment. Most citizens are not interested in donating time to an organization to perform jobs that are neither challenging nor rewarding. They prefer to be more involved in the major service activities of the department or organization rather than in the tasks that support those activities. "Volunteer fatigue", as Harriet Naylor terms the phenomenon which occurs when volunteers have not had good experiences, is a common result in agencies where rewarding duties are not delegated and volunteer interests are not taken into consideration.⁵⁶

One of the most frequently cited objections to the use of volunteers is the amount of training and supervision required in relation to the amount and value of the work actually performed. A prevalent attitude in many organizations is that salaried staff time should be put to other uses which would produce greater benefits. According to the volunteer coordinator in the Ventura County Library System, the first year volunteers were used on a wide scale, fiscal year 1978-79, the program was not cost effective. She estimated that \$40,518 was spent in staff time and for supplies, but she added that the amount of the staff time allotted to volunteer training was so high because they had not adequately planned and conducted the training.⁵⁷

Volunteers also do not always understand the need for receiving a thorough orientation to the organization's goals, policies and procedures, as well as training in how to accomplish them. The tendency to be anxious to begin working immediately while the enthusiasm for the project is still high is exemplified by a woman attending a volunteer organizational meeting in Ventura: "I don't see why we can't go out right now and open up the library. There are over a hundred of us right now in this room. We don't have to wait for any

training." In that particular instance the volunteer's enthusiasm did not last long enough for her to even return once to contribute time.⁵⁸

The level of commitment volunteers may have to the organization and its defined goals is questioned by salaried staff. Because the volunteers are not receiving pay for the work they perform and in most cases are only contributing several hours a week, it is difficult for the regular full-time staff to believe that the volunteers would be as interested as they are in providing high quality service. In addition, the volunteers are not motivated to improve their job performance by most of the same methods that are used with the rest of the staff, such as merit increases tied to performance appraisal systems, possibility of advancement within the organization, and enhancement of job security.

The skills and abilities of volunteers recruited of course vary greatly and time must be taken to carefully match persons to appropriate jobs. The same criteria should ideally be used in selecting volunteers for specific jobs as are used in selecting salaried staff, but in reality they rarely can all be considered. The normally small number of volunteers willing to contribute time greatly restricts how selective the hiring supervisor can be. In many cases the supervisor either accepts the volunteer that is available or he/she has no one to perform the job. The public relations aspect of volunteer utilization can also become an extremely sensitive issue when the persons are not suitable for the jobs that they are interested in and do not recognize it. The situation becomes even more difficult when a volunteer is actually given a particular job and later it becomes apparent that he/she is unable to perform it adequately.

In most municipalities salaried employees are hired with the understanding that if they cannot satisfactorily perform the job by the end of a specified probationary period, they will be terminated. However, terminating persons who are willingly donating time to an organization poses potential problems with citizen relationships and further recruitment.

The questionable reliability of volunteers is also mentioned often when objections to their use are raised. Higher priorities in the volunteers' personal lives and lack of incentive to fulfill the assignments are major contributors to this problem. If the assignments given to volunteers involve public service coverage and strict adherence to a schedule, reliability is very important but it is not essential in many clerical and maintenance tasks. It has been suggested that task-oriented, short-term assignments that don't require the repeated attention of the same person and do not have to be performed at a specific time are the most effective approaches to the problem of volunteer unreliability. Seeing immediate results to their contributed efforts can be a positive stimulus in some cases.⁵⁹ However, such task-oriented assignments as filing, stuffing envelopes, and various maintenance chores are not challenging and personally satisfying to most volunteers. Finding the right balance between solving the problem of volunteer unreliability and providing fulfilling assignments can be very difficult for the participating departments.

Limitations of Community Service Restitution Volunteers

Although there are of course some limitations and problems associated with community service restitution as compared to tradi-

tional voluntarism, agencies participating in these programs generally agree that the advantages by far outweigh the problems. One common problem faced in most agencies is the reluctance of some staff members to supervise and/or work with persons who are on probation. As has already been mentioned there is a tendency for some persons to have a very negative stereotypical image of an offender which automatically prejudices them against restitution volunteers. The fairly common practice of mistakenly equating probation to parole complicates the situation.

As in the use of traditional volunteers, the available group of restitution volunteers may not always include persons that possess the skills that are needed in performing the jobs satisfactorily. In those instances the jobs either are left unfilled or an inordinate amount of time is spent in training the persons contributing time. A higher percentage of restitution volunteers may also not be suitable for jobs that involve direct contact with the public. They are not initially engaged in volunteer work for the same reasons as those persons that are not making restitution and as a result, they may not be as interested in the quality of services that are provided to citizens in the community. In some cases, restitution volunteers have exhibited inappropriate attitudes for public service work and have been given alternative work assignments.

Another limitation involves the length of the community service restitution sentences. Although, as evidenced in the preceding survey of selected restitution programs, the sentence lengths do vary among programs, as well as among types of offenses committed, the average length tends to be about one hundred hours. Therefore, long-range projects cannot generally be assigned and the participating

departments must be prepared to contend with a regular turnover of volunteers. Assignments that require more than about one hundred hours for completion must not be dependent upon the work of only one individual but should instead allow for the substitution of several volunteers. The sentence length also restricts the amount of training that can be reasonably given before the volunteer begins an assignment. The time spent in training is applied toward the total sentence and if the training period is too lengthy, the volunteers do not contribute a substantial amount of actual work to the organization.

Advantages of Community Service Restitution Volunteers

Use of community service restitution workers has some positive benefits that are not associated with traditional volunteers. Participating agencies do not have to be as concerned with monitoring the amount of personal satisfaction the volunteers are receiving from their work in order to retain them. The restitution workers have an added incentive for being reliable and satisfactorily completing the assignments they are given within a specified period of time because successful completion of the community service work is generally stipulated as a condition of probation. Some programs allow for an extension of the specified time period for completion if the offender presents valid reasons and requests permission in advance of the set finish date. If the work is not completed probation may be revoked and the offender may be required to pay a fine and/or serve a jail sentence. As a result, participating agencies report that the majority of restitution volunteers are agreeable to complying with the requirements of their jobs and are reliable. Community service is not usually mandatory and in most areas where

it is used as a sentencing alternative, offenders are given the option of whether they would like to participate in lieu of a more traditional sentence or in addition to a reduced traditional sentence. Because offenders are not forced to participate in community service work and are also usually given a choice of two or more agencies in which to perform the work, supervisors have generally found the restitution volunteers to be cooperative and interested in completing the jobs.

Union and other worker groups cannot object to the use of community service restitution volunteers as adamantly as they do to traditional volunteers. The major purpose of community service restitution is to allow the offenders to make reparation to society, or in this case to the community in which the crime was committed. The offenders are not performing work without pay in the same manner as traditional volunteers are; they are paying back a debt to the community, which is serving as the substitute victim of the crime they have committed. The volunteers are not performing the work on a long-term basis and cannot justly be criticized for taking permanent jobs away from citizens who need them for pay. The restitution volunteers are being paid for the work in the sense that they are being allowed to ~~make~~ amends for the crimes that they have committed.

Restitution volunteers can successfully be given tasks that other types of volunteers are not interested in performing. The clerical and maintenance tasks that need to be performed in all organizations do not attract most traditional volunteers and do not provide the challenge and stimulation that encourage them to continue contributing their time and skills. These duties can reasonably be assigned to restitution workers if they possess the required job

skills because they are volunteering for the organization for a set period of time which is generally short-term and because they have a commitment to the terms of their probation.

Probably the greatest advantage in the use of restitution volunteers is the ability of the participating agencies to refuse to assign specific individuals to jobs if the value of their potential contributions is doubtful and to terminate any individuals who are not performing satisfactorily. A common feature in many currently operating programs is the use of an agreement or contract which the offenders sign, acknowledging that if their services are unsatisfactory and/or if they do not exhibit cooperative attitudes they realize that their assignments will be terminated. Most contracts also add the condition that if the volunteers do not satisfactorily complete their assignments, they are referred back to the sentencing courts for further disposition. Contract examples used in Travis County, Texas and Multnomah County, Oregon are included in the Appendix. In all of the programs surveyed, participating organizations were under no obligation to retain workers who were unsuitable and were in fact encouraged to report any problems that occurred to the appropriate probation department contact person. The termination of restitution workers does not pose the potential problems of strained public relations and limited recruitment possibilities that traditional volunteer termination does. Organizational supervisors do not need to be as hesitant to refuse the help of persons who are not freely contributing their services.

When an organization agrees to become a participating agency in a functioning community restitution program, it is not involved in the recruitment of the volunteers. After job descriptions have

been prepared that include the types of duties, necessary qualifications and required work schedules, the organization does not have to spend any additional time on recruitment. The agency in charge of coordinating the restitution program screens the offenders sentenced to community service and forwards them to the appropriate organizations for interviewing. Organizational supervisors do not need to be concerned with recruitment methods and sources for potential workers as in traditional volunteer programs. Although in the initial stages of a program referrals to the participating agencies may be sporadic, the supply of volunteers generally becomes relatively constant after the program is actively functioning.

An added benefit to organizations using restitution volunteers is the location of an additional source for recruitment of traditional volunteers. Restitution volunteers who have had positive experiences in their community service work may be interested in contributing additional time after their sentences have been completed. Participating organizations in the Alameda County, California and Travis County, Texas programs have reported that a significant number of restitution volunteers have expressed interest in contributing additional time at a later date and some have actually continued to work without interruption of their schedules after sentence completion. Harris County, Texas has had an extremely effective continuation rate with thirty percent electing to donate additional time.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the use of community service restitution volunteers in municipal government is not a perfect solution to the increasing financial problems involved in service provision. However, it is an alternative that should be explored by all departments because of its proven effectiveness in partially alleviating the critical need for additional employees. As demonstrated in the previously described functioning programs and in the interviews with an executive director of a program, supervisors in participating agencies and probation department officials, agencies throughout the country are successfully utilizing community service restitution volunteers to assist, either directly or in support functions, with their service delivery. Departments that have refused to consider recruiting and using traditional volunteers because of their generally assumed inherent limitations should examine the advantages associated with restitution use. Education of the departmental staff concerning the purposes of community service restitution, the difference between probation and parole, and the misconception of the stereotypical offender image; tailoring of assignments that require the repeated attention of one individual to the average sentence length; and use of a contractual agreement to facilitate termination of unsatisfactory volunteers should eliminate the majority of the problems that could

occur with restitution worker usage. Community service restitution programs provide a source of labor that cannot reasonably be overlooked by any municipal department.

END NOTES

1

"A Vision of Voluntarism," Time, 19 October 1981, p. 47.

2

Kerry Ken Allen, "Volunteering in America; A Status Report, 1981-82," Voluntary Action Leadership, Winter 1982, p. 18.

3

Burt Galaway, ed. and Joe Hudson, Offender Restitution In Theory and Action (Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath & Co., 1978), p. 1.

A

Anthony Cain, **comp.**, Restitution; A Selected Bibliography (Washington, D. C.: National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice; 1979), p. v.

5

Dennie Briggs, In Place of Prison (London: Temple Smith, 1975), p. 84.

6

James Beha, Kenneth Carlson and Robert H. Rosenblum, Sentencing To Community Service (Washington, D. C.: National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, 1977), p. 16.

7

Dennie Briggs, In Place of Prison (London: Temple Smith, 1975), p. 85.

8

James Beha, Kenneth Carlson and Robert H. Rosenblum, Sentencing To Community Service (Washington, D. C.: National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, 1977), pp. 17-20.

9

Ibid., pp. 21-22.

10

Julie M Jones, "Court-Referred Volunteers Increase," Voluntary Action Leadership, Fall 1981, p. 6.

11

James Beha, Kenneth Carlson and Robert H. Rosenblum, Sentencing To Community Service (Washington, D. C.: National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, 1977), pp. 7-8.

12

Ibid., p. 11.

13

Julie M. Jones, "Court-Referred Volunteers Increase," Voluntary Action Leadership, Fall 1981, p. 5.

14

James Beha, Kenneth Carlson and Robert H. Rosenblum, Sentencing To Community Service (Washington, D. C.: National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, 1977), p. 10.

15

Burt Galaway, ed. and Joe Hudson, Offender Restitution In Theory and Action (Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath & Co., 1978), pp. 151-153.

16

Ibid., p. 155.

17

James Beha, Kenneth Carlson and Robert H. Rosenblum, Sentencing To Community Service (Washington, D. C.: National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, 1977), p. 12.

18

Louis P. Carney, Corrections and the Community (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1977), pp. 72-74.

19

James Beha, Kenneth Carlson and Robert H. Rosenblum, Sentencing To Community Service (Washington, D. C.: National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, 1977), p. 13.

20

Louis P. Carney, Corrections and the Community (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1977), p. 72.

21

James Beha, Kenneth Carlson and Robert H. Rosenblum, Sentencing To Community Service (Washington, D. C.: National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, 1977), p. 13.

22

Burt Galaway, ed. and Joe Hudson, Offender Restitution In Theory and Action (Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath & Co., 1978), pp. 161-166.

23

Telephone interview with Jim Donahue, 22 April 1982.

24

"Community Service Restitution; A Sentencing Alternative," Texas Journal of Corrections, November/December 1980, pp. 17-18.

25

Giles Garmon et al., Letter, n.d.

26

Telephone interview with Jim Donahue, 22 April 1982.

27

Interview with Gene Oakes, Austin Public Library, Austin, Texas, 2 March 1982.

28

Telephone interview with James Rodgers, 25 March 1982.

29

Telephone interview with Wendy Biro, 20 February 1982.

30

Interview with Stephanie Allen, Austin Public Library, Austin, Texas, 5 February 1982.

31

"Community Service Restitution; A Sentencing Alternative," Texas Journal of Corrections, November/December 1980, pp. 17-18.

32

Telephone interview with Gene Gundersen, 11 May 1982.

33

Gene Hayes and Carl McDaniels, "The Leisure Pursuit of Volunteering," Parks & Recreation, September 1980, p. 56.

34

Joseph H. Holmwood, "Xettering, Ohio: Where Volunteers Make the Difference," Parks & Recreation, September 1980, pp. 59-60.

35

"How Americans Solve Problems On Their Own," U. S. News & World Report, 28 December 1981/2 January 1982, p. 49.

36

"California Parks Need You," Sunset, July 1981, pp. 32-33.

37

Jay S. Shivers and Joseph W. Halper, The Crisis in Urban Recreational Services (Rutherford, N. J.: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1981), pp. 12-13.

38

"Chicago Gets Volunteer Chief To Coordinate New Program," Library Journal 104 (15 May 1979): 1100.

39

"Volunteers in Libraries are Winning Plaudits," Library Journal 104 (15 October 1979): 2154.

40

William W. Sannwald and Catherine W. Hofmann, "Volunteers in Ventura County," Library Journal 107 (15 March 1980): 342.

41

"Volunteers Assist Staffers, Run Area Libraries," Library Journal (1 February 1979): 341.

42

"Volunteers Man Maryland Library," Library Journal 104 (1 February 1979): 342.

43

"Volunteers in Libraries are Winning Plaudits," Library Journal 104 (15 October 1979): 2154.

44

"Columbus Volunteer Army Gives 16,000 Hours," Library Journal 105 (15 May 1980): 1126.

45

"Metropolitan Library System of Oklahoma City," LJ/SLJ Hotline, 16 November 1981, p. 3.

46

Connie Wright, "Residents Pitch In To Expand Services Provided By Cities," Nation's Cities Weekly, 1 February 1982, p. 7.

47

City of Austin, "Volunteer Services Survey," 18 February 1982.

48

Metropolitan Regional Council, Voluntary Action In Urban Communities (New York: Metropolitan Regional Council, 1970). p. 8.

49

Xerry Ken Allen, "Volunteering in America; A Status Report, 1981-82," Voluntary Action Leadership, Winter 1982, p. 29.

50

"After Proposition 13, Volunteers Needed," Time, 7 August 1978, p. 34.

51

Xerry Ken Allen, "Volunteering in America; A Status Report, 1981-82," Voluntary Action Leadership, Winter 1982, p. 20.

52 "After Proposition 13, Volunteers Needed," Time, 7 August 1978, p. 34.

53 Connie Wright, "Residents Pitch In To Expand Services Provided By Cities," Nation's Cities Weekly, 1 February 1982, p. 7.

54 Sylvia Lamont, "Library Scabs," Library Journal 107 (1 May 1982): 836.

55 Kerry Ken Allen, "Volunteering in America; A Status Report, 1981-82," Voluntary Action Leadership, Winter 1982, p. 31.

56 Harriet H. Naylor, Volunteers Today - Finding, Training and Working With Them (New York: Association Press, 1967), p. 13.

57 William W. Sannwald and Catherine N. Hofmann, "Volunteers in Ventura County," Library Journal 107 (15 March 1980): 682.

58 Ibid.

59 Metropolitan Regional Council, Voluntary Action In Urban Communities (New York: Metropolitan Regional Council, 1970), p. 38.

APPENDIX

SAMPLE CONTRACTS

District Court of Oregon For Multnomah County
1021 s. w. 4th Avenue Room 154
Portland, Oregon 97204
248-5191

District Court of Oregon For Multnomah County

ALTERNATIVE COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAM AGREEMENT

After being advised by the court of the Alternative Community Service Program, I voluntarily agree to perform _____ hours of unpaid community service for a non-profit agency. I agree to abide by the following conditions of the program:

1. A schedule will be arranged for me that is agreeable with me and with the agency. This schedule will enable me to complete the work program prior to the assigned "due date" (_____). This schedule can only be altered with permission of the District Court Program coordinator or the non-profit agency supervisor. Failure to comply with this schedule, i.e., no show or tardiness, will result in termination of the assignment.
2. Should my contribution of services be unsatisfactory or be performed with an uncooperative attitude, as assessed by the agency representative or the District Court Program Coordinator, the assignment will be terminated.
3. I understand that should I experience any difficulties or problems in performing the volunteer services to the assigned non-profit agency, I am to contact the District Court Program Coordinator for resolution of the problem.
4. Additional Conditions:

I have read, or had read to me, the conditions under which I will be assigned an agency through the District Court Alternative Community Service Program and the conditions under which this assignment will be continued. I fully understand that my failure to comply with the above conditions will result in the termination of this assignment and the referral of this case back to the sentencing judge for appropriate disposition.

Signature of the Assignee _____

Witness and Title _____ Date _____

JUDICIAL DISTRICT ADULT PROBATION DEPARTMENT
FOR TRAVIS COUNTY
P. O. Box 1748
Austin, Texas 78767

COMMUNITY SERVICE RESTITUTION PROGRAM

CONTRACTUAL AGREEMENT

This agreement, made and entered into this _____ day of _____, 198____ by and between the Community Service Restitution Program, a program of the Judicial District Adult Probation Department for Travis County hereinafter called "CSR" and

hereinafter called "Agency".

I. PURPOSE:

This agreement provides the basis under which "CSR" and the "Agency" may carry out their inter-related activities. The ultimate purpose of this agreement is to provide offenders the opportunity to repay a portion of his or her injury to society caused by the offense, by perform-useful work for a governmental or non-profit agency.

II. SERVICES:

The "Agency" agrees to provide work assignments as able, that can be completed by volunteers. The work required in the assignments should not include work that may pose a danger to the public, such as providing transportation in an automobile or other vehicle, and work that may endanger the volunteer, such as construction work or maintenance work that involves a significant risk of injury.

The "CSR" agrees to provide as able persons to complete the work assignments. The "CSR" agrees to provide a specific number of hours within a specific time frame to be completed by the CSR participant.

III. REFERRAL PROCESS:

The "Agency" will notify "CSR" of work assignments that are available, provide a description of the work assignment, the name, and telephone number of the contact person. This will be accomplished by placing a telephone call to Ms. Judy McCown at 478-4671. Ms. Judy McCown will publish a weekly list of work assignments available and a description of the work assignment to be distributed to Probation Officers. Probation Officers having a CSR participant to assign to a work assignment will contact Ms Judy McCown at 478-4671 to secure the contact persons name and telephone number. The Probation Officer will telephone the contact person to arrange an appointment time for the "Agency" Representative and the "CSR" participant will be given

(1)An amendment to the Conditions of Probation and acknowledgment

of CSR Placement document; (2) verified appointment; (3) a self-addressed envelope, to provide to the "Agency".

Upon completion of the interview the "Agency" Representative will notify the Probation Officer listed on the Verified Appointment if the "CSR" participant is acceptable or non-acceptable by telephone. If acceptable the "Agency" will sign the Amendment to the conditions of Probation and an Acknowledgment of CSR Placement legal size form and return via U. S. Mail to the Probation Officer listed on the Verified Appointment in the envelope provided. If unacceptable, the "Agency" **will not sign** the Amendment to the Conditions of Probation and an Acknowledgment of CSR Placement legal size form and return via U. S. Mail to the Probation Officer listed on the Verified Appointment in the envelope provided.

When the "Agency" notifies the Probation Officer by telephone that the "CSR" participant is acceptable the Probation Officer will telephone Ms. Judy McCown at 478-4671 to advise that the work assignment has been taken.

The Probation Officer will notify the "CSR" participant of acceptability and provide to the "CSR" participant a Community Service Restitution Identification Card.

When the Probation Officer receives the signed Amendment to the Conditions of Probation and an Acknowledgment of CSR Placement from the "Agency" the Probation Officer will send the Agency representative as indicated by the signed form the Agency Reply Card via U. S. Mail.

IV. PROGRESS AND/OR EVALUATION REPORTS:

If for any reason there is a concern over the performance or non-performance of the CSR participant the "Agency" will contact the Probation Officer as identified by the Amendment to the Conditions of Probation and an Acknowledgment of CSR Placement or as identified by the verified appointment.

An "Agency" representative will initial the CSR participant's Community Service Restitution Identification Card at the completion of each day that work has been completed.

V. TERMINATION

The "Agency" agrees not to terminate a CSR Participant prior to completion of the specified hours unless such action is made known to the Probation Officer identified by the Verified Appointment and/or the Amendment to the Conditions of Probation and An Acknowledgement of CSR Placement via telephone.

Either Party, "Agency" or "CSR", may terminate this contract by giving written notice of the intent to terminate to the other party. Recession, Amendment or re-negotiation of this Contractual Agreement is possible if the cooperating parties mutually consent to such.

"CSR" Representative

"Agency" Representative

TRAVIS COUNTY
COMMUNITY SERVICE RESTITUTION PROGRAM

An Amendment to the Conditions of Probation
and
An Acknowledgment of CSR Placement

Name _____ Cause Number _____

Court _____

The Travis County Community Service Restitution Program is a cooperative undertaking between the Travis County Courts-At-Law/District Courts and the Travis County Adult Probation Department and various governmental and private, not-for-profit, service agencies in Travis County. The purpose of the program is to assist persons convicted of misdemeanor/felony offenses in their efforts to rehabilitate themselves and to pay their debts to society by providing useful service to the community.

You must understand that you may or may not AGREE to perform community service as a VOLUNTEER. If you choose not to accept this alternative and prefer the court to dispose of your case by more conventional methods, you should indicate so now. You should not undertake to perform a service by voluntary agreement which you do not intend to perform or which you have reason to believe you cannot perform.

The following conditions shall govern your participation in the Travis County Community Service Restitution Program:

1. Completion of _____ hours of community service at a court approved agency to be selected by the coordinator of the program and which must be performed by the date determined by said coordinator.
2. Satisfactory performance of such service will be determined by the resource agency and the coordinator. Unsatisfactory performance will constitute a basis to terminate your status as a Community Service volunteer and result in referring your case to the sentencing court for further disposition. If determination is made by the coordinator that the agency referral is unsuitable for reasons of your physical inability to perform or the agency's lack of available work, reassignment through the coordinator may be arranged.
3. Participation as a community service volunteer does not bestow any status on you as a Travis County employee, nor does it entitle you to claim any benefits of the State Worker's Compensation Law through Travis County. When you are referred to a particular agency to perform service, you are not an agent or employee of Travis County. The latter has no responsibility for claims arising from your participation as a volunteer in this program.

AGENCY _____ PHONE NUMBER _____
 CONTACT PERSON _____ TYPE OF ASSIGNMENT _____
 PROBATION OFFICER _____ PHONE NUMBER _____
 DEADLINE FOR COMPLETION _____ DEFENDANT AGRRES TO COMPLETE _____
 HOURS.

I have read or had read to me the foregoing conditions and requirements imposed upon my volunteer community service and I fully understand and accept them. I do acknowledge that failure to comply faithfully with the conditions may cause my program to be terminated. I further acknowledge that I will be required to appear before the sentencing judge for further proceedings which may include imprisonment, fine, or such other disposition the judge may impose.

 Signature of Probationer

WITNESSED AND APPROVED:

 Community Service Restitution Officer

 Date

 Supervisor, Participating Agency

 Date

 Presiding Judge

SOURCES CONSULTED

Articles

- "After Proposition 13, Volunteers Needed." Time, 7 August 1978, pp. 34-37.
- Allen, Kerry Kenn. "Volunteering in America; A Status Report, 1981-82." Voluntary Action Leadership, Winter, 1982, pp. 17-32.
- "Business Volunteers: A Boon To Government." Management, June 1976, pp. 47-48.
- "California Parks Need You." Sunset, July 1981, pp. 32-33.
- "Chicago Gets Volunteer Chief To Coordinate New Program." Library Journal 104 (15 May 1979): 1100.
- "Columbus Volunteer Army Gives 16,000 Hours." Library Journal 105 (15 May 1980): 1126.
- "Community Service Restitution; A Sentencing Alternative." Texas Journal of Corrections (November/December 1980): 16-19, 29.
- Gates, Mary M. "The Changing Role of Women in Voluntarism." Vital Speeches of the Day 47 (1 May 1981): 436-439.
- Goodrich, Terry. "Paying in the Street." Austin-American Statesman, 14 March 1982, p. B5.
- Hanley, John W. "Voluntarism in America: A Realistic Look Ahead." Vital Speeches of the Day 43 (1 August 1977): 634-637.
- Hayes, Gene and McDaniels, Carl. "The Leisure Pursuit of Volunteering." Parks & Recreation, September 1980, pp. 54-57.
- Henderson, Karla A. "Programming Volunteerism for Happier Volunteers." Parks & Recreation, September 1980, pp. 61-64.
- _____. "Why Do People Volunteer?" Parks & Recreation, February 1982, pp. 16-17.
- Hesburgh, Theodore M. "Reflections on Voluntarism in America: Regulations Must Promote the Common Goal." Vital Speeches of the Day 66 (1 June 1980): 484-487.
- Holmwood, Joseph H. "Kettering, Ohio: Where Volunteers Make the Difference." Parks & Recreation, September 1980, pp. 58-60.

Articles (cont.)

- "How Americans Solve Problems On Their Own." U. S. News & World Report , 28 December 1981/4 January 1982, pp. 49-50.
- Jones, Julie M. "Court-Referred Volunteers Increase." Voluntary Action Leadership, Fall 1981, pp. 5-6.
- Lamont, Sylvia. "Library Scabs." Library Journal 107 (1 May 1982): 836.
- "Metropolitan Library System of Oklahoma City." LJ/SLJ Hotline, 16 November 1981, p. 3.
- "National Center for Voluntary Action Operates Clearinghouse." Aging, September-October 1977, p. 22.
- "Over 40 Million Hours of Service Given by seniors." Aging, July-August 1978, p. 20.
- Pittman, Craig. "Escambia May Boost Cost of Driving Drunk." The Pensacola Journal, 18 August 1982, p. 1C.
- Rutter, Laurence. "Strategies for the Essential Community: Local Government in the Year 2000." The Futurist, June 1981, pp. 19-28.
- Sannwald, William W. and Hofmann, Catherine N. "Volunteers in Ventura County." Library Journal 107 (15 March 1980): 681-682.
- Stokes, Bruce and Allen, Kerry Ken. "Volunteers: Two Views." Nation's Cities Weekly, 1 February 1982, pp. 5-6.
- "A Vision of Voluntarism." Time, 19 October 1981, pp. 47-48.
- "Volunteers Assist Staffers, Run Area Libraries." Library Journal 104 (1 February 1979): 341.
- "Volunteers in Libraries are Winning Plaudits." Library Journal 104 (15 October 1979): 2154-2155.
- "Volunteers in Libraries: Reports from All Over." Library Journal 107 (1 January 1982): 20-21.
- "Volunteers Man Maryland Library." Library Journal 104 (1 February 1979): 342.
- Wright, Connie. "Residents Pitch In To **Expand** Services Provided By Cities." Nation's Cities Weekly, 1 February 1982, pp. 5-7.

Books

- Beha, James; Carlson, Kenneth; and Rosenblum, Robert H. Sentencing To Community Service. Washington, D. C.: National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, 1977.

Books (cont.)

Briggs, Dennie. In Place of Prison. London: Temple Smith, 1975.

Cain, Anthony, comp. Restitution; A Selected Bibliography. Washington, D. C.: National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, 1979.

Carney, Louis P. Corrections and the Community. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1977.

Corrections in the Community: Success Models in Correctional Reform. Reston, Va.: Reston Publishing Co., 1977.

Flanagan, Joan. The Successful Volunteer Organization. Chicago: Contemporary Books, 1981.

Galaway, Burt, ed. and Hudson, Joe. Offender Restitution In Theory and Action. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath & Co., 1978.

Gittell, Marilyn. Limits To Citizen Participation. Beverly Hills, Ca.: Sage publications, 1980.

Hudson, Joe and Galaway, Burt, eds. Victims, Offenders and Alternative Solutions. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath & Co., 1980.

Metropolitan Regional Council. Voluntary Action In Urban Communities. New York: Metropolitan Regional Council, 1970.

Naylor, Harriet H. Volunteers Today - Finding, Training and Working With Them. New York: Association Press, 1967.

O'Connell, Brian. Effective Leadership In Voluntary Organizations. Chicago: Follett Publishing Co., 1976.

Pell, Arthur R. Recruiting, Training and Motivating Volunteer Workers. New York: **Pilot Industries, 1972.**

Routh, Thomas A. The Volunteer and Community Agencies. Springfield, I . : Charles C. Thomas, 1972.

Sandhu, Harjit S. Community Corrections: New Horizons. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1981.

Schindler-Rainman, Eva and Lippitt, Ronald. The Volunteer Community: Creative Use of Human Resources. Washington, D. C. : Center for a Voluntary Society, 1971.

Shivers, Jay S. and Halper, Joseph W. The Crisis in Urban Recreational Services. Rutherford: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1981.

Wilson, Marlene. The Effective Management of Volunteer Programs. Boulder, Co: **Volunteer Management Associates, 1976.**

Interviews

Allen, Stephanie. Volunteer Coordinator, Austin Public Library. Interview, 5 February 1982.

Biro, Wendy. Volunteer Coordinator, Community Health Volunteer Program, Austin-Travis County Health Department. Interview, 20 February 1982.

Donahue, Jim. Travis County Adult Probation Department. Telephone interview, 22 April 1982.

Gundersen, Gene. Executive Director, Community Service Option Program, Houston. Telephone interview, 11 May 1982.

Oakes, Gene. Adult Probation Officer, Travis County. Interview, 2 March 1982.

Rodgers, James. Zilker Park Manager, Austin Department of Parks and Recreation. Telephone interview, 25 March 1982.

Unpublished Materials

City of Austin. "Volunteer Services Survey." 18 February 1982.

Garmon, Giles; Henderson, G.; Jones, B; Williams, M. P. and Wisser, J. Letter.

Judicial District Adult Probation Department for Travis County. "Community Service Restitution Program. Contractual Agreement. "

Travis County Community Service Restitution Program. "**An** Amendment to the Conditions of Probation and **An** Acknowledgement of CSR Placement. "