

402

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

Kenneth L. Hardy
Director

FINAL REPORT (year 1)

to

National Institute of
Law Enforcement and
Criminal Justice

on

NI-70-021

THE EX-OFFENDER AS
PAROLE OFFICER

August 1971

NCJ-000538

CONTENTS

HIGHLIGHTS	i
INTRODUCTION	1
RESEARCH PLAN AND IMPLEMENTATION	3
Attitude Data	3
Performance Data	4
Other Data	4
PAROLEE PERFORMANCE	5
Arrest Records	5
Warrant Requests	6
INTERVIEWS WITH PAROLE OFFICERS	7
SECOND INTERVIEWS WITH PAROLEES	13
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	16

HIGHLIGHTS

The Ex-Offender as Parole Officer Project, funded by the National Institute for Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, was designed to determine the capabilities of ex-offenders as parole officers. The project began August 3, 1970.

One-hundred parolees were randomly assigned to the experiment, fifty to the D. C. Parole Office and 50 to Bonabond, Inc., an ex-offender organization. The project is not a tightly controlled experiment, however both groups had a budget of \$1.30 per day per parolee and were responsible for enforcing Parole Regulations and reporting violations to the D. C. Parole Board.

Measures of the effectiveness of the project included a survey of parole performance, and interviews with the parole officers and parolees.

During the project year the same number of control and experimental subjects were arrested by the District of Columbia Police. Bonabond parole supervisors requested 12 warrants compared to 21 requested by the D.C. parole officers. Warrants were requested primarily for new arrests and "whereabouts unknown." Two Bonabond parolees were revoked and 7 D. C. parolees were revoked.

Interviews with the Parole Officers indicated the D. C. Parole Officers generally felt there should be a distance between parole officer and parolee to maintain a proper relationship.

In ranking characteristics of parole officers many of the D. C. Parole Officers ranked understanding the feelings of others and ability to make objective decisions as the most important characteristics. Bonabond supervisors indicated that administrative facets of parole supervision were important.

Analysis of the interviews with parolees, both experimentals and controls, indicated very little difference in responses between groups.

The results reported here show the Bonabond group had fewer revocations than the D. C. Department of Corrections group. This would seem to indicate the effectiveness of ex-offenders as rehabilitating and cost-reducing factors in the correctional system.

INTRODUCTION

The Ex-Offender-as-Parole-Officer Project, funded by the National Institute for Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, began August 3, 1970. The purpose of the project was to determine whether ex-offenders could supervise parolees as well as professional parole officers. The project had an experimental design, in which a pool of 100 recently-released or soon to be released parolees were randomly assigned half to regular parole supervision, and half to supervision by an organization of ex-offenders, Bonabond, Inc.

Bonabond was established five years ago to provide surety bonds to men coming out of prison who had difficulty finding work because they were not bondable under existing circumstances. Since its inception, Bonabond has also performed such services for the criminal justice system as operating a counseling program for narcotic addicts, and working with the courts on recommendations for probation. For the Ex-Offender Project, Bonabond hired one new ex-offender from Washington and switched another New Jersey ex-offender from other duties in the organization. They were released in 1963 and 1968, respectively.

The two bonabond parole "supervisors" as they are called, are not the first ex-convicts to have the full responsibility of parole officers. Other states have used ex-offenders to

carry out some or all of the duties of parole officer, and plan to continue practice.

From the start, the design of the project was recognized as inadequate for its task. Far from testing the effect that having been a convicted offender has on one's supervisees, the project in fact compared Bonabond and the Parole Division of the Department of Corrections. The differences between these two groups are several; namely

BONABOND

DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS

Parole supervisors are ex-offenders

Parole officers not ex-offenders (with one exception).

Caseload size 25.

Caseload size 55-60

No prior supervisory experience.

Much prior supervisory experience.

Supervisory techniques innovative, perforce.

Supervisory techniques routinized.

Project success highly important to parole supervisors and Bonabond.

Project parolees treated same as other in caseload.

Although the differences between the two groups were great enough to make uncertain the causes of any performance difference that might appear, there were similar constraints on the groups to be noted, as follows:

- both groups had a budget of \$1.30 per day per parolee
- both groups were responsible for enforcing the 14 Parole Regulations and reporting violations to the D.C. Parole Board.

The research plan was to follow the community performance of the project subjects and examine the attitudes of parolees and parole officers toward the parole process and each other. In addition, background data were gathered on the subjects to ascertain that the assignment of parolees to the experimental and control groups was random. The plan is described in more detail below.

RESEARCH PLAN AND IMPLEMENTATION

The research plan set forth in the proposal for funding of the project included two sets of parolee interviews--at the beginning and at the end of the project year. These interviews were to be accompanied by a battery of attitudinal and personality measures. Insofar as possible the original plan was adhered to, but some parts of the plan were eliminated because they were impractical or the necessary forms were unavailable.

The modified plan was as follows:

Attitude Data

1. First Interview with Parolees (form included in August 1970 Quarterly Report), accompanied by Adjective Check List--Actual Self and Ideal Self--and Mylonas Law Scale.
2. Second Interview with Parolees (Appendix A), accompanied by Mylonas Law Scale and list of 10 characteristics of parole officers, to be ranked in order of importance.

3. Interview with Parole Officer (Appendix B) accompanied by list of 10 characteristics of parole officers (Appendix C) to be ranked in order of importance.

Performance Data

4. Metropolitan Police Department arrest records.
5. Record of Warrant Requests and their disposition.
6. FBI Criminal Career follow-up.

Other Data

7. Background data on subjects for profile and to ascertain randomization.

Implementation of the modified plan was complete, except with regard to the parolee interviews, which were arranged through the parole officers and held at night for the convenience of the parolees. Approximately two-thirds of the subjects appeared for the first interview, but less than half appeared for the second, although those who were interviewed received \$3.00 for their time and effort. The second round of interviewing covered a shorter span of time than the first.

PAROLEE PERFORMANCE

The ultimate goal of this is to improve correctional practices. Because the generally accepted standard of improvement is reduced recidivism rates, subject performance data will be discussed first.*

The data provided by FBI records proved to be the least useful. Responses were received on only 63 out of 115 requests for follow-up data submitted to the Criminal Careers data bank. According to the records, none of the 63 had been arrested during the project year. One of these men had, in fact, been arrested and convicted for bank robbery in Virginia. Two other sources of data were used: arrests by the Metropolitan Police Department, and warrant requests by parole officers.

Arrest Records: During the project year the same number of control and experimental subjects were arrested by the District of Columbia police -- 14 from

* The first 100 subjects were comparable on three demographic variables:

	BONABOND	D. C.
Average yr. of birth	1938	1936
Average Age 1st arrest	19	19
Average number of adult felony commitments	2	2

each group. The distribution of arrestees between the original 50 parolees and the first 9 replacement parolees for each group is shown below.

Subjects Arrested by MPD

	BONABOND	DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS
Original 50	9	13
Replacement 9	5	1

The striking differences in the number of replacement parolees arrested suggests that there was a difference between the replacement parolees supervised by Bonabond and those supervised by the Department of Corrections. The available demographic data did not explain the differences in arrest rates.*

Warrant Requests: By the end of the first project year, 33 warrants had been requested. Thirty-one were issued. Although many of these warrants were still in process, nine parolees had been revoked, as follows.

*The average year of birth of the Bonabond replacements was 1929; the average year of birth of the D.C. parolees 1939, presumably making the D. C. parolees greater arrest risks. The average age at first arrest was 17 years for Bonabond replacements and 18 for D. C. replacements. The average number of adult felony commitments was 3 for the Bonabond replacement group and 2 for the D.C. replacement group, a difference that is not surprising in view of their relative youth. Five Bonabond replacements and four from D.C. were known to have drug problems. There is, therefore, no immediate explanation for the great difference in arrest rates of the two sets of replacement parolees.

	Warrants Requested	Warrants Issued	Parolees Revoked
Bonabond (n=59)	12	11	2 (3%)
D. C. (n=64)	21	20	7 (11%)

The reasons for requesting warrants varied somewhat between D. C. parole officers, although the majority included a new arrest as one reason. Most other warrants were issued for "whereabouts unknown" as shown below:

	<u>Grounds for Warrant Requests</u>		
	New Arrest	Whereabouts Unknown	Other Technical
Bonabond (n=12)	9 (75%)	3 (25%)	--
D. C. (n=21)	12 (57%)	7 (33%)	2 (10%)

INTERVIEWS WITH PAROLE OFFICERS

The parole officers were interviewed for information on their backgrounds, how they defined parole and their role in it, and their judgment concerning their project parolees successful completion of parole. (Interview form in Appendix B). All 21 parole officers who worked for the Department of Corrections during the project year had at least one project parolee. All were interviewed, except for one who resigned early in the year,

one who began work late in the year, and one who refused to be interviewed. The two Bonabond parole supervisors were also interviewed.

The 18 D. C. parole officers were highly trained -- two having been in their present jobs over 10 years at the start of the project. The others had worked 3 years or less as adult parole officers in D. C., and had experience in similar work elsewhere. The two Bonabond supervisors, on the other hand, were both new to supervision, although one had had some counseling experience. There was also one D.C. parole officer with an MSW who had been incarcerated as a youth in the D. C. Receiving Home, Cedar Knoll and the National Training School.

To find out whether the degree of professionalism of the parole officers affected their attitudes toward supervision, the parole officers were asked "How close do you think you should be to parolees?" and "Do your parolees know how to reach you at any time?" Three of the Department of Corrections' parole officers thought parole officers should be very close to parolees, but most responded that the parole officer should "establish a good rapport," "be friendly but firm," be "business-

like" and not "fraternize." These terms recurred very often.

One parole officer emphasized the importance of maintaining a "line" between parolee and parole officer and of keeping the parolee aware that he was not on the same plane as the parole officer. In contrast, another parole officer pointed out that a parolee is most likely to run into trouble in social situations during evenings and weekends. This officer believed that it would be desirable to be present in these social situations to give the parolees someone to emulate other than the associates they have had all their lives. As he pointed out, a parolee "can see that I can have what he wants and not go to Jail."

The Bonabond parole supervisors responded that the parole officer should be as close as possible to his parolees, and went on to explain that that included staying for dinner, having a drink or two with a parolee, and getting to know his family.

Responses to the question "Do your parolees know how to reach you at any time?" revealed great differences between the operation of the two groups of parole supervisors. Seven out of the 18 D. C. parole

officers interviewed said they could be reached only in the office. Some of these men explained why:

"We don't make a practice of giving them our home phone because I don't think people like to answer telephones to bother with problems that can wait till tomorrow."

"...many times I find that they have called in desperation when it's not as desperate as one might think. And then if anything does happen ... the next day is usually time enough ..."

The other parole officers were not clear about their accessibility, although two made a point of giving their home number to parolees with special problems. Three mentioned that their numbers were listed. A few officers mentioned that the Department of Corrections does not supply business cards to parole officers.

Both Bonabond supervisors said they could definitely be reached at any time and were available nights and weekends. In contrast to the D. C. parole officers, they did not appear to fear loss of objectivity, although they may have been aware of the possibility of losing perspective as familiarity increased. One said, "it should not be a brother and sister relationship."

Most of the parole officers, including both from Bonabond, felt that they could predict parolee success or failure with some degree of accuracy. Some emphasized that it was easier to predict failures than successes, creating the possibility of a self-fulfilling prophecy.* One parole officer pointed out another danger in making predictions:

"I don't try to prejudge a man, because it's pretty difficult, because if I do I'm judging him as what he was, and not as what he's capable of being."

The parole officers were asked to rank 10 characteristics of parole officers in order of importance (See Appendix C). Four of the D. C. parole officer rankings were done incorrectly and could not be tallied. Of the 14 rankings tallied, seven chose "Understands the feelings of others" as the most important characteristic. This characteristic was placed among the top three by 11 parole officers. Four put

*Most of the parolees who were revoked were revoked before their parole officers were interviewed, so it was not possible to see whether the parole officer would have predicted failure, except in one case, where he did not.

"Has ability to make objective decisions" in first place, and 11 named it among the top three. The next characteristics most often named in the top three choices were: "Is willing to support the Department's philosophy and policies"; and "Has ability to make decisions under pressure." The characteristic put in last place by six of the twelve responders was "Makes required number of contacts each month."

The two Bonabond parole supervisors showed no overlap in their choices of the three most important characteristics, although both agreed that making the required number of contacts should come last. One Bonabond supervisor put a willingness to support the Department's philosophy and policies first, relating well with colleagues second and understanding the feelings of others third. The other supervisor gave priority to meeting deadlines and maintaining forms, ability to make objective decisions and keeping up with new concepts in parole in that order. The emphasis placed on fitting into the organization -- supporting policies, meeting deadlines -- would seem to reflect concern with the administrative aspects of parole supervision.

SECOND INTERVIEWS WITH PAROLEES

Forty-five parolees appeared for the second interview, 32 from Bonabond and 13 from the Department of Corrections. The controls and experimentals agreed on the answers to several questions, and differed on the answers to others in ways that were interesting, but not statistically significant.

Every parolee interviewed thought he should be able to talk to his parole officer outside of working hours. This response is worth noting, considering the opposing views of many of the parole officers. Eight interviewees remembered times they had tried unsuccessfully to contact their parole officer. The three Bonabond parolees (9% of Bonabond respondents) with this experience had tried to reach their parole supervisor at home but the officers did not return their calls. Five D. C. parolees (39% of D. C. respondents) remembered unsuccessful attempts to reach their parole officers. None had the parole officer's home telephone number. Three of these men had tried unsuccessfully to reach their officers during working hours. One of these parolees had been arrested on a weekend and wished to secure bond.

Thirty out of 32 Bonabond parolees (94%) expressed confidence that they would successfully complete their parole term, and 9 (69%) of the D.C. parolees had expressed such confidence.

The parolees were asked "To what do you attribute your success thus far on parole?" About a third of each group credited other people with their success -- the parole officer being named 7 times by Bonabond parolees and twice by D. C. parolees. A higher percentage of the Bonabond parolees (38% vs. 17%) gave their own efforts as the reason for their success, substantiating the impression of greater self-confidence among Bonabond parolees. When asked to give a probable reason for failure on parole, Bonabond parolees expected to fail for lack of a job, whereas the D. C. parolees most often cited new criminal or drug involvement -- reasons not mentioned by Bonabond parolees.

Most of the parolees in both groups thought parole officers should make appointments for home and job visits, although many mentioned that they did not think parole officers should visit them on the job at all.

"Do you think a parole officer should make appointments for:

	Home Visits?"		Job Visits?"	
	Bonabond	D. C.	Bonabond	D. C.
Yes	22	10	18	6
No	10	3	7	4

As indicated in the tabulation below, the great majority of Bonabond parolees interviewed thought it would help a parole officer to have been in prison.

"Do you think it helps (would help) a parole officer to have been in prison?"

	Bonabond	D. C.
Yes	25 (81%)	6
Not necessary	5	5
Don't know	1	2

In the first interview 68% of the Bonabond interviewees and 56% of the D. C. interviewees said it would help a parole officer to have served time. As in the first round of interviews, the reason given most often for a positive response was that the parole officer would be more understanding. "If he's been there he knows what it takes to stay out." "He can understand the problems of a parolee much better." One parolee pointed out, however, that "It could work both ways, depending on how the parole officer has adjusted

himself, how honest he is with himself."

Both groups of parolees ranked "Understands the feelings of others" most often among the top three characteristics of parole officers. They also agreed that the ability to make decisions under pressure should be ranked near the top. The characteristics ranked third most often among the top three by Bonabond was "Can take and maintain a firm stand when necessary and appropriate." One could conjecture that they had come to appreciate the necessary toughness their supervisors showed on occasion. D. C. parolees named "Keeps up with new concepts in parole" with great frequency among the top three. The rankings showed great diversity, and are difficult to interpret.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Bonabond had two revocations compared to seven for the Department of Corrections. At the same time, the two groups had an equal number of parolees arrested in D. C. Thus, assuming equal treatment by the Parole Board, it would appear necessary to conclude that the

Bonabond parole officers can tolerate some behavior that would prompt a D. C. officer to request a warrant. This tolerance may be a function of case-load differences, differences in abilities or backgrounds, or a combination of both.

What is the effect of this higher level of tolerance by Bonabond? There seems to be no effect on new arrests. There is no reason to believe that arresting officers knew which parolees were in the project, and further, there is even less reason to believe that, had they known which of the project parolees were supervised by Bonabond, these parolees would have been accorded more lenient treatment.

There is an effect on cost to the criminal justice system. Bonabond receives the same amount per parolee as does the Department of Corrections. If both groups of parolees had had only two revocations, there would be five fewer people returned to Lorton Reformatory, an already overcrowded institution. There would be reduced costs in processing these men for return, reduced costs to their families in seeking new sources of support, reduced costs to their personalities in the bitterness that might have been avoided.

The two justifications for returning men to prison are the protection of society and the opportunity for treatment in prison. As for the first, warrant requests for five of the seven D.C. parolees revoked did not cite a new arrest as reason for the request. How dangerous, then, would it have been to leave these men in the community? As for the second justification, what is the likelihood that a man could receive more "treatment" in prison than on parole? It would appear that behind these two justifications lies a third important consideration: the amount of work a parole officer is willing, or is able to do with a difficult case.

What is there for a parole officer to gain by keeping his men out of prison? A difficult case may be replaced by a model parolee. There is little, if any, stigma attached to having one's parolees revoked. There is no bonus to win for exceptionally good performance, and very little chance of losing one's job for exceptionally bad performance as long as the rules are followed. All that can be won is pride in a job well done and perhaps a little gratitude.

What have the Bonabond parole supervisors to gain by continuing to work with difficult cases? They had much to gain in the first year of the project: a personal opportunity for the future, increased acceptance of ex-offenders by the "establishment," and more viability for Bonabond, Inc., in the future. They could also gain pride in a job well done, and perhaps the gratitude of some of their charges.

If the Bonabond parole supervisors in one or two more years begin to write warrant requests for the same reasons presently used by D.C. parole officers the new correctional costs generated by the parolees under this group will be equivalent to those generated by the parolees of the professionals. It would be to the advantage of the Department of Corrections to reduce these costs, but how? One possibility might be to contract for supervision with another ex-offender organization that wishes to "establish its credibility."

A second possibility might be to make it more worthwhile for parole officers to help their men stay on parole. This could be done by adopting the Work Unit system used in California. If every parole officer

had an equal number of work units, there would be nothing to gain by allowing a difficult parolee to return to prison, as he would be replaced by one expected to be equally difficult, or two or three less difficult parolees. Some sort of predictive system would have to be developed and tested in practice, perhaps using an instrument similar to the NILE-funded study of factors predictive of success on Work Release.*

Another step that might be taken is the typing of parolees and parole officers so that they might be matched to optimize the chances for successful parole. D. C. Parole Supervisors assign parolees intuitively to the parole officers in their Area who can be expected to work best with them. In addition, each Parole Area has one or two parole officers with caseloads of addicts only. These caseloads number only 35, versus the usual 60, and approach the use of the Work Unit principle in caseload assignment.

* Development of A Scoring System to Predict Success on Work Release, Fair, Isaac, Inc., and the Department of Corrections, D. C., January 1971.

The ideal parole arrangement might be one that combined the two innovations noted above with an incentive plan. Under this plan, the processing of recidivists by the Department of Corrections would be given some monetary value. Every parolee would also have a monetary value based on the predicted difficulty of his case (his base expectancy). The Parole Officer would then be assigned the task of keeping his men "on the street" while still assuring the protection of society. He could have as large a case-load as he wanted. At the end of every parolee's first successful year (or other specified term) under supervision, he would be discharged from parole, and his parole officer would be paid a portion of the amount set earlier, which was saved the Department by the parolee's failure to return.

Such a plan would not preclude contracting with outside organizations to further investigate the question of success-producing characteristics of parole officers. One question unanswered by the results of the first year of the Ex-Offender Project is "What sort of background produces effective parole officers?" Is professional training helpful, harmful,

or irrelevant? Tentatively, one might conclude that it is irrelevant. Time and time again, parolees said a parole officer should be "understanding." They did not unanimously recommend a prison term to create this understanding -- in fact, some parolees in both groups said they wouldn't recommend prison for anyone.

It is true that even toward the end of the project year the reports written by the ex-offender parole supervisors were considered inferior to those written by the D. C. officers, and the Parole Board occasionally had to request additional information. Still, it is probable that the D. C. officers learned the proper form for reports while on the job, under the tutelage of others senior to themselves. It may be possible, again, that professional experience is needed when caseloads are as large as 60. Questions of this sort should be answered, so that qualifications sought can be brought in line with qualities needed in good parole officers.

Some recommendations can thus be made for the operation of the Department of Corrections Parole Division:

1. That the Department of Corrections continue to contract for parole supervision with ex-offender and other organizations, and that the experimental design be maintained for studying contractors' performance.
2. That the Department of Corrections develop and test a prediction system to use in assigning parolees work unit values.
3. That the Department of Corrections develop a typology of parolees and parole officers to produce optimal matching.
4. That the Department of Corrections explore the possibility of providing incentives to parole officers for exceptionally good performance, that is, a high percentage of successful parolees, and that the definition of good performance and description of incentives be set down in writing, in a contract.
5. That the Department of Corrections actively encourage innovation in parole supervision practices, and emphasize the availability of training opportunities through the Department of Corrections.
6. That the Parole Division establish, as part of its policy the following rules: a) all parole

officers will give their home telephone numbers to parolees; b) job visits will be drastically reduced; if not eliminated as a supervisory technique, and c) until adequate "rapport" has been established, home visits will be made only by appointment.

Prepared by

Virginia A. McArthur

Interviewer _____ Interviewee _____

SECOND PAROLEE INTERVIEW--EX-OFFENDER PROJECT

We asked you to come in for a followup interview, like the one you had last Fall. From this interview we hope to find out some of the ideas you have about parole, now that you have been in the community for a year or so. Again, the answers to these questions are kept absolutely confidential. Only three or four people in the Planning and Research division have access to these answers. Please speak freely and say as much as you like. Your answers may help improve parole supervision practices in the Department of Corrections.

1. When did you go on parole (conditional release)? _____
2. Approximately how many times have you seen your parole officer in the past two months? _____
3. How often did you see him in the first two months you were on parole? _____
4. Where did you see him most often? _____
5. Do you think you should be able to talk to your parole officer outside of working hours? _____
6. Was there ever a time that you can remember that you wanted to get in touch with your parole officer, but couldn't _____
Why were you unable to reach him? _____

7. Has your parole officer been helpful to you, or could you have done as well on your own? _____

8. Is there any way in which your parole officer may have been harmful to your success in the community? _____

9. How could your parole officer have been more helpful to you than he was? _____

10. Which of the following most closely describes the way a parole officer is, in your opinion? I'll read four choices to you. A friend, a helper, a policemen, a counselor.

11. Which of them most closely describes the way a parole officer should be, to be a good parole officer? A friend, a helper, a policeman, a counselor.

12. If you were in a situation where it might appear that you were doing something wrong even if you weren't, would you explain it to your parole officer as soon as possible, or hope that he wouldn't hear about it? _____

13. During your time on parole, have there been times when you felt you almost messed up and had your parole revoked? _____

When was that? _____

How many times did you feel that way? _____

14. At such times, was your parole officer able to do anything to help you? _____

15. How confident do you feel now that you will make it to the end of your parole term without failing? _____

16. To what do you attribute your success thus far on parole? _____

17. If you were going to fail, do you think your parole officer would be likely to have anything to do with it? _____

18. What would probably be the reason for your failing, if you did? _____

19. How would you describe a good parole officer _____

20. How would a good parole officer act with his parolees? _____

21. How often should a good parole officer see his parolees? _____

22. Do you think a parole officer should make appointments for home visits? _____ job visits? _____

23. Did you know that Bonabond was supervising some parolees? _____ Do you think it helps (would help) a parole officer to have been in prison? _____

Why? _____

24. Do you think some of the men on parole should not have been granted parole? _____ In your opinion, is the Parole Board too lenient, too strict, or just right? _____

APPENDIX B

EX-OFFENDER PROJECT OFFICER INTERVIEW

(Give reason for interview: "To learn about your background before you became a parole officer, about your concept of parole, and about the parolees you have in the ex-offender project." Explain use of tape recorder: "To get complete answers and to assure that they are recorded accurately." Mention that no one outside of the Research Division will hear the recording.)

1. How long have you been in your present job?
2. What was your background, leading up to being a parole officer? -- your education, other jobs, experience with prisons and corrections generally?
3. Why did you decide to be a parole officer?
4. How would you describe the job of parole officer generally?
5. How close do you think you should be to parolees?
6. Do your parolees know how to reach you at any time?
7. Do they ever call to tell you something good that happens to them?
8. Can you usually predict whether someone is going to make it on parole?

Now I'd like to ask you a few questions about the parolees you have in the Bonabond project.

When is the last time you saw Mr. _____?

How much supervision does he require -- a lot, not much?

Where does he work?

Who does he live with?

Do you think he'll make it on parole?

Please explain why you think he'll make it (not make it).

Do you treat parolees in the Bonabond Project differently from your regular parolees?

APPENDIX C

CHARACTERISTICS OF PAROLE OFFICERS

Below are listed ten characteristics of parole officers. Rank them in order of importance for being a competent parole officer. Place a number 1 by the most important characteristic, a number 2 by the second most important characteristic, and so on down to number 10, which will be the least important characteristic.

RANK

CHARACTERISTIC

- | | | |
|-------|---|---|
| _____ | Relates well with colleagues and others in agency. | A |
| _____ | Understands the feelings of others. | B |
| _____ | Has ability to make decisions under pressure. | C |
| _____ | Keeps up with new concepts in parole. | D |
| _____ | Has ability to make objective decisions. | E |
| _____ | Meets deadlines and maintains all Department's records and forms as outlined. | F |
| _____ | Is willing to support the Department's philosophy and policies. | G |
| _____ | Can take and maintain a firm stand when necessary and appropriate. | H |
| _____ | Makes required number of contacts each month. | I |
| _____ | Knows and uses community resources. | J |

APPENDIX D

PROJECT FACTS AND FIGURES AS OF END OF FIRST PROJECT YEAR

	BONABOND	D.C.D.C.
Total number of parolees or parole plans assigned	59	64
Number of original 50 assignees never released to parole	4	4
Number of parolees who died	2	2
Number of parolees successfully completing parole	3	2
Number of warrants requested	12	21
Number of warrants not issued pending disposition of charge	0	3
Number of warrant requests withdrawn	1	2
Number of warrants not served to date	3	6
Number of parolees revoked	2	7
Number of parolees reinstated	2	2
Number of parolees reassigned to new parole officers during the year	1	23
Number of original 50 parolees on whom warrants were requested	6	20
Number of first 9 replacement parolees on whom warrants were requested	5	1