

Federal Probation

Implementing Community Service: The Referral

Process Probation Division,
Administrative Office
of the United States Courts

Strategies for Working With Special Needs

Probationers Ellen C. Wertlieb
Martin A. Greenberg

In Conventional Industries Adversely Impact

the Private Sector? Robert C. Grieser

of State Correctional Officials

Proceeding: Causes, Court Orders, and Solutions Fred Holbert
Jack E. Call

Information of Prison Guards:

Support Rehabilitation? Francis T. Cullen
Faith E. Lutze
Bruce G. Link
Nancy Travis Wolfe

NCJRS

MAY 15 1989

ACQUISITIONS

of Correctional Privatization:

in the 19th Century Experience and
for Modern Corrections Alexis M. Durham III

reformed' Reformatory:

A Sample of Failed Institutional Reform Beverly A. Smith

Prisoner Abuse Program: A Private

and Probationers and Prisons Kenneth F. Vito

in Juvenile Courts: A Case Study Rose R. Hargrave

117255
117263

MARCH 1989

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

117255-
117263

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this ~~copyrighted~~ material has been
granted by
Federal Probation

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

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

This Issue in Brief

Implementing Community Service: The Referral Process.—A community service sentence can serve many purposes—to deter, punish, or rehabilitate, while at the same time assuring that an offender receives a publicly discernable penalty. With increased interest in community service, many questions and issues have arisen regarding its use. This article, an excerpt from the monograph, *Community Service: A Guide for Sentencing and Implementation*, concentrates on the practical aspects of operating a community service program. Among the issues addressed are how to select appropriate agencies to receive community service; how to prepare the offender for community service; how to follow up after the offender is placed with an organization; and how to evaluate the success of a community service program. The information is especially directed to Federal probation officers but will also serve as a guide for other criminal justice and corrections professionals involved in sentencing and sentence implementation.

Strategies for Working With Special-Needs Probationers.—Authors Ellen C. Wertlieb and Martin A. Greenberg discuss the results of a survey of what alternatives to incarceration probation officers use with their disabled clients. Findings indicate a great deal of disparity regarding the approaches used within and across probation jurisdictions. All probation officers agreed, however, that they needed additional training to better serve their special-needs clients. The article concludes with some suggested strategies for improving service-delivery to probationers with disabilities.

Do Correctional Industries Adversely Impact the Private Sector?—Correctional industries have been the subject of much attention and often unfavorable publicity over the past several years. Complaints have gotten stronger in recent months as prison industries nationally are seeking to expand to keep pace with rapidly rising prison populations. Author Robert C. Grieser responds to those com-

plaints by addressing some of the numerous myths about prison industries that exist on the part of many in the private sector. The author also suggests ways in which the private sector and prison industries can work together to the benefit of both.

The Perspective of State Correctional Officials on Prison Overcrowding: Causes, Court Orders, and Solutions.—Overcrowding continues to be a major problem facing prison administrators

CONTENTS

Implementing Community Service: The Referral Process	Probation Division, Administrative Office of the United States Courts	117255
Strategies for Working with Special-Needs Probationers	Ellen C. Wertlieb Martin A. Greenberg	117256
Do Correctional Industries Adversely Impact the Private Sector?	Robert C. Grieser	117257
The Perspective of State Correctional Officials on Prison Overcrowding: Causes, Court Orders, and Solutions	Fred Holbert Jack E. Call	117257
The Correctional Orientation of Prison Guards: Do Officers Support Rehabilitation?	Francis T. Cullen Faith E. Lutze Bruce G. Link Nancy Travis Wolfe	117259
Rehabilitation and Correctional Privatization: Observations on the 19th Century Experience and Implications for Modern Corrections	Alexis M. Durham III	117260
Ireland's Ennis Inebriates' Reformatory: A 19th Century Example of Failed Institutional Reform	Beverly A. Smith	117261
The Kentucky Substance Abuse Program: A Private Program to Treat Probationers and Parolees	Gennaro F. Vito	117262
The Forgotten Few: Juvenile Female Offenders	Ilene R. Bergsmann	117263
Departments		
News of the Future		79
Looking at the Law		85
Reviews of Professional Periodicals		89
Your Bookshelf on Review		95
Letter to the Editor		105
It Has Come to Our Attention		106

in the United States. Authors Fred Holbert and Jack E. Call report on the results of a survey conducted in April 1987 to examine the overcrowding problem from the perspective of correctional administrators in the 50 states. Administrators were asked to indicate their opinions regarding the reasons for overcrowding, some solutions they were currently attempting, and some solutions they had used in the past to satisfy court orders. The findings suggest that state correctional administrators see the current "law and order" attitude of the public as strongly related to the current overcrowding problem. According to the authors, a variety of physical, personnel, policy, and legislative solutions are being used by state correctional administrators to respond to the overcrowding problem.

The Correctional Orientation of Prison Guards: Do Officers Support Rehabilitation?—

Although correctional officers have traditionally been portrayed as having custodial and punitive attitudes toward inmates, revisionist scholars have suggested that officers often embrace a human services view of their work. Based on a survey of officers from a southern correctional system, authors Francis T. Cullen, Faith E. Lutze, Bruce G. Link, and Nancy Travis Wolfe provide data on these competing assessments. The authors' analysis reveals that officers see maintaining order as an integral function of their work and harbor some negative attitudes toward inmates but that they also believe that rehabilitation is a salient part of their role and that prisons should do more than warehouse offenders. Multiple regression analysis indicates that role problems and working the night shift intensify commitment to custodial attitudes, while minority status and entering correctional work at an older age encourage support for rehabilitation.

Rehabilitation and Correctional Privatization: Observations on the 19th Century Experience and Implications for Modern Corrections.—During the past decade there has been an increasing amount of interest in the privatization of punishment. A variety of arguments have been adduced in support of this penal reform. Through an examination of the early experience of the State of New York, one of the most progressive 19th century states, author Alexis M. Durham III examines the claim that a privatized system will have an enhanced

ability to achieve rehabilitative objectives. Several important 19th century dilemmas are identified, and the implications of these problems for modern corrections are considered.

Ireland's Ennis Inebriates' Reformatory: A 19th Century Example of Failed Institutional Reform.—

In the late 19th century, one of the chronic problems facing Irish prison authorities was the habitual drunkard. As author Beverly A. Smith explains, the General Prisons Board (GPB) consistently called for some other means of dealing with the alcoholic recidivist than repeated, short-term imprisonments. As an answer to this problem, the government converted Ennis Prison into a state inebriates' reformatory under the GPB. Annual reports on Ennis showed the strains of competing with private reformatories, of running an institution different in form and purpose from prisons, and of dealing with a small, recalcitrant population. Ennis disappeared after World War I along with the late Victorian spirit of reform that had spawned it.

The Kentucky Substance Abuse Program: A Private Program to Treat Probationers and Parolees.—

On July 1, 1986, the Kentucky Corrections Cabinet established a contractual relationship with Kentucky Substance Abuse Programs Inc. (KSAP) to provide group counseling sessions for drug/alcohol abusing probationers and parolees in three areas of the state (Covington, Lexington, and Louisville). Author Gennaro F. Vito focuses upon the recidivism rates and other outcomes generated during the first year of KSAP operations.

The Forgotten Few: Juvenile Female Offenders.—

Juvenile female offenders often receive inappropriate attention from the juvenile justice system. Author Ilene R. Bergsmann describes the typical adolescent female and the differential treatment of females and males by police officers, judges, and correctional educators and administrators. While workforce changes in the 1990's point to the need for a highly skilled labor force, results of a national survey of correctional education in juvenile training schools show that females lack the necessary training in high wage occupations to compete. The author suggests the implementation of policy, standards, and an educational bill of rights to promote educational equity for all youthful female offenders.

Implementing Community Service: The Referral Process*

Probation Division, Administrative Office of the United States Courts

Introduction

IN THIS era of sentencing reform, where Congress has made explicit the purposes to be accomplished by sentences and judges are required to explain their reasons for a particular sentence, community service takes on a fresh importance as a flexible means to accomplish a variety of ends. The Sentencing Reform Act for the first time lists community service as a condition of probation and supervised release and further makes community service, a fine, or restitution a mandatory condition of probation for a felony. These provisions of the Sentencing Reform Act encourage the use of community service and recognize that community service can serve many purposes—to deter, punish, or rehabilitate and at the same time to assure that an offender will receive a publicly discernable penalty. A community service condition properly tailored and supervised has the flexibility to achieve a measure of each objective simultaneously. The United States Sentencing Commission in its guidelines recognizes the importance of community service by listing it among sentencing options available and has, at the same time, left the option fully flexible by not structuring its use.

With increased interest in community service, many questions and issues have arisen regarding its use. This article concentrates on the practical aspects of implementing community service. It is especially directed to Federal probation officers who supervise offenders performing community service and provides information regarding agency selection, preparation of the offender, placement procedures, followup, and evaluation.

Once community service—nonsalaried service by an offender for civic or nonprofit organizations—is ordered, the offender must be referred to a community agency for an appropriate work assignment. The referral process is just that, a process, consisting of agency selection, preparation of the offender, placement, followup, and evaluation. The elimination of

any of these critical steps in the process will lessen the likelihood of satisfactory community service performance.

Agency Selection

Agencies considered for community service should meet the following criteria:

- The organization must be nonprofit, tax exempt, and not primarily politically partisan. Nonprofit auxiliaries serving profit-making organizations may be considered on a case-by-case basis.
- The organization must not discriminate in the acceptance of volunteers in a client service on the basis of race, religion, age, or sex.
- The organization must serve valid community needs in an appropriate manner and must have a demonstrated ability to use volunteers effectively.
- If the organization is a membership organization, the primary purpose of the organization must not be to serve the economic or social needs of the members.
- The agency must have a "job description" for the work to be performed by each community service worker, and the performance of the job must not seriously jeopardize the safety or health of the offender or the community.
- The work performed by probationers for those agencies should not displace paid workers and should consist of duties and functions that would not have otherwise been performed without volunteer workers.

The officers selecting community service agencies will occasionally find nonprofit organizations in the community that, upon superficial review, appear to be appropriate placement sites but in practice prove to be unsatisfactory. Some agencies have no experience in dealing with volunteers, much less with offenders. Others may discriminate informally against individuals on the basis of race, religion, age, or sex. Some represent themselves as serving a valid com-

*This is an excerpt from Publication 108, *Community Service: A Guide for Sentencing and Implementation*.

munity need when in fact they do not. Some agencies express a willingness to accept community service workers as volunteers but then place them in positions where they are improperly utilized. Fortunately, problems such as these are typical of only a small percentage of agencies. However, when they do arise, the consequences can affect not only the offender and the community, but also the integrity and prestige of the court and the probation office. Adherence to the agency selection criteria listed above and a thorough assessment of the agency will eliminate many potential problems.

No referral should be made either directly to a placement agency or to a volunteer clearinghouse until the probation officer has conducted a site visit. Such a visit is necessary to:

- Clarify the expectations, requirements, and responsibilities of the agency, the court, and the offender;
- Identify the volunteer needs of the agency;
- Assess the agency's capability to supervise offenders; and
- Identify any potential problems that may arise.

In selecting placement sites, it should be noted that there are types of nonprofit agencies that may be inappropriate for placement or which should be used with caution. Nonprofit agencies engaging in political or other advocacy activities should not be used for community service. It is inappropriate to provide aid for partisan activities through court-ordered community service.

Religious organizations may provide worthwhile opportunities for community service. Churches often sponsor nonsectarian programs that benefit the needy. However, it would be inappropriate for probationers to perform ministerial functions or to support religious observance. A community service order which requires a probationer to become too closely involved with the activities of a particular religious organization could raise first amendment problems in that it may be viewed as an infringement on the probationer's religious freedom. In referring clients to such an organization, consideration should be given to whether the community service work would help only the organization itself or whether needy citizens served by the organization would also benefit. Thus, requiring probationers to work at a church fundraiser would be clearly inappropriate. On the other hand, a referral to a church-sponsored philanthropic program in which meals are delivered to underprivileged senior citizens, regardless of religious preference, would be acceptable.

Community service referrals to fraternal or social organizations would generally be inappropriate. While these frequently perform service of public benefit, the primary concern of such organizations is in meeting the social needs of their membership.

Many hospitals, convalescent homes, mental health facilities, and other board and care facilities are privately owned and profit-oriented. As a result, they often do not fit the criteria for placement.

Frequently, probationers will offer suggestions for their own placements. This typically presents no problem as long as the prospective agency meets the selection criteria and the probation officer determines that no relationship exists between the offender and the agency personnel which may conflict with the agency's ability to supervise the offender. Situations will occur, however, that technically meet the guidelines but still create conflict. For example, a man volunteered to keep score at his daughter's high school basketball games. He usually attended the games but did not take any official role. The officer decided that this was not a suitable community service placement, since the only person really being serviced would be the offender who would be able to attend the games while receiving credit for community service.

In another case, an offender was serving as the leader of a Boy Scout troop. Nothing indicated that he should not continue to do so. However, imposition of community service meant that he either would have to give up these duties in order to provide community service elsewhere or continue to serve as a Boy Scout leader, an otherwise appropriate community service assignment. The same situation might apply to a little league coach or to any other situation where a person is already serving as a volunteer. If such a placement is not approved for community service, the person may have to give up a position he has served well in order to do other community service. This leaves a Boy Scout troop without a leader or a little league team without a coach. The conflict occurs in that the person is already performing this service and is not being penalized by the imposition of the community service order.

In such cases, the officer must assess the situation considering the merits of the case and the sentencing objective of the court and exercise professional judgment in determining the suitability of the community service placement. If necessary, the matter may be referred to the court for resolution.

Agencies may be located through such sources as:

- volunteer clearinghouse publications;
- the Combined Federal Campaign's list of par-

- icipating agencies;
- state court referral agencies;
- the United Way's directory of participating agencies;
- the yellow pages telephone directory;
- personal contacts in the local area; and
- interviews with the offender.

How the probation office develops placement opportunities will vary with the situation in each district. In metropolitan areas with numerous community service cases, one or more officers may specialize in agency selection to maintain consistency within the district and minimize duplication of effort. In non-metropolitan areas, each officer may have to perform this function. Many communities have volunteer clearinghouses to assist in referring offenders to suitable organizations where community service can be performed. Some of these agencies may also provide orientation and followup.

In corporate community service cases where a complex task or project is required, involving the time of corporate staff, funds, or other resources, the court may wish to designate a community agency to coordinate and oversee the service. Such an agency can provide access to worthwhile projects to benefit the public welfare and act as a fiduciary if the management of funds and resources is necessary. In such cases, the probation officer may represent the court to ensure that the corporation and agency understand their roles and obligations in the project. It may be helpful to prepare a memorandum of agreement delineating responsibilities of each party to be signed by appropriate representatives and submitted to the court for approval.

Since such community service may constitute a valuable contribution to the community, more than one organization may wish to compete for designation as the recipient agency or beneficiary. In order to avoid claims of favoritism or conflict of interest, the court may wish to allow the corporation to select the agency or to request that a broad-based, public-benefit agency such as United Way make the selection. The court could also consider the appointment of an impartial board, comprised of a cross-section of community representatives, to select and oversee the project.

Preparing the Offender

As soon as possible following sentencing, an initial interview should be conducted to orient the probationer to community service and to identify the probationer's skills, interests, and abilities as well

as circumstances which may interfere with placement. Such circumstances may include lack of transportation, irregular work schedule, child care problems, or third party risk. The presentence report and judgment and commitment order should be reviewed prior to this interview for relevant information regarding the offender and the intent of the court at sentencing.

The purpose of the orientation is to provide necessary information to clarify any misconceptions and to motivate the offender to complete the assignment successfully. This orientation should be provided to all probationers with community service orders, whether the probation officer or a volunteer clearinghouse will make the worksite assignment. The orientation can be conducted on an individual basis or in a group setting.

Topics that should be covered are:

- purpose of the community service order;
- nature of community service and assignment options;
- expectations of the court, service agency, probation officer, and the probationer;
- responsibilities of the agency, the probation officer, and the probationer;
- placement and followup procedures; and
- discussion of the probationer's concerns.

Placement Procedures

The next step in the referral process is to match the offender with the most appropriate community service agency. A successful placement offers more than the opportunity for an offender to comply with the minimal requirements of the special condition. It offers an experience that the offender perceives as valuable and rewarding, thereby promoting active participation rather than passive compliance and increasing the benefit to the recipient agency.

The three areas requiring consideration in selecting a specific agency for placement are:

- Sentencing objective of the court,
- Characteristics of the offender, and
- Needs of the agency.

The probation officer should attempt to establish a placement that matches offender interests and skills with agency needs on the premise that community service can be mutually beneficial and thereby a positive experience for both the probationer and the community. However, if the court has indicated that restitution or punishment is the primary sentencing objective for the community service, this will affect

placement selection. The court's sentencing objective should be the first consideration in the placement decision.

Secondly, consider the following characteristics of the offender that affect placement suitability:

- Interests
- Skills and abilities
- Location
- Transportation
- Time
- Obstacles
- Treatment needs.

If placement can be arranged in an activity that interests the offender, the likelihood of active participation and commitment on the part of the offender is increased. Most offenders have little or no previous experience with volunteer work. Consequently, the degree of expressed interest may be quite limited due to the inability of the offender to conceptualize the situation. The probation officer may find it useful to discuss interests in terms of target groups for volunteer services such as: physically handicapped, homeless, senior citizens, or troubled youth; and also in terms of agency description such as hospital, soup kitchen, or convalescent home. Even the probationer who finds it difficult to define his interests may at least be able to identify areas that he definitely dislikes.

In addition to interest in a particular area, the probationer must also possess the necessary skills and abilities to perform the required tasks. An illiterate probationer cannot work as a volunteer tutor, and an offender without a driver's license cannot drive cancer patients to the hospital for treatment, no matter how interested they may be in performing these services.

The geographic location of the community service placement may be important to the probationer. Most will want to arrange for their community service work to be in close proximity to either their residence or place of employment. Others may be willing to travel great distances to perform community service work that interests them.

Availability of transportation is a key variable that affects the suitability of any specific location for community service. Offenders with access to personal automobiles generally have a greater range of placement opportunities than those depending on public transportation, particularly in rural areas.

The availability of time is important to the extent that community service should involve the forfeiture of leisure time and should not disrupt normal work

hours and other legitimate commitments. Allowing the probationer reasonable discretion, where feasible, in determining the time scheduled for community service will increase the likelihood of successful performance.

The probationer may experience personal problems or obstacles that need to be addressed to ensure a successful placement such as child care responsibilities and the lack of a babysitter, work schedule conflicts, health problems, or a history of offense behavior that prohibits certain placements. The probation officer should make every effort to assist the offender in overcoming obstacles or identify placement opportunities that are workable despite existing problems. For example, a female offender with young children and no available babysitter was placed with a public day care center where she was able to bring her children while she did volunteer office work.

Frequently, a probation officer can match an offender with a community service agency where the service performed also aids in meeting other treatment needs of the offender. For example, one illiterate, young probationer was placed with an adult education center where his task was to set up the room for the basic adult literacy class and to clean up afterward. The court, which was primarily concerned with the offender's illiteracy, also allowed community service credit for his time spent attending the class. In another case, an unemployed female offender was placed in an agency doing clerical work where she was able to brush up on her typing skills and obtain a current reference which aided her employment search.

It may not be possible to meet all of the offender's needs with a single placement, since the offender characteristics described may at times conflict with one another. A probationer may be interested in working in a day care center but may not be available on weekdays. Or a probationer who desires a placement near his home on Saturdays may not like the nature of the available assignment. When conflicts arise, offender characteristics need to be considered in priority order. The probationer should be involved as much as possible in setting his own priorities and making necessary choices. This involvement will help motivate the probationer toward successful completion of his community service obligation.

The third major area of consideration in matching the offender with the most suitable agency is the needs of the agency, specifically what skills are required and what timeframes are available. The probation officer cannot systematically develop a

successful community service placement without a thorough knowledge of the community agencies available or access to resources such as volunteer clearinghouses that have this information.

Once a suitable agency has been identified, a personal interview should be scheduled between the probationer and the individual who will coordinate the volunteer work for the agency. This interview serves as a mutual screening mechanism whereby both the probationer and the agency can clarify expectations. If both the offender and the volunteer coordinator agree that the placement is a good match, then a work schedule is established and the probationer is expected to adhere to the agreed upon schedule.

When making a referral, the probation officer may be confronted with the issue of disclosure of criminal record information. The recipient agency should be informed that the community service worker is an offender who is ordered to perform community service as a condition of probation. If a volunteer clearinghouse is used to assist in placement, the probation officer should ensure that the clearinghouse relays the information to the recipient agency. If the agency or clearinghouse requests details regarding the offender's criminal record, that information should be disclosed. If the agency does not request criminal record information, the officer is not required to disclose such information unless it is determined that disclosure is necessary due to a reasonably foreseeable risk to third parties. In such a case the same guidelines that apply to employment or any other third party risk situation should be followed. (Guide to Judiciary Policies and Procedures, Vol. X, Section 4302).

In some cases, community service may be a more positive experience if the offense is not revealed to avoid the negative implications of labeling. On the other hand, if the recipient agency requests the information, there are no confidentiality regulations prohibiting the disclosure. The probation officer must determine whether such disclosure would be appropriate by considering the needs of both the offender and the agency.

If a volunteer clearinghouse agency is used to make the referral, the same principles regarding disclosure will apply.

Followup

Close contact by the probation officer with the offender and recipient agency throughout the duration of the community service is critical to ensure continued compliance on the part of offender, con-

tinued satisfactory performance on part of the agency, and timely intervention should problems develop.

Continuous liaison is essential to communicate the probation officer's interest and availability to the recipient agency, thereby maintaining a positive working relationship that will facilitate future placement.

The probation officer should contact the service agency as frequently as necessary to monitor performance. The frequency should be based upon the performance of the offender and the officer's familiarity with the agency. The probation officer should negotiate with the agency to establish a procedure for accountability of hours. Most officers prefer to provide accountability forms to the cooperating agencies so that community service hours can be submitted to the probation office at regular intervals, typically monthly. Such forms provide written documentation of the number of hours completed in an efficient manner for the officers but may create a burden for the agency. In some cases, it may be advisable for the officer to minimize the paperwork on the part of the agency to secure its participation and cooperation. This can be accomplished by utilizing copies of existing agency forms for accountability of volunteer hours or, if necessary, confirming hours by personal or telephone contact. The number of hours contributed as well as an assessment of the quality of the service performed should be recorded in the case chronological record.

Problems may develop following placement even in situations where the probation officer has developed what appeared to be the ideal match between sentencing objectives, offender characteristics, and agency needs. Such problems include undesirable changes in assigned tasks or work schedule, personality conflicts between the offender and agency staff, or changes in the offender's situation that render a placement unworkable.

Whenever the probation officer becomes aware of a problem he should confer with the agency and the probationer in an attempt to work out a solution that would best serve the interests of all parties. While noncompliance on the part of the offender must be reported to the sentencing judge, the probation officer should first make every effort to provide suitable placement opportunities and to motivate the offender to perform satisfactorily.

Failure to comply with a community service order may result from willful dereliction on the offender's part or from the existence of circumstances beyond the offender's control which prevent completion. Community service is a special condition of proba-

tion and in either case, noncompliance must be reported to the court. If the situation involves no fault on the offender's part, the officer is likely to recommend modification of the special condition. On the other hand, willful noncompliance constitutes a violation of the probation agreement and requires that the officer recommend specific action to either bring the offender into compliance or pursue revocation. Alternative measures to incarceration are considered first with revocation decision of last resort.

There are three types of willful noncompliance, and the probation officer must make a careful analysis of the circumstances to determine which of the following types of violation exist:

- An unacceptable pattern of behavior,
- Flagrant disregard for the special condition, and
- Incidental behavior.

An unacceptable pattern of behavior is characterized by repeated incidents such as unjustifiable absenteeism or unsatisfactory performance or demeanor that results in the termination of the community service agreement by the recipient agency. These violations should be reported to the court.

A flagrant disregard for the community service special condition is characterized by willful failure to adhere to the condition when the means and ability to comply are present. Examples include refusal to accept the assigned task or to report to the recipient agency. These violations should also be reported to the court.

Incidental behavior represents neglect or oversight on the part of the offender. This neglect may be consistent with a pattern of irresponsible behavior and reflect more the limitations of the offender than intentional disregard for the conditions of supervision. Such incidental behavior could be occasional lateness or absenteeism, personality conflicts with agency staff, or marginal performance. While this type of violation may be reported to the court in periodic adjustment reports, the primary responsibility of the probation officer is to bring the person under supervision into compliance.

Noncompliance with a community service order generally calls for action, other than revocation, by the probation officer to help the offender reach compliance. Violations may be resolved by more restrictive approaches. With the concurrence of the court, alternatives to revocation include admonition, the addition of more stringent conditions, impositions of time limits to come into compliance, and residence at a community treatment center. Consideration of

alternatives carries with it the responsibility to measure carefully the offender's response to determine if violations have been resolved. Revocation, the decision of last resort, is one possible conclusion after a formal hearing before the court.

The sentencing court may wish to receive information regarding initial placement, progress at regular intervals, and completion of the community service obligation. In some districts, Federal probation officers routinely submit copies of the "Classification and Initial Supervision Plan" (probation form 42) and the "Case Review" (probation form 43) to the court for this purpose.

Evaluation

Program effectiveness and efficiency are critically important in the Federal Probation System given the ever increasing workload demands. Calling a program successful merely because everyone involved likes it is insufficient. Evaluation of a community service program requires that results be measured against goals. The probation office should develop a process evaluation model, tailored to the local situation, that examines both quantitative and qualitative data.

To answer questions regarding effectiveness, it is necessary to collect and analyze data in three areas:

- offender performance,
- recipient agency performance, and
- probation office procedures.

The following questions are suggested for evaluation:

Offender Performance

Quantitative Issues

- How many hours were ordered?
- What time limit for completion was imposed?
- How many hours were completed?
- What duration of time was required for completion?

Qualitative Issues

- Was the offender punctual?
- Was the offender dependable?
- Was the offender cooperative?
- How did the agency assess the quality of the offender's performance as compared to that of other volunteers?
- What was the offender's assessment of the community service experience?
- What was the probation officer's assessment of the impact of community service?

- Was there any discernable community reaction (describe)?

Recipient Agency Performance

Quantitative Issues

- How many offenders have been referred to the agency?
- How many offenders have satisfactorily completed their service with the agency?

Qualitative Issues

- What is the probation officer's assessment of agency cooperation?
- What is the probation officer's assessment of the value of the service performed?
- What is the probation officer's assessment of the agency's ability to supervise offenders?

Probation Office Procedures

Quantitative Issues

- What is the completion/failure rate for the office and for each officer?
—How many cases were ordered?
—How many cases completed their obligation?
- What is the average length of time needed for completion for the office and for each officer?
—What is the average number of hours ordered?
—What is the average length of time between

sentencing and placement?

- What is the average length of time needed for completion of the community service requirement following placement?

Qualitative Issues

- What are the identifiable reasons for failure to perform community service?
- Are procedures followed uniformly and consistently within the district?
- Is duplication of effort minimized?
- Are officers maintaining sufficient agency liaison?

Conclusion

Offenders performing community service provide valuable resources in noncompensable labor and talent to local civic groups, nonprofit organizations, and, in some instances, individual victims. In turn, community service enables the community to participate in the correctional process. Probation officers with responsibility to place offenders and evaluate their performance in community service help make this sentencing option viable. Proper selection of the recipient agency, adequate preparation of the offender, and the officer's diligence in monitoring the offender's progress are the keys to successful community service.