
 U. S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION		DISCRETIONARY GRANT PROGRESS REPORT KK	
AGENCY Georgia State Crime Commission	LEAA GRANT NO. 74-DF-04-0012	DATE OF REPORT Apr. 23, '75	REPORT NO. 8
IMPLEMENTING SUBGRANTEE Fulton Co. Adult Probation Dept.	TYPE OF REPORT <input type="checkbox"/> REGULAR QUARTERLY <input type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL REQUEST <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FINAL REPORT		
SHORT TITLE OF PROJECT Intensive Counseling Of Burglary/Robbery Offenders	GRANT AMOUNT 342,190		
REPORT IS SUBMITTED FOR THE PERIOD April 1, 1974		THROUGH January 31, 1975	
SIGNATURE OF PROJECT DIRECTOR <i>Wayne E. Elliott</i>	TYPED NAME & TITLE OF PROJECT DIRECTOR Wayne E. Elliott Probation Officer Supervisor		
COMMENCE REPORT HERE (Add continuation pages as required.) The Fulton County Adult Probation Department's Intensive Counseling Im- pact project was based on the hypothesis that Burglary and Robbery pro- bationers would recidivate less if significantly more time were spent in face-to-face contact, broadly termed "counseling," with their Probation Officers. Consequently, the project was designed so as to allow officers to work with greatly reduced caseloads, and to allow probationers to re- port to a neighborhood office, rather than to the centrally located main office, unless the main office was closer to their homes, and to provide that those neighborhood offices would open at noon and remain open three to three and a half hours longer than the main office normally did. For project probationers only, the main office also remained open three hours longer than usual. Quantitatively, it was the goal of the Intensive Counseling Project to (a) increase the amount of personal contact between each probationer and his office from about 5 minutes each week to 1 hour each week ("intensive probation services" was substituted by a grant adjustment for the term "counseling" as used in the original proposal); (b) reduce the rate of			
RECEIVED BY GRANTEE STATE PLANNING AGENCY (Official)		DATE	

34594
READING ROOM

NCJRS

MAY 28 1975

ACQUISITIONS

 U. S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION

DISCRETIONARY GRANT
PROGRESS REPORT RK

GRANTEE	LEAA GRANT NO.	DATE OF REPORT	REPORT NO.
Georgia State Crime Commission	74-DF-04-0012	Apr. 23, 75	8
IMPLEMENTING SUBGRANTEE	TYPE OF REPORT		
Fulton County Adult Probation Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> REGULAR QUARTERLY <input type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL REQUEST <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FINAL REPORT		
SHORT TITLE OF PROJECT	GRANT AMOUNT		
Intensive Counseling Of Burglary/Robbery Offenders	342,190		
REPORT IS SUBMITTED FOR THE PERIOD	THROUGH		
April 1, 1974	January 31, 1975		
SIGNATURE OF PROJECT DIRECTOR	TYPED NAME & TITLE OF PROJECT DIRECTOR		
<i>Wayne E. Elliott</i>	Wayne E. Elliott Probation Officer Supervisor		

COMMENCE REPORT HERE (Add continuation pages as required.)
 The Fulton County Adult Probation Department's Intensive Counseling Impact project was based on the hypothesis that Burglary and Robbery probationers would recidivate less if significantly more time were spent in face-to-face contact, broadly termed "counseling," with their Probation Officers. Consequently, the project was designed so as to allow officers to work with greatly reduced caseloads, and to allow probationers to report to a neighborhood office, rather than to the centrally located main office, unless the main office was closer to their homes, and to provide that those neighborhood offices would open at noon and remain open three to three and a half hours longer than the main office normally did. For project probationers only, the main office also remained open three hours longer than usual.

Quantitatively, it was the goal of the Intensive Counseling Project to (a) increase the amount of personal contact between each probationer and his office from about 5 minutes each week to 1 hour each week ("intensive probation services" was substituted by a grant adjustment for the term "counseling" as used in the original proposal); (b) reduce the rate of

RECEIVED BY GRANTEE STATE PLANNING AGENCY (Official) DATE

NCJRS

34594
READING ROOM

MAY 28 1975
ACQUISITIONS

recidivism by 20% among those receiving intensive services as compared with two control groups and with a base recidivism rate for each of the two offenses. Additionally, this project was one of eight or more local Impact Projects whose goal, partially, was to reduce the incidence of Burglary and Robbery in the Atlanta area by 5% in two years and 20% in 5 years.

It was deemed impossible by the Project Director to obtain a true base recidivism rate for this project from Fulton County's probation records due to the methods of recording and filing that have been in effect there for years. Instead, an approximate comparison can be made with the 1973 recidivism figures for Impact offenders compiled by the Atlanta Regional Commission. Those rates are based on convictions of persons within two years of satisfactorily being discharged from Fulton County Probation in 1971. Those rates are:

	Impact Recidivism	Other Felonies	Misdemeanors	Totals
Robbery	7.1%	4.8%	4.8%	16.7%
Burglary	2.7%	4.1%	13.5%	20.3%

Appendix B reflects these figures as compared to the combined rates for the Impact groups.

The recidivism rates of the control groups should give more valid criteria for evaluation of the success of the project, since current socio-economic, judicial, and political variables, such as the recent inflation and recession, should have comparable effect on those groups and the experimental groups.

The first goal of the project, reduced recidivism, was not met by Experimental Group I and II to any degree of statistical significance, as reflected in Appendix A. Experimental Group III, however, gives reason for some hope of success when statistics are finally computed at the end of 1976, one year after project participation.

The second goal of the project, to provide one hour of counseling per subject, per week was met from the standpoint that the accessibility of the officer and his time was provided and urged upon the probationers by persuasion, by offers of positive reinforcement, by negative reinforcement and by the threat of revocation proceedings where applicable.

The goal was not met in operational terms for various reasons, such as: some probationers were hostile to the idea; rearrests removed some probationers from accessibility for portions of the project; transportation problems; problems of employment schedules; and on some occasions, after a brief visit, officers and probationers determined that to extend the interview for a full hour would be an unnecessary artifice in light of the probationer's individual situation. It must be added that numerous interviews extended well beyond the one-hour goal in order to provide reasonable and expected services, from the Court's point of view, in individual circumstances.

PERSONNEL

Ten new Probation Officers were hired and trained in the standard manner for Probation Officers in Fulton County, in order to staff three neighborhood offices at widely divergent points around the city which were set up specifically to accommodate this project. These ten officers were augmented with ten veteran officers who agreed to work ten hours per week overtime in order to provide services for a portion of the project probationers who were to report to the main office in the evening. They were also assigned as advisors to the newer officers.

All 20 officers received 20 hours of training in the use of reinforcement systems, prior to being assigned cases, from Dr. June Woodward, consultant psychologist for training and statistics for the project. Similar training is not part of routine officer training. In addition, throughout the full 18 months of the "counseling" phase of the project, all officers received approximately eight hours per month of consultive services and on-going training of whatever nature the officers identified as being needed.

At the end of each six months, there was almost 100% turnover of veteran officers working overtime (each experimental group of probationers remained in the project only six months), but since it was discovered that reinforcement systems as a method was not being extensively applied, and since most of the veteran officers had formal education or experience in counseling, each new group of officers was only briefly exposed to reinforcement systems concepts and was assigned a caseload after approximately 10 hours of orientation to the project.

SELECTION OF CASES

All available Burglary and Robbery cases on probation as of March 1974, were screened for eligibility by residence and geographic area of offense. Those subjects who qualified and who were not incarcerated currently for open charges were divided into three groups by the use of a table of random numbers. Those groups were designated E-1 for the first group to receive services, and C-1 and C-2 for the two control groups. Analysis by age, sex, race, offense, number of past offenses and length of time on probation revealed no significant differences between the groups.

TESTING OF GROUPS

An analysis of personality factors as measured by the Clinical Analysis Questionnaire showed no significant differences between E-1 and C-1 (Later testing of groups E-2 and E-3 showed them to be comparable to E-1 and C-1). Control group 2 was not tested or made aware in any way that they were part of a project.

Control group 1 received additional testing, as did each experimental group at the end of its six-month project participation period, with the Revised Roetter I-E Scale and a Schedule of Recent Events. The former instrument is a measure of internal or external personality orientation, and the latter instrument is a measure of stress. Dr. Woodward found no statistically significant differences between the groups for these factors. Post-testing of the experimental groups with the Clinical Analysis Questionnaire showed change in the desired direction among factors which hopefully would change during a helpful interpersonal relationship, but again, the changes were too small to be statistically significant.

TREATMENT

The first treatment group, or experimental group, was generally very hostile to the idea of reporting weekly and talking to an officer for one hour. Many of these probationers had been on probation for months or years, and some had previously been on a weekly report schedule but were currently on a monthly schedule. They generally viewed the change as harrassment or as punishment for some failure on their part.

There exists within routine routine probation several inducements to report in addition to the threat of revocation for not reporting. Cases sentenced on the Georgia First Offender Act may be recommended for early discharge and an expunged record upon satisfactory completion of one-half of the period of probation. Other felony cases could be recommended for early closure after three-fourths of the probated sentence. Reporting schedules and methods could graduate from one providing close supervision to a monthly schedule of reports by mail. All of these procedures were used to persuade probationers in the project to cooperate.

A further comparison with routine probation might have been made but was not. It is the writer's impression that the Impact Project greatly increased the percentage of required reports that were met. The typical probationer can usually escape reprimand if he makes as few as sixty per cent of his required reports.

During the course of the project, officers were required to keep case narratives and a face sheet which indicated type and length of

each contact with the probationer. Time will not permit such extensive recording of other probation cases.

The entire population of Burglary and Robbery offenders on probation, with the exception of a handful who were not immediately available, had been used for C-1, C-2, and E-1, so group E-2 consisted of all eligible offenders who had been probated from April through September 1964. Since this group had not been on probation for as long as the other groups, much less expressed hostility was experienced from this group. About mid-way through the treatment period, officers began to experiment with the idea of asking their cases to contract to reach some goals and to occasionally meet in groups, but the major modality of treatment remained one-to-one "counseling."

Group E-3 was derived from those persons probated from October 1974 through May 1975, thus producing slightly larger caseloads for each officer. Whereas fulltime staff officers had been working with caseloads of eleven, they now began working with twenty to twenty-five cases. Officers had now had several training sessions in how to use the contract to implement reinforcement systems, consequently 122 probationers, over half of the total, signed a contract at the beginning of their treatment period to work for goals derived from discussion with their officers. Thirty-five probationers were involved as their primary mode of treatment in structured discussions to improve self concept and interpersonal effectiveness. Most of those probationers also met regularly for brief reports to their particular officer, but the group experience was their primary treatment.

POSITIVE OUTCOMES

At the last weekly training meeting during the treatment period for group E-2, it had become apparent that the project probably was not greatly reducing recidivism; so as an after thought at that meeting the writer instructed officers to attempt to obtain some subjective evaluations from all probationers they would see that week. That instruction was mainly forgotten, but six or seven officers did remember and submitted 32 quotes from their probationers. Twenty-nine of those opinions of probationers were very favorable. A typical statement is, "I think it's better because you have someone to talk to that at least listens and tries to understand you. It helps to get yourself and things together." Many commented on the increased convenience provided by having the office close to home.

Strongly positive statements were heard by the writer time and again from probationers in group E-3 during and after the project. This group seemed genuinely enthusiastic about sharing the responsibility of choosing outcomes and the method of treatment they would receive while on probation. The writer believes that multiple treatment modalities and the use of contracts to implement those modalities, containing input from both the officer and the probationer, should be further explored.

Most, and maybe all, of the Impact officers agree that this project has enhanced the image of the Probation Department in the eyes of many in the probation community.

In the project proposal, a person is considered a recidivist if he is convicted of a crime or of violation of probation within the project period or twelve months after participation in the project--the most significant result being the number who recidivate for Impact crimes. The statistics reflecting convictions are misleading, however. Due to the fact that arrest statistics are relatively easy to obtain by the use of Police Department and F.B.I. fingerprint sheets, but many case dispositions are never shown on those sources but remain on record in various offices of court clerks in several jurisdictions, it is safe to conclude that a significant number of convictions have not yet been detected. Additionally, the more skillful offender may succeed in having his case postponed literally for years before finally being convicted.

Recidivism based on arrests rather than on convictions are made a part of this report and are considered by the writer to be more accurate than those based on convictions, but not entirely so, due to the unknown factor of cases that were dropped or in which the defendant was acquitted, a factor which elevates the rate as compared to the conviction figures used in the A.R.C.-obtained base rate.

Further difficulty in categorizing recidivist results from the fact that many subjects were arrested but not convicted prior to the project, than were convicted during the project, and they may have been arrested also on subsequent offenses during the project.

The combination of offenses committed at one time or various times by an individual could include Impact offenses, other felonies, misdemeanors, and other probation violations.

In order to obtain a degree of brevity and usefulness in reporting these recidivism statistics, they are given in this manner: The date of the first arrest subsequent to being probated is used as the date of recidivism; in the event that subject had convictions during the project only for offenses that occurred prior to the project they are not reported here. where a combination of offenses were committed by a single subject he is reported in the category for the most serious offense, absconders being superseded by misdemeanors, misdemeanors by other felonies, other felonies by Impact felonies.

APPENDIX A
RECIDIVISM TABLES

CONTROL GROUP I
ROBBERY OFFENDERS, N=59

TYPE OF RECIDIVISM	MEAN TIME SUCCESSFUL PROBATION	MEAN TIME SUCCESS IN PROJECT	NUMBER OF PERSONS ARRESTED	NUMBER OF PERSONS CONVICTED	MEAN NUMBER OF PRIOR CONVICTIONS
IMPACT	351 days	110 days	3 : 5 %	2 : 3.4%	.8
OTHER FEL.	360	206	3 : 5 %	0	.3
MISDEMEAN.	1136	187	7 : 11.9%	2 : 3.4%	.4
ABSCONDER	231	148	7 : 11.9%	0	1.3

BURGLARY OFFENDERS, N=97

TYPE OF RECIDIVISM	MEAN TIME SUCCESSFUL PROBATION	MEAN TIME SUCCESS IN PROJECT	NUMBER OF PERSONS ARRESTED	NUMBER OF PERSONS CONVICTED	MEAN NUMBER OF PRIOR CONVICTIONS
IMPACT	667 days	150 days	9 : 9.3%	9 : 9.3%	2.7
OTHER FEL.	458	76	7 : 7.2%	3 : 3.1%	2.7
MISDEMEAN.	519	107	8 : 8.2%	2 : 2.1%	2.8
ABSCONDER	331	149	6 : 6.2%	0	.5

RECIDIVISM TABLES

CONTROL GROUP II
ROBBERY OFFENDERS, N= 53

TYPE OF RECIDIVISM	MEAN TIME SUCCESSFUL PROBATION	MEAN TIME SUCCESS IN PROJECT	NUMBER OF PERSONS ARRESTED	NUMBER OF PERSONS CONVICTED	MEAN NUMBER OF PRIOR CONVICTIONS
IMPACT	610 days	179 days	4 : 7.5%	4 : 7.5%	0
OTHER FEL.	668	137	1 : 1.9%	1 : 1.9%	1
MISDEMEAN.	1392	147	5 : 9.4%	3 : 5.7%	1.2
ABSCONDER	1839	198	1 : 1.9%	0	0

BURGLARY OFFENDERS, N=107

TYPE OF RECIDIVISM	MEAN TIME SUCCESSFUL PROBATION	MEAN TIME SUCCESS IN PROJECT	NUMBER OF PERSONS ARRESTED	NUMBER OF PERSONS CONVICTED	MEAN NUMBER OF PRIOR CONVICTIONS
IMPACT	539	174 days	11 : 10.3%	7 : 6.5%	1.3
OTHER FEL.	261	183	4 : 3.7%	1 : .9%	.5
MISDEMEAN.	338	149	5 : 4.7%	2 : 1.9%	3.6
ABSCONDER	680	155	9 : 8.4%	0	1.4

ROBBERY OFFENDERS N-63

TYPE OF RECIDIVISM	MEAN TIME SUCCESSFUL PROBATION	MEAN TIME SUCCESS IN PROJECT	NUMBER OF PERSONS ARRESTED	NUMBER OF PERSONS CONVICTED	TYPE OF TREATMENT			HOURS OF TREATMENT	MEAN NO. PRIOR CONVICTIONS
					I	I&R	G&R		
IMPACT	1911	182 days	2 : 3.2%	2 : 3.2%	2			14	4.5
OTHER FEL.	-	-	0	0					
MISDEMEANOR	346	68	2 : 3.2%	2 : 3.2%	2			5	5
ABSCONDER	623	114	2 : 3.2%	2 : 3.2%					2

BURGLARY OFFENDERS N-99

TYPE OF RECIDIVISM	MEAN TIME SUCCESSFUL PROBATION	MEAN TIME SUCCESS IN PROJECT	NUMBER OF PERSONS ARRESTED	NUMBER OF PERSONS CONVICTED	TYPE OF TREATMENT			HOURS OF TREATMENT	MEAN NO. PRIOR CONVICTIONS
					I	I&R	G&R		
IMPACT	632	126 days	9 : 0.9%	8 : 8.1%	9			11.9	1.1
OTHER FEL.	734	99	13 : 13.1%	9 : 9.1%	13			13.9	2
MISDEMEANOR	539	97	11 : 11.1%	5 : 5.1%	11			16.6	2.9
ABSCONDER	266	196	1 : 1.0%	0	1			19.0	0

E - 2

ROBBERY OFFENDERS N-45

TYPE OF RECIDIVISM	MEAN TIME SUCCESSFUL PROBATION	MEAN TIME SUCCESS IN PROJECT	NUMBER OF PERSONS ARRESTED	NUMBER OF PERSONS CONVICTED	TYPE OF TREATMENT			HOURS OF TREATMENT	MEAN NO. PRIOR CONVICTIONS
					I	I&R	C&R		
IMPACT	219	22 days	3 : 6.7%	1 : 2.2%	Ind.		11	1.3	
OTHER FEL.			0	0	Ind.		-		
MISDEMEANOR	480	58	2 : 4.4%	1 : 2.2%	Ind.		21	.5	
ABSCONDER			0	0	Ind.		-		

BURGLARY OFFENDERS N-120

TYPE OF RECIDIVISM	MEAN TIME SUCCESSFUL PROBATION	MEAN TIME SUCCESS IN PROJECT	NUMBER OF PERSONS ARRESTED	NUMBER OF PERSONS CONVICTED	TYPE OF TREATMENT			HOURS OF TREATMENT	MEAN NO. PRIOR CONVICTIONS
					I	I&R	C&R		
IMPACT	194	49 days	3 : 2.5%	2 : 1.7%	Ind.		9.3	1	
OTHER FEL.	444	49	5 : 4.2%	2 : 1.7%	Ind.		11.8	1	
MISDEMEANOR	357	58	12 : 10.0%	6 : 5.0%	Ind.		15.0	2.3	
ABSCONDER	638	46	1 : .8%	1 : .8%	Ind.		4.0	0	

ROBBERY OFFENDERS N-40

TYPE OF RECIDIVISM	MEAN TIME SUCCESSFUL PROBATION	MEAN TIME SUCCESS IN PROJECT	NUMBER OF PERSONS ARRESTED	NUMBER OF PERSONS CONVICTED	TYPE OF TREATMENT			HOURS OF TREATMENT	MEAN NO. PRIOR CONVICTIONS
					I	I&R	G&R		
IMPACT	262	94 days	1 : 2.5%	0	1	0	1	25	5
OTHER	-	-	0						
MISDEMEANOR	-	-	0	0					0
ABSCONDER	-	-	0						

BURGLARY OFFENDERS N-187

TYPE OF RECIDIVISM	MEAN TIME SUCCESSFUL PROBATION	MEAN TIME SUCCESS IN PROJECT	NUMBER OF PERSONS ARRESTED	NUMBER OF PERSONS CONVICTED	TYPE OF TREATMENT			HOURS OF TREATMENT	MEAN NO. PRIOR CONVICTIONS
					I	I&R	G&R		
IMPACT	141	21.5 days	4 : 2.1%	0	3	2	0	14	1.6
OTHER	168	17	1 : 0.5%	1 : 0.5%	0	0	0	0	.0
MISDEMEANOR	162	43	7 : 3.7%	2 : 1.0%	3	3	3	17	0.7
ABSCONDER									

APPENDIX B
COMBINED RECIDIVISM RATES

CONVICTIONS OF IMPACT OFFENSE

	Base Rate	Comb. Control Groups	Comb. Exp. Groups
Robbers	7.1	5.5	1.8
Burglars	2.7	7.9	3.3

CONVICTIONS OF OTHER FELONIES

	Base Rate	Comb. Control Groups	Comb. Exp. Groups
Robbers	4.8	1	0
Burglars	4.1	2	3.8

CONVICTIONS OF MISDEMEANORS

	Base Rate	Comb. Control Groups	Comb. Exp. Groups
Robbers	4.8	4.6	1.8
Burglars	13.5	2	3.7

COMPARISONS BY ARREST
IMPACT OFFENSES

	Combined Controls	Combined Exp. Groups
Robbers	6.3	4.1
Burglars	9.8	1.8

OTHER FELONIES

	Combined Controls	Combined Exp. Groups
Robbers	3.5	0
Burglars	5.5	5.9

MISDEMEANORS

	Combined Controls	Combined Exp. Groups
Robbers	10.7	2.5
Burglars	6.5	8.3

END