

LETA

COMMUNITY BASED JUVENILE PROBATION:

THE ALLEGHENY COUNTY PROGRAM

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

Community and Regional Centers
for Juvenile Probationers

Court of Common Pleas, Family Division
Juvenile Section, Allegheny County
3333 Forbes Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

Funded by: Allegheny Regional Office
Governor's Justice Commission of Pennsylvania
1400 Park Building, 355 Fifth Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15222

Submitted by: Philip L. Taylor, Ph.D.
R. D. 2, Scott Avenue
Mount Joy, Pennsylvania 17552

Assistance from: Kenneth W. Masters, Ph.D.

Contract No.: AG-75-C-9E-1-328

Date: January, 1977

NCJRS

APR 13 1977

ACQUISITIONS

MICROFICHE

40527

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors wish to thank Lawson Veney, Director of Court Services; Gerald Gorman, Assistant Director; Raymond Novak, Master; and the many other court employees who cooperated in this study.

We also acknowledge the editorial assistance of Francine Z. Taylor and the typing by Gladys Singer.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Page
I. Executive Summary	1
II. Project Activities	7
III. Evaluation Activities	28
IV. Project Results and Analysis	32
V. Findings and Recommendations	57
VI. Appendix - Questionnaires	69

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Total Workload of the Court in 1975	10
2. Changes in Population by Age, Race and Sex, Allegheny County and Pittsburgh: 1970 and 1976	12
3. Crime Victimization and Reporting Rates . . .	18
4. Disposition of Charges in 1975	20
5. Recidivism Rates for Correctional Agencies in Allegheny County	26
6. Recidivism Rates in Pennsylvania by Type of Area	26
7. Type and Size of Probation Office Caseloads by Probation Office	38
8. Probation Officer Workloads	42
9. Probation Officers and Cases Involved in GGI Groups, May 1967	44
10. Comparative Report for Probation Activities in Allegheny County, January-June 1975 and 1976	51

Section I. Executive Summary of Evaluation Report

1. Briefly describe the project's objectives and major activities.

The general objective of this project was to expand the "intensive probation" started on an experimental basis within the city limits of Pittsburgh to the entire county. The goal was to extend the "community based" probation system to the cities and suburbs which were experiencing rapid increases in juvenile crime. The goal of the more intensive treatment is to increase compliance with conditions of probation. The net result would be a decrease in the repetition of criminal behavior and therefore, other things being equal, a reduction in crimes committed by juveniles.

In order to accomplish these objectives the court set up four additional probation offices outside the city limits but still within the county. These offices were staffed by adding 12 probation officers to the county payroll. Along with the additional staff, the project had the following goals for the entire city and county probation system.

By the end of the present project period, the Court expects that training of all treatment officers in the use of the Guided Group Interaction model will be complete. Moreover, the Court expects a reasonably refined attainment of group process skills by the individual probation officers. The Court seeks to add vigor and life to the recently established volunteer programs in the community centers. The Court will begin the establishment of volunteer programs in the four regional centers. Moreover, a new foster home program for delinquent youngsters will be fully operational by the end of the year. The Court will continue its efforts to lobby for the establishment of community resources for the treatment of delinquent youngsters. Once the Court establishes accurate recidivism data through the new data collection system, it is hoped that a reduction in the amount of recidivism can be documented. (Community and Regional Centers for Juvenile Probation, 1975)

As part of this effort an education component for the probation officers was developed by the Intermediate Unit and the Court under a separate grant from the Governor's Justice Commission. That program has provided additional educational counseling and tutoring for probationers. An evaluation of that program has been recently completed by this evaluator.

2. Very briefly summarize the evaluation activities and project records which provided the basis for arriving at the findings.

Evaluation activities began in June 1976, and have included the following: interviews with all administrators connected with the program; interviews with all nine probation office supervisors at their offices; collection and analysis of questionnaires for all treatment and investigation probation officers; observation of court sessions; interviews with Judge Tamilia and Master Novak at the Shuman Center; tour of Shuman Center; interviews with counselors and child care workers of the educational program; observation of tutoring sessions; physical inspection of all probation offices; observation of probation officers' meetings with probationers; informal interviews with probationers; interviews with group home and Youth Development Center staff; interviews with social service personnel who deal with the court system; following court-related stories in newspapers and on television; discussions with court statistical staff; review and analysis of statistical data.

The following data are used in this evaluation: statistical reports of the court; monthly statistical reports of the probation offices; questionnaire data from probation officers; interview data from probation office supervisors; crime data from the Allegheny Regional Planning Council's reports; statistical data from the Governor's Office of the Budget; statistical data on tutoring collected by the educational program; other additional interview and statistical data.

3. Summarize the major findings, results, and recommendations.

a. The project does not operate as a separate program but instead provides part of the budget for an integrated ten office system. This integration is a desirable feature of the project. It is difficult and often artificial to try to analyze the work of the project separately from that of the other court services. The evaluation which follows is based upon analysis of the total system with a focus on the impact of the project budget.

b. The project has succeeded in its general goal of extending probation services into offices outside the city limits. Offices are operating in Wilkinsburg, Millvale, McKeesport and Castle Shannon, and are providing probation services to approximately eight hundred "at home" juveniles at any one time, as well as the related investigatory and other services. These centers also provide the base from which the Intermediate Unit's educational program operates.

c. The evaluators found a high level of expertise, training, education, and commitment on the part of project personnel. The general professional level of staff is very high. There is a sincere concern for the welfare of the children despite the high level of frustration which this type of caseload produces. Many staff members have or are pursuing further work-related education on their own time. One of the former administrators of the project has been appointed the first Master of this court. In areas where there might be disagreement between the evaluators and project staff concerning the best approach, there is no doubt on the evaluator's part about the sincerity of the concern for the children and the legitimacy of the project staff's point of view.

d. At the same time as additional probation officers have been added, the total caseload of the court has been increasing. Although the project was planned so that there would be "intensive probation," caseloads now average about seventy home treatment cases for each treatment probation officer. These caseloads are on the average about twenty cases larger than those of the city probation offices. In addition, the separation of treatment and investigation workloads found in the city offices has not been maintained. Therefore, due to the pressures of large caseloads, the intensive probation model with specialized caseloads started in the North and Southside city offices has not been extended to the new county offices under this project.

e. Based upon available research findings and the principal author's extensive experience with programs which "divert" clients from the traditional juvenile justice system, we recommend working toward improving the court system rather than developing alternatives to it. The Allegheny Court has demonstrated a progressive approach as well as a high level of concern for both the care and protection of the children who come under its responsibility as offenders and for those persons who come to it as victims. Its staff has been trying for years to develop community resources for children and to keep traditional institutionalization to a minimum. "Diversionary" efforts outside the Court system would probably serve to undermine whatever controlling function the court now has over anti-social juvenile behavior.

f. Based upon demonstrated need for probation services, the high quality of the staff involved, and the desirability of keeping them within the Court system, it is strongly recommended that the project be refunded.

g. Keeping funding at its present level will leave high caseloads which make "intensive" probation impossible. However, while it can be defended on humanitarian grounds, intensive probation is difficult to defend with existing "hard" research results. The research on the effects of caseload size on probation outcomes show ambiguous results.

Even if positive, the effects are not large. It can by no means be guaranteed that smaller caseloads will cause significantly reduced delinquent recidivism. Improvements in the data collection system may make it possible to demonstrate the benefits of intensive probation.

h. A systematic behavioral analysis of juvenile crime should be carried out by the Allegheny Regional Planning Council and the Court. Delinquency, like all other behaviors, is a product of complex patterns of reinforcement and punishment which we will refer to as contingencies. The legal and social welfare systems operate in part to control behavior through the control of contingencies at its disposal. There is a need in the court system for clearer understanding and more systematic analysis of the ways in which it does effect behavior. Psychological research has established that positive reinforcement is more effective in shaping long-term patterns of behavior than negative sanctions or punishments. Yet the criminal justice system operates primarily with negative sanctions.

Thinking in behavioral terms has brought us to pose the following hypothetical questions about the operation of this court system. In particular, we would raise the question as to whether intensive attention from court staff might actually serve to reinforce some delinquent behavior among some youths and thus increase the frequency of its occurrence. Such an effect of attention to oppositional behavior by younger children has been demonstrated. Systematic removal of such attention is the basis for several highly successful behavioral treatment programs.

Providing more vocational, educational and social services for those who have been sent to the court than to those who are in need but do not get sent to the court can be interpreted as actually rewarding delinquent behavior and thus increase its frequency.

What other types of contingencies besides court sanctions are available in Allegheny County to reduce the possible rewarding aspects of delinquent behavior?

Is unemployment really the "cause" of delinquent behavior, or is there a much more complex set of rewards, punishments, and individual differences in responses which shape some unemployed youths into frequent offenders and not others?

Only a broad analysis of behavioral contingencies will make possible the design of a total program which would reduce the incidence of juvenile crime. Until such an analysis is done, we will be uncertain as to whether any particular program is increasing or decreasing crime. If it is legitimate for society to shape behavior unsystematically, it is likewise legitimate for it to shape it systematically to meet the concerns of the community for reasonable control over crime.

i. The model under which these county centers are operating should be clarified. If there is a rationale for separating treatment and investigation, ways should be investigated to keep that separation in the county offices. If not, then changes should be made in the descriptions of the program so they correspond with the actual practice.

j. The same would hold true for the use of guided group interaction (GGI). If it is to be the treatment method, then it should be more widely applied. At present, only an estimated 13 percent of the county caseloads are involved in GGI, and many probation officers are not conducting any GGI groups. If it is not going to be generally used, then some alternative treatment models should be introduced and systematically applied.

Our review of the reports available on the effectiveness of GGI suggest that only a small effect, if any, on recidivism can be expected from it. It may be highly effective, but none of the available research proved it.

It is also recommended that a systematic method be developed to assign clients to GGI and any other forms of specialized treatment. As has been discussed, literature on juvenile treatment suggests that some clients are more likely than others to benefit from such treatments.

k. It is also recommended that every effort be made by the Court through disposition decisions and probation supervision to focus on the control of chronic offenders. As we have discussed in Section II, the chronic offenders can be committing a large proportion of the total offenses. Such offenders should be identified and their supervision should be carried out with great care. A form of treatment should be found which has the greatest likelihood of success. If the chronic offenders are not amenable to such treatment, they should be removed from society and placed in institutions. At least while they are institutionalized they cannot victimize the public.

l. Considerable progress has been made by this court in the keeping of statistical records that can be used to assess its work. A monthly reporting system from the field offices is operational. Changes were made so that accurate counts of cases can now be made. Every effort should be made to keep this system working and up to date. The system should now be used to make a study of the recidivism over a several year period for those youth who came into the system in 1976. (The use of the term "recidivism" in the statistical reports of the court, refers to the proportion of referrals which are not new cases. While this is a useful figure, it should not be used to compare recidivism in this court with other courts, as this is not the method by which recidivism is usually calculated.)

m. Considerable progress has also been made in the acquisition of adequate office space for both the probation and I.U. education staffs in the four new county offices. The best arrangement is to have the education offices near to but separate from the probation offices. Different suites in the same office building is the best arrangement. Both offices should be clearly marked with professionally designed signs, preferably on the outside of office buildings. A visit in December to the new Penn Hills office--which replaces the Wilkinsburg office--found that they met these recommendations. If it has not already been done, the remaining offices should be brought to this standard.

n. Court statistics for the first six months of 1976 show an overall slight reduction in the number of referrals as compared to the first six months of 1975. This welcome change is clouded by the fact that the number of Part I crimes showed a 42 percent increase.

If crime rates were constant, caseloads would vary with shifts in the total number of youths in the county. Since 1970, the number of youths 15-19 years of age increased by only 5 percent; however, the number of black males of that age increased 16 percent. These changes do not account for the dramatic increase in referrals over that period.

Assuming no unusual changes in migration, there should be fewer male youths in the high risk age brackets in the next few years than there were in 1976. These reductions will be greater for whites than non-whites; the latter should drop about 10 percent in five years and 20 percent in ten years.

o. Efforts to recruit women and minority probation officers have been made by this court and should be continued. Uncertainty about continued funding has been an obstacle in such recruitment.

p. If possible, additional funds should be provided to implement the systematic behavioral analysis of delinquency contingencies suggested in section "h." Additional funds could also be used to explore the possibility of different forms of intensive treatment other than GGI, specifically some behaviorally oriented approaches.

Section II. Project Activities

1. Briefly describe the original goals and objectives of the project and the problem the project has to alleviate.

The Problem

The problem is defined by the laws and court proceedings of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The Probation Department, Family Division, Juvenile Section is responsible for the intake, investigation, preparation for court, and supervision after court of juveniles referred to it. Referrals of juveniles come from police departments, parents, social and welfare agencies and crime victims.

This court system is responsible for two types of children--the deprived and the delinquent. The deprived have not committed any "offense," but are considered to have such severe lack of proper home care and supervision that there is a need for legal intervention. The legal system becomes involved with such children in order to protect the legal rights of parents, children and other parties when decisions are to be made which affect the legal status of the children. For example, removal from the home and placement into a foster care or group residence situation involves a change in the legal status of the child and the parents. In 1975, 83 percent of final court hearings involved referral into the social-welfare system (Annual Statistical Report 1975). The probation services of the court are not generally used to

supervise the deprived who are not also delinquent. However, the threat of future court appearances is used to get all parties involved with a child's welfare to take the "deprivation" seriously.

Deprived Referrals

There were a total of 1156 deprived referrals to the juvenile court in 1975. Of these, 528, or 45.7 percent were disposed of at intake, and 628 or 54.3 percent had final court hearings. (Each referral represents a juvenile dealt with by the Court at a particular time. Multiple charges or offenses settled in a single disposition are considered as one referral. Annual Statistical Report 1975).

The most common form of outcome at intake was some form of "adjustment," and the most common form at final hearing was referral to child welfare agencies. It should be noted here that there is disagreement as to whether deprived cases ought to come under the jurisdiction of the court. (Officers of this court have discussed this in Tamilia, 1975, 1976, 1976, 1976, and Novak, 1972, 1973.) Debate on that question is beyond the scope of this evaluation, except to say the position of keeping deprived children under the custody of the Court can be defended as best protecting the welfare of the child. Further discussion of this subject is found in Graham, 1976.

Delinquents

Delinquents are categorized by two definitions. "Charges" are defined as "different delinquent acts or offenses committed at intervals, one unrelated to the other." In contrast, "referrals" each "represents a juvenile dealt with by the Court at a particular time. Multiple charges or offenses settled in a single disposition are considered as one referral. The same juvenile re-entering the Court system on one or more charges is counted as another referral." (Annual Statistical Report, 1975)

The juvenile courts have had a dual purpose, since their inception. One is to protect the public from offenders, and the other to care for those who commit offenses. One author explains the duality this way. "Conscientious corrections workers have always asked themselves anxiously whether their duty lies more with treatment or with surveillance" (Keve, 1967, p. 9; see also Graham, 1976, p. 2).

If one wishes to focus on the protection function of the court, then statistics on charges would be of interest because it most closely represents the amount of crime being committed. In contrast, if the focus is on helping the offender, then the number of such offenders, rather than the amount of crime they have committed, will be of interest and "referrals" would be counted. Different

segments of society are more concerned about one or the other of these functions. Crime victims are usually most concerned about the future protection of the public; social welfare workers, offenders, and their defenders are most concerned about the services for the offenders. Public attitudes shift in accord with shifts in political, social, economic and demographic changes. The court is constantly buffeted by these shifts as it attempts to serve the dual purposes of protection and treatment.

Thus the "problem" to which this court must respond is both the amount of juvenile crime that is being committed and the number of juvenile offenders who are in need of "treatment." The statistics of the court system and crime trends will be examined to describe the dimensions of both these problems to which this court must respond.

Table 1 shows the total workload of the Court in 1975 in both charges and referrals.

Table 1
Total Workload of the Court in 1975¹

<u>Type of disposition</u>	<u>No. of charges</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>No. of referrals</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Unofficial intake/ probation dispositions	4123	36	3812	44
Final hearing dispositions	7387	64	4915	56
Total	11510	100	8727	100

¹Annual Statistical Report, 1975.

Comparison with numbers of cases in previous years in this court is clouded by the fact that prior to 1975 the Court statistics were kept somewhat differently. With this caution stated, there is little doubt that there has been a dramatic increase in both charges and referrals. In 1974, there were an estimated 5012 charges settled at final hearings. The 1975 figure of 7387 is an increase of 47.4 percent.

Demographics

Comparing the population of youths aged 10 to 19 years of age in Allegheny County in 1970 and 1976,¹ there were more youths in 1976 in the 15 to 19 age group but considerably fewer between 10 and 14 years of age. Since youth between ages 15 and 19 are the higher risk delinquency ages, the probabilities of delinquency and deprivation are higher now than six years ago but should decrease in the future unless the prevalence for age specific groups increases drastically.

However, as shown in Table 2, the demographic shifts in the City of Pittsburgh differ from those in the county as a whole. Because of the different patterns of births and migration, the population of both white and black youths are generally decreasing by smaller percentages in the suburbs.

¹Using data from the 1970 Census of Population and estimates for 1976 prepared by the Allegheny County Department of Health.

Table 2

Changes in Population by Age, Race and Sex
Allegheny County and Pittsburgh: 1970 and 1976¹

Allegheny County - Whites								
Age Group	Males				Females			
	1970	1976	Absolute Change	%	1970	1976	Absolute Change	%
Total population	695,046	665,261	-29,785	-4.3	765,197	743,345	-21,852	-2.9
Under 5 years of age	52,551	33,248	-19,303	-36.7	50,248	31,817	-18,431	-36.7
5-9 years of age	63,926	50,340	-13,586	-21.3	61,105	47,839	-13,266	-21.7
10-14 years of age	72,968	60,970	-11,998	-16.4	70,145	57,887	-12,258	-17.5
15-19 years of age	65,166	69,713	+ 4,547	+7.0	66,376	67,078	+ 702	+1.1
Allegheny County - Non-whites ²								
Total population	67,442	69,475	+ 2,033	+3.0	77,331	79,461	+ 2,130	+2.8
Under 5 years of age	6,896	6,316	- 580	-8.4	6,655	6,174	- 481	-7.2
5-9 years of age	8,131	6,865	- 1,266	-16.3	8,190	6,527	- 1,663	-20.3
10-14 years of age	8,195	7,481	- 714	-8.7	8,179	7,517	- 662	-8.1
15-19 years of age	6,984	8,121	+ 1,137	+16.3	7,743	8,049	+ 306	+4.0

¹Using data from the 1970 Census of Population and estimates for 1976 prepared by the Allegheny County Department of Health.

²Negroes in 1970.

Table 2 (Continued)

Pittsburgh - Whites								
Age Group	Males				Females			
	1970	1976	Absolute Change	%	1970	1976	Absolute Change	%
Total population	193,575	175,849	-17,726	-9.2	221,149	203,539	-17,610	-8.0
Under 5 years of age	12,705	8,260	- 4,445	-35.0	12,297	7,702	- 4,595	-37.4
5-9 years of age	14,712	10,867	- 3,845	-26.1	13,834	10,437	- 3,397	-24.6
10-14 years of age	16,907	13,006	- 3,901	-23.1	16,537	12,172	- 4,365	-26.4
15-19 years of age	18,612	15,785	- 2,827	-15.2	19,620	15,361	- 4,259	-21.7
Pittsburgh - Non-whites ¹								
Total population	48,768	49,164	+ 396	+ 0.8	56,625	56,585	+ 40	+ 0.1
Under 5 years of age	4,967	4,405	- 562	-11.3	4,757	4,399	- 358	- 7.5
5-9 years of age	5,852	4,640	- 1,212	-20.7	6,132	4,436	- 1,696	-27.6
10-14 years of age	5,937	5,273	- 664	-11.2	5,914	5,331	- 583	- 9.9
15-19 years of age	5,046	5,648	+ 602	+11.9	5,563	5,676	+ 113	+ 2.0

¹Negroes in 1970.

Crime Incidence and Victims

One of the primary goals stated in the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, under which this project is funded, is "to reduce and prevent crime and juvenile delinquency, and to insure the greater safety of the people." Unfortunately, there is no known measure of the actual occurrence of crime. Instead, we must rely upon various indirect measures of crime incidence. A widely used measure is arrest rates. This measure is based upon the actual apprehension of a suspect of a crime which has either been observed by police or about which a complaint has been filed. It is generally recognized that this measure must be interpreted in the light of changes in methods and intensity of police activity (Wilson, 1975). Because of the relative accuracy and uniformity with which this measure is kept, it has been widely used in studying crime patterns. Because most juveniles are not arrested when apprehended, arrest rates are not of much use in studying juvenile crime. Instead of being arrested, juveniles are usually brought to the Intake Department of the Court. Records are kept of the offenses for which juveniles are apprehended. However, before discussing that data, other measures of crime will be described.

Complaints are another possible measure of crime incidence. On face value, complaints would be a more accurate measure of crime incidence than arrests. However,

those crimes which do not involve a victim would be reported only if an observer were present and motivated to make the complaint. The term "crime rate" is generally used for the records kept by police departments of complaints which are reported and become the Uniform Crime Reports (UCR) of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Because the age of the perpetrator is usually not known to the police at the time of complaint, UCR data do not specifically identify juvenile crime rates. In addition, there are other sources of inaccuracy in the UCR. The reports are in part based upon classifications of crime by police officers based upon a possible unsubstantiated report. The description of the incident may be distorted, particularly by a property crime victim who may wish to inflate insurance claims for losses. As with arrest data, complaints are also subject to influence by the very programs which may be designed to decrease crime. Increased police patrols will increase the accessibility of police to citizens to make complaints. Greater public awareness of rape, for example, will certainly increase the rate of reporting (Brownmiller, 1975). Improved training for police may improve their efficiency in keeping crime data.

As measured by both arrest and complaint rates, crime has been rising dramatically since 1960. The national data on robbery rates shows that there was a decline from 1935 to 1959, when it started to increase. By 1968, it

had more than doubled (Wilson, 1975, p. 6). Conventional social theories of crime have tied it to economic deprivation. However, it showed a dramatic increase during the 1960's when there was economic prosperity and the opening up of economic and social opportunities by the anti-poverty programs. Many complex factors are related to crime rates, including demographics and economics. However, the simplistic view prevalent in the 1960's that as legitimate economic opportunities increased crime would decrease must now be dismissed. It could be hypothesized that prosperity contributes to property crime by making more goods available to tempt would-be thieves. (If there were not as many citizen band radios, kids could not be stealing so many.) Currently, increases in some crime rates are moderating during a period when economic conditions are poor. The dramatic increases in juvenile crime rates during the 1960's have continued as moderate to severe increases in the 1970's with heightened public concern about the victimization of the offenders by youthful offenders. It is safe to say that effective methods to turn increases in crime rates into decreases have not been either adequately described, tried or demonstrated. More will be said on that subject later. For now, let us return to other methods of reporting crime rates. Because of these limitations, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) has collected another type of data

on crime incidence based upon a survey method.

Crime victimization surveys were conducted in 1974 in Pittsburgh and 12 other cities of comparable size (TSC, 1976). Data were collected in door-to-door surveys conducted with the assistance of the U.S. Census staff. Respondents were asked a number of specific questions about whether they had been the victim of a crime in the past year. Those crimes which do not involve a victim or in which the victim does not detect or report the crime are not reported by this method. Reporting would be affected by changes in public perception of what a crime is, but would not otherwise be influenced by the same types of errors that can influence arrest or UCR data. Intensity of police patrols, for example, should not have influenced reporting rates.

The Allegheny Regional Planning Council has reported on the victimization rates found by the LEAA-Census study in its publication, Toward a Safer Community (Vol. V, 1976, pp. 8-10). Crimes were divided into the following categories: personal--rape, robbery, assault, and theft; household--burglary, larceny, and auto theft; commercial--burglary and robbery. The following summary is provided:

The survey found that about half of the crimes reported to the census interviewers had been directed against persons, 42 percent against households, and 8 percent against business establishments. Larceny accounted for about half the crimes, with personal larceny outnumbering household larceny by about two to one. Burglary was the next most frequently

reported crime, and three-fourths of the burglaries were committed against households. Assault was the third most prevalent crime, and motor vehicle theft came fourth. Seventy-five percent of the robberies were committed against persons, 25 percent against businesses. (Toward a Safer Community, p. 8)

Table 3
Crime Victimization and Reporting Rates

<u>Type of Crime</u>	<u>Rate per 1000 Population</u>	<u>Percent Reporting to Police</u>
Overall	337	
Robbery with injury	6	70
Robbery without injury	9	46
Assault (simple and aggravated)	30	37
Theft (with and without contact)	83	24
Burglary (with and without force)	93 ¹	32
Auto theft	43 ¹	66

¹Per household

Since some persons and families are affected by more than one type of crime or by repeated criminal offenses during a year, the proportion of persons and families affected by crime in Pittsburgh is a significant proposition of the population. Thus, from a victimization point of view, crime in Pittsburgh affects a very large proportion of the population.

Such data reinforce the results of other surveys, which show that nationally crime and the control of crime rates is one of the greatest, if not the greatest, concerns of people who live in urban environments (Wilson, 1975, Chapter 2).

The crime victimization data can also be used to compare crime in different cities. Averages for victim reported crime rates were calculated for thirteen cities the size of Pittsburgh. (City size has a positive correlational association with crime rates, so that comparisons are usually made of cities of similar size.) Overall, Pittsburgh ranked ninth in personal crimes, seventh in household crimes, and sixth in commercial crimes. There was no difference reported for rape; Pittsburgh was 28.4 percent below the average of the other twelve cities for commercial burglary. (Toward a Safer Community, 1976)

In summary, approximately one-third of Pittsburgh residents report that they have been crime victims. Despite the high rate, the rate for most crimes is below that of other cities of comparable size. The actual incidence of crime is unknown.

Table 4 summarizes the charges listed against juveniles in 1975. They are divided into seventeen categories that involve crime victims and one that includes all others. It should be emphasized that the total number of crime victims is not reported here, since a single

Table 4
Disposition of Charges in 1975¹

<u>Charge Category</u>	<u>Total dispo- sition</u>	<u>Unofficial intake dispositions</u>	<u>Disposed of by Court Hearing</u>
Total	11,510	4123	7387
Murder	4	3	1
Voluntary Manslaughter	4	1	3
Involuntary Man- slaughter	2	0	2
Aggravated Assault	238	15	223
Rape	36	1	35
Arson	92	18	74
Burglary and Trespass	1746	186	1560
Robbery	247	23	224
Purse Snatching	231	8	223
Auto Theft	737	65	672
Theft over \$50	420	80	340
Theft under \$50	359	131	228
Simple Assault	744	353	391
Other Sex Crimes	122	25	97
Retail Theft	416	266	150
Resisting Arrest	137	27	110
All other charges	5975	2921	3054

¹Source: Annual Statistical Report, 1975.

reported charge such as assault can involve a number of different persons assaulted at the same time. In addition, victimization studies indicate that between 30 and 70 percent of crimes are not reported and of those reported, only a portion are "cleared" with an apprehension. These apprehension rates vary by type of crime and neighborhood, and range from 30 to 90 percent. We will estimate that except for murder and auto theft, which have high report and clearance rates, that there were between five and eight times as many victims of juvenile crimes as crimes reported. The exception to this would be rape, where the multiplier is probably greater than ten times (Brownmiller, 1975).

As is shown in Table 4, the Intake Department settles a large proportion of the charges. Without making an official determination of guilt or innocence, there is considerable discretion allowed as to whether the case will be pursued in the court. Many offenders at this stage get a reprimand and the threat of court action if the child reappears in the system. Overall, 36 percent of all charges and 22 percent of charges involving victims were disposed of unofficially. These included 15 aggravated assaults, 18 arsons, 186 burglaries, 23 robberies, 65 auto thefts, and 353 simple assaults.

Table 4 shows that total charges were 11,510, 5975 or 48 percent of which involved crimes without victims and 5535 or 52 percent involved crimes with victims. Totals

for the sixteen categories of crime range from 2 for involuntary manslaughter to 1746 for burglary and trespass.

Court's Statement of the Problem.

The probation office has presented its statement of "the problem" and its objectives in its grant application narrative. We have summarized it here for those readers who are not already familiar with it.

The problem to which this project has addressed itself was the limited ability of the juvenile probation staff of the Court of Common Pleas of Allegheny County to cope effectively with the antisocial behavior of children in the community. The traditional approach to probation services left much to be desired in terms of effectively helping youngsters who had been placed on probation to behave in a manner consistent with the rights of others in their persons and property.

The ultimate aim of the project is, of course, to reduce the number of antisocial acts committed by children within the communities served by the centers. More immediately, however, the goal is to move probation services closer to the people being served. During the twelve months of this grant, the community programs will be continued, refined and expanded. (Community and Regional Centers for Juvenile Probationers, 1975)

The grant application narrative also describes a number of objectives which are to be met. The following paragraph from the grant narrative spells these out.

By the end of the present project period, the Court expects that training of all treatment officers in the use of the Guided Group Interaction model will be complete. Moreover, the Court expects a reasonably refined attainment of group process skills by the individual probation officers. The Court seeks to add vigor and life to the recently established volunteer programs in the community centers. The Court will begin the establishment

of volunteer programs in the four regional centers. Moreover, a new foster home program for delinquent youngsters will be fully operational by the end of the year. The Court will continue its efforts to lobby for the establishment of community resources for the treatment of delinquent youngsters. Once the Court establishes accurate recidivism data through the new data collection system, it is hoped that a reduction in the amount of recidivism can be documented. However, we realize that many other socio-economic factors completely beyond our control will impact upon the recidivism rate. (Community and Regional Centers for Juvenile Probation, 1975)

The project activities are providing probation supervision to the four new "county" probation offices located outside the city limits. Services include investigation and treatment. The goal has been to expand the more intensive probation supervision begun in the city offices. Guided Group Interaction groups are part of this approach. Greater involvement with community activities and the use of community resources are also expected. An expansion of the volunteer and foster home programs is also part of this program.

As part of this effort an educational component for the probation offices was developed by the Allegheny County Intermediate Education Unit and the Court financed by a separate grant from the Governor's Justice Commission. That program has provided additional educational counseling and tutoring for probationers. An evaluation of that program has been recently completed by this evaluator.

Recidivism

Recidivism is the repetition of criminal actions by persons who have been previously arrested and/or convicted of criminal behavior (Wilson, 1975; Radzinowicz and Wolfgang, 1971). An exhaustive study of the delinquent acts of all boys born in Philadelphia in 1945 and living there from their 10th to their 18th birthdays was carried out by Wolfgang (1972). The following quotation describes an interesting finding of this study.

We undertook an additional subgrouping of the offenders by defining as chronic offenders those boys who committed more than four violations. This group of 627 chronic offenders (18 percent of the total number of offenders) was responsible for over one-half of all offenses. The non-chronic recidivists (more than one offense but less than five) accounted for 36 percent of the offenders but for only 33 percent of the offenses. (Wolfgang, 1972, p. 248)

This finding suggests that any effort to reduce the number of offenses being committed should focus on identifying and controlling the delinquent behavior of the minority of chronic offenders.

A study of juvenile recidivism in the Allegheny Court was carried out recently by the Division of Program Planning and Evaluation of the Governor's Office of the Budget. Titled "Juvenile Correction Recidivism Evaluation" (J.C.R.E.), it was published in February 1976 and brought to the attention of the project administrators by this evaluator.

There is some disagreement as to whether this study utilizes valid recidivism rates. According to the

statistical department of the Court, the case records for the period under study were based upon a non-unique numbering system which precluded accurate recidivism calculation. With this caution as to precise accuracy, we report some of the results.

The J.C.R.E. study defined recidivism as "a subsequent contact with the juvenile or adult justice system which resulted in the substantiation of a complaint within three years of release from a juvenile institution or placement on probation by a juvenile court in Pennsylvania" (p. vii). There are a number of interesting comparisons of institutional and probation recidivism rates and a comparison of Philadelphia and Allegheny County recidivism. It is recommended for its comparisons of recidivism rates for youth receiving institutional and non-institutional forms of treatment. For the purposes of this evaluation, we will present only a brief summary of results on Allegheny County and one cross-county comparison.

Table 5 shows a comparison of recidivism by five correctional components with cases from the Allegheny County Court. Overall rates are lowest for the Youth Forestry Camps and highest for private institutions. Because of differences in the types of cases sent to these correctional components and small sample sizes, caution should be exercised in making comparisons among these recidivism rates. The probation recidivism rate of 42.8

Table 5

Recidivism Rates for Correctional Agencies in
Allegheny County¹

(Youth placed on probation January-June 1971 or released
from a juvenile institution July-December 1970)

<u>Agency</u>	<u>No. of Youth in Study</u>	<u>Percent recidivism rate by type</u>			
		<u>Total</u>	<u>Juveniles with petition</u>	<u>Juveniles without petition</u>	<u>Adult</u>
Probation Department	409	42.8	30.3	8.3	4.2
Youth Development Center	128	39.8	20.3	5.5	14.1
Camp Hill	22	36.4	--	4.5	31.8
Youth Forestry Camp	16	37.5	18.8	--	18.8
Private Institutions	11	45.5	9.1	27.3	9.1

¹Source: Juvenile Correction Recidivism Evaluation, 1976.

Table 6

Recidivism Rates in Pennsylvania by
Type of Area

<u>Area</u>	<u>Percent recidivism</u>
Philadelphia County	48.6
Allegheny County	41.9
All other urban areas	44.2
Other rural and suburban areas	27.3

percent indicates that a large proportion of cases put on probation were, and probably are, being returned to the Court.

Table 6 shows a comparison of recidivism rates across the state. In this comparison Allegheny County shows a lower rate than Philadelphia and other Pennsylvania urban areas studied, but a higher rate than rural and suburban areas.

In summary, these data reinforce the impression that there has been and probably continues to be a serious problem of high recidivism in the Allegheny County Court system, Juvenile Section.

Summary

As presently organized, the probation department is responsible to the judges of the Family Division, Juvenile Section, for screening, preparation and recommendations for court action and for surveillance and "treatment" of those placed on probation. This grant was prepared so that personnel to carry out these services could be further decentralized into a total of nine "field" offices in addition to the central office. The goal was to continue to expand more intensive treatment through Guided Group Interaction (GGI) groups and the separation of investigation and treatment functions for individual staff. Crime prevention per se was not a focus of the program, as providing court services to the judges is the job of this staff.

Section III. Evaluation Activities

1. Describe the nature, extent, and timing of all evaluation activities upon which this report is based.

Involvement with this evaluation began in January 1976, when the evaluator was sent a copy of the program description and invited to submit an evaluation design. A narrative proposal for evaluation was submitted for this project, the Community Based Education project and the Shuman Center on January 30, 1976.

In April the evaluator was invited to a meeting to discuss these projects and in late May an agreement for an evaluation was signed. (It has turned out that this "pass-through agreement" was not considered a valid contract and that another contract had to be executed by the county before the monies could be paid.) The Shuman Center contract was not awarded.

Evaluation activities since May have included nine trips to Pittsburgh with a total of approximately twenty-six days in Pittsburgh. They have also included approximately 25 days of work in Mount Joy on data analysis, review of research findings, and writing.

Evaluation activities include the following: interviews with all administrators connected with the program; interviews at their offices of the nine probation office supervisors; questionnaires which were completed by all treatment and investigation probation officers; observation

of court sessions; interviews with Judge Tamilia and Master Novak at Shuman Center; tour of Shuman Center; interviews with counselors and child care workers of the education program; observation of tutoring sessions; physical inspection of all probation offices; observation of probation officers' meetings with probationers; informal interviews with probationers; interviews with group home and Youth Development Center staff; interviews with social service personnel who deal with the court system; following court related stories in newspapers and television; discussions with court statistical staff; review and analysis of statistical data.

2. Describe the data and information used in this evaluation.

The following data are used in this evaluation: statistical reports of the court; statistical reports of probation offices; questionnaire data from probation officers; interview data from probation office supervisors; crime data from Allegheny Regional Planning Council reports; observation of court sessions; interview data from Judge Tamilia and Master Novak; interview data from administrators of court services; statistical data on tutoring of the educational program; statistical data from the Bureau of the Budget; other additional interview and statistical data.

All of the data used has been reviewed carefully to assess its validity. Where possible, interview responses were checked with other sources. All data has been viewed with critical skepticism, and no conclusions are based upon a single source of data.

The Court has been working to improve the reliability and validity of its statistical record system for several years. The 1975 data were not used for a recidivism analysis because in the collective judgments of the court statistical staff and the evaluators it was considered too unreliable for such analysis. The problem lay in possible errors in counting cases more than once, or not being able to distinguish reappearances of siblings. The improved quality of the 1976 data will allow for such analyses once that data are available.

3. Describe the scope and limitations of the evaluation effort.

The evaluation was made as broad as possible given the limitation of time. A great deal of effort was made to observe the range of services provided. All of the offices were visited, as well as the Shuman Center, the Warrendale Youth Development Center, Patec, and other group homes, and many neighborhoods. In addition, the activities of the Community Based Education Program were observed and analyzed.

The evaluation was limited by the amount of time budgeted and the fact that reliable statistical data on recidivism was not available.

4. Describe how and when feedback was given to the project and any modifications made as a result of that feedback.

Formal feedback has come in two forms. First, an evaluation of the Community Based Education Program, which, of course, overlaps with the probation work, has been submitted. Second, a letter recommending refunding was submitted to the Allegheny Regional Planning Council in December. No other formal feedback has been given.

No modifications that we are aware of have been made as a result of any feedback from us. However, it is certainly possible that the very presence of the evaluators has resulted in changes of which we are not aware.

Section IV. Project Results and Analysis

1. What are the results of the project and how do they differ from the "Anticipated Results" as outlined in the Subgrant Application?

Introduction

The project does not operate as a separate program but instead provides part of the funding for an integrated ten office system. This integration is a desirable feature of the project; it is consistent with the anticipated results. It is both difficult and artificial to try to analyze the work of the project separately from that of the other court services. The evaluation which follows is based upon analysis of the total system with a focus on the impact of the project budget.

a. General results

The project has succeeded in its general goal of extending probation services into offices outside the city limits of Pittsburgh. Offices are operating in Penn Hills,¹ Millvale, McKeesport and Castle Shannon; these offices are providing probation services to approximately eight hundred "at home" juveniles at any one time, as well as the related investigatory and other services for the court.

Cases are assigned to these offices on a geographic basis in order to cover all the county which lies outside the Pittsburgh city limits. Services provided by these offices are similar to the services provided within the Pittsburgh city limits: individual treatment, GGI groups,

¹Former Wilkinsburg Office moved to Penn Hills.

foster home placement, volunteer programs, investigation and tutoring by the Allegheny Intermediate Unit's Community Based Education Program.

The general impression about the work of these offices is favorable. The goal of extending probation services into additional offices which are closer to clients' residences has been achieved.

The target population for services is juveniles who come into the Court system and live in the county but outside the Pittsburgh City limits. All juveniles who are brought to the Court are processed through the Intake Department either at the Oakland Office or at Shuman Detention Center, which is open on a twenty-four hour, seven day a week schedule. Intake makes an initial determination as to whether the juvenile should be detained at Shuman and whether the case will be adjusted without further action or will be assigned for further investigation. Records are started once the case comes through the Intake door. All cases are being "serviced" because an internal paper tracking and statistical system virtually assures that no case is lost or not acted upon. The possibility of a case that has been referred to a county probation office not being followed-up was discussed in interviews with the supervisors; our conclusion is that the target population is being systematically tracked for service and that there is no problem with lost cases.

The overwhelming reaction of the staff to the additional offices is favorable. Supervisors and staff alike praised the change. The following are some positive features: increased contact between probation officers and clients; increased contact between the probation officers and community institutions and services; increased utilization of community services; increased autonomy for staff members; better working conditions; improved morale; facilitation of the Community Based Education Program; improved communication with the school systems; and improved ability to respond to client crises.

Despite the additional four new offices, accessibility to services outside the city is not as good as in Pittsburgh, partly because of the size and geographic make-up of the county. Lack of adequate public transportation and congested highways frequently makes traveling to these probation offices difficult for those who live outside the city or borough in which they are located.

Transportation problems severely affect the participation in such activities as GGI and the tutoring program. To increase participation tutoring for these offices has been arranged at satellite locations such as churches and community service buildings. Staff members often have used their personal cars to transport clients to the tutoring sessions.

b. Space

When the Community Based Education Program began in 1974, space was needed in each office for an additional two-and-a-half full-time staff members plus the tutors. Existing space in the offices was reorganized to accommodate these added persons. However, this made working conditions very crowded. When tutoring was carried out in the offices, it was often accomplished at the expense of space needed by the probation officers. Over the past year, plans to provide additional space have been realized. Although it may not be optimal, the space now available in these county offices is adequate to house both the probation and education programs.

c. Personnel

The evaluators found a high level of expertise, training, education, and commitment on the part of project personnel. The general professional level of staff is very high. There is a sincere concern for the welfare of the children despite the high level of frustration which this type of caseload produces. Many staff members have or are pursuing further work-related education on their own time. One of the former administrators of the project has been appointed the first Master of this court. In areas where there might be disagreement between the evaluators and project staff concerning the best approach, there is no doubt on the evaluator's part about the sincerity of the

concern for the children and the legitimacy of the project staff's point of view.

There is a systematic personnel system operating. It includes a step-wise system for advancement from Assistant Probation Officer to Supervisor. Salary ranges are publicly distributed for each of the steps. A written evaluation is made periodically by supervisors, with opportunity for appeal to the project administrators. In addition, probation officers reported getting frequent informal feedback on their work. The probation officers report that the personnel system which works on a merit basis, is fair and open. Staff members expressed concern that the present system could be circumvented through "political" pressures from outsiders such as county administrators.

There is some frustration among those at the senior probation officer ranks about the lack of opportunity for further upward mobility in the system. Although limited in number, the appointments to supervisory positions and the one recent appointment to an assistant director position have been made from within the ranks.

Despite the systematic evaluation of probation officers, the supervisors themselves have not been evaluated in a formal manner in the recent past. When asked about this, some of the supervisors expressed a strong desire to be evaluated, while others did not feel strongly about it. All said they received much informal verbal

feedback on their work and had access to their supervisor when needed.

Supervision of the supervisors has been divided among the Project Director and the two Assistant Directors of Court Services. When one of the assistant directors was appointed Court Master, the Project Director assumed greater supervisory responsibilities. The newly appointed Assistant Director should now be assuming some of these responsibilities.

A question on the probation officer's questionnaire asked for a rating of job satisfaction. The response scale ranged from 1, "Highly satisfied," to 5, "Very dissatisfied." The mean rating for all respondents was 2.2, or slightly less than "satisfied." Although differences were small, the rank order of most satisfied to least satisfied was white females, white males, black males, and black females.

d. Caseload distribution

Table 7 gives the number of treatment and investigation probation officers for each office, the number of cases on at-home supervision, and the average number of such cases for each probation officer. The table is organized to compare the Pittsburgh offices with the new county offices. The figures are taken from the May monthly statistical reports. There will, of course, be month-to-month variations.

Table 7

Type and Size of Probation Office
Caseloads by Probation Office¹

Office	No. of probation officers (P.O.s) by type of duty:			Total cases ²	Treatment P.O.s ³	Cases per treatment P.O.
	Treatment only	Investigation only	Both treat- ment and Investiga- tion			
All offices	38	5	20	2277	42	54.2
Pittsburgh offices, Total	32	5	1	1513	31	48.8
North	8	0	1 ⁴	377	8	47.8
South	8	0	0	382	8	47.5
Oakland ⁴	6	2 ⁵	0	285	6	52.8
Lawrenceville	5 ⁶	2	0	211	4	51.6
East Liberty	5	1 ⁵	0	258	5	48.8
Rest of County, Total	6	0	19	764	11	69.5
Castle Shannon	2	0	4	147	2	73.5
Millvale	2	0	4	228	2	114.0
Wilkinsburg	0	0	6	257	5	51.4
McKeesport	2	0	3	132	2	66.0
County-city difference						20.7

¹Based upon probation office monthly reports for May 1976.

²Not including cases handled by short term assistant or investigatory, P.O.s.

Footnotes continued from Table 7

³Adjusted to correspond to cases included in previous column.

⁴One female P.O. who does female investigation and treatment.

⁵Not including one female P.O. in Lawrenceville who handles female investigations for these offices also.


⁶Includes only "short term worker." This worker and his cases are not counted in the averages because of the unique nature of this position.

The table shows that there was only one probation officer--a woman who handles female cases--in the Pittsburgh offices who was doing both treatment and investigation. In contrast, 76 percent of the county staff members handled both treatment and investigation. This overlap of treatment and investigation responsibilities is contrary to the ideal model presented in the proposal narrative.

Questionnaire data collected in July and August found the average treatment caseload to be 43 with an average 33 of those in at home treatment.

Table 7 presents caseload averages based upon monthly office reports and has been adjusted to remove the cases handled by short-term, assistant and investigatory probation officers. Caseloads calculated in this manner ranged from a low of 47.8 at the North Side Office to a high of 114 for the Millvale Office. Wilkinsburg is the only county office which has an average comparable to the Pittsburgh averages. The overall Pittsburgh average was 20.7 cases per worker lower than the county office average. It should be noted that these data are based on one month only and that month-to-month variation in office averages should be expected.

Although the project was planned so that there would be "intensive" probation, caseloads now average about 70 treatment cases for each treatment probation officer in the new county offices. In addition, the separation of



treatment and investigation workloads found in the city offices has not been maintained. Due to the pressures of large caseloads, therefore, the intensive probation model with specialized caseloads started in the North and South-side city offices has not been extended to the new county offices.

e. Workloads of probation officers

Table 8 shows nine categories of activities and the average time per week probation officers spend at each activity. The data are from self-reports. It shows that their largest block of time is consumed by court appearances and the related preparation. Out of the total of 42.5 hours, the average probation officer spends only 8.8 hours in one-to-one contact with clients and only 1.3 hours per week leading GGI groups.

f. Guided Group Interaction

GGI has been the focus of the "new" treatment since the beginning of the intensive probation approach in the Pittsburgh city offices. A series of research studies were conducted for the court to determine if there was any relationship between participation in GGI groups and reduced recidivism. After failing to find any such relationship in several studies, one study did report a small positive relationship for some subgroups of clients. A thorough review of all the reports available has led us to

Table 8
Probation Officer Workloads

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Average Hours per week¹</u>
Court appearances	6.8
Preparation for court appearances	6.7
Travel	6.7
One-to-one contacts with clients	8.8
Record keeping	4.9
Leading GGI groups	1.3
Other supporting work	4.1
Meeting with community agencies	1.7
Other	1.7
Total	42.5

¹Based on self-report data for 64 probation officers.

question whether, from a rigorous research standpoint, any conclusion could be drawn. If there is any effect, its magnitude in a community setting is small (Ryan 1971; Preliminary Report, 1973; and other reports available at Court Offices).

Table 9 shows the number and percentages of probation officers and cases involved in GGI groups by probation office. It is apparent from the table that there is a considerable variation in the degree to which GGI was being used during May. The Pittsburgh city offices, with the exception of East Liberty, had a higher level of participation in GGI than the county offices. Northside had the highest percentage of cases in GGI, 23 percent, and Millvale had the lowest, 4 percent. The exact ranking of the offices is unimportant and certainly changes from month to month. Yet the overall level and variation in use of GGI is important. Among the Pittsburgh city offices a reported 15 percent of clients were in GGI, but in the county offices only 9 percent of clients were reported in GGI. During May only 33 percent of treatment probation officers were leading GGI groups. The GGI training of many probation officers is limited to feedback from their supervisors. Formal GGI training was not evident, and no outside GGI consultants had been used during the past year.

The use of GGI continues but does not have the enthusiastic support of many probation officers. Some

Table 9

Probation Officers and Cases Involved
in GGI Groups, May 1967¹

Office	No. of treatment P.O.s	No. of P.O.s Leading GGI	Percent of P.O.s Lead- ing GGI	Total Home Cases	Home Cases in GGI	Percent of Cases in GGI
All offices	56	33	59	1898	239	13
Pittsburgh offices, Total	33	25	76	1136	171	15
North	9	7	78	277	65	23
South	8	6	75	299	43	14
Oakland	6	6	100	220	24	11
Lawrenceville	5	4	80	148	28	19
East Liberty	5	2	40	192	11	6
Rest of County, Total	23	8	35	762	68	9
Castle Shannon	6	2	33	192	26	14
Millvale	6	2	33	272	10	4
Wilkinsburg	6	2	33	179	13	8
McKeesport	5	2	40	119	19	16

¹Based on monthly statistical reports, May 1976. Although there may be relative office-to-office shifts, from one month to the next, the May figures represent the overall pattern of recent GGI treatment.

report examples of GGI success, but others report frequent recidivism among youth in GGI groups they have worked with resulting in ambivalence toward leading GGI groups. The present grant application does not fully reflect these realities about the continued use of GGI under this grant.

The available data on this project is not appropriate to test the effectiveness of GGI in preventing recidivism.

g. Community Resources

One of the goals of this project is to maximally utilize resources that are available in the communities. It is difficult to assess how well the resources are being utilized because a thorough knowledge of the available resources was beyond the scope of this evaluation. Time constraints made it impossible to conduct an exhaustive resource study. Thus, we will report our subjective impressions based upon the interviews and questionnaires collected.

Considerable effort has been made by staff members to utilize educational, mental health, social-welfare and recreational services. There has been considerable expansion in referrals to such services since the inception of the new county offices. Probation officers now report they have better knowledge of what is available in their clients' communities. Good working relationships have developed between probation officers and many of the community agencies. However, there is a wide variation among

probation officers and supervisors as to the extra effort they will make to establish good working relationships. Some probation officers are active in these communities both on and off the job both through helping on recreation projects or serving on community boards. Others seem to limit their involvement, leaving the community when the official four o'clock quitting time arrives.

Knowing the human service systems of these areas is no simple matter; a wide range of services is available which are provided according to geographic boundaries or "catchment areas" which differ from service to service. For example, there are 46 different school districts in the area served by these county offices. Their boundaries are different from those of the mental health center catchment areas, which differ from welfare department service areas, which are in turn different from other service area boundaries. Crisis intervention services under mental health are available in some areas but not in others. Pittsburgh city offices have a more clearly defined set of services than the county offices because their geographic areas are smaller and the services more centralized.

The Community Based Education Program has been helpful in developing working relationships with the school systems. Although working out of the probation offices, it carries the sponsorship of the Intermediate Unit, which can claim a legitimate access to schools as part of an education

program which cuts across school district boundaries. Even so, many suburban communities resist acknowledging that they have any delinquency related needs or problems.

Placing children in schools has traditionally been a major part of the responsibilities of juvenile probation officers. There is, therefore, some overlap between the responsibilities of the I.U. staff in these offices and the probation officers. There is wide variation in the degree to which probation officers make referrals to the I.U. program. Overall, the supplementary services of the I.U. program are being well used. This evaluator recently recommended that the I.U. program be continued with some refinements (Taylor, 1976).

h. Volunteer Program

In addition to the use of volunteers by individual probation offices, several programs for using volunteers were in existence at the time of the study: a city program conducted under the auspices of the court, a county program (Volunteers in Probation), two programs operated at Shuman Center (Big Brothers and Big Sisters), a Waynesburg program (Friends In Deed), and a Y.M.C.A. program.

The first two programs account for a caseload of approximately 100 youth. The objectives of the programs were reported as "to help the kids feel good about themselves" and "to help remove the stigma of criminal identification." The rationale for the use of volunteers is to

provide supplementary contact with youth in addition to the limited time the probation office can spend, and to provide the probation officer with additional perceptions of the problems faced by the probationer and the progress, or lack of progress, he or she is making.

The services of the volunteer may also compensate for ineffective or inadequate school counseling.

Recruitment of volunteers has posed some problems, particularly the recruitment of males.

Safeguards to the effective use of volunteers are a training and orientation program, screening for suitable volunteers, matching volunteers with probationers, having probation officers "clear" volunteers with the parents of the youth and requiring volunteers to prepare periodic reports for the probationer's file.

Because of the efforts by the coordinators for the court-sponsored Pittsburgh program and the Volunteers in Probation, there appears to be an effective organization of volunteers to provide informal counseling and tutoring, alert probation officers to special problems and help probationers assume new community roles. However, not all probation officers have accepted the volunteer as a valuable community resource.

i. Group Homes

While the use of group homes was limited to a relatively small number of youth during the time of the project,

there is a definite place for such facilities in the range of treatment modes used by the County. At the same time, it is recognized that the dedication and competence needed for a group home director is difficult to find. In addition, the problems of zoning regulations and the lack of an organization which can provide continuous effective management and leadership must be reckoned with in extending placement of youth who lack suitable home situations. We support the efforts of the judges and probation officers in developing such facilities.

2. What factors led to results other than those anticipated?

The continued increase in new cases coming into the Court from the areas served by these offices made achievement of intensive probation difficult. The caseload is beyond the immediate control of the project. (In the long-run, decreased recidivism could conceivably reduce caseloads.) It is possible that better planning or more efficient processing of court cases could also reduce caseloads.

3. What impact have the results of this project had on:
a. the problem

Services have been brought closer to clients who live outside the Pittsburgh city limits. The additional staff members, provided by this grant, have provided

services to clients which previously were not available.

Comparisons of intakes during the first six months of 1975 versus 1976 have been made by the Court and are presented in Table 10. There has been a slight decrease in total referrals for these periods. While unofficial dispositions have dropped, the total charges presented at final hearings have increased. Charges falling into Part I, the most serious category, increased by 42 percent. This indicates that although the total number of delinquents is leveling off, the number and seriousness of their acts has sharply increased.

Table 10 also shows that total reappearances of delinquents on probation decreased, as did the rate of such reappearance. Although this is not a direct measure of recidivism, it is an indication that recidivism may be stabilized or slightly decreasing.

Logic does not allow us to attribute the decrease in total offenses to the project without also attributing to it the increase in Part I crimes. At the same time the drop in reappearance rates is positive. Due to changes in case counting methods and case identification numbering which took place during the period under study, it would be best to reserve judgment about the apparent decrease in reappearance rates. The trend certainly is hopeful.

Table 10

Comparative Report for Probation Activities in
 Allegheny County
 January-June 1975 and 1976¹

<u>Category</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1975</u>	<u>Percent Change</u>
Total Delinquent Referrals	4052	4235	-4.3
Intake/Probation Unofficial Dispositions	1520	1900	-20.0
Final Hearing Dispositions	2532	2535	0.1
Intake Referrals Adjusted	1380	1566	-11.9
Probation Referrals Adjusted	140	334	-59.1
Intake Referrals Given Final Hearing	1644	1455	12.7
Probation Referrals Given Final Hearing	888	880	0.9
Total Charges Referred	6019	5664	6.3
Part I	2671	1882	42.5
Part II	2209	2452	-9.9
Part III	1139	1330	-14.4
Total Charges/Unofficial Dispositions	1673	2088	-19.9
Total Charges/Final Hearing Dispositions	4346	3576	21.5
Total Children Referred	3413	3449	-1.0
Total Reappearances	639	786	-18.7
Reappearance Rate	18.7	22.8	-18.0

¹Data supplied by the Court.

- b. the relevant component of the criminal justice system

The impact of the project results on the Probation Department of the Family Division, Juvenile Section of the Court of Common Pleas has been favorable in several respects. The morale of both probation officers and supervisors has increased under the decentralization and the reduction in caseloads. Decentralization has reduced travel for home and school visits and has made possible a closer identification of the P.O.s with the communities in which they work. To the extent that caseloads have been reduced and services per youth have increased and become more effective, P.O.s have found greater satisfaction in their work.

4. Could these same results have been obtained more efficiently by a different allocation of resources or project activity?

It is difficult to say whether a different allocation of resources could have obtained these results more efficiently. It is our opinion that it is more effective to spend this money directly on the probation and court system rather than spending it on ancillary service for delinquents. As long as the caseloads of the probation officers are as large as they are, grant money should be used to supplement the monies provided by the county.

5. Based on your experience in this field and your knowledge of the relevant literature, how do the results of this project compare with:
 - a. the results of other projects using a similar approach or method to solve the problem?
 - b. the results of other projects using different approaches?
 - c. the results which might have been expected in the absence of the project?

In general terms and based upon available data, this project compares favorably to many other juvenile probation programs; it is probably better than the average but not as good as the best.

A report by Empey (1967) emphasizes the dangers of attributing changes in outcome to a particular treatment method. Empey's article on the "Provo Experiment" reports on one of the few studies of juvenile community treatment which is based upon an experimental design using random assignment to experimental and control groups. Empey writes that both the intensive treatment and the "normal" probation group showed a significant improvement in recidivism as compared to the rates prior to the introduction of the experiment. If the control group had not been used, the positive results would have been erroneously attributed to the intensive treatment. Instead it appears that the greater attention given to treatment in the control and experimental group changed outcomes for both groups.

It is doubtful if intensive probation improves the probation behavior of all types of offenders. Keve writes

"The intensive supervision idea [will be] truly appropriate when we eventually are able to select with accuracy those cases that especially need and will productively respond to intensive work" (Keve, 1967, p. 59).

Other reviews of intensive probation programs can be found in Weeks, 1958, and Warren, 1967. A comprehensive review of treatment outcome studies can be found in a recent book titled Evaluating Correctional and Community Settings (Moos, 1975). An excellent review of the subject from a psychological point of view can be found in Delinquency and Crime, a Biopsychological Approach, by Cortés and Gatti, 1972.

The complexities of a rigorous research approach to comparative treatment effectiveness become evident in the highly sophisticated multivariate study reported by Jesness, 1975. This study compares the effectiveness of a Behavior Modification treatment to a Transactional Analysis treatment program. It found that both of the methods were effective in reducing recidivism and that other differences in outcome varied with the type of outcome measure.

The most important generalization which can be made from all these studies is that no single approach is universally appropriate for all delinquents, some of whom do as well with no special treatment as with the most intensive. A system which differentiates among clients and has a variety of treatment and supervision approaches available.

would have the greatest overall chance of success.

A second generalization is that behaviorally based treatment approaches tend to do better when measured by behavioral outcomes. On the other hand, interpersonal forms of treatment tend to do better when measured by psychological outcomes other than behavior (Jesness, 1975).

It is impossible to compare this Allegheny County project directly with other projects in terms of recidivism, because it has not yet been possible to measure recidivism accurately with this court. Until 1976 the statistical data collection system contained a non-unique client identification. The 1976 clients have not been in the system long enough to have a meaningful recidivism study done on them.

The present program does not include a systematic method of assigning cases to GGI groups. It also does not offer more than the one basic treatment method, GGI.

However, without this project the four new county probation offices would not have existed.

6. Aside from the project-specific results, what was learned from this project that should be pursued further.

This project has demonstrated the feasibility of a decentralized, integrated program of supervision and treatment of juvenile offenders. It has shown that the services of a major city can be integrated with services of its

surrounding smaller cities and suburbs. It has also shown that education services can be successfully attached to the court offices in order to provide much needed counseling and tutoring.

The companion research on the Community Based Probation Education Program has shown that there is a continuing need for special educational assistance to the probation clientele, which is only partially being provided by existing programs (Taylor, 1976).

7. Analyze the results of the project in terms of its costs.

The money was well spent because it bought a highly competent, well run addition to a part of the criminal justice system which needed more staff. A recent review of studies of L.E.A.A. funded programs--of which this is one--points out the general weaknesses of a high proportion of the projects (L.E.A.A., 1976).

The principal author of the evaluation was part of a team which made an extensive study of a large number of L.E.A.A. funded programs in New York City. The overall conclusion of the final report said that the programs had a dubious, if not negative, effect upon the criminal justice system (Criminal Justice Evaluation Project, Final Report, 1975). In the light of the national picture and the impression which the author has of other programs in Pennsylvania, the money for this project was well spent.

Section V. Findings and Recommendations

1. The items listed in this section have already been thoroughly discussed in the Results section.
2. State all recommendations concerning:
 - a. the appropriateness and practicality of project objectives.

The objectives are certainly appropriate. It is not practical, however, to expect a significant reduction in juvenile crime as a result of this project alone. There are many other factors which reinforce the commission of crimes by juveniles. Only a systematic management of a wide range of behavioral contingencies in and outside the criminal justice system will significantly alter crime rates.

- b. the value of the basic method and approach used by the project to solve the problem.

As has been stated above, intensive probation is not really being carried out, and the implementation of GGI treatment is limited. It is recommended that the decentralized system be continued with greater attention to developing alternative treatment methods and to selecting appropriate clients.

- c. the operation of the project.

(1) The model under which these county centers are operating should be clarified. If there is a rationale for separating treatment and investigation, ways should be investigated to keep that separation in the county offices.

If not, then changes should be made in the descriptions of the program so they correspond with the actual practice.

(2) The same would hold true for the use of guided group interaction (GGI). If it is to be the treatment method, then it should be more widely applied. At present, only an estimated 13 percent of the county caseloads are involved in GGI, and many probation officers are not conducting any GGI groups. If it is not going to be generally used, then some alternative treatment models should be introduced and systematically applied.

Our review of the reports available on the effectiveness of GGI suggest that only a small effect, if any, on recidivism can be expected from it. It may be highly effective, but none of the available research proved it.

It is suggested that alternatives to GGI, such as some form of behavior modification tied to the probation "contract" be investigated.

(3) Considerable progress has been made by this court in the keeping of statistical records that can be used to assess its work. A monthly reporting system from the field offices is operational. Changes were made so that accurate counts of cases can now be made. Every effort should be made to keep this system working and up to date. The system should now be used to make a study of the recidivism over a several year period for those youth who came into the system in 1976. (The use of the term

"recidivism" in the statistical reports of the court refers to the proportion of referrals which are not new cases. While this is a useful figure, it should not be used to compare recidivism in this court with other courts, as this is not the method that recidivism is usually calculated.)

(4) Considerable progress has also been made in the acquisition of adequate office space for both the probation and I.U. education staffs in the four new county offices. The best arrangement is to have the education offices near to but separate from the probation offices. Different suites in the same office building is the best arrangement. Both offices should be clearly marked with professionally designed signs, preferably on the outside of office buildings. A visit in December to the new Penn Hills offices found that they met these recommendations. If it has not already been done, the remaining offices should be brought to this standard.

(5) Efforts to recruit women and minority probation officers have been made by this court and should be continued. Uncertainty about continued funding has been an obstacle in such recruitment.

d. modifications in project objectives, methods, and operations.

(1) At the same time as additional probation officers have been added, the total caseload of the court has

been increasing. Although the project was planned so that there would be "intensive probation," caseloads now average about seventy home treatment cases for each treatment probation officer. These caseloads are on the average about twenty cases larger than those of the city probation offices. In addition, the separation of treatment and investigation workloads found in the city offices has not been maintained. Therefore, due to the pressures of large caseloads, the intensive probation model with specialized caseloads started in the North and Southside city offices has not been extended to the new county offices under this project.

(2) Based upon available research findings and the principal author's extensive experience with programs which "divert" clients from the traditional juvenile justice system, we recommend working toward improving the court system rather than developing alternatives to it. The Allegheny Court has demonstrated a progressive approach as well as a high level of concern for both the care and protection of the children who come under its responsibility as offenders and for those persons who come to it as victims. Its staff has been trying for years to develop community resources for children and to keep traditional institutionalization to a minimum. "Diversionary" efforts outside the Court system would probably serve to undermine whatever controlling function the court now has over anti-social juvenile behavior.

(3) Keeping funding at its present level will leave high caseloads which make "intensive" probation impossible. However, while it can be defended on humanitarian grounds, intensive probation is difficult to defend with existing "hard" research results. The research on the effects of caseload size on probation outcomes show ambiguous results. Even if positive, the effects are not large. It can by no means be guaranteed that smaller caseloads will cause significantly reduced delinquent recidivism. Improvements in the data collection system may make it possible to demonstrate the benefits of intensive probation.

(4) A systematic behavioral analysis of juvenile crime should be carried out by the Allegheny Regional Planning Council and the Court. Delinquency, like all other behaviors, is a product of complex patterns of reinforcement and punishment which we will refer to as contingencies. The legal and social welfare systems operate in part to control behavior through the control of contingencies at its disposal. There is a need in the court system for clearer understanding and more systematic analysis of the ways in which it does affect behavior. Psychological research has established that positive reinforcement is more effective in shaping long-term patterns of behavior than negative sanctions or punishments. Yet the criminal justice system operates primarily with negative sanctions.

Thinking in behavioral terms has brought us to pose the following hypothetical questions about the operation of this court system. In particular, we would raise the question as to whether intensive attention from court staff might actually serve to reinforce some delinquent behavior among some youths and thus increase the frequency of its occurrence. Such an effect of attention to oppositional behavior by younger children has been demonstrated. Systematic removal of such attention is the basis for several highly successful behavioral treatment programs (Hutchison, 1976).

Providing more vocational, educational and social services for those who have been sent to the court than to those who are in need but do not get sent to the court can be interpreted as actually rewarding delinquent behavior and thus increase its frequency.

What other types of contingencies besides court sanctions are available in Allegheny County to reduce the possible rewarding aspects of delinquent behavior?

Is unemployment really the "cause" of delinquent behavior, or is there a much more complex set of rewards, punishments, and individual differences in responses which shape some unemployed youths into frequent offenders and not others?

Only a broad analysis of behavioral contingencies will make possible the design of a total program which would reduce the incidence of juvenile crime. Until such

an analysis is done, we will be uncertain as to whether any particular program is increasing or decreasing crime. If it is legitimate for society to shape behavior unsystematically, it is likewise legitimate for it to shape it systematically to meet the concerns of the community for reasonable control over crime.

(5) It is also recommended that every effort be made by the Court through disposition decisions and probation supervision to focus on the control of chronic offenders. As we have discussed in Section II, the chronic offenders can be committing a large proportion of the total offenses. Such offenders should be identified and their supervision should be carried out with great care. A form of treatment should be found which has the greatest likelihood of success. If the chronic offenders are not amenable to such treatment, they should be removed from society and placed in institutions. At least while they are institutionalized, they cannot victimize the public.

(6) It is also recommended that a systematic method be developed to assign clients to GGI and any other forms of specialized treatment. As has been discussed, literature on juvenile treatment suggests that some clients are more likely than others to benefit from such treatment.

e. the cost of the project.

If possible, additional funds should be provided to implement the systematic behavioral analysis of delinquency.

contingencies suggested in section "d." Additional funds could also be used to explore the possibility of different forms of intensive treatment other than GGI, specifically some behaviorally oriented approaches.

f. The project definitely should be continued. There is a demonstrated need for the probation services. There is a high quality of personnel and the staff is performing a worthwhile service.

g. Further evaluation of this project should be done in the context of a complete behavioral analysis proposed above. That will provide the context within which to assess the importance of various policy changes in changing delinquency rates.

Over the next several years a complete recidivism study of the 1976 cohort of cases should be done. These results could be compared to those previously reported to see if progress is being made.

3. Discuss the implications of this project and your evaluation for the Governor's Justice Commission policy in this area of criminal justice and law enforcement.

In the opinion of these researchers, the courts are crucial part of the criminal justice system which have not received the support, influx of new talent, monies and programs that they need. The probation sections of juvenile and county adult courts play the crucial role of

supervising offenders who, hopefully, will adjust to society. We therefore would place high priority upon further improvements in juvenile probation departments throughout the state.

State-federal monies are apparently needed to supplement the budgets which counties are willing and able to provide for probation services for juvenile offenders. If this grant money had not been available for Allegheny County, the probation officers would have had such large caseloads throughout the City of Pittsburgh and the County that even minimal supervision would have been difficult.

Instead of making funding choices among the new proposals brought to it each year, the G.J.C. should systematically review the entire criminal justice system, starting with the courts, to determine the greatest needs. It should then serve as a creator of proposals for new programming in different parts of the state based upon a comprehensive understanding of the relative needs of the various parts of the criminal justice system.

REFERENCES

- Annual Statistical Report for the Year 1975. Pittsburgh, Pa.: Court of Common Pleas of Allegheny County, Family Division, Juvenile Section, 1976.
- Brownmiller, S. Against Our Will: Men, Women, and Rape. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1975.
- Community and Regional Centers for Juvenile Probationers. Pittsburgh, Pa.: County of Allegheny, Court of Common Pleas, Family Division, Juvenile Section, 1975.
- Cortés, J. B., Gatti, F. M. Delinquency and Crime: A Biopsychological Approach. New York: Seminar Press, 1972.
- Criminal Justice Evaluation Project, Final Report. New York: Research Foundation of the City University of New York, 1975.
- Empey, L. M. The Provo Experiment: Research and Findings. In L. Radzinowicz and M. Wolfgang (Eds.), Crime and Justice, Vol. III. New York: Basic Books, 1971.
- Graham, V. Kids, or Criminals? Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, August 3, 1976, p. 19.
- Jesness, C. F. Comparative Effectiveness of Behavior Modification and Transactional Analysis Programs for Delinquents. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1975, 43, 6, 758-779.
- Juvenile Correction Recidivism Evaluation. Harrisburg, Pa.: Office of the Governor, Bureau of the Budget, Division of Program Planning and Evaluation, February, 1976.
- Keve, P. W. Imaginative Programming In Probation and Parole. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1967.
- L.E.A.A. Under Review. A.P.A. Monitor, August, 1976, p. 1; 10.
- Moos, R. H. Evaluating Correctional and Community Settings. New York: John Wiley, 1975.
- 1970 Census of Population. Allegheny County Department of Health, 1976.
- Novak, R. A. The Incurable Child Under the New Pennsylvania Juvenile Act: An Unsound, Unsupportable, and Unfortunate Policy Choice. University of Pittsburgh Law Review, 1973, 35, 1, 73-92.

Novak, R. A. The "Delinquent Child": An Unsound and Problematic Definition. University of Pittsburgh Law Review, 1972, 34, 2, 233-241.

Preliminary Report on Re-Apprehension Rates. Pittsburgh, Pa.: Health and Welfare Association of Allegheny County, November 1973.

Radzinowicz, L., Wolfgang, M. E. Crime and Justice: Vol. III, The Criminal In Confinement. New York: Basic Books, 1971.

Ryan, B. Intensive Probation Project Final Report on Experiment III. Pittsburgh, Pa.: Health and Welfare Association of Allegheny County, November 1971.

Semiannual Statistical Report for the Year 1976. Pittsburgh, Pa.: Court of Common Pleas of Allegheny County, Family Division, Juvenile Section, 1976.

Tamalia, P. R. Remarks at Public Hearings, Programmatic Needs for Juveniles in Pennsylvania. Pittsburgh, Pa.: Court of Common Pleas, Allegheny County, February 1976.

Tamalia, P. R. Summary of Position Paper of the Juvenile Court Judges. Pittsburgh, Pa.: Court of Common Pleas, Allegheny County, 1976.

Tamalia, P. R. Toward a More Credible Juvenile Justice System in the United States. Juvenile Justice, May 1976, pp. 3-11.

Tamalia, P. R. What are the Gaps? How May They Be Filled? Pittsburgh, Pa.: Court of Common Pleas, County of Allegheny, October 1975.

Taylor, P. Community Based Education Program of the Allegheny Intermediate Unit. Harrisburg, Pa.: Governor's Justice Commission of Pennsylvania, 1976.

Toward a Safer Community, Vol. V. Pittsburgh, Pa.: Allegheny Regional Planning Council, Governor's Justice Commission of Pennsylvania, 1976.

Warren, M. Q. The Community Treatment Project: History and Prospects. In L. Radzinowicz and M. Wolfgang (Eds.), Crime and Justice, Vol. III. New York: Basic Books, 1971.

Weeks, H. A. The Highfields Study. In L. Radzinowicz and M. Wolfgang (Eds.), Crime and Justice, Vol. III. New York: Basic Books, 1971.

Wilson, J. Q. Thinking About Crime. New York: Basic Books, 1975.

Wolfgang, M. E., Figlio, R. M., and Sellin, T. Delinquency in A Birth Cohort. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972.

Hutchison, Joan. Help for the Very Young. The Challenge, Pa. Dept. of Welfare, March-April, 1976.

APPENDIX

ALLEGHENY COUNTY JUVENILE PROBATION OFFICERS

Form III

An evaluation of Allegheny County Juvenile Probation Centers is being conducted by an independent evaluator as part of a Governor's Justice Commission review. Your answers will, in part, be used to evaluate the A.I.U. education program located in the probation centers. Your cooperation in completing this questionnaire is appreciated. If you have any questions, you may call 681-8210, ext. 201.

Names are needed so that a return by all staff can be verified. No court employees will see your name connected with your answers.

Instructions

Complete this face sheet.

All Probation Officers complete Part A.

Treatment Officers also complete Parts B and C.

Please answer all questions on the form provided. Additional comments may be attached.

Answers to questions asking for numbers of cases in various categories may be approximated.

Return to: Philip L. Taylor, Ph.D.
R. D. 2, Scott Avenue
Mount Joy
Pennsylvania 17552

Name _____

Office _____

Date _____ Race _____

Years worked as P.O. _____

Please check one:

___ Treatment caseload

___ Male caseload

___ Investigation caseload

___ Female caseload

___ Both (Explain) _____

___ Both (Explain) _____

Part A

1. How many adjudicated youths were on your caseload as of June 30, 1976?
 Total _____ At home _____ In institutions _____
2. How many investigations did you work on last month? _____
3. Do you have help from an Assistant Probation Officer(s) with the above caseload or with investigations?
 Yes _____ No _____
 How many A.P.O.s help you? _____
 How many cases are they carrying? _____
4. Check off information that you keep in client's records.
 _____ Contacts with client
 _____ Contacts with family of client
 _____ Calls concerning the client
 _____ Violations of client's probation
 _____ Successful completion of probation
 _____ Contacts with schools concerning the client
 _____ Results of investigations
5. What are the skills and qualities needed for effective one-to-one contact with clients? _____

 Are these attributes written down and were they discussed with you by your supervisor?
 Yes _____ No _____ If so, when? _____
6. Divide your typical work week into the estimated number of hours you spend on the listed activities?
 Hours
 _____ Court appearances including waiting for hearings
 _____ Preparation for court appearances
 _____ Travel to meet clients, go to Shuman Center, etc.
 _____ Direct one-to-one contact with clients
 _____ Keeping records and other office work
 _____ Leading G.G.I. groups
 _____ Other work needed to support and monitor client's probation or carry out investigations
 _____ Meetings with community agencies
 _____ Other (Explain) _____
 _____ Total

7. What are the characteristics of your relationships with other community agencies?

Yes No

____ Are there specific contact persons?

____ Do persons from these agencies meet regularly with the P.O.s?

____ Are records kept of the referrals made?

____ Is there a systematic means of gathering feedback from these agencies?

Name some of these agencies: _____

Comments: _____

8. Were you employed by the Probation Office prior to the move to community based offices?

Yes ____ No ____ If yes, what was your position? _____

9. How do you evaluate the change to community-based offices?

a. What differences in client services have resulted, if any? _____

b. What differences in the use of other community services resulted? Examples? _____

c. What working relationships with agencies in this community have developed? _____

d. How has it changed relationships to the Intake and Investigation Units? _____

e. How has it changed relationships to the judges? _____

- f. In your opinion, do the clients and the public benefit from decentralization? Why? _____

10. Are there any problems within the system of probation or in this office? _____

11. What training, if any, have you had in the past 12 months? (Include graduate courses) _____

 Was it useful? _____
 Why? _____
12. What training, if any, would you like? _____

13. Rate your overall job satisfaction by checking one:
 _____ Highly satisfied _____ Somewhat dissatisfied
 _____ Satisfied _____ Very dissatisfied
 _____ Can't say
- Comment on what you like and dislike. _____

14. What is your greatest frustration in the job? _____

Part B. To be answered by Treatment Officers only.

15. How much G.G.I. training have you had?
 _____ Phase I _____ Training by your supervisor
 _____ Phase II _____ Other (Explain)
 _____ Phase III
 _____ Additional (Explain) _____

16. What are the skills and qualities needed for leading G.G.I. groups? _____
- _____
- _____

17. The following is a list of categories of clients with various educational needs. Rank order them, from 1 to 5, according to the priority you give them for referral to the A.I.U. staff. Also, list the approximate number on your home caseload with that problem which you have referred to the A.I.U. staff at your center.

<u>Rank</u>	<u>No. of Cases</u>	
_____	_____	In school and could benefit from tutoring/counseling but not serious school problems.
_____	_____	Not in school and no diploma.
_____	_____	Returned from institution and needs placement in school.
_____	_____	In school but has <u>serious</u> learning problems as shown by frequent failures.
_____	_____	In school and has serious disciplinary problems/gets suspended.

18. Is the placement in school of clients returning from institutions primarily your responsibility or that of the A.I.U. staff?

_____ P.O. _____ A.I.U.

Comment: _____

19. Have your clients been helped by the A.I.U. program?

Yes _____ No _____

How? _____

Part C. To be answered by Treatment Officers only. The following questions apply only to adjudicated youths at home, the total number of which on your caseload is _____.

20. How many of the youths are in the following employment categories? (List each youth only once)

_____ Employed full-time

_____ Employed part-time

_____ Unemployed and seeking part-time work

_____ Unemployed and seeking full-time work

_____ Unemployed and not seeking work

The following questions apply only to adjudicated youths at home:

21. How many of the youths are receiving public assistance, including those whose parents receive AFDC for them? _____
22. Approximately what number of youths on your home caseload have the following educational/learning problems?

of
Youths

- _____ Can not read.
- _____ Can read but are achieving below grade level.
- _____ Are truant often.
- _____ Have been suspended at least once during the past school year.
- _____ Have been unfairly treated by school personnel during the past school year.
- _____ Have family problems which interfere with their school work.
- _____ Have quit school without obtaining a diploma.
- _____ Have mental retardation or other "learning disabilities."

23. What educational services do the youths need which would address the problems indicated above?

of
Youths

- _____ Special tutoring for reading for school courses and for preparation for GED test.
- _____ An outside advocate to "stand up for them" to school personnel--deal with principles, teachers, school counselors.
- _____ Counseling on how to cope with a school situation which is difficult because of peer pressure, teacher pressure, hostility from other students, etc.
- _____ Someone to follow-up regularly with the youths to see how they are doing in school.
- _____ Other (specify) _____

24. How many youths are receiving the educational services they need and who specifically are providing these services?

	<u># Receiving Help</u>	<u>Provider</u>
Remedial education	_____	_____
Supplemental tutoring	_____	_____
GED	_____	_____
School advocate	_____	_____
Coping skills/counseling	_____	_____
Close educational follow-up	_____	_____
Special education classes	_____	_____

The following questions apply only to adjudicated youths at home:

25. How many of the youths regularly use the following services?

Estimated No.
of Youths

Neighborhood parks/basketball courts _____

Major city-county parks (North Park,
Schenley Park) _____

Open schools (evening program of Dept. of
Parks and Recreation) _____

School teachers and programs _____

YMCA/YWCA _____

Youth groups sponsored by church or social
agencies (specify) _____

Volunteers (one-to-one) _____

Adult education in local schools re:
gardening, auto repair, etc. _____

Individual counseling re: interest and
skills development from P.O. _____

from other sources (specify) _____

Other (specify) _____

26. Which of the following would be helpful in developing the youths' interests and talents? Rank as 1 = very helpful; 2 = helpful; 3 = minimally helpful; 4 = not helpful.

___ Additional recreational facilities (specify which type) _____

___ Improved recreational facilities (specify how) _____

___ Part-time jobs to provide spending money _____

___ Someone to work with the youths individually to encourage them to try out some new things _____

___ A directory of all available recreational and cultural programs and activities _____

___ Group activities for probationers--going to ball games, ice skating, etc. _____

___ Availability of transportation _____

___ One-to-one activities for probationers _____

27. How many youths need and are receiving help? Who specifically is providing these services?

	# Needing Help	# Receiving Help	Providers
--	-------------------	---------------------	-----------

Individual counseling _____

Group counseling _____

Family counseling _____

Mental health therapy _____

Group activities _____

Adult role model (big
sister/brother) _____

1. How does this office get its caseload?
Mechanisms by which referrals are made?
What would happen if this office failed to follow-up on a referral?
2. Once a client is referred here, what records are kept on him/her?
Is the length of probation recorded?
Disposition?
Number of contacts per month?
Examples of forms.
3. How are clients assigned to specific P.O.s?
Are caseloads specialized? *How?*
Who assigns?
4. What are the skills needed for one to one contact with clients?
Are these written down and discussed with all P.O.s?
5. Has training in these skills been provided in the past year? If so, how? Methods?
By whom? How often?
6. Are criteria for performance of P.O.s documented?
7. Are regular personnel evaluations of center staff done? How? By whom? Is
feedback given in writing?
8. Is there a career ladder system? If so, is it spelled out in writing? Examples?
9. Are salary ranges for job classifications specified? Are these distributed?
10. How and by whom are you evaluated?
Are criteria clear to you?
Is feedback given? How?
When were you last formally evaluated?
11. What is your formal relationship to "outside" personnel assigned to your office, e.g.
I.U., C.B.E., and volunteers? *Interns?*
Are supervisory lines clear? *How are they specified?*
Are job descriptions and schedules specified for them?
12. How are referrals made to C.B.E. staff? *(I.U.)*
Criteria for referrals?
13. Is a "contract" of expectations drawn up between the P.O. and the client?
How are these monitored?
How would you know if a P.O. in this office were failing to keep track of and
meet with his/her clients?
14. Are there means used to gather formal feedback on client's assessment of the
P.O.'s performance?
If so, what are they? How do they work?
Is feedback on G.G.I. included?

15. Are volunteers used by this center?

If so, how?

What records of volunteer work are kept?

16. What relationships do you have with other community agencies? Examples?

Are there structured methods of communication?

Are there specific contact persons?

Do persons from these agencies meet regularly with the P.O.s?

Are records kept of the referrals made?

Is there a systematic means of gathering feedback from these agencies?

17. Is there a program involving parents of clients?

If so, what is being done?

18. What aggregate records are kept of this center's work?

What is included in the monthly summaries? (Copy)

Are total client contacts calculated? Referrals made? Cases closed?

New petitions?

19. Were you employed by the Probation Office prior to the move to community based offices? Yes No

If yes, what was your position?

20. How do you evaluate the change to community-based offices?

(a) What differences in client services have resulted?

(b) What differences in the use of other community services resulted? Examples

(c) What working relationships with agencies in this community have developed?

(d) How has it changed relationships to the Intake and Investigation Units?

(e) How has it changed relationships to the judges?

(f) In your opinion, do the clients and the public benefit from decentralization?

21. Are there any problems within the system of probation or in this office that you would like to tell me about?

22. Do you have any suggestions as to what the evaluation should study?

23. What purpose, if any, do you see in this evaluation?

Juvenile Probation Supervisors

Name: _____

Years/months as a PO: _____

Years/months as a Supervisor: _____

Note: Your answers to the following questions will help to provide a better understanding of the knowledge, skills, and training requisite for effective performance of the duties of your position, thus providing a basis for planning and evaluation.

1. Responsibilities: What specific things do you do in the following areas and what percentage of your time do you devote to each?

(a) Office:

(1) Operations (%) _____

(2) Personnel Supervision/Training (%) _____

(b) Working directly with probationers (%) _____

(c) Community Resources

(1) Utilization of present resources (%) _____

(2) Development of new resources (%) _____

(d) Other (specify) _____ (%)
_____ (%)

2. Supervision:

(a) Who is your supervisor? _____

(b) How are you kept up to date on new policies and procedures? _____

(d) What personnel do you supervise? Include all regular staff and auxiliary personnel. _____

(e) On what basis do you assign cases to probation officers? _____

(f) What other work assignments do you make? _____

(g) How often are staff meetings held? _____

Who attends? _____

(h) What type of oversight or control do you have regarding the Intermediate Unit personnel assigned to your office? _____

(i) How are you held accountable for the work that you do? _____

3. Training:

(a) What training have you had in supervision? _____

(b) In which areas would you like to have further training? _____

4. Purpose:

(a) What are the basic objectives of Juvenile Probation? _____

(b) How does what you do fit into the overall objectives of your agency? _____

5. If you were employed by the Probation Office prior to the move to community-based offices, how have the operation and effectiveness of probation been influenced by the decentralization, i.e., what difference has it made? _____

END