

X EVALUATION OF THE
SAN DIEGO COUNTY PROBATION DEPARTMENT
PROGRAM

X ADULT PROPERTY CRIME DEFERRED PROSECUTION PROJECT

November 1, 1973 to November 30, 1974

Submitted to:

Ruben E. Dominguez, Administrator
Human Resources Agency

Kenneth F. Fare
Chief Probation Officer

Prepared by:

San Diego County Probation Department
Program Evaluation Unit

Consultation provided by:

American Justice Institute

Principal Researchers:

Kathy Donohue, Deputy Probation
Officer II

Mary V. Ramirez, Senior Probation
Officer

Project Director:

Frank L. DuPont, Supervising
Probation Officer

5969/1
"The preparation of these materials was financially aided through a Federal Grant from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration and the California Office of Criminal Justice Planning under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended. The opinions, findings and conclusions in this publication are those of the author and are not necessarily those of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration or the California Office of Criminal Justice Planning."

"OCJP reserves a royalty-free, non-exclusive and irrevocable license to reproduce, publish and use these materials, and to authorize others to do so."

Dated June 20, 1975

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I Summary	1
II Introduction	3
III Program Description	4
IV Methodology	5
V Detailed Results	6
A. Population Statistics	6
B. Program Objectives	8
C. Comparison of Successes, Failures and Rejects	9
1. Area of Residence	9
2. Age	11
3. Sex	12
4. Ethnic Characteristics	12
5. Prior Record	13
6. Marital Status	15
7. Level of Education	16
8. Citation/Arrest	17
9. Offense Resulting in Referral	18
10. Felony/Misdemeanor	19
11. Referral Source	19
12. Comments	20
D. Description of Supervision Services	20
1. Process Time	21
2. Probation Term	23
3. Conditions of Probation	24
4. Referrals to Outside Agencies	26
5. Contacts	26
6. Program Failures	29
7. Comments	29
VI Conclusions and Recommendations	30
VII Appendix	

N CJRS
JUL 27 1979
ACQUISITIONS

I. SUMMARY

The Adult Property Crime Deferred Prosecution Project was selected for a summative evaluation by the Ad Hoc advisory committee to the Human Resources Agency. The evaluation covered the project's first 13 months of operation from November 1, 1973 through November 30, 1974. The case files were obtained for all cases that were closed on or before November 30, 1974 and altogether, 316 files were examined. This included 164 files of program successes, 11 files of program failures, and 141 files of individuals who were excluded from participation.

The three program groups (successes, failures and rejects) were compared in terms of selected characteristics in order to get some idea about the program population in general and also to determine if there were differences between groups. Available data indicated that the typical success case was a caucasian, 31 year old female who had received a citation for shoplifting. Success cases typically did not have a prior record and the vast majority had at least a high school education. The typical failure, on the other hand, was a caucasian, 24 year old male who had been arrested for petty theft. He was also more likely to have a prior record and to have a lower educational level. Rejected cases most closely resembled the successes except the majority were males and they were more likely to have prior records. There were other small differences between groups but it was the failure group that most often showed the greatest differences. It is not known, however, whether or not these differences are really significant because there was such a small group of failure cases to analyze.

An attempt was also made to discover the kind of supervision service that was provided for program participants. It was determined that the time lapse between the commission of the offense and the beginning of the voluntary supervision program was approximately six weeks (1.5 months). This was contrary to the original expectation that the supervision program could begin within a few days of the arrest. The average period of time actually under supervision, for successes, was found to be approximately six months during which time the client was seen an average of three times. Only ten cases appear to have been referred to outside community resources even though the original proposal stated that community resources would be used whenever applicable. Judging from the information available in the case file, it would appear that the supervision services provided were neither "intensive" nor "tailored to the individual" as originally intended. It is possible that this was not the case but rather, that project personnel simply failed to adequately document their casework activities in the case record.

Overall, 15 individuals were arrested on new charges while under supervision. Ten remained in the program and finished it successfully while the remaining five were terminated as failures. The other six failures were terminated for being uncooperative or for not maintaining contact with the probation officer.

Because of the limited scope of this study, it is not possible to draw definite conclusions about the program's effectiveness in dealing with certain types of offenders. This report is, instead, primarily a description of certain aspects of the program. It is believed, however, that the program should be evaluated in terms of its effectiveness but that the evaluation should be conducted on an on going basis.

The evaluation effort was somewhat hampered by inaccurate records and incomplete data. Information was not collected consistently nor was it recorded systematically. Case files were particularly lacking in documentation of casework services, and what information was available was carelessly and incompletely recorded.

From the information available, it would appear that the program dealt primarily with low-risk individuals. This possibility needs further investigation, but if it is true, the program is not making as great a contribution to the improvement of the Criminal Justice System as it potentially could if it could show itself to be effective with higher-risk individuals.

On the basis of the information gained in this evaluation, the following recommendations are being made.

Recommendation I - It is recommended that a formative evaluation be designed to be conducted on an on-going basis.

Recommendation II - It is recommended that record keeping procedures be improved and that documentation of casework activities be included in case files.

Recommendation III - It is being recommended that an effort be made to increase the number of referrals for felonies from the District Attorney.

II INTRODUCTION

In December 1974, the Ad Hoc advisory committee to the Human Resources Agency selected the Adult Property Crime Deferred Prosecution Project as one of the programs to be evaluated by the Probation Department's Evaluation Unit. The program was selected for a summative evaluation to cover only the first 13 months of operation from November 1, 1973 through November 30, 1974. Evaluation design was scheduled to begin on February 17, 1975 with data collection to start on March 17, 1975 and continuing through April 30, 1975.

Midway through the data collection period a change in emphasis and direction was approved for the Evaluation Unit. This resulted in a shift in priorities and a re-allocation of the time and resources of Evaluation Unit personnel. In regard to the Property Diversion evaluation, it was determined that time permitted completion of only the first phase of the data collection - examination of case files. Phase Two of the data collection effort was to involve an examination of court records and Sheriff's records on all individuals referred to the program. This would have provided the recidivism and cost data mentioned in the original evaluation design. Since time did not permit collection of this data, this report covers only that information obtained from the examination of case files and does not cover as broad an area as had been originally anticipated.

III PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Adult Property Crime Deferred Prosecution Project is a CCCJ grant project which began on November 1, 1973. It is a cooperative venture between the District Attorney, the San Diego City Attorney, and the Probation Department to divert some adult property crime offenders from formal prosecution. Selected individuals (usually first-time offenders) are referred to the project by the prosecuting agencies prior to the beginning of the prosecution process. After additional screening, eligible offenders are then given the opportunity of participating in a tailored program of voluntary probation on an intensive and short-term basis. Community agencies and resources are used when appropriate and a maximum effort is made to set and meet realistic goals. Successful completion of the probation program results in a dismissal of the criminal charge by the prosecutor.

There was a 60-day delay in beginning the project due, in part, to a delay by the Board of Supervisors in appropriating the necessary "matching" funds. Other delays were encountered in releasing projected project personnel from their assignments within the Probation Department. Consequently, the Project Director was not assigned to the Project until January 4, 1974. Three probation officers had been assigned by January 21, 1974 and the fourth and final officer joined the program a few weeks later in February, 1974. The two clerical positions were also filled during this period of time and the program began receiving its first referrals by the end of January. In spite of the delays, the deficit in program participants was made up by the end of the third quarter (7-31-74).

The stated objectives of the project are as follows:

- That approximately 10% of the first-time property crime offenders will be diverted from formal court prosecution;
- That while under probation supervision, 95% of the offenders will not be arrested for a new offense;
- That 60 days following termination of probation, 90% of the offenders will not be arrested for a new offense; and
- That 98% of the offenders will successfully complete the program.

IV METHODOLOGY

The first concern of the evaluation effort was to determine if the Project met its stated objectives. Secondly, an effort was made to examine all referred cases (including program successes, failures and rejects) in terms of selected characteristics. This was to determine the types of clients selected by the program and to determine their difference, if any, from those rejected. Additionally, an attempt was made to examine the quantity and quality of the supervision services provided to those accepted into the program.

The Project Director provided a card file index of all cases referred to the project, broken down into groups of successes, failures, and rejects. Only those cases closed on or before November 30, 1974 were considered in order to coincide as much as possible with the program's fourth quarter report. These cases were then cleared through Adult Records and data was collected from all files that could be located. Information that was specific to the program was collected on the form found in Appendix A. General information was recorded in the Adult Data form found in Appendix B.

Data collection was attempted on 74 variables. This report, however, will only cover approximately 30 variables since there was insufficient information to comment on the remaining variables. It should be stressed that all the data included in this report was taken from case files only and does not include whatever information may have been recorded elsewhere by project personnel. Table 1 shows the total number of files examined in relation to the number in each category as reported in the Project's fourth quarter report.

Table 1

Number of Cases	Success	Failure	Reject	Total
Reported by Program	169	13	148	330
Located for Evaluation	164	11	141	316
Difference	-5*	-2**	-7***	-14

*The card file index provided by the Project listed only 165 cases, one of which was actually a rejected case and was, therefore, transferred to that category.

**The card file index listed only 12 failures instead of 13. One case file could not be located as it was in transit between officers.

***The card file index listed 148 rejected cases. Three case files could not be located because they were in transit between officers and there was no record in the Adult probation index on the other four names.

V DETAILED RESULTS

A. POPULATION STATISTICS

In terms of program status all offenders referred to the program break down into three groups, the successes, failures and rejects. Table 2 indicates the status of cases handled by the four Probation officers. (It must be remembered that the Table does not reflect the approximately 230 cases that were still open on November 30, 1974 but only those that had been closed.)

Table 2

Probation Officer	Success		Failure		Reject		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
P.O.-0-Unassigned	0	0%	0	0%	10	7.1%	10	3.7%
P.O.-1	36	21.9%	3	27.3%	23	16.3%	62	19.6%
P.O.-2	38	23.2%	2	18.2%	44	31.2%	84	26.6%
P.O.-3	48	29.3%	4	36.3%	32	22.7%	84	26.6%
P.O.-4	42	25.6%	2	18.2%	32	22.7%	76	24.0%
Total	164	100%	11	100%	141	100%	316	100%

The table shows that probation officer 1 handled fewer cases than the other officers. This might be explained by the fact that this officer entered the program approximately three weeks after the other officers and the other three, therefore, had a headstart.

Program statistics indicate that 148 cases were rejected from program participation. The specific reasons for rejection in the 141 cases examined are found in Table 3.

Table 3

Rejection Reason	Total Rejected
1. Currently on Probation/Parole	9
2. History of Criminality/Prior record	39
3. Offender not interested	25 Total
a. Reason unknown	13
b. Prefers to go to court	2
c. Wants to leave town	7
d. No suitable rehabilitation program	1
e. Offender claims innocence	2
4. Rejected by Prosecution after record check	5
5. Unable to locate offender	16
6. Offender uncooperative/failure to keep appointments	29
7. Offender living outside area	4
8. Mother would not allow offender to participate	1
9. Other	13 Total
a. Prosecutor decided not to prosecute	3
b. Case dismissed	2
c. Court disposed of case	1
d. Court refused diversion	1
e. Unable to process through municipal court	2
f. Offender pleaded guilty	1
g. Offender mentally ill	2
h. Offender had more stolen articles	1
TOTAL	141

The table indicates that the largest group of offenders was rejected because of prior record.

Reason #1 -	9	
Reason #2 -	39	
Reason #4 -	5	
	<u>53</u>	= 38% of Total

The next largest group was those who were uncooperative, (29=21%) and next, those who were simply not interested (25=18%). Together, these three reasons account for 76% of the cases rejected. (It should be noted that in some cases the offender was rejected by the program and in other cases the program was rejected by the offender. However, all of them will be handled under the general heading of program Rejects.)

B. PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

Objective I - that approximately 10% of first time property crime offenders will be diverted from formal court prosecution.

Because of time considerations, it was not possible to develop independent statistical data on the number of property offenders entering the judicial process in order to determine whether 10% were being diverted. Instead, data provided by the project is being used to estimate whether or not the project has achieved this objective.

The Project Director reports that the estimated number of property offenders during 1973 was 4125. Ten percent of that would be 412. (Appendix C describes how this figure was computed.) Again using project data, 563 referrals were received and 148 were rejected. Therefore, 415 were placed under supervision which is very close to the ten percent figure initially estimated. It would appear from the available information that the first objective has been met.

Objective II - that while under probation supervision, 95% of the offenders will not be arrested for a new offense.

Case file information indicates that 15 out of the 175 program participants, evaluated in this study, were arrested while under supervision. Five of those arrested (including one who was arrested twice) were terminated from the program as failures. The other ten went on to successfully complete the program. It would appear then that only 91% of the program participants remained arrest-free while under supervision. The arrests break down as follows:

Successes

Drunk Driving	4
Drug Charges	3
Trespassing	1
Welfare Fraud	1
Contempt of Court	1
Total	<u>10</u>

Failures

Petty Theft	2
Burglary	2
Drunk & Failure To Appear	1
Total	<u>5</u>

Objective III - that 60 days following termination of probation, 90% of the offenders will not be arrested for a new offense.

Case files did not reflect any data beyond the termination date and since it was not possible to check other records, this data is unavailable. The Project Director indicates that 60-day record checks were completed on 141 individuals and that only one had a new arrest.

Objective IV - that 98% of the offenders will successfully complete the program.

Of the 175 offenders selected for participation 169, or 94% successfully completed the program according to the available data.

C. COMPARISON OF SUCCESSES, FAILURES AND REJECTS

The three groups of offenders, successes, failures and rejects, were compared in terms of some selected characteristics in order to determine if there were any major differences between the various groups. The characteristics selected were limited to those on which sufficient data had been collected by program personnel. There are other characteristics that might have proved useful to investigate, but unfortunately, the data was insufficient in many areas.

1. Area of Residence

Each offender's area of residence was determined by his zip code at the time of arrest. Table 4 indicates the areas of residence for the project population.

Table 4

AREA OF RESIDENCE

Zip	Area	Success	Failure	Reject	Total
001	Alpine			1	1
002	Bonita	1			1
010	Chula Vista	1		1	2
011	Chula Vista	1			1
014	Del Mar	2			2
020	El Cajon	2		3	5
025	Escondido	3			3
032	Imperial Beach	1			1
037	La Jolla	1		1	2
040	Lakeside			1	1
041	La Mesa	1		3	4
045	Lemon Grove	1		1	2
050	National City	5		4	9
064	Poway	2			2
071	Santee	3			3
073	San Ysidro	1			1
077	Spring Valley	5		1	6
101	Downtown San Diego	3		5	8
102	Southeast San Diego	8		13	21
103	Hillcrest	8	1	11	20
104	North Park	4	3	3	10
105	East San Diego	9	1	3	13
106	Point Loma	2		1	3
107	Ocean Beach	1		6	8
108	Mission Valley	2			2
109	Mission/Pacific Beach	18	1	10	29
110	Old Town	7		4	11
111	Linda Vista	14		6	20
113	Logan Heights	2		10	12
114	Encanto	6		11	17
115	East San Diego	6		6	12
116	Normal Heights	11	2	7	20
117	Clairemont	5	1	7	13
118	Coronado	1		1	2
119	Fletcher Hills			2	2
120	Lake Murray	1		1	2
121	UCSD	1			1
122	University City	3			3
123	Serra Mesa/Mission Village	3	1	1	5
124	San Carlos			1	1
126	Mira Mesa	1			1
127	Mira Mesa	1			1
128	Rancho Bernardo	1			1
129	Rancho Penasquitos			1	1
131	Scripps Ranch	4			4
136	Unknown			1	1
139	Paradise Hills	1		1	2
154	Nestor/Imperial Beach	3			3
262	Out of County	1			1
888	Mexico	4		4	8
999	Unknown	2	1	9	12
TOTALS		164	11	141	316

Table 4 shows that 78% of all referrals come from the city of San Diego with the highest number (29) coming from the Mission Beach and Pacific Beach communities. Fifteen percent come from county areas outside the city. The remaining 7% are either outside the area or unknown.

2. Age

Table 5 indicates the age range for all cases examined calculated from the date of arrest.

Table 5

Age Range	Success		Failure		Reject		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. 18-22	69	42.1%	7	63.6%	76	53.9%	152	48.2%
2. 23-27	26	15.9%	2	18.2%	28	19.9%	56	17.8%
3. 28-32	14	8.6%	1	9.1%	8	5.8%	23	7.3%
4. 33-37	8	4.9%			5	3.5%	13	4.1%
5. 38-42	7	4.3%			4	2.8%	11	3.5%
6. 43-47	12	7.3%	1	9.1%	2	1.4%	15	4.7%
7. 48-52	9	5.5%			6	4.2%	15	4.7%
8. 53-57	5	3.0%			4	2.8%	9	2.8%
9. 58-62	6	3.6%			1	0.7%	7	2.2%
10. 63-67	1	0.6%			1	0.7%	2	0.6%
11. 68-72	4	2.4%			2	1.4%	6	1.9%
12. 73 and over	3	1.8%			4	2.8%	7	2.2%
Total	164	100%	11	100%	141	100%	316	100%
Age Range	18-79		18-44		18-76		18-79	
Average Age	31.88		24.36		31.56		31.48	

The Table indicates that referrals were of all ages and that they were accepted and rejected in roughly equal proportions in most categories. The only major difference between the various groups is with the failures in that their average age was somewhat lower than that for other groups.

3. Sex

Table 6 shows the breakdown of the program population by sex.

Table 6

Sex	Success		Failure		Rejects		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Male	76	46.3%	8	72.7%	84	59.6%	168	53.2%
Female	88	53.7%	3	27.3%	57	40.4%	148	46.8%
Total	164	100%	11	100%	141	100%	316	100%

The Table indicates that 53.2% of all referrals were male, but only 50% were accepted into the program. Conversely, females accounted for 46.8% of the referrals but 61.5% were accepted. When examined by group that females tended to do better. The major differences are again apparent with the failure group.

4. Ethnic Characteristics

Table 7 illustrates the ethnic characteristics of the program population.

Table 7

Ethnic	Success		Failure		Reject		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Caucasian	121	73.8%	11	100%	84	59.6%	216	68.4%
2. Mexican	20	12.2%			13	9.2%	33	10.4%
3. Black	16	9.8%			41	29.1%	57	18.0%
4. American Indian	0	0			1	0.7%	1	0.3%
5. Oriental	3	1.8%			1	0.7%	4	1.3%
6. Other	4	2.4%			0	0	4	1.3%
7. Unknown	0	0			1	0.7%	1	0.3%
Total	164	100%	11	100%	141	100%	316	100%

Examination reveals that Caucasians represented 68.4% of all referrals but 75.4% of all accepted cases. The biggest reason for this appears to lie with the blacks. They made up 18% of the referred population but only 9.8% of the accepted group. It is unknown why they were in the Rejects group in a larger proportion than other ethnic groups. It may be that a larger percentage of blacks were not interested in participating in the program.

5. Prior Record

Table 8 indicates the number of individuals in each group with prior arrests. All arrests were tabulated with no effort made to differentiate between arrests that resulted in convictions and those that did not.

Table 8

Arrests	Success		Failure		Reject		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
0	147	89.6%	6	54.5%	94	66.8%	247	78.2%
1	9	5.5%			14	9.9%	23	7.3%
2	7	4.3%	2	18.2%	12	8.5%	21	6.7%
3			1	9.1%	4	2.8%	5	1.6%
4	1	0.6%			5	3.6%	6	1.9%
5					1	0.7%	1	0.3%
6					1	0.7%	1	0.3%
7					2	1.4%	2	0.6%
8					2	1.4%	2	0.6%
9					0		0	
10					2	1.4%	2	0.6%
11					0		0	
12					0		0	
13			1	9.1%	2	1.4%	3	1.0%
14			1	9.1%	0		1	0.3%
18					2	1.4%	2	0.6%
Totals	164	100%	11	100%	141	100%	316	100%

The Project Director stated that individuals with prior records were generally excluded from the program. Exceptions were made, however, when the prior offense(s) was considered very minor or when the offense(s) had occurred many years previously. Table 9 illustrates the total number of priors committed by each group and the average number per case.

Table 9

	Success	Failure	Reject	Total
Total Priors for Group	27	34	193	254
Number in Group	164	11	141	316
Average per Case	.16	3.09	1.37	.80

It was to be expected that the Rejects group would have a larger number of priors because this was the basis for rejection in many of the cases. What is significant, however, is that among the accepted cases, the 11 failures had a higher total number of priors than the 164 success cases. Additionally, 45.5% of the failures had priors while only 10.4% of the successes did.

6. Marital Status

Table 10 represents the marital status of all groups.

Table 10

Status	Success		Failure		Reject		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Never married	70	42.7%	6	54.5%	57	65.5%	133	50.7%
2. Married	57	34.7%	2	18.2%	19	21.8%	78	29.8%
3. Separated	4	2.4%	1	9.1%	2	2.3%	7	2.7%
4. Divorced	18	11.0%	2	18.2%	7	8.0%	27	10.3%
5. Widowed	7	4.3%			1	1.2%	8	3.0%
6. Remarried	6	3.7%			0		6	2.3%
7. Other	2	1.2%			1	1.2%	3	1.2%
8. Unknown	0				54	missing	54	missing
Total	164	100%	11	100%	141	100%	316	100%

Because marital status information was missing in 54 (38.3%) of the rejected cases, it is difficult to draw conclusions about the entire referred population. Comparisons between groups is also difficult but it would appear that the successes had the highest percentage of married individuals.

7. Level of Education

Table 11 tabulates the number of years of education completed by all program participants.

Table 11

Grade	Success		Failure		Reject		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
6	5	3.3%					5	2.4%
7	1	0.7%					1	0.5%
8	4	2.6%			2	4.0%	6	2.8%
9	2	1.3%					2	0.9%
10	12	7.8%	1	11.1%	1	2.0%	14	66.6%
11	15	9.8%	2	22.2%	16	32.0%	33	15.6%
12	60	39.2%	5	55.6%	17	34.0%	82	38.6%
13	19	12.4%			7	14.0%	26	12.3%
14	12	7.8%	1	11.1%	4	8.0%	17	8.0%
15	10	6.5%			1	2.0%	11	5.2%
16	9	5.9%			2	4.0%	11	5.2%
17	1	0.7%					1	0.5%
18	2	1.3%					2	0.9%
19	0						0	
20	1	0.7%					1	0.5%
Unknown	11	missing	2	missing	91	missing	104	missing
Known	153	100%	9	100%	50	100%	212	100%
Total	164		11		141		316	
Average of Known	12.25		12.0		12.08		12.20	

Education data was missing in a large number of cases particularly in the rejects group (91=64.5%).

What information was available, indicates that the average educational level was fairly high and roughly equivalent for all groups. However, when looking at individuals with less than a high school education, there appears to be some differences between groups. The success group had 39 (25.5%) with less than a high school education, the failures 3 (33.3%) and the rejects, 19 (38.0%). Complete data for all groups would be needed to determine whether or not these differences are actually significant.

8. Citation/Arrest

Table 12 shows the program population in terms of those who were arrested as opposed to those who were given a citation at the time of the offense.

Table 12

	Success		Failure		Reject		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Arrest	67	40.9%	6	54.5%	86	64.2%	159	51.5%
Citation	97	59.1%	5	45.5%	48	35.8%	150	48.5%
Unknown	0		0		7	missing	7	missing
Total	164	100%	11	100%	141	100%	316	100%

The data indicates that arrests and citations were referred in roughly equal numbers but the arrest cases were more likely to be rejected. (64.2% of rejected cases were arrests.) This appears reasonable in that arrests would more likely represent the more serious offenses. Citations are generally not issued to offenders with prior records or with felony offenses. Data indicates that a larger percentage of reject cases had prior records, and a citation was issued in only one felony offense.

9. Offense Resulting in Referral

Table 13 indicates the offenses that result in referral to property diversion by all program participants.

Table 13

Offense	Success		Failure		Reject		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Theft of lost property	1	0.6%					1	0.3%
Burglary	12	7.3%	2	18.2%	12	8.5%	26	8.2%
Forgery	3	1.8%			6	4.3%	9	2.9%
NSF checks	2	1.2%	1	9.1%	3	2.1%	6	1.9%
Petty theft	141	86.1%	7	63.6%	107	75.9%	255	80.8%
Credit card theft	2	1.2%					2	0.6%
Grand theft	1	0.6%					1	0.3%
Receiving stolen property	1	0.6%	1	9.1%	10	7.1%	12	3.8%
Malicious mischief	1	0.6%					1	0.3%
Grant theft-auto					1	0.7%	1	0.3%
Other					2	1.4%	2	0.6%
Total	164	100%	11	100%	141	100%	316	100%

The greatest number of all referrals was for petty theft (80.8%), over half of these being successes. Failures had a larger percentage (more than double) of burglaries than did either the successes or rejects. Of the successes, only 23 of 164 cases (14%) were referred for charges other than petty theft.

10. Felony/Misdemeanor

Table 14 represents a comparison of felony and misdemeanor offenses for each group.

Table 14

	Success		Failure		Reject		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Felony	31	18.9%	4	36.4%	36	26.3%	71	22.8%
Misdemeanor	133	81.1%	7	63.6%	101	73.7%	241	77.2%
Unknown	0		0		4	missing	4	missing
Total	164	100%	11	100%	141	100%	316	100%

Only 22.8% of the program's referrals were felony charges which is somewhat below the program's original expectations that at least a third of their cases would be felonies. The percentage of those accepted was slightly lower (20%) and the percent successfully completing the program was 18.9%. The program itself, however, is not to be faulted for this lower percentage since the program is totally dependent on the prosecuting agencies for referrals.

11. Referral Source

Table 15 represents the source of referrals for all participants. Originally, referrals were to come only from the offices of the City Prosecutor and the District Attorney. During the second quarter however, it was decided to include individuals who had received field citations for petty theft (shoplifting). Because of the method of processing citations, it was necessary to include the court in the referral process. At the time of the defendant's arraignment, the court was informed of the City prosecutor's wishes to defer prosecution. If the court concurred, the arraignment was continued for six months, in order to permit the defendant to participate in the program. Additionally, the court also began to make its own referrals to the program which increased the referral rate. Table 15 indicates the referral source for all cases by District Attorney, City Prosecutor, and court referrals. It should be noted that all court referrals also come from the City Prosecutor even though they were also handled by the court.

Table 15

Referral Source	Success		Failure		Reject		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
District Attorney	26	16.0%	4	36.4%	31	22.1%	61	19.4%
City Prosecutor	68	41.7%	3	27.2%	56	40.0%	127	40.4%
Court	69	42.3%	4	36.4%	53	37.9%	126	40.2%
Unknown	1	missing	0		1	missing	2	missing
Total	164	100%	11	100%	141	100%	316	100%

Again, the data reflects a lower percentage of referrals from the District Attorney than had been originally anticipated. Additionally, 40.2% of all referrals involved the court, a factor which was not anticipated in the original planning.

12. Comments

The somewhat limited number of characteristics examined in relation to all groups was limited by the lack of data found in the case files. Information was particularly lacking in the files of the rejected cases and they frequently contained nothing more than the basic arrest information. Part of the reason for this lies in the fact that a large number of these individuals were never interviewed and, therefore, there was no opportunity to get certain kinds of information. However, even in the cases where individuals were interviewed, information was not collected in any systematic way and, therefore, much information was missing.

On the basis of available information, Successes and Rejects appeared to be somewhat similar with the Failures being the most different. They differed from the other groups in almost every characteristic with major differences showing up in age and severity of prior record. They were, however, a very small group, and these differences should again be examined when a larger group is available for study.

D. DESCRIPTION OF SUPERVISION SERVICES

The original proposal by the Diversion Project stated that supervision would center around a mutually agreed upon plan of supervision tailored to the individual. The offender was to be dealt with on an intensive and short-term basis with existing community resources to be used when applicable.

The case files of all individuals accepted into the program (Successes and Failures) were examined in order to get some idea about the level of supervision services being provided.

Again the factors examined were determined by the information that was recorded by program personnel.

1. Process Time

Table 16 represents a comparison of program successes and failures in terms of process time. Process time refers to the amount of time (in months and tenths) between the date of arrest for the property offense and the date the offender was formally placed under probation supervision.

Table 16

Process Time	Success		Failure		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
0.1 - 0.5	13	7.9%	2	18.2%	15	8.6%
0.6 - 1.00	44	26.8%	6	54.6%	50	28.6%
1.10 - 1.50	62	37.9%	2	18.2%	64	36.6%
1.60 - 2.00	24	14.7%			24	13.7%
2.10 - 2.50	7	4.3%	1	9.0%	8	4.5%
2.60 - 3.00	3	1.8%			3	1.7%
3.10 - 3.50	3	1.8%			3	1.7%
3.60 - 4.00	2	1.2%			2	1.1%
4.10 - 4.50	1	0.6%			1	0.6%
4.60 - 5.00	1	0.6%			1	0.6%
5.10 - 5.50						
5.60 - 6.00						
6.10 - 6.50						
6.60 - 7.00						
7.10 - 7.50	3	1.8%			3	1.7%
7.60 - 8.00						
8.10 - 8.50						
8.60 - 9.00						
9.10 - 9.50						
9.60 - 10.00	1	0.6%			1	0.6%
Total	164	100%	11	100%	175	100%
Average	1.52 months		1.04 months		1.49 months	

The average process time for program successes was 1.52 months and 1.04 for program failures. Process time for the majority of program successes was 1.40 months, but only 1.00 month for program failures.

The original grant proposal for this program states that "Routinely, several months pass between the time the offense is committed and the time probation may be granted ... The problems which led to commission of the offense, many times, becomes magnified or so deeply hidden that probation and rehabilitative efforts are rendered less effective." "... the [Diversion] plan will allow intervention within a few days of the commission of the offense." "The project will provide immediate treatment for the offender, thereby reducing the delay between arrest and probation supervision."

These goals or desires do not seem to have routinely been met since nearly 70% of all people accepted into the program had a process time of over one month (In fact, 11 of 175 clients had process times of over three months, and 4 had times over seven months!). Generally, failures had briefer process times than successes (91% of failures had process times less than 1.5 months while only 71.6% of successes fell into this category).

It should be pointed out that the length of process time was not solely under the control of the Property Diversion Unit; the referring agencies could delay referral of a case for weeks. This was particularly true for citation cases where arraignment hearings were set three weeks after the offense. Whatever the reason, it does appear that process time was not in accordance with the stated goals in the original proposal.

2. Probation Term

Table 17 indicates the terms of probation supervision granted for program successes and failures.

Table 17

Term in Months	Success		Failure		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
2.2	1	0.6%			1	0.6%
3.0	2	1.2%			2	1.2%
4.0	14	8.6%			14	8.1%
5.0	6	3.7%			6	3.5%
6.0	136	84.1%	9	81.8%	145	83.8%
7.0	2	1.2%	1	9.1%	3	1.6%
8.0	1	0.6%	1	9.1%	2	1.2%
Unknown	2 missing				2 missing	
Total	164	100%	11	100%	175	100%
Average Time	5.75 months		6.27 months		5.79 months	

The average term of probation for successes was 5.75 months, for failures, 6.27 months. This difference could be due to the failure cases appearing to need longer supervision at the initial screening.

The great majority of all cases (83.8%) were granted six months probation supervision. It should be noted that the original grant proposal stated the term would be geared to individual needs, and it was felt that this would be seven months in most cases. However, once the court became involved in the process, the judges began setting the time at six months.

In those cases with supervision terms other than six months, it is assumed that the term was more geared to the specific needs of the individual client.

The actual time under supervision was also computed for each case. The success cases, of course, were almost always supervised for the entire term initially agreed upon. Failure cases, on the other hand, were generally removed from the program prior to the expiration of the original term set. For the failures, time under supervision, ranged from 1.7 to 6.0 months with an average time of 4.62 months.

3. Conditions of Probation

As a part of the supervision plan, offenders must agree to abide by certain conditions of probation. There are four standard conditions which everyone must agree to, which are listed below.

1. Report in person as directed by the Probation officer.
2. Notify the Probation officer promptly of any change in residence or employment.
3. Be a law-abiding citizen. If arrested, notify the Probation officer at once.
4. Do not leave the County without proper permission.

In addition to the standard conditions some offenders had one or more additional conditions tailored to their individual needs. Additional conditions fell into the following categories.

1. Engage in program of work and/or school.
2. Non-association with specified individuals.
3. Write report on offense.
4. Make restitution.
5. Engage in volunteer work.
6. Engage in a therapy program.
7. Contact the Probation officer at specified times.
8. Enroll in an English class.

Table 18 indicates the numbers of individuals with each of the specified conditions.

Table 18

Condition	Success	Failure	Total
1. Work/School	32	8	40
2. Limit Associates	1		1
3. Write Report	37	2	39
4. Restitution	8	1	9
5. Volunteer Work	25	1	26
6. Therapy	10	3	13
7. Contacts	9	3	12
8. English Class	3		3

Some offenders had more than one additional condition and Table 19 summarizes this information.

Table 19

Number of Conditions	Success		Failure		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No additional conditions	51	31.1%	0		51	29.1%
1 additional condition	102	62.2%	5	45.5%	107	61.1%
2 additional conditions	10	6.1%	5	45.5%	15	8.6%
3 additional conditions	1	0.6%	1	9.0%	2	1.2%
Total	164	100%	11	100%	175	100%

The table indicates that most offenders (71%) had at least one special conditions in addition to the four standard ones. What is significant is that the failures appear to have had more conditions imposed than the successes in that over half had at least two additional conditions. Less than 7% of the successes had two or more conditions. One interpretation would be that failures were recognized in the screening process as potential problems and, therefore, more conditions were imposed. An opposite view would be that additional conditions increased the individual's potential for failure in that there were more requirements to meet. Only a more in depth study could determine which view is correct.

4. Referrals to Outside Agencies

Table 20

Number of Referrals	Success		Failure		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
0	154	93.9%	11	100%	165	94.3%
1	10	6.1%	0	0%	10	5.7%
Total	164	100%	11	100%	175	100%

Referrals were to the following agencies:

Job Corps	1
Therapist	1
V.A. Hospital	1
Chicano Federation	2
Western Behavioral Sciences Institute	1
Legal Aid	1
Jewish Community Services	1
Senior Services	1
Department of Public Welfare	1

The original grant proposal indicates "Existing community agencies and resources will be used when applicable." Case file information would indicate that referrals to outside agencies were applicable in only 10 (6.1%) cases.

This seems to be in conflict with the information presented about the conditions of probation. Table 18 indicates that of those who successfully completed the program, 25 were ordered to do volunteer work and 10 were ordered to obtain therapy. It can only be concluded, therefore, that either some individuals did not in fact comply with their conditions of probation, or that their compliance was not properly documented in the case file.

5. Contacts

All case files included a log sheet for recording contacts with clients. The form provided space for indicating the date and type for each contact. Tables 21, 22 and 23 summarize the information obtained from those logs.

Table 21

Success Group	Office		Field		Type Unknown*		Total Contacts**	
Number of Contacts	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
0	31	18.9%	140	85.4%	104	63.4%	19	11.6%
1	33	20.1%	12	7.3%	29	17.7%	9	5.5%
2	29	17.7%	8	4.7%	14	8.5%	21	12.8%
3	30	18.3%	2	1.2%	6	3.7%	39	23.8%
4	22	13.4%	2	1.2%	9	5.5%	33	20.1%
5	12	7.3%			2	1.2%	26	15.8%
6	6	3.7%					15	9.2%
7	1	0.6%					1	0.6%
8							1	0.6%
Total	164	100%	164	100%	164	100%	164	100%
Average Number per Client	2.27		0.26		0.74		3.26	

*Contact logs sometimes showed dated entries with no indication as to what type of contact it was.

**Total contact figures include all log entries including those where the type was unknown.

Table 22

Failure Group	Office		Field		Type Unknown		Total Contacts	
Number of Contacts	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
0	3	27.3%	11	100%	8	72.7%	3	27.3%
1	5	45.5%			1	9.1%	3	27.3%
2	2	18.1%					3	27.3%
3	1	9.1%			1	9.1%		
4							1	9.1%
5								
6								
7					1	9.1%		
8								
9								
10							1	9.1%
Total	11	100%	11	100%	11	100%	11	100%
Average Number per Client	1.09		0		1.0		2.09	

Table 23

Group Averages	Office	Field	Type Unknown	Total Contact
Average for Successes	2.27	0.27	0.74	3.26
Average for Failures	1.09	0	1.0	2.09
Average for Total	2.19	.24	.75	3.19

Information from the tables indicates that 132 (23.6%) of the entries on the contact sheets did not specify the type of contact. It is very possible that many of these were telephone contacts rather than face-to-face contacts. Only those specified as "office" or "field" are known for sure to have been face-to-face meetings. Looking at only these two types, the average number of total contacts per client drops to 2.43.

Contacts for failures were lower than those for successes but this was to be expected. Many of the failures were excluded from the program precisely for failing to maintain contact with the probation officer.

The table for the success group does, however, show some surprises. From the available information, 19 (11.6%) of the successes had no contacts at all recorded in the case file. This was in spite of the fact that in some of those cases, court report information indicated that the offender had "reported monthly." Since the average term of probation was approximately six months (Table 17) for successes, it can be calculated that they were contacted on an average of once every 1.7 months or approximately every 7½ weeks. This is counting all types of contacts including those that might possibly have been telephone calls.

The project proposal indicated that "intensive" supervision services would be provided. Available information does not reflect that this was the case and there are several possible explanations. It may have been determined that many individuals did not need more intensive service and, therefore, there was no necessity to see them more often. The other possible explanation is that program personnel were careless in their case recording and simply did not properly document their activities with clients. As previously mentioned, many entries that were made, were carelessly done and did not specify type.

6. Program Failures

Eleven individuals were terminated from the program as failures. The reasons for failure were as follows:

1. Offender re-arrested	5
2. Offender failed to maintain contact	4
3. Offender uncooperative	2
Total	<u>11</u>

No additional information is known about the final disposition in these cases except that the five who were arrested were subsequently referred to the Probation Department to be processed through normal procedures.

7. Comments

The first impression received after examining case files was that they contained very little information. There appears to have been very little concern about documenting casework activities and as a result it appears as if there was only minimal interaction with clients. As with other characteristics, there appeared to be some differences between the successes and failures in terms of the kind of supervision service provided. Only a more detailed examination could determine if this is, in fact, true.

VI CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It would be impossible, at this time, to draw definitive conclusions about the effectiveness of the Adult Property Crime Deferred Prosecution Project primarily because of the limited scope of this study. Instead, an attempt has been made to simply describe certain aspects of the program and its clientele in the hopes of providing some useful information for future program planning. This study has, in many ways, raised more questions than it has answered and it is for this reason that the following recommendations are being submitted.

Recommendation I - It is recommended that a formative evaluation be designed to be conducted on an on-going basis.

The major question still needs to be answered as to whether or not the project is more effective in dealing with certain types of offenders than the normal criminal justice process. In order to respond to this question it is essential to know what the long range effects of the program are on its' participants in relation to similar individuals who do not go through the program. This could best be determined by designing and conducting an on-going study that would include comparison or control groups. A careful design would also insure that data collection would be systematic and that sufficient data would be available on those variables considered to be important.

A related question to be answered has to do with program cost. The determination of program effectiveness must also take into consideration the cost of services provided. It may be that a program is extremely effective in dealing with a particular problem but that the cost is greater than can be afforded. Only a comprehensive formative design could respond to this question. Additionally, any other areas of interest to program personnel could be built into an evaluation design.

Recommendation II - It is recommended that record keeping procedures be improved and that documentation of casework activities be included in case files.

Throughout this evaluation effort, there was a continuing problem with inaccurate and incomplete records. There was little consistency in what information was collected or how it was recorded. Additionally, case files were characterized by a scarcity of information about Probation Officer/Client interaction. This lack of documentation makes it appear that the supervision services provided were neither "intensive" nor "tailored to the individual." Even if this is not the case, program personnel would have no way of refuting that charge at this point. It is primarily for this reason that an improvement in record keeping is being recommended regardless of whether or not any additional evaluation will be conducted in the future.

Recommendation III - It is being recommended that an effort be made to increase the number of referrals for felonies from the District Attorney.

Just on the basis of the limited number of characteristics presented the question arises as to whether program participants would not have been just as "successful" without the program. If the program is selecting that kind of individual, then it's contribution to the improvement of the Criminal Justice System is less than if it dealt with individuals presenting a higher risk. Those individuals committing the more serious offenses would be in this higher risk category and the recommendation is that an attempt be made to have more of them included.

It is recognized that the decision to refer offenders lies with the prosecuting agencies and is, therefore, beyond the control of the Project Director. However, it is believed that an effort should be made to increase referrals from the District Attorney so that the program will have a greater chance of impacting the Criminal Justice System.

VII. APPENDIX

APPENDIX B

Adult Data Form
Post Program Adult Data Form

Appendix C

Statistical data on the number of defendants prosecuted for property crimes within the San Diego Judicial District is not readily available. While the various police agencies have data on reported crime and arrests, data on specific crimes prosecuted is not currently available from the courts.

In order to obtain data on which to compare the Project Objective of deferring from prosecution approximately 10% of those offenders who would originally have been prosecuted for property crimes, project staff went to the Municipal Court Criminal Control Register and manually counted, by the day, the number of complaints filed. Since it would have been prohibitive in time to have surveyed the entire year, two weeks each in January and October 1973 were selected as being representative. Court filings were determined for both misdemeanors and felonies. Individuals scheduled for arraignment in the South Bay Branch of the San Diego Municipal Court were rejected as being outside the area covered by the project.

The following information was obtained from the survey:

MISDEMEANORS

<u>January 1973</u>	<u>October 1973</u>	
1-2-73 16	10-1-73 8	
1-3-73 12	10-2-73 6	
1-4-73 23	10-3-73 12	
1-5-73 9	10-4-73 1	
1-6-73 17	10-5-73 8	Total: 243
1-8-73 17	10-9-73 5	Daily average: 11.6
1-9-73 8	10-10-73 25	Weekly average: 57.5
1-10-73 12	10-11-73 6	Estimated No.: 2875
1-11-73 11	10-12-73 11	
1-15-73 15	10-15-73 14	
1-16-73 10	10-16-73 10	

FELONIES

<u>January 1973</u>	<u>October 1973</u>	
1-2-73 18	10-1-73 9	
1-3-73 8	10-2-73 0	
1-4-73 17	10-3-73 10	
1-5-73 17	10-4-73 8	
1-8-73 4	10-5-73 14	Total: 103
1-9-73 17	10-9-73 7	Daily average: 5
1-10-73 15	10-10-73 6	Weekly average: 25
1-11-73 5	10-11-73 15	Estimated No.: 1250
1-12-73 6	10-12-73 12	
1-15-73 12	10-15-73 10	
1-16-73 17	10-16-73 12	
1-17-73 5		

Estimated Property Crime filing in San Diego Judicial District,
 Misdemeanor and Felony = 4125
 10% = 412

Appendix A
ADULT PROPERTY CRIMES DEFERRED
PROSECUTION DATA FORM

NAME: _____		DOB: _____	
I. OFFENSE			
DATE: _____		CHARGE: _____	
AGENCY: _____		A/C: _____ M/F: _____	
II. REFERRAL			
DATE: _____		AGENCY: DA _____, CP _____, CT _____	
III. SCREENING			
DATE: _____		ACCEPTANCE <input type="checkbox"/>	
DECISION: REJECTION <input type="checkbox"/>		P.O. ASSIGNED _____	
REASON _____		_____	
DIS. OF CHARGE _____		_____	
IV. INTAKE			
NOT ACCEPTED <input type="checkbox"/>		ACCEPTED <input type="checkbox"/>	
REASON _____		DATE (of Agreement) _____	
DISP. OF CHARGE _____		TERM _____	
_____		CONDITIONS _____	
_____		P.O. ASSIGNED _____	
V. PROGRAM			
CONTACTS: DATES _____		TOTAL _____	
PLACES _____		_____	
LENGTH _____		_____	
REFERRALS: PROBATION _____		_____	
OTHER AGENCIES _____		_____	
ADDITIONAL _____		_____	
NEW ARRESTS:			
DATE	CHARGE	AGENCY	DISP.
CLOSING: FAILURE <input type="checkbox"/>		SUCCESS <input type="checkbox"/>	
DATE _____		DATE _____	
TOTAL TIME _____		TOTAL TIME _____	
REASON _____		CHARGED DISMISSED:	
DISP. OF CHARGE _____		YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	
_____		DATE _____	
VI. POST-PROGRAM			
60-DAY DATE: _____			
ARRESTS: NO <input type="checkbox"/>		YES <input type="checkbox"/>	
DATE	CHARGE	AGENCY	DISP.
Filled out by: _____		Date filled out: _____	

ADULT DATA FORM

1. NAME: Case/N _____
 T/H _____
 AKAs _____
2. PROGRAM: _____
 Entry Date: _____
 Status: Exp _____ Cont _____ Other _____
 Comments: _____
3. NUMBERS: Prob _____
 CII _____
 FBI _____
 CBL _____
 SS _____
4. ADDRESS: _____ ZIP _____
5. DOB: 1/1/ 6. AGE: _____ 7. SEX: _____ 8. ETHNIC _____
yr mo day
9. SUPERVISION: Type _____ Status _____ 10. P.C. _____
11. SUPERVISOR: _____ 12. I-LEVEL: Jcs _____ Int _____

13. PROBATION GRANTS/DIVERSIONS:

NUMBER	DATE	TERM	OFFENSE	D/G	I/C	CONDITIONS	T/REM	T/SERV
				1/2	1/1			

14. PRIOR RECORD: JUV: _____ First Adult Arrest Date _____

PRE-PROG	INC. DATES	TRAFFIC	DRUG/ALC	PROPERTY	PERSON	OTHER	INTEL
C-6 FGD							
D-12 MGD							
G-24 MGD							
H-24 MGD							
I-24 MGD							

15. PRIOR COMMITMENTS:

DATE	AGENCY	REASON	RELEASE	T/SERVED	COMMENTS

16. PROBATION PROGRAMS: Current _____
 Past _____

17. OUTSIDE AGENCIES/PROGRAMS: Current _____
 Past _____

18. MARITAL STATUS: _____ 19. MILITARY STATUS: 1 T/Discharge _____

20. EMPLOYMENT (CURRENT/MOST RECENT): Dates: _____ To _____
 Employer _____ Occ. _____ Ssl/Ins. _____

21. EDUCATION: Highest Grade _____ Deg/Cert. _____

ADULT DATA FORM

1. NAME: COUSO/N
S/N
AKAs

2. PROGRAM: _____
 Entry Date: _____
 Status: Exp _____ Cont _____ Other _____
 Comments: _____

3. NUMBERS: Prob _____
 CII _____
 FEL _____
 GDL _____
 SS _____

4. ADDRESS: _____ ZIP _____

5. DOB: / / 6. AGE: _____ 7. SEX: _____ 8. ETHNIC _____
yr mo day

9. SUPERVISION: Type _____ Status _____ 10. P.O. _____

11. SUPERVISOR: _____ 12. I-LEVEL: Jcs _____ Int _____

13. PROBATION GRANTS/DIVERSIONS:

NUMBER	DATE	TERM	OFFENSE	1/2 1/2		CONDITIONS	T/REM	S/SERV
				D/G	D/C			

14. PRIOR RECORD: JUV: _____ First Adult Arrest Date _____

PRI-PRCG	INC. DATES	TRAFFIC	DRUG/ALC	PROPERTY	PERSON	OTHER	TOTAL
0-5 1988.							
0-12 1988.							
0-10 1988.							
0-21 1988.							
0- 1988.							

15. PRIOR COMMITMENTS:

DATE	AGENCY	REASON	RELEASE	T/SERVED	COMMENTS

16. PROBATION PROGRAMS: Current _____
 Past _____

17. OUTSIDE AGENCIES/PROGRAMS: Current _____
 Past _____

18. MARITAL STATUS: _____ 19. MILITARY STATUS: _____ T/Discharge _____

20. EMPLOYMENT (CURRENT/MOST RECENT): Dates: _____ To _____
 Employer _____ Occ. _____ Ss I/no. _____

21. EDUCATION: Highest Grade _____ Deg/Cert. _____

POST PROGRAM ADULT DATA SHEET

1. ADDRESS: _____ CITY _____

2. AGENCY _____ 3. SUPERVISION: Type _____ Status _____

4. P.O. _____ Supervisor _____

5. PROBATION GRANTS/DIVERSIONS: SUBSEQUENT FROM _____

NUMBER	DATE	TEAM	OFFENSE	1/2 1/3		C. CONDITIONS	T/R.M.	T/SERV
				B/G	D/S			

6. SLEEPER RECORDS: FROM _____

PRE-PROG	INC. DATES	TRAFFIC	DRUG/AIC	INHERENT	PERSON	OTHER	TOTAL
0-1 1971							
0-12 1971							
0-18 1971							
0-24 1971							
0-30 1971							

7. SUBSEQUENT COMMITMENTS: FROM _____

DATE	AGENCY	REASON	RELEASE	T/SERVED	COMMENT

8. EDUCATIONAL COURSES: MATTERS _____
 Post _____

9. SERVICE AGENCIES/PROGRAMS: Current _____
 Past _____

10. MARITAL STATUS: _____ 11. MILITARY STATUS: _____ C/Discharge _____

12. EMPLOYMENT (CURRENT/MOST RECENT): Dates: _____ To _____
 Employer _____ Occ. _____ Sal/no. _____

13. EDUCATION: Highest Grade _____ Deg/Cert. _____

14. ASST. _____

POST PROGRAM ADULT DATA FORM

1. ADDRESS: _____ ZIP _____

2. AGE: _____ 3. SUPERVISION: Type _____ Status _____

4. P.O. _____ Supervisor _____

5. PROBATION GRANTS/DIVERSIONS: SUBSEQUENT FROM: _____ / _____ / _____

NUMBER	DATE	TERM	OFFENSE	D/G	C/G	CONDITIONS	COMPL	TERM:

6. SUBSEQUENT RECORD: From: _____ / _____ / _____

PRE-PRG	INC. DATE	TRAFFIC	DRUG/ALC	PROPERTY	PERSON	OTHER	TOTAL
0-6 mos.							
6-12 mos.							
12-18 mos.							
18-24 mos.							
0- mos.							

7. SUBSEQUENT COMMITMENTS: From: _____ / _____ / _____

DATE	AGENCY	REASON	RELEASE	RECEIVED	COMMENTS

8. PROBATION PROGRAMS: Current _____
Past _____

9. OUTSIDE AGENCIES/PROGRAMS: Current _____
Past _____

10. MARITAL STATUS: _____ 11. MILITARY STATUS: _____ T/Discharge _____

12. EMPLOYMENT (CURRENT/MOST RECENT): Dates: _____ To _____
Employer _____ Occ. _____ Sal/mo. _____

13. EDUCATION: Highest Grade _____ Deg/Cert. _____

14. AGEN'S _____

END