THE CITY OF NEW YORK

CRIMINAL JUSTICE COORDINATING COUNCIL

RESEARCH, EVALUATION AND INFORMATION DIVISION

VOLUNTEERISM IN THE CRIMINAL AND JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEMS:

THE OAR MODEL AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE PLANNING

VOLUNTEERISM IN THE CRIMINAL AND JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEMS: THE OAR MODEL AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE PLANNING

An Evaluation Report

Prepared by the

RESEARCH, EVALUATION AND INFORMATION DIVISION

of the

Criminal Justice Coordinating Council
111 John Street
New York, New York 10038

By

MICHAEL B. GREENE

In Consultation with Karen Beatty

and

With Assistance from Sydney Brink

October 1979

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES/CONTINUED...

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In this report a review of the nature and extent of volunteerism in the juvenile and criminal justice systems is presented; Offender Aid and Restoration (OAR), a community-based volunteer program funded by the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council (CJCC) is evaluated; and recommendations are made with regard to future planning and funding of volunteer programs.

For the OAR evaluation, four sources of data were used. Fifty-two OAR volunteers were interviewed (volunteer survey); 680 volunteer files were examined; OAR reports of volunteer and staff activities, as verified by CJCC, were analyzed; and direct observations of OAR's training and feedback sessions were made by CJCC staff.

Volunteer Programs in the Criminal Justice System

Estimates of the number of volunteers currently providing direct services to clients under the jurisdiction of the criminal and juvenile justice systems vary from 200,000 to one million volunteers. The vast majority of volunteer programs are geared toward young offenders, and are usually affiliated with courts and probation departments. In most cases, volunteers are assigned to work on a one-to-one basis with clients (sponsorship model) in conjunction with or under the supervision of professional probation officers. A paid full-time Coordinator or Director of Volunteers is generally retained to oversee recruitment, secure pre-service and on-going training, assign volunteers to clients, and mediate any problems or difficulties between volunteers and staff.

Generally, volunteer programs have been found to function as well or better than other program alternatives with which they have been compared; and in cases where appropriate comparison groups have been secured, volunteer programs generally have been shown to reduce rates of recidivism. One volunteer program, the Volunteer Probation Counselor Program, has received L.E.A.A.'s Exemplary Project designation.

OAR: Roles and Functions

Offender Aid and Restoration of New York City, Inc. (OAR) was formed in May 1975 and began operation at the Adolescent Detention Center on Rikers Island four months later. Initially funded through private and foundation sources, OAR has been funded principally by CJCC from October 1975 to the present. From October 1975 through January 1979 OAR recruited and worked with adolescents (16 to 21 years of age) at Rikers Island; since February 1979, OAR has recruited and worked with juveniles (12 to 15 years of age) at Rikers Island and Spofford Juvenile Center, while continuing to work with those adolescent clients who were recruited prior to that time.

OAR, like other volunteer programs, trains volunteers to work on a one-to-one basis with young offender clients. After initial sessions with the client at one of New York City's detention centers, the volunteer attempts to maintain the relationship throughout the client's criminal or juvenile justice system involvement. Volunteers serve as role models and friends to their clients, work with their clients' families, provide support during their clients' court cases, and help their clients start thinking about living more fulfilling and productive lives.

The volunteers are asked during training to make a one year commitment to the program. While their clients are in detention, the volunteers are required to visit once per week for two hours. If volunteers miss three consecutive counseling sessions (without giving prior notification) they are terminated from the program. Volunteers are also asked to attend monthly or bi-monthly feedback sessions. In addition, volunteers are encouraged to contact their clients' families to help with any problems they are experiencing (provided their clients agree to this), and to accompany their clients to court hearings and trials.

The staff of OAR, which during 1979 consisted of twelve full-time paid positions (three administrators, seven direct service personnel, and a bookkeeper and executive secretary), perform a variety of functions. First, staff recruit, train, supervise and provide backup support and information to all OAR volunteers. All service delivery staff, as well as OAR's three administrators, participate to varying degrees in the training of volunteers. Training is conducted in seven week cycles, and OAR runs from three to five training cycles each year. In addition, one or two staff members lead monthly feedback sessions for active volunteers. The Coordinator of Volunteers and his or her assistant serve as principal liaisons between the volunteer and OAR. They coordinate the assignment of clients to volunteers and maintain records of all volunteer activities. The Court Liaison operates principally in the courtrooms, frequently accompanying clients whose volunteers cannot make daytime court appearances. Between April and September 1979, the Court Liaison, as well as other OAR staff, made an average of two court appearances a day. The Court Liaison also works with lawyers and volunteers in helping to develop strategies for minimizing their clients penetration into the criminal justice system, serves as a resource person regard standard courtroom and legal activities, and provides information to volunteers such as court dates and lawyers names.

Two further areas which OAR staff oversee are "aftercare" and "outreach." Aftercare refers to all services provided to clients who are living in their communities. This includes those on bail, probation, parole and those whose cases were dismissed. Aftercare services presently provided by OAR staff include group counseling (one juvenile and one adolescent group), individual counseling, limited tutoring

and educational testing and referrals to appropriate agencies and programs. Outreach, at present, consists primarily of family counseling. A parents' group meets once a week, and both parents and young people have sought counseling for a variety of familial problems.

Finally, the staff initiate and maintain relationships with institutions and facilities with which the young people are involved. Clients have been recruited, over the past five years, from five separate facilities on Rikers Island and from Spofford Juvenile Center. A staff member usually gives a brief talk about OAR to the detainees and then individually interviews those who are interested in signing up for the program. Prospective clients are promised a volunteer during the following week. A staff member is also needed to monitor and serve as a trouble-shooter for each group of volunteers which vists any of the facilities.

Goals and Objectives

OAR states as its main goal the diversion of clients from, or minimization of their penetration into, the criminal justice system.

A second major goal has been to actively involve citizens in and inform them about the criminal and juvenile justice systems. It is OAR's position that without citizen involvement the justice system will remain insular and unresponsive to the needs of the communities it attempts to serve. Volunteers are encouraged by OAR to return to their communities and speak with their neighbors about their volunteer experiences.

The specific plans set forth by OAR to meet these goals have varied from year to year, depending upon its level of funding and the type of clients to be served. For 1979, OAR proposed to work with approximately 600 junveniles and adolescents during their detention, incarceration and post-release periods. Correspondingly, they proposed to maintain already trained volunteers and to train new ones in numbers sufficient to meet this caseload. OAR also proposed in 1979 to improve the employment skills and job readiness of its adolescent clients and to improve the skills, educational levels and self-images of its juvenile clients.

Program Components

Recruitment and Training:

Since 1975, OAR has relied most heavily on radio announcements to attract volunteers. During its first two year OAR also contacted such standard sources as the Mayor's Office of Volunteers and colleges and universities to supplement the radio announcements. For the past three years, in addition to the radio ads, word of mouth and news reports have served as referral sources.

When a prospective trainee calls and expresses interest in volunteering for the program, he or she is sent an invitation to attend the training cycle. Descriptive materials and a schedule of training sessions are enclosed with the invitation. For the past two training sessions one-quarter of those receiving these materials arrived for the initial training session.

OAR limits to eighty the number of people allowed into frist training sessions; during the two most recent training cycles about sixty percent of those who started training completed the entire cycle. This appears to have been the case for earlier training cycles as well. Most drop out on their own; however, a small number of obviously inappropriate candidates are screened out by OAR staff during or at the close of the training cycle.

The structure and content of OAR's pre-service training has not varied substantially over the past five years. The sessions span a seven week period and include approximately forty hours of training. Trainees are required to attend every session.

OAR's pre-service training component is one of its strongest assests. During the course of training, volunteers participate in role plays to prepare them for the kinds of attitudes, enviroment and situations they will encounter in working with clients; they tour the facilities in which they will work; and they are given instruction in legal, courtroom and correctional department procedures. Individuals employed in various parts of the juvenile and criminal justice systems as well as experienced OAR volunteers are invited to speak to the volunteers; and the OAR staff, at least half of whom are ex-offenders, speak to the volunteers about their own experiences in prison and discuss their views that environmental pressures, such as poverty, unequal educational opportunity and racism are the main causes of crime. Over ninety percent of the fifty-two volunteers surveyed felt that OAR's training sessions were "good" or "excellent;" and based upon direct observations by CJCC staff, the training sessions appear to be informative, stimulating, well-paced and relevant.

Placement:

OAR matches volunteers with clients on the basis of residence in the same borough. They do this so that volunteers will be more aware of local community resources for clients. Many volunteer programs do more elaborate volunteer-client matching. Research literature is equivocal on the fruitfulness of geographic or other matching. There is no evidence that volunteers residing near their clients are significantly more aware of community resources than volunteers residing in other places.

Institutional Access and External Relationships

For the most part, OAR has maintained during the course of the past few years excellent relationships with official agencies and departments with whom it has had dealings. Letters of support for OAR have been written by representatives from the Legal Aid Society, the Juvenile Justice Department, Criminal Court, and the Department of Correction. These organizations have also actively and willingly participated in OAR's pre-service training. However, personal interviews conducted for this report with department and agency heads from Rikers Island facilities (Adolescent Reception and Detention Center and the Juvenile Offender Detention Center) and Legal Aid Society programs (Youth Complex, Special Services and Prison Aid Program) yielded mixed responses.

After several months of negotiations with Spofford Juvenile Center, OAR was granted access to Spofford in late August 1979. Presently OAR is recruting juveniles from Spofford three times per week. Some apparent tensions exist between OAR and the juvenile counselors, but this situation seems to be improving.

Supervision and Ongoing Training

Besides group feedback sessions, OAR provides supervision to its volunteers in three ways. First, OAR staff give their home as well as office telephone numbers to all volunteers and inform volunteers that they can call whenever they need help or just want some feedback as to their clients' progress. Almost all volunteers interviewed said that OAR staff were always available and the vast majority said the help they received from staff was good or excellent. Second, one OAR staff member is always present to provide assistance and support during the counseling sessions at each of the facilities (currently three times per week at Spofford and twice per week at the JODC). Third, the Volunteer Coordinator at OAR calls every volunteer once per month to record the volunteers' monthly activities and dicusss any problems the volunteers wish to talk about at that time.

Despite these avenues of supervision, both OAR volunteer perceptions and the literature on volunteerism suggest that OAR staff should be more active in monitoring their volunteers' work. Manuals on volunteerism in the criminal and juvenile justice systems recommend explicit goal-setting as an integral part of volunteer supervision.

Clients Served

From September 1974 to September 1979, OAR worked with over 2,000 clients and trained over 1,600 volunteers. Based upon a random sample of forty-three clients active in 1978, the mean length of their involvement with an OAR volunteer was 11 months.

During the first seven months of its current funding year, OAR served 321 clients, or fifty percent of its annual contractual obligation, and maintained an average end-of-the-month caseload of 175 clients. This includes 246 adolescents and seventy-five juveniles; however, the proportion of juveniles is increasing. Based upon its recent access to Spofford (late August 1978) the program, as in the past, should have no difficulty in fulfilling its contractual obligation of serving 600 youths.

Almost all clients are male and approximately eighty percent are black or Hispanic. That OAR has and continues to serve the more serious young offender is reflected in these data: Over fifty percent were initially charged with A and B felonies (mainly murder 2^{o} and robbery 1^{o}). As of September 1, 1979, twenty-one percent of OAR's clients were in detention facilities, forty-seven percent were in state prisons and thirty-two percent were "on the street."

Volunteer-client relationships were most frequently broken at the point when clients return to the streets. The conclusion is based upon the 112 relationships established by the fifty-two volunteers interviewed. Only four percent of the relationships were broken at Rikers Island (detention), thirty-nine percent of the relationships in which the clients went to prison were broken while in prison, and seventy percent of the relationships in which the client was on the street were broken while the client was on the street. Furthermore, of those broken in prison, over half had been maintained for at least one month, while of those broken in the street, fewer than a third had been maintained for one month or more.

Volunteer Activities

Most voluntters feel that their relationships with their clients are "good" or "excellent" and most feel they really do help their clients. Volunteers appear to help their clients most in three areas: general attitudes and self-esteem, family relationships and legal and court matters. Through their volunteers' continued expressions of caring and concern, the clients appear (to the volunteers) to develop improved self-concepts, become more optimistic about their futures, and some come to believe, often for the first time in their lives, that someone cares for them and wants to help them. That volunteers establish and maintain such relationships with these youths is significant in itself, given the instability of many of their past relationships. At the very least, feelings of psychological isolation, so prevalent among this population, are reduced and the contact with someone from the "outside" reduces institutional isolation.

More concretely, volunteers help their clients in a variety of ways with their court cases. As indicated above, volunteers help their clients understand standard

court procedures, work as liaisons with the clients' lawyers and accompany their clients to court. In addition, most volunteers, with the consent of their clients, maintain contact with their clients' families and provide assistance and support in whatever ways are appropriate or needed. This is consistent with OAR's philosophy that a young person in trouble should be viewed as a component of a troubled family unit, and thus help should be provided to the entire family unit.

Most volunteers also discuss with their clients their educational and vocational interests, needs and plans. And while their clients often do not make any concrete progress in these areas while incarcerated, they do seem to become more open to thinking about these areas of their lives in a positive vein. It is quite possible that such counseling is a necessary precursor to seeking professional help in these areas.

In maintaining an active roster of about 150 volunteers who engage in these activities, OAR more than adequately accomplished one of its primary goals of involving citizens in the juvenile and criminal justice systems. Moreover, a majority of volunteers attempt to recruit friends and relatives to volunteer with OAR, and most volunteers talk to members of their communities about their experiences and views.

Most volunteers fulfill their one year commitment to OAR and many remain active in the program for substantially longer periods of time. This level of commitment by OAR volunteers is greater than that reported from most volunteer programs in the criminal and juvenile justice systems and signifies its overall success in working with serious young offenders.

Recommendations for OAR

Pre-Service Training:

OAR's pre-service training is generally of excellent quality. Only one change is recommended. In order to improve their relationship with Spofford, OAR staff should invite Spofford personnel, and in particular representatives from the juvenile counselors' union, to participate in OAR's training sessions. This will expose OAR volunteers and staff to the perspectives and concerns of the juvenile counselors and, correspondingly, will expose the juveniles counselors to the perspectives and concerns of OAR. Through this exposure, the roles and responsibilities of each can be better distinguished and the potential for closer cooperation enhanced.

Feedback Sessions:

OAR's feedback sessions are generally not well attended. Volunteers and CJCC staff thought these sessions needed improvement. The following recommendation is made. Individuals having expertise in one or more aspects of juvenile justice and/or social services for youth should be invited to speak at feedback sessions.

Discussion and instruction focusing on the needs of OAR clients who are on the street should be stressed. Time should be allowed following presentations for volunteers and staff to discuss the implications of the information and perspectives shared by the speakers. As much as possible, volunteers should participate in the selection of topics and speakers.

Supervision:

Although volunteers generally felt OAR staff were available to them, some volunteers and CJCC staff thought more direct supervision by OAR staff should be initiated. It is recommended that the Coordinator of Volunteers, in her monthly contacts with volunteers, initiate discussions about the nature and quality of the volunteers' work. This can also be done during the course of visits to the detention centers and at other points of staff/client contact.

Aftercare:

Volunteer-client relationships were most frequently broken after clients were released from detention or prison. Also, only limited aftercare services were provided by OAR. It is recommended that OAR enhance its linkages with agencies and programs which provide services to its client population, and that referrals to these agencies and programs be made when appropriate. Volunteers should be made aware of available aftercare services through feedback sessions and during the supervisory contacts.

Implications for Planning of Volunteer Programs

Organization and Structure of Volunteer Programs:

Because OAR both trains and supervises its volunteers and provides a variety of back-up services for them (aftercare, outreach, courtwork, etc.), a relatively large staff is required. Also, OAR, in contrast to institutionally affiliated or in-house programs, must negotiate visiting and working privileges with various individuals and departments within the justice system. This too requires additional personnel, primarily administrative staff.

For these reasons, the external costs to maintain a community-based volunteer program like OAR are substantially greater than "in-house" volunteer programs. However, there are at least two major service-related consequences which result from the inherent differences between in-house and community-based volunteer programs. First, OAR follows clients throughout their criminal justice system involvements. Thus a volunteer can maintain a relationship with his or her client regardless of whether the client is placed on probation, released on his own recognizance, sent to prison, or paroled. Most volunteer programs, by contrast, are geared toward working

with clients either while on probation or during parole and do not follow them from one system to another. Given a young person's need for stable and consistent relationships, and the psychological strains involved in shifting from one bureaucracy to another, this difference between community-based and in-house volunteer programs has significant ramifications in terms of service delivery.

Second, community-based volunteers are less restrained in the kind of work they do with their clients. They are not, like volunteers in other programs, tied to official departmental or agency policies. Such inhibitions are frequently perceived by clients. Seeing the volunteer withholding help may diminish a client's trust in his volunteer. OAR, on the other hand, encourages its volunteers to work with their clients, their clients' attorneys and their clients' families in whatever ways seem appropriate to them for fostering the best interests of their clients.

The decision as to which kind of volunteer program ought to be funded and implemented should rest on the significance one attaches to these service-related differences, in conjunction with the differential costs of operating the two basic types of programs.

At least half of OAR's staff are ex-offenders. It is important, though perhaps not essential, to include some ex-offenders on the staff. In lieu of this, it is critical to hire some staff who have had extensive experience working with serious young offenders. Either kind of experience will be helpful for educating volunteers about the realities of the serious offender and of prison life in general. Anecdotes about personal experiences in prison, if used judiciously, seem useful for training and supervisory purposes. Also, if ex-offender staff conduct groups for clients and for their families, group members are frequently more willing to open up to individuals who have already gone through what they are now going through. In this role, staff members can provide basic life skills counseling that can prepare and motivate their clients to seek professional guidance and assistance when needed.

Second, OAR takes the position that the detention and prison system, as it is now constituted, is harmful rather than rehabilitating. Despite its espoused philosophy, however, OAR has generally maintained excellent relationships with the Department of Correction and the Department of Juvenile Justice. Apparently these departments view the work OAR does as constructive. Second, OAR's strongly and sincerely held views tend to heighten motivation in its volunteers because of the importance the volunteers then place on their work. Therefore, espousing the need for major reforms in the criminal justice system does not necessarily hinder the operation of a volunteer program and may in fact increase the enthusiasm of its volunteers.

Roles and Responsibilities:

OAR volunteers did not perform particularly well in providing aftercare services to their on-the-street clients. Other sponsorship programs, however, have been shown to be effective in working with parolees and other clients not in institutions. It is, therefore, suggested that volunteer programs reach out to this population with the stipulation that programs provide adequate training to their volunteers in the area of aftercare. Volunteers, at a minimum, should be made aware of available community resources, and could also be taught to provide such services as tutoring and vocational counseling. One should not assume that volunteers are aware of services provided in their own communities.

One further role which OAR encourages its volunteers to adopt is that of community liaison or advocate. Based upon volunteer comments solicited during their interviews, it appears that while volunteers frequently talked to their neighbors about the needs of prisoners and ex-offenders and about the nature of the criminal justice system, these discussions made relatively little impact upon their listeners. Volunteers could yield potential benefits by increasing citizens' knowledge of and involvement in the criminal justice system. The possibility, of course, exists that volunteers could develop uncritically biased views against the juvenile and criminal justice systems, and then communicate these views to the community at large. However, based upon interviews with OAR volunteers, their criticisms, derived mainly from the OAR perspective of client advocacy, were relatively judicious in nature.

Finally, it has been suggested that the sponsorship role is most effectively implemented when specific goals and objectives are articulated and understood by the volunteers. This was not done at OAR. While rigid goal-setting could diminish spontaneity in the friendship role, OAR, and volunteer programs in general, would benefit from regular supervision in which the shape and direction of actual volunteer-client relationships are discussed in comparison with some standards.

Type of Client Served:

The major foci of volunteer programs in the criminal justice system have been the courts and probation. These programs, for the most part, have been relatively successful. Programs geared toward the serious offender or the incarcerated offender are the exception. OAR has demonstrated quite clearly that volunteers can effectively establish and maintain sponsorship relationships with youthful serious offenders. Ideally, volunteer services should be made available to all offenders; but, if priorities must be established, volunteer programs should be geared toward the serious offender.

Based upon feedback from both OAR volunteers and staff, it appears that juveniles have more difficulty than young adults in talking about their needs and feelings. It is almost as if they want, or perhaps need, to establish their "manliness" by playing "tough guy." In addition, juveniles are detained and sentenced for shorter periods of time. Consequently, at any one point in time, a greater proportion of juveniles than older adolescents are on-the-street clients (assuming similar drop out rates). Therefore, volunteer programs which serve juveniles should provide additional training in appropriate counseling techniques and place more emphasis on their "aftercare" services.

Recruitment:

OAR has never encountered difficulties in recruiting a sufficient number of volunteers. Apparently, at least in the New York City metropolitan area, there are a plethora of citizens interested in volunteering for work in the criminal or juvenile justice system. OAR has always recruited a majority of its volunteers through free radio ads. Underutilized by OAR is the method of speaking to various relevant community groups, such as tenant groups, civil rights group, and so on.

Volunteer programs should be cautioned not to over-recruit. OAR sends out approximately four times the number of mailings than individuals they can accomodate in training. Other programs may have a higher or lower drop out rate, but the four to one ratio seems appropriate for estimating drop out rate for a volunteer program just getting under way.

Finally, information describing the program, a pre-service training schedule, and the requirements it makes of its volunteers should be included in a letter of invitation to interested persons. Mailings should be sent out not more than one month prior to the first training session.

Orientation and Pre-Service Training:

Pre-service training is essential for all direct service volunteer programs in the juvenile and criminal justice systems. Such training is essential for several reasons. Minimally, volunteers must learn the procedures and regulations of the facilities or settings where they will work, they must learn something about the clients they will work with, and they must learn some basic counseling techniques. Training sessions should be relevant, informative and practical; they should include: role plays; tours of appropriate facilities; talks by former offenders and/or clients; talks with staff members of different departments and agencies with whome the volunteers will have contact; corrections department procedures; and discussions with experienced volunteers. Furthermore, during the first or second training session, the

responsibilities and requirements associated with volunteering should be fully explained and the program's philosophy, goals and objectives should be articulated; these should be reviewed during the final session. Rapid assignment following pre-service training is also critical to retaining volunteers.

Placement:

Controversy exists in the literature as to whether and to what extent volunteers should be matched with clients. While detailed information was not available from OAR records, it was determined that gender and ethnic group differences made relatively little difference in terms of the duration over which volunteer-client relationships were maintained. This result, combined with other reports of neglible consequences of matching, lead to the conclusion that matching, in general, is not significantly advantageous. However, it seems reasonable to take into consideration any special skills volunteers may have in relation to the interests of clients. OAR, based upon volunteer interviews, could have taken better advantage of the special skills possessed by some of its volunteers. Matching clients and volunteers on the basis of shared neighborhood or borough, as OAR does, could benefit clients who are on the street and need referral to local services, but OAR did not demonstrate success in this area.

On-going Training and Supervision:

As indicated earlier, OAR was somewhat deficient in its supervision of volunteers and was minimally successful in its feedback sessions and on-going training. Generally, the more difficult a client is to work with, the more supervision is needed.

Evaluation and Record-Keeping:

In general, recidivism data should be maintained if appropriate comparison groups are available; pre- and post- measures of progress made by clients in areas of services provided should be obtained (achievement test data for example, if tutoring is provided); and detailed records of the nature and extent of services provided and by whom they were provided should be maintained. Also, detailed records should be kept as to client progress and status changes. For example, when, for how long, for what, and to where a client is sentenced should be recorded. Volunteer and client records, of course, should be cross-referenced. Finally, logically distinct categories of reason for volunteer and client termination should be developed.

Chapter 1

Volunteerism in the Juvenile and Criminal Justice Systems

Throughout the United States and Canada volunteers are presently active in almost all phases of the criminal and juvenile justice systems. Ellis and Noyes (1978) list over twenty separate areas of the criminal justice system (CJS) in which volunteers have been used, including police reserve units, civilian review boards, courtroom monitors, and one-to-one counseling of probationers, inmates, and parolees; and Scheier and his colleagues (Scheier, Berry, Cox, Shelly, Simons, & Callaghan, 1972) cite estimates indicating that volunteers outnumber paid staff in the criminal justice system four or five to one. Formally recognized in the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 as a national resource that should be tapped to improve juvenile justice and reduce youth crime, volunteeers have become an increasingly active force in the juvenile justice system (Schwartz, Jensen, & Mahoney, 1977). While some attempts have been made to assess the impact and influence of volunteers in the juvenile and criminal justice systems, much work remains to be done. This report was undertaken by the Research, Evaluation and Information Division of the New York City Criminal Justice Coordinating Council (CJCC) to advance our knowledge in this area and to address pertinent policy issues regarding the use of volunteers in Juvenile and Criminal Justice Programs.

More specifically, the present report will include the following. First, the history and present nature and extent of voluntunteerism in the criminal and juvenile systems will be reviewed and discussed. (Non-direct service provision, such as court monitoring and police reserve units, will be excluded from review and discussion.) Second, an in-depth description and evaluation of a program which uses volunteers to work on a one-to-one basis with serious young offenders will be presented. This program, Offender Aid and Restoration of New York City (OAR), was chosen to examine the effectiveness of volunteers in working with the serious offender, a topic rarely addressed in the volunteer literature.

History of Volunteerism in the CJS

The first organized volunteer program designed to provide services to prisoners was initiated in 1787 by the Philadelphia Society for Alleviating the Miseries of Public Prisoners (Ellis,& Noyes, 1978). This group, which exists today as the Pennsylvania Prison Society, supplied needy prisoners with food and clothing. In addition, its members developed a program to supervise and aid released prisoners. In this latter capacity, the Society functioned as the first organized group of volunteer parole officers.

The concept of probation also has roots in the volunteer movement (Buckley, 1974). In 1841, John Augustus, a Boston cobler and strong advocate of the temperance movement, requested and received temporary, pre-sentencing custody of a man described as a common drunkard and derelict. Augustus put his ward to work in his shop and initiated a rigorous rehabilitation program. When his "client" returned for sentencing three weeks later, he appeared completely reformed and so well kempt that he was barely recognized by those who had seen him earlier. The judge was impressed and imposed a one cent fine rather than the customary prison sentence. Because of this initial success, further appropriate cases were referred to John Augustus for the purpose of rehabilitation.

Until his death in 1859, John Augustus continued and expanded his volunteer service as the first probation officer given recognition by the criminal justice system. With the assistance of interested community volunteers, he either directly helped or found homes for over 2,000 "probationers." Based primarily on the largely successful work of John Augutus, Massachusetts in 1858 passed the first law in the United States in which the duties of a professional probation officer were described.

Other states rapidly followed suit, beginning a trend toward expanded use of professionals in the criminal justice system. As paid staff increasingly took on the roles and functions formerly carried out by volunteers and as these roles became increasingly designated as professional positions, the number of volunteers active in the CJS first decreased and then remained dormant throughout the first half of the twentieth century (Buckley, 1974; Nelson, Ohmat, & Harlow, 1976; Scheier, 1977; Scioli & Cook, 1976).

An upsurge in the volunteer movement began in the late 1950s and early 1960s and then leveled off during the 1970s. Recent estimates of volunteer strength place the number of volunteers working in corrections at approximately 200,000 (Scheier, 1977) and the number of volunteers working in the juvenile courts at approximately one million (Arthur D. Little, 1978). The impetus for this recent upsurge in the use of volunteers in the CJS has been attributed to the work of two local judges. Judge Keith Leehouts, a municipal court judge in Royal Oaks, Michigan, initiated a probation system which, because of fiscal restraints, drew its personnel from professionals willing to volunteer their time. Stimulated by results from this program showing a reduction in recidivism rates from twenty to ten percent (Arthur D. Little, 1978), the initial group of Royal Oaks volunteers expanded and developed into the national organization known today as Volunteers in Probation (VIP).VIP, in turn, has affiliated with the National Council on Crime and Delinquency. Though VIP has been generally successful in its projects, the New York City VIP project funded by CJCC, was defunded before expiration because of broken contract obligations.

In 1961 Judge Horace Holmes initiated a similar probation system in Boulder, Colorado which used volunteers to work on a one-to-one basis with probationers. This group of volunteers also expanded and developed into a national organization, the National Information Center on Volunteers (NICOV). This organization, along with the National Center for Voluntary Action (NCVA), sponsors workshops and con-

ferences on all aspects of volunteerism, provides technical assistance to volunteer groups, distributes books and pamphlets through its catalogue "Volunteer Readership," and in 1978 initiated the Corrections Volunteer Information Service to meet the specific information needs of programs and individuals working in the criminal justice system.

As volunteerism proliferated within the criminal justice system, other national and local organizations developed and expanded. In 1974 the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges initiated the Children in Placement (CIP) project, a program which utilizes volunteers to help juvenile courts make appropriate decisions regarding the placment of children into foster and adoptive homes. The National Association on Volunteers in the Criminal Justice System, formed in 1970, sponsors annual forums on volunteerism. In addition, several state law enforcement agencies have funded volunteer programs, such as VolinCor in Hawaii; and New York City's Department of Probation (DOP) has funded two full-time positions to coordinate its volunteer program.

The Roles of Volunteers in the CJS

Perhaps cautious of infringing upon the duties and responsibilities of the professional worker, much of the literature on volunteerism in the criminal justice system carefully specifies the role of the volunteer as one of assisting or complementing the professional, rather than of performing duties similar to the professional:

> "correctional literature explicitly reveals that no volunteers are seen as providing 'professional' services. The use of volunteers is limited to complementing or supplementing the work of the professional staff. Usually the volunteer has been seen as one who simply relieves the professional of routine non-professional tasks so that the professional's time can be freed to devote his attention to where it is needed most" (Schwartz, 1971, p. 46).

and

> "It should be emphasized that the volunteer is not a professional counselor, nor is it the purpose of the project to train him to become a professional" (Human Systems Institute, 1976, p. 2).

This caution in distinguishing the volunteer from the professional role is well founded. In at least two instances criminal justice system employees, or their unions,

filed suit against volunteer or paraprofessional groups (Buckley, 1974; Nelson, et al., 1978). The employees considered these groups to be threatening their job security and status. In one of these cases, the Legal Advocate Program in New York City, a volunteer program designed to assist the Brooklyn DOP in its pre-sentencing investigations, was sued by the Probation and Parole Officer's Association of Greater New York (Buckley, 1974, p. 137). Although this case was dismissed and such dispositions are the exception rather than the rule, conflict between volunteers and paid staff poses a problem for volunteer programs.

The principal recommendation made by writers addressing this issue is to involve union members and paid staff in the early phases of planning any volunteer effort (Groves, 1977; Schwartz, et al., 1977). It is also recommended that paid employees be recruited to help train volunteers and that volunteers perform only those functions not performed by paid staff. Finally, some writers have argued that volunteers, in the role of assistants to paid staff, can increase the status of paid workers, and in fact, create more rather than fewer jobs (Arthur D. Little, 1978; Fox, 1973).

Consistent with the suggestion that potential conflicts between volunteers and paid staff should be minimized, the literature on volunteerism is replete with statements that volunteers can be fruitfully utilized as role models or as friends to their participants, functions which paid staff do not usually perform (Arthur D. Little, 1978; Blew, McGillis,& Bryant, 1977; James, Sloan, & Perry, 1977; Ku, undated; Lee, 1978; Schéier, et al., 1972). Unkovic and Davis (1969) comment, in this regard, that:

> "He (the volunteer) is, first of all, a friend who is sincerely interested in the plans, problems, and needs of the offender." (p. 42)

The benefits resulting from the volunteer functions of friend and role model have been particularly stressed in programs for incarcerated prisoners and for serious offenders in general (Blew, et al., 1977; Jorgensen, & Scheier, 1973; Lewis, McKee, Goodstein, Beamesderfer, & Kaufman, 1976). It is in this role, the argument runs, that the negative effects of "institutionalization," effects which have been amply documented in the sociological and corrections literature (Buckley, 1974; Goffman,

1961; Sykes, 1958), can be mitigated.

Prison life is highly routinized and structured, and without contacts with or perspectives from persons outside the prison, the inmate very rapidly learns how to survive with only minimal effort. Once adapted to prison life, the prospect of returning to life on the streets, a place where most inmates have experienced repeated failures, arouses a great deal of fear and apprehension (see, for example, the case study illustrating this point in Jorgensen & Scheier, 1973, pp. 95-98). Such feelings are, at least in part, rationally grounded in the prisoner's knowledge that the survival and coping skills learned in prison are inadequate and often counterproductive to establishing productive life outside the prison.

Fears and anxieties about coping on the outside are especially pronounced in the prisoner who has had few visits from friends or relatives while incarcerated. The significance of this problem is suggested by estimates that twenty-five to fifty percent of the prison population receive no visits at all during the course of a full year in prison (Holt, & Miller, 1972; M-2 Sponsors, 1978; Sykes, 1958).

Two research reports provide preliminary evidence that prison visitation is directly related to parole outcome. Holt and Miller (1972), focusing principally on the effects of prison visits by family members, found that parole success (neither violations nor rearrests) is directly related to the number of visitors received by the parolee while he was incarcerated. This association is maintained above and beyond other commonly used predictors of parole outcome, such as job offers and types of residence at release. And in the M-2 Sponsors program, a volunteer sponsorship program for prisoners and parolees, a direct relationship was found between number of prison visits by a volunteer sponsor and parole success (M-2 Sponsors, 1978). Certinly more research needs to be done in this area, but initial findings support the contention that concerned visitors can have a measureable beneficial effect on parole outcome.

Other direct service roles taken on by volunteers include tutoring, leading discussion groups, recreational activities, psychological and employment counseling

and guidance, family and legal liaison and special services provided by volunteers with specific skills and backgrounds, e.g., yoga classes, dental care, and so on (Arthur D. Little, 1978; Buckley, 1974; Human Services Institute, 1976; Jorgensen, & Scheier, 1973; Scheier, et al., 1972). It has been suggested in the literature that in each of these roles, and certainly in the role of friend or role model, volunteers have certain advantages over paid staff in terms of services provided (Fox, 1973; Jorgensen, & Scheier, 1973).

First, volunteers are seen by inmates or participants as less authoritarian, less threatening and more concerned about the needs and interests of their participants than are the paid staff. If for no other reason than the fact that the volunteer is not paid for his or her work, the participant views the volunteer as being more sincere than the paid staff. Howell's (1972) research on a volunteer probation program confirmed this speculation in that the clients supervised by volunteers, in contrast to those supervised by paid staff, liked their probation officers better and perceived them as less authoritarian.

Second, because of the enormous caseloads most probation and parole officers are burdened with, they frequently cannot secure the kinds and amount of information necessary to make in-depth needs assessments of their clients. This is also true for public defenders, who frequently are forced to present cases without having secured a great deal of information about their clients. Volunteers are sometimes able to obtain information enabling professionals to better do their jobs (Carroll, 1977; Schwartz, 1971; Unkovic, & Davis, 1969). Two examples, among many, of volunteers serving in this capacity are the Seattle Guardian ad Litem program (Ray-Bettinski, 1978) and the Hennepen County Volunteer Supportive Services Project (Stoeckel, Sterne, & Sterne, 1975). In both programs, volunteers prepare lengthy pre-disposition reports for juvenile court judges and make recommendations as to preferred courses of action for the juvenile clients they had been working with. Both programs have been highly praised by juvenile justice personnel and by the clients.

Third, volunteers, in conjunction with professional staff or on their own, can

serve as liaisons between the offenders and their communities (Beless, Pilcher, & Ryan, 1972; Bergman, 1977; Jorgensen, & Scheier, 1973; Lewis, et al., 1976; M.2 Sponsors, 1978, Unkovic, & Davis, 1969). Volunteers residing in the same communities as their participants have or can easily obtain information regarding vocational, educational and housing opportunities for their participants and can make appropriate referrals for them. As responsible community members, and operating in the role of a concerned citizen rather than as a paid employee, volunteers are often better received by employers and fellow community members than are criminal justice personnel. Also, volunteers have sometimes been able to educate community members as to the needs of probationers, parolees and prisoners and to increase the participation of community members in the criminal and juvenile justice systems (Fox, 1973; Hurlow-Hannah, 1978; James, et al., 1977; McCollum, 1977; Miller, 1973).

Several disadvantages or criticisms of volunteers in the criminal justice system have also been suggested (Fox, 1973; Jorgensen, & Scheier, 1973). First, it costs money and requires professional staff to adequately train volunteers. The volunteers, in turn, may be unreliable because of the absence of any pecuniary sanctions. Also, it has been suggested that well-intentioned volunteers are easily manipulated by offenders and, in some cases, inappropriately attack criminal justice staff for alleged injustices. Finally, it has been suggested that volunteers are unable to help the offender resolve serious problems. Each of these issues are important and will be addressed, either implicitly or explicitly, throughout this report.

Types of Volunteer Activities

At present, most direct service volunteer programs are court sponsored, directed to the needs of youthful probationers, and involve the pairing of a volunteer with a single participant (Buckley, 1974; Gandy, 1977). This trend is reflected in a survey of reports on volunteer programs in the criminal justice system conducted by Scioli and Cook (1976). Out of the thirty-five reports they reviewed, seventy-four percent involved service to probationers, and of these, sixty-two percent were designed for clients under seventeen years of age and almost all followed the one-to-one sponsor model.

Typical of such programs are the Volunteer Probation Counselor Program in Lincoln, Nebraska (Ku, undated), the Youth Advocate Training Project in Pennsylvania (Bergman, 1977), the Assistant Probation Officer Program in New Orleans (Carroll, 1977), and the Volunteer Probation Officer Program in Manitoba, Canada (James, et al., 1977). Most commonly the volunteer is matched with a probationer and, either alone or in conjunction with a probation officer, serves as a friend or role model to the probationer, providing whatever services are appropriate, e.g., counseling, recreational activities, tutoring.

Less prevalent are volunteer programs serving the parolee or soon-to-be-paroled individual. As with the volunteer probation programs, a volunteer is typically assigned to work on a one-to-one basis to help the parolee make the transition from prison to his or her community. Most commonly, services provided by the volunteer are geared principally toward employment and education, and secondarily toward social adjustment and housing needs of the parolee. In most cases, as with the M-2 Sponsors program in Washington and California (M-2 Sponsors, 1978), the volunteer is encouraged to visit his or her client in prison prior to release, though in most cases only those prisoners who are scheduled for parole within a relatively short period of time are matched with a volunteer (Lewis, et al., 1976). Descriptions of other volunteer programs directed to the parolee are also available in the literature (Beless, et al., 1972; Palmer, 1973; Sorel, & Rossman, 1977).

Least common are programs in which the volunteer works with incarcerated or detained individuals, regardless of their potential for receiving parole (Gandy, 1977). One effort designed to reverse this trend is the Citizen Involvement Project (CIP). This project, operated by Offender Aid and Restoration, (OAR, USA) sponsored twenty workshops throughout the United States in which criminal justice personnel worked closely with civic leaders to develop volunteer sponsorship for prisoners programs (Hurlow-Hannah, 1978). In this way, OAR-USA is serving to extend its existing programs of one-to-one counseling with prisoners and parolees (Metametrics, 1975). Also, interspersed throughout the country are individuals and small groups,

such as theater groups and the clergy, who go into local, county, and state correctional facilities to work with inmates. Relative to the total volunteer force in the criminal justice system however, the proportion of volunteers in correctional facilities is quite small.

Who Volunteers to Work in the Criminal Justice System?

While the situation has begun to change during the past decade, volunteers are most frequently drawn from one of two segments of the population: moderately well-educated, middle-class married women, and college students (Arthur D. Little, 1978; Gandy, 1977; Servin, 1979). The clientele whom the volunteers serve, on the other hand, are predominantly male, poor, and,more often than not, black or Hispanic. While such differences do not necessarily impede the effectiveness of the volunteer's ability to help the participant, many proponents of volunteerism in the criminal justice system have advocated the use of a screening mechanism through which the abilities and interests of volunteers are matched to the specific needs of their clients (Arthur D. Little, 1978; Human Services Institute, 1976; Ku, undated; Palmer, 1973).

Though general agreement exists as to the inappropriateness of randomly assigning volunteers to clients, there is little agreement as to what dimensions ought to be considered in the matching process, and what criteria ought to be utilized along each dimension. For example, the Volunteer Probation Counselor Program in Lincoln, Nebraska, (which received L.E.A.A.'s "ExemplaryProject" designation) employs a psychologist to oversee a matching process which others would consider unduly elaborate (Ku, undated). In this process, clients are assessed as to which of four types of volunteer roles can best meet their needs (role model, peer, supervisor, or counselor); and volunteers are assessed along ten dimensions, some of which are thought more critical to one type of role than others. These are: ethnic group background, sex, age, education, intelligence, occupation, community contacts, income socioeconomic legel, and counseling skills. While providing no statistical evidence to substantiate his claim, Ku feels the success of the program is due, in major respects, to the matching procedures employed.

Palmer (1973), however, does cite statistical evidence that matching in terms of personal characteristics (using adjective checklists and interviews) can enhance the degree to which volunteers can help their clients, in this case juvenile delinquents. Dimensions along which success was measured included rates of parole revocation, court recommendations, and rearrests.

Others have suggested the importance of such factors as age, skills and hobbies, sub-culture, and sex (Arthur D. Little, 1978; Human Services Institute, 1976; Whiteman, & Bourn, undated). Some writers have argued that volunteers should come from the same community and/or social class as the clients with whom they are assigned to work (Beless, et al., 1972; James, et al., 1977; Nelson et al, 1978. In this regard Jorgensen and Scheier (1973) cite preliminary studies which indicate that "reduction in rearrest rates may be associated with pairing volunteers and offenders close to each other in social class" (p. 16). Rigid adherence to this criterion for matching has been criticized, on grounds that it reduces the extent to which clients are exposed to perspectives different from their own(Servin, 1979. And still others have disputed claims that similarity of personality or cultural background make any noticeable difference in outcome (Schwartz, et al., 1977; M-2 Sponsors, 1978). Once again further and continued research is needed in this aspect of volunteerism in the CJS.

Operation and Organization of Volunteer Programs

During the 1970s, as volunteerism became more well-established and accepted in the criminal and juvenile justice systems, several administrative manuals, books and articles articulating procedural guidelines for volunteer programs were published (Arthur D. Little, 1978; Buckley, 1974; Fox, 1973; Human Systems Institute, 1976; Jorgenson, & Scheier, 1973; Lewis, et al., 1976; Schwartz, et al., 1977; Whiteman, & Bourn, undated). This section represents a condensed summary of these publications.

The operation of volunteer programs can be divided into four progressive phases: recruitment, orientation and training, placement and on-going training and supervision. The start-up and initial organization of a volunteer program entail a great deal of planning, usually requiring from two to six months prior to commencement of volunteer recruitment. During this time the needs of the criminal and/or juvenile justice systems should be assessed, and relevant justice system personel should be contacted so that program ideas can be discussed with them. All manuals stress the necessity of support by justice system administration and staff, without which volunteer programs cannot function:

> "You will need to ensure the support, commitment and involvement of your probation department in the planning and objectives-setting process, so that they understand the purpose and benefit of volunteer programming" (Human Services Institute, 1976, pp. 8-9).

Recruitment should initially be conducted through the news media and by making presentations to community groups. The latter is particularly important in that community support is essential to maintain an adequate source of volunteers. Presentations should, at a minimum, include the purposes and objectives of the volunteer program, and a sufficiently detailed description of the roles, duties, and responsibilities of volunteers in the program. Brochures should be handed out and preliminary applications should be made available to the audience. All applications should be responded to promptly by phone and by letter.

Other sources for recruiting volunteers include volunteer service bureaus, religious groups, professional organizations and local colleges. The volunteer department of the New York City Department of Probation, for example, recruits volunteers primarily through local colleges and universities and through the Mayor's Voluntary Action Office. To a lesser extent they recruit through such voluntary organizations as the National Council of Jewish Women and the Key Women of America. Once a program is established, experienced volunteers can recruit friends, associates and relatives.

Programs of course vary in the qualities and characteristics they wish their volunteers to possess, and their recruitment efforts should vary accordingly. A program which hopes to maintain their volunteers for at least one year, for example, would not gear most of its recruitment efforts toward students who frequently want to volunteer only in conjunction with a one or two semester course. And if the program wishes to maintain a community-based, primarily black and hispanic group of volunteers, national volunteer groups would be an inappropriate source from which to recruit.

Most volunteer programs interview prospective volunteers before they begin training. This interview is perceived by some authorities as a means by which the program can screen potential candidates and by others as a opportunity for the candidate to ask specific questions about the program; and depending upon the answers, the candidate can choose whether or not to start training.

Almost all volunteer programs provide initial training to their volunteers. Training is usually conducted over a two to four week period, and lasts from ten to twenty hours. However, some programs simply provide a brief orientation session of two or three hours duration (Ray-Bettinski, 1978), and others provide over thirty hours of training over the course of several weeks (Stoeckel, et al., 1975). The initial training should at least provide volunteers with information about the criminal or juvenile justice system, and should familiarize the volunteers with skills and techniques they will use in working with clients. Other kinds of information which should be included are: administrative requirements of the volunteers, program policy and organization, community resources and theories about the causes of crime. Much of this information can be summarized in a volunteer handbook, which also should include volunteer job descriptions.

There is a fair degree of consensus as to methods and techniques best suited to volunteer training. Role playing is mentioned by all authorities as an ideal

method to familiarize trainees with the type of clients and situations they will be dealing with and as a means to teach counseling techniques. Authorities also consistently advocate the advisability of visits to the facilities and institutions where the volunteers will be working. These visits, furthermore, are best followed by group discussions.

Most writers stress that training should be practically and experientially oriented, with straight lecturing limited to about a half hour. Writers also emphasize the importance of trainee participation in all phases of training, with many small group exercises and large group summaries.

Finally, as mentioned earlier in this chapter, criminal and juvenile justice system staff should be involved in and consulted about initial training. Perhaps the easiest way to involve them in training is to invite them to lecture to the trainees. This provides the trainees with the perspectives and knowledge of the staff with whom they will be having contact and also gives the staff a sense of camaraderie with the program:

> "placed in the role of expert providing training, the skeptic finds less reason to be threatened because he discovers through direct experience that he has knowledge upon which the volunteer is by necessity dependent" (Jorgensen, & Scheier, 1973, p. 212).

Also suggested as useful speakers are experienced volunteers and former or current clients.

Most of what needs to be pointed out about placement has already been discussed under the topic of matching. One additional point about placement, however, needs to be made. After they have completed training, volunteers should be promptly assigned to clients. Without rapid assignment, the motivation and stimulation gradually built up during training quickly wanes. This need for prompt assignment, of course, also holds true for clients. The VIP program funded and then defunded by CJCC failed, in part, because of delays in excess of two months for matching volunteers with clients.

Ongoing or in-service training, as well as individualized supervision, are essential to helping volunteers maintain acceptable standards of performance. In most

Success in Volunteer Programs: What Is It and How Can It Be Evaluated?

Success in social service intervention programs is, of course, relative to the objectives and purposes of the program. Unfortunately, objectives are, for the most part, imprecisely stated or too intangible to measure:

> "Objectives should be stated in a measurable form, specifying who is to be effected by the program, what is to be effected and when, and finally how long the effect will last" (Scioli & Cook, 1976; p. 195).

Objectives notwithstanding, there are at least four levels on which programs can be assessed: 1) how well and to what extent does the program provide the services it contracts to provide; 2) how much do the services provided cost in comparison to the provision of the same or similar services provided by other programs or interventions; 3) what are the effects of the program on the clients receiving the services; and 4) can the clients be more efficiently and effectively served by other programs or interventions? These questions remain generally unanswered with regard to volunteer programs in the criminal justice system, as they do, it should be added, for all types of intervention and rehabilitative programs in the criminal justice field.

Scioli and Cook (1976), reviewed 250 reports of volunteer programs in the criminal justice system to assess the effectiveness of such programs. Reflecting the state of the field, only thirty-five of these reports, or fourteen percent, examined client impact. Even among these reports, the outcomes considered varied from report to report. Given these limitations, Scioli and Cook reached the following conclusion:

> "volunteer programs performed as well as, or better than, the program alternatives with which they were compared." (p. 198).

Recidivism, whether in terms of rearrests, reconvictions, or reincarceration, has been for some time the most highly regarded, and most heavily criticized, outcome variable in the criminal justice literature. At least four volunteer program evaluations have employed one or another measure of recidivism in comparing program clients to an appropriate control group. In three of the four programs, the experi-

volunteer programs, in-service training is conducted by the Coordinator of Volunteers or Volunteer Director, and immediate supervision is provided by criminal justice system staff members with whom the volunteers work. If inexperienced in supervision, these staff sometimes need training in supervisory principles and techniques.

The in-service training sessions, generally conducted on a monthly or bi-monthly basis, should be focused on specific problems the volunteers have been encountering. In this way, volunteers can not only learn skills and techniques from each other (and from the group leader) but also can gain a sense of camaraderie with other volunteers. Despite these benefits, attendance at these sessions is frequently less than desired. Other forms of communication among volunteers, such as newsletters, coffee hours and social gatherings, are useful supplements to on-going training.

In terms of direct supervision, staff members (parole and probation officers, caseworkers, etc.) are frequently burdened with excessive caseloads and therefore do not have the time to conduct individual counseling sessions. In lieu of this, it is recommended that they run small-group supervisory sessions. Some authorities on this topic suggest that supervision should grow out of specific and measurable monthly objectives which are agreed to by the volunteers and their supervisors. In any event, supervisory sessions should be conducted in a "helping environment" out of which volunteers can improve in carrying out their assigned duties.

Finally, the need for accurate and up-to-date records cannot be emphasized too strongly. Funding agencies must be informed as to what the program is doing and how well it is doing what it does. Volunteer programs vary as to their effectiveness, and, without accurate record-keeping, one cannot distinguish effective from ineffective programs. Furthermore, documentation of services provided to clients as well as some indication of client progress can be used to help clients eligible for diversion, parole or probation.

mental group, or clients participating in the volunteer program, had statistically significant[1] lower rates of recidivism (Ku, undated; Lichtmen, Smock, Binder, & Nathan, 1978; M-2 Sponsors, 1978), and in the remaining program, no significant differences were noted (Berger, Crowley, Gold, & Gray, 1975). It is not at all clear, however, what aspects of the "successful" programs were critical to their success, and what aspects of the "unsuccessful" program were critical to its failure. Also, while experimental studies are praiseworthy, it is not at all clear that recidivism rates represent the most useful criterion upon which to evaluate programs such as these. Volunteer programs can have positive consequences which are not readily, or only in the long run, reflected in decreased recidivism rates. Programs may, for example, affect reading improvement in their clients or increase job skills and employment rates. Such consequences are measurable and, for some programs, closely tied to the types of interventions made. Recidivism rates, on the other hand, are related to a variety of factors, the most powerful of which may transcend the effects of any one program. It is extremely unrealistic to try to measure the effectiveness of a particular prison program in terms of recidivism.:

> "The total prison experience coupled with a mutitude of such other factors as a person's life history and the quality of that life at the time of incarceration are much more relevant. Additionally, postrelease family and other socioeconomic connections, if any access to opportunity systems, mental and physical health, and a host of other variables contribute substantially to an individual's behavior on release from incarceration" (McCollum, 1977, p. 32; see also Rutherford & McDermott, 1976, p. 39-40).

Other, not so readily measurable outcomes are also relevant to assessing the impact of volunteer one-to-one sponsorship programs. How, for example can the effects of providing a reliable and caring friend to a prisoner of parolee be evaluated? If Jorgensen and Scheier's (1973) contention that "more than any one thing the offender needs to know intimately a stable, reliable person" is sound, then perhaps the simple overall measure of length and consistency of volunteer-client relationships can be used as a valid measure of success (see Chapter 4 of this report). Another potential outcome which is difficult to measure is that of making a wide community of citizens

[1]Statistical significance refers to the fact that the observed differences between the experimental and control groups are very unlikely to have occurred by chance alone.

informed of and involved in the criminal justice system. Helping parents or wives of offenders adjust to and provide support for their children or husbands is another often overlooked potential outcome.

Perhaps the most fruitful suggestion that can be made with regard to the evaluation of volunteer programs at this time is that a multifaceted approach should be adopted. If available and appropriate, recidivism rates should be assessed, but not relied on exclusively. Measures, both direct and indirect, ought to be developed to assess the degree and quality of client-volunteer relationships, and to assess, or at least document, interventions made by the volunteer in the areas of family life and legal and courtroom proceedings. Finally, different agencies or individuals knowledgeable about the consequences of volunteer interventions (lawyers, judges, parents, and friends) ought to be consulted.

Chapter 2

OAR: Functions and Mode of Operations

Offender Aid and Restoration of New York City, Inc. (OAR) was formed in May 1974 and began operation at the Adolescent Detention Center on Rikers Island four months later. Initially funded through private and foundation sources, OAR has been funded principally by CJCC from October 1975 to the present. From October 1975 through January 1979 OAR recruited and worked with adolescents (16 to 21 years of age) at Rikers Island, and since February 1979 OAR has recruited and worked with juveniles (12 to 15 year olds) at Rikers Island and Spofford Juvenile Center while contining to work with those adolescent clients who were recruited prior to that time.

Staff and Volunteer Functions

From its inception, OAR has been designed to train citizens to work on a voluntary basis with detained adolescents and juveniles. Volunteers are matched on a one-to-one basis with young detainees and are expected to build and maintain a relationship with their clients through all phases of the young person's juvenile or criminal justice system involvement. This attempt to maintain a stable and consistent relationship as the youth proceeds from one bureaucratic system to another (detention, probation, prison, etc.) and from one service person to another (legal aid attorneys, prison counselors, psychiatrists, etc.) is unique in New York City.

Consistent with the volunteer literature, OAR volunteers are expected to serve as a friend and role model to their clients. In addition, they are trained to work with and assist their clients' attorneys, and serve as advocates for their clients when appropriate. In this capacity volunteers have served as character witnesses for their clients and have written letters to judges, probation officers, prison counselors, wardens and parole boards on their behalf. In many cases, volunteers have gone to court with their clients to provide moral support and to reduce the sense of bewilderment which many of these young people experience.

Volunteers are trained and encouraged to work with their clients' families (unless clients do not wish them to do so) by helping their clients and their clients' families with any family problems or tensions they may be experiencing. Volunteers are also encouraged to explore their clients' educational and vocational interests and plans, and the suitability of their living situation after release. Finally, as appropriate and when desired, volunteers provide direct counseling, tutoring and referrals to relevant agencies and programs.

The staff of OAR, which during 1979 consisted of twelve full time paid positions (three administrators, seven direct service personnel, and a bookkeeper and executive secretary), perform a variety of functions. First, and perhaps most importantly, the staff recruit, train, supervise and provide backup support and information to all OAR volunteers. All service delivery staff, as well as OAR's three administrators, participate to varying degrees in the training of volunteers. Training is conducted in seven week cycles and OAR runs three to five training cycles each year. In addition, one or two staff members lead monthly feedback sessions for active volunteers.

The Coordinator of Volunteers and his or her assistant serve as principal liaisons between the volunteers and OAR. They coordinate the assignment of clients to volunteers and maintain records of all volunteer activities.

The Court Liaison operates principally in the courtrooms, frequently accompanying clients whose volunteers cannot make daytime court appearances. The Court Liaison also works with lawyers and volunteers in helping to develop strategies for minimizing their clients penetration into the criminal justice system, serves as a resource person regarding standard courtroom and legal procedures and provides information to volunteers, such as specific court dates and lawyers' names.

Two further areas which OAR staff oversee are "aftercare" and "outreach." Aftercare refers to all services provided to clients who are living in their communities.

This includes those on bail, probation, parole and those whose cases were dismissed. Aftercare services presently provided by OAR staff include group counseling (one juvenile and one adolescent group), individual counseling, limited tutoring and educational testing and referrals to appropriate agencies and programs. Outreach, at present, consists primarily of family couseling. A parents' group meets once a week, and both parents and young people have sought counseling for a variety of familial problems.

Finally, the staff initiate and maintain relationships with institutions and facilities with which the young people are involved. Clients have been recruited, over the past five years, from five separate facilities on Rikers Island and from Spofford Juvenile Center. A staff member usually gives a brief talk about OAR to the detainees and then individually interviews those who are interested in signing up for the program. The client is then told he will meet with his volunteer during the following week. A staff member is also needed to monitor and serve as a trouble-shooter for each group of volunteers which visits any of the facilities.

Goals and Objectives

OAR succinctly states as its goal "to get 'em out and keep 'em out," i.e., to divert their clients from, or minimize their contact with the criminal justice system, and then to reduce recidivism. In this regard, OAR has always included as one of its goals to reduce the rate of recidivism among juveniles and adolescents. The work the volunteers and staff do is, of course, oriented to helping their clients establish and maintain productive, rewarding and crime-free lives.

A second major goal has been to actively involve citizens in and inform them about the criminal and juvenile justice systems. It is OAR's position that without citizen involvement the justice system will remain insular and unresponsive to the needs of the communities it attempts to serve. Volunteers are encouraged by OAR to return to their communities and speak with their neighbors

about their volunteer experiences.

The final major goal is the promotion and development of structured aftercare services for their juvenile and adolescent clients. Ideally this would involve services in a number of areas, including education, vocational guidance, medical care and legal services. Because of extensive demands on staff time, OAR has chosen to restrict its staff aftercare activities to conducting life skills counseling groups for its clients and to conducting discussion groups for its clients' families. OAR feels that it does not have the manpower to provide vocational and educational guidance and training to its clients.

The specific objectives set forth by OAR to meet these goals have varied from year to year depending upon its level of funding. For 1979 OAR proposed to work with approximately 600 juveniles and adolescents during their detention, incarceration and post-release periods. Correspondingly, they proposed to maintain already trained volunteers and to train new volunteers in numbers sufficient to meet this caseload. It should be noted, in this regard, that OAR asks all of its volunteers to make a one year commitment to the volunteer work they are trained to do.

In terms of impact upon its clients, OAR proposed to improve the employment skills and job readiness of its adolescent clients and improve the skills, educational levels and self-images of its juvenile clients. OAR did not, however, specify how such improvements could be assessed in its CJCC contracts.

A final objective set forth by OAR is to work with the various departments in the juvenile and criminal justice systems in providing aftercare for their clients. Again, however, no means by which this could be assessed in terms of level and kind of activities was given.

Recruitment and Training

Since 1975 OAR has relied most heavily on radio announcements to attract volunteers. During its first two years, OAR also contacted such standard sources as the Mayor's Office of Volunteers and colleges and universities to supplement the radio announcements. For the past three years, radio ads, word of mouth,

and news reports have served as the main referral sources. As can be seen in Table 2-1, data from the volunteer survey (including volunteers who have been trained since October 1976), and data from the first two training cycles in 1979, reveal that approximately seventy percent of OAR's volunteers hear about OAR either through radio ads or from friends. Not shown in this table is that in 1975 only two percent of the volunteers were recruited through friends, as contrasted with the most recent figures which show that twenty-five percent were recruited through friends.

When a prospective trainee calls and expresses interest in volunteering for the program, he or she is sent an invitation to attend the training cycle. Along with an announcement of the dates and times of the training sessions, a newspaper article describing OAR and a two page letter entitled "Advice to OAR Volunteers" are enclosed. These written materials briefly describe the program and give the person some idea of what will be expected. For the past two training sessions only one quarter of those receiving these materials actually come to the initial training session.

The number of individuals beginning training has varied over the years with changes in staff size and amount of space available. At one training cycle 250 individuals appeared at the first session. The OAR administration now recognizes that groups of this size are unmanageable, and at present, limits to eighty the number of people allowed into the first session.

During the two most recent training cycles, about sixty percent of those who started training completed the entire cycle. This appears to have been the case for earlier training cycles. Most drop out on their own, however a small number of obviously inappropriate candidates are screened out by OAR staff during or at the close of the training cycle. During the most recent training cycle, for example, two trainees out of the fifty who completed training were screened by the staff as inappropriate. The characteristics OAR considers important for their volunteers are: honesty about one's feelings, openness to criticism, ability to refrain from moralizing and evangelizing, ability

Table 2-1

Referral Sources of OAR Volunteers

	Volunteer Survey[a] (N=52)	Volunteers Trained in Early 1979 (N=73)
Referral Source		
Radio	50%	59%
Friend	21	25
Newspaper	8	7
Other	21	10

[a] This survey included volunteers who were trained between October, 1976 and April, 1979 (see Appendices A and B for details of sampling procedures and a copy of the questionnaire used for the interviews).

to see clients as human beings who are no different from anyone else and ability not to impose values and ideas on the clients as to what the volunteer considers right or best for them.

The structure and content of OAR's training has not varied substantially over the past five years. As indicated earlier, the sessions span a seven week period and include approximately forty hours of training (see Appendix C for examples of two training schedules). Trainees are required to attend every session. The following description of OAR's training is based upon OAR reports and proposals and upon observation of the most recent training cycle (June through August 1979) by the author of this report.

Training begins with a two and a half hour session on Friday evening, followed by an all day session on Saturday. Four or five OAR staff and/or administrators are present at every training session. The training starts with introductions of the staff and administrators and a brief description of their functions. Also, a brief description of the history, goals, and objectives of the organization is given. Following this, the trainees are asked to give their impressions of what they expect to find at the detention centers. Minimal feedback is given by the staff, other than to reassure them that the work is not dangerous and inform them that the work entails a great deal of responsibility.

This is followed by one of the staff (at least half of whom have been incarcerated) recounting his or her prison experiences. This is done in a straightforward manner, with "street language" used throughout. The philosophy of the organization is clearly reflected in this talk, i.e., prisons, as they now exist, provide no rehabilitation, reduce self-esteem and in general have no redeeming features. The talk also illustrates the organization's belief that individuals commit crimes and become delinquent in reaction to societal forces such as racism, poverty, and discrimination; and that the criminal justice system, as a whole, aggravates these problems.

OAR intentionally structures the first session in such a manner that its perspective on the criminal justice system and the kind of volunteer work required by the program are made abundantly clear to the trainees. Consequently, most

trainees who either feel they cannot fulfill the obligations of the volunteer work or are unsympathetic to the views of the staff drop out during the first few training sessions. During the past training session, for example, seventy percent of all trainees who did not complete training dropped out after the first Friday evening session.

On Saturday, the day starts out with trainees breaking into small discussion groups followed by large group discussions. The topics included during the most recent cycle were: why the trainees wanted to volunteer and what they wanted to learn from the staff. Several questions are then posed one at a time by the staff to the trainees and responses are written down on a large sheet of paper. Occasionally, a staff member interjects comments of his or her own. The questions in this past cycle were: where do we get our ideas about crime, where do sources of crime really come from, what does the juvenile justice system say it does, what does it really do and what role do you expect to play as a volunteer? Also during the day, one or two staff members lecture and answer questions on the Criminal and Family Court systems.

For the cycle attended by this author, the discussions were lively and the day was well-paced. Though generally focused on the interests and opinions of the trainees, the discussions were infused with the theme that the juveniles and adolescents seen by OAR are generally oppressed by such environmental factors as racism and poverty, and that the juvenile and criminal justice systems are unresponsive to their needs.

The following Friday, and for the following four Wednesday evenings, speakers from various parts of the criminal and juvenile justice systems are invited to speak to the trainees about their areas of expertise. During the past training session these included, among others, a criminal court judge, a representative from the New York State Division for Youth, a Legal Aid Society attorney, a representative from the New York City Department of Probation, and the Acting Director of Spofford Detention Center. Although oriented to juveniles rather than adolescents, this list of speakers is typical of those invited to participate in training during previous years. The talks are generally informal, with questions

answered as they are raised.

The second Saturday[1] is primarily devoted to intensive counseling simulations or role playing. A trainee volunteers to take the role of a new or experienced OAR volunteer and a staff member or experienced volunteer plays the role of the client. These role plays take place in the center of a large circle of trainees, and after about five or ten minutes, feedback is given by the observing trainees and by the staff. Throughout these critiques the trainee who played the volunteer is not allowed to comment, so that he or she will have to listen to these comments rather than prepare explanations or excuses.

Some typical situations portrayed by the staff are: a black juvenile who does not want to work with a white volunteer, a juvenile who was raped in the detention center and feels he cannot go back to the tiers, a male juvenile who is sexually agressive to a female volunteer and a young person who only wants help in getting out as quickly as possible. In this observer's opinion, these sessions are excellent in preparing the trainees for the realities of the volunteer work. The role plays are thought-provoking, challenging, emotionally involving and concrete.

The last formal Wednesday session is devoted to feedback about training, reviewing the duties of volunteers and the functions of each staff member, and distribution of Department of Correction passes (which are secured by OAR).

The final aspect of training consists of tours of the detention centers in which the volunteers are assigned to work. During the most recent training session, tours were arranged for the Juvenile Offender Detention Center (JODC) on Rikers Island and Spofford. In both cases the institutional staff were cordial and cooperative.

---

[1]From 1975 through 1978, role playing was conducted during part of the first Saturday session, and the second Saturday session was given at the Tombs. At the Tombs, talks were given by Department of Corrections staff and, as part of their training, trainees were locked in a cell for about two hours in order to experience what it feels like to be incarcerated.

Since the training sessions were designed to meet the needs of the volunteers, current and former volunteers were asked, as part of a volunteer survey conducted by the CJCC (see Appendices A and B), several questions pertaining to the initial training sessions.

As can be seen from Table 2-2, over ninety percent of the volunteers surveyed felt the training was "good" or "excellent," with over half rating it excellent. Six percent rated the training sessions as "fair" and two percent rated them "poor."

The volunteers were also asked to indicate which aspects of training were most helpful to them. As can be seen from Table 2-3, over half the volunteers referred to the role playing sessions. Volunteers frequently commented that they had encountered some of the situations portrayed in the role playing while working with their clients. Other aspects of training which volunteers considered helpful were the "rap sessions," the reality-orientation of the training, the experience of being locked up at the Tombs, the legal information given, and the information and perspectives provided by the invited speakers.

The volunteers were then asked how they felt the training could be improved. As shown in Table 2-4, almost one-third either could not think of any way training could be improved, or simply thought it was excellent the way it was and did not need improvement. Another twenty-one percent indicated that the content of the training sessions was fine but that certain structural changes, such as shorter sessions, more printed material,[2] and more trainee involvement, would have improved the training. Nineteen percent of the volunteers wanted more information regarding legal and court procedures, aftercare services and counseling techniques. Further suggestions included more or different speakers, better screening of trainees and modification or expansion of the role plays.

---

[2]The main printed material provided by OAR during training are a brochure entitled "Introduction to the Court System," which details much of the legal information presented, and the "Volunteer Handbook," for working with adolescents. As of this writing, OAR is in the process of preparing a volunteer handbook geared toward working with juveniles.

Table 2-2

Volunteer Assessments of

Training Sessions

Rating	Percent (N=52)
Excellent	54%
Good	38
Fair	6
Poor	2

Table 2-3

Volunteer Assessments of Which Aspects

of Training Were Most Helpful

Aspect of Training	First Choice	Second Choice[a]
Role Playing	52%	8%
Realistic Perspective	10	10
Rap Sessions	10	8
Tombs Lock-up	8	13
Legal Information	8	8
Invited Speakers	8	6
Counseling Techniques	6	4
Other	-	3

[a]Thirty-two volunteers listed at least two aspects of training they found most helpful. The second aspect mentioned by these volunteers is listed here. The percentages are based on the entire sample (N=52) and therefore do not add to 100%.

Table 2-4

Suggestions for Improving Training

by Volunteers

Suggestions	Percent (N=52)
None	31%
Structural Changes	21
More Information	19
Better or Different Speakers	15
Better Trainee Screening	8
Modified or Expanded Role Plays	6

Two further data sources are relevant to the evaluation of OAR pre-service training sessions. First, volunteers were asked how clear they were in their duties and responsibilities as OAR volunteers. While the answers to this question cannot be attributed exclusively to training, they are, to a large extent, influenced by the initial training sessions. Three-quarters of the volunteers responded that they were very clear, and the remaining quarter responded that they were somewhat clear. None felt unclear as to their duties and responsibilities.

Second, an attempt was made to contact and interview trainees who had dropped out of the most recent training cycle (see Appendix B). Of the nineteen for whom OAR had telephone numbers (out of a total of 27), eleven were reached and all but one interviewed. The specific reasons given for dropping out varied, but in general centered around time conflicts of one sort or another, rather than dissatisfactions with the training. Eight of the dropouts felt the training session(s) they had attended were good, necessary or worthwhile, while only two of the dropouts disagreed with the content or attitudes expressed by OAR staff and other trainees.

Furthermore, the dropouts did not significantly differ from the volunteers who were interviewed in terms of age, ethnic distribution, sex, or reasons for volunteering. They did differ from the volunteers, however, in that none of them had previously done any volunteer work, as contrasted with sixty percent of volunteers who had previously done volunteer work. Most of the dropouts did not realize the extent of work involved in volunteering.

In summary, most of the volunteers, as well as CJCC staff, feel the OAR training is relevant, informative, and generally well done. Most of the volunteers feel the role playing sessions are particularly helpful in preparing them for their volunteer work. Over half the volunteers think the content of the sessions is fine, though some suggested that structural changes, such as shorter sessions with more trainee involvement, would be helpful. Of those who dropped out, most dropped out because of time conflicts rather than from dissatisfactions with the training.

In addition, the training appears to have given the volunteers a clear idea as to their roles and responsibilities. The only change recommended by this author, the rationale for which will be articulated in the next section, is that relevant personnel from the Spofford Juvenile Facility should be invited to participate in the training session.

Institutional Access

The main concern of the staff and administration of the New York City Department of Correction is security, and to the extent that they perceive individuals or organizations who desire access to their institutions as a threat to security, these individuals and organizations will be denied access. OAR has worked closely with the administration and staff at Rikers Island and, for the most part, has developed an excellent working relationship with them. This is reflected in several letters of support over the past four years from Department of Correction personnel (see also Chapter 5 of this report), by the participation of Department of Correction staff in OAR's training (see Appendix C), and by the fact that access has been extended on Rikers Island to the Women's House of Detention, the New York City Correctional Institution for Men, and the Juvenile Offender and Detention Center. OAR volunteers were also the first to be granted access to the ward for designated or acknowledged homosexuals.

Access to Spofford Juvenile Detention Center has and continues to be a problem. The problems have stemmed mainly from administrative and policy changes at Spofford and to a lesser extent from conflicts and misunderstandings with the juvenile counselors' union. Since negotiations began with Spofford concerning OAR's access, the directorship of Spofford has changed hands four times, jurisdiction of Spofford has shifted from the Human Resources Administration to the Department of Juvenile Justice, and the supervision of most juvenile offenders has been transferred from Rikers Island to Spofford. After several months of negotiations and re-negotiations, OAR finally did gain access and at present is recruiting and seeing clients at Spofford two evenings during the week and on Sunday afternoons. OAR, it should be pointed out, is the first organization to

be granted evening visiting privileges at Spofford.

The problems with the union are related to the juvenile counselors' apparent perception of OAR volunteers as a threat to their job security and as an infringement on their authority, a problem not uncommon in volunteer programs. OAR staff is attempting to work closely with the union, as well as other staff and administrators at Spofford, and has alleviated some of the tensions. However, the union has rejected OAR's request to recruit juveniles from the residential dorms. At present, OAR recruits all juveniles (both boys and girls) from the reception and orientation dorm, but because many of these juveniles are released or transferred from Spofford within two or three days, they leave before they can be placed with OAR volunteers. The residential dorms house a more stable youth population.

It appears to this writer that OAR has done its best to promote and maintain good relationships with the institutions from which it recruits clients. The only recommendation is to increase the involvement of Spofford staff, especially juvenile counselors, in its future training cycles and feedback sessions. Perhaps a few staff representatives could be invited to a Wednesday evening session. In this way each group may gain an appreciation for what the other does and come to understand the potentially complementary nature of the work they perform.

Placement

Once an OAR volunteer has completed training, he or she is matched as quickly as possible with a detainee. OAR's matching philosophy, as stated by the organization, is as follows:

> "Volunteers are matched with juveniles (and formerly with adolescents) on a borough or neighborhood basis as much as possible. Other individual factors may also be considered, but as much as possible OAR encourages the common community concept in order to marshall resources in a given community to the re-entry process."

This orientation, as noted in Chapter 1, has received at least partial support by authorities in the field.[3]

---

[3] See also Chapter 4 of this report, in which the consequences of ethnic and gender matches between volunteers and clients are analyzed.

Also noted in Chapter 1 is the importance of prompt assignment of volunteers to clients following their completion of training. Data pertaining to the questions of waiting time between the completion of training and client assignment were gathered from two sources: the volunteer survey and a random sample of forty-one OAR volunteer files. As can be seen from Table 2-5,the data from the volunteer survey reveal a shorter placement time than the data from the volunteer files but even these latter data show that three-quarters of the volunteers are placed within two months. Over half the volunteers surveyed were placed within the first two weeks following training completion, with ninety-two percent being placed within two months.

Supervision and Feedback Sessions

During their training, volunteers are told that the staff are always available to assist them and provide information, or simply to give support in what is at times a very frustrating job. For this purpose, volunteers are given a roster of telephone numbers and addresses of active volunteers and OAR staff. In the survey, OAR volunteers were asked if the staff were generally available to them when they needed assistance. Ninety-four percent said the staff were always available and the remaining six percent said they were sometimes available.

Volunteers were also asked how open staff were to the ideas and opinions offered by volunteers. Again the responses were quite favorable, with seventy-nine percent indicating that the staff were very open, and thirteen percent indicating that the staff were somewhat open. Four percent responded that the staff were generally not interested in their ideas and opinions, and four percent said they had too little contact with staff to answer this question.

To assess the nature of help given by the staff, the volunteers were asked how the staff were helpful to them in their volunteer work. As can be seen from Table 2-6, the most common type of help provided by the staff was in answering factual questions posed by the volunteers. Questions asked by volunteers were related mainly to standard legal and corrections procedures. Next in frequency was direct service, such as staff court appearances, advice about counseling, and moral support

Table 2-5

Time Between Completion of
Training and Volunteer Placement

Time Period	Data Source: Volunteer Survey (N=51)	Data Source: Volunteer Files (N=41)
1 - 2 weeks	63%	76%
3 weeks - 2 months	29	
3 - 6 months	4	22
More than 6 months	3	2

Table 2-6

Staff Help Provided
to Volunteers

Type of Help	Percentage of Responses (N=52)
Concrete Information	60
Direct Service	17
Counseling Advice	13
Moral Support	4
No Help Provided or Requested	6

Six percent said they either did not need help or received no help from the staff.

Finally, volunteers were asked to rate the quality of staff help they received and asked how they felt the staff could have been more helpful. As can be seen from Table 2-7, the volunteers appeared very satisfied with the help they received from the staff. Ninety-two percent rated staff help either "excellent" or "good" and fifty-two percent could not think of any way the staff could have been more helpful. Of those making suggestions as to how the staff could have been more helpful, nineteen percent felt the staff should provide closer or more supervision, ten percent felt the only way the staff could be more helpful was to add more personnel to the staff and six percent felt the staff could be more helpful in providing and recommending aftercare services. Among the twelve percent coded "other," suggestions included hiring a hispanic staff member, more help in working with clients' families and more information on their clients' backgrounds.

With regard to the suggestion that the staff provide closer supervision, perhaps this could be accomplished without significantly expanding the demands on staff time. Each month, as noted earlier in this chapter, the Coordinator of Volunteers and his assistant contact all active volunteers for the purpose of documenting the type and extent of work performed by each volunteer (see Chapter 3). OAR's present policy is that the staff will not probe for details as to how a volunteer is doing with his or her client(s), unless the volunteer expresses interest in having such discussions. It may prove fruitful for the staff to more aggressively seek information as to how well or how badly the volunteers are doing with their clients, and in this way provide closer supervision and attempt to be more helpful. Some volunteers may feel that the problems they are having are unique and/or unsolvable and consequently do not think to discuss them with OAR staff.

Table 2-7

Volunteer Assessments of OAR Staff

Overall Rating	Percent (N=52)
Excellent	48%
Good	44
Fair	4
Poor	0
No Staff Contact	2
Suggestions for Improvement	
None, Couldn't Be Better	52%
Closer or More Supervision	19
Increase Staff Size	10
More Help with Aftercare	6
Other	12
Never Asked for Help	2

Besides direct help on an individual basis, the principal means by which OAR maintains contact with and provides help to volunteers is through monthly feedback sessions. Usually led by two staff members, feedback sessions also provide an opportunity for volunteers to exchange experiences and ideas among themselves.

At both sessions observed by CJCC staff, fifteen to twenty volunteers attended, out of approximately ninety active volunteers. Consistent with the description given earlier in this chapter volunteers exchanged experiences and gave advice to one another. Many volunteers who had worked with adolescents felt juveniles were much more difficult to work with, an opinion shared by the staff. Also discussed were the status of negotiations with Spofford, the poor attendance at feedback sessions, suggestions to improve attendance, and after-care services available from other sources and provided by OAR.

Volunteer responses to questions on the survey concerning the feedback sessions reveal that this is one area where improvement is needed. First, attendance, as shown in Table 2-8, was confirmed to be sporadic, with thirty percent never or infrequently attending them, and thirty-one percent attending sometimes. Table 2-9 shows that while thirty-one percent of the volunteers felt the feedback sessions were "very helpful," another thirty-one percent felt the sessions were only "somewhat helpful", eight percent rated them as a little helpful, and fifteen percent rated them as not helpful. Furthermore, fifteen percent never went or went too infrequently to appropriately rate them.

To gain further insight into the feedback sessions, volunteers were asked how, if at all, the feedback sessions were helpful and how they could be improved. Table 2-9 reveals that thirty percent of the volunteers surveyed either did not find them helpful or had not attended feedback sessions. Among those who did find the sessions helpful, thirty-one percent found the perspectives shared by fellow volunteers were generally useful in helping them work with their clients, and thirty-one percent said the shared perspectives helped reduce the isolation they sometimes felt. Eight percent said they had received concrete information at the sessions.

Table 2-8

Volunteer Attendance
at Feedback Sessions

Frequency	Percent (N=51)
Attended Most or All Sessions	39%
Attended Some of the Sessions	31
Attended Sessions Infrequently or Never	29

Table 2-9

Volunteer Assessments
of Feedback Sessions

Overall Rating	Percent (N=52)
Very Helpful	31%
Somewhat Helpful	31
A Little Helpful	8
Not Helpful	15
Never or Infrequently Went	15
Ways in Which Helpful	
Shared Perspectives Useful to Volunteer Work	31%
Shared Perspectives Reduce Isolation	31
Not Helpful	15
Didn't Attend Enough to Assess Helpfulness	15
Concrete Information Provided	8
Suggestions for Improvement	
More Structure and Concrete Information	21%
None, Can't Think of Any	19
Improve Volunteer Attendance	15
Didn't Attend Enough to Make Recommendations	13
More Volunteer Participation	8
More Staff and/or Administration Involvement	8
Other	15

The most frequent suggestion for improving the feedback sessions, twenty-one percent, was to make them more structured with more concrete information provided. Some volunteers, in this regard, suggested that relevant speakers should be invited to the sessions to talk about legal, counseling, or court information. Next in frequency were suggestions that volunteer attendance should be improved (15 percent) and that volunteers should have more input in setting the agenda of these sessions (13 percent). These suggestions are particularly significant in light of the fact that thirty-four percent of the volunteers either had not attended enough sessions to make any suggestions or could not think of any recommendations. In addition, eight percent wanted more staff and/or administration involvement, and fifteen percent made a variety of unique suggestions such as daytime sessions and the development of a newsletter.

The following recommendations are based on these responses as well as direct observations. First, active volunteers ought to be surveyed as to subject areas they would like to see covered in feedback. Second, speakers should be invited to discuss issues suggested by the volunteers and announcements of these sessions should be sent to all active volunteers. Enough time should be allowed following such presentations for volunteers to share thoughts, reactions and experiences among themselves. And third, based on the spontaneous reasons some volunteers gave for not attending feedback sessions, the sessions should start at 6:00 p.m. instead of 7:00 p.m., so that the volunteers can grab a quick bite to eat after work and then go directly to OAR. Some volunteers, once they were home for an hour after work, just did not feel like going out again.

Volunteer Characteristics

In order to obtain an accurate overall picture of the type of person who volunteers at OAR, approximately 680 volunteer files were examined. These data are supplemented with results from the volunteer survey and from extensive data collected on active volunteers from February through August 1979 (see

Appendices A and B for details and sampling procedures).

Since September 1974, OAR has trained over 1,600 volunteers. At any single point in time, an average of approximately 150 volunteers are actively working with clients.[4] The average length of time during which volunteers remain active has been about a year, although recent data indicate that volunteers are remaining in the program for longer periods of time.

Comparing demographic data from the volunteer files, the volunteer survey, and OAR's most recent progress report describing their active volunteers in 1979, the demographic distributions of volunteers appear quite consistent and stable. For ease of presentation therefore, only data from the volunteer files are shown in Table 2-10. From this table it can be seen that female volunteers slightly outnumber male volunteers (though in 1979 the proportion of males and females was nearly equal); and that the majority of volunteers are black (69 percent) followed by white (20 percent) and Hispanic (10 percent). The average age of the volunteer is thirty, with the majority ranging from twenty to thirty; and forty percent have some college education, with thiry percent only attending high school and thirty percent graduating from college. Most are single (65 percent) and one-fifth are married. The volunteers come from a variety of occupations, most commonly clerical, social services and semi-professional positions. Twenty-two percent were students and ten percent were unemployed, although these have decreased in 1979 to thirteen and one percent, respectively. Fifteen percent of the volunteers have been arrested and four percent have a history of drug and/or alcohol abuse.

---

[4]This is a rough approximation based upon progress reports submitted by OAR over the past four years. Between April and August of 1979 the average number of volunteers at the end of each month dropped to 88 due to access problems at Spofford.

Table 2-10

Demographic Characteristics of OAR Volunteers

Characteristic	Sample Size[a]	Percent
Sex	683	
Female		61%
Male		39
Ethnic Group	619	
Black		69%
White		20
Hispanic		10
Oriental		1
Age[b]	676	
Under 20		4%
20 - 29		59
30 - 39		24
40 - 49		9
50 - 59		3
60 and older		1
Education	522	
Some High School		5%
High School Graduation		26
Some College		40
College Graduation		21
Post College		9
Marital Status	565	
Single		65%
Married		20
Separated		7
Divorced		5
Widowed		2
Occupation	622	
Unemployed		10%
Student		22
Clerical		19
Semi-professional		13
Skilled Labor		5
Business		5
Police or Security		1
Social Service (including education)		15
Religious Work		1
Professional		2
Other		7

[a] While the total number of files examined was 683, data was missing for all categories except sex.

[b] The mean age is 30.

In addition, two questions were included on the volunteer survey which further contribute to the characterization of OAR volunteers. The volunteers first were asked whether they had previously done any volunteer work and were then asked why they had volunteered with OAR. As can be seen from Table 2-11, sixty percent previously did volunteer work, mostly in the area of direct human service, e.g., work with retarded adults and tutoring young people. As Table 2-12 shows, the volunteers have a variety of reasons for volunteering with OAR, the most common of which are to contribute skills or do some good (27 percent), to work with clients in the criminal justice system (19 percent), and to supplement their jobs or school work (19 percent). The reasons OAR volunteers give for joining the program are similar to those reported for other criminal justice programs, as is the extent to which volunteers had previously done volunteer work (Fox, 1973; Gandy, 1977).

In contrast to most other criminal and juvenile justice volunteer programs, OAR volunteers are less likely to be female, possess somewhat less formal education, are more diverse in their occupational statuses, more represented by minority ethnic groups, and more frequently single (Arthur D. Little; 1978; Gandy, 1977; Ku, undated; M-2 Sponsors, 1978; Sorel,& Rossmen, 1977; Stoeckel, et al., 1975). Finally, the average length of volunteer involvement is greater than that reported by most other programs (Ku, undated; Scheier, et al., 1972; Servin, 1979). This important topic will be taken up in Chapter 4.

Client Characteristics

From September 1974 to September 1979, OAR worked with over 2,000 clients. Based upon a random sample of forty-three clients active in 1978, the mean length of their involvement with an OAR volunteer was eleven months.[5] Since no cumulative

---

[5] This figure underestimates duration, since many of these relationships are continuing and some relationships continue after volunteer contact with OAR is broken. The mean length of the 112 relationships documented on the volunteer survey is 20 months. In the volunteer survey some relationships has lasted as long as four years.

Table 2-11

Previous Volunteer Experiences
of OAR Volunteers

Type of Work	Percent (N=52)
Direct Service with Youths	19%
Direct Human Service (other than with youths)	31
Community or Political Work	8
None	40

Table 2-12

Reasons for Volunteering
With OAR

Reason	Percent (N=52)
Do Good or Contribute Skills	27%
Work with Criminal Justice Clients	19
Related to Work or Studies	19
Personal Growth	12
Work with Youth	10
Relative, Friend or Self Previously Imprisoned	10
Other	4

data are available, most of the data described below are based on clients, both adolescents and juveniles, active in the program between April 1 and September 1, 1979. During this period 283 clients were active in the OAR program, with an average of 175 active clients at the end of each month.

Table 2-13 shows the characteristics of clients active as of September 1979 and the characteristics of all new clients joining the program between April and August (new clients). The cross-section of active clients includes carry-overs from pervious years when OAR was actively recruiting adolescent clients, while the new clients are comprised almost exclusively of juveniles. As can be seen from Table 2-13 the only demographic difference between the active and new clients is that the new clients, as would be expected, are younger than the active clients.

Almost all clients are male and approximately eighty percent are black or Hispanic. That OAR has and continues to serve the more serious young offender is reflected in these data: Over fifty percent were initially charged with A and B felonies (mainly murder 2^{o} and robbery 1^{o}). Again, it should be noted that OAR is exceptional in using volunteers to work with the serious offender, and unique in following clients throughout their criminal justice involvement.

At any single point in time some OAR clients are in detention, some are in state prisons (or, for juveniles, Division for Youth facilities), and some are on the street. Table 2-14 shows the status of juvenile and adolescent clients at different points in time. The shifts in the adolescent client population from late 1978 to late 1979, as shown in Table 2-14, are understandable. First, as OAR stopped recruiting new adolescents (as of February, 1979), the total number of adolescents decreased, as did the proportion of adolescents in detention. Second, as those in detention were sentenced and those in state facilities released, the proportion of adolescents in state prison and on the street increased.

Table 2-13

Client Characteristics

Characteristics	Client Population: Active Clients on 7/31/79 (N=169)	Client Population: New Clients from 4/1/79 to 7/31/79 (N=77)
Sex		
Male	96%	99%
Female	4	1
Ethnic Group		
Black	58%	63%
Hispanic	23	18
White	18	20
Oriental	1	
Age at Intake[a]		
13-15	19%	29%
16-18	24	56
19-21	38	9
Over 21	19	6
Charge at Intake		
Felonies[b]		
A	23%	21%
B	44	48
C	16	13
D	11	6
E	2	4
Misdemeanors	2	5
Other[c]	1	3

[a]Some clients who were arrested and charged when they were 15 turned 16 by the time they were recruited into the OAR program; therefore some clients coded in the 16-18 range are, from a legal standpoint, juveniles.

[b]Data are missing for two clients on the 7/31 sample

[c]This includes one PINS case and one client charged with a federal offense.

Table 2-14

Client Status at Selected Points in Time

Status	Adolescents 10/78 (N=297)	Adolescents 4/79 (N=167)	Adolescents 9/79 (=106)	Juveniles 4/79 N=14	Juveniles 9/79 N=48	Total 10/78 N=297	Total 4/79 N=181	Total 9/79 N=154
Detention	19%	12%	6%	50%	56%	19%	15%	21%
State Facilities	56	68	61	7	15	56	64	47
On the Street	25	20	33	43	29	25	22	32[a]

[a]Of these clients, 31 percent were released on their own recognizance, 22 percent were on bail, 27 percent were on probation, 14 percent were on parole and 6 percent had served their time and were free. Fifty-three percent had cases pending.

The shifts in the juvenile client population are less reliable because of the small number of juveniles involved. As of August, OAR had still not been granted access to Spofford, and thus the small number of juveniles represented in Table 2-13 were all recruited from the Juvenile Offender and Detention Center on Rikers Island. It is impossible to accurately predict future status distributions which will include mainly Spofford clients, based upon these data. However, the trend in which most juveniles at any one point in time are either in detention or on the street will most likely continue. When OAR was working exclusively with adolescents, in contrast, the majority of their clients were usually in prison at a given point in time. Juveniles, despite the Juvenile Offender Laws, simply are receiving shorter sentences than adolescents.[6] Consequently, an increasing proportion of clients, both juveniles and adolescents, will be on the street. What this means is that OAR will, of necessity, have to focus more intensively on aftercare services.

This recommendation is especially significant in light of a finding from the volunteer survey that volunteer-client relationships are most frequently broken at the point when clients return to the streets. This conclusion is based upon the 112 relationships established by the fifty-two volunteers surveyed (see Appendix B). As shown in Table 2-15, only four percent of the relationships were broken at Rikers Island (detention), thirty-nine percent of the relationships in which the clients went to prison were broken while in prison, and seventy percent of the relationships in which the client was on the street were broken while the client was on the street. Furthermore, of those broken in prison, fifty-three percent had been maintained for at least one month, while of those broken in the street, only thirty percent had been maintained for one month or more. These figures give only a partial picture of the situation, since the level of service provided is not taken into account; they do reinforce the suggestion that OAR should intensify its aftercare componment.

---

[6] A large percentage of these cases are removed to and adjudicated in Family Court.

Table 2-15

Status at Which Volunteer-Client Relations are Broken

When Relationship Was Broken	At Rikers (N=112)	At Prison (N=71)	On the Street (N=43)
Immediately as Client Enters Status	-0-	18%	49%
One or More Months after Client Enters Status	4%	21	21
At Any Point in Status	4	39	70

Note: These figures do not take into account level of services provided.

Chapter 3

Staff and Volunteer Activities

In this chapter the type of services provided by the volunteers and by the staff will be described. The primary data sources used to document services by the volunteers will be the volunteer survey (Appendices A and B) and monthly logs maintained by OAR (Appendix D), and verified by CJCC, on volunteer activities between April and September, 1979. Staff activities, as logged by OAR (Appendix D) and verified by CJCC, cover this same time period.

Volunteer Activities

Volunteer activities are logged by OAR in five main categories: individual counseling (most of which occurs at the detention centers and lasts about two hours), family contacts, correspondence to and from clients, telephone calls, and legal activities. Table 3-1 shows the average monthly activity level by volunteers in each of these categories between April and September, 1979. Also shown in this table are estimates of the time required to complete each activity.

In order to place these data in perspective, the status of the clients served during this time period must be considered. As can be seen from Table 3-2, twenty-one percent of the clients (juveniles and adolescents) were in detention, fifty-three percent were in state facilities, and twenty-six percent were on the street. Because twice as many clients were in state facilities (with whom the volunteers correspond) than were in detention (where volunteers visit with their clients), it is understandable that more letters were exchanged between volunteers and their clients than individual counseling sessions were conducted. Family contacts, which also exceeded the number of individual counseling sessions, are made by volunteers with clients in all three categories; and legal activities, including time-consuming court appearances, are engaged in by volunteers with clients either on the street (pre-trial) or for clients in detention. The average number of volunteer hours per months is 5.3; but again, this must be viewed in light of the fact that over half the clients were in

Table 3-1

Volunteer Activities

from April to September, 1979

Type of Activity	Mean Number of Monthly Activities	Hours Per Activity	Mean Number of Hours Per Month[a]
Individual Counseling Sessions	84.4	2.0	168.8
Family Contacts			74.1
Individual Counseling	22.6	1.0	22.6
Telephone/Letters	103.0	.5	51.5
Correspondence			81.5
From Clients	107.6	.25	26.9
To Clients	109.2	.5	54.6
Telephone Calls			39.2
To Client	78.6	.25	19.7
To Staff	47.0	.25	11.8
Regarding Aftercare	11.8	.25	3.0
To Parole/Probation Officer	10.0	.25	2.5
Other	8.6	.25	2.2
Legal Activities			98.4
Court Appearances	20.8	3.0	62.4
Attorney Contacts	44.8	.5	22.4
Other	10	.5	5.0
Other Activities[b]	17.2	.5	8.6

Note: The average number of volunteers active at the end of each month for this five month period was 88,

[a]These estimates were made by the author of this report and agreed to by OAR's Assistant Project Director.

[b]These include visits and letters to programs and agencies.

state facilities during this time period. Since state facilities are generally quite distant from New York City, most volunteers correspond with their clients in these facilities, an activity requiring minimal time demands.

Table 3-2

Mean Number of Clients
Occupying Each Status From
April to September, 1979

Status	Mean Number of Clients	Percent
Detention	36.6	21%
Prison	94.0	54
On the Street	44.6	25

Note: These calculations are based upon client statuses at the end of each month.

In order to learn in more detail the nature of the services provided by volunteers to their clients, several questions were included in the volunteer survey concerning volunteer service delivery. In most general terms, volunteers were asked to rate their relationship with their clients, and to rate how much they felt they had helped their clients. As can be seen from Tables 3-3 and 3-4, approximately ninety percent of the volunteers rated their relationships as "excellent", and felt they helped their clients "a lot" or "a fair amount." These results appear quite favorable, but it is possible that some volunteers inflated their ratings. Cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957) would predict that the volunteers who had invested a great deal of time and energy in working with their clients would tend to rate their work favorably. Inflated or not, these are subjective ratings, and should only be interpreted to mean that these volunteers feel they are doing an effective job, a not insubstantial finding.

Table 3-3
Volunteer Ratings of Their
Client Relationships

Rating[a]	Percent (N=52)
Excellent	42%
Good	48
Fair	8
Poor	2

[a]These choices were provided by the interviewer.

Table 3-4
Volunteer Perceptions of How
Much They Helped Their Clients

Rating[a]	Percent (N=52)
A lot	52%
A fair amount	37
A little	8
Not at all	4

[a]These choices were provided by the interviewer.

Volunteers were then asked about the nature of the help they provided to their clients in each of six areas: attitudes, education, vocational assistance, legal/court concerns, family relationships, and living arrangements. Responses on each area were compiled and then collapsed into the smallest reasonable number of categories. Each of these areas will be discussed in turn.

As shown in Table 3-5, eight categories were needed, and since thirty-five of the volunteers gave at least two responses, their second responses were also coded. Consistent with the literature on volunteerism in the criminal justice system, the most

frequent first response in this area (twenty-seven percent) was that the volunteer had helped his or her client build up trust and confidence that someone cared for him.[1] The next most frequent first responses (both seventeen percent) were that the volunteer had helped the client accept responsibility for his actions, and that by listening to the client express his feelings, the volunteer had helped the client become more self reflective and considerate of others. The most frequent second responses were: counseling help about general life issues (29 percent) and, again, building up trust and confidence in the client (26 percent). In general, the volunteers felt they helped improve their clients' attitudes by conveying to their clients that they cared and were trustworthy.

As shown in Table 3-6, the most frequent response in the area of education was that the volunteers had discussed with clients their need for and interest in education, and had encouraged them to further their education (thirty-five percent). No concrete educational goals were noted, however. Based upon this result and upon spontaneous statements made by the volunteers, it appears that the main accomplishment in this area (and also in the vocational area discussed below) was to help the clients simply talk about their educational interests and needs, and reverse their clients' sense of pessimism and failure that many had experienced throughout their lives. To a lesser extent, the volunteers helped tutor or teach their clients (fifteen percent) and encouraged and supported their clients who were in school, either while incarcerated (fifteen percent) or while on the street (eight percent).

In terms of responding to their clients[1] vocational needs and interests, Table 3-7 shows that exactly half the volunteers discussed with clients their interests and future plans regarding work and/or training. As in the area of education, many volunteers felt these discussions were important because their clients had not previously talked positively or realistically about their future work. Nineteen percent of their clients were working or in training while in prison, and this was encouraged and supported by the volunteers; and eight percent of the volunteers gave or found their clients jobs.

---

[1] Clients from the volunteer survey will be referred to as male for ease of presentation, despite the fact that one client is female.

Table 3-5

Volunteers' Perceptions of Their

Effects on Client Attitudes

Type of Help	First Response (N=52)	Second Response (N=34)
Built up trust and confidence that someone cares for and is supportive of client	27%	26%
Helped client accept responsibility for his actions	17	14
Helped client become more self reflective and/or considerate of others	17	9
Heped client become more optimistic about his future	15	11
Discussed possible avenues for rehabilitation	12	11
Attitudes didn't change and are negative	8	0
Attitudes didn't change and are positive	4	0
Counseled about general life issues	0	29

Table 3-6

Volunteer Help With Clients'

Educational Needs and Interests

Type of Help	Percent (N=52)
Discussed and supported educational interests and needs of client	35%
Tutored or instructed client	15
Encouraged and supported client's attendance at school while incarcerated	15
Attempted to discuss educational issues but client not interested	10
Encouraged and supported client's attendance at school while on the street	8
Supplied client with educational materials	6
Encouraged and supported client's efforts in obtaining his GED[a]	4
No discussion about education	8

[a]High School General Equivalency Diploma.

Table 3-7

Volunteer Help with Clients'

Vocational Needs and Interests

Type of Help	Percent (N=52)
Discussed client's interests and future plans regarding work or training	50%
Encouraged and supported participant's work or training while in prison	19
Gave or found client a job	8
Discussion about vocational plans attempted but client not interested	8
Participant got own job	4
Other vocational assistance	4
No discussion of vocational plans, needs, or interests	8

Volunteers provided the most concrete help to their clients in the area of legal and courtroom activities. As shown in Table 3-8, twenty-five percent of the volunteers provided concrete assistance with their clients' court cases by writing letters of support to the court on behalf of the clients, serving as character witnesses, speaking with the judges, and so on. Another seventeen percent accompanied their clients to court, thirteen percent explained standard legal or courtroom procedures to their clients and another thirteen percent discussed their clients' cases with their clients' lawyers. Ten percent, it should be noted, began seeing their clients at too late a stage in legal processing to make any interventions in this regard.

Table 3-8
Volunteer Help in Legal
and Courtroom Matters

Type of Help	Percent (N=52)
Provided assistance with court case	25%
Accompanied client in court	17
Explained legal or courtroom procedure	13
Discussed case with lawyer	13
Gave useful information to lawyer	4
Other legal or courtroom help	10
Too late in processing to intervene	10
No help	8

With regard to family matters, as shown in Table 3-9 most volunteers thought they had played an active role in helping clients and their families become more supportive of one another. Sixty-five percent of the volunteers contacted their clients' families, whether by phone or in person; and though two-thirds did not specify the purpose or result of these contacts, twelve percent said they helped the families cope with or understand criminal justice and/or Department of Correction procedures, ten percent said they helped the families accept and/or reach out to their clients, and six percent relayed messages between clients and their families. Furthermore, twenty-three percent of the volunteers discussed with clients their family relationships, with ten percent indicating that their clients' attitudes toward their families had improved.

Table 3-9

Volunteer Help with

Family Relationships

Type of Help	Percent (N=52)
Contacted client's family - purpose and consequences not noted	38%
Discussed family relationships with client - consequences not noted	13
Helped family cope with or understand justice system and/or Department of Corrections procedures	12
Helped parents accept and/or reach out to clients	10
Discussed family relationships with client and client's attitude improved	10
Relayed message(s) between client and family	6
Other help in family matters	2
Neither family contact nor discussion with client about family	10

Staff Activities

Excluding initial training and feedback sessions (see Chapter 2), OAR staff involve themselves in a variety of activities. These activities can be grouped into ten separate categories, as shown in Table 3-10. Some of these activities are explained in Chapter 2, while some need further explanation.

The first activity shown in Table 3-10 is individual counseling. Most staff are assigned or take on the counseling of one or more clients who are either in detention or in prison. The staff do this because they feel that keeping abreast of the problems and needs of their clients make them better qualified to train and supervise volunteers. This client involvement was particulary helpful to staff when OAR began recruiting juvenile clients. The interests, needs and problems of juveniles differ significantly from adolescents, and the staff gained additional insights into these differences through their individual counseling of juveniles.

The staff, mainly the Aftercare Coordinator, also provide individual counseling to their aftercare or "on the street" clients and their families. These sessions focus on a variety of issues, including employment and educational plans, court cases (many of these clients have not yet been sentenced) and various family matters. The category listed as "non-participants" includes mainly individuals who, after hearing about OAR through friends or associates, join one of the aftercare groups and subsequently request individual counseling. These individuals frequently have had prior legal problems and are now just trying to stay out of trouble.

As noted in Chapter 2, OAR conducts two aftercare groups (one for adolescents and one for juveniles) and a group for their clients' families (mainly parents of juveniles). In conjunction with the family groups, which are led by the Outreach Coordinator, home visits are made, and individual counseling sessions for family members are conducted, telephone calls made, and letters written to them. As of September 1, 1979 a core group of ten families consistently attend while seventeen families have attended on an irregular basis.

Table 3-10

Staff Activities from
April to September, 1979

Activity	Monthly Average	Monthly Average for Activity Type[a]
Individual Counseling Sessions		94.6
Clients in Detention/Prison	27.6	
Aftercare Clients	47.0	
Non-participants	20.0	
Family Contacts		240.7
Individual Counseling Sessions	12.0	
Group Sessions	3.5	
Telephone/Letters	214.6	
Home Visits	10.6	
Aftercare Groups		
Number of Clients	10.8	
Number of Groups	4.0	
Institutional Monitoring		13.6
Correspondence		120.0
From Clients	46.6	
To Clients	48.6	
Legal Related	18.2	
Other	6.6	
Telephone Activities		485.2
To/From Clients	171.4	
Legal Related	42.8	
Programs	81.6	
Education/Employment Related	17.6	
Volunteers	94.4	
Other	77.7	
Court Activities		248.4
Court Appearances	47.8	
Court Related Conferences	23.8	
Telephone Contacts	176.8	
Education		
Tests Administered	11.6	
Volunteers Trained[b]	4.0	
Participants Tutored	2.2	
Referrals	2.6	
Employment		
Referrals	3.8	
Direct Placement	.4	
Administrative Visits		9.6

[a]These are not given when sub-categories are not logically cumulative.

[b]This was done only in July.

The extent of institutional monitoring shown in Table 3-10 is atypically low for OAR. Mainly, this included monitoring of volunteers at the JODC on Rikers Island, since access to Spofford was not granted until late August 1979. At present, staff monitor volunteers at Spofford three times per week and are continuing to monitor those volunteers who have clients at the JODC twice per week.

The staff also devote a great deal of time and energy to making court appearances and attending court related conferences. Between April and September, OAR staff made, on the average, nearly two court appearance per day. Because it is unknown in advance the exact time at which a case will be called, court appearances may require several hours of waiting time (and counseling time) until a case is called.

The telephone work and correspondence maintained by the staff are self-explanatory and do not require further comment other than to indicate that all active volunteers are contacted each month in order to log their activities (see Appendix D).

As shown in Table 3-10, staff involvement in making educational and vocational referrals to their aftercare clients and in providing direct services in these areas is quite limited. As indicated earlier in this chapter, OAR chose to focus the groups it conducts on general life issues rather than providing educational or vocational skills training; however this should not have precluded referrals to other agencies or programs when appropriate. Also in this regard, it should be noted that as of August 1, 1979, fifty-three percent of OAR's aftercare clients still had cases pending, and therefore were more difficult to place into jobs or enroll in educational or training programs.

In accordance with their contract, OAR staff are generally performing their duties conscienciously. The major area of weakness, a weakness acknowledged by OAR staff and administration, is OAR's limited referral and service provision in the areas of education and employment. In lieu of hiring additional staff to provide services and training in these areas, OAR should seek out appropriate agencies, programs, and individuals who can assist them with this function. Individuals from such organiza-

tions could be invited to speak to volunteers and staff during training and feedback sessions. In any event, links between OAR and relevant service organizations should be established and maintained.

Chapter 4

Outcomes

As noted in Chapter 1, there are no well established criteria by which to evaluate volunteer programs in the criminal and juvenile justice systems. Recidivism rates have been used in a small number of studies to compare clients enrolled in the program with an appropriate control group. In each of these programs clients were "at risk" (on the streets) during the year following their entrance into the program[1], and all clients had the same status, either probation or parole. A single comparison group, therefore, could be used to evaluate each program.

The OAR program, in contrast to other volunteer programs, maintains clients at various phases of their criminal or juvenile justice system involvement, e.g., bail, detention, prison, probation and parole. Consequently, OAR's clients vary as to their time at risk during their first, as well as during subsequent years, following their entry into the program. Furthermore, in order to properly evaluate any recidivism rates, several comparison groups would be required, one for each of the following: pretrial clients on the street, clients whose cases are dismissed, probationers, and parolees. White theoretically possible, such a study was too costly and time-consuming for the present evaluation.

Other typical outcome measures employed in criminal justice program evaluation include educational progress and job placement. Since neither the staff nor the volunteers provided significant service in these areas, these measures are inappropriate to the evaluation of OAR's effectiveness.

Two quantitative outcome measures are both appropriate and available for OAR: (1) clients participation as measured by number of clients served and length of time active in the program, and (2) volunteer participation as measured by length of time volunteers remain active in the program. These figures, of course, are

---

[1] In the M-2 volunteer sponsor program, however, volunteers first see their clients while they are in prison just prior to their parole; and thus these are not at risk when they formally enter the program, but this was only for a brief period of time. All clients included in the evaluation, though, were on parole at or soon after program entry, and therefore at risk.

only meaningful in light of the actual services provided, which are, in turn, documented in Chapter 3.

Number of Clients and Length of Client Participation

Despite the fact that OAR did not gain access to Spofford until late August, a delay of approximately six months, OAR served during the first seven months of its funding year fifty-four percent of the number of clients for which it contracted. Between February and September 1979, OAR served 321 clients, the majority of whom were adolescents (see Chapter 2). The average number of clients active at the end of each month, between April and September, was 175.

The number of client terminations between February and September was 142, approximately half of whom "completed services,"[2] and more than half of whom (at least between May and September) had been in the program for one year or more. This figure is consistent with results obtained from a random sample of sixty-four adolescent clients terminated prior to April 1979. Among this sample, the mean length of involvement in the program was 11.5 months. Length of client participation, of course, cannot be properly calculated for active clients because it is not known how long they will continue to participate in the program.

Given the fact that OAR will be actively recruiting clients from Spofford during the last five months of their funding year, the program should have no difficulty meeting its contractual obligation of 600 clients. Although 142 of the clients OAR served during the first seven months of their funding year were terminated (46 percent termination rate), sixty-two percent of the terminated clients[3] were long term clients

---

[2]This category, developed by OAR in conjunction with CJCC includes: those clients who are doing well without continued OAR intervention (by mutual agreement between OAR and the client); those clients who are actively involved in another program to the extent that they no longer need OAR; and those who are serving long terms in the state prison system and are no longer active by choice, though they may resume contact just prior to or following their release. Other reasons for termination included: non-cooperation (34 percent) in which clients continuously miss appointments or are unresponsive to OAR's attempt to contact them, for a period of two months; self-terminations (5 percent) in which clients inform OAR of their wish to no longer participate in the program; volunteer terminations (8 percent) in which the volunteer either misses three consecutive appointments or chooses to terminate the relationship; transfers (3 percent) in which OAR intervenes to transfer client to another agency or program.

[3]This figure is based upon data from May through September 1979.

who had been with the program one year or more. Therefore, in terms of number of clients served, OAR has been and continues to meet its contractual obligations.

Length of Volunteer Commitment

Length of volunteer participation in a program, or tunover rate, has been cited by two leading authorities on volunteerism in the criminal justice system as an important and relevant measure of a program's effectiveness:

> "Turnover rate is a critical index of the success of volunteer programs. A high rate is generally indicative of problems in volunteer motivation and program leadership, and it strongly suggests that volunteers are unable to give offenders or the agency the consistency of service which would normally be required for effectiveness." (Scheier, et al., 1972, p. 29), and

> "The problem of staff (meaning CJS staff) resistance, high volunteer drop out rates, and volunteer discouragement are directly related to type and quality of supervision the volunteer receives." (Schwartz, 1977, p. 2).

As indicated in Chapter 2, OAR asks and expects each of its volunteers to make a one year commitment to the program. A large percentage of OAR volunteers, in fact, do participate in the program for at least a year.[4] An examination of over 650 volunteer files, dating back to late 1975, reveals that 49.7 percent of the volunteers remained active for one year or more. However, eighty-two percent of the volunteers active as of September 1, 1979 have been active in the program for more than one year.

Drawing on the large sample of data from the volunteer files (see Appendix A for sampling procedures), an analysis was undertaken to determine whether volunteers who fulfill their one year commitment differ in any significant manner from those who did not fulfill their one year commitment. Results of this analysis can be used to discern what characteristics of the volunteers tend to be associated with ability to fulfill the one year requirement. Data on eight volunteer characteristics were available for this type of analysis: sex, age, ethnic group, marital status, education, employment status, arrest history and drug use history. The results of these analyses

---

[4] Nationwide norms, based primarily on volunteer programs for probationers, indicate that sixty-two percent of all volunteers drop out within the first year. Moreover, the average length of participation of volunteers in an LEAA exemplary project for probationers was ten months (Ku, undated).

are shown in Tables 4-1 and 4-2.

As can be seen from these tables, four of the eight factors showed statistically significant effects.[5] Those volunteers who fulfilled their one year commitment differed from volunteers who did not fulfill this commitment in terms of ethnic group, level of formal education, employment status, and arrest history. Each of these will be discussed in turn.

With regard to ethnic group membership, Hispanic volunteers less frequently fulfill their one year commitment than black or white volunteers. As can be seen from Table 4-1, 77.8 percent of the Hispanic volunteers leave the program prior to serving one year. There is no readily apparent explanation for this finding. Perhaps Hispanics feel relatively isolated in the OAR program since none of the staff are Hispanic and only 10.3 percent of the volunteers (at least in this sample) were Hispanic.[6]

As to level of formal education, volunteers who had not completed their high school education are less likely to meet their volunteer commitment that those who had completed their high school education. Moreover, the difference in volunteer commitment between those who graduated from high school but did not graduate from college and those who graduated from college is not significant. It appears, then, that a minimal level of formal education and the self-discipline to have completed high school are important qualities in retaining volunteers to work with young offenders. This is not surprising in that volunteers are supposed to model qualities they wish to instill in their clients, and most clients need help in returning to school and completing their high school educations.

From Table 4-1 it can be seen that volunteers who are unemployed, or are students, fulfill their commitment to a lesser extent than those who are employed. Students, it should be noted, fare no better nor worse than unemployed volunteers. It is feasible,

---

[5]The statistic "chi square" was used to analyze the seven categorial variables and a "t-test" was used to analyze age differences. Statistical significance is a mathematical term referring to the fact that it is highly unlikely that chance alone can account for the finding.

[6]In the most recent analysis of active volunteers, only 6.9 percent were found to be Hispanic.

Table 4-1

Completion of Volunteer Commitment

and Volunteer Characteristics[a]

Characteristic	N	Volunteered More Than One Year	Volunteered Less Than One Year	Chi Square[b]
Sex				1.98
Male	265	46.0%	54.0%	
Female	413	51.6	48.4	
Ethnic Group				23.75**
White	121	59.5	40.5	
Black	422	49.5	51.5	
Hispanic	63	22.2	77.8	
Marital Status				2.82
Single	364	48.1	51.9	
Married	113	46.0	54.0	
Divorced/Separated	72	54.2	45.8	
Widowed	13	30.8	69.2	
Education				13.06**
Some High School	24	20.8	79.2	
High School Grad	338	50.3	49.7	
College Grad	155	59.4	40.6	
Employment Status				14.64**
Unemployed or Student	192	38.5	61.5	
Employed	426	55.1	46.9	
Arrest History				3.87*
Never Arrested	576	51.6	48.4	
Arrested	110	37.3	62.7	
Drug Use History				3.23
No Use	650	50.3	49.7	
Some Use	25	32.0	68.0	

*Difference is statistically significant at a .95 probability level.
**Difference is statistically significant at a .99 probability level.

[a]Overall, 49.7 percent fulfilled their one year commitment and the mean length of volunteer participation is 11.7 months.

[b]This is a standard, well-accepted statistic used to compare distributions of categorical data.

and anecdotal data support this hypothesis, that as the students enter the labor market and as the unemployed find jobs, their leisure time diminishes and they begin to experience their volunteer work as an unnecessary drain.

Furthermore, as alluded to in Chapter 1, students who volunteer in conjunction with a particular course they are taking frequently lose their motivation to continue their volunteer work once the course is completed. That students in general do not tend to make long term commitments to volunteer work is supported by the fact that the volunteer unit of the Department of Probation in New York City, which relies heavily on students, reports a two-thirds annual turnover rate (Servin, 1979).

Finally, those volunteers who reported having arrest histories tended not to fulfill their one year requirement as frequently as those with no arrest histories. The explanation for this finding is not clearly evident. At least half the staff and administration have arrest histories, and if anything, such experiences contribute to the credibility of their perspectives and enhance the training they provide. It is possible that among the volunteer ex-offenders many simply find the experience of working with detained youths too painfully evocative of their own pasts.

A word of caution in interpreting these results is appropriate at this point. The results, despite their statistical significance, do not mean that all prospective volunteers who are Hispanic, have a tenth grade education, are unemployed, and have been arrested should be ruled ineligible for volunteer work at OAR. Rather, the results can be used to help OAR focus on the underlying reasons which account for these trends. For example, do Hispanics feel alienated or isolated in the program? Are students and unemployed individuals using the volunteer work as a brief, temporary substitute for a full-time job? And are some volunteers with arrest records still trying to work through unresolved personal conflicts?

Table 4-2

Difference Between Mean Ages
of Volunteers Fulfilling and
Not Fulfilling Their Commitments

Commitment Status	N	Mean Age	Standard Deviation[a]	t[b]
Fulfilled	329	30.4	8.2	0.1
Unfulfilled	340	29.8	8.3	

[a]This is a well-established and commonly used statistic to express degree of dispersion from the average value.

[b]This is a well-established and commonly used statistic to assess the extent to which two sample means differ. The difference, in this case, is not statistically significant.

The Question of the Match

As reviewed in Chapter 1, some controversy exists in the literature as to whether matching volunteers to clients on the basis of common characteristics or interests is fruitful or advantageous. OAR, as noted earlier, does not follow this practice. The only pertinent data available to address this issue with regard to OAR are the sex and ethnic group membership of volunteers and clients. Four types of naturally-occurring pairs, based upon a random sample of 110 relationships were examined: gender match but no ethnic group match, ethnic group match but no gender match, double match, and double mismatch. The outcome measure, or dependent variable, used to assess the possible benefits of matching is length of client-volunteer relationship.

The results of this analysis are shown in Table 4-3. Clearly, these results do not support the contention that the more closely volunteers and clients are matched on these variables, the more durable the relationship. In point of fact, the double mismatch relationships tended to be maintained longer than any other pair type, and significantly [7] longer than pairs in which there is a gender match (male volunteer) but ethnic mismatch. Moreover, this is the only statistically significant difference.

[7]This refers to statistical significance in that such differences are mathematically very unlikely to occur by chance alone.

Table 4-3

The Effect of Gender and Ethnic Matches

on Length of Volunteer-Client Relationships

Pair Type[a]	N	Mean Length of Relationship (Months)	t[b]
Double Mismatch	22	12.8	
Ethnic Match/ Gender Mismatch	29	9.3	1.76*
Gender Match/ Ethnic Mismatch	31	7.8	
Double Match	28	10.3	

*Statistically significant difference at the .95 level of probability.

[a]All clients in this sample are male and therefore all gender mismatches involve female volunteers.

[b]This is a well-established and commonly used statistic to assess the extent to which two sample means differ. Only statistically significant differences are shown in this column.

Effects on the Volunteer

One of the goals articulated by OAR is to increase community involvement in the juvenile and criminal justice systems. Certainly by training and placing over 1,600 volunteers, OAR has accomplished this goal. In order to assess whether the trained and involved OAR volunteer reaches out to still other community members, two questions were included in the OAR survey to address this issue.

First, volunteers were asked whether they had encouraged friends or relatives to become OAR volunteers. Eighty percent answered affirmatively and forty-six percent of these volunteers indicated that the individuals they had spoken to did become OAR volunteers. Second, volunteers were asked if they had spoken to anyone in their communities about the criminal justice system. In this case, sixty-two percent responded affirmatively, though many volunteers added that they had not affected anyone's point of view.

Volunteers were also asked two questions related to how their volunteer work had affected them personally. First, they were asked if their views toward the criminal justice system had changed as a function of their volunteer work. As illustrated in

Table 4-4, almost half the volunteers, forty-five percent, had become more negative about the criminal justice system; i.e., prior to their volunteer work and, for most, prior to their exposure to the criminal justice system, they thought the system was fairer or more just than they now perceived it to be. Twenty-four percent said they had always felt the system was unfair and/or unjust, and ten percent said they had become more positively disposed toward the criminal justice system as a consequence of their OAR involvement.

Second, volunteers were asked if their volunteer work had affected their career or educational plans or involvement. One-quarter of the volunteers responded that their volunteer work had indeed helped to clarify the direction of their career or educational plans, and thirty-one percent felt their volunteer work had given them a clearer perspective on their present educational and career involvements. Twenty-three percent of the volunteers stated that their volunteer work was unrelated to their education and work.

Table 4-4

Effects of Volunteer Work on
Volunteer Views of the Criminal Justice System

View Change	Percent (N=51)
Changed - more negative	45%
No change - views negative	24
Changed - more positive	10
No change - views unspecified	8
No change - views positive	6
Changed - more knowledgeable	6
Changed - direction unspecified	2

In summary, most volunteers have been personally affected by their volunteer work. Most had attempted to recruit friends or relatives to become OAR volunteers and most had talked to members of their community about their feelings toward and experiences with the criminal justice system. In addition, most volunteers felt their volunteer work had an influence on their studies or career, and the majority felt that, as a consequence of their involvement in the criminal justice system, their views about the justice system had changed.

Chapter 5

Opinions of External Agencies and Departments

Thus far in this report OAR has been described and evaluated from an internal perspective, that is, based upon program records and perceptions of the program by its volunteers. In this chapter external views of agencies and departmental staff with whom OAR works will be examined. For this purpose the directors of three separate divisions of the Legal Aid Society (LAS) and the Warden and Deputy Warden of two detention facilities at Rikers Island were queried as to their experiences with and opinions about OAR (see Appendix E for the interview schedules).

These interviews supplement the generally favorable letters of support OAR has received from administrative heads of various agencies and departments within the juvenile and criminal justice systems. During 1978 and 1979, for example, such letters of support were written by the former Commissioner of the New York City Department of Correction, the then Acting Director of the Spofford Youth Facility, the former Supervising Warden of the Adolescent Reception and Detention Center on Rikers Island, the Acting Justice of Kings County Supreme Court and the former Director of the New York State Division for Youth.

Each of these letters reflect an understanding of how OAR operates and what its goals and objectives are. The following excerpt is typical of the rationale cited to support the program:

> "It (OAR's Program) can result in a long-term relationship of trust and respect between the youth and the volunteer that could and will make the difference on the ultimate issue of whether the youth "makes it" or gets back into trouble.... Having the volunteer follow the youth through his or her period of institutionalization can contribute significantly to the effectiveness of the services the youth is receiving at the time and to rebuilding the relationship between the youth and his family and community". (Peter Edelman, former Director DFY, letter dated 9/11/78).

Legal Aid Society Interviews

Since OAR had not worked as extensively with juveniles as it had with adolescents (as of late August, 1979), it was decided to interview staff in the

Criminal Division of LAS rather than the Juvenile Rights Division. Leon Polsky, the director of the Criminal Division, was contacted in late August and asked to recommend appropriate personnel in his organization who had contact with OAR and could speak in a knowledgeable manner about the program. Mr. Polsky then recommended speaking to the following individuals: Bart Lubow, Director of Special Defender Services; William Sanneman, Deputy Attorney, Youth Complex, New York County; and Wilfred O'Connor, Program Director, Prison Legal Assistance Program.

Each of these individuals was contacted and the purpose of the interview was explained to them. Each was also asked to invite staff members who might be particularly knowledgeable about OAR's activities. The views, descriptions, and opinions of these individuals and their staffs varied significantly. For ease of presentation each of the interviews will be discussed separately.

Of the LAS staff interviewed, Bart Lubow and a social worker on his staff were the most favorably disposed toward OAR. Their program, Special Defender Services, is the social service arm of LAS. They work principally with indicted serious offenders, trying to divert them from prison and help them with their social and family needs.

Both Mr. Lubow and the social worker were very familiar with the OAR program and the services it provides. When asked how OAR has been helpful to them and their mutual clients they referred mainly to the aftercare services provided by the OAR staff and to a lesser extent to services provided by OAR volunteers. In terms of staff help, they felt OAR's aftercare groups, or as they called them "non-professional psychiatric counseling groups," were highly effective, and both had referred clients to these groups. They felt these clients need adult models like the OAR staff, who can speak their language and share common backgrounds. They also spoke favorably of staff presentations to the courts on behalf of their mutual clients, the fact that volunteers occasionally wrote them letters about clients which helped in preparing pre-sentencing memoranda, and the long term follow-up provided by many volunteers.

They felt that OAR's strongest aspects were its reliability and dependability, and the fact that OAR was providing counseling to a population of young people who normally would not receive such services. OAR's weakest aspect, they felt, was the variability in quality of its staff. Other than one or two minor differences of opinion between LAS staff and OAR volunteers about a client, differences which were amicably resolved, Mr. Lubow and the social worker said that neither OAR staff nor volunteers had interfered with their work. Finally, both felt strongly that OAR should be funded on a permanent basis.

William Sanneman, and one of his staff attorneys, were also quite knowledgeable about the kinds of services OAR provides. Their program, the Youth Complex, provides attorneys to all youth, ages 16 to 19, who otherwise do not have and cannot afford legal representation, and their attorneys defend half the juvenile offenders whom Legal Aid represents. Mr. Sanneman, although he has had minimal contact with OAR for the past nine months, generally felt OAR does a good job and plays an important role. At least he felt this was the case in the past. The staff attorney felt that OAR, since they fired one of their court liaisons about a year ago,[1] has done a very poor job in the courts.

Mr. Sanneman felt OAR was helpful mainly in their counseling activities and in finding appropriate programs to serve the needs of their mutual clients. He also felt OAR was helpful to LAS's diversion program in providing useful information for pre-sentencing reports. He said, however, that he had not had enough contact with OAR to specify their strongest and weakest features.

The staff attorney, on the other hand, was quite vocal in his criticism of OAR. Mr. Silverblatt did not trust OAR staff to work with juvenile offenders, felt their aftercare groups were too threatening to their clients, felt they were no longer visible and probably less credible than in the past in the eyes of the courts and said the staff was ineffective in supervising its volunteers. Furthermore, he felt the program should be defunded, although he agreed with Mr. Sanneman that neither OAR staff nor volunteers

---

[1]This former employee, according to OAR, was terminated in February, 1979 because of funding cutbacks. Shortly after this employee was terminated Mr. Silverblatt wrote a letter to OAR protesting this action.

had ever interfered with or hindered LAS staff from carrying out their duties.

Wilfred O'Connor was least knowledgeable about the services provided by OAR, although based on what he did know he was favorably disposed toward the program. His program, the Prison Legal Assistance Program, operates mainly in New York City's detention centers. Mr. O'Connor's staff function partially as liaisons between staff attorneys and their clients and partially to help out detainees in any way they can. Mr. O'Connor thought OAR served mainly clients on the street, including probationers and pre-trial young people on bail or released on their own recognizance. Although he knew OAR volunteers had gone into Rikers Island facilities (he said he last saw them at the JODC), Mr. O'Connor thought that this was in the capacity of following up on clients they had started to work with on the street. Mr. O'Connor, in other words, understood OAR to be an on-the-street diversion program which relied on volunteers to establish one-to-one relationships with their clients.

When asked what he felt were OAR's strongest aspects, Mr. O'Connor responded that it was important to have individuals (volunteers) speak with clients, devote attention to them, gain their confidence and help them in their social adjustment. As to OAR's weakest aspects, he felt OAR could benefit from having a structured and comprehensive program for counseling and job training; short of this, they should provide referral and follow-up services to help divert clients from the criminal justice system, and in this way help reduce rates of recidivism. He had heard that OAR's Court Liaison person was excellent, and as far as he knew, OAR staff and volunteers had never interfered with or hindered the work of his program. Finally, he simply had not had enough contact with OAR to comment about refunding.

The views expressed by LAS staff, then, do not yield a clear or unified picture of OAR. Based on the above interviews, it appears that OAR is most effective in providing social services, and particularly counseling, to indicted offenders who are on the street. It also appears that they are, at best, moderately effective in the Courts and in providing legal assistance to their clients. Finally, regardless of whether the staff felt OAR was effective or ineffective, none felt OAR and its volunteers had hindered or interfered with LAS work.

As a final note regarding Legal Aid, it should be pointed out that OAR volunteers had mixed views about LAS attorneys. When volunteers were asked how helpful their clients' Legal Aid attorneys were, thirty percent said they were very helpful, fourteen percent felt they were somewhat helpful, and twenty percent stated they were not helpful at all.[2] In addition, twenty-five percent said the degree of help varied among the attorneys they had worked with and eleven percent of the volunteers had not had contact with their clients' LAS attorney.

Rikers Island Interviews

Since September, 1974 OAR has recruited most of its adolescent clients from the Adolescent Reception and Detention Center (ARDC) on Rikers Island, and between April and August of 1979 recruited juvenile clients, all juvenile offenders, from the Juvenile Offender Detention Center (JODC) on Rikers Island. The heads of both facilities were contacted and interviewed (see Appendix E for copies of the interview schedules).

At the ARDC, which houses pre-trial and pre-sentenced youths between sixteen and twenty-one years of age, Warden Joseph D'Elia, and two members of his staff, and Captain Reginald Thorne were jointly interviewed. These individuals had varying levels of contact with OAR, but all were familiar with OAR's involvement at the ARDC and were aware of OAR's goals and objectives.

---

[2]Eighty-six percent of the volunteers indicated their clients were represented by LAS attorneys.

In general, the interviewees did not feel the OAR program significantly benefited the adolescent detainees. Their criticisms of the program followed two lines of reasoning. First, they felt that OAR should have served the first offender rather than the serious offender. First offenders, they felt, are more open to and in need of counseling while at the ARDC, and since many first offenders are released or placed on probation they need community services upon release. Serious offenders, in the opinion of these ARDC personnel, participated in the OAR program principally as a means to break the prison routine and frequently manipulated the volunteers. In short, the interviewees felt that OAR would have been more effective and would have served a more pressing need if they had worked with first offenders.

Their second line of criticism was more fundamental and centered around their reservations about volunteer programs in general. Warden E'Elia stated, for example, that "we don't like to run prison programs with volunteers because they're not reliable. We need people on salary so they have a reason to come in." And one of his staff said "you'd think they (the young and attractive women volunteers) would have better things to do with their evenings than come here."

One of the staff members felt that OAR volunteers were, like volunteers in other programs, unreliable, generally came for only two or three sessions, and frequently missed appointments with their clients.[3] When a young person's volunteer missed an appointment, the staff member stated, the corrections officers had to handle the client's anger and resentment after OAR had left the facility. The interviewees felt, moreover, that OAR volunteers were negatively biased against the ARDC Corrections Officers; however, none of the interviewees were aware of OAR ever having interfered with the work of the Corrections Officers and they commented that OAR was knowledgeable about and respectful of prison rules.

On a more positive side, the ARDC personnel felt that OAR was one of the best volunteer programs they had seen, and commented that OAR had remained longer than any other program at their facility. Also, they felt the sincere interest shown

---

[3]As indicated in Chapter 4, a majority of volunteers remain in the program at least one year, clients remain in the program an average of eleven months, and based on data from 1978, 30 percent of the volunteers' counseling sessions were missed. Also OAR [illegible]s volunteers who miss three consecutive sessions without advance

CONTINUED

1 OF 2

to the adolescents had a positive influence and that the supervision provided by OAR staff was generally good. Finally, the interviewees said they would like to see the OAR program re-funded, but only to work with first offenders and only if OAR became more community-based, as contrasted with their current (in their view) prison orientation.

Deputy Warden John Inceldon from the Juvenile Offender and Detention Center program more consistently praised the OAR program than did the ARDC staff.[4] The JODC houses juvenile offenders, though with the minor exception of juveniles charged with the most serious offences, juvenile offenders are presently sent to Spofford.[5] In general, Deputy Warden Inceldon felt that the OAR program is very worthwhile and "a lot more meaningful than most other programs." He indicated that OAR had worked for several years at Rikers Island and had an excellent reputation throughout the institution. He further stated that he and his staff are highly selective in who (volunteers and volunteer programs) they let into their facility, primarily because of the requirement for caution and confidentiality in working with juveniles. When asked if any other volunteer programs had worked or are working at the JODC, he mentioned two programs: START, involving a woman who comes in and works with juveniles on creative writing, and Friendly Visitors, which has developed art programs. Neither of these programs, however, does one-to-one counseling like OAR.

When asked how the kids benefit, he said that the juveniles do not get many visits and look forward to the sessions with their volunteers. The volunteers, he said, develop a rapport with the juveniles. He also added that some kids will always try to take advantage if they see any chance of getting special help, but implied that the OAR volunteers handle this pretty well. In general, he believes that the OAR volunteers serve an important liaison role between the kids and the courts, their lawyers, their family, halfway houses and other programs, and that OAR follows up on the kids when they leave the JODC.

---

[4]This interview was conducted over the telephone.

[5]OAR, as of September 1, 1979, was still seeing a small number of clients at the JODC but no longer actively recruiting clients from there.

As to the staff and the volunteers, he commented that the staff are very cooperative and handle any problems that arise and that the volunteers are properly trained and trustworthy. He does not worry about violations of contraband rules by the volunteers, though they do go through the standard search procedures. Also, in response to a question as to whether there had been any problems between his staff and the volunteers, he indicated that there was not any conflict. Finally, Deputy Warden Inceldon said that he hoped OAR would continue to be funded.

Like their LAS counterparts, the individuals from the ARDC and JODC varied somewhat in their opinions of OAR. While the ARDC staff felt the serious offender benefits very little from the work OAR does and felt that the volunteers are generally unreliable, the Deputy Warden at the JODC felt that OAR and its volunteers are very responsible and help the juveniles a great deal. It is difficult to discriminate whether these differences derive from attitudinal and philosophical differences between the individuals interviewed or are based primarily on differential performance of OAR at the two facilities.

Volunteers, it should be noted, viewed the Corrections Officers fairly positively. As shown in Table 5-1, more than half the volunteers (67 percent) felt the Corrections Officers were friendly and almost half the volunteers (44 percent) felt the officers were somewhat or very helpful. Only six percent said that the officers were hostile and four percent said that the officers hindered them in their work.

Table 5-1

Volunteer Assessments of
Corrections Officers

Receptiveness	Percent[1]
Friendly	67%
Indifferent	12
Hostile	6
Varied by Individual	6
Never Talked With	10
Helpfulness	
Very Helpful	15%
Somewhat Helpful	29
A Little Helpful	13
Not Very Helpful	8
Interferred with Work	4
Varied by Individual	29
No Contact	2

[1]For Receptiveness N=51, for Helpfulness N=52.

Chapter 6

Recommendations and Implications

In this chapter, the results obtained and conclusions reached in Chapters 2 through 5 will be highlighted, recommendations concerning the OAR program will be made and the implications of this study for planning and funding of volunteer programs in the criminal and juvenile justice systems will be discussed.

OAR: Accomplishments, Strengths and Weaknesses

During its five years of operation, OAR has trained over 1,600 volunteers to work on a one-to-one basis with young serious offenders. Volunteers are assigned to work with clients from their own borough or neighborhood, and after meeting their clients in one of New York City's detention centers, attempt to maintain relationships with them throughout their clients' criminal or juvenile justice system involvements. Volunteers serve as role models and friends to their clients, work with their clients'families, provide support regarding their court cases, and, minimally, help their clients start thinking about living more fulfilling and productive lives.

OAR's seven week training cycle is one of its strongest assets. During the course of training, volunteers participate in role plays to prepare them for the kinds of attitudes, environment, and situations they will encounter in working with clients; they tour the facilities in which they will work; and they are given instruction in legal, courtroom, and corrections department procedures. Individuals employed in various parts of the juvenile and criminal justice systems are invited to speak to the volunteers; and the OAR staff, at least half of whom are ex-offenders, speak to the volunteers about their own experiences in prison and discuss with the volunteers their views that environmental pressures, such as poverty, unequal educational opportunity and racism are the main causes of crime.

Over ninety percent of the fifty-two volunteers surveyed felt that OAR's training sessions were "good" or "excellent;" and based upon observations by CJCC staff, sessions appear to be informative, stimulating, well-paced and relevant. The only substantive change in OAR's training that can be recommended at this time is related

to OAR's relationship with Spofford employees. In order to improve their relationship with Spofford, OAR should invite Spofford personnel, and in particular representatives from the juvenile counselors' union, to participate in one of OAR's Wednesday evening training sessions. This will expose OAR volunteers and staff to the perspectives and concerns of the juvenile counselors and, correspondingly, will expose the juvenile counselors to the perspectives and concerns of OAR. Through this exposure, the roles and responsibilities of each can be better distinquished and the potential for closer cooperation enhanced.

Volunteers are asked to commit themselves to participate for at least one year in the program; and while clients are in detention, the volunteers are required to visit them once weekly for a two-hour counseling session. Generally, volunteers who feel they cannot fulfill these requirements drop out after the first two or three training sessions. Of those who complete training, approximately eighty percent are placed with clients, and of these, more than half fulfill their one year commitment. Among volunteer programs in the criminal justice system, this turnover rate is among the best reported in the literature.

In addition to participating in the initial training sessions, volunteers are asked to attend monthly or bi-monthly feedback sessions. During these sessions, volunteers are encouraged to discuss any client-related problems they have encountered and share with each other experiences they feel could be helpful to one another. These sessions are not well attended; they are considered by volunteers and by this observer to be one of the weakest aspects of the program. Based primarily upon interviews with the volunteers, the following recommendation can be made. Individuals having expertise in one or more aspects of juvenile justice and/or social services for youth should be invited to speak at feedback sessions. Discussion and instruction focusing on the needs of OAR clients who are on the street should be stressed. Time should be provided, however, for volunteers to discuss among themselves the implications of the information and perspectives shared by the speakers. As much as possible, volunteers should participate in the selection of topics and speakers.

Based upon the volunteer interviews and verified data on recent volunteer activities, it appears that the volunteers are most successful in maintaining relationships with their clients while their clients are in detention. During this time, volunteers meet with their clients on a weekly basis, often keep in touch with their clients' families, and frequently help them through their court cases by explaining procedures to them, working with the clients' attorneys, accompanying their clients to court, testifying on behalf of their clients, and so on. Some volunteers lose contact with their clients when they go to prison, although a majority of volunteers correspond with their incarcerated clients and continue to maintain relationships with their clients' families, often helping their families cope with this situation. Finally, while some volunteers maintain relationships with their clients once their clients are paroled, released, or placed on probation, many lose contact with clients at this time. A recommendation addressing this problem will be given below following the discussion of staff duties and functions.

Most volunteers feel their relationships with their clients are "good" or "excellent" and most feel they really do help their clients. Volunteers believe they help their clients most in three areas: general attitudes and self-esteem, family relationships, and legal and court matters. Through their volunteers' continued expressions of caring and concern, the clients appear (to the volunteers) to develop improved self-concepts, become more optimistic about their futures, and some come to believe, often for the first time in their lives, that someone cares for them and just wants to help them. That volunteers establish and maintain such relationships with these youths is significant in itself, given the instability of many of their past relationships (Blew, et al., 1976). Jorgensen and Scheier (1973) comment in this regard that "perhaps more than any one thing the offender needs to know intimately a stable, reliable person" (p. 264). At the very least, feelings of psychological isolation, so prevalent among this population, are reduced and the contact with someone from the "outside" reduces "institutionalization" (Buckley, 1974; and see also Chapter 1).

More concretely, volunteers help their clients in a variety of ways with their

court cases. As indicated above, volunteers help their clients understand court procedures, work as liaisons with the clients' lawyers, and accompany their clients to court. In addition, most volunteers, with the consent of their clients, maintain contact with their clients' families and provide assistance and support in whatever ways are appropriate or needed. This is consistent with OAR's philosophy that a young person in trouble should be viewed as a component of a troubled family unit, and thus help should be provided to the entire family unit (see also Jorgensen, & Scheier, 1973, p. 264).

Most volunteers also discuss with their clients their educational and vocational interests, needs and plans. And while their clients often do not make any concrete progress in these areas while incarcerated, they do seem to become more open to thinking about these areas of their lives in a positive vein. It is possible, as the social worker from Special Defender Services suggested, that such counseling is a necessary precursor to seeking professional help in these areas.

In maintaining an average active roster of about 150 volunteers who engage in these activities, OAR more than adequately accomplishes one of its primary goals of involving citizens in the juvenile and criminal justice systems. Moreover, a majority of volunteers attempt to recruit friends and relatives to volunteer with OAR, and most volunteers talk to members of their communities about their experiences and views.

About half the volunteers fulfill their one year commitment to OAR, and many remain active in the program for substantially longer periods of time. This level of commitment by OAR volunteers is greater than that reported from most volunteer programs in the criminal and juvenile justice systems (Scheier, et al., 1972). Throughout its pre-service training cycle OAR emphasizes the need for consistency in working with clients. If volunteers miss, unannounced, three consecutive counseling sessions, they are dismissed. Approximately thirty percent of all volunteer counseling are missed despite this emphasis, although many volunteers make up missed sessions the same week. Compared to volunteers in other programs, OAR's volunteers are among the most reliable.

The OAR staff, besides training and supervising volunteers, does a great deal of court-related work, mainly making court appearances in support of clients whose

volunteers cannot take off work-time to appear in court. They also conduct two life skills or counseling groups, one for adolescents and one for juveniles; they conduct a weekly group for family members of their clients (mainly families of juveniles); they serve as liaisons between volunteers and the detention facilities by accompanying and monitoring volunteers during the five weekly visits to these facilities; they carry small individual caseloads (in addition to clients in counseling groups); and they provide limited service and referrals in the areas of education and employment for their on-the-street clients.

While generally maintaining high standards in their work, the staff need improvement in two areas: supervision and aftercare service. Volunteers almost universally felt that OAR staff were available to them and provided appropriate and useful assistance when needed; however, other than recording the number and kinds of volunteer activities on a monthly basis, the staff do not generally review with volunteers the progress they are making or the problems they are encountering unless the volunteers initiate such discussions. Some volunteers expressed the need for closer supervision, and in light of the generally poor attendance at feedback sessions, this seems needed and appropriate. It is recommended that the Coordinator of Volunteers, in his or her monthly contacts with volunteers, initiate discussions about the nature and quality of the volunteers' work. This can also be done during the course of visits to the detention centers and at other points of staff/client contact.

With regard to aftercare, the staff should place greater emphasis on helping volunteers assist their clients as they return to their neighborhoods, and should increase their own limited efforts in referring clients to appropriate service agencies and programs.[1] Emphasis on aftercare is particularly important in light of the fact that the proportion of OAR's client population who are on the street and in need of

---

[1]OAR believes they need additional funding for this purpose. The limited number of referrals made between April and September 1979 is partially understandable in light of the fact that many of their aftercare clients had cases pending and therefore were more difficult to place into jobs or enroll in educational or training programs.

such services is increasing. It is recommended that OAR enhance its linkages with agencies and programs which provide services to its client population, and that referrals to these agencies and program be made when appropriate. Volunteers should be made aware of available aftercare service through the feedback sessions and when appropriate, during their supervisory contacts.

During the first seven months of its current funding year, OAR has served 321 clients, or fifty-four percent of its annual contractual obligation. This includes 246 adolescents and seventy-five juveniles, although it should be noted that the proportion of juveniles is increasing. Based upon its recent access to Spofford (late August 1979) the program, as in the past, should have no difficulty in fulfilling its contractual obligation of serving 600 youths.

OAR's client population as of September 1, 1979[2] is almost exclusively male, eighty percent black and Hispanic, and comprised mainly of serious offenders, sixty percent of whom were charged at intake with A and B felonies. As of September 1, twenty-one percent were in detention, forty-seven percent were in state facilities (mainly adolescents), and thirty-two percent of OAR's clients were on the streets (over half of these clients had cases pending).

Unfortunately, concrete measures of client success are unavailable. Recidivism rates and the four or five comparison groups needed to make them interpretable are theoretically possible to obtain, but would be too costly and time-consuming. Recidivism rates for active clients have been collected from time to time, varying from three and a half to eight percent, but such data are almost totally uninterpretable without adequate comparison groups and without comparable data for clients who dropped out of the program. Furthermore, these figures do not take into account varying lengths of "at-risk" time.

The degree to which active clients on the street, and former clients, seek out and receive educational and vocational assistance would be informative, but follow-up data

---

[2]These data are very similar to data obtained on OAR's clients in past years.

on clients and one or more comparison groups would, again, be very costly and time consuming to obtain. The assessment of how and to what extent the OAR program benefits its clients must, perforce, rest on the analyses of services provided and the responsiveness of the clients to these services. Based upon such data, OAR has been shown to be, for the most part, highly effective.

Planning Implications

The volunteer program model adopted and implemented by OAR differs in three major respects from most volunteer programs in the juvenile and criminal justice systems. First, volunteers are assigned to a youth while he is in detention and are expected to maintain, or attempt to maintain, a relationship with the youth throughout his various stages of involvement in the juvenile or criminal justice system. Most volunteer programs are geared toward one department or agency within the justice system, typically probation or parole.

Second, OAR maintains its own staff who train, supervise, assign and monitor their volunteers. Most volunteer programs are directly affiliated with the juvenile or criminal justice system, maintain a Coordinator or Director of Volunteers to oversee the program and rely on justice system staff to provide direct supervision to their volunteers. And third, OAR assigns its volunteers to work primarily with serious offenders, while most volunteer programs are geared to work with less serious offenders, typically youthful probationers.

Because of these differences, direct comparisons are difficult to make between OAR and such programs as the Volunteer Probation Counselor Program (Ku, undated) and the Youth Advocate Training Program (Bergman, 19770), both of which differ from OAR along the lines described above. On the other hand, such differences are useful from a planning perspective in that the consequences of such variations have become at least partially known. For the remainder of this chapter, the implications for planning derived from the present evaluation of OAR's program will be discussed. This discussion of volunteerism in the criminal justice system will touch upon the

the following topics: administration and staffing, the roles and responsibilities of volunteers, type of client served, volunteer recruitment, orientation and pre-service training, placement, on-going training and supervision and evaluation and record-keeping.

Administration and Staffing. As indicated above, most volunteer programs in the criminal justice system have a direct affiliation with a department or agency within the justice system. As such, the direct supervision of volunteers is almost always provided by the paid staff with whom the volunteers work (Schwartz, et al., 1977); and the functions of coordinating volunteer placement, arranging for pre-service and on-going training (often provided by criminal justice system staff) and resolving volunteer-staff conflicts are usually handled by one or two individuals holding the title of Volunteer Coordinator or Director of Volunteers. Moreover, the positions of Volunteer Coordinator or Director of Volunteers are frequently institutional positions within the criminal justice system. For example, the two Volunteer Coordinators for New York City's Department of Probation (DOP) are both paid by the DOP, and in fact, were transferred to these positions from former positions within the Department.

OAR, on the other hand, maintains a semi-autonomous relationship with criminal and juvenile justice departments. Because OAR both trains and supervises its volunteers and provides a variety of back-up services for them (aftercare, outreach, courtwork, etc.), a relatively large staff is required.[3] Also, OAR, in contrast to institutionally affiliated or in-house programs, must negotiate visting and working privileges with various individuals and departments within the justice system. This too requires additional personnel, primarily administrative staff.

For these reasons, the external costs to maintain a community-based volunteer program like OAR are substantially greater than "in-house" volunteer programs.[4]

---

[3]At present, OAR maintains a staff of twelve, including three administrators, seven service workers, a bookkeeper, and an executive secretary.

[4]There are, however, several hidden costs involved in the operation of in-house programs, such as the costs of staff supervisory time, the time needed to train staff in supervisory principles, the staff time involved in training volunteers, etc.

at least two major service-related consequences which result from the inherent differences between in-house and community-based volunteer programs. First, as stressed throughout this report, OAR follows clients throughout their criminal justice system involvements. Thus a volunteer can maintain a relationship with his or her client regardless of whether the client is placed on probation, released on his own recognizance, sent to prison or paroled. Volunteers from the DOP, on the other hand, cannot work with young people who are in detention or are sentenced to prison. They can only see young people after a judge places them on probation. Given these clients' needs for stable and consistent relationships, and the psychological strains involved in shifting from one bureaucracy to another, this difference between community-based and in-house volunteer programs has significant ramifications in terms of service delivery.

Second, community-based volunteers are less restrained in the kind of work they do with their clients. A volunteer working with a probation officer (PO) must follow the guidelines and objectives set by the PO and the DOP. Volunteers working in the DOP, for example, most likely would not be permitted to work with their client's attorney to reduce or suspend the client's probationary period. Such inhibitions are frequently perceived by clients. Seeing the volunteer withholding help may diminish a client's trust in his volunteer. OAR, on the other hand, encourages its volunteers to work with their clients, their clients' attorneys, and their clients' families in whatever ways seem appropriate to them for fostering the best interests of their clients.

The decision as to which kind of volunteer programs ought to be funded and implemented, should rest on the significance one attaches to these service-related differences, in conjunction with the differential cost of operating the two basic types of programs.

Two further points regarding the staff of community-based programs are appropriate to consider at this point. First, as pointed out in Chapter 2, at least half of OAR's staff and administration are ex-offenders.

In general, it is important, though perhaps not essential, to include some ex-offenders on the staff. In lieu of this, it is critical to hire some staff who have had extensive experience working with serious young offenders. Either kind of experience will be helpful for educating volunteers about the realities of the serious offender and of prison life in general. Anecdotes about personal experiences in prison, if used judiciously, seem useful for training and supervisory purposes. Also, if ex-offender staff conduct groups for clients and for their families, group members are frequently more willing to open up to individuals who have already gone through what they are now going through. In this role, staff members can provide basic life skills counseling that can prepare and motivate their clients to seek professional guidance and assistance when needed.

Second, OAR takes the position that the detention and prison system, as it is now constituted, is harmful rather than rehabilitating. From a planning perspective, what are the effects resulting from the promulgation of such views? This is somewhat difficult to ascertain in the absence of a similar volunteer programs which does not promulgate such views. However, two points can be made in this regard. First, despite its espoused philosophy, OAR has maintained excellent relationships, in general, with the Department of Corrections and the Department of Juvenile Justice.[5] Apparently, these departments view the work OAR does as constructive. Second, OAR's strongly and sincerely held views tend to highten motivation in its volunteers because of the importance the volunteers then place on their work. Therefore, espousing the need for major reforms in the criminal justice system does not necessary hinder the operation of a volunteer program and may in fact increase the enthusiasm of its volunteers.

---

[5]OAR, however, has not consistently been held in such positive regard by line staff workers (see Chapter 5).

Roles and Responsibilities of Volunteers. OAR utilizes, along with most direct service volunteer programs in the criminal justice system, the sponsorship model. That is, volunteers are assigned to work on a one-to-one basis with their clients. The roles and responsibilities of OAR volunteers are also similar to those in other volunteer programs. Volunteers serve as role models and friends to their clients, they provide assistance in their clients' court cases, they work closely with their clients' families, they discuss their clients' educational and vocational interests and needs with them and they help their clients when they are released, placed on probation or paroled. With the exception of the latter role, OAR volunteers, as shown in the body of this report, performed excellently.

OAR volunteers did not perform particularly well in providing aftercare services to their on-the-street clients. Earlier in this chapter, recommendations were made to improve this situation. Were it not for the fact that other sponsorship programs have been shown to be effective in working with parolees[6], no conclusion could be reached at this time regarding the potential effectiveness of volunteers working with this population. The M-2 Sponsors program, in particular, has been successful in working with parolees (M-2 Sponsors, 1978; see also Palmer, 1973; and Sorel, & Rossman, 1977). Given these results and the importance of helping the young offender during his parole period, it is suggested that volunteer programs reach out to this population, with the stipulation that programs provide adequate training to their volunteers in the area of aftercare. Volunteers, at a minimum, should be made aware of available community resources, and could also be taught to provide such services as tutoring and vocational counseling. One should not assume, as does Beless and his colleagues (1972), that volunteers are aware of services provided in their own communities.

One further role which OAR encourages its volunteers to adopt is that of community liaison or advocate. This role has two aspects. First, volunteers are encouraged to

---

[6]The aftercare population with whom volunteers work, or try to work, are mainly parolees, as contrasted with the aftercare population which staff works with, the majority of whom have cases pending.

speak to members of their community about the needs of ex-offenders, e.g., jobs, schooling, acceptance, etc. Second, OAR encourages its volunteers to speak to members of their community about the problems in, and misconceptions about, the criminal justice system. Based upon volunteer comments solicited during their interviews, it appears that while volunteers frequently did talk to their neighbors about the needs of prisoners and ex-offenders and about the nature of the criminal justice system, these discussions made relatively little impact upon their listeners. Volunteers talking to their neighbors about these issues could yield potential benefits by increasing citizens' knowledge of and involvement in the criminal justice system. The possibility, of course, exists that volunteers could develop uncritically biased views against the juvenile and criminal justice system, and then communicate these views to the community at large. However, based upon interviews with OAR volunteers, their criticisms, derived mainly from the OAR perspective of client advocacy, were relatively judicious in nature.

Finally, it has been suggested by some authorities in the field that the sponsorship role is most effectively implemented when specific goals and objectives are articulated and understood by the volunteers (Human Systems Institute, 1976). This was not done at OAR. While too much specificity in this regard may be counter-productive in diminishing the spontaneity inherent in the friendship role OAR, and volunteer programs in general, should provide regular supervision in which the shape and direction of the volunteer-client relationships are discussed.

Type of Clients Served. As indicated in Chapter 1, the major foci of volunteer programs in the criminal justice system have been the courts and probation. These programs, for the most part have been relatively successful. Programs geared toward the serious offender, the incarcerated offender, are the exception. OAR has demonstrated quite clearly that volunteers can effectively establish and maintain sponsorship

relationships with young serious offenders. While it is difficult to compare populations in terms of extent and severity of need, it seems that more services are available for the first offender and less serious offender than for the serious offender. Ideally, volunteer services should be made available to all offenders; but, if priorities must be established, new volunteer programs should first and foremost be geared toward the serious offender.

Also, as noted in Chapter 4 of this report, adolescents (16 to 21 years old) are easier to work with than juveniles (12 to 15 year olds). Based upon feedback from both OAR volunteers and staff, it appears that juveniles have more difficulty talking about their needs and feelings. It is almost as if they want, or perhaps need, to establish their manliness by playing "tough guy." In addition, juveniles are detained and sentenced for shorter periods of time. Consequently, at any one point in time, a greater proportion of juveniles than adolescents are on-the-street clients (assuming similar dropout rates). Therefore, volunteer programs aimed toward juveniles should provide additional training in counseling techniques designed to meet the specific needs of juveniles, and place more emphasis on their aftercare component.

Recruitment. OAR has never encountered difficulties in recruiting a sufficient number of volunteers. Apparently, at least in the New York City metropolitan area, there are a plethora of citizens interested in volunteering for work in the criminal or juvenile justice system. OAR has always recruited a majority of its volunteers through free radio ads. Underutilized by OAR is the method of speaking to various relevant community groups, such as tenant groups, civil rights groups, and so on.

In selecting where and how recruitment efforts should be made, it is useful for a volunteer program to decide what kinds of characteristics they wish their volunteers to possess. Radio stations vary a great deal in what audience they cater to, and thus a different type of volunteer will respond to ads on different stations. OAR, for

example, runs ads primarily on a minority-owned and operated station which gears its programming to a predominately, though not exclusively, black working class audience.

Volunteer programs should be cautioned not to over-recruit. As indicated in Chapter 2, OAR sends out approximately four times the number of mailings than individuals they can accomodate in training. Other programs may have a higher or lower dropout rate, but the four to one ratio seems appropriate for estimating dropout rate for a volunteer program just getting under way.

Finally, information describing the program, a pre-service training schedule, and the requirements it makes of its volunteers should be included in a letter of invitation to interested persons. Mailings should be sent out not more than one month prior to the first training session.

Orientation and Pre-Service Training. Pre-service training is essential for all direct service volunteer programs in the juvenile and criminal justice systems. Such training is essential for several reasons. Minimally, volunteers must learn the procedures and regulations of the facilities or settings where they will work, they must learn something about the clients they will work with, and they must learn some basic counseling techniques. Training sessions should be relevant, informative, and practical; and should include: role plays; tours of appropriate facilities; talks by former offenders and/or clients; talks with staff members of different departments and agencies with whom the volunteers will have contact; corrections department procedures; and discussions with experienced volunteers. Furthermore, during the first or second training session, the responsibilities and requirements associated with volunteering should be fully explained and the program's philosophy, goals and objectives should be articulated; and these should be reviewed during the final session. Rapid assignment following pre-service training is also critical to retaining volunteers.

Placement. As indicated in Chapter 1, controversy exists in the literature as to whether and to what extent volunteers should be matched with clients. While detailed information was not available from OAR records, it was determined that gender and

ethnic group differences made relatively little difference in terms of the duration over which volunteer-client relationships were maintained. This result, combined with other reports of neglible consequences of matching, lead to the conclusion that matching, in general, is not significantly advantageous. However, it seems reasonable to take into consideration any special skills volunteers may have in relation to the interests of clients. For example, if a volunteer is particularly interested in music and a client loves to play music, they should be paired. OAR, based upon volunteer interviews, could have taken better advantage of the special skills possessed by some of its volunteers.

Matching on the basis of shared neighborhood or borough, as OAR does, seems reasonable, but without significant consequences in the case of OAR. Residing in the same neighborhood is potentially quite beneficial in cases where clients are on the street, but it was there that OAR was least effective. One could also make the argument that benefits can be derived by pairing volunteers and clients who reside in different neighborhoods or boroughs, by virtue of their exposures to each other's neighborhood.

On-going Training and Supervision. As indicated earlier in this chapter, OAR fell short in its supervision of volunteers and was minimally successful in its feedback sessions and ongoing training. Generally, the more difficult a client is to work with, the more supervision is needed. For example, as an increasing proportion of OAR volunteers are assigned to work with juveniles (who are usually more difficult to work with than adolescents), proper supervision will become more and more critical. The suggestions and recommendations made earlier in this chapter regarding supervision and training are applicable to volunteer programs in general, and thus will not be discussed further.

Evaluation and Record-Keeping. Evaluation of volunteer programs has been discussed throughout this report. In general, recidivism data should be maintained if appropriate comparison groups are available (see, for example, M-2 Sponsors, 1978);

Pre- and post- measures of progress made by clients in areas of services provided should be obtained (achievement test data for example, if tutoring is provided); and detailed records of the nature and extent of services provided and by whom they were provided should be maintained. Also, detailed records should be kept as to client progress and status changes. For example, when, for how long, for what, and to where a client is sentenced should be recorded. Volunteer and client records, of course, should be cross-referenced. Finally, logically distinct categories of reasons for volunteer and client termination should be developed.

REFERENCES

Arthur D. Little. Volunteer Services. Washington, D. C.: L.E.A.A., June, 1978.

Beless, D. W., Pilchur, W. S., Ryan, E. J. Use of indigenous nonprofessionals in probation and parole. Federal Probation, 1972, 36, 10 - 15.

Bergman, B. A. Juvenile Justice Center Advocate Training Program, Executive Summary of Evaluation Report. Harrisburg, Pa.: Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency, 1977.

Blew, C. H., McGillis, D., & Bryant, G. Project New Pride: An Exemplary Project. Washington, D. C.: L.E.A.A., 1977.

Buckley, M. Breaking Into Prison: A Guide to Volunteer Action. Boston: Beacon, 1974.

Burger, R. J., Crowley, J. E., Gold, M., & Gray, J. Experiment in a Juvenile Court: A Study of a Program of Volunteers Working With Juvenile Probationers. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Institute of Research, University of Michigan, 1975.

Carroll, S. P. Volunteer Utilization in Juvenile Court - Final Target Area Impact Evaluation of the New Orleans (La.) Experimental Program. New Orleans, La.: Mayor's Criminal Justice Coordinating Council, 1977.

Ellis, S. J., & Noyes, K. H. By the People A History of Americans as Volunteers. Philadelphia: Energize, 1978.

Fox, V. Handbook for Volunteers in Juvenile Court. Reno, Nevada: National Council of Juvenile Court Judges, 1973.

Gandy, J. M. Volunteers in four provincial adult correctional institutions: Services provided and perceptions of inmates and staff. Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections, 1977, 19, 67 - 79.

Goffman, I. On the characteristics of total institutions. In D. R. Clessey (Ed.) The Prison: Studies in Institutional Organization and Change. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1961, pp. 15 - 61.

Groves, P. H. A report on community service treatment and work programs in British Columbia. Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections, 1977, 19, 123 - 141.

Holt, N., & Miller, D. Explorations in Inmate-Family Relationships. Sacramento, California: Research Division, Department of Corrections, 1972.

Howell, J. C. A Comparison of Probation Officers and Volunteers. Springfield, Va.: NTIS, U. S. Department of Commerce, April 1972.

Human Systems Institute. Administrative Manual for Juvenile Probation Volunteer Programs. Springfield, Va.: NTIS, 1976.

Hurlow-Hannah, E. The Proceedings of the Citizen Involvement Project. Washington, D. C.: National Institute of Justice, December 1978.

James, J. T. L., Sloan, R. L., & Perry, R. P. The volunteer probation officer program in Mantioba. Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections, 1977, 19, 95 - 104.

Jorgensen, J. D., & Scheier, I. H. Volunteer Training for Courts and Corrections. Metuchen, N. J.: Scarecrow Press, 1973.

Ku, R. The Volunteer Probation Counselor Program, Lincoln, Nebraska. Washington, D. C.: L.E.A.A., undated.

Lee, R. J., Volunteer Case Aid Program: A Community Responds. Crime and Delinquency, 1968, 14, 331 - 335.

Lewis, M. V., McKee, D. E., Goodstein, L. I., Beamesderfer, A. O., & Kaufman, J. J. How to organize a community sponsor project. Prison Journal, 1976, 56, 18 - 27.

Lichtman, C. M., Smock, S. M., Binder, L., & Nathan, N. A. Project Start - Evaluation of Second Grant Period. Detroit, Mich.: Center for Urban Studies, April 1978.

M-2 Sponsors. Successful Habilitation of Ex-Offenders. Hayward, Calif., 1978.

McCollum, S. G. What works! A look at effective correctional education and training experiences. Federal Probation, 1977, 41, 32 - 35.

Miller, H. S. The citizen's role in changing the criminal justice system. Journal of Crime and Delinquency, 1973, 19, 343 - 352.

Nelson, E. K., Ohmart, H., & Harlow, N. Promising Strategies in Probation and Parole. Washington, D. C., November 1978.

Palmer, T. B. Matching worker and client in corrections. Social Work, 1973, 18, 95 - 103.

Ray-Bettineski, C. Court Appointed Special Advocate: The Guardian ad Litem for Abused and Neglected Child. Juvenile and Family Court Journal, 1978, 29, 65 - 70.

Rutherford, A., & McDermott, R. Juvenile Diversion: National Evaluation, Phase I Summary Report. Washington, D. C.: National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, September 1976.

Scheier, I. H., Berry- J. L., Cox, M. L., Shelly, L. V., Simmons, R., & Callaghan, D. Guidelines and Standards for the Use of Volunteers in Correctional Programs. Washington, D. C.: L.E.A.A., August 1972.

Schwartz, I. M. Volunteers and Professionals: A Team in the Correctional Process. Federal Probation, 1971, 35, 46 - 50.

Schwartz, I. M., Jensen, D. R., & Mahoney, M. J. Volunteers in Juvenile Justice. Washington, D. C.: National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, October 1977.

Scioli, F. P., Jr., & Cook, T. J. How Effective Are Volunteers - Public Participation in the Criminal Justice System. Crime and Delinquency, 1976, 22, 192 - 200.

Servin, E. Personal Communication, August 9, 1979.

Schéier, I. H. Volunteerism in Corrections: A Look Into the Future. Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections, 1977, 19, 134 - 143.

Sorel, E. D., & Rossman, M. R. Factors Related to Outcome of Volunter Intervention with Criminal Offenders. Conference on Criminal Justice Evaluation, Washington, D. C., February 1977.

Stoeckel, J., Sterne, R., & Sterne, M. Volunteers in a juvenile court. Social Work, 1975, 20, 232 - 235.

Sykes, G. M. The Society of Captives: A Study of a Maximum Security Prison. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1958.

Unkovic, C. E., & Davis, J. R. Volunteers in Probation and Parole. Federal Probation, 1969, 33, 41 - 45.

Whiteman, S. L., & Bourne, B. L. (Eds.). Volunteer Probation Officer Manual. Worcester, Mass.: Youth Opportunities Upheld, undated.

Appendix A

DATA SOURCES
AND
SAMPLING PROCEEDURES

Three principal data sources were used in preparing this report: the volunteer survey, OAR volunteer files, and recent descriptive statistics on OAR staff and volunteers. Each of these will be described below.

The Volunteer Survey[1]. In order to obrain a representative sample of volunteers, the names addresses and telephone numbers of individuals who had completed OAR's pre-service training between October, 1976 and March, 1979 were obtained. A stratified random sample of 144 was then culled from this list. Letters of introduction were sent to these volunteers, explaining the purpose of the interviews (see below). All volunteers who went sent letters were then called, and if contacted, were asked then they would like to be interviewed. Finally, volunteers were called at the appointed time and interviewed by telephone. These proceedures resulted in forty-eight volunteers interviews.[2] An additional four volunteers, whom OAR recommended, were also interviewed.

Volunteer Files All available OAR volunteer files as of March, 1979 were examined. The total number of files examined was 683, which is substantially less than the total number of volunteers trained. When OAR centralized its offices in 1978, approximately half its total number of volunteer files were either misplaced or lost in the course of moving, thus accounting for this difference. The demographic characteristics of the volunteers were taken from the Volunteer Registration Form (see below) and from records of their volunteer activities (see Appendix D). Two randomly selected subsamples of files from all volunteers active in 1978 were also examined for separate analyses described in Chapter 4.

Recent Descriptive Data[2] The base period for which these data on OAR volunteers and staff were collected in April 1 to September 1, 1979. Although OAR was funded to work with juveniles as of February, 1979, the present data collection system developed by OAR in conjunction with the CJCC Performance Evaluation Unit (see Appendix D) was not operational until April, 1979. The data were drawn from

---

1 The author would like to thank Sydney Brink, Deborah Chandler and Kathi Zeman for their assistance in conducting the volunteer interviews for the survey.

2 Sixteen (11 percent) had moved and could not be located, 39 (27 percent) had changed their telephone numbers and correct listings could not be obtained, 17 (12 percent) could not be reached during the interview period(which was prime vacation time), and 24 (17 percent) either cancelled or missed their appointment times or did not return the interviewers' messages.

individual client data files, monthly project summary statistics, quarterly rogress reports, interviews with OAR administrative staff, and site visits to the program. The Performance Evaluation Unit has verified all aggregate data submitted by OAR and used in this report. OAR, it is relevant to note, has been particularly conscientious about maintaining project records and has consistently cooperated with CJCC's requests for data and for permission to observe OAR's activities.

The City of New York

CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
CRIMINAL JUSTICE COORDINATING COUNCIL
111 JOHN STREET
NEW YORK, N.Y. 10038

EDWARD I. KOCH
MAYOR

HERBERT J. STURZ
CHAIRMAN

H. LAKE WISE
DIRECTOR

Dear

As you may or may not know, the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council (CJCC) is a major sponsor of OAR's volunteer program. We believe that volunteer involvement in the criminal justice system is very important and we hope that through discussions with involved citizens like you we can expand and improve the services now provided by OAR and its volunteers.

With OAR's cooperation we are contacting OAR volunteers who are now volunteering or have volunteered in the past. My staff and I would very much like to talk to you about your experiences as a volunteer in the criminal justice system. We will be calling you some time in the next month to discuss with you your experiences as an OAR volunteer. If you wish, you may call me at (212) 732-0806.

Of course, you participation is completely voluntary. We hope, though, that whatever your experiences as an OAR volunteer were or are that you'll share them openly with us. Following standard procedures, your comments to us will be kept strictly confidential. No one, not even OAR, will know what you, as an individual, say to us.

My staff and I look forward to speaking with you, and we thank you in advance for your serious consideration. If you have any questions, please feel free to call me at the number given above.

Sincerely,

Michael B. Greene
Staff Associate

MBG:kjt

OAR/NYC
Volunteer Registration

OAR ID NUMBER: _____ MONTH AND YEAR TRAINED _____

_____
LAST NAME FIRST MIDDLE

_____
MAIDEN NAME, IF ANY

_____
HOME ADDRESS BORO/STATE/ZIP

HOME PHONE NO: _____

Date of Birth: _____ SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER: _____

OCCUPATION: _____ BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER: _____

BUSINESS NAME AND ADDRESS: _____

ETHNICITY: _____ SEX: _____ HEIGHT: _____ WEIGHT: _____ EYES: _____

HAIR COLOR: _____ LAST YEAR OF SCHOOL COMPLETED: _____

DO YOU SPEAK ANY OTHER LANGUAGE? (Specify) _____

PERSONAL RECORD

(A) FORMERLY ADDICTED TO ALCOHOL? _____YES _____NO
(B) FORMERLY ADDICTED TO NARCOTICS? _____YES _____NO
(C) PRESENTLY ADDICTED TO NARCOTICS? _____YES _____NO

IF YOUR ANSWER TO ANY OF THE ABOVE IS YES, ANSWER THE FOLLOWING:

(1) ARE YOU PRESENTLY A MEMBER OF ANY ALCOHOL ABUSE PROGRAM? _____YES _____NO
IF YES, WHICH PROGRAM: _____
ADDRESS: _____ PHONE NUMBER: _____

(2) ARE YOU PRESENTLY ENROLLED IN A NARCOTIC TREATMENT PROGRAM? _____YES _____NO
IF YES, WHICH PROGRAM: _____
ADDRESS: _____ PHONE NUMBER: _____

(3) IF PRESENTLY ADDICTED, LIST DRUG ADDICTED TO AND TREATMENT AGENCY:
DRUG: _____ NAME OF AGENCY: _____
ADDRESS: _____ PHONE NUMBER: _____

CRIMINAL RECORD

(A) WERE YOU EVER ARRESTED OR CONVICTED OF A CRIME? _____YES _____NO

ARE YOU PRESENTLY ON PAROLE OR PROBATION? _____YES _____NO

IF YES, GIVE PAROLE OR PROBATION OFFICER'S NAME AND PHONE NUMBER:

NAME:_____PHONE NUMBER_____

(B) IF EVER ARRESTED, STATE DATE, CHARGES AND DISPOSITION:

(1)_____
(TIME SERVED, IF ANY)

(2)_____
(TIME SERVED, IF ANY)

(3)_____
(TIME SERVED, IF ANY)

SOURCE OF REFERRAL:_____

MARITAL STATUS:_____NUMBER OF CHILDRES:_____

DATE OF FIRST ASSIGNMENT:_____

PARTICIPANT ASSIGNED:_____

COMMENTS:_____

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT:_____DATE_____

Appendix B

VOLUNTEER SURVEY INTERVIEWS
AND
CODE EXPLANATIONS

OAR VOLUNTEER INTERVIEW

Interviewer: _____ Training Session: _____

Name: _____ Date: _____

Age: _____ Sex: _____ Ethnic Group: _____

After you finished training, how long did you wait to see a participant?

_____

How did you find out about the OAR program? _____

Why did you first volunteer for OAR? _____

_____

Did you do any volunteer work before OAR? _____ If yes, what kind?

_____

How many participants have you worked with: _____

If more than one participant:

1) Answer all remaining questions about participant for current participant if relationship is more than two months duration; if not, focus on longest volunteer-participant relationship and
2) for all other volunteer-participant relationships, give information on page 7 -- do this after you've finished the rest of the interview.

Name of participant: _____

When did you first meet your participant (month and year)? _____

Where did you first meet your participant? _____

What was he/she charged with and (if relevant) sentenced for? _____

_____

How old was your participant when you first met him/her? _____

Why do you think your participant volunteered for the OAR program?

_____

Are you still working with your participant? If no, why did relationship end?

_____

_____

What is your participant's present legal status or status at termination? Did your participant go to prison? If yes, where and for how long?

_____

_____

When did you last see or write to your participant? _____

Type of contact (letter, visit, phone, etc.): _____

On the average, how often did you see your participant while he/she was in detention at (Rikers/Spofford)?

_____

On the average, about how many hours a month do (did) you work with your participant while in prison and/or on the street (includes letter writing, phone calls, family visits, etc.)?

_____

_____

Did your participant get into any additional legal trouble while you were working with him/her?

___ yes ___ no If yes, please explain briefly.

_____

_____

Volunteer-Participant Relationship

In general how would you rate your relationship with your participant:

___ excellent ___ good ___ fair ___ poor

In general do you feel you helped your participant:

___ a lot ___ a fair amount ___ a little ___ not at all

Do you feel you helped him/her in (use code):

1. not at all 2. a little 3. a fair amount 4. a lot

Code

developing positive attitudes or outlook

_____ ___

_____

1. not at all 2. a little 3. a fair amount 4. a lot

Code

educational development-schooling
(tutoring, getting into school, raise interest in school)

_____ ____

_____

vocational development-preparation
(training program, job placement, resume)

_____ ____

_____

legal-court problems

_____ ____

_____

family relationships

_____ ____

_____

living arrangements

_____ ____

_____

other (please specify)

_____ ____

_____

Training

In general, do you feel the initial training sessions were ___ excellent ___ good ___ OK ___ poor, in preparing you for the volunteer work?

What aspects of the initial training did you find most helpful?

_____

In what areas do you think the initial training sessions could be improved?

_____

_____

Have you gone to any monthly feedback sessions? _____

If yes, how often or how many times? If no, why not?

_____

_____

The monthly feedback sessions are (were): ___ very helpful ___ somewhat helpful

___ a little helpful ___ not helpful at all. Please explain your answer.

_____

_____

The monthly feedback sessions could be improved by: _____

_____

Supervision

In general, are (were) you ___ very clear ___ somewhat clear ___ not clear at all, on what you were supposed to do in your volunteer work?

What would you say are the main goals of OAR? _____

_____

Has OAR staff generally been available when you needed their assistance? _____

How has (did) the OAR staff helped (help) you in your work with your participant?

_____

_____

In what ways do you think the OAR staff could be (have been) more helpful?

_____

_____

Are (were) the OAR staff open to your ideas and opinions? Probe with: When talking with staff about your participant, do they often ask for your opinions?

_____

_____

In general, do you feel the help you receive (received) from OAR staff in working with your participant is (was):

___ excellent ___ good ___ fair ___ poor

Do you feel the amount of paperwork or reporting required of you is (was):

___ way too much ___ too much ___ OK ___ too little

Any suggestions for improving? _____

_____

External Contacts

Do you ever talk with the correctional officers? (Probe with whether the talks are (were) friendly, hostile, or what?)

_____

_____

In general, are (were) the correctional officers ___ very helpful
___ somewhat helpful ___ a little helpful ___ not very helpful
___ interfered with your work ___ varied by individual.

Comments: _____

_____

The Legal Aid Society staff are (were):

___ very helpful ___ somewhat helpful ___ not very helpful

___ varied by individual

Do (did) you have contact with other agencies or people concerning your participant? (Please specify)

_____

_____

Benefits

In what ways have you personally benefited from your volunteer work?

_____

_____

Has your volunteer work influenced your education and/or career plans or involvements?
___ yes ___ no If yes, please explain how:

_____

General

Have you recommended to any of your friends or relatives that they volunteer for OAR?

Have you talked with anyone in your community about the criminal justice system? What have you talked about?

If you were to write a brief job description of your volunteer work, what would you include?

When, if at all, did you most doubt the usefulness of your volunteer work (i.e., did you ever think about quitting)? Please explain.

For those who are no longer OAR volunteers: Why are you no longer a volunteer at OAR?

Have you done any volunteer or paid work in the criminal justice system other than OAR? (Probe with letter writing, community groups, advocacy groups, etc)

___ yes ___ no If yes, please specify.

Have your views or opinions about the criminal justice system changed since you started your volunteer work? (Please explain)

As far as you know, has (did) your participant receive helpful service from anyone else while you have been (were) working with him/her? (explain)

In what ways do you think the OAR program could be improved (other than stated above)?

_____

_____

_____

	2nd Longest Relationship	3rd Longest Relationship	4th Longest Relationship
Name of Participant			
Age			
Arrest Charge and Sentence			
Date of First Contact			
Length of Relationship			
Reason for Termination			
Status at Present or Termination			

8/27/79

OAR TRAINEE DROPOUTS

Interviewer _____ Training Session _____

Name _____ Date _____

Age _____ Sex _____ Ethnic Group _____

Did you do any volunteer work before OAR? _____ If so, what kind?

_____

How did you find out about the OAR program? _____

_____

Why did you volunteer for the OAR program? _____

_____

_____

_____

How many training sessions did you attend? _____

Why didn't you complete the training cycle? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Any suggestions for improving the training? _____

_____

_____

_____

Are you thinking of going through another training session in the future? _____

_____

Do you have anything else you'd like to tell me about OAR? _____

_____

_____

_____

OAR VOLUNTER INTERVIEW

CODE EXPLANATIONS

Category or Question	Code #	Code Explanation
Training Session	1	Spring 1979 - juvenile training -- only if participant discussed is juvenile.
	2	June 1978
	3	February 1978
	4	June 1977
	5	April 1977
	6	February 1976
	7	November 1976
	8	October 1976
	9	Pre-October 1976
Number of Months Active	(In Months)	Based on time actually worked with participants -- use date of first contact with participant to date at which regular (monthly) contact with any participant occurred.
Age	(In Years)	
Sex	1	Female
	2	Male
Ethnic Group	1	Black
	2	White
	3	Hispanic
	4	Other
How long waited?	1	1 - 2 weeks
	2	3 weeks - 2 months
	3	3 months - 6 months
	4	7 months - 1 year
	5	More than 1 year
How found out about? (first & second response)	1	Radio
	2	Friend
	3	Newspaper
	4	Other

OAR Codes

Category or Question	Code #	Code Explanation
Why first volunteered? (first & second response)	1	Wanted to work with young people
	2	Wanted to work with CJS clients, youth in trouble
	3	Wanted to do some good, contribute skills
	4	Personal growth, good experience, broaden views
	5	Had relative, friend, or self in prison
	6	Related to studies, interests, or work
	7	Other
Previous volunteer work? (first & second response)	1	No
	2	Yes - direct service with youth
	3	Yes - other direct service (e.g., at hospital, church, crisis intervention)
	4	Yes - community or political work (e.g., tenant groups, PTA, voter registration)
Number of participants	Number	
Type of participant	1	Adolescent (16 - 21)
	2	Juvenile (15 or under) - also if 16 and committed crime when 15 or under
Charge	1	Personal crimes (robbery, murder, rape)
	2	Property crimes (arson, larceny, burglary, pickpocket)
	3	Other (drugs, weapons, parole violation)
Why participant volunteered?	1	Relieve boredom - breaking routine - chance to get off tiers
	2	Relieve distress - fear, anxiety, isolation, rejection - by talking with someone
	3	Wanted help with case
	4	Wanted someone to talk to for positive reasons (e.g., friendship, someone to rely on, help straighten out life)

OAR Codes

Category or Question	Code #	Code Explanation
	5	Recommended by peer/friend
	6	Other
Still working with participant?	1	Yes
	2	No - participant went to upstate prison
	3	No - participant on street - lost touch
	4	Other
Prison contact	1	None
	2	Letters on less than monthly basis - no family contact
	3	Letters on less than monthly basis - family contact
	4	At least monthly letters
	5	At least monthly letters and at least one visit - family contact
	6	At least monthly letters and bi-monthly visits - family contact
	7	Not in prison
Street contact	1	None
	2	Less than monthly contact
	3	Less than monthly contact with participant - at least monthly contact with family
	4	At least monthly contact
Any additional legal trouble?	1	No
	2	Yes - infraction of prison rules
	3	Yes - sentenced for additional crime
Rate relationship	1	Excellent
	2	Good
	3	Fair
	4	Poor

OAR Codes

Category or Question	Code #	Code Explanation
Feel helped participant?	1	A lot
	2	A fair amount
	3	A little
	4	Not at all
Help attitudes (~~first & second response~~ and examine "Other")	1	Instilled optimistic attitude regarding possibility of constructive, non-criminal future
	2	Helped participant learn to accept responsibility and consequences for his/her actions
	3	Discussed avenues for rehabilitation or discussed alterantives to criminal life
	4	Built up trust and confidence that someone cares for and is supportive of him/her - also volunteer served as friend, role model, or parent figure
	5	Listened to young person express feelings with implication or statement that young person becomes more open to self or others
	6	Attitudes haven't changed with implication or statement that attitudes are negative
	7	Attitudes haven't changed with implication or statement that attitudes are positive
	8	Provided counseling around general life issues (e.g., religion, boy-girl relationships, poverty, justice)
Education-schooling help	1	Discussion and encouragement of need for or interest in furthering education - no concrete movement in this direction thus far
	2	Tutoring or instruction by volunteer, including critiques of letters or poetry and reading and/or writing together
	3	Supplied participant with educational materials
	4	Participant in school (all types) while in prison -- encouraged and supported by volunteer
	5	Participant going to school while on street -- encouraged and supported by volunteer

OAR Codes

Category or Question	Code #	Code Explanation
	6	Participant received GED - encouraged and supported by volunteer
	7	Discussion about education attempted by volunteer but participant not interested
	8	No discussion about educational issues
Vocational-job development help	1	Gave or found young person a job
	2	Participant working and/or in training at prison - supported and encouraged by volunteer
	3	Participant got own job - volunteer supportive
	4	Discussion of future plans or interests regarding work and/or training
	5	Discussion about jobs and/or working attempted by volunteer but participant not responsive
	6	No discussion of jobs, job plans, or training
	7	Other
Legal-court help (first & second responses)	1	Explained legal procedures, provided legal information, and/or relayed legal information from lawyer to participant
	2	Discussed case with lawyer or wrote letters to lawyer about case
	3	Gave specific information or advice to lawyer which was helpful to lawyer
	4	Provided concrete assistance with court case (e.g., wrote letter(s) or spoke to judge/court, was character witness, got charges or sentences reduced, etc.)
	5	Made court appearances - supportive role to participant
	6	No help, case at too late a stage for intervention or charges dropped
	7	No help
	8	Other

OAR Codes

Category or Question	Code #	Code Explanation
Family relationships help	1	Contacts with young person's family by phone or in person - basic supportive role to parents - more detailed information not provided
	2	Discussed family relationships with participant - consequences not noted or probed for
	3	Discussed family relationships with participant - with result that young person's attitudes improved
	4	Volunteer helped parents cope with or provided them assistance regarding one or more aspects of criminal justice system (e.g., visits to prison, court appearances, etc.)
	5	Volunteer helped parents accept and reach out to participant
	6	Volunteer relayed messages or mail between parents and participant
	7	Neither contact with family nor discussion about family with participant
	8	Discussion about family relationships attempted by volunteer, but participant not interested
Living arrangements help	1	Volunteer discussed with participant his/her plans to live with family, girlfriend, aftercare program, or on own
	2	Volunteer offered to provide temporary housing at volunteer's residence
	3	Volunteer was influential in family's willingness to let participant live with them or influenced the family to move to a different location which would be better for the participant
	4	Volunteer plans to offer assistance with housing in the future
	5	No discussion or help regarding living arrangements because present arrangements appeared satisfactory
	6	Volunteer felt discussions about living arrangements were premature or irrelevant because participant was in prison
	7	No discussion or assistance - no reason stated

OAR Codes

Category or Question	Code #	Code Explanation
Other ways helped	1	Spoke with other professionals about participant
	2	Provided material assistance (e.g., money, food, clothes, etc.)
	3	No other help
		The following may be listed under other, but should be re-categorized under "help attitudes"
	(8)	~~Provided general counseling around~~ specific life issues (e.g., religion, boy-girl relationships, proverty, etc.)
	(2)	Helped participant accept responsibility and consequences for his/her actions
	(4)	Built up trust and confidence that someone cares for and is supportive of young person (i.e., volunteer served as friend, role model, or parent figure)
Training sessions were:	1	Excellent
	2	Good
	3	OK
	4	Poor
Aspects of training helpful (first & second response)	1	Role playing
	2	Being locked up at Tombs
	3	Realistic and/or multi-facted perspective given
	4	Legal-court information provided
	5	Rap sessions - informal question and answer format
	6	Perspective provided by outside speakers
	7	Information and/or techniques on how to work with participants
	8	Other
How to improve training	1	Modification and/or expansion of role playing
	2	Better screening of volunteers
	3	Better or different speakers
	4	Structural or organizational changes (e.g., more office space, shorter sessions, more trainee involvement, more printed information -- content of training OK)

Category or Question	Code #	Code Explanation
	5	More information regarding counseling, legal system, available aftercare services - also longer training
	6	No - can't think of any
Attend feedback sessions	1	Yes - all the time or almost every session
	2	Yes - sometimes
	3	No or once or twice with implication or statement indicating he/she would not attend further sessions
Feedback sessions were:	1	Very helpful
	2	Somewhat helpful
	3	A little helpful
	4	Not helpful at all
	5	Never went
How feedback sessions helpful	1	Not helpful
	2	Didn't go
	3	Perspective of other volunteers useful in terms of how to better help participant - but not specific, concrete information
	4	Sharing with other volunteers reduces isolation, provides reinforcment, can air grievances, make friends with those having similar concerns
	5	Gets practical-concrete information
Feedback session improvement	1	Improve attendance by volunteers and means by which to do this other than changing nature of sessions
	2	More structured, concrete information
	3	None - can't think of any
	4	Didn't attend - can't say
	5	More volunteer input and/or participation
	6	More staff and/or administration involvement
	7	Other

OAR Codes

Category or Question	Code #	Code Explanation
Clear on duties	1	Very clear
	2	Somewhat clear
	3	Not clear at all
Main goals (first & second response)	1	To keep participants out of prison
	2	To get participants out of prison
	3	To be a friend - caring, moral support, provide positive image, provide contact with person out of prison
	4	Liaison between participant and his family
	5	Counseling - self-understanding, taking responsibility, help in problem solving, improve attitudes
	6	Advocacy for participant in CJS
	7	Change CJS
Availability of staff	1	Always
	2	Sometimes
	3	Rarely or hardly ever
How staff helped	1	Concrete information or where to get it
	2	Moral support/encouragement
	3	Advice on counseling or how to help participant
	4	Direct service to participant, including court appearances
	5	No help - not necessary, or didn't need it
How staff help improved	1	None - can't think of ways
	2	Increase size of staff
	3	Close staff-volunteer contact, supervision or training
	4	Provide more aftercare help
	5	Other
Staff openness	1	Very open and receptive
	2	Somewhat or sometimes open
	3	Generally not interested in volunteer input
	4	No or very little staff contact

OAR Codes

Category or Question	Code #	Code Explanation
Staff help received	1	Excellent
	2	Good
	3	Fair
	4	Poor
	5	No staff contact
Paperwork	1	OK
	2	Way too much
	3	Too much
	4	Too little
Talks with CO's	1	Friendly
	2	Indifferent
	3	Hostile
	4	Never talk to CO
	5	Receptiveness varied by individual
	6	Never talked to
Help from CO's	1	Very helpful
	2	Somewhat helpful
	3	A little helpful
	4	Not very helpful
	5	Interfered with work
	6	Varied by individual
Legal Aid lawyers	1	Very helpful
	2	Somewhat helpful
	3	Not very helpful
	4	Varied by individual
	5	No knowledge or contact
Personal benefits	1	Satisfaction from helping, doing some good, or being useful
	2	Learned about CJS
	3	Learned about people and/or improved counseling skills
	4	Personal growth
	5	Helpful in terms of own work
	6	Other

OAR Codes

Category or Question	Code #	Code Explanation
Influence on career or education	1	Yes - helped clarify direction of future education or work
	2	Yes - helped, improved, or gave perspective to present education or work
	3	No
Recommendations to friends	1	Yes - they became volunteers
	2	Yes - either doesn't know whether they became volunteers or they didn't become volunteers
	3	No
Talked to community members	1	No
	2	Yes - communicated views or information about CJS
	3	Yes - encouraged people to provide services or did community work
Job description	1	Focus on duties
	2	Focus on qualities needed for work
	3	Included both
Job description duties (first & second response)	1	Legal assistance, support, liaison, advocacy
	2	Family visits, liaison
	3	Friendship and support to participant - visits and letters
	4	Counseling and rehabilitation
	5	Aftercare support
	6	Other
	7	Did not focus on duties
Job description - qualities needed (first & second response)	1	Care, concern, consistency, acceptance, open-minded
	2	Good listener
	3	Express self well and relate to different kinds of people
	4	Devote time
	5	Patience
	6	Other
	7	Do not focus on qualities

OAR Codes

Category or Question	Code #	Code Explanation
When doubted usefulness	1	Never
	2	Frustration because results of help or attempted help were minimal
	3	Personal problems, also experience or view of volunteer interfered with work
	4	Other
	99	Missing data
Why no longer volunteer	1	Is still volunteer
	2	Time conflict because of school
	3	Time conflict because of job
	4	Time conflict - scheduling problem - reason not specified
	5	Other
Other volunteer or work	1	No
	2	Yes - other direct service volunteer work
	3	Yes - other advocacy or other non-direct service
	4	Yes - paid work
Views on CJS	1	Changed - became more negative
	2	Cahnged - became more positive
	3	Changed - no direction indicated
	4	Did not change - tended to view as fair
	5	Did not change - tended to view as unfair
	6	Did not change - views not specified
	7	Changed - more informed
Help from other sources	1	No - or from OAR staff
	2	Lawyer
	3	Social worker or psychiatrists
	4	CJS staff
	5	Participant's family
	6	Other

OAR Codes

Category or Question	Code #	Code Explanation
OAR improvement (first & second response)	1	Increase or expand services
	1a	More aftercare services
	1b	More staff
	1c	Subsidize transportation costs for volunteers
	1d	Other
	2	Better or closer supervision of volunteers, including better screening and more ongoing training
	3	Can't think of any
	4	Make CJS more responsive to OAR operations and goals
	5	Other

Appendix C

OAR TRAINING
OUTLINES AND SCHEDULES

Offender Aid & Restoration of NYC, Inc.
OAR/NYC
184 Fifth Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10010

TRAINING DESIGN
October 3 - December 5, 1975

FRIDAY, October 31, 1975 - 7-10 p.m.

7-8 p.m.	Dinner, informal get together
8-9 p.m.	Introductory Excerise: Who am I? What am I doing here? Why be an OAR volunteer? - - - - - Nancy Mamis, OAR & Sharon Smolick, OAR.
9-10 p.m.	The Cold Hard Facts: A presentation by J. Kenneth Jackson, a former convict, former President of the Fortune Society, President of OAR/NYC, member of the NYC Board of Correction.

SATURDAY, November 1, 1975

10 a.m. - 1 p.m. (ROLE PLAY)	An OAR History - - Nanch Mamis. By utilizing a variety of techniques, simulations, gaming and role plays..... staff will attempt to help the group experience and anticipate many of the issues and problems facing those who work in jails. STAFF: Mel Rivers, Jimmy McGinley, Rodney Taylor, Jose Garcia, Julian Roberts, Terry Mahoney, Joe Martinez, Bob Levenson, Bob Hollis, Roy Calderon and Jim Gillian.
1-2 p.m.	LUNCH BREAK
2-3 p.m.	Film and Discussion: "MAX-OUT" -
2-3 p.m.	Intensive counseling simulations ---- STAFF: Mel Rivers, Jimmy McGinley, Rodney Taylor, Jose Garcia, Julian Roberts, Terry Mahoney Joe Martinez,

Bob Levinson,
Bob Hollis,
Roy Calderon, and
Jim Gillian.

FRIDAY, November 7, 1975

7-8 p.m.	Dinner
8-10 p.m.	Honorable Bruce M. Wright, NYC Civil Court; and Assistant Commissioner Alphonso Ford, NYC Dept. of Correction An informal discussion on any and all topics related to correctional services and court system in New York City.

SATURDAY, November 8, 1975

9 a.m. - 12 noon	THIS SESSION WILL BE HELD AT THE TOMBS --- 125 White Street ..... PLEASE BRING YOUR LUNCH I. Introduction to the department & institution. II. Role of the Correction Officer and/or custodial staff. III. Emergency procedures (personal protection). Deputy Warden Jacqueline McMickens--- Center for Correctional Training----- NYC Dept. of Correction.
12-1 p.m.	LUNCH
1-2 p.m.	Continuation of A.M. session.
2-4 p.m.	Population Data.....Michael Cleary, NYC Board of Correction.

WEDNESDAY, November 12, 1975

7:30 - 10 p.m.	Lt. Paul DeJulio & Officer Frank Piazza, Nassau County Correction Facility.

WEDNESDAY, November 19, 1975

7:30 - 10 p.m.	Film: "ATTICA" (This is the Cinda Firestone Film).

WEDNESDAY, November 26, 1975 — Eric Lowin, Attorney. FINAL TRAINING MEETING. Summary & wrap-up.

WEDNESDAY, December 2-5, 1975

** 6:00 p.m.	ON EACH OF THESE EVENINGS: DESIGNATED GROUPS WILL MEET AT THE BRIDGE ON RIKERS ISLAND.

** PLEASE NOTE TIME CHANGE.

Offender Aid & Restoration of NYC, Inc.
OAR/NYC
184 Fifth Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10010

JUVENILE/ADOLESCENT VOLUNTEER

TRAINING DESIGN

June 30 - August 10, 1979

Friday, June 29, 1979 - 7-9 PM

7:00 - 8:00 Registration and informal get together

8:00 - 8:45 INTRODUCTORY EXERCISE: What am I doing here? What are our expectations?...M. Sharon Smolick, OAR Staff

8:45 - 9:30 THE COLD HARD FACTS: The reality of the experience. J. Kenneth Jackson and Rodney Taylor, OAR Staff

Saturday, June 30, 1979 - 10:00 AM - 5:00 PM

10:00 - 10:15 Warm-up Exercise ... Norbert Poli, OAR Staff

10:15 - 10:30 GOAL SETTING: Rosemarie Smith, OAR Staff

10:30 - 11:00 CREATING NEW FRAMEWORKS: ... M. Sharon Smolick, OAR Staff

11:00 - 11:20 THE MYTHS AND REALITIES OF THE JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM: Al Haber, OAR Staff

11:20 - 1:00 OVERVIEW OF THE JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM: M. Sharon Smolick

1:00 - 2:00 Lunch Break

2:00 - 3:00 FILM AND DISCUSSION: "Bad Boys"

3:00 - 5:00 THE ROLE OF THE VOLUNTEER: ... Bob Levinson, OAR Staff

Friday, July 6, 1979 - 7:00 - 9:30 PM

7:00 - 8:00 Judge, N.Y.C. Courts

8:00 - 9:00 Marvin Schechter, Legal Aid Society, Criminal Defense Unit

9:00 - 9:30 DISCUSSION

Saturday, July 7, 1979 - 10:00 AM - 5:00 PM

10:00 - 10:15 Warm-up Exercise

10:15 - 1:00 INTENSIVE COUNSELING SIMULATIONS: by utilizing a variety of techniques, simulations, gaming and role plays, staff will anticipate many of the issues and problems facing those who will work with youngsters....Nancy Mamis, OAR Staff

1:00 - 2:00 Lunch Break

2:00 - 2:30 INSTITUTIONAL ACCESS: A discussion of the various problems of getting in and maintaining access and schedules in institutions.

2:30 - 5:00 INTENSIVE COUNSELING SIMULATIONS (continued from morning session)

Wednesday, July 11, 1979 - 7:00 - 9:30 PM

7:00 - 8:00 Roschel Peters, Director, Satellite intake project, NYC Dept. of Probation

8:00 - 9:00 Jeff Klein, Sr. Youth Division Counselor, NYS Division for Youth

9:00 - 9:30 Discussion

Wednesday, July 18, 1979 - 7:00 - 9:30 PM

7:00 - 8:00 Noreen Connelly, Legal Aid Diversion - Queens

8:00 - 9:00 Tim Walther, Spotford Liaison, NYS Division For Youth

9:00 - 9:30 Discussion

Wednesday, July 25, 1979 - 7:00 - 9:30 PM

7:00 - 8:00 Paul Strasburg, Assistant to the Mayor for Youth Services, Office of the Deputy Mayor

8:00 - 9:00 Captain Mauney, Juvenile Offender Detention Center, Rikers Island

Wednesday, August 1, 1979 - 7:00 - 9:30 PM

7:00	- 8:00	Sharing Feelings and needs with "seasoned" volunteers
8:00	- 9:00	THE COURT PROCESS: Rosemarie Smith & Brenda Andrews OAR Staff
9:00	- 9:30	Housekeeping (ID Cards, Schedules, Tours, etc.)

Week of August 6 - August 10, 1979

6:00	Tours of the institutions (to be announced)

Appendix D

OAR VOLUNTEER AND STAFF ACTIVITIES:

RECORD-KEEPING FORMS

VOLUNTEER ACTIVITIES
(MONTHLY)

CLIENT'S NAME: _____ OAR I.D. NO: _____

PAGE NO: _____

MONTH	COUNSELING SESSIONS	COURT APPEARANCES ADDRESSED	COURT VISITS IN COURT PENS	CORRESPONDENCE: TO COURT	CORRESPONDENCE: TO CLIENT FROM CLIENT	CORRESPONDENCE: OTHER (SPECIFY)	TELEPHONE CONTACTS: TO/FROM CLIENT	TELEPHONE CONTACTS: FAMILY	TELEPHONE CONTACTS: ATTORNEY	TELEPHONE CONTACTS: RE:SCHOOL	TELEPHONE CONTACTS: RE: JOB	TELEPHONE CONTACTS: RE: PROG	TELEPHONE CONTACTS: TO OAR	TELEPHONE CONTACTS: PAROLE	TELEPHONE CONTACTS: PROBATION	TELEPHONE CONTACTS: DOC	TELEPHONE CONTACTS: OTHER (SPECIFY)	PERSONAL CONTACTS: ATTORNEYS	PERSONAL CONTACTS: FAMILY	PERSONAL CONTACTS: RE: JOBS	PERSONAL CONTACTS: OTHER PROGRAMS (SPECIFY'	PERSONAL CONTACTS: PAROLE	PERSONAL CONTACTS: PROBATION	PERSONAL CONTACTS: OTHER (SPECIFY)	OTHER ACTIVITIES (SPECIFY)	COMMENTS

STAFF ACTIVITIES

DATE	TYPE OF ACTIVITY	PURPOSE/OUTCOME

CLIENT NAME: _____ ID NO: _____ PAGE _____

AFTERCARE SERVICES

NAME: _____ ID NO: _____

TESTS:

	Date	Score	Date	Score	Date	Score
Reading Scores:						
Math Scores:						

Others: _____

_____

NEEDS ASSESSMENT:

A. Residence needed: Yes ___ No ___: (specify) _____
B. Employed: Yes ___ No ___: (specify) _____
C. Medical Problems: Yes ___ No ___: (specify) _____
D. In School: Yes ___ No ___: (specify) _____

DATE	TYPE OF ACTIVITY	PURPOSE/OUTCOME

OAR Monthly Activity Reports

III. VOLUNTEER ACTIVITIES

A. Individual Counseling Sessions . . . . . _____
(How many were with Juveniles _____)

B. Family Contacts

1. Individual Counseling Sessions . . . . . _____
2. Telephone Contacts . . . . . _____
3. Correspondence . . . . . _____

C. Correspondence

1. Letters from Clients . . . . . _____
2. Letters to Clients . . . . . _____
3. Other (Specify _____) . . _____

D. Telephone Activites

1. Volunteer/Client Phone Contacts . . . . . _____
2. Volunteer Calls to OAR Staff . . . . . _____
3. Education related . . . . . _____
4. Employment related . . . . . _____
5. Parole/Probation . . . . . _____
6. Other (Specify) . . . . . _____

E. Legal Activities

1. Court Appearances . . . . . _____
2. Court Pen Visits . . . . . _____
3. Addressed Court . . . . . _____
4. Letters to Court . . . . . _____
5. Attorney Contacts . . . . . _____
6. Calls to Attorney . . . . . _____
7. Other (Specify) . . . . . .

F. Other Activities

1. Program Visits . . . . . _____
2. Parole/Probation Meetings . . . . . _____
3. Other (Specify) . . . . . _____

G. Training Sessions

1. New Volunteers in Training During Month . . . _____
2. In-Service Training Sessions During Month . . _____
3. Group Sessions (# of Volunteers attending Group Sessions) . . . . . _____

IV. STAFF ACTIVITIES

A. General (Primarily in Reference to Incarcerated Clients)

1. Individual Counseling Sessions
   a) Juvenile . . . . . _____
   b) Other . . . . . _____
2. Family Activities
   a) Individual Counseling Sessions . . . . . _____
   b) Group Counseling Sessions
      (1) # Staff Involved in Group . . . . . _____
      (2) # Parents Participating During Month . _____
   c) Correspondence with Families . . . . . _____
   d) Telephone Calls to/from Families . . . . . _____
   e) Visits to Home . . . . . _____
3. Institutional Monitoring Sessions . . . . . _____
   a) Rikers Island . . . . . _____
   b) Spofford Juvenile Detention Center . . . . _____
   c) Upstate Facilities . . . . . _____
   d) Intake . . . . . _____
4. Correspondence
   a) To the Court . . . . . _____
   b) To Clients . . . . . _____
   c) From Clients . . . . . _____
   d) Parole/Probation . . . . . _____
   e) Attorneys . . . . . _____
   f) Other (Specify) . . . . . _____
5. Telephone Activities
   a) DOC . . . . . _____
   b) To/from Clients . . . . . _____
   c) Parole/Probation . . . . . _____
   d) Programs . . . . . _____
   e) Job/Education . . . . . _____
   f) Volunteers . . . . . _____
   g) Other (Specify) . . . . . _____

6. Training Sessions Attended by Staff During Month _____
   a) # Staff . . . . . _____
   b) # Sessions . . . . . _____

B. Court Activities

1. Court Appearances (Staff)
   a) Bronx . . . . . _____
   b) Manhattan . . . . . _____
   c) Brooklyn . . . . . _____
   d) Queens . . . . . _____
   e) Staten Island . . . . . _____
   f) Other (Specify) . . . . . _____
   TOTAL COURT APPEARANCES - END OF MONTH . . . . . _____
2. Court Pen Visits . . . . . _____
3. Addressed Court on Behalf of Client . . . . . _____
4. Conferences: (In Reference to the Case)
   a) Attorneys . . . . . _____
   b) Judges . . . . . _____
   c) District Attorney's Office . . . . . _____
   d) Probation . . . . . _____
   e) Client . . . . . _____
   f) Families . . . . . _____
   g) Other (Specify) . . . . . _____
5. Telphone Activities in Refence to Court Activities
   a) Attorneys . . . . . _____
   b) Client . . . . . _____
   c) Families . . . . . _____
   d) Other Programs . . . . . _____
   e) Volunteers . . . . . _____

C. Staff Aftercare Activities

1. Individual Counseling Sessions
   a) Clients
      (1) Juvenile . . . . . _____
      (2) Other . . . . . _____
   b) Non-Participants . . . . . _____
   c) Families . . . . . _____

2. Group Activities
   a) # Sessions for the Month . . . . . _____
   b) # Clients Involved
      (1) Juvenile . . . . . _____
      (2) Other . . . . . _____
3. Education
   a) Test Administered During Month . . . . . _____
      (1) Antonym Test (Literacy Volunteers) . . _____
      (2) Word Test (Literacy Volunteers) . . . _____
      (3) SAT Paragraph Meaning Test . . . . . _____
      (4) SRA: W Level 1 _____ X Level 1 _____
               W Level 2 _____ X Level 2 _____
      (5) WRAT . . . . . _____
   b) Tutoring
      (1) # Volunteers Trained this Month . . . _____
      (2) # Participant Tutoring Sessions this Month . . . . . _____
   c) Referrals For This Month
      (1) Tutoring Services . . . . . _____
      (2) Training Programs . . . . . _____
      (3) School Programs (Specify) . . . . . _____
      (4) Other (Specify) . . . . . _____
4. Employment
   a) Referrals
      (1) Employment Agencies . . . . . _____
      (2) Manpower/CETA Programs . . . . . _____
      (3) Other (Specify) . . . . . _____
   b) Direct Placements . . . . . _____
5. Administrative Visits to Other Programs . . . _____

V. ATTACHMENTS

A. List of Adjudicated Cases for the Month

B. List of Rearrests

C. Terminations (Intake Form)

Appendix E

LEGAL AID SOCIETY
AND
RIKERS ISLAND
INTERVIEW FORMS

9/6/79

LAS INTERVIEW ABOUT OAR

Division: _____ Date: _____

Staff

Name: _____ Title: _____

Name: _____ Title: _____

Name: _____ Title: _____

Name: _____ Title: _____

Interviewer: _____

What does your division do?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Based on your knowledge of OAR, what kinds of services do they provide?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

In what ways have the OAR staff and volunteers been helpful to you and your staff(s)? (In general terms and two or three concrete examples.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

In what ways do you think your mutual clients benefit from the services provided by OAR? (In general terms and two or three contrete examples.)

As far as you know, have the OAR staff or their volunteers interfered with or in any way hindered you or your staff(s) in carrying out your duties? If yes, please explain.

How knowledgeable are the OAR staff and their volunteers in the work they do?

How trustworthy are the OAR staff and their volunteers in the work they do? (Especially with regard to issues of confidentiality and other delicate legal issues.)

What would you say are OAR's strongest and weakest aspects?

Strongest: _____

_____

_____

_____

Weakest: _____

_____

_____

_____

Would you like to see OAR funded on a permanent basis? Why?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Do you have anything else you'd like to tell me about OAR?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

ARDC[1] STAFF INTERVIEW ABOUT OAR

Date: _____ Interviewer: _____

Staff

Name: _____ Title: _____

Name: _____ Title: _____

Name: _____ Title: _____

Name: _____ Title: _____

Who do you house at the ARDC?

_____

_____

_____

Based on your knowledge, what services does OAR provide?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

How do the inmates benefit from the work OAR does? (In general and two or three specific examples.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

[1]With minor modifications this interview was also used to interview the Deputy Warden at the JODC.

Have you or your staff participated in or contributed to the training sessions OAR conducts for its volunteers? If yes, describe.

What is OAR's reputation among your correctional officers?

As far as you know, have the OAR staff or their volunteers ever interfered with or hindered the work of your correctional officers? If yes, please explain.

Do you ever hear comments about OAR from the inmates? If yes, what do they say?

How knowledgeable are the OAR staff and their volunteers in the work they do?

How trustworthy are the OAR staff and their volunteers in the work they do? (Especially in terms of contraband and talking with the inmates about prison life.)

What would you say are the strongest and weakest aspects of the services OAR provide

Strongest:

Weakest:

Have other volunteers and voluntary agencies worked at the ARDC? If yes, what are some of their names and functions? Do or did any provide services similar to those provided by OAR?

How does OAR compare to these other agencies?

As you know, OAR is no longer taking on new inmates at the ARDC. Would you like to see them return on a permanent basis to work with new inmates at the ARDC? Why or why not?

Do you have anything else you'd like to tell me about OAR?

END