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REPORT OF INITIAL VALIDATION STUDY
COMMUNITY SERVICES CASE CLASSIFICATION
AND WORKLOAD MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

INTRODUCTION

Historical Overview

The Illinois Department of Corrections Division of Community Services is responsible for the successful reintegration of parolees into the community. Reintegration accomplished through parole supervision which considers the safety of the public, risk of program failure, and the needs of the offender.

An effective classification system within this division is especially significant since there is a growing number of parolees to supervise with a limited number of agents and diminishing community resources. Ideally, such a system should be able to predict the releasee's ability to reenter society and estimate the number and types of monthly contacts with the parole agent needed to successfully complete parole, e.g., establish level of supervision required and the type(s) of constraints needed.

In 1979, the Illinois Department of Corrections, Division of Community Services, initiated development of a Workload Management System with two major goals:

1) To improve the effectiveness of supervision by better allocation of resources, and
2) To provide information for efficient management, research, and budgeting.

By June, 1980, Deputy Director Anthony M. Scillia's Task Force had screened available state and federal systems, and had analyzed Illinois parole profiles. April through June, 1980, the Task Force conducted a successful feasibility test in Peoria and Markham Parole Districts, and concluded that a modified version of the Wisconsin Case Classification/Staff Development Project (WCCSDP) might best meet Illinois' needs. With continuing support from the National Institute of Corrections, Community Services and Policy Development staff and their consultant spent late summer of 1981 doing a preliminary validation study. The objectives of the study were to:

1) Test the utility of the information system;
2) Develop a comprehensive classification instrument for assessing releasees according to both
   a) probability of program failure and
   b) casework service needs;
The Preliminary Validation was performed while the information system was being built and "debugged". Information checks suggested that "downstate" (Area II) data were fairly accurate and reliable; however, "upstate" data (Area I) had to be collected primarily during a training effort and were not precisely comparable. In addition, terminations from both areas were fewer than optimal for analysis. Thus, the consultant recommended that discriminant analysis and regression analyses be replicated when terminations were more adequate.

The replications were made in March, 1982; and although Area I terminations are still problematic when compared to those from Area II, the results of the preliminary validation study have been essentially confirmed. What follows is a detailed discussion of the case classification and workload management system and the results from the second validation study.

The Case Classification and Workload Management System

A parolee is given constraints to live within, such as where he can live, whom he can see, the rules he must follow, and the number of contacts he must have with his agent. The classification system determines both constraint and supervision level.

The Illinois Workload Management System breaks away from the traditional caseload concept which dictates that all community supervision, or parole, cases are the same in the amount of the parolee's needs, and the probability of failure.

Studies have shown that the number of contacts alone is unrelated to the success or failure of parole. Working on that principle, the classification system must identify factors which indicate the parolee's potential for successful parole completion so that effective services can be provided to him/her. This is done by analyzing the parolee's risk and needs.

Risk assessment measures dimensions of behavior, such as the stability or violence of the releasee. Its purpose is to define the minimal amount of releasee supervision needed to protect the public safety while helping the releasee successfully complete parole. Needs assessment measures the releasee's basic needs, such as living conditions, food, clothing, education, and the releasee's personal problems, such as drug abuse and emotional instability. Its purpose is to identify programs which will meet the releasee's needs so he can successfully complete parole.

Scales for the risk (supervision) level and needs level were developed from survey data gathered from all Illinois parole agents on the entire population. Input from all district supervisors was also gathered.

The system, then, is designed to determine the probability of successful termination and assist agents in developing effective case action strategies. The validation study examines the extent to which the instruments can accurately predict parole outcome. There are four primary instruments. (See Appendix B.) The analysis that follows evaluates the performance of all four instruments and combinations thereof against outcome.

Forms were then designed indicating high, medium, and low supervision levels, and high, medium, and low needs levels. (Appendix B contains the forms.) The actual classification of the releasee, or the casework level assigned, comes from these two forms and gives a rating of high, medium, or low. The agent and supervisor can override this casework level only if a higher or lower level is genuinely justified.

To determine the parolee's risk level, the agent assesses his propensity for rule and law violations. There are two forms for this process, one based on information prior to incarceration (initial evaluation completed 30 days after release) called the A Risk Form and one based on current information (reevaluations every 60 to 90 days) called the B Risk Form.

To determine the parolee's needs level, the agent completes an initial and/or reevaluation which assesses the parolee's classified needs, such as food and clothing, living arrangements, emotional stability, mental stability, psycho-sexual adjustment, substance abuse, and education and/or vocation.

Initially, the Community Supervision Classification System classifies the parolee high on the casework level (for his first 30 days). This time allows the parole agent to become acquainted with the releasee/case. After 30 days, the parole agent evaluates the parolee's risk and needs levels. The matrix plots the results from the two evaluation forms and shows the overall casework level to be assigned to the parolee. The case must be reevaluated within 90 days. If the agent disagrees with the classification level, and the supervisor agrees with the agent, the level is overridden. Then the case must be reevaluated within 60 days. Reevaluation of any case is mandatory as specified at either 60 or 90 days; however, any case may be reevaluated at any time.

Each item on each of the forms is weighted, with high levels receiving the higher numbers, medium levels the mid-range numbers, and low levels the lower numbers. These scores are then placed on the casework level matrix which determines the parolee's classification level. (See Figure 1.) The classification level determines how much time the agent will spend with the parolee, just as the indicators determine what kind of services the agent will try to provide.

The system, then, is designed to determine the probability of successful termination and assist agents in developing effective case action strategies. The validation study examines the extent to which the instruments can accurately predict parole outcome. There are four primary instruments. (See Appendix B.) The analysis that follows evaluates the performance of all four instruments and combinations thereof against outcome.
Illinois is divided into areas for purposes of managing the parole population. Area I consists of Chicago and nearby localities. The rest of the State is considered Area II. (See Figure 2.) Area I releases are predominantly urban and black, whereas Area II releases are generally rural and white.

The data base from the Community Services Workload Management Information System contained a total of 1,168 terminated cases out of over 4,000 total cases as of March, 1982. Of the 1,168 terminations, 368 were from Area I offices, and 800 from Area II.

There were numerous variables in the data base whose values differed significantly between Area I and Area II. Of the case action variables (see appended instruments), an ANOVA analysis showed significant differences between areas on all elements except sentence year, release type, sex, and offense class.

No differences appeared in the type of release, with 75% of the releases receiving Mandatory Supervised Release (MSR). Although they were not receiving statistically, there were more Class 3 and 4 offenses in Area II and more Class X and M offenses in Area I. Accordingly, Area I releases tended to be assigned longer supervision terms. 83.2% of Area I parolees had shorter terms and 29.6% of Area I releases had a 3-year term. Nonetheless, the average time on supervision before termination was 15 months in both areas.

Ninety-five percent of parolees were male in both areas. There was a greater percentage of Whites in Area II (68.4%, compared to 23.1%) and of Blacks and Hispanics in Area I (70% Black and 6.5% Hispanic, compared to 31% and 1%). That Area II parolees were slightly older in average age (31 as opposed to 29) in Area I is probably a phenomenon resulting from the bias of Area I. Initial inputs of older cases is probably a phenomenon resulting from the bias of Area I. Initial inputs of older cases.

As was the case with the "Preliminary Study" Chicago-Peoria/Dixon analysis, the outcome of supervision was predominantly positive. State-wide, 70.8% of the terminations were positive. Differences were seen between Area I and Area II, 77.2% of Area I cases terminated positively, while 68% of Area II outcomes were positive. There were 10.4% more recommended discharges in Area I. The differences in negative terminations were more pronounced. There were 51 (6.4%) new misdemeanor convictions and AWOLs in Area I, and none in Area II. 6.5% of the cases in Area II were for a technical violation while only 2.7% of the Area I cases terminated in this manner. The distribution of new felony convictions was stable for both Areas.

More importantly, Area II releases scored higher on all instruments (A and B; risk and needs), with differences significant at the .10 level for...
most items, total scores, and levels of supervision. Thus, separate analyses for the validation of the instruments were conducted for Area I and Area II, although state-wide totals were also examined. (Inter-agent reliability checks made by departmental staff both during intensive start-up training efforts and since that time have been good to excellent; consensual validation surveys have not proved so positive; agents have tended to see "A risk" as more nearly predictive of outcome than the instruments that seem to be better predictors -- "B risk" and "AC needs."

The general results of this initial validation study are summarized by the following points:

1. For both Area I and Area II, the risk, score-based casework level and final casework levels of the reevaluation instruments were better predictors than initial risk.

2. There is some hope for predicting short-term outcome from the knowledge of supervisory level. Two-thirds of the cases showed an outcome appropriate to their classification. The reevaluation risk scale alone does an excellent job of identifying those releases most likely to succeed, but does not distinguish as well among the rest. Needs seem to be a useful predictor in Area I while risk seems to be a better predictor in Area II and state-wide. (B risk levels in Area II were close to 90% accuracy when taking only misclassified highs and lows into account.)

3. The possibility of better cutting points was examined for both risk and needs instrument. However, based on this analysis, keeping current cutting points is recommended until further refinement of both data and instruments. Risk level cutting points should be altered only when higher risk cases are not rendered more subject to "successful" misclassification by the modifications.

4. The creation of a superhigh category was explored. This analysis suggested that a superhigh category for the risk scales could be of some use in identifying unsuccessful cases. Given current data, a cutting point near 25 seems indicated. There were, however, too few high needs classifications to support the use of a superhigh needs level for either Area. Because of Area differences, if changes are to be made, they should be made separately for each Area. It is recommended that further analysis controlling for such factors as offense type and length of time on supervision be used to assist refinement of cutting points in relation to agent workload levels.

5. Demographic information does not have a strong relationship to termination type, nor does it add a significant amount to the variance explained by the scales. The most useful item was age, which supports the adage that older individuals "do better", at least short-term, on parole.
Two further analyses of termination types were conducted. The best results were obtained with the order of negative termination from most serious to least serious: new felony, technical violation, new misdemeanor, and AWOL's (with transfers and other terminations removed). In both recode-of-termination tests, the A and B risk scales and needs items demonstrated slightly more predictive power than did the termination ordering used in the preliminary validation study, and the order of the items' contribution in the stepwise analysis altered somewhat.

Assessment was made of the predictive power of the various instruments. Independently, the risk and needs scales hold some predictive power, but the B risk scale is best, accounting for 31.4% of the variance in termination type. For the six possible dual combinations, the B risk and A needs hold the greatest potential when combined, as was true in the preliminary validation: 48.2% of the variance is explained by the combined items. Further, the B risk-A needs identify the lowest percentage of false positives, with 5.4%. All the serious violators were rated as medium or high on the B risk-A needs scale. Thus, the releasee's previous service needs and his most recent supervised assessment best identify the releasee's propensity for failing or successfully completing his supervision. If recommendations are to be made for early supervision discharge (or forced release) based on predictions of those releasees most likely to succeed, with the least potential to commit the more serious offenses, the B risk-A needs combination should provide the most accurate projections. This combination provides few mispredictions at either the low or high end of the scale. (See Table I-A and 1-B.)

These results should be used, not only for purposes of continuous validation, but also for refinement of present instruments into administrative predictive scales comparable to the adult institution classification dangerousness and adjustment scales. Furthermore, a third scale, called environment, should also be investigated, and if appropriate, constructed. The intent of this third scale would be to distinguish characteristics of the releasee's home and community setting from offender characteristics.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The four research questions of the Preliminary Study were again addressed in this revalidation study using the 1,168 terminated cases:

1a. Do the supervision (risk) level and needs level adequately indicate risk and service requirements of the releasees as reflected by termination type (positive termination and negative termination)?
1b. Do the supervision (risk) level and needs level adequately indicate risk and services requirements of the releasing as reflected by termination type (successful, unsuccessful, and highly unsuccessful)?
2a. Are better cutting points possible for the supervision scale and the needs scale?
2b. Can a superhigh category be created from the present high category for the supervision scale and the needs scale to identify those cases most likely to fail?
3. How well do the items of each scale indicate eventual supervision success or failure?
4. Is there information outside the scale items that indicates success or failure on supervision; i.e., do releasee characteristics (age at termination, sex, and race) affect success?

RESEARCH FINDINGS

1a. Do the supervision (risk) level and needs level adequately indicate risk and service requirements of the releasees as reflected by termination type (positive termination and negative termination)?

For this analysis, the termination types were recoded into 2 categories: Negative termination (new felony, new misdemeanor, AWOL, technical violation, and other negative), and positive termination (discharge at expiration; discharge recommended; and other positive). (Transfers were selected out of the analysis.)

As was the case with the Preliminary Study, the levels of supervision and needs as indicated by the instruments varied between Area I and Area II, and within each area varied from initial to reevaluation. In Area I on the initial risk evaluation, cases shifted from 68% high and 8% low to 16.8% high and 42.2% low on the reevaluation. In Area II, cases shifted as they did state-wide, from 82% high, 13.6% medium and 4.5% low on the initial risk evaluation to 27% high, 43% medium and 29.6% low on the reevaluation. The shift of needs level from the A to the last B
was not so dramatic as on the risk level. In Area I, approximately 85% of the cases had a low needs level, although a few highs appeared on the B which were not present on the A. In Area II, many cases shifted from medium to low with fewer than 10% high needs levels on both instruments. The cases shifted from 32.5% medium on the A to 20.5% on the B, while they shifted from 57.7% low to 73.5% low.

The majority of cases were classified at a high or medium supervision (risk) level and a low needs level. Since the scorebased casework level is determined by the supervision except in the case of low risk level and high needs (which is medium on the matrix), the breakdown for the scorebased level was similar to that of the supervision level. In every instance except one, the supervision level matched the scorebased level. This is an important finding because from the scorebased to the final casework level, differences are made only with overrides. In almost every instance, overrides were used to bring a casework level down from a high to a medium or medium to a low. Final casework levels for those A levels in Area I shifted from 68% high to 60% after the override. Area I B’s shifted from 48% low to 50% low after the override to medium. 65% in Area II were overridden from medium to low for 13 cases. State-wide, scorebased casework levels changed in the same manner as did the supervision level. With overrides, there were 1 less low, 8 more mediums and 8 fewer highs on the final (initial) casework level. The use of overrides on the reevaluation produced 4 fewer highs, 34 fewer mediums, and 38 more lows from the casework to final level.

Generally, final casework levels were higher on the A than on the B and in Area II than Area I. In addition, there was a higher percentage of positive terminations in Area I than Area II. How well these outcomes related to supervision levels was examined next. Tau, Eta, and Gamma were the statistics used.*

*To test the predictive power of the supervision levels in the Preliminary validation. ETA WITH TERMTYPE DEPENDENT was utilized. This statistic assumed that the independent variables (levels) were nominal while the dependent variable (termination type) was interval. (Eta indicates how dissimilar the means of termtype and supervision levels are in the same categories of the low, medium, and high levels. If means are different, it indicates how little association there is between the two. As the means of the two variables are more alike, Eta increases toward unity (1).) This statistic was calculated in a similar manner. (Perfect prediction of termination type with supervision levels, and variance and means are small, Eta increases toward unity (1).) This statistic measures their association along the diagonals. Gamma, whose values are generally higher than Tau, is calculated in a similar manner. (Perfect prediction of termination type in addition, a "misclassification percentage" was calculated by multiplying the total percentage of those lows with unsuccessful outcome and highs with successful outcome. (The closer this percentage is to 0 the more predictive power of outcome from supervision level is present.)

For the initial evaluation, the statistics for Area II suggested that the needs level was a better indicator of outcome than the supervision (risk) level, as was the case with the preliminary analysis. However, low values of Tau (although the negative direction indicates lack of support) and Eta demonstrated that there was little relation between any of the levels and outcome. The "misclassification percentage" was lowest from the needs level, while risk and scorebased levels nearly 50%. The small sample size in Area I does not make it possible to draw any conclusions from those data. (77.6% of those who succeeded on supervision were classified initially as a high risk while only 7.5% were classified as a high need.)

For both Area I and Area II, the risk, scorebased casework level, and final casework levels of the reevaluation instruments were better predictors of outcome than initial risk. Tau, Eta, and Gamma are all higher for those 3 levels. As was the case in the preliminary study, data analysis showed neither reevaluation needs nor supervision assessment to be as useful as the first needs assessment for Area I. The best predictions could be made for Area I. The first reevaluation analysis by analyzing the areas together. The best predictions could be made for Area I. By including the Area I initial evaluations, Tau and the misclassification percentage were improved slightly. No improvement was made in the reevaluation analysis by analyzing the areas together.

1b. Do the supervision (risk) level and needs level adequately indicate risk and service requirements of the releases as reflected by termination type (successful, unsuccessful, and highly unsuccessful)?

The second question used the same analyses and statistics. Termination type was recoded into 3 categories, as was done during the preliminary analysis. Termination type was recoded into successful, unsuccessful (new misdemeanor, technical violation, and other negative), and other positive. Tau, Eta, and Gamma are all higher for those 3 levels. As was the case in the preliminary study, data analysis showed neither reevaluation needs nor supervision assessment to be as useful as the first needs assessment for Area I. The best predictions could be made for Area I. The first reevaluation analysis by analyzing the areas together. The best predictions could be made for Area I. By including the Area I initial evaluations, Tau and the misclassification percentage were improved slightly. No improvement was made in the reevaluation analysis by analyzing the areas together.

Results from this analysis were very similar to those from the dichotomous breakdown of termination type. The B risk and casework levels, especially in Area II, are the best predictors of downstate Illinois parole outcome. More terminations from Area I are needed before similar conclusions can be reached; however, Area I cases were analyzed. Upstate, successful releases tended to have high risk scores and lower
needs scores; 88% of the successful releasees fell into the medium and high final casework level categories. Unsuccessful releasees had a high initial risk and low initial needs evaluation; no unsuccessful Area II releasees were classified as low on the initial evaluation. On the reevaluation for Area I, 86% of the successful releasees had a low or medium risk level and a low needs level. As a result, only 11% of the successful releasees had a high final classification. 13 correctly being picked up by the override. 89% of the highly unsuccessful releasees were classified as medium or high risk while all had low or medium needs. 86% had a medium or high initial level; one case was overridden from a low to a medium and was thus misclassified.

In Area II, 77.6% of successful releasees were classified as high on the initial risk while 66.5% were low on the initial needs. On the other hand, 93% of both the unsuccessful and highly unsuccessful releasees scored high on the initial risk while 86% were low or medium on the initial needs. The scorebased and final levels are mirrored in the initial risk results. The reevaluation instrument for Area II, shows the best results. Only 13.6% of the successful releasees were misclassified high risk while approximately 87% of the unsuccessful and highly unsuccessful releasees were correctly rated as high risk. 83% of the successful releasees were classified as low needs. Only about 48% of the unsuccessful were low needs. 87% of the successful were rated low or medium on the final casework level; while only 7 of 57 (13%) of the unsuccessful and highly unsuccessful releasees had low final levels (Gamma above .80).

State-wide, 76% of successful releasees were classified as high on the initial risk while 66.25% were low on the initial needs. The scorebased and final levels are mirrored in the initial risk results. On state-wide risk reevaluations, 96% of all low classifications were for successful releasees. However, 44% of the highs were also successful. Thus, the reevaluation risk scale does an excellent job in identifying those most likely to succeed, but does not distinguish as well among the rest. Results are similar for the needs level. It holds true that scorebased and final casework levels also identify those most likely to succeed better than those most likely to fail. The reevaluation risk instrument nonetheless has some predictive power, especially in Area II.

In conclusion, there is some hope for predicting short-term outcome from the knowledge of supervision level. At least two-thirds of the releasees showed an outcome appropriate to their classification. B risk levels, especially in Area II, seem to be the best predictors, with close to 90% accuracy when taking only misclassified highs and lows into account. Since it guides the final casework level, in 93-94% of the cases it should hold the most predictive power. This was the case in Area II and state-wide; both more data and more representative data are needed from Area I offices to support this claim UPSTATE. As of now, and as was the case with the Preliminary Validation Study, needs seems to be a useful predictor in Area I while risk seems to be a good predictor in Area II and state-wide.

2a. Are better cutting points possible for the supervision scale and the needs scale?

In this analysis, the cutting points presently on the classification instruments were utilized. It is quite possible better cutting points can be calculated to improve the accuracy of predicting success and failure of Illinois offenders on parole. Since there are hundreds of possibilities of cutting points from both instruments, crosstabs of total scores with outcome were examined to determine where sensible cutting points could be made. For Area I's initial evaluation risk total score, unsuccessful cases began to be picked up around the total score of 14 and successful cases began dropping off near 29. For the initial evaluation needs total score in Area II, good predictability could be established if the cutting point for low were 13 and for high were 28. Little differences between successful and unsuccessful outcome were seen before this point, and there were more unsuccessful terminations after this point. No analyses could be conducted with Area I cases because of small sample size.

Since there were only 45 unsuccessful cases who had a reevaluation completed in Area I, it was more difficult to estimate cutting points. Unsuccessful did start to increase at 12 and successfuls decreased at 17. In Area II, reevaluation risk scores could be cut off at 11 for low and start at 22 for highs. Reevaluation needs scores for Area I were positively skewed, with 40% of all cases having a minimum score of 1. There, the present cutting points looked to be the best.

For the initial evaluation in Area II, new cutting points for the supervision (risk) moved 184 of 222 (83%) releasees from high to medium. 109 of the 125 (87%) successful releasees classified as high were lowered to medium while 75 of the unsuccessful releasees were lowered to medium. Only 3 more releasees classified as low were unsuccessful. Although this decreased the misclassification percentage from 47.6% to 7.5%, other statistics did not increase substantially (in fact, Gamma decreased). New cutting points for the initial needs did not change the statistics. The needs level scored releasees "low" approximately 60% of the time despite changes in the cutting points. Casework level changes were mirrored in the supervision statistics.

For the initial risk and casework level in Area II, more successful lows were identified and most successful highs moved to medium. Unfortunately, most unsuccessful highs also moved to medium. Nevertheless, raising the low cutting point to above 10 should be useful
in identifying more lows who are successful without adding many unsuccessful releasees to the cell.

Area I cutting points were altered for the reevaluation classification. These new points moved 80 successful mediums to lows while adding only 8 unsuccessful lows from medium, 21 successful highs moved to medium, and only 10 unsuccessful highs moved to mediums. Although more successful lows were identified, highs dropped from 17.1% to 6.9% overall.

Since only 5% of the initial evaluations in the data base were from Area I, initial cutting point changes for all cases were not examined. However, since results differed between areas for cutting points on the reevaluation instrument, state-wide changes were tested. Cutting points on the risk instrument of 0 to 11 for low, 12 to 19 for medium, and 20 and above were examined first. Many more successful lows (43%) were identified, but 3.5 times as many unsuccessful releasees were moved from medium to low. Without further testing, raising the cutting point for lows to 11 is not recommended, and raising the high point to 20 would not help identify those cases most in need of supervision. New cutting points for the needs scale moved both successful and unsuccessful releasees equally from high to medium. Keeping current cutting points is recommended until further refinement of both data and instruments. If changes in cutting points are to be made based on future study, they should be made separately for Area I and Area II so that individual time allocations specific to each area can be coordinated.

In conclusion, better cutting points are undoubtedly possible. As was the case with the preliminary validation of cutting points, the "scales can be made more accurate in some instances, and the percentage at each resource level can be made more appropriate in all instances". However, risk level cutting points should be altered only when higher risk cases are not rendered more subject to "successful" misclassification by modifications.

2b. Can a superhigh category be created from the present high category for the supervision scale and the needs scale to identify those cases most likely to fail?

For this analysis, high risk levels and needs levels were recoded into a superhigh category. Four separate superhigh cutting points were established for each level. Risk level cutting points begin at 22 and increased by 3, producing cutting points of 22, 25, 28, and 31. Needs level cutting points began at 35 and also increased by 3, producing cutting points of 35, 38, 41, and 44. Risk levels guided the scorebased casework level matrix as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHE</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td>SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initial evaluations for Area I cases could not be analyzed due to the small sample size of 13. For Area II, of the 54 highly unsuccessful releasees classified at high on the risk scale, 39 were identified as superhigh with the cutting point of 22. Of the 43 unsuccessful releasees at the high risk level, 31 were identified as superhigh; 57% of the misclassified highs also fell into the new superhigh category. Results for the superhigh cutting point of 25. Approximately 50% of the highly unsuccessful and unsuccessful releasees fell into the superhigh category, while only 1/3 of the successful highs fell into the superhigh. The Eta, Gamma, and Tau values were highest when the cutting point was 25. These values fell when higher cutting points were tested. Since needs level scores were so positively skewed, there were only 25 high needs cases on the initial evaluation in Area II. All superhigh cutting points produced only 1 superhigh case. The casework level produced the same results as the risk level. Because the risk level still guides this casework level, the creation of a superhigh needs category does not seem to be useful. Best identification of unsuccessful or highly unsuccessful cases using a superhigh category is for a risk level cutting point of 25. The same results appeared when the 13 Area I cases were analyzed together with the Area II data.

The creation of a superhigh category in Area I for the reevaluation scales also seemed fruitless. For the risk level, Tau remained very low near .34. Only 29% of the reevaluation needs levels were high (5 of the 6 cases were successful). The scorebased casework level results were better for the superhigh category. The casework level performance was almost as good as the risk level, which was the same as those from the risk level. This supported the risk level guidance but certainly did not indicate the use of a superhigh category for reevaluations in Area I.

The creation of a superhigh category for reevaluations in Area II could be of some assistance in identifying those cases most likely to fail. With a risk level cutting point of 22, 46 of the 50 unsuccessful releasees rated high fell into the superhigh category, while only 19 of the 29 successful rated high fell into the superhigh category. Eta and Tau also increased. Results were not so good for the cutting points of 25
and 28. A superhigh category for the needs scale again proved useless. Case worker levels were affected in the same way as the risk levels for all cutting points.

In conclusion, the creation of a superhigh category for the risk scales could be of some use in identifying unsuccessful releases. High risk cutting points near 25 seemed to be best given current data. There were too few high needs classifications to support the use of a super high needs level in either area. Using all 877 state-wide cases with reevaluations, results were interestingly different from the analysis conducted by area. The risk level cutting points of 22 and 28 showed some promise for creating a superhigh category, i.e., 19% of unsuccessful then successful highs moved to the superhigh category. For the cutting points of 22, 1/3 of the unsuccessful moved to high while only 1/3 of the successful were included in that cell. The cutting point of 25 on the risk scale moved an equal percentage of successful and unsuccessful releases into the superhigh category. Thus, this cutting point could not be recommended state-wide as it was in Area II. The cutting point of 28 moved 21 of 116 unsuccessful highs to the superhigh category and only 8 of 91 successful highs to the superhigh category.

Two important facts were noted from the altering of cutting points. First, since Area I showed different results from Area II, if changes are to be made they should be made separately for each area. State-wide results were very different from for either area and may, therefore, only confound the results for each area. Second, cutting point changes were higher than successful highs. Altering cutting points at the low end (raising them on the risk) would not assist agents greatly in identifying those releases most likely to succeed. Furthermore, many unsuccessful releases fell into the low end category when they, in fact, would "need" more time and service from their parole agent. Further analyses controlling for such factors as offense type and length of time on supervision might assist refinement of cutting points in relation to agent workload levels.

3. How well do the items of each scale indicate eventual supervision success or failure?

The outcome variable was coded from 1 to 9 in the following order: discharge recommended, discharge by expiration, new misdemeanor conviction, other negative termination, technical violation, AWOL, and new felony conviction. The correlations between each item on the initial risk scale and the outcome were very poor. (Correlations between items and the supervision level were better than those for termination type and the intercorrelations.) State-wide, the agent's impression of client attitude explained only 7% of the variance in supervision outcome. Using stepwise regression, age at first conviction increased R² to .09. The addition of all other items increased R² to .11. With the 25 Area I cases removed from the analysis, the attitude variable explained 7% of the variance. The number of prior felony convictions variable was entered last, increasing the multiple R² to only .11. As in the first validation, no other item contributed more than 4% to the prediction of outcome.

For the initial needs scale there was some improvement in the items' relationships to outcome. Agent impression of client needs contributed 5.2% to outcome while the academic/vocational variable contributed 5.0%. Basic human needs, living arrangement, and emotional stability each made between a 3% and 4% independent contribution to outcome. Taking all intercorrelations into effect, the multiple R² increased only to .10.

Thus, both initial risk and initial needs items contributed little to the predictive accuracy of outcome when the termination types were arranged as above. (They contributed even less than in the preliminary study.) Regression results were better for the reevaluation. For the risk level for the 923 terminated case with B's completed, the compliance with the parole agreement variable explained 24% of the outcome variance. The employment and interpersonal problem variables made an 8% independent contribution to outcome while the R² for social interactions was .16. All items taken together contributed to 30% of the variance.

Results were similar for the 322 Area I cases. Interpersonal problems contributed only 2% of the variance. All variables explained 25.5% of the explained variance in outcome. Unlike the preliminary study, items were correlated more highly with outcome in Area II. All items contributed 34% of the variance. Employment and interpersonal problems together made a 10% independent contribution to outcome. The R² for the compliance variable was .27; the R² for the social interaction item was .19; the R² for the use of community resources variable was .31. All items, except for the offense item, contributed between 2% and 4% of the variance in outcome.

On the B needs scale correlations were fairly high except for the psycho-sexual variable. Most of the releases were scored zero for this item; therefore correlated low. State-wide, the agent's impression of client needs variable had an R² of .23. All other items had zero-order R²'s between .02 and .09. Alcohol and academic/vocational items entered 2nd and 3rd in the stepwise analysis. All items were intercorrelated to some degree. The contribution of all items added only 10% additional variance beyond that of the impression of client needs variable.

In Area I correlations were much lower. The agent's impression of client needs variable explained 17% of the variance in outcome. Living arrangement increased the R² to .19. All items explained only 20% of the variance in outcome. Basic human needs, living arrangements, and psycho-sexual adjustment contributed less than 1% of the variance explained. Simple R²'s for the other variables were less than .02.
As with the risk scale, Area II correlations were higher than those in Area I for the needs assessment. Area II results were similar to the state-wide results. Items contributed in the same order as in the state-wide analysis, with all variables explaining 24% of the variance in outcome. The simple R² for the agent's impression of client needs variable was .23, while psycho-sexual adjustment makes an independent contribution of less than 1%. Statistically, some items could be removed from the scales without hurting the predictive value of the instruments. As anticipated, more needs items could be eliminated than risk items. However, Community Services Workload Management System staff feel these items should remain so that as the need arises for their identification, they are available for case management purposes. For example, for prediction purposes, the psycho-sexual adjustment variable served little function. However, if a releasee is arrested for a series of rapes, he must be accounted for by the system; an agent must be able to identify this individual. In addition, the emotional stability, mental ability and psycho-sexual adjustment variables were not included on the original instrument. Because overrides were so often used to identify these problem areas, they were added for operational identification purposes. (See "Low Unsuccessful Profile" in Appendix A.) For the initial risk scale, the assaultive offense category was implemented on the scale to identify a few crucial cases. Statistically speaking, for predictive purposes, it is not an item which identifies the "average" high case. But for the purpose of the agent in identifying a potentially harmful individual, it was included on the scale. Clearly, these categories need definition and refinement. But to remove these unsatisfactory predictors from the instrument would defeat one of the main goals of the system, i.e., to allow agents to identify those releasees presumed to be most in need of services. (However, a true "scale" should be created from a modified set of predictors for statistical use by the Department's administrative staff.)

4. Is there information outside the scale items that indicates success or failure on supervision; i.e., do releasee characteristics (age at termination, sex, and race) affect success? Counselor ratings utilized in the Preliminary Validation were not available for this re-analysis, but termination types were regressed against age, sex, and race. State-wide, Area I, and Area II data were analyzed separately.

State-wide the population was 54.2% White, 43% Black and 2.7% Hispanic. 94.8% of the releasees were male. The mean age was 28.8 years and ranged from 19 to 73 (s.d. = 7.8). 52.1% were 26 or younger.

For those 311 releasees who had an initial evaluation, age correlated negatively with termination type (r = -.13); as expected, the older the releasee, the more likely he or she is to "succeed" (or at least to exit the system without serious difficulty). Race and sex explained less than 1% of the variance in termination type. With the initial risk items, the demographic variables added less than 1% to the variance. With the initial needs items, age, sex, and race contributed 1% to the variance in termination type. In Area II, the demographic variables made a 2% contribution beyond that of the needs scale.

For the 915 reevaluations analyzed, age again correlated negatively with termination type (r = -.15). R²'s for sex and race were less than 1%. When termination type was regressed against all B risk items and the demographic variables, age, sex, and race added practically no additional variance. With the B needs scale, the releasee characteristics added 1% of the explained variance.

In Area I, the demographic variables explained 3% more variance beyond that of the reevaluation risk scale. This was also the case when the needs scale was analyzed. Virtually no contribution was made by age, sex, and race in Area II, for either the risk or needs scales.

Similar conclusions to those in the first validation can be reached for this analysis. Although the supervision and needs instruments provide selective information for determining parole outcome, demographic information does not bear a strong relationship to termination type, nor does it add a significant amount to the variance explained by the instruments.
NEW REGRESSION ANALYSES OF TERMINATION TYPES

The regression analyses were rerun with the termination type (dependent variable) recoded differently. The values were recoded (1 to 5) from least to most serious in the following order: discharge recommended, discharge expiration, AWOL, technical violation, new misdemeanor, and new felony. The termination type categories "other negative", "other positive", and "transfers" were not used in this analysis.

Two factors must be considered during the interpretation of these results. First, data are not still available in a representative magnitude, especially in Area I. Of all 1,168 cases, negative outcomes are only 14.9% in Area I and 26.5% in Area II. There were no data for AWOL's and new misdemeanors in Area I, and only 10 cases (2.7%) for technical violation. With these data the changes made in termination type do not affect a large percentage of the cases studied. Second, the data base does not show if a technical violator has been revoked or resumed. All cases are treated as an official violation although approximately one-third are actually REVOKED (the refined data base should have this problem resolved).

State-wide, there were 241 cases who had an "A" form completed and terminated. 230 were from Area II while only 11 were from Area I. With termtype coded in this manner, the A risk items explained 13.3% of the variance, as opposed to 11% in the previous analysis. All variables explained a similar amount of variance independently. Age at first conviction's R2 decreased from .043 to .033 to mark the largest change. The agent's impression of client attitudes item explained 7% of the variance and was thus entered first in the stepwise analysis. Employment, entered 3rd in the previous analysis, entered 5th (after the alcohol and offense items) to bring the multiple R2 to .128.

On the "A needs", the "agent's impression of client needs" item explained 8% of the variance present in termtype (an increase from 5%). Living arrangements, entered 7th previously, entered next, bringing the R2 to .09. The academic/vocational item added .4%. Interestingly, and not surprisingly from a theoretical viewpoint, psycho-sexual adjustment entered 4th (it entered last previously), bringing the R2 to .10. (Psycho-sexual adjustment seems best accounted for by the few high needs cases downstate who failed on supervision.) The remaining 4 variables increased the R2 only to .108 and thus contributed little beyond that of the first 4 variables.

For the state-wide B risk scale, some changes from the previous analysis were apparent. All 12 items explained 1.5% more variance with the newly recoded termination type. The independent R2 for prior revocations explained 4.0% of the variance whereas it had explained 2.9% previously. All items, except for the employment, address changes, and interpersonal problem items had R2's similar or higher in the second analysis. The compliance with the parole agreement, social interaction, and employment items entered the stepwise procedure to explain 30% of
the variance in termination type. Address changes, personal problems, and
use of community resources variables had slightly less predictive
power in the second analysis when all item intercorrelations were taken
into effect.

Finally, on the B needs scale, all items explained 25.4% of the variance
in termination type (as opposed to 24% previously). As on the A needs
scale, the living arrangement item had less predictive power
independently on the B needs (R² = .035 as opposed to R² = .044). Psycho-sexual adjustment remained a poor predictor (as was not the case
on the A). The independent predictive power of the "agent's impression
of client needs" increased from .230 to .245 (R²). This item entered
first, again, on the stepwise analysis, while the alcohol abuse and
academic/vocational items remained the best predictors. This analysis
had living arrangements entered 3rd when all item intercorrelations were
accounted for.

Thus, by recoding termination type, making AWOL's less serious and
new misdemeanor convictions more serious (and removing other
terminations and transfers), most A and B risk and needs items had
more predictive power. The order of the items' contributions in the
stepwise analysis was somewhat altered, but the scales demonstrated
slightly more predictive power. (A recommended next step is to remove
the least powerful predictors from the regression analysis to create an
"administrative" scale.)

When separate analyses were conducted for Area I and Area II cases,
more differences from the first analysis were noted. Because 230 of the
241 (95%) cases with A forms were from Area II, these results were
similar to those from the total cases. However, those cases with B's
could be studied separately.

In Area I, 23 cases were removed when other terminations and transfers
were selected out of the analysis; 299 cases were analyzed. Previously
the B risk items explained 25.0% of the variance in termination type; this
analysis showed all 12 items to explain 27.5% of the variance. Some
major changes were seen in the independent R²'s of the items; i.e., all
increased except for the address changes item (which decreased from
.019 to .012) and the offense item (which remained at .031). The R²
for the prior revocations variable increased notably from .021 to .031.

The "compliance with the parole agreement" variable (R² = .21) entered
first in the stepwise regression analysis while the employment item
entered second in both analyses. The social interaction and use of
community resources items entered 3rd and 4th (in reverse order from
the previous run). The offense variable increased the R² to .265. As
was the case before, address changes, prior felony convictions, age at
first conviction and prior revocations added little to the predictability
of termination type for the B risk scale in Area I.

There were 541 cases in Area II which had a B form completed before
terminating in the 6 manners studied in this analysis (a drop from 601 in
the previous analysis—mostly due to the removal of other positive
terminations). As was the case in Area I, the independent R²'s
increased in the second analysis despite a smaller sample size (except for
the employment and interpersonal problems items). However, the multiple
R² did not increase by even 1% over the previous analysis (the
compliance with the parole agreement, social interactions, prior felony
convictions, and employment items entered the stepwise analysis in that
order, all of these items explained 33.4% of the variance in termination
type. Prior revocations entered 5th in the second analysis while it had
entered 10th previously. The interpersonal problem, alcohol abuse,
address changes, and offense items added little to the predictability of
termination type in Area II. Thus, there seem to be definite differences
in the predictive power of the B risk items between Area I and Area II.

The prior felony conviction and revocation items were better predictors
in Area I, while interpersonal problems and offense items were better
predictors in Area II.

For the B needs items in Area I, only the "agent's impression of client
needs" item was a powerful predictor of termination type. Only alcohol
abuse, academic/vocational and the impression items R²'s increased in the
second analysis (.030, .035, and .189 respectively). No other item
explained over 1.4% of the variance in termination type. All items
explained 23.2% of the variance in termination type in the second
analysis, an increase from 20% previously. The agent's impression of
client needs, living arrangements, and mental ability items entered the
stepwise procedure in that order, alone explaining 22.5% of the variance.
Academic/vocational needs entered 4th (it had entered second last
previously). As before, psycho-sexual adjustment, basic human needs
and substance abuse added little to the predictability of termination
type in Area I for the B needs scale.

In Area II the independent R²'s for all items except for the agent's
impression of client needs (an increase from .252 to .282) and substance
abuse (a steady .068) decreased in the second analysis. (There were 40
fewer cases.) In addition, the psycho-sexual adjustment item showed
some predictability in Area II; it entered 4th in the stepwise procedure
(behind the agent's impression, substance abuse, and academic/vocational
items), increasing the R² to .273. The remaining items added little to the
predictability in Area II. All items explained 27.5% of the variance
(they had explained 26.7% previously).

In conclusion, the recoding of termination type, adding seriousness to
new misdemeanor convictions and less to AWOL, and the removal of other
terminations and transfers, changed results of the regression analysis
for both Area I and Area II. For the B risk scale, independent R²'s
generally increased after the second run. Different predictors were
useful for each area, which led to the conclusion that scales for each
jurisdiction might be created and tested separately. R²'s decreased from
the first analysis for the B needs scale in Area I, while they increased
in Area II. Area differences appeared especially for the psycho-sexual
adjustment item.
Since project staff feels these recodes of termination type are more realistic, they will be used together with others which weight "technical" in future analyses. The next step of including only those items which show some predictive power should remove intercorrelations with less powerful predictors.

As a result of findings from the Adult Institution Classification Validation efforts showing technical violations as having a strong correlation with serious misconduct histories in institutions, a second recoding of termination type/analysis was conducted.

In this second recoding it was hypothesized that a technical violator was more serious than an AWOL or a new misdemeanor conviction. The assumption was made based on institutional intake frequencies. Few AWOL's and parolees convicted of a new misdemeanor are returned to the institution; however, the figures for those returned for technical violations are similar to those for first admissions; i.e., they are a high percentage of the total number of admissions.

Analyses were made in reference to 3 research questions from the original "Research Strategy":

1b. Do the supervision (risk) level and needs level adequately indicate risk and service requirements of the releasees as reflected by termination type (successful, unsuccessful, and highly unsuccessful)?

The newer unsuccessful category consisted of new misdemeanor convictions, AWOL's, and other negative terminations while the revised highly unsuccessful category contained new felony convictions and technical violations. The successful category retained the 3 positive termination types.

These outcome categories were crosstabbed with risk, needs, casework, and final levels for each A and B instrument. Separate results were obtained for Area I and Area II as well as for all the appropriate cases state-wide.

The first analysis addressed the association between scale and casework levels and termination type. Since the frequencies for the successful category were not affected, the releasees classified as low or medium who moved from the highly unsuccessful category to the unsuccessful column and those classified as high and moved up in seriousness were of importance to note; thus, the Tau, Gamma, and Eta statistics should not have altered greatly while the misclassification percentage should not have changed at all.

For the 278 statewide cases who were evaluated with an A instrument, some changes were observed. Thirteen of the 100 negative high cases moved to the highly unsuccessful category from the unsuccessful category on the risk scale. The same held true for the casework and final levels. On the other hand, more highly unsuccessful lows were identified.

For the 877 cases with a B instrument, small improvements were seen. On the risk scale 12 high cases and 12 mediums moved from the unsuccessful to highly unsuccessful category. On the needs scale, more mediums and fewer lows were in the highest outcome category while only 1 high case was affected. Thus, the medium cases were seriously affected, and high and low cases changed for the better. (The statistics for both instruments were unchanged.)

No significant changes could be noted for the 13 Area I cases with an A. For the B instrument, less than 1% of the 304 cases was affected. The lack of data in Area I would not allow for a more complete analysis.

In Area II, results for the A scales were similar to those for the total cases. For the B risk scale 10 additional high cases were included in the technical violation/new felony category while 9 mediums were also added. A negative effect was seen on the needs scale. Twelve lows and 6 mediums were moved to the highly unsuccessful level. No high cases were affected. After the override was used one medium case moved downward while one high case moved to the highly unsuccessful category.

Two stepwise regression analyses were conducted to address the research questions:

1. How well do the items of each scale indicate eventual supervision success or failure?
2. Is there information outside the scale items that indicate success or failure on supervision; i.e., do release characteristics (age at termination, sex, and race) affect success?
3. How well do the items of each scale indicate eventual supervision success or failure?
4. Is there information outside the scale items that indicate success or failure on supervision; i.e., do release characteristics (age at termination, sex, and race) affect success?

The values of the dependent variable were recoded (1-6) from least to most serious at the ordinal level as follows: discharges recommended, AWOL, new misdemeanor, technical violation, and new felony. The three remaining outcomes were again excluded.

Results were varied between analyses, enough to further examine the association between outcome and the scales. A stepwise regression analysis was utilized to test the contribution of the items and released characteristics to supervision success and failure.

For the 241 cases with an A form completed, the independent R2's of the items did in fact increase slightly when termination type was recoded with technical violations being more serious than new misdemeanor convictions. Only alcohol abuse, address changes and the offense variables' R2's decreased. All items explained 13.3% of the variance in termination type (as opposed to 13.3% previously).
that age at first conviction entered before the use of community resources item and had slightly more predictive power. All items explained 34.9% of the variance. The compliance with the parole agreement, social interaction, employment, and previous revocation items remained the best and significant predictors. In this analysis prior felony convictions was a better predictor than before, although it was not significant.

On the B needs scale no changes were seen. The agent's impression of client needs and substance abuse items were the only significant predictors. Less than 1% of additional variance was explained when termination type was recoded.

In Area I, the 11 cases with A's were not examined. For the 259 Cook County releases with a reevaluation, no differences were seen on the risk scale. All items explained 27.56% of the variance in termination type. The compliance with the parole agreement, employment, social interaction, and use of community resources items explained 26% by themselves and were the only significant predictors.

The multiple R² for the B needs items decreased from .23 to .228. The client needs and living arrangement items explained 21.7% of the variance by themselves and were significant.

Area I results cannot be interpreted too finely; until more cases come into the base from Area I, no conclusions can be drawn.

In Area II, results for the A instruments were the same as for those of all the cases. There were 541 Area II cases with a B instrument completed before termination. Less than 1% additional variance was explained by the B risk items. The only change worth mentioning is that age at first conviction entered before the use of community resources item and had slightly more predictive power. All items explained 34.9% of the variance. The same held true for the needs scale. 3% more variance was accounted for while client needs, substance abuse, and academic/vocational items remained significant predictors.

Despite the fact that most cases were from Area II and 1.7% of all terminations were for new misdemeanors (none in Area I), the recoding of termination type in this manner was supported, more so on the initial evaluation, than on the reevaluation instruments. Although none of the selected demographic characteristics was a better predictor than before, for the 25% of the variance accounted for, (Termination type should be further examined for both Area I and Area II using this recoding scheme.)

Next, the contribution of age, sex and race, both independently and with the scale items, was examined. (State-wide, the population of terminated cases was 54% White, 43% Black and 2.7% Hispanic while it was nearly 95% male. The mean age was 28.8 years and ranged from 19 to 73.) For the A instrument no significant changes occurred. The independent R²'s for sex and race continued to be below .001 while age remained a significant predictor when used with the needs scale items. Age also remained a significant predictor on both the B risk and needs scales, while sex continued to be a better predictor than race.

In Area I the population was 70% Black with an average age of 30.2. For the B instrument scales, age and race were significant predictors along with the compliance, employment, social interaction and use of community resources items on the risk assessment and the impression of needs and living arrangement items on the needs scale.

In Area II the population was 68% White and averaged 28.2 years of age. On the A scale results were the same as those for all cases. Race did explain 3% of the variance in termination type while age contributed 2.6% independently. Race had slightly less predictive power when included with the risk items but remained a significant predictor (along with age and client needs impressions) with the needs scale.

There were no major differences between the methods of measurement for the outcome items when they were regressed against demographic variables. Generally these characteristics proved poor predictors of outcome although they did hold more potential than some of the scale items.
PREDICTIVE ASSESSMENT OF COMBINED INSTRUMENTS

The risk and needs scales held some predictive power when used independently. Little additional variance was accounted for when releasee characteristics were included in the regression models. The A and B, risk and needs scales were combined to note the predictive power of the instruments when used in conjunction with each other.

At this point, the B risk scale had the best predictive power. The 12 items accounted for 31.4% of the variance explained in termination type. The B needs items explained 25.4% of the variance. A risk and needs items accounted for 13.3% and 10% of the variance respectively.

For the 6 possible dual combinations, as in the preliminary validation, the B risk and A needs scales held the greatest predictive potential when combined. 48.2% of the variance was explained by all the items. Compliance with the parole agreement and social interaction (both needs) and the substance abuse (risk) items were the only significant variables. The employment and agent's impressions of client needs items entered second and third (after the compliance item) but did not retain a significant F-ratio.

The opposite combination (A risk and B needs) also demonstrated greater predictability than the separate instruments. Interestingly, seven items (six of them from the B needs) were significant where earlier only three items had been significant. Three B needs items (academic/vocational, psycho-sexual adjustment and mental ability) became significant when combined with A risk items. The only significant A risk item was age at first conviction. The agent's impression of client attitude item accounted for 1% additional variance but was not significant.

The combinations of the similar scales for both the initial and reevaluation instruments had only slightly less predictive power. The two risk scales combined to explain 46% of the variance in the outcome variable. Both prior felony conviction items had significant F-values while the compliance with the parole agreement and employment items from the B were also significant. All other items, except for the age at first conviction from the A and social interactions from the B added little to the predictability of outcome.

Separately, the two needs scales failed to account for more than 25% of the variance; together, they accounted for 44.7%. Five of the six significant items (agent's impression of needs, academic/vocational, living arrangements, alcohol or drug abuse and psycho-sexual adjustment) were from the reevaluation scale while substance abuse was the only significant predictor from the initial evaluation scale. These items, along with the emotional stability variable from the A, alone explained 42.2% of the variance.

The combinations of risk and needs scales for similar instruments produced the least powerful results. The combination of the risk and needs scales from the A explained only 17% of the outcome variance. Only the attitude and age at first conviction items were significant.
The A risk was combined with the B needs and the B risk was used in conjunction with the A needs scale to examine how the false negative and false positive cases were identified. The risk and needs levels were entered into the matrix calculation in the same manner as in the interinstrument formula. The levels were cross-tabulated with successful and unsuccessful outcomes.

Three points must be made here. First, the risk scale still guides the calculation of the score-based casework level; therefore, only in the situation where a releasee is scored high on the needs and low on the risk scales will the needs level be taken into effect. Second, because the agents did not participate in this analysis, the override function could not be used; the casework level was represented by the matrix calculation only. Third, only those who were evaluated with both an initial and reevaluation were included in the interinstrument calculations. Thus, there was a variation in sample sizes. The cell percentages were examined; since the summary statistics can be affected by sample size, their contribution was minimal. (However, the two interinstrument sample sizes were equal and statistics could be compared.) Total, Area I, and Area II results were calculated.

For all cases, the B risk and A needs unity identified the lowest percentage of false positives (5.4% of all lows). Although the B risk-B needs combination identified 16 fewer unsuccessful lows, it recognized 2% more successful highs. The B risk-A needs matchup misidentified only 18 of 169 releasees. The A risk-B needs combination misclassified 61% of their high releasees. In addition, despite the small N, the B risk-A needs statistics were highest. Again, support was generated for the B risk-A needs scales to aid in the prediction of outcome.

Since only one Area I releasee received both an initial and reevaluation (a successful medium), area comparisons would have been misleading. Area II results were similar to those for all cases.

Throughout the various analyses, the B risk instrument seemed to provide the most useful predictive potential. It had almost equal power in identifying misclassified releasees when used with both needs instruments. However, when termination type was regressed against the instruments' joined items, the B risk-A needs items combination explained nearly 50% of the variance, much more than the B risk-B needs matchup (34%). Joining the various instruments did contribute to the predictive accuracy of the scales. (The B risk-A needs combination needs to be examined further.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Total Number of Cases</th>
<th>Number of Successful</th>
<th>Percentage of Successful</th>
<th>Number of Successful</th>
<th>Percentage of Successful</th>
<th>Number of Unsuccessful</th>
<th>Percentage of Unsuccessful</th>
<th>Number of Unsuccessful</th>
<th>Percentage of Unsuccessful</th>
<th>Predictive Accuracy Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area I</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area II</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area I</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area II</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Final</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>102.0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area I</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area II</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area I</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area II</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area I</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area II</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Final</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area I</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area II</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>62.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Predictive Accuracy Percentage was calculated by dividing the number of Successful Lows and Unsuccessful Highs by the total number of low and high cases.
### TABLE 1-B
PERCENTAGE OF CORRECT PREDICTIONS: COMBINED INSTRUMENTS BY OUTCOME**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combined Instrument Area</th>
<th>Total Number of Cases</th>
<th>Number of Successful Low</th>
<th>Number of Successful Medium</th>
<th>Number of Successful High</th>
<th>Number of Unsuccessful Low</th>
<th>Number of Unsuccessful Medium</th>
<th>Number of Unsuccessful High</th>
<th>Predictive Accuracy Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Risk - Total</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Needs - Area I</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Needs - Area II</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Need - Total</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Need - Area I</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Need - Area II</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Risk - Total</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Needs - Area I</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Needs - Area II</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Need - Total</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Need - Area I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Need - Area II</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Predictive Accuracy Percentage was calculated by dividing the number of Successful Lows and Unsuccessful Highs by the total number of low and high cases.

** Tau, Gamma and Eta statistics were also calculated. These statistics were highest for the B Risk - A Needs combination of instruments. (Tau = .57; Gamma = .89; Eta = .60)
or a felony conviction. When the initial and reevaluation instruments were used separately, the level of classification did not differentiate between the least and most serious negative outcomes. On the other hand, most releases classified lower on the scales were recommended for discharge while more high releases went through their entire term before exiting the system. Thus, the instruments clearly determine successful outcome; although they do not currently make fine distinctions among more serious violators. (See Table I-B.) However, the lack of data for the A instrument and AWOL's and new misdemeanor convictions in Area I obstructs the determination of real predictive accuracy at this point.

When the A risk scale was combined with the B needs (N=169), results were similar to those of the individual instruments. There were few unsuccessful lows (1) and mediums (2) but most of the accurately classified highs violated parole guidance or were convicted of a felony. Sixty-five percent of the lows, mediums, and highs alike who terminated successfully were discharged from supervision via expiration of sentence.

The hypothesis that the B risk-A needs combination provides the most predictive accuracy was supported further in this more precise analysis. Approximately 75% of the negatively terminated mediums and highs were for the more serious violations. Conversely, there were two misrepresented lows, both having less serious outcomes (one AWOL; the other, a misdemeanor). Results were also impressive for those successful cases. A larger percentage of lows was recommended for discharge than were percentages of mediums and highs. With other positive terminations removed, 41% of the lows and 15% of the mediums were recommended for discharge. Moreover, none of the eight highs was recommended for discharge.

Again, prediction of outcome for the combination of the B risk and A needs scales was more accurate than those projections made from the scales individually. Few highs and mediums were recommended for early release. All releases who were recommended and received an early discharge were classified as low or medium in Area I at the other end of the continuum, the more serious violators were classified high, while no low rated releases committed the more serious offenses. With this scale combination, the releases classified at the low end of the scale were usually successful, many being recommended for early discharge. All of the serious violators were rated as either medium or high on the B risk A-needs combination.

Thus, if predictions for recommendations for early discharge are to be made and those releases with the most potential to commit the more serious offenses are to be identified, the B risk-A needs combination should provide a more accurate projection. This combination has already provided few mispredictions at both ends of the scale. It has demonstrated that the offenders with the greatest potential for committing the least serious and most serious offenses can be identified in most cases. Prisoner Review Board members could find these instruments for recommending low or medium classified releases for discharge and for testing results of such use.

In Area I for both the initial and the reevaluation scales, results were similar to the previous analysis. Age, of course, correlated negatively (R2 = .16), while correlation coefficients for sex and race were less than .01. On the A risk scale, these 3 variables explained 1.8% additional variance beyond that of the items. On the A needs scale, they increased the multiple R2 by 2%, with age and sex entering the stepwise procedure 2nd and 4th respectively. For the B risk scale in Area I, age and race were better predictors than sex. Age and race entered 4th and 6th respectively during the stepwise procedure. They explained 1% more variance beyond that of the 12 risk items (R2 = .35). For the B needs scale in Area I, the demographic variables explained 2% additional variance beyond that accounted for by the B risk items in Area I. The same held true for the B needs scale in Area I. Thus, in Area I, knowledge of race and age added a bit in the prediction of termination type. More importantly, all demographic variables entered earlier in the stepwise procedure than the last five B needs items.

In Area II for both the initial and the reevaluation scales, results were similar to the previous analysis. Age, of course, correlated negatively (R2 = .18), while correlation coefficients for sex and race were less than .01. On the A risk scale, these 3 variables explained 1.5% additional variance beyond that of the items. On the A needs scale, they increased the multiple R2 by 2%, with age and sex entering the stepwise procedure 2nd and 4th respectively. For the B risk scale in Area II, age and race were better predictors than sex. Age and race entered 4th and 6th respectively during the stepwise procedure. They explained 1% more variance beyond that of the 12 risk items (R2 = .35). For the B needs scale in Area II, the demographic variables added 1.5% additional variance to the items (R2 = .29). Age and race entered 2nd and 3rd while sex entered last. Age and race entered 2nd and 3rd while sex entered last. When included with needs items and risk items on the B scales for Area II.
SUMMARY

In summary, demographic information, especially age, as confirmed by other studies, can be of some assistance to the items predicting parole outcome. (These variables should be included with future "best predictors" analyses, with poor predictors removed, to note their contribution relative to "good" variables.) The items listed in Table II would seem to be useful predictors for each scale in each area. Only a few of the items were significant predictors (p < .05 level); these are preceded by an *. (An F-value of at least 2.9 is needed; these were the only items to meet that criterion.) Table I shows relationships between instruments and outcomes, and combinations of instruments and outcomes.

From various attempts at finding predictors of parole outcome using regression analysis, it can be concluded that most of the scale items by themselves are not good predictors. The items which were significant at the .10 level explained less than 30% of the variance in all cases. Knowledge of age and race added somewhat to the prediction of outcome; the reevaluation instrument items were better predictors than those of the initial evaluation instrument. No more than 34% accuracy was determined for the scales when used individually.

The combination of the B risk and A needs scales provided the most accurate predictions after all individual and combinations of instruments were studied. Few cases were misclassified, especially at the low end of the scale where predictions of success for those who fail would be of great harm to public safety.

Results indicated that the best way to order termination type on a least serious to most serious continuum would be: discharge by recommendation; discharge by expiration of sentence; AWOL; new misdemeanor conviction; technical violation and new felony conviction. Predictive accuracy is most improved with this arrangement (state-wide).

Recommended at this point is continued examination of the reevaluation instrument and the B risk-A needs combination for further predictive accuracy. However, the various instruments should continue to be utilized so that agents can become familiar with their releasees immediately following release, obtaining information concerning their prior criminal activities, social and environmental problems, living arrangements and needs, and emotional problems. The B needs instrument should be examined so that the agent can identify and monitor the specific service needs required by each releasee. The needs instruments were not designed to predict. The use of the instruments for their various purposes also needs closer examination.

A profile of the very few (2%) unsuccessful low releasees indicated that most were originally convicted of burglary or robbery. (See Appendix A.) Each had some needs problem such as mental or drug difficulties.
Additional analysis should be done of those releasees convicted of serious property crimes who are classified as low risk, as well as on sex-related cases. The problem with these cases in regard to classification may be in part a function of statutory definitions of Class X, Class 1, and Class 2, as with the Institutional Classification Study, such cases seem especially problematic both in terms of assessment and in returns to the system (e.g., preliminary results suggest that Class 1 should be inclusive of many current Class 2 cases).

The next series of analyses should add and utilize both length under supervision and commitment-free 3-year period prior to current offense to see their effect on parole outcome. At this point, instrument items alone cannot be used confidently to predict supervision outcome, despite the fact that B risk levels, especially in Area II, seem to predict with close to 90% accuracy when only misclassified highs and lows are taken into account.

### TABLE II

**VARIABLES SELECTED FROM THE ORIGINAL STEPWISE PROCEDURE**

**(In Order of Selection in Stepwise Analysis)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE-WIDE</th>
<th>AREA I</th>
<th>AREA II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A RISK INSTRUMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Attitude</em></td>
<td><em>Age at First Conviction</em></td>
<td><em>Attitude</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Age at First Conviction</em></td>
<td>Alcohol Abuse</td>
<td><em>Age at First Conviction</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Abuse</td>
<td>Record of Offenses</td>
<td>Alcohol Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record of Offenses</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Record of Offenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Felony Convictions</td>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felony Convictions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Felony Convictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A NEEDS INSTRUMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Impression of Client Needs</em></td>
<td><em>Impression of Client Needs</em></td>
<td><em>Impression of Client Needs</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Arrangements</td>
<td>Living Arrangements</td>
<td>Living Arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic/Vocational</td>
<td>Academic/Vocational</td>
<td>Academic/Vocational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psycho-Sexual</td>
<td>Psycho-Sexual</td>
<td>Psycho-Sexual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B RISK INSTRUMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Parole Agreement</em></td>
<td><em>Parole Agreement</em></td>
<td><em>Parole Agreement</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Social Interaction</em></td>
<td><em>Social Interaction</em></td>
<td><em>Social Interaction</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Employment</em></td>
<td><em>Employment</em></td>
<td><em>Employment</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Prior Revocations</em></td>
<td><em>Prior Revocations</em></td>
<td><em>Prior Revocations</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at First Conviction</td>
<td>Interpersonal Problems</td>
<td>Use of Community Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felony Convictions</td>
<td>Alcohol Abuse</td>
<td>Age at First Conviction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B NEEDS INSTRUMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Impression of Client Needs</em></td>
<td><em>Impression of Client Needs</em></td>
<td><em>Impression of Client Needs</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Living Arrangements</em></td>
<td><em>Living Arrangements</em></td>
<td><em>Living Arrangements</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic/Vocational</td>
<td>Academic/Vocational</td>
<td>Academic/Vocational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Ability</td>
<td>Psycho-Sexual</td>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic/Vocational</td>
<td>Basic Needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant Predictors at .10 level.*
APPENDIX A

LOW UNSUCCESSFUL PROFILE

Of the 837 releasees who had a "B" series evaluation completed before terminating either successfully or unsuccessfully, there were 13 (2%) who were classified as low on the scorebased casework level but unsuccessfully completed parole. These cases were profiled so that similarities among these releasees could be specified.

Three were released from a maximum institution and 1 was "out of state" (Indiana). Six releasees were on a Correctional Parole Counselor III's caseload at termination. Six releasees committed the original offense in Cook County and six in downstate counties. Six lived in Cook County while on supervision, whereas seven lived downstate. 11 were sentenced later than 1977; one in 1973; and one in 1975. All were sentenced for terms over three years, while two had sentences of over ten years.

A major finding appeared when the type of committing offense was examined. Six of the 13 were convicted of burglary (Class 2), four for armed robbery (Class X), one for robbery (Class 2), and one for rape-deviate sexual assault (Class X). Thus, 12 were convicted of serious property and/or assaultive crimes. The other served for a Class 3 controlled substance violation. Six had two-year supervision terms, and six had three-year terms. All were male; seven were White; six were Black. Eight were 25 or younger; one was 48 years old. Of the 13, nine were returned for a new felony; one for AWOL; one, technical violation; one, new misdemeanor; and one, other negative termination.

Only two releasees had an A (initial evaluation) completed and were classified as medium on that instrument. Thus, 11 had been released for over 30 days before they were first evaluated. For the B (reevaluation) risk instrument, item responses were generally low; however, every releasee had at least one non-zero score. Eight had at least one prior felony conviction, while only one had one or more prior revocations. Eleven were 23 or younger (only three were 19 or younger) at first conviction. One was recorded as having a moderate alcohol problem, and one as having a moderate substance abuse problem. Only three were currently employed under 40% of the time. Six had had one address change in the last 12 months, while the other seven had not moved. Only one was listed under "personal problems" and one as interacting with "delinquent" groups. Ten utilized, but were not recorded as needing, community resources. Ten had theft-related conviction records.

The B (Form CB) needs items responses were also low. Only two had living arrangement problems, while one needed some assistance with a mental problem. One was listed as having a moderate alcohol or drug problem, while four needed some academic or vocational assistance. Although all had a low needs level, four agents thought their releasee needed medium casework service. One override was used bringing a
case classified as low to the medium category; thus, one agent recognized a problem with an unsuccessful case and corrected it.

In conclusion, a noteworthy finding among these misclassified unsuccessful cases is that 92% were originally sentenced for a serious property and/or assaultive crime. At least one supervision and/or needs problem was identified for each case, but not so sufficiently as to put the cases in a higher classification level.

APPENDIX B

CASE CLASSIFICATION INSTRUMENTS

A - Initial Risk Assessment Instrument
AC - Initial Needs Assessment Instrument
B - Reevaluation Risk Assessment Instrument
BC - Reevaluation Needs Assessment Instrument
D - Casework Level Assignment Instrument
Case Action - Case Tracking Data Collection Instrument
**Community Supervision Management System**

**INITIAL SUPERVISION LEVEL EVALUATION**

**IDENTIFICATION:**
- Parole Office:
- Release Name: [Print]
- Agent Name: [Print]
- Release Number: [Print]
- Institution: [Print]
- Releasement Date: [Print]
- Agent Number: [Print]

**EVALUATION:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Total number of prior felony convictions and juvenile adjudications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. None ........................................................................... Enter 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. One ............................................................................ Enter 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Two or more ................................................................ Enter 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Total number of prior periods of probation/release supervision (Adult &amp; Juvenile)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. None ........................................................................... Enter 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. One or more .................................................................... Enter 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Total Number of Prior Probation/Release Revocations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. None ........................................................................... Enter 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. One or more ................................................................ Enter 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. Age at first conviction or adjudication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. 24 years or more ................................ Enter 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 20-23 years ............................................ Enter 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 19 years or less ...................................... Enter 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. History of Alcohol Abuse (prior to incarceration)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. No history of abuse ..................................... Enter 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Occasional abuse ........................................ Enter 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Frequent abuse ............................................ Enter 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F. History of Other Substance Abuse (prior to incarceration)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. No history of abuse ............................................. Enter 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Occasional abuse ................................................. Enter 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Frequent abuse .................................................... Enter 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G. Percent of Time employed in 12 months prior to incarceration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Base estimate on 40 hours/week for full year = 100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. 60% or more ................................................................ Enter 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 40-59% .................................................................... Enter 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Under 40% ................................................................ Enter 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Unemployable and/or supported by other means .............. Enter 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H. Number of address changes in year prior to incarceration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. None ....................................................................... Enter 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. One ....................................................................... Enter 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Two or more ................................................................ Enter 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Agent's Subjective Appraisal of Client's Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Sincere desire to behave responsibly ................ Enter 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Dependant or irresponsible ............................. Enter 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. No indication of motivation to behave responsibly .... Enter 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J. Record of convictions or Adjudication for Selected Offenses (including current offense)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. None of the above ................................. Enter 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Burglary, Theft, Auto Theft, Robbery .......................... Enter 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Forgery, Deceptive Practices ................... Add 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Assaultive Offense ................................. Add 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL SCORE**

**SUPERVISION LEVEL:**
- HIGH (15+)
- MEDIUM (8-14)
- LOW (0-7)

*Preceding page blank*
**DETOC (Print)**

**IDENITIFICATION:** (Print)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Picture No.</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Parole No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RELEASE DATE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EVALUATION:**

- **A.** Basic Human Needs
  - Adequate food, shelter, clothing for clean and presentable appearance
  - Appropriate toiletries
  - Hair cut
  - Medications
  - Personal hygiene

- **B.** Living Arrangements
  - Stable supportive relationships with family or others in living group
  - Ability to live independently within existing household
  - Social support
  - Good sense of accomplishment
  - Mental capacity
  - Lack of problem behavior

- **C.** Commodity Stability (Health)
  - No symptoms of any physical medical or behavioral problems
  - Symptoms of physical or mental illness
  - Treatment and/or medication

- **D.** Mental Health (Present)
  - Able to function independently
  - Adequate emotional adjustment
  - Good judgment
  - Mental capacity

- **E.** Physical-Sexual Adjustment
  - No physical defects
  - No evidence of violence
  - No evidence of physical or verbal coercion

- **F.** Substance Abuse (Housed or Unhoused)
  - Close supervision
  - Substance abuse
  - Withdrawal symptoms

- **G.** Academic and/or Vocational
  - Released from school
  - Aims of vocational rehabilitation
  - Work-placed or in school
  - Employment
  - School
  - Retraining

- **H.** Agent's Impression of Client's Needs
  - Low social or service need
  - High social or service need

**TOTAL SCORE:**

**NEEDS LEVEL:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**SUPERVISION LEVEL:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parole Office</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EVALUATION:**

- **A.** Total number of non-fatal convictions and juvenile adjudications
  - Enter 0

- **B.** Total number of prior probation
  - Enter 0

- **C.** Age at first conviction or adjudication
  - Enter 0

- **D.** Current Alcohol Abuse
  - Enter 0

- **E.** Other Substance Abuse
  - Enter 0

- **F.** Percent of Time Employed in Training or in School
  - Enter 0

- **G.** Number of Address Changes in Past 12 Months
  - Enter 0

- **H.** Interpersonal Problems in Current Living Situation
  - Enter 0

- **I.** Social Interests
  - Enter 0

- **J.** Compliance with Conditions of Parole (Relate to Limitations of Parole)
  - Enter 0

- **K.** Use of Community Resources
  - Enter 0

- **L.** Record of Conviction or Adjudication for Selected Offense
  - Enter 0

**TOTAL SCORE:**

**SUPERVISION LEVEL:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**SUPERVISION LEVEL:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parole Office</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IDENTIFICATION:</strong></td>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EVALUATION:**

- **A. Basic Personal Needs**
  - Adequate food, shelter & clothing for client & dependents
  - Able to meet basic self-care needs
  - Strong problem-solving skills & effective coping strategies

- **B. Living Arrangements**
  - Stable & supportive relationships with family or others
  - Able to maintain residence
  - Adequate access to necessary treatment

- **C. Emotional Stability/Health**
  - No symptoms of emotional instability
  - Expresses emotions appropriately

- **D. Mental Health/Psychiatric**
  - Ability to understand & manage mental health issues
  - Ability to maintain medication regimen

- **E. Physical Health**
  - No serious or chronic health problems

- **F. Substance Abuse**
  - In treatment for substance abuse issues
  - No current problems with substance abuse

- **G. Academic/Skilled Vocational**
  - Able to maintain employment or skilled vocational training
  - Able to maintain a learning environment

- **H. Agent's Opinion of Client's Needs**
  - Low risk social service needs
  - Moderate risk treatment goals

**SCORE: 48**

**NEEDS LEVEL:**

- High (25-54)
- Medium (13-24)
- Low (0-12)

**CASEWORK LEVEL ASSIGNMENT:**

- Score-Based: High 3, Medium 2, Low 1
- Override Explanation: _______________________

**FINAL CASEWORK LEVEL:**

- High 3, Medium 2, Low 1

**APPROVED:**

[Signature]
**CASE ACTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Release Name</th>
<th>Aged Name</th>
<th>Aged Name</th>
<th>Aged Name</th>
<th>Aged Name</th>
<th>Aged Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Release Number</th>
<th>Aged Number</th>
<th>Aged Number</th>
<th>Aged Number</th>
<th>Aged Number</th>
<th>Aged Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arrest Date: (Day)</th>
<th>(Month)</th>
<th>(Year)</th>
<th>Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. ENTER:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Birth: (Day)</th>
<th>(Month)</th>
<th>(Year)</th>
<th>Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>All Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Arrest:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence Date: (Day)</th>
<th>(Month)</th>
<th>(Year)</th>
<th>Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. TERMINATE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Termination Date: (Day)</th>
<th>(Month)</th>
<th>(Year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Out of State</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**(Revised 03/82)**

---

**Case Action-1**