

112122

CR-Sent
10-11-88

112122

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

112122

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

Suffolk County Department
of Probation

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

FIFTEEN MONTH PLANNING AND EVALUATION
REPORT OF THE 'SPECIAL OFFENDER PROGRAM'
(SOP) IN SUFFOLK COUNTY:

Preliminary Statistical Results

January, 1988

Patrick G. Halpin
County Executive

Suffolk County Department of Probation

Edward N. Draffin, Director
Frank D. Bossert, MSW, Deputy Director
Vincent J. Iaria, MPA, MSW, CSW
Project Director
Carol F. Newman, Ph.D., Clinical
Psychologist

Prepared by: William A. Stewart
Senior Program Examiner

James J. Golbin
Chief Planner

NCJRS

JUL 6 1988

ACQUISITIONS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| I. Introduction | 1 |
| II. Preliminary Findings | 2 |
| III. Program Rationale, Objectives & Design | 4 |
| IV. Profile of the Special Offender Population | 6 |
| V. Research Methods & Evaluation Design | 15 |
| VI. Results | 16 |
| 1. Rearrest Criminal Recidivism | 16 |
| 2. Probation Compliance Record | 16 |
| VII. Analysis & Conclusion | 23 |
| References | 24 |
| Appendix | 25 |

I. INTRODUCTION:

The Suffolk County Department of Probation's 'Special Offender Program' (SOP) is a multidisciplinary, community corrections program designed to provide an appropriate dispositional response to a population of sex offenders, offenders exhibiting major mental illness and/or developmentally disabled offenders. These offender groups present special problems for traditional probation supervision.

The major purpose of this program is to develop an effective strategy to reduce recidivism with those at-risk criminal offenders that could directly benefit from appropriate therapeutic intervention. The protection of the community is a critical concern of this program and one specific objective of this approach is to significantly reduce the number of subsequent victims.

The overall program design is a cooperative, interagency model that can best be described as an accountable, intensive special supervision approach¹ which is modelled after Suffolk Probation's 'Probation Alcohol Treatment' (PAT) program.² The PAT design has been extremely effective with the chemically dependent multiple recidivist population and current research indicates that this design would be effective with the sexual offender and emotionally disturbed probationer populations as well.³

This report is a preliminary statistical report that presents recidivism results after the first fifteen months of SOP program operations. A more comprehensive evaluation and planning report that includes both clinical and correctional outcome measures; as well as a complete analysis of program design is scheduled for release in April, 1988.

The current report presents the results of program operations from October 1, 1986 to December 31, 1987; and has been organized in the following way: I) Introduction; II) Preliminary Findings; III) Program Rationale, Objectives and Design; IV) Profile of the Special Offender Project Population; V) Research Methods & Evaluation Design; VI) Results; VII) Analysis & Conclusions.

II. PRELIMINARY FINDINGS:

1. The attempt to develop and implement a program that provides comprehensive diagnostic, treatment and intensive supervision services for selected adult sex offenders and mentally deficient persons sentenced to probation supervision appears to have been quite successful during the first fifteen months (10/01/86-12/31/87) of the Special Offender Project. A workable design is fully operational.
2. As of 12/31/87, 83 individuals representing 103 cases had been accepted into the Special Offender Project. 64 or 77.1% were sex offenders and 19 or 22.9% were offenders who exhibited a major mental illness and/or were developmentally disabled.
3. As of 12/31/87, 68 individuals of the original cohort representing 76 cases were still active in the program. 52 or 76.5% were sex offenders and 16 or 23.5% were offenders who exhibited a major mental illness and/or were developmentally disabled.
4. An analysis of the client profile data clearly documents that the project population consists of the appropriate target groups identified in the original grant proposal. That is, all of the cases are either convicted sexual offenders and/or, individuals with extraordinary psychological problems.
5. After an average follow-up time of 295.4 days or approximately 9.8 months for the 83 individuals accepted into the program between 10/01/86 and 12/31/87, 4 individuals or 4.8% had been rearrested for a felony crime; and an additional 6 individuals or 7.2% were rearrested for misdemeanor offenses. Thus, 10 individuals out of 83 or 12% have been subsequently arrested for felony or misdemeanor level offenses.
6. The rearrest rate for the sexual offender population of the project was 6 out of 64 or 9.4% while the rearrest rate for the mentally deficient offender population was 4 out of 19 or 21.1%.
7. There were no recidivist felony sex crime arrests during the first fifteen months of SOP program operations. Two (2) of the projects' sex offenders were charged with public lewdness, which is a B misdemeanor sex offense. (The six recidivists from the sex offender subgroup were charged with nine offenses; 4 non-sexual felonies; and 5 misdemeanors.)
8. There were no felony recidivism crimes committed by the mentally deficient subgroup. The four rearrested offenders collectively were charged with two A misdemeanors and two B misdemeanors, one of which was a sex related misdemeanor (public lewdness).

9. 9 individuals (10.8%) in the project were charged with violations of probation, 4 of which were the result of rearrests and 5 of which were the result of technical violations. These 9 individuals consisted of 6 sex offenders and 3 mentally ill offenders.
10. The number of sentenced probationers that meet the selection criteria for the Special Offender Program (SOP) far exceed available project resources. (During the last quarter of operations (10/1/87-12/31/87), suitable referrals to the program have been rejected because caseload levels have been at a maximum - 34 individuals per P.O., for a total of 68 individuals as of 12/31/87).

III. PROGRAM RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES & DESIGN:

The operational design of the Special Offender Project has been specifically developed in order to reduce criminal recidivism with 'high-risk' offenders. This would be accomplished by closely monitoring the offender's behavior while addressing existing dysfunctions that may be contributing to the pattern of illegal behavior. The SOP model is an intensive special supervision approach as opposed to the popular intensive supervision design.

Basically, intensive supervision means reduced caseload size, increased monthly contacts, and appropriate referral to service agencies. Many existing intensive supervision projects have created caseloads consisting of all high recidivism-risk cases requiring intensive supervision services. Caseload size usually averages between around 25 and 35 cases and the number of monthly mandated contacts between the offender and probation officers is a minimum of four per month. Each caseload usually consists of offenders convicted of a variety of current offenses, including assault, burglary, robbery, sexual abuse and many other crimes. Dysfunctions are also quite varied on an intensive supervision caseload and often include alcoholism, drug addiction, serious emotional disturbance and others.

The intensive special supervision approach is a variation of probation intensive supervision. The characteristics of reduced caseload size and increased monthly contacts remain identical, but this approach is different in several significant ways.

First of all, the intensive special approach targets one specific offender population; such as multiple recidivist drunk drivers, repeat sexual offenders, mentally disabled offenders, etc. Caseloads are comprised of individuals with the same or similar dysfunctions, and the probation officers are highly trained in correctly identifying the level of this particular dysfunction and in appropriate treatment modalities.

Another major difference in the intensive special supervision approach is that immediately accessible treatment services are integrated into, and guaranteed by, the overall design. The obstacles of long waiting periods for diagnosis, rejection of resistant or unmotivated clients; etc. are avoided by this integrated, multidisciplinary design.

Also, by having relevant services, targeted to correct a particular dysfunction built into the overall design, the quality of the increased contacts should be improved. The quantity vs. quality of contacts issue is addressed by the intensive special supervision design. The basic strategy essentially is that by targeting and focusing in on specific subgroups according to identifiable dysfunctions, not only are the number of contacts increased but the probability of improving the relevancy of those contacts is also increased.

Another major element in the intensive special supervision design is essentially a team approach between correctional and treatment disciplines. As a result, there is increased coordination, cooperation

and communication between these disciplines. Goals and objectives are similar, and interdisciplinary procedural agreements are implemented. Also, by having treatment and probation personnel co-conducting groups, etc., communication is continuous and case planning consistent. Duplication of services should also be reduced with this approach.

Current research indicates that the intensive special supervision approach holds considerable promise as a sentencing alternative for multiple recidivist offenders.

A summary of justifiable hypotheses includes the following:

1. Quality of contacts are more important than quantity of contacts in reducing recidivism;
2. There is greater probability that supervision contacts will be relevant with the specialized caseload design; and,
3. The intensive special supervision approach is statistically significant in reducing recidivism with the special offender population as compared to other traditional supervision approaches.

The specific program objectives of the 'Special Offender Project' include the following:

- 1) To develop and implement an effective integrated interdisciplinary program between the mental health community and the correctional system for sexual offenders and mentally disabled individuals sentenced to probation supervision;
- 2) To provide treatment and intensive supervision to 100 selected adult sex offenders and mentally disabled persons sentenced to probation supervision.
- 3) To realize a statistically significant reduction in recidivism as compared to pre-post and comparison evaluation groups.
- 4) To conduct a comprehensive empirical evaluation of the effectiveness of this approach for the subgroups of the target population.
- 5) To conduct a cost benefit analysis of this approach as compared to the traditional modalities currently in operation.
- 6) To file a written copy of the results of this program's outcome and evaluative research at the end of the contract year.

For a detailed description of the SOP program design, including operational procedures and selection criteria, the reader is directed to the project interim reports 1, 2, 3 and the report entitled, The Special Offender Project: A Multi-Discipline Alternative To Incarceration.⁶ These reports are available upon request from the Suffolk County Department of Probation.

IV. PROFILE OF THE SPECIAL OFFENDER PROJECT POPULATION

This section illustrates and describes the profile of 83 male probationers who were accepted into the Special Offender Project between 10/1/86, when project operations began, and 12/31/87. The tables that follow are each divided into three columns: the first representing those probationers who met the sexual offender target population criteria, the second representing those probationers who met the mental health target population criteria and the third representing the overall population. The 83 probationers profiled include 64 sex offenders and 19 mentally ill probationers. It is also noted that 4 of the probationers included in the sex offender group also met the mental health criteria, but they have not been broken out as a separate group.

Tables 1 to 11 reflect the profile of the Special Offender Project population and include the following characteristics: age, marital status, employment status, educational level, ethnic origin, family structure, psychological data, history of alcohol and drug dependency, severity and frequency of current conviction charges, number of prior arrests and convictions and number and type of conditions of probation imposed.

1. Age - As illustrated in Table 1, the majority of probationers, 71 or 85.5% were 25 years old or over at the time of sentencing for the charge that resulted in their acceptance into the Special Offender Project. 57 or 68.7% were in the 25-44 age bracket, with 14 or 16.9% having been 45 years old or over.

TABLE 1: AGE OF SPECIAL OFFENDER PROJECT POPULATION

| Age | Sex Offenders | | Mentally Ill Offenders | | Overall Total | |
|--------------|---------------|------|------------------------|------|---------------|-------|
| | # | % | # | % | # | % |
| 16-19 years | 1 | 1.2 | 2 | 2.4 | 3 | 3.6 |
| 20-24 | 7 | 8.4 | 2 | 2.4 | 9 | 10.8 |
| 25-29 | 18 | 21.7 | 7 | 8.4 | 25 | 30.1 |
| 30-34 | 5 | 6.0 | 3 | 3.6 | 8 | 9.6 |
| 35-39 | 12 | 14.5 | 4 | 4.8 | 16 | 19.3 |
| 40-44 | 7 | 8.4 | 1 | 1.2 | 8 | 9.6 |
| 45-49 | 4 | 4.8 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4.8 |
| 50-54 | 3 | 3.6 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3.6 |
| 55 and above | 7 | 8.4 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 8.4 |
| Total | 64 | 77.1 | 19 | 22.9 | 83 | 100.0 |

The range in ages was from 16-65 and the average age at the time of sentencing was 34.3.

2. Marital Status - As reflected in Table 2, at the time of acceptance into the Special Offender Program, almost half of the probationers (47.0%) were single, slightly less than one-third (31.3%) were married and less than one-quarter (21.7%) were separated or divorced. In the mentally ill group, 84.2% were single and the remaining 15.8% (3 probationers) were separated or divorced.

TABLE 2: MARITAL STATUS OF THE SPECIAL OFFENDER PROJECT POPULATION

| Marital Status | Sex Offenders | | Mentally Ill Offenders | | Overall Total | |
|----------------|---------------|------|------------------------|------|---------------|-------|
| | # | % | # | % | # | % |
| Single | 23 | 27.7 | 16 | 19.3 | 39 | 47.0 |
| Married | 26 | 31.3 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 31.3 |
| Separated | 9 | 10.8 | 2 | 2.4 | 11 | 13.3 |
| Divorced | 6 | 7.2 | 1 | 1.2 | 7 | 8.4 |
| Total | 64 | 77.1 | 19 | 22.9 | 83 | 100.0 |

3. Employment Status - As shown in Table 3, at the time of acceptance into the Special Offender Program, 59 or 71.1% of the probationers held some form of employment or were retired. However, among the mentally ill probationers, 14 or 73.7% had no employment with 8 or 42.1% receiving some sort of public assistance or disability payments and 1 was not in the job market due to his mental disability.

TABLE 3: EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF THE SPECIAL OFFENDER PROJECT POPULATION

| <u>Employment Status</u> | <u>Sex Offenders</u> | | <u>Mentally Ill Offenders</u> | | <u>Overall Total</u> | |
|--------------------------|----------------------|----------|-------------------------------|----------|----------------------|----------|
| | <u>#</u> | <u>%</u> | <u>#</u> | <u>%</u> | <u>#</u> | <u>%</u> |
| Full-Time | 52 | 62.7 | 3 | 3.6 | 55 | 66.3 |
| Part-Time | 1 | 1.2 | 2 | 2.4 | 3 | 3.6 |
| Unemployed | 4 | 4.8 | 5 | 6.0 | 9 | 10.8 |
| Receiving Assist. | 6 | 7.2 | 8 | 9.6 | 14 | 16.9 |
| Not In Job Market | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1.2 | 1 | 1.2 |
| Retired | 1 | 1.2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1.2 |
| Total | 64 | 77.1 | 19 | 22.9 | 83 | 100.0 |

4. Educational Level - Table 4 indicates that slightly less than one-third (32.5%) of the Special Offender Program population were high school dropouts, with the balance having achieved at least high school graduate/GED status (40 or 48.2%) or having received some education beyond the high school level (16 or 19.3%). Within the subgroup of mentally ill offenders however, 11 or 57.9% were high school dropouts, while only 7 or 36.8% achieved high school graduate/GED status and 1 or 5.3% received an associates degree.

TABLE 4: EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF THE SPECIAL OFFENDER PROJECT POPULATION

| Educational Level | Sex Offenders | | Mentally Ill Offenders | | Overall Total | |
|-------------------|---------------|------|------------------------|------|---------------|-------|
| | # | % | # | % | # | % |
| School Dropout | 16 | 19.3 | 11 | 13.3 | 27 | 32.5 |
| H.S. Grad. | 27 | 32.5 | 5 | 6.0 | 32 | 38.6 |
| GED | 6 | 7.2 | 2 | 2.4 | 8 | 9.6 |
| Some College | 8 | 9.6 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 9.6 |
| Assoc. Degree | 2 | 2.4 | 1 | 1.2 | 3 | 3.6 |
| College Graduate | 3 | 3.6 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3.6 |
| Graduate Degree | 2 | 2.4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2.4 |
| Total | 64 | 77.1 | 19 | 22.9 | 83 | 100.0 |

5. Ethnic Origin - As found in Table 5, the vast majority of the Special Offender Project population, 72 or 86.7% were White, while 6 or 7.2% were Black and 5 or 6.0% were Hispanic. In both subgroups, the percentage breakdowns by race were quite similar to the overall population.

TABLE 5: ETHNIC ORIGIN OF THE SPECIAL OFFENDER PROJECT POPULATION

| Race | Sex Offenders | | Mentally Ill Offenders | | Overall Total | |
|----------|---------------|------|------------------------|------|---------------|-------|
| | # | % | # | % | # | % |
| White | 56 | 67.5 | 16 | 19.3 | 72 | 86.7 |
| Black | 3 | 3.6 | 3 | 3.6 | 6 | 7.2 |
| Hispanic | 5 | 60.0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6.0 |
| Total | 64 | 77.1 | 19 | 22.9 | 83 | 100.0 |

6. Family Structure - The family structure of the Special Offender Project is illustrated in Table 6 and shows that over one-third (36.1%) of the total population resided with parents at the time of their acceptance into the program, with this total consisting of 57.9% of the mentally ill sub-group. In addition, almost one-third (31.3%) of the sex offender sub-group lived in intact families. The 11 or 13.3% of the overall total that lived in "other" types of families primarily involved other relatives such as aunts, uncles, grandparents, etc.

TABLE 6: FAMILY STRUCTURE OF THE SPECIAL OFFENDER PROJECT POPULATION

| Family Structure/ Lives With | Sex Offenders | | Mentally Ill Offenders | | Overall Total | |
|---------------------------------|---------------|------|------------------------|------|---------------|-------|
| | # | % | # | % | # | % |
| Parents | 19 | 22.9 | 11 | 13.3 | 30 | 36.1 |
| Spouse (Incl. Children) | 20 | 24.1 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 24.1 |
| Children (W/O Spouse) | 1 | 1.2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1.2 |
| Paramour | 3 | 3.6 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3.6 |
| Friends | 1 | 1.2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1.2 |
| Alone | 10 | 12.0 | 5 | 6.0 | 15 | 18.1 |
| Institution | 2 | 2.4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2.4 |
| Other | 8 | 9.6 | 3 | 3.6 | 11 | 13.3 |
| Total | 64 | 77.1 | 19 | 22.9 | 83 | 100.0 |

7. Psychological Data - Table 7 displays information at the time of program acceptance on the number of individual project participants and the corresponding percent of the overall total (83) for the following categories: received treatment/therapy in a state/public institution; received treatment/therapy at a state/public outpatient clinic; received treatment/therapy at a private clinic or with a private therapist; had a psychiatric diagnosis made; was currently taking psychotropic medication. Regarding the type of Psychiatric Diagnosis, of the 49 total, 16 or 32.7% were diagnosed as schizophrenics with the remainder being diagnosed primarily with various types of personality or sexual disorders.

TABLE 7: PSYCHOLOGICAL DATA

| Category | Sex Offenders | | Mentally Ill Offenders | | Overall Total | |
|--|---------------|------|------------------------|------|---------------|------|
| | # | % | # | % | # | % |
| Rec'd Treatment In State Inst. | 12 | 14.5 | 15 | 18.1 | 27 | 32.5 |
| Rec'd Treatment At Public Outpatient Clinic | 25 | 30.1 | 12 | 14.5 | 37 | 44.6 |
| Rec'd Treatment At Private Clinic/Therapist | 22 | 26.5 | 4 | 4.8 | 26 | 31.3 |
| Had Psychiatric Diagnosis Made | 31 | 37.3 | 18 | 21.7 | 49 | 59.0 |
| Was Taking Psychotropic Medication | 4 | 4.8 | 10 | 12.0 | 14 | 16.9 |

8. Alcohol and Drug Dependency - Reflected in Table 8 is data concerning the history of alcohol and drug abuse by the Special Offender Program population. As the statistics show, slightly less than half of the total population had alcohol or drug problems (47.0% and 41.0% respectively), while slightly more than one-fourth (26.5%) of the total population had a history of both alcohol and drug dependence.

TABLE 8:

| Category | Sex Offenders | | Mentally Ill Offenders | | Overall Total | |
|--|---------------|------|------------------------|------|---------------|------|
| | # | % | # | % | # | % |
| History of Alcohol Abuse | 27 | 32.5 | 12 | 14.5 | 39 | 47.0 |
| History of Drug Abuse | 21 | 25.3 | 13 | 15.7 | 34 | 41.0 |
| History of Both Drug and Alcohol Abuse | 13 | 15.7 | 9 | 10.8 | 22 | 26.5 |

9. Current Conviction Charges - Table 9 illustrates the most severe conviction charge for each of the probationers in the Special Offender Program. These types of conviction charges resulted in the probationers being accepted into this project. According to the table, D Felonies and A Misdemeanors were the most frequent of the most severe conviction charges. For the 83 probationers in the project, there were a total of 103 conviction charges that led to their project entrance. These conviction charges are listed below Table 9 by frequency and the percent of the total population (83) that was convicted of each charge.

TABLE 9: SEVERITY OF CURRENT CONVICTION CHARGES

| Conv. Charge | Sex Offenders | | Mentally Ill Offenders | | Overall Total | |
|---------------|---------------|------|------------------------|------|---------------|-------|
| | # | % | # | % | # | % |
| C Felony | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1.2 | 1 | 1.2 |
| D Felony | 25 | 30.1 | 3 | 3.6 | 28 | 33.7 |
| E Felony | 10 | 12.0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 12.0 |
| A Misdemeanor | 14 | 16.9 | 11 | 13.3 | 25 | 30.1 |
| B Misdemeanor | 15 | 18.1 | 4 | 4.8 | 19 | 22.9 |
| Total | 64 | 77.1 | 19 | 22.9 | 83 | 100.0 |

Frequency of Charges: Sex Abuse 1st: 20/24.1%; Public Lewdness: 9/10.8%; Sex Abuse 2nd: 8/9.6%; Sex Abuse 3rd: 7/8.4%; Petit Larceny: 7/8.4%; Attempted Sex Abuse 1st: 5/6.0%; Sodomy 2nd: 4/4.8%; Attempted Burglary 2nd: 4/4.8%; Attempted Sodomy 3rd: 4/4.8%; Criminal Mischief 4th: 3/3.6%; Burglary 2nd: 3/2.4%; Attempted Petit Larceny 2/2.4%; Rape 2nd: 2/2.4%; Sodomy 3rd: 2/2.4%; Forgery 3rd: 2/2.4%; Rape 3rd: 2/2.4%; Attempted Public Lewdness: 1/1.2%; Attempted Sex Abuse 2nd: 1/1.2%; Assault 3rd: 1/1.2%; Attempted Assault 3rd: 1/1.2%; Attempted Reckless Endangerment 2nd: 1/1.2%; Attempted Sodomy 2nd: 1/1.2%; Criminal Impersonation 2nd: 1/1.2%; Criminal Possession of Marijuana 5th: 1/1.2%; Endangering Welfare of a Child: 1/1.2%; Sexual Misconduct: 1/1.2%; Attempted Aggravated Harrassment: 1/1.2%; Resisting Arrest: 1/1.2%; Assault 2nd: 1/1.2%; Attempted Rape 2nd: 1/1.2%; Criminal Trespass 2nd: 1/1.2%; Tampering With a Private Communication: 1/1.2%; Leaving the Scene of an Accident: 1/1.2%; Passing a Red Light: 1/1.2%.

10. Prior Legal History - Table 10 Displays the prior legal history of the Special Offender Project participants in the areas of prior arrests, prior convictions and the most severe prior conviction according to type. As the table shows, slightly more than one-third (37.3%) of the total probationers had no prior arrests, while slightly more than half (51.8%) had no prior convictions, with 29 or 72.5% of the 40 who had prior convictions having been convicted of misdemeanors and 11 or 27.5% having been convicted of felonies.

TABLE 10: PRIOR LEGAL HISTORY

| Category | Sex Offenders | | Mentally Ill Offenders | | Overall Total | |
|---|---------------|------|------------------------|------|---------------|-------|
| | # | % | # | % | # | % |
| a) <u>Prior Arrests</u> (Range = 0-21; Average = 3.1) | | | | | | |
| 0 Priors | 28 | 33.7 | 3 | 3.6 | 31 | 37.3 |
| 1 Prior | 10 | 12.0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 12.0 |
| 2 Priors | 7 | 8.4 | 3 | 3.6 | 10 | 12.0 |
| 3 Priors | 7 | 8.4 | 1 | 1.2 | 8 | 9.6 |
| 4 Priors | 3 | 3.6 | 1 | 1.2 | 4 | 4.8 |
| 5 Priors | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2.4 | 2 | 2.4 |
| 6 Priors | 2 | 2.4 | 1 | 1.2 | 3 | 3.6 |
| 7 Priors | 3 | 3.6 | 3 | 3.6 | 6 | 7.2 |
| 9 Priors | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1.2 | 1 | 1.2 |
| 10 Priors | 1 | 1.2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1.2 |
| 11 Priors | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1.2 | 1 | 1.2 |
| 12 Priors | 1 | 1.2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1.2 |
| 13 Priors | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1.2 | 1 | 1.2 |
| 14 Priors | 2 | 2.4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2.4 |
| 16 Priors | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1.2 | 1 | 1.2 |
| 21 Priors | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1.2 | 1 | 1.2 |
| Total | 64 | 77.1 | 19 | 22.9 | 83 | 100.0 |

| Category | Sex Offenders | | Mentally Ill Offenders | | Overall Total | |
|---|---------------|------|------------------------|------|---------------|-------|
| | # | % | # | % | # | % |
| b) <u>Prior Convictions</u> (Range = 0-17; Average = 1.7) | | | | | | |
| 0 Convictions | 40 | 48.2 | 3 | 3.6 | 43 | 51.8 |
| 1 Conviction | 10 | 12.0 | 4 | 4.8 | 14 | 16.9 |
| 2 Convictions | 4 | 4.8 | 2 | 2.4 | 6 | 7.2 |
| 3 Convictions | 3 | 3.6 | 2 | 2.4 | 5 | 6.0 |
| 4 Convictions | 3 | 3.6 | 2 | 2.4 | 5 | 6.0 |
| 5 Convictions | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3.6 | 3 | 3.6 |
| 6 Convictions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1.2 | 1 | 1.2 |
| 7 Convictions | 1 | 1.2 | 1 | 1.2 | 2 | 2.4 |
| 8 Convictions | 2 | 2.4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2.4 |
| 12 Convictions | 1 | 1.2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1.2 |
| 17 Convictions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1.2 | 1 | 1.2 |
| Total | 64 | 77.1 | 19 | 22.9 | 83 | 100.0 |

| Category | Sex Offenders | | Mentally Ill Offenders | | Overall Total | |
|--|---------------|------|------------------------|------|---------------|-------|
| | # | % | # | % | # | % |
| c) <u>Severity of Worse Prior Conviction</u> | | | | | | |
| No Prior Conv. | 40 | 48.2 | 3 | 3.6 | 43 | 51.8 |
| B Felony | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2.4 | 2 | 2.4 |
| C Felony | 1 | 1.2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1.2 |
| D Felony | 3 | 3.6 | 3 | 3.6 | 6 | 7.2 |
| E Felony | 1 | 1.2 | 1 | 1.2 | 2 | 2.4 |
| A Misdemeanor | 12 | 14.5 | 6 | 7.2 | 18 | 21.7 |
| B Misdemeanor | 7 | 8.4 | 4 | 4.8 | 11 | 13.3 |
| Total | 64 | 77.1 | 19 | 22.9 | 83 | 100.0 |

11. Conditions of Probation - The most frequently imposed conditions of probation at the time of sentencing for the current conviction charges are displayed in Table 11 and are shown as a percent of the total population (83) of the Special Offender Project. In addition to the data in the table, 81 or 97.6% of the 83 total project participants had 1 or more conditions imposed at sentencing with the range being 0-5 and the average 2.0. Also, 32 probationers or 38.6% had 1 condition, 22 or 26.5% had 2 conditions, 19 or 23% had 3 conditions, 6 or 7.2% had 4 conditions and 2 or 2.4% had 5 conditions.

TABLE 11: CONDITIONS OF PROBATION

| <u>Condition</u> | <u>Sex Offenders</u> | | <u>Mentally Ill Offenders</u> | | <u>Overall Total</u> | |
|------------------|----------------------|----------|-------------------------------|----------|----------------------|----------|
| | <u>#</u> | <u>%</u> | <u>#</u> | <u>%</u> | <u>#</u> | <u>%</u> |
| Psych | 58 | 69.9 | 16 | 19.2 | 74 | 89.2 |
| Alcohol | 23 | 27.7 | 8 | 9.6 | 31 | 37.3 |
| Narcotic | 14 | 16.9 | 9 | 10.8 | 23 | 27.7 |
| Order Protection | 19 | 22.9 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 22.2 |
| Restitution | 5 | 6.0 | 4 | 4.8 | 9 | 10.8 |

V. RESEARCH METHODS & EVALUATION DESIGN:

1. Program Impact

The major objective of the evaluation is to determine the effectiveness of the program strategy that has been employed in the treatment and supervision of the project population. The outcome measures that will be documented include: 1) criminal recidivism (all types of offenses) for the entire population and each subgroup, which for the purposes of this report has been calculated based on rearrests but with a longer follow-up period will be based on convictions; and 2) clinical outcome measures that consist primarily of psychological test data of various types. Also, relevant socioeconomic factors, legal status, prior criminal history, major dysfunctions, familial background, educational level and other important data will be collected for each case. (The data collection instrument used to record the profile data is attached as Appendix 1.)

The research strategy involves two levels of analysis as follows: 1) comparison of the project population with a preprogram group of offenders with comparable convictions, criminal histories and psychiatric/psychological backgrounds; and 2) an in-depth analysis of the project population itself and the criminal recidivists in terms of what the characteristics of each are.

However, for purposes of this progress report, only the preliminary outcome measures of criminal recidivism of the project population and the profile of the entire population, each subgroup and the recidivists are included. In subsequent studies, a comparison of the successful and unsuccessful (legally and clinically) cases will be made using multivariate analysis in an attempt to identify significant client dynamics. A three year follow-up is an acceptable follow-up period for this analysis; although evaluations will be made on a periodic basis.

2. Program Planning

In addition, to a statistical analysis of program impact, an ongoing systemic evaluation has also been undertaken. All of the personnel that are involved with program operations have been involved in a system evaluation and planning process since October 1988.

Methodology used for this systemic analysis includes confidential questionnaires, structured interviews, and group problem-solving exercises. The results of this evaluation will be completed and reported by the end of April 1988. Recommendation for program modifications will be made based on the combined results of the statistical and systemic evaluation processes.

VI. RESULTS:

In this section, two (2) aspects of the program results will be discussed. The first is the rearrest criminal recidivism of the project population, which has been analyzed according to formal arrest rates. The second is the probation compliance record of the program participants, which is measured by the number of violations of probation that were filed, due to both rearrests and technical violations.

1. Rearrest Criminal Recidivism - At this point, rearrest rather than reconviction is being used as the primary outcome measure because of the insufficient follow-up period. Future evaluative reports will use conviction rates as the primary outcome measure. Basically, when the follow-up period is of short duration, there are a large number of missing values regarding the conviction and disposition of recidivism arrests. If conviction rates were currently used instead of rearrest rates as our major recidivism measure, the rates would be significantly lower at this time.

As was stated in Section II, Preliminary Findings, the recidivism follow-up period ranged from one to fifteen months for individual cases. After an average follow-up time of 295.4 days or approximately 9.8 months for the 83 individuals accepted into the program between 10/01/86 and 12/31/87, 4 individuals or 4.8% had been rearrested for a felony crime; and an additional 6 individuals or 7.2% were rearrested for misdemeanor offenses. Thus 10 individuals out of 83, or 12% have been subsequently rearrested for felony or misdemeanor level offenses.

This data and rearrest rates for each subgroup are reflected below in Table 12.

TABLE 12: OVERALL REARREST CRIMINAL RECIDIVISM OF TOTAL POPULATION AND BOTH SUBGROUPS

| | Sex Offenders | | Mentally Deficient Offenders | | Overall Total | |
|---------------------|---------------|------|------------------------------|-----|---------------|------|
| | # | % | # | % | # | % |
| Felony Rearrests | 4 | 4.8 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4.8 |
| Misdemeanor Arrests | 2 | 2.4 | 4 | 4.8 | 6 | 7.2 |
| Total Rearrests | 6 | 7.2% | 4 | 4.8 | 10 | 12.0 |

Looked at another way, Table 12 data shows that the rearrest rate for the sexual offender population was 6 out of 64 or 9.4% while the rearrest rate for the mentally deficient offender population was 4 out of 19 or 21.1%. Also, there were no felony recidivism crimes committed by the mentally deficient subgroup. The four rearrested offenders collectively were charged with two A misdemeanors and two B misdemeanors, one of which was a sex related misdemeanor (public lewdness).

In addition, and as illustrated in Table 13, there were no recidivist felony sex crime arrests during the first fifteen months of SOP program operations. Two (2) of the projects sex offenders were charged with public lewdness, which is a B misdemeanor sex offense. (The six recidivists from the sex offender subgroup were charged with nine offenses; 4 non-sexual felonies; and 5 misdemeanors.)

TABLE 13: SEX OFFENDER REARRESTS

| Project Population | Sex Related Felony Rearrests | | Non-Sex Related Felony Rearrests | | Sex Related Misd. Rearrests | | Non-Sex Related Misd. Rearrests | |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|-----|--------------------------------------|-----|--|-----|
| | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % |
| 64 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6.3 | 2 | 3.1 | 1* | 1.6 |
| Total | | | | | | | | |
| # % | | | | | | | | |
| 6 9.4 | | | | | | | | |

*This individual was rearrested for one (1) felony and two (2) misdemeanor offenses, all of which were non-sex related.

The individual profiles that follow display key background data, collected primarily at the time of project acceptance, for each of the rearrested probationers. The first six are the sexual offenders who were rearrested while the last four are from the mentally deficient subgroup. A number of interesting and important observations taken from the rearrested probationer profiles are highlighted as follows: The average age of the recidivists was 31.5; all of the rearrested mentally deficient offenders were single while the marital status of the rearrested sexual offenders varied; all of the sexual offenders were employed full-time while all of those in the mentally deficient subgroup were unemployed. Education and family structure were varied and 7 were white and 3 were black.

Regarding treatment undergone prior to entering the project, 9 of the 10, including the 4 mentally deficient offenders, had been treated for varying lengths for differing psychological problems (4 of the 10, including 3 of the 4 mentally deficient offenders were diagnosed as schizophrenics). 5 of the 10, including all 4 mentally deficient offenders, were also taking psychotropic medication. 7 out of the 10 had a history of alcohol and/or drug abuse, again including all 4 mentally deficient offenders.

In the area of legal history facts, the average number of prior arrests was 5.8 but ranged from 0 (3 of the 10) to 21. The average number of prior convictions was 3.5 but here the range was from 0 (5 of the 10) to 17. All but 1 of the 10 had varying special conditions of probation, with psych conditions (7 of the 10) being the most frequent.

Individual Profiles Of Project's Rearrest Recidivist Population

| <u>Recidivist Profile</u> | <u>One</u> | <u>Two</u> | <u>Three</u> | <u>Four</u> |
|---|---|---------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| Age Time of Rearrest | 36 | 61 | 27 | 22 |
| Marital Status | Single | Married | Separated | Single |
| Employment Status | Employed F/T | Employed F/T | Employed F/T | Employed F/T |
| Education | G.E.D. | HS Grad | Some Collge | HS Dropout |
| Ethnic Origin | White | Black | White | White |
| Family Structure/ Lives With | Parents | Spouse Incl/Chldrn | Alone | Alone |
| Rec'd Treatment Prior to Project | Yes | No | Yes | Yes |
| Psychiatric Diag. | Yes Exhbtnsm | No | Yes Mjr. Deprssn | Yes AntiSocpers Disorder |
| Was taking psycho- tropic medication | No | No | No | No |
| History Alcohol Abuse | No | No | Yes | Yes |
| History Drug Abuse | No | No | Yes | Yes |
| Convc. Chrg at Proj. Acceptance | Public Lewdness (B Misd.) | AttSex Abuse 1 (E Felony) | SexAbuse 2 (A Misd.) | CPStlnProp (C Felony) |
| No. of Prior Arrests | 12 | 1 | 3 | 7 |
| No. Prior Convc. & Most Severe | 8 (A. Misd) | 0 | 0 | 4 (D Felony) |
| Conds. Probation | Psych | None | Alc, Narc No contact Victm/Famly | Psych, Alc Narc. |
| Rearrest Chrg & Severity | Public Lewdness 2 Cts (B Misd) | GrndLarcny (D Felony) | Burg. 2/Crim Trspss 2/ Resist Arrest C Fel., A Misd. A Misd. | Burglary 2 (C Felony) |

Individual Profiles of Project's Rearrest Recidivist Population

| <u>Recidivist Profile</u> | <u>Five</u> | <u>Six</u> | <u>Seven</u> |
|---|--------------------------------|--|---|
| Age at time of Rearrest | 26 | 23 | 23 |
| Marital Status | Married | Single | Single |
| Employment Status | Employed F/T | Employed F/T | Unemployed |
| Education | HS Graduate | HS Graduate | HS Grad/Spec. Ed |
| Ethnic Origin | White | Black | White |
| Family Structure/ Lives With | Spouse/Incl. Children | Parents | Sister-in-Law w/her Children |
| Rec'd Treatment Prior to Project | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Psychiatric Diag. | No | Yes/Schizo- phrenic | Yes/Mild Mental Retardation/Pers Disorder |
| Was taking Psycho- tropic Medication | No | No | No |
| History Alc. Abuse | No | No | Yes |
| History Drug Abuse | No | Yes | Yes |
| Conv. Chrg. Time of Project Acceptance | Public Lewd- ness (B Misd.) | Sex Abuse 3 (B Misd.) | Crim. Imprsnation 2/Att PetitLarcny (A & B Misd.) |
| No. Prior Arrests | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| No. Prior Conv. & Most Severe | 0 | 0 | 4 (B Felony) |
| Cond. of Probation | Psych | Psych, Narc, Refrain from Carrying a Weapon | Psych, Restitutn |
| Rearrest Chrg. & Severity | Public Lewdness (B Misd) | Crim Poss Weapon 3rd (D Felony) | Crim Poss Weapon 4th (A Misd.) |

Individual Profiles of Project's Rearrest Recidivist Population

| <u>Recidivist Profile</u> | <u>Eight</u> | <u>Nine</u> | <u>Ten</u> |
|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Age at time of Rearrest | 33 | 27 | 37 |
| Marital Status | Single | Single | Single |
| Employment Status | Unemployed | Receives SSI | Receives PA |
| Education | HS Dropout | HS Dropout | HS Dropout |
| Ethnic Origin | White | Black | White |
| Family Structure/ Lives With | Parents | Parents | Alone |
| Rec'd Treatment Prior to Project | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Psychiatric Diag. | Yes/Schizo- phrenia | Yes/Schizo- phrenia | Yes/Schizo- phrenia |
| Was taking Psycho- tropic Medication | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| History Alc. Abuse | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| History Drug Abuse | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Conv Chrg. Time of Proj. Acceptance | PetitLarcny (A Misd) | Att Burg 2 (D Felony) | Att Burg 2 (D Felony) |
| No. Prior Arrests | 3 | 0 | 21 |
| No. Prior Conv. & Most Severe | 2 (B Felony) | 0 | 17 (D Felony) |
| Cond. of Probation | Psych, Alc, Narc, Restitutn | Psych, Narc | ISP, Alcohol |
| Rearrest Chrg & Severity | PublicLewdnss (B Misd) | CrimTrspss 3 (B Misd) | PetitLarceny (A Misd) |

2. Probation Compliance Record - 9 individuals or 10.8% of the project's overall population were charged with violations of probation, 4 of which were the result of rearrests and 5 of which were the result of technical violations. These 9 individuals consisted of 6 sex offenders and 3 mentally deficient offenders. This information is outlined in Table 14.

TABLE 14: OVERALL VIOLATIONS OF PROBATION

| <u>VOP</u> | <u>Sex Offenders</u> | | <u>Mentally Ill Offenders</u> | | <u>Overall Total</u> | |
|----------------------|----------------------|----------|-------------------------------|----------|----------------------|----------|
| | <u>#</u> | <u>%</u> | <u>#</u> | <u>%</u> | <u>#</u> | <u>%</u> |
| VOP Due to Rearrest | 2 | 2.4 | 2 | 2.4 | 4 | 4.8 |
| VOP Due to Technical | 4 | 4.8 | 1 | 1.2 | 5 | 6.0 |
| Total VOPs | 6 | 7.2 | 3 | 3.6 | 9 | 10.8 |

The program results in this section should be viewed as very preliminary outcome measures only and should not be interpreted as causal evidence. The sample size is relatively small and the follow-up period is short. The results are meant to be analyzed in combination with the other comparative data included in this report.

VII. ANALYSIS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Special Offender Program is a variation of the intensive supervision format. It is a special intensive supervision program for sex offenders, offenders exhibiting a major mental illness and/or developmentally disabled offenders, which comprise a group of offenders that present special problems for traditional probation supervision. The probation officers in the SOP have specialized caseloads and have been trained to address the primary dysfunctions exhibited by their caseloads. Immediately accessible and relevant treatment services are another important aspect of this program.

As indicated in Section II, Preliminary Findings, the attempt to develop and implement the above described special intensive supervision program has been quite successful during the first fifteen months of project operation and a workable design is currently fully operational. In addition, analysis of the probationer characteristics reveals that the project population is indeed comprised of sex offenders and mentally deficient offenders as identified in the original grant proposal.

The preliminary outcome measures are quite favorable and are consistent with Dr. Banks' findings (See reference #3) that although most intensive supervision programs do not decrease recidivism, there are some specialized programs that offer evidence of success. After an average follow-up time of 9.8 months, the overall rearrest rate was 12.0% (10 out of 83 probationers had been arrested) and the rearrest rate for felony offenses was only 4.8% (4 out of 83). The sexual offender population had a rearrest rate of 9.4% (6 out of 64) and the mentally deficient population had a rearrest rate of 21.2% (4 out of 19).

No one in the sexual offender population was rearrested for a felony sex offense and only 2 of the 6 sex offender recidivists were rearrested for sex offenses which consisted of B Misdemeanor charges only. No one in the mentally deficient subgroup was rearrested for any felony offenses.

Again, these initial results are encouraging, but only represent early indicators. It is a far too early to measure program impact. That will be explored to a much greater degree in future evaluations reports. It is expected that by the spring of 1988, this report will have been expanded to include preliminary clinical outcome measures as well as systemic strengths and weaknesses. However the overall planning and evaluation efforts of this program should continue for three years in order to accurately measure the correctional and clinical impact of this integrated correctional/treatment approach.

REFERENCES

1. Golbin, James J. Intensive Special Supervision: The Development of a Promising Probation Strategy for Serious Offenders, 1983, Suffolk County Department of Probation, Suffolk County, New York, Pages 1-27.
2. Golbin, James J.; Bannon, N.; Samson, B.; Powers, S.; Dolle, C. Planning and Evaluation Report of the Probation Alcohol Treatment (PAT) Demonstration Project in Suffolk County: Thirty Month Report, Suffolk County Department of Probation Planning and Research Report, Suffolk County Department of Probation, Suffolk County, New York, 1982, Pages 1-112.
3. Banks, Jerry, et al. Evaluation of Intensive Special Probation Projects National Evaluation Program: Phase I Summary Report, U. S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C., 1977.
4. Iaria, Vincent J. and Newman, Dr. Carol F. First Interim Report (10/01/86-12/31/86): Special Offender Project, Suffolk County Department of Probation, Program interim report submitted to the NYS Division of Probation & Correctional Alternatives, Suffolk County Department of Probation, Suffolk County, New York, 1987.
5. Iaria, Vincent J. and Newman, Dr. Carol F. Second Interim Report (01/01/87-03/31/87) Third Interim Report (04/01/87-06/30/87) Suffolk County Department of Probation progress reports. Suffolk County Department of Probation, Suffolk County, New York, 1987.
6. The Special Offender Project: A Multi-Discipline Alternative To Incarceration, Suffolk County Department of Probation program funding proposal. Suffolk County Department of Probation, Suffolk County, New York January 1985.

PROFILE OF THE S.O.P. POPULATION

Date Profile Done: _____

Name (Last, First, M.I.): _____ Village/Hamlet: _____

I. PERSONAL DATA

1. a) D.O.B.: _____ (Month/Day/Year) b) Age at Date of Sentence on Current Offense: _____
2. Sex: All Male
3. Race: 1. White _____ 2. Black _____ 3. Other _____
4. Ethnic Origin: 1. Hispanic _____ 2. Non-Hispanic _____
5. Marital Status: 1. Single _____ 2. Married _____ 3. Widowed _____
4. Divorced _____ 5. Separated _____ 6. Common-Law _____ 7. Unknown _____
6. Number of Children: _____ 7. Number of Dependents: _____
8. Family Structure/Lives With: 1. Parents _____ 2. Guardian _____
3. Spouse (Incl. Children) _____ 4. Children W/O Spouse _____
5. Girlfriend/Boyfriend _____ 6. Friends _____ 7. Alone _____
8. Institution/Halfway House _____ 9. Other _____
9. Number of Residence Changes (Last 12 mos.): _____
10. Veteran Status: 1. Non-Vet _____ 2. Veteran _____ Type Veteran & Discharge (e.g. Vietnam, Korean & Honorable, Dishonorable, etc.): _____
11. Physical Disability: 1. No _____ 2. Yes _____ Explain: _____
12. Medication Taken for Physical Disability: 1. N/A _____ 2. No _____ 3. Yes _____
Type: _____

II. SOCIAL CIRCUMSTANCES

1. Educational Attainment: 1. Eleven Grades or Less _____ 2. H.S. Graduate _____
3. GED Diploma _____ 4. Some College _____ 5. Associates Degree (2yrs.) _____
6. College Grad (4 yrs.) _____ 7. Some Graduate Work _____ 8. Grad Degree _____
2. Employment Status: 1. Unemployed _____ 2. Employed Full-Time _____
3. Employed Part-Time _____ 4. Not In The Job Market _____
5. In School Full-Time _____ 6. In School Part-Time _____ 7. Other _____

3. Public Assistance Status: 1. Not Receiving P.A. ____ 2. Receiving P.A. ____

Type & Amount: _____

4. Other Sources of Income: 1. No ____ 2. Yes ____ Type & Amount: _____

5. Family Income at/or Below Poverty Level (refer to current poverty level income guidelines): 1. No ____ 2. Yes ____

3. Not Enough Data Available to Determine ____

6. Homeowner: 1. No ____ 2. Yes ____

III. PSYCHOLOGICAL HISTORY

1. Target Population: 1. Sexual Offender ____ 2. Mental Illness ____

3. Mental Retardation/Organic Brain Damage ____

2. Psychiatric Diagnosis: 1. Schizophrenia ____ 2. Major Depression ____

3. Other ____ Explain: _____

3. a) Psychotropic Medication Taken: 1. No ____ 2. Yes ____

b) Psychotropic Medication Previously Used: 1. No ____ 2. Yes ____

Type: _____

c) Psychotropic Medication Currently Used: 1. No ____ 2. Yes ____

Type: _____

4. Number of Previously Documented (Psychiatric) Hospitalizations: _____

5. Treatment History (For each type of treatment that took place, state number of times admitted or re-admitted): 1. State Institution ____ 2. Outpatient Clinic (Public Agency) ____ 3. Private Therapist or Clinic ____

6. Type and Length of Therapy (For type of therapy, state length in weeks):

1. Individual ____ 2. Group ____

7. Documented History of Child Abuse of Defendant:

1. No ____ 2. Yes ____ Specify Type (i.e. Physical, Sexual) ____

8. Documented History of Alcohol Abuse by Defendant: 1. None ____ 2. Self-Admission ____

3. Multiple Arrests While Under the Influence ____

4. Hospital/Residential Treatment ____ 5. Other Source of Documentation ____

9. Documented History of Drug Abuse: 1. None _____ 2. Self-Admission _____
3. Multiple Arrests While Under the Influence _____ 4. Hospitalization/Residential
Treatment _____ 5. Other Source of Documentation _____
10. Multi-Problem Family (Based on Current Living Arrangement): 1. No _____ 2. Yes _____
Check those that apply:
1. Alcohol _____ 2. Drugs _____ 3. Arrests _____ 4. Abuse _____
5. Disability _____ 6. Other _____

IV. LEGAL HISTORY

1. Case Number: _____ 2. Date Sentenced to Probation: _____
3. Length of Sentence (Include any jail time): _____
4. Current Conviction Charge(s)[Include Law Code]: _____
5. Original Charge(s)[Include Law Code]: _____
6. Number of Victim(s): _____ 7. Age of Victim(s): _____
8. Gender of Victim(s): _____
9. Special Conditions of Probation: 1. No _____ 2. Yes _____ List all Conditions, including Order of Protection: _____
10. Number Prior Arrests (Include juvenile arrests which were forwarded to Family Court): _____
11. Number Prior Convictions (Include Family Court Adjudications and State Most Severe e.g. "D" Felony, etc.): _____
12. No. Prior PINS Adjudications: _____ 13. No. Prior Felony Convictions: _____
14. No. Prior Violent Felony Convictions: _____
15. Weapon Used in Committing an Offense: 1. No _____ 2. Yes _____ Type: _____
16. Physical Force Used in Committing an Offense: 1. No _____ 2. Yes _____
17. Age at First Arrest: _____ 18. Any Recidivism (i.e. pre, during or post program):
1. No _____ 2. Yes _____ Date & Type: _____
19. Any Arrests for Sex Offenses: 1. No _____ 2. Yes _____ Date & Type: _____
20. V.O.P. (i.e. pre, during or post program & state date and type): _____
21. Any Prior Probation: 1. No _____ 2. Yes _____

OUTCOME MEASURES FOR THE S.O.P. POPULATION

Date Prepared: _____

Probationer Name (Last, First, M.I.): _____

V. LEGAL OUTCOMES

1.) Total # Rearrests (Since Enrollment in SOP): _____

2.) Rearrest Charge #1 (Include Law Code): _____

3.) Severity Rating of Rearrest Charge #1: 1. A Felony _____ 2. B Felony _____

3. C Felony _____ 4. D Felony _____ 5. E Felony _____

6. A Misdemeanor _____ 7. B Misdemeanor _____ 8. U Misdemeanor/Violation _____

4.) Rearrest Charge #2 (Include Law Code): _____

5.) Severity Rating of Rearrest Charge #2: 1. A Felony _____ 2. B Felony _____

3. C Felony _____ 4. D Felony _____ 5. E Felony _____

6. A Misdemeanor _____ 7. B Misdemeanor _____ 8. U Misdemeanor/Violation _____

6.) Total # VOP's (Since Enrollment in SOP): _____

7.) Total # VOP's That Were: 1. Technical Violations _____ 2. Rearrests _____

VI. SOCIAL ADJUSTMENTS

1.) Actual Housing Arrangements: 1. Same as at Time of PSI _____ 2. Changed
from Time of PSI _____

2.) Condition of Housing Arrangements: 1. Improved from Time of PSI _____

2. Poorer from Time of PSI _____ 3. No Change from Time of PSI _____

Explain: _____

3.) Familial (Domestic) Situation: 1. Improved from Time of PSI _____ 2. Poorer
from Time of PSI _____ 3. No Change from Time of PSI _____ Explain: _____

4.) a. Support of Dependents: 1. Increased from Time of PSI _____ 2. Lessened
from Time of PSI _____ 3. No Change from Time of PSI _____ 4. Not
Applicable _____

Explain: _____

b. Order of Support Complied With? 1. No ____ 2. Yes ____ 3. Not

Applicable ____

5.) Employment Status: 1. Improved from Time of PSI ____ 2. Poorer from Time of
PSI ____ 3. No Change from Time of PSI ____ Explain: _____

6.) Educational Status: 1. Improved from Time of PSI ____ 2. No Change from
Time of PSI ____ Explain: _____

VII. GROUP THERAPY

1.) Length of Time in S.O.P. (In Weeks): _____

2.) Number of Sessions Attended: _____

3.) Attitude Toward S.O.P. Sessions: 1. Poor ____ 2. Fair ____ 3. Good ____

4. Very Good ____ 5. Excellent ____

4.) Site of Therapy Other Than S.O.P.: 1. State Institution ____ 2. Outpatient
Clinic (Public Agency) ____ 3. Private Therapist or Clinic ____ 4. None ____

5.) Type of Therapy Other Than S.O.P.: 1. Individual ____ 2. Group ____ 3. None ____

6.) Length of Other Therapy (In Weeks): _____

7.) Number of Sessions of Other Therapy: _____

8.) Estimate of Success of Other Therapy: 1. Low ____ 2. Medium ____

3. High ____ Explain: _____

9.) Probationer's I.Q.: _____

10.) MMPI L Scale Initial T Score: ____ 11.) MMPI F Scale Initial T Score: ____

12.) MMPI K Scale Initial T Score: ____ 13.) MMPI F-K Initial Raw Score: ____

14.) MMPI Initial Goldberg Index: ____ 15.) MMPI Initial Two Point Code: ____

16.) MMPI Hs Scale Initial T Score: ____ 17.) MMPI D Scale Initial T Score: ____

18.) MMPI Hy Scale Initial T Score: ____ 19.) MMPI Pd Scale Initial T Score: ____

20.) MMPI Mf Scale Initial T Score: ____ 21.) MMPI Pa Scale Initial T Score: ____

22.) MMPI Pt Scale Initial T Score: ____ 23.) MMPI Sc Scale Initial T Score: ____

24.) MMPI Ma Scale Initial T Score: ____ 25.) MMPI Si Scale Initial T Score: ____

26.) MMPI A Scale Initial T Score: ____ 27.) MMPI R Scale Initial T Score: ____

28.) MMPI Es Scale Initial T Score: ____ 29.) MMPI Dy Scale Initial T Score: ____

| | |
|---|---|
| 30.) MMPI Do Scale Initial T Score: _____ | 31.) MMPI Re Scale Initial T Score: _____ |
| 32.) MMPI Cn Scale Initial T Score: _____ | 33.) MMPI O-H Scale Initial T Score: _____ |
| 34.) MMPI MAS Scale Initial T Score: _____ | 35.) MMPI MAC Scale Initial T Score: _____ |
| 36.) MMPI D1 Scale Initial T Score: _____ | 37.) MMPI D2 Scale Initial T Score: _____ |
| 38.) MMPI D3 Scale Initial T Score: _____ | 39.) MMPI D4 Scale Initial T Score: _____ |
| 40.) MMPI D5 Scale Initial T Score: _____ | 41.) MMPI Hy1 Scale Initial T Score: _____ |
| 42.) MMPI Hy2 Scale Initial T Score: _____ | 43.) MMPI Hy3 Scale Initial T Score: _____ |
| 44.) MMPI Hy4 Scale Initial T Score: _____ | 45.) MMPI Hy5 Scale Initial T Score: _____ |
| 46.) MMPI Pd1 Scale Initial T Score: _____ | 47.) MMPI Pd2 Scale Initial T Score: _____ |
| 48.) MMPI Pd3 Scale Initial T Score: _____ | 49.) MMPI Pd4a Scale Initial T Score: _____ |
| 50.) MMPI Pd4b Scale Initial T Score: _____ | 51.) MMPI Mf1 Scale Initial T Score: _____ |
| 52.) MMPI Mf2 Scale Initial T Score: _____ | 53.) MMPI Mf3 Scale Initial T Score: _____ |
| 54.) MMPI Mf4 Scale Initial T Score: _____ | 55.) MMPI Mf5 Scale Initial T Score: _____ |
| 56.) MMPI Mf6 Scale Initial T Score: _____ | 57.) MMPI Pa1 Scale Initial T Score: _____ |
| 58.) MMPI Pa2 Scale Initial T Score: _____ | 59.) MMPI Pa3 Scale Initial T Score: _____ |
| 60.) MMPI Sc1a Scale Initial T Score: _____ | 61.) MMPI Sc1b Scale Initial T Score: _____ |
| 62.) MMPI Sc2a Scale Initial T Score: _____ | 63.) MMPI Sc2b Scale Initial T Score: _____ |
| 64.) MMPI Sc2c Scale Initial T Score: _____ | 65.) MMPI Sc3 Scale Initial T Score: _____ |
| 66.) MMPI Ma1 Scale Initial T Score: _____ | 67.) MMPI Ma2 Scale Initial T Score: _____ |
| 68.) MMPI Ma3 Scale Initial T Score: _____ | 69.) MMPI Ma4 Scale Initial T Score: _____ |
| 70.) MMPI Si1 Scale Initial T Score: _____ | 71.) MMPI Si2 Scale Initial T Score: _____ |
| 72.) MMPI Si3 Scale Initial T Score: _____ | 73.) MMPI Si4 Scale Initial T Score: _____ |
| 74.) MMPI Si5 Scale Initial T Score: _____ | 75.) MMPI Si6 Scale Initial T Score: _____ |
| 76.) MMPI L Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____ | 77.) MMPI F Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____ |
| 78.) MMPI K Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____ | 79.) MMPI F-K Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____ |
| 80.) MMPI Retest 1 Goldberg Index: _____ | 81.) MMPI Retest 1 Two Point Code: _____ |
| 82.) MMPI Hs Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____ | 83.) MMPI D Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____ |
| 84.) MMPI Hy Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____ | 85.) MMPI Pd Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____ |
| 86.) MMPI Mf Scale Retest 2 T Score: _____ | 87.) MMPI Pa Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____ |
| 88.) MMPI Pt Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____ | 89.) MMPI Sc Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____ |

- 90.) MMPI Ma Scale Retest 2 T Score: _____ 91.) MMPI Si Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____
- 92.) MMPI A Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____ 93.) MMPI R Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____
- 94.) MMPI Es Scale Retest 2 T Score: _____ 95.) MMPI Dy Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____
- 96.) MMPI Do Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____ 97.) MMPI Re Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____
- 98.) MMPI Cn Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____ 99.) MMPI O-H Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____
- 100.) MMPI MAS Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____ 101.) MMPI MAC Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____
- 102.) MMPI D1 Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____ 103.) MMPI D2 Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____
- 104.) MMPI D3 Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____ 105.) MMPI D4 Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____
- 106.) MMPI D5 Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____ 107.) MMPI Hy1 Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____
- 108.) MMPI Hy2 Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____ 109.) MMPI Hy3 Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____
- 110.) MMPI Hy4 Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____ 111.) MMPI Hy5 Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____
- 112.) MMPI Pd1 Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____ 113.) MMPI Pd2 Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____
- 114.) MMPI Pd3 Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____ 115.) MMPI Pd4a Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____
- 116.) MMPI Pd4b Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____ 117.) MMPI Mf1 Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____
- 118.) MMPI Mf2 Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____ 119.) MMPI Mf3 Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____
- 120.) MMPI Mf4 Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____ 121.) MMPI Mf5 Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____
- 122.) MMPI Mf6 Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____ 123.) MMPI Pa1 Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____
- 124.) MMPI Pa2 Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____ 125.) MMPI Pa3 Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____
- 126.) MMPI Sc1a Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____ 127.) MMPI Sc1b Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____
- 128.) MMPI Sc2a Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____ 129.) MMPI Sc2b Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____
- 130.) MMPI Sc2c Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____ 131.) MMPI Sc3 Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____
- 132.) MMPI Ma1 Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____ 133.) MMPI Ma2 Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____
- 134.) MMPI Ma3 Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____ 135.) MMPI Ma4 Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____
- 136.) MMPI Si1 Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____ 137.) MMPI Si2 Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____
- 138.) MMPI Si3 Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____ 139.) MMPI Si4 Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____
- 140.) MMPI Si5 Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____ 141.) MMPI Si6 Scale Retest 1 T Score: _____

| | |
|--|--|
| 142.) MSI PI Scale Initial Score: _____ | 143.) MSI SSD Scale Initial Score: _____ |
| 144.) MSI SO Scale Initial Score _____ | 145.) MSI L(cm) Scale Initial Score: _____ |
| 146.) MSI L(r) Scale Initial Score: _____ | 147.) MSI L(ex) Scale Initial Score: _____ |
| 148.) MSI L(in) Scale Initial Score: _____ | 149.) MSI CDI Scale Initial Score: _____ |
| 150.) MSI J Scale Initial Score: _____ | 151.) MSI TA Scale Initial Score: _____ |
| 152.) MSI CM Scale Initial Score: _____ | 153.) MSI Ra Scale Initial Score: _____ |
| 154.) MSI Ex Scale Initial Score: _____ | 155.) MSI PASO Scale Initial Score: _____ |
| 156.) MSI SD Scale Initial Score: _____ | 157.) MSI SKB Scale Initial Score: _____ |