

CR-Sent
12-21-88



New Jersey Supreme Court
STATE ADVISORY BOARD for PROBATION
Report for 1985 - 1986

113503

113503

New Jersey Supreme Court

113503

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

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
NJ Administrative Office of the
Courts/Probation Services Div.

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

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

STATE ADVISORY BOARD FOR PROBATION

Report For 1985 - 1986

Horace J. DePodwin, Chair

Administrative Office of the Courts
Probation Services Division
Justice Complex, CN 987
Trenton, N.J. 08625

NCJRS

SEP 13 1986

ACQUISITIONS

October 1986

SUMMARY

In 1984, Chief Justice Robert N. Wilentz appointed a State Advisory Board for Probation to serve as an advisor to the Supreme Court on matters related to probation. The Board is composed of 22 members from government, business, labor, academia, the probation service, and the public at large. During the past year, the Board pursued work in three major areas through committees on Public Involvement and Support; Performance, Standards and Information; and Innovative Projects.

The Committee on Public Involvement and Support guided the establishment of Local Probation Advisory Committees in Essex, Gloucester, Mercer and Morris Counties; and developed a proposal to conduct a comprehensive public relations project for probation.

The Committee on Performance, Standards and Information developed a proposal to conduct research into the relationship of resources, activities and outcomes in probation supervision.

The Committee on Innovative Projects began a new search for innovative projects in probation, updating and expanding their earlier report.

The proposed agenda for 1986-87 will include establishing more Local Probation Advisory Committees, conducting the public relations project and the research project and continuing the search for innovative projects in probation. The Board is grateful for the dedicated support they received from Harvey M. Goldstein, Assistant Director for Probation; William D. Burrell, Chief, Supervision Services; Mary I. Swayser, Assistant Chief, Juvenile Services; and Michael H. Epstein, Research Associate of the Administrative Office of the Courts.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. BACKGROUND.....	2
III. PROGRESS OF THE BOARD IN 1985-1986.....	5
IV. PROBATION TRAINING.....	16
V. AREAS OF ADDITIONAL INTEREST.....	19
Automation.....	19
Services to Probationers.....	21
VI. AGENDA FOR 1986-1987.....	23
A. Agenda Area One: Innovation and Creativity.....	23
B. Agenda Area Two: Public Involvement and Support.	24
C. Agenda Area Three: The Effectiveness and Efficiency of Probation.....	25
VII. APPENDICES.....	26
A. Speakers, 1985-86	
B. Local Probation Advisory Committees	
C. Public Relations Initiative Proposal	
D. Research Proposal	

I. INTRODUCTION

This second report of the New Jersey Supreme Court's State Advisory Board for Probation covers the Board's work over 18 months, January 1985 - June 1986. The Board's first report covered calendar 1984, after which the court year calendar was adopted for these reports.

The State Advisory Board for Probation (hereafter Advisory Board) is an independent body established by the Supreme Court to advise it on matters related to probation. While the Court provides direction for the Advisory Board by defining its objectives, the Board proposes and pursues, with Court approval, an agenda of its own making. This report details the Board's work on the agenda proposed to the court in the Spring of 1985.

The Advisory Board is composed of 22 members and represents a broad cross-section of New Jersey residents with interest in the efficient and humane functioning of the State's justice system. The Board includes members of the business community, academicians, social service providers, citizen volunteers, and justice system professionals. All are appointed by the Chief Justice and receive no compensation for their work. Staff for the Advisory Board is provided by the Probation Services division of the Administrative Office of the Courts.

II. BACKGROUND

The Advisory Board derives from a series of activities initiated by Chief Justice Robert N. Wilentz early in his term. In 1980, the Chief Justice appointed the Committee on Efficiency in the Operation of the Courts of New Jersey which undertook a comprehensive review of the administrative aspects of the New Jersey trial court system. The Committee reported deficiencies in the system's administrative structure and particularly in control and guidance for Probation Services. The Committee recommended that the Supreme Court focus the 1982 Judicial Conference on Probation and that it appoint "a community and court support board including private citizens speaking for their communities" to review probation and report to the Judicial Conference. Both recommendations were adopted. The 1982 Judicial Conference was devoted to Probation, and the Chief Justice appointed twelve local committees to provide guidance to the conference. The local committees consisted of justice system professionals and other residents of New Jersey. Several hundred persons representing a very broad array of occupations and community groups were involved.

From that process, a clear endorsement for citizen involvement in the Court's probation function emerged. In the Final Report on State and Local Public Participation in Probation (1982) from the Conference, the purpose of citizen participation in probation was articulated.

The average citizen's awareness of the Probation System and the Courts--what they are, where they are and what they do has been very limited. The creation of State and regional boards with membership from the general public would do much to bring the systems and the community in closer touch with

one another, providing citizens an opportunity to share their special points of view and to be involved in shaping probation policies. (At 2.)

The 1982 Judicial Conference accepted the recommendation of the local committees as embodied in the Final Report and endorsed two administrative rules to accomplish these ends.

R. 9:6-3 State-Level Advisory Board

There shall be a state-level Advisory Board to recommend policies, advise the Supreme Court regarding the adequacy of plans and budgets of each probation office, report annually to the Supreme Court as to the effectiveness of the services provided and assume any other responsibilities as the Supreme Court may delegate. The Chief Justice shall appoint to the Board community members and criminal justice practitioners. The Administrative Director shall be a member of the Board and serve as its secretary.

R. 9:7-6(E) Local Advisory Committees

Advisory committees shall be established at the county level to provide advice and guidance to the probation offices. The committees shall be composed of criminal justice professionals and community members appointed by the Chief Justice upon recommendation of the Assignment Judge. The local probation liaison judge shall chair the committee and the local chief probation officer shall serve as secretary.

These rules were adopted by the Supreme Court in May 1983. In January 1984, the Chief Justice first appointed persons (21) to the Advisory Board. The current list of members, including their affiliations and year of appointment, follows:

State Advisory Board for Probation

Dr. Horace J. DePodwin, Chair (1984)
Graduate School of Management
Rutgers University

Mr. Peter Brill (1986)
Bergen County Probation Dept.

The Rev. Albert C. Clayton (1985)
Ocean, Inc.

Dr. Todd R. Clear (1985)
School of Criminal Justice
Rutgers University

Mr. Ross Doyle (1986)
Union County Probation Dept.

Mr. C. Roy Epps (1985)
Civic League of Greater New Brunswick

Ms. Tricia Fagan (1984)
Association for Children of NJ

Mr. Harold Holloway (1984)
Mercer County Probation Dept.

Ms. Dawn Jennings (1984)
Camden County Probation Dept.

Mr. Walter Johnson (1984)
Family & Children's Services of
Monmouth County

Mr. Edward J. Lenihan (1984)
Renaissance Newark, Inc.

Dr. Paul Lerman (1984)
Graduate School of Social Work
Rutgers University

Robert D. Lipscher, Esquire (1984)
Administrative Director of the
Courts

Mr. Jude T. Mayo (1984)
Department of Labor & Industry

Mr. John T. McHugh (1984)
Middlesex County Administrator

Ms. Barbara McLaughlin (1985)
Schering-Plough Corporation
Volunteer-in-Probation

Dr. Joseph I. Naus (1984)
Statistics Department
Rutgers University

The Rev. Edward Reading (1984)
Medical Society of New Jersey

Ms. Diane Scott-Bey (1984)
Essex County Probation Dept.

Ms. Candace Tice-Tomasik (1986)
Ocean County Probation Dept.

Mr. Richard van den Heuvel (1984)
Middlesex County Corrections &
Youth Services

Mr. Bohdan Yaworsky (1984)
Jersey City State College

III. PROGRESS OF THE BOARD IN 1985-1986

In its last report to the Supreme Court, the Advisory Board recommended its agenda for the next several years. The Court accepted three of the four agenda items proposed. They are reported on in some detail in the next three sections on committee work.

The fourth agenda item was to have the Advisory Board evaluate its performance since its inception and make recommendations to the Court based thereon. In reviewing that proposal, the Court suggested that it was too early in the existence of the Advisory Board to conduct an effective evaluation. Consequently, action on that item has been postponed.

The Advisory Board meets regularly in plenary session to discuss the progress of its committees on their agenda assignments, to receive reports on probation services in New Jersey from the Administrative Office of the Courts, and to hear presentations from individuals and organizations on probation matters of importance to the Advisory Board. The speakers who addressed the Advisory Board during 1985-1986 and their topics are listed in Appendix A.

The Advisory Board has organized itself into three committees. The membership of each, as well as the 1985-1986 agenda and accomplishments of each, are covered below.

State Advisory Board for Probation

Committee on Public Involvement and Support

Mr. Edward J. Lenihan, Chair
Rev. Albert C. Clayton
Mr. C. Roy Epps
Ms. Tricia Fagan
Ms. Dawn Jennings
Mr. Walter Johnson
Ms. Diane Scott-Bey
Ms. Candace Tice-Tomasik
Mr. Bohdan Yaworsky

This Committee bears significant responsibility for a primary function of the Advisory Board, i.e., to increase public involvement in probation so that effective and continuing community support for probation is achieved. The work of the Committee reflects the Advisory Board's belief that the success of probation depends in large measure on the extent of community support available to probationers and local probation departments and that support can best be obtained by involving residents of New Jersey in the work of probation. The task of this committee is to create means for public involvement and support.

The Committee's agenda follows:

1. Create Local Probation Advisory Committees and monitor the performance of these committees against established standards. The local committees will be organized sequentially as the year progresses so that the Board may benefit from the experience gained.
2. Create a statewide program of support for probation in New Jersey by enlisting business, educational, social, religious, and community organizations to help improve the effectiveness of probation as well as the chances of individual probationers succeeding.
3. Explore the potential for success of a community based New Jersey foundation devoted to exploring and testing alternatives to traditional probation methods.

4. Develop, and to the extent possible implement, a plan to improve the public's perception of probation and the role it plays in society. This includes evaluating the public's image of probation in the context of its realities.
5. Study the funding of probation and, in particular, the feasibility of having some probationers bear a portion of the costs they impose on taxpayers. Such a study should consider the issues of equity and feasibility of charging offenders on probation for their supervision. The experiences of states which charge such fees and proposals for such fee collections, which have been introduced into the New Jersey Legislature, should be reviewed.

The major element of the Committee's work in 1985-1986 was the establishment of Local Probation Advisory Committees in four counties. The Committee recognized the desire of the Supreme Court to establish the mechanism for involvement of the community with probation at the local level. The guidelines for the local units were developed during the Advisory Board's first year of operation through its Committee on Local Probation Advisory Committees. The guidelines included suggested membership, functions, organization, and administrative structure.

The Committee is pleased to report that the four counties selected as pilot sites have had their committees appointed by the Chief Justice and are now functioning as planned. Gloucester County was the first, followed by Morris, Essex, and Mercer. Membership lists for the four local committees are included in Appendix B. The creation of these four Local Probation Advisory Committees was accomplished through the exceptional support of the Assignment Judges and Chief Probation Officers in the pilot counties. They include Judge Samuel G. DeSimone and Chief Norman L. Helber, Gloucester; Judge Reginald Stanton and Chief John J. Enright, Morris;

State Advisory Board for Probation

Judge John A. Marzulli and Chief Nicholas Fiore, Essex; and Judge Samuel D. Lenox and Chief Harold Holloway, Mercer. The Advisory Board is very grateful to them for their contributions to the creation of these local committees.

The members of the local committees were nominated for appointment by the Assignment Judge from among individuals suggested by judges and probation staff. Those who agreed to serve were considered for appointment by the Chief Justice. The Advisory Board is pleased to note the uniformly positive responses received to the invitations to join the local committees.

The image the public has of probation in New Jersey is also a point of focus of the Committee's work. As has been stated in the literature on criminal justice, probation has a negative image in the public's mind, if it has a definable image at all. This is believed to be the case in New Jersey, although there is no creditable information to support this belief. In any event, the Committee has reasoned that if public involvement in the work of probation is to be achieved, community-minded persons in the State must be educated on the importance of probation and its potential for reducing criminal activity. The work of the Committee in this area was influenced and aided greatly by Sherry Haller, Executive Director of the Criminal Justice Education Center of Hartford, Connecticut.

The Committee has developed a strategy for public involvement which includes a coordinated state and local public information initiative for probation, designed to educate the public about probation, develop interest in probation programs, and generate support for probation services. The initiative

would include training for key probation staff members, producing professionally developed media materials, and coordinating state and local press coverage. The full proposal is included in Appendix C.

Committee on Performance, Standards and Information

Dr. Todd R. Clear, Chair
Mr. Peter Brill
Dr. Horace J. DePodwin
Mr. John T. McHugh
Dr. Joseph I. Naus
Mr. Richard van den Heuvel

This Committee is charged with investigating a rather broad and complex area, which includes proposing: (i) measures of performance for the probation function; (ii) standards to ensure an adequate level of services; and (iii) systems for recording and analyzing the information needed to manage the function effectively. The agenda for the committee was defined in the Advisory Board's last report.

1. Ascertain minimum standards of performance for probation departments, including standards relating to the success of probationers under their control; work output and job performance of probation activities, e.g., juvenile supervision, child support enforcement, community service.
2. Work with Probation Services, AOC, to create an on-going system for monitoring probation performance across the State and test the system in several probation departments.
3. Work with Probation Services, AOC, to create a modern system for recording and analyzing information through a movement from labor intensive methods to the use of modern dispersed data processing.
4. Once the Probation Personnel Committee report is released, move promptly to help implement its major recommendations.

5. In 1985, the Board will work with the AOC to institute formal training for persons in probation along the lines advocated in this report. Should the AOC request, the Board will undertake further work on the proposed Training Academy, pursuing details of cost of training, sources of revenue, curriculum, faculty, and relevance for and integration with other AOC functional areas.

In addressing its agenda, the Committee returned repeatedly to the finding presented in the Board's prior report on the disparity in workloads and expenditures among New Jersey's county probation departments. (At 13-15.) The Committee asked: What are the implications of this disparity for the delivery of probation services to the probationer, the court, and the community? The question of equity in the administration of justice was raised. Does wide disparity among counties mean that those counties well below the State average provide a lesser degree or different quality of services?

In its effort to address the issues raised by this question, the Committee examined the documentation of the probation supervision process. Probation case files were obtained from six counties and the probation supervision process in each county was evaluated. The evaluation revealed that the State's probation function relies heavily on nongovernmental, community social service agencies to assist in supervision and to provide professional services critical for probation. The Committee found that probationers, especially juveniles, may be shunted from agency to agency, while often receiving little professional help because of a system which has fundamental flaws.

The flaws in the Court's probation system become obvious when one traces the common sequence of events when the State's

probation officers have probationers requiring professional services, e.g., psychiatric counseling, alcohol and drug abuse programs, job placement, and the like. They usually refer their charges to community agencies which frequently view probationers as potentially troublesome clients. Since the State and its counties have no contractual arrangements with these agencies, the agencies are not integrated into the probation process in any formal way.

Consequently, they accept no probation responsibility for the cases they receive from the State or county. This includes no responsibility to keep probationers in their programs, much less to report their progress to probation officers or departments. This is the responsibility of individual probationers. The records show that frequently such responsibility is not accepted by probationers, especially juveniles.

Probation officers, with no authority over agencies which do or might provide probationers with professional services, function simply as information and referral points, having available to them only what the community is willing to provide. They can exert little, if any, pressure on community groups and agencies to accept probationers, provide them with special services or insure that vocational and rehabilitation programs are available to probationers when needed, e.g., nights and weekends for probationers who work.

The Board believes that the problem of securing services for probationers in individual cases is compounded by the substantial disparity among counties with respect to probation expenditures per case. In its first report to the Supreme Court, the Board noted its concern that the level of

probation resources within each county directly affected the resources available to each probationer. Questions were then raised about the impact of that on the consistency of services provided statewide. Thus, disparity in probation funding appears to be mirrored in, and possibly compounded by, disparity in community resources among counties.

It is important to acknowledge the dilemma in which community agencies find themselves. They are usually not funded generously, and they allocate their limited resources in the manner which best enables them to meet their goals, which may or may not coincide with those of probation.

Some promising experiences have provided encouragement. With the implementation of the Family Court legislation, limited funding was made available at the county level to purchase services for juvenile offenders. In some counties, formal agreements between the court and/or probation have been drawn, providing a contractual relationship with funding support. This approach remedies some of the problems noted above and should be pursued.

Further, the Committee is heartened to note the progress being made by the state and county Youth Services Commissions (YSC) which were established to bring together the many and varied groups providing services to youths involved in the juvenile justice system. This has resulted in increased communication and coordination among such agencies, with more and better services being made available to youthful offenders. Probation staff have frequently taken a leadership role with the county Youth Service Commissions, thus increasing services to juvenile probationers.

Despite the progress outlined, the Committee believes that overall the entire system of handling probation cases requiring professional services is haphazard, and may well be quite ineffective in ensuring that probationers with problems receive the services they require. The Court has no practical ability to require professional service agencies to accept and treat such cases. The agencies have no responsibility to report their progress to the Court, except for whatever professional conduct responsibilities they may recognize in individual cases. The Courts and their probation officers currently offer these agencies neither contracts nor compensation. It is indeed a wonder that such non-contractual arrangements generate the volume of good quality professional services currently being delivered. That should not go unrecognized. Nevertheless, experimentation with contractual arrangements between probation departments and community agencies should extend beyond the Family Court.

As a consequence of this preliminary evaluation of the probation supervision process, the Committee concluded that a definitive evaluation should be made of the effectiveness of probation and the productivity of probation officers and departments.

The evaluation will be made through a rigorous research effort which will examine in depth the process of probation supervision in several counties. The research will document the level of resources available, the specifics of the supervision provided, and the outcomes obtained. Simply stated, the Committee wishes to know with some degree of confidence, whether what they suspect to be true is in fact true, i.e., providing more professional resources than are now being made

State Advisory Board for Probation

available can be reliably linked to improved performance by probationers.

The Advisory Board notes that a study of this type has important implication for probation in New Jersey and nationwide. No study is available which examines the effectiveness of probation, focusing on the relationships among activities, outcomes, and resources.

The research is being conducted by Ms. Patricia Hardyman, a doctoral candidate at the School of Criminal Justice, Rutgers University. Ms. Hardyman is a capable and knowledgeable probation researcher and has worked in probation. The Administrative Office of the Courts has made funds available to support the project and the Advisory Board is grateful to the AOC for its support. The research proposal is included in Appendix C.

Committee on Innovative and Exemplary Projects

Mr. Harold Holloway, Chair
Mr. Ross Doyle
Dr. Paul Lerman
Mr. Robert D. Lipscher
Mr. Jude T. Mayo
Ms. Barbara McLaughlin
Rev. Edward Reading

This Committee is charged with a continuing search for innovative and exemplary projects in probation and communicating the results to interested and concerned parties. Specifically, the Committee has sought to do the following:

1. Disseminate throughout the State information on innovative and exemplary projects. Encourage county probation departments to have their programs include more effective methods of dealing with probationers.
2. Search nationwide for innovative projects and, as appropriate, include exemplary projects with those recommended for adoption by county departments.

The Committee began its dissemination work by printing a small booklet-sized version of its report. Copies were given to every participant at the annual conference of the Probation Association of New Jersey in November 1985. Additionally, copies were included in the materials distributed to over 500 probation staff participants at the last three major probation training institutes held in the last year. Also, copies were made available at the Annual Institute of the American Probation and Parole Association (APPA), held in Houston in September 1985.

The Committee is planning a more systematic national distribution. A copy of the APPA membership list of over 2,000 persons has been obtained. A mailing is planned which will include a copy of the Committee's report and a request for

information on innovative or exemplary probation projects currently underway in other jurisdictions.

In preparation for that national mailing, the Committee is updating the material in its report. Each Chief Probation Officer will have the opportunity to update projects covering their departments and to submit any new projects for consideration by the Committee.

The results of the national mailing will be evaluated and, as appropriate, included in future reports about innovation in probation.

IV. PROBATION TRAINING

In last year's report, the Advisory Board recommended a comprehensive training program for probation officers. Since then, the AOC has made much progress in expanding, improving, and strengthening its training program.

During the past year, four major training institutes (two juvenile and two adult) for probation and court support staff have been conducted by the training unit of the AOC. Over five hundred staff received training in these two-day residential programs. They were the foundation of a training program which, for the first time, came very close to offering enough hours of training to allow each probation officer to receive the recommended 35 hours per year of training. The Advisory Board commends the AOC for these institutes and encourages their continuation and expansion.

The AOC's expanded training effort is based on training needs assessments, clearly linking courses to the perceived needs of probation personnel. Training has also been designed into new projects as they have been developed.

Basic training for new probation staff has been decentralized, allowing it to be offered more frequently and more closely timed to local hiring. A standard program with increased hours and greater depth has been prepared for delivery by county probation staff.

Further, the first line supervisor is the focus of an extensive model training program because this position is key to the effective operation of the probation department. All too often persons are promoted to a supervisory position without adequate training. This program features several tracks which target specific skills areas.

Cooperative programs are being offered with other state agencies. For example, 16 different one-day workshops on alcohol and the law were sponsored with the Division on Alcohol of the Department of Health. A program was initiated to facilitate the involvement of probation officers in the Certified Alcohol Counselor program.

The training unit has broadened its scope to include judicial support staff in the executive development program. This will enable probation personnel to improve their abilities and skills and to enhance their career mobility. Thus, the judiciary should gain a cadre of trained managers for managerial and administrative positions.

State Advisory Board for Probation

The Board is pleased to note that the Chief Probation Officers Association, in conjunction with the American Probation and Parole Association, sponsored several regional training programs on child abuse. Additionally, several county probation departments have secured local funding resources to expand their own training programs. This type of initiative is heartening and should be encouraged.

The Advisory Board reiterates its support of quality training for probation staff for the following reasons: A constant influx of new staff requires regular orientation training. New laws and new probation procedures and techniques require that the staff be educated continually. Finally, developmental training is important to maintaining professionalism at a high level. The Advisory Board will continue to monitor the training area as an ongoing concern. It is important that funding and resources continue to be available to support training.

•

V. AREAS OF ADDITIONAL INTEREST

A. Automation

In its first report, the Advisory Board noted that probation in New Jersey had failed to take advantage of the substantial benefits which can accrue from the use of contemporary computer technology. This area is still one of importance and the Advisory Board is concerned that it not be ignored.

Several bright spots have emerged since the first report. The Administrative Office of the Courts has installed a major data center in Trenton and is beginning to centralize data processing for court information systems. This will affect probation through the Family Automated Case Tracking System (FACTS) which will include juvenile probation supervision through the Juvenile Probation Management Information System (JPMIS). There is another system, a joint project between the AOC and the Division of Public Welfare, to automate the child support program. Known as the Automated Child Support Enforcement System (ACSES), it will not be operated through the AOC's data center but through the data center of the Department of Human Services. The pilot site, Burlington County, began installation in the summer, and all 21 counties are expected to be on line within three years.

This leaves two major probation functions, adult probation supervision and community service, to be computerized. There are several local management information system initiatives in place in these two areas and

several being implemented. They are not part of a statewide implementation plan, rather they have emerged in response to local interests and resources.

The AOC Probation Services staff is currently working with Camden County to develop a micro-computer based information system for the community service program. The intent is to implement and refine the software in Camden and then make it available to all counties for use in their community service programs. In adult probation supervision, a model exists in the Adult Probation Management Information System, but its implementation is the responsibility of individual counties.

The Advisory Board notes that a committee of Chief Probation Officers is currently working on recommending a model for probation management information systems as part of a larger supervision case management system. This work to develop a uniform and systematic approach should be supported as part of an overall effort to enable probation in New Jersey to meet modern standards for information management.

Acquisition and installation of computers alone will not realize the full potential of automation. The systems need to be integrated into the daily operation and decision-making processes of each probation department. The AOC should endeavor to provide, either directly or through consultants, training and technical assistance to probation managers on the use of computers.

B. Services to Probationers

The Advisory Board has become increasingly aware of the substantial problems in insuring that probationers receive required services. As noted above, probation officers are at the mercy of community organizations and agencies when seeking services needed by their probationers. As noted above, these services are usually provided by local voluntary agencies. Probation officers believe that they do not command the attention and respect required to move agencies to action.

In several rather rare instances, individual probation officers work in close collaboration with voluntary agencies. By and large, probation departments have not duplicated such work.

Considering all of this, the Advisory Board is attempting to formulate a new mechanism to assist probation officers and probation departments. The Advisory Board is exploring the creation of a non-profit organization to support probation. The organization would raise funds to support initiatives for new projects and conduct experiments designed to make probation more effective.

The details of such an organization have yet to be determined, though some fundamentals have emerged from the Advisory Board's discussions. The organization might well be independent of the State, allowing it to raise funds and operate its own programs. It might make funds available on a grant basis to probation departments and other organizations to develop and

State Advisory Board for Probation

implement innovative and creative projects to insure that probationers receive such services as job placement assistance, alcohol and drug abuse counseling, skill training and the like.

VI. AGENDA FOR 1986-1987

The Advisory Board proposes that its agenda for the Court Year 1986-87 build on its prior work, continuing in some areas and branching out in others. The reader will note that there are many interrelationships in the agenda, reflecting the complex, intertwined components one encounters when examining the probation function. The Advisory Board has focused on several that are seen as crucial in strengthening the ability of probation to effectively deliver services to the probationers, the courts, and the community.

A. Agenda Area One: Innovation and Creativity

The Advisory Board believes that there continues to be a need to encourage and facilitate innovation and creativity in probation in New Jersey. To that end, two items are proposed for this area of the Advisory Board's agenda.

The work of the Committee on Innovative and Exemplary Projects should be continued, expanding the dissemination of their reports to a national audience. The Committee should continue to solicit information on exemplary and innovative projects nationwide. This information should be evaluated and provided to probation departments in New Jersey.

The Advisory Board should continue to explore the possibility of establishing a private, non-profit organization or foundation. This would provide a valuable opportunity for experimentation outside the traditional bounds of government.

B. Agenda Area Two: Public Involvement and Support

The probation function in New Jersey remains in need of greater public involvement and support. The process has begun but much remains to be done. The Advisory Board should pursue several objectives in this agenda area.

The establishment of the Local Probation Advisory Committees should continue apace. The experience with the four pilot counties, while limited, indicates that there is a great reservoir of interest and willingness to be involved waiting to be tapped. The experience of the four pilot counties should be formalized into a document to assist the remaining counties as they undertake to establish Local Probation Advisory Committees.

Care should be taken not to abandon the Local Probation Advisory Committees after they are established. The Advisory Board made special note of the recommendation in its last report for support of the Local Probation Advisory Committees, including a manual, training, and conferences (at 11).

With the approval of the Supreme Court, the Advisory Board will institute a broad educational effort, targeting the media as a vehicle for educating the public about probation. This educational effort should raise the level of public awareness on the importance of probation to society. The Board's Committee on Public Involvement and Support is in the process of undertaking a probation marketing project to educate the public and the media about probation. The details of this effort are contained in Appendix C.

C. Agenda Area Three: The Effectiveness and Efficiency of Probation

The Advisory Board continues to be interested in and concerned with the effectiveness of probation. This concern is covered in the report of the Advisory Board's Committee on Performance, Standards and Information. With the approval of the Supreme Court, the Advisory Board will have this Committee proceed with a research project to explore the relationships among the level of resources available to probation, the supervision provided, and the outcomes obtained. The research is outlined in Appendix D.

The Advisory Board will also closely monitor nationwide efforts at computerization in probation. Despite several laudable efforts, probation in New Jersey is behind in the use of computers. Through close monitoring, the Advisory Board can help to maintain a high priority on obtaining and utilizing contemporary, state of the art computer technology for probation.

A P P E N D I C E S

APPENDIX A

SPEAKERS BEFORE THE STATE ADVISORY BOARD FOR PROBATION

<u>Meeting Date</u>	<u>Speakers</u>	<u>Topic</u>
June 1985	Todd R. Clear, Associate Professor School of Criminal Justice Rutgers University	<u>Granting Felons Probation,</u> RAND Corp. (1985)
August 1985	Sherry Haller, Executive Director Criminal Justice Education Center Hartford, Connecticut	Community Relations & Marketing
October 1985	Robert Joe Lee, Chief Court Interpreting, Legal Translation & Bilingual Services Administrative Office of the Courts	Supreme Court Task Force on Interpreters & Transla- tion Services
	Carol Shapiro, Director Program Resource Center	Program Resources Center School of Criminal Justice Rutgers University
November 1985	Todd R. Clear, Associate Professor School of Criminal Justice Rutgers University	National Issues in Adult Probation
February 1986	Martin Hodanish, Executive Director Juvenile Delinquency Disposition Commission	Juvenile Delinquency Disposition Committee
	Michael H. Epstein, Research Associate Probation Services	Juvenile Probationer Needs Assessment
	Gregory B. Wilcenski, Chief Juvenile Supervision Administrative Office of the Courts	Non-Profit Organizations & Their Role in Probation
April 1986	Raymond R. Rainville, Chief Child Support Enforcement Services	Child Support Enforcement
	John L. Neufeld, Chief Training Administrative Office of the Courts	Probation Training
June 1986	Thomas L. Jacobs, Commissioner New York City Dept. of Probation	NOVA ANCORA Project
	Jacob Ross, Executive Director NOVA ANCORA	NOVA ANCORA Project

APPENDIX B

Local Probation Advisory Committees

ESSEX COUNTY
Local Probation Advisory Committee Members

Donald Brown, Chair
Sheriff's Office

Paul Sanders
Office of Affirmative
Action

Hon. John A. Marzulli
Assignment Judge

Gail Mandheim
Mental Health Agency

Nicholas Fiore
Vicinage Chief Probation Officer

Joseph Parlavecchio
Freeholder

David Kerr
Integrity, Inc.

Catherine F. Willis
Div. of Community Action

Michael Droppa
Alcon Project

Ron Manzella
Div. of Youth Services

William Jones
Jail Ombudsman

John Mavros
Div. of Correctional Svcs.

Ruth Elam
Essex County Jail

Joel A. Pisano, Esquire
Essex Co. Bar Association

Dr. Robert Johnson
University of Medicine and
Dentistry of New Jersey

Armenus Williams
Private Industry Council

Gloria Perez-Aquino
Essex County Administration

Rocco Montesano
County Police

Joseph Tedeschi
Businessman

Carmen A. Orechio
Township of Nutley

Dr. William Harvey
Essex County Vocational Schools

Ann Noon
Intensive Supervision Program

James Hense
Essex County Community College

Celia D. Abalos
Dept. of Citizen Services

Hilda Siegel
Division of Welfare

Anthony Bocchino, Secretary
Senior Probation Officer

Carmen Fernicola
Division of Youth Services

Antonio Giarruto
Probation Officer

Richard Papile
Allegheny Employment Agency

Walter L. Joyce, Ass't
Chief Probation Officer

GLOUCESTER COUNTY
Local Probation Advisory Committee Members

Thomas G. Heim, Esquire, Chair
Attorney

Hon. Samuel G. DeSimone
Assignment Judge

Roland G. Hardy, Jr., Esquire
Attorney

Kim Haynes-Keene
Probation Officer

Nancy Delia
Private Citizen

Mark Parker
Y.M.C.A.

Samuel H. Bullock, Esquire
Attorney

Angel Estes
Robin's Nest Girl's Home

David W. McIlvaine
Businessman

Ann Marie Conway
Juvenile Conference Committee

Ann Marie Evangelista
Citizen Member

Mr. & Mrs. Robert Cooke
Citizen Members

Hon. Robert Francis
Presiding Judge, Family Division

Norman Helber
Vicinage Chief Probation Officer

Dr. Stanley Yeldell
Glassboro State College

Stephen Fingerman
Trial Court Administrator

John Maier
Freeholder Director

Gary Stuhltrager
State Assemblyman

Evelyn Ginter
People Against Spouse Abuse

John Olejarski
Citizen Member

Delores White
Private Citizen

Hon. Alex Alampi
Retired Municipal Court Judge
Secretary

Dr. Edward Shimberg
Psychologist

Elizabeth Currey
Community Dispute
Resolution Committee

Hon. Norman Telsey
Presiding Judge, Criminal Div.

MERCER COUNTY
Local Probation Advisory Committee Members

Reverend Dana Fearon, Chair
Lawrenceville Presbyterian Church

Hon. Samuel D. Lenox, Jr.
Assignment Judge

Hon. A. Jerome Moore
Presiding Judge, Criminal Division

Hon. Theodore T. Tams, Jr.
Presiding Judge, Family Division

Harold Holloway
Vicinage Chief Probation Officer

Shirley K. Turner
Freeholder, Mercer County

Stephen Kitts, Executive Director
Mercer Street Friends' Center

Harold Hall
Trenton Police Department

Patrick C. Hastings
Mercer Co. Youth Detention Center

Richard Niamark
Volunteer in Probation

V. Samuel Vukevich, Principal
Mercer Co. Vocational School

Dr. Michael Nitolli
Trenton State College

Jeffrey R. Robbins
Community Guidance Center of
Mercer County

Frank Cirillo
Mercer County Board of
Social Services

Eugene Gadson
Trenton Board of Education

Neil H. Shuster
Mercer County Prosecutor's
Officer

Edward G. Lavelle, Esq.
Office of the Public Defender

Barbara Wood
Div. of Drug, Alcohol and
Youth Services

Willard Schlossberg
Mercer Co. Community College

Patsy Valenza
N.J. State Employment Service

Shelia E. Owens
Assistant Court Administrator
Secretary

Robert Linder
Citizen Member

Maria Marinni
Probation Officer

E. John Wherry, Jr., Esq.
Attorney

MORRIS COUNTY
Local Probation Advisory Committee Members

Reed Henderson, Chair
Family Service of Morris County

Hon. Reginald Stanton
Assignment Judge

John J. Enright
Vicinage Chief Probation Officer

Geneva D. Brown
Citizen Member

Anthony Pennucci
United Brotherhood of Carpenters

Fred J. Rossi
County Administrator

John M. Fox
Sheriff

Lewis Stein
Attorney

Chris Fettweiss
Morris County After-Care Clinic

James S. Vance
Morristown High School

Celeste Kalina
Dept. of Social Services

Kathleen Leanard
Probation Officer

Kim Campbell-Studer
Volunteer in Probation

Paul F. Lubertazzi
Horizon Bank

Pastor, New Jerusalem
Institutional Baptist Church

Donald R. Capen
Madison Police Department

Barbara A. Lynch, ACSW
St. Claire's Hospital

Edward S. Small
County College of Morris

APPENDIX C

A Proposal to Conduct a
Public Relations Initiative
for Probation

Committee on Public Involvement
and Support
State Advisory Board for Probation

June 1986

Introduction

The Committee on Public Involvement and Support proposes that a coordinated state and local public relations and marketing initiative be conducted for probation in New Jersey. The purpose of the initiative would be to increase the visibility of probation in the community and improve its public image. The Committee believes that public involvement with, and support for probation would increase as a result.

I. The Problem

Nationally and locally, probation has been criticized for being isolated from the community, disconnected from the citizenry. Probation is anonymous, few people outside the justice system know what it is, and what it does. By taking a low profile, probation has cut itself off from a variety of potential constituencies, people and groups who could help and support probation, in crises as well as in day-to-day operations.

Probation administrators have not been regularly involved in the marketing of probation, the process of selling their product, to the public. They need training and technical support to effectively do so.

Information about probation, suitable for consumption by the lay public in today's fast-paced media environment, does not exist. What information does exist is ponderous, dry and primarily statistical. Short, illustrative and visual material is needed to get the message across.

What publicity probation has received tends to be ad hoc and episodic, and often negative. If a new program started or an editor's curiosity was piqued by an incident an article could appear. Some counties did better than others, but the performance was sporadic when it came to positive, upbeat stories.

Negative and critical stories about probationers committing new crimes, or probation being lenient or ineffective were more likely to appear. These stories tend to be sensationalistic, and thus garner more prominent placement in the paper, and thus greater readership.

In short, the public need to be educated about probation. To be done effectively, that task should utilize contemporary communication techniques and a coordinated strategic approach

which encompasses the entire state. Probation has a responsibility to the public; the public also has a responsibility to probation.

II. The Project

The probation public relations and marketing initiative would be a multi-part, statewide coordinated effort to improve probation's public image. The project would be sponsored by the State Advisory Board for Probation, with the Chief Probation Officers Association (CPOC) the Probation Association of New Jersey (PANJ) and the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) as co-sponsors. It would be guided by a steering committee consisting of members of the Committee on Public Involvement and Support, several Chief Probation Officers, PANJ representatives, AOC Probation Services staff and the AOC Public Information Officers.

The Committee envisions four major components to the project.

A. Planning

The Steering Committee would prepare a detailed plan for implementation of the project.

B. Training and Technical Assistance

A 2-3 day training program on marketing and public relations would be provided for the CPO's and certain key staff. Follow-up technical assistance would also be available.

C. Media Materials

A variety of materials would be developed for use by the county probation staff in reaching out to the media and the public.

1. Press Kits

Information on probation in a form readily usable by the print and electronic media.

2. Video Tape

A professionally produced tape presenting and explaining probation.

3. Public Service Announcements

Short press about probation for radio and television.

D. Press Conferences

A coordinated state and local press conferences, starting with a large, state-wide focused conference, to be followed up by county probation staff with local press conferences and other marketing activities. The local initiatives should be co-sponsored by the Local Probation Advisory Committees.

III. Resources

Several organizations experienced in this area have expressed interest in working on this project.

- National Institute of Corrections, Washington, DC
- Criminal Justice Education Center, Hartford, Connecticut
- Program Resource Center, School of Criminal Justice, Rutgers University

APPENDIX D

Proposal to Study the Relationship
of Probation Resources, Activities
and Outcomes

Committee on Performance Standards
and Information

State Advisory Board for Probation

June 1986

Introduction

The Committee on Performance, Standards and Information of the the State Advisory Board for Probation proposes to study adult probation supervision in six New Jersey counties. The study will focus on the relationship among resources, activities and outcomes; and a mathematical model will be developed for assessing the impact of variations in the level of resources or the types of activities on the outcome of supervision.

The research would be conducted by Patricia Hardyman, a doctoral candidate at the School of Criminal Justice, Rutgers.

I. Statement of the Problem

One of the major responsibilities of the State Advisory Board for Probation is to

"...report annually to the Supreme Court as to the effectiveness of the (probation) services provided."

As the Board noted in its first report to the Court, it is presently not possible to determine with reasonable accuracy the effectiveness of probation services (p. 13).

The amount of valid and reliable information available concerning effectiveness, efficiency or costs is greatly lacking. Information which is available is in rough form, providing descriptive statistics with little analytic value. For example, across the 21 counties of New Jersey, adult probation caseloads vary from less than 60 probationers per office to well over 200. The cost for a year of supervision range from \$190 to \$490 per probationer. These variations raise questions about the equality of probation services across the state; questions we cannot currently answer.

Other researchers examining probation have not proven particularly helpful because they have predominately focused only on the outcome of supervision. This is somewhat simplistic and results in descriptive information of limited value. We need to know why something happened, not just that it happened. In order to thoroughly understand probation effectiveness and be able to measure it, the research must examine the process of probation supervision as well as the input (Probationers, resources) and outcomes. The process in this instance consists of the interactions between probation officers and probationer in carrying out the court ordered supervision. A myriad of factors comprise and influence the process, and these must be examined as a whole, not in isolation.

II. The Study

The goal of this study is to document the relationship among resources, activities and outcomes in probation supervision in order to assist probation administrators in deciding how to allocate resources to accomplish their goals in the most efficient and effective manner. By documenting these relationships, the impact of given policies and procedures can be assessed more accurately.

The study will focus on adult probation supervision in six counties. For each, data will be collected to address the following questions.

- What are the resources which support supervision, and how do they vary among the counties?
- Do variations in resources lead to differences in the supervision process, and if so what are the differences?
- What is the impact of the differences in the supervision process on the impact/outcome of supervision.

III. Methods

A. Sample

These questions will be addressed through data to be collected from a representative sample counties in New Jersey. Sampling is based on caseload sizes for adult offenders, geographic location and type of county (urban or suburban/rural). The counties tentatively selected for study are Ocean, Camden, Morris, Hunterdon, Union, Mercer. (See Appendix A.) In order to provide an accurate representation of the nature of probation resources and activities, the committee anticipates a need to tap a variety of data sources. The data will be collected from the 1982 probation casefiles (6 counties x 200 probationers = 1,200), interviews with probation administrators and line

officers, written policies and procedures of the respective departments, United States Bureau of Census reports, annual reports of the local departments, the Annual Report of the New Jersey Judiciary, New Jersey State Bureau of Identification records and observations of the probation officers' activities. All information, regardless of the source, will be kept completely confidential. Neither names nor identifying characteristics of the probation cases will be recorded, and the anonymity of all personnel will be assured.

B. Measurement

Data must be collected on the three major aspects of the probation resources system:

1. Input

Probationers' characteristics; probation department's funding level, goals, policy and procedures; organizational structure; probation staff characteristics; and county demographics.

2. Activities

Caseloads, supervision techniques, direct/indirect contacts and services provided and administrative methods.

3. Output

Probationers' arrests, violations, and incarcerations; and improvements in overall adjustment to the community.

Appendix B contains a table of potential variables for each proxy and possible sources for data collection.

C. Statistical Analyses

Analyses of the numerous variables will require a multi-stage process. A validation sample of 20% of the data collected from the probation case files will be set aside prior to Stage One. In Stage One, the degree of association among all the variables will be determined through cross-tabulation and correlation analyses. The Second Stage will entail fitting together the elements of probation services into a mathematical model of how they interact. The data from the probation casefiles will enable us to predict the probation outcomes from the activities of the probation department staff while controlling for variations in the inputs among the departments. This enables us to measure the impact of funding levels on casework activities and probation outcomes. Stage Three will be the validation of the model developed in Stage Two by application to the subsample set aside prior to Stage One.

IV. Results

The research and analysis will produce a mathematical model for assessing the impact of the level of resources and process of supervision on the outcome by supervision. To be successful, the model must be able to predict the dependent variable (probation outcomes) from the independent variable (activities) while holding constant numerous control variables pertaining to system inputs (resources).

V. Expected Benefits of the Research

This study will move beyond the limits of the previous research by simultaneously describing the day-to-day activities and linking the activities to resources and outcomes. The model

should suggest what inputs and activities and their combinations best advance the probation department's goals, given resource constraints. Moreover, the model will show what changes in activities and outcomes can be expected from increases or decreases in funding.

The study should aid the Advisory Board, the Supreme Court, the Administrative Office of the Courts and the county probation departments of New Jersey in assessing the quality of probation services and in estimating the costs associated with implementing uniform standards for probation effectiveness.

FIGURE 1

New Jersey Counties Tentatively Selected for Modeling
 Probation Resources Grouped According to
 Case Load, Type of County and Location

TYPE OF COUNTY (Location)	CASE LOAD SIZE		
	Small	Moderate	Large
Urban	Morris (Northern)	Union (Central)	Camden (Southern)
Suburban/Rural	Hunterdon (Central)	Ocean (Southern)	Mercer (Central)

FIGURE 2
EXAMPLES OF THE TYPES OF DATA TO BE COLLECTED

<u>ELEMENTS</u>	<u>ASPECT</u>	<u>VARIABLES</u>	<u>SOURCE</u>
Community	Community Resources	Social Agencies Welfare Board Poverty Rate Unemployment Rate	Probation Officers Census Reports Labor Statistics
	Crime Rate	Types and Rates of Offenses	Uniform Crime Reports
Courts	Sentencing Practices	Authorized Dispositions, Number & Type of Sentences, Special Conditions.	Statutes Judgements of Conviction
Probation Department	Staff Profile	Sex, Age, Ethnicity, Education, Experience, Goals	Survey of Probation Officers and CPO's.
	Services	Caseloads, Referrals, Number & Type of Contacts, Number of Words per Visit	Casefiles, Surveys
	Philosophy	Probation Officer Role Theory of Deviance Change Strategies	Surveys
	Policies	Criteria for VOP, and Successful Termination.	Surveys, Policy and Procedure Manuals.
Probationers	Structure	Salary, Rewards, Hierarchy, Relationships.	1982-85 Budgets, Pol. & Proc. Man. Surveys, Organizational Chart
	Risk to Community	Current Charge, Prior Arrests, Convictions and Sentences, Legal Status at Arrest.	Casefiles
	Needs	Health, Substance Abuse, Living Arrangements, Emotional & Mental Stability, Sexual Behavior, Transportation Vocational Skills, Family & Peer Relations, Communication Skills	Casefiles
Outcomes	Success	Decrease in Needs, Decrease in Risk, Employment, Compliance with Conditions.	Casefiles
	Failure	VOP's, new offenses, convictions, incarceration.	State Bureau of Identification Files