



# **Intermediate Sanctions for Women Offenders**

March 1995

155228

Prepared for  
Oregon Criminal Justice Council and the Department of Corrections

by  
Intermediate Sanctions for Female Offenders Policy Group

155228

NCJRS

JUL 26 1995

ACQUISITIONS

# **Intermediate Sanctions for Women Offenders**

March 1995

Prepared for  
Oregon Criminal Justice Council and the Department of Corrections

by  
Intermediate Sanctions for Female Offenders Policy Group

155228

**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

Public Domain/NIC

U.S. Department of Justice

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

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

This document was made possible by Grant Number 93CO3GHT9 from the National Institute of Corrections, U.S. Department of Justice.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and the Intermediate Sanctions for Women Offenders Policy Group and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the Oregon Criminal Justice Council, the Oregon Department of Corrections or the U.S. Department of Justice.

For further information or copies of this report, the reader may contact:

Oregon Department of Corrections  
2575 Center Street NE  
Salem, OR 97310  
(503)945-9091

---

## Table of Contents

Intermediate Sanctions for Women Offenders Policy Group .....	3
Acknowledgments .....	5
Executive Summary .....	7
Project Process .....	13
Project Origins .....	13
Creating a Vision .....	16
Vision Statement of Criminal Justice System Values and Goals .....	16
Information Collection and Analysis .....	17
Developing Policy and Program Recommendations .....	19
Findings and Observations .....	21
Decision Making Process and Policies .....	21
Observations .....	21
Supervision, Treatment and Other Resources .....	22
Observations .....	23
Perspectives of Women Offenders and Probation/Parole Officers .....	23
Summary of Issues from Parole/Probation Officers' Panel .....	25
Summary of Issues from Women Offenders' Panel .....	26
Trend Data .....	28
Reported Crime .....	29
Arrest Rates .....	29
Circuit Court Criminal Case Filings .....	29
Prison Commitments .....	30
Sentences to Felony Probation .....	30
Trends within Corrections .....	31
Observations .....	33
A Profile of Women Offenders on Probation and Parole in Oregon .....	33
Introduction .....	33
Sampling Plan and Survey Design .....	34
Sampling Plan .....	34
Survey Design .....	35
Offender Characteristics .....	36
Demographic Characteristics .....	37
Substance Abuse Problems .....	43
Current Offense Information .....	44
Criminal Justice System Responses and Behavior Under Supervision .....	48
Factors Related to Success/Failure on Probation and Parole .....	54
Observations .....	64

Recommendations .....	65
Information System Development .....	65
Program and Sanctioning Resource Needs .....	66
Partnerships for Planning and Service Delivery .....	67
Training and Education on Women Offender Issues .....	68
Future Research Directions .....	69
Legislative Initiatives .....	70
Dissemination of Information .....	70
Future Women Offender Policy Development Agenda .....	71
Appendix A: A Glossary of Common Terms .....	73
Appendix B: Decision Mapping .....	77
Appendix C: Resource Inventory .....	83
Appendix D: Data Collection Form .....	89
Appendix E: DOC Risk Assessment Tools .....	95

---

## Intermediate Sanctions for Women Offenders Policy Group

### **CHAIR**

Tamara Holden, Director  
Multnomah County Department of  
Community Corrections

Kathy Treb, Program Administrator  
Women's Transition Services  
Multnomah County Department of  
Community Corrections

### **VICE-CHAIR**

Jo Anne Trow, Vice Provost  
Student Affairs  
Oregon State University

Sally Anderson, Assistant Director  
Administrative Services  
Department of Corrections

Elyse Clawson, Assistant Director  
Community Corrections  
Department of Corrections

Lee Coleman, Branch Manager  
Multnomah Branch  
Children's Services Division

Paul Snider, Legal Counsel  
Association of Oregon Counties

Marva Fabien, Chair  
Board of Parole and Post-prison Supervision

Tom English, Director  
Oregon Council on Crime and Delinquency

Sonia Hoyt, Superintendent  
Oregon Women's Correctional Center

David Factor, Director  
Oregon Criminal Justice Council

Judge Janice Wilson  
Multnomah County Circuit Court

Kate Brown, State Representative  
House District 13

Donna Lattin, Director  
Lane County Justice Services

Commander William Wood  
Program Division  
Multnomah County Sheriff's Office

---

### **STAFF**

*Barbara McGuire, Project Coordinator  
Administrator, Community Corrections Option I*

*Bill Penny, Special Projects  
Community Corrections*

*Holly Getter, Executive Support  
Administrative Services*

### **CONSULTANT**

*Teri Martin, Ph.D.  
Law and Policy Associates*



---

## Acknowledgments

Many individuals donated their time and energy to help in completion of the project. A special thanks is extended to the following individuals:

### *DATA COLLECTORS*

Chris Bell, Deschutes  
Ann Benefiel, Linn  
Keith Benefiel, Central Administration  
Beverly Bentz, Douglas  
Robyn Branzell, Multnomah SE  
Dawn Bruce, Central Administration  
Catherine Bryant, Multnomah SE  
Guillermo Centavos, Central  
Administration  
Shay Christensen, Central Records  
Lyn Cokely, Polk  
Sue Doctor, Multnomah EA  
Kim Drake, Washington  
Eric Elwood, Lane  
Doug Farris, Lane  
Michael Haines, Multnomah SW  
Gene Harness, Linn  
Wende Hickman, Washington  
Christine Jensen, Multnomah SW  
Florence King, Multnomah SE  
Linda Labash, Clackamas  
Angelo Mauceri, Multnomah DC  
Robert Milton, Multnomah NE  
Kim Perkins, Jefferson  
Rob Persson, Marion  
Alfredo Rangel, Multnomah SE  
Sandi Rorick, Multnomah NE  
Frank Sardone, Multnomah SW  
Noreen Swan, Multnomah NE  
Mary Tegner, Marion  
Susan Walcutt, Multnomah CE

### *PANELISTS*

Lyn Cokely, Polk  
Bonnie Collins, Clackamas  
Susan Doctor, Multnomah  
Tony Meier, Lane  
Karensa G.  
Brenda H.  
Renee J.  
Katherine P.

### *ASSISTANTS IN MAPPING PROCESS*

Douglas Bray, Multnomah County Court  
Administrator  
Mike Greenlick, Attorney, Metropolitan  
Public Defenders  
Marsha Gruhler, Resource Coordinator,  
Metropolitan Public Defenders  
Jim Maras, Oregon Women's Corrections  
Center  
Larry Rutter, Hearings Officer  
Ron Stogsdill, Oregon Women's Cor-  
rections Center  
Tom Tintera, Senior Deputy District  
Attorney, Washington County



Oregon has long been concerned with the growing number of women offenders in its corrections system and the lack of accessible and appropriate sanctions and interventions for women offenders. When work on this project began in 1993, the number of women incarcerated in Oregon's prisons had been increasing at a faster rate than the male population for several years. The National Institute of Corrections, as part of its national women offender policy development initiative, provided a grant to support the work of Oregon's Intermediate Sanctions for Women Offenders Policy Group, jointly established by the Department of Corrections and the Oregon Criminal Justice Council. During the 18-month project, the Policy Group and its staff compiled and analyzed a variety of qualitative and quantitative information on women offenders, the criminal justice decision making process and sanctioning and programming resources available to women offenders in Oregon. The Policy Group reached consensus regarding a vision of an optimal criminal justice system for Oregon, and recommends changes in policies and practices intended to improve the effectiveness of criminal justice system interventions with women offenders.

### Creating a Vision

The Policy Group's vision statement describes core values, goals and strategies it advocates as the foundation for Oregon's criminal justice system:

#### *Core Value*

- To preserve personal dignity, honor diversity and support families and communities while promoting public safety.

#### *Criminal Justice System Goals*

- Sanction offenders equitably, consistently and humanely.
- Apply the least restrictive sanctions necessary to reduce the risk of re-offending.
- Impose the least intrusive interventions necessary to change behaviors that lead to criminal activity.
- Hold offenders accountable for harm to victims and the community.
- Facilitate offenders' integration into a healthy and supportive environment.
- Promote system accountability, efficiency and cost-effectiveness.

#### *System Strategies and Methods*

- Balance commitment to individualized responses to offender behavior with concern for consistency and uniformity.
- Provide interventions that are both tolerant of and provide for measured, appropriate responses to the phenomenon of relapse.
- Employ sanctions that are certain, swiftly administered, and as short as necessary to accomplish sanctioning goals.
- Provide for continuity in case management throughout offenders' involvement with the justice system.

- Make available the appropriate array of supervision, interventions and sanctions.
- Develop and implement programs that are gender and culture-relevant.
- Collaborate among justice system agencies, with other organizations, and across jurisdictions.
- Provide staff with training and support necessary to achieve system goals.
- Provide for ongoing evaluation of sanctioning and intervention processes and outcomes.

### **Findings and Observations**

The Policy Group, along with other key Oregon decision makers, defined and described criminal justice processes at twelve key decision points from arrest through case closure. The Group examined issues of particular relevance to women offenders in the context of decision options available, articulated and unspoken policies that guide decisions, and information used in making decisions. Through the mapping process, the Policy Group sharpened its understanding of the ways decision policies and practices may either constrain or enhance the criminal justice system's effectiveness in achieving its goals with both women and men offenders. The informal, unwritten decision rules found by the Policy Group to guide or influence all decisions were cited as the most likely sources of inequitable or ineffectual decision outcomes.

Through panel discussions, the Policy group elicited the perspectives of women offenders and of probation/parole officers about ways to enhance women offenders' probability of success under community supervision. Both offenders and officers observed that chemical dependency is a leading cause of criminal activities by women, and that sexual, emotional and/or physical abuse is often a causal factor leading to substance abuse by women. Long-term treatment is seen as essential to address women offenders' chemical dependency problems effectively. Because most women offenders are mothers, supporting them in effective parenting is critical, not only for their success, but also for the long-term physical and emotional health of their children. Offenders and probation/parole officers also concurred in their view that the presence of one supportive, caring individual who expects the best from a woman offender often makes a critical difference in ensuring her success; this individual can be a probation/parole officer, but may also be a relative or volunteer mentor.

A comprehensive inventory of services and sanctions available to women offenders throughout Oregon revealed that there are few specifically designed for women offenders. Although there is a wide array of interventions, services and sanctions for offenders under community supervision, no sanctions were found that had an expressed emphasis on serving the needs of women offenders. While many counties have specialized supervision caseloads for women offenders, few resources exist to support this supervision through interventions, services or sanctions that take into account real differences between men and women in their learning and relationship styles and life circumstances. State prison facilities for women offer the most comprehensive array of gender-specific programs in Oregon. This may contribute to decisions to revoke community supervision for some women who are not endangering public safety, but who cannot obtain comparable services in the community.

The Policy Group invested significant resources in assembling and analyzing information about women who successfully complete or are revoked from probation and parole supervision. Data

on probationers and parolees exiting supervision between September 1, 1992 and August 31, 1993 shows that 82% of women probationers in contrast to just 42% of women parolees successfully complete supervision. Many of the same factors were significantly associated with success or failure on community supervision for both probationers and parolees, including:

- Prevalence of substance abuse problems
- Level of employment while under supervision
- Stability in the community as measured by address changes
- Total score on the Department of Corrections risk assessment scale (which includes measures of the above items)

Participation in alcohol and drug treatment also was significantly associated with likelihood of success under supervision, although the magnitude of the effect that could be measured with available data is smaller than for risk scale factors that are less readily affected by criminal justice system interventions. Through this data collection process, the Policy Group learned that many types of information about women, their families and support networks, and their participation in programs and sanctions are not routinely or reliably available in existing automated data bases. This lack of information hampered efforts to document correlations between criminal justice system interventions and supervision outcomes. The Group also observed technological and organizational barriers to information-sharing that hampered coordinated delivery of services and sanctions to women offenders.

## Recommendations

The Policy Group's recommendations focus on five central themes that have grown out of its work on this project.

1. Comprehensive and accurate information about female offenders and the sanctions and services provided them must be routinely available to practitioners and policy makers.
  - Incorporate processes for efficiently collected essential data about female offenders as new automated information systems are developed and existing ones are revamped.
  - System designers should develop standard definitions of terms and variables so that data collected in diverse parts of the state and by various agencies and service providers is consistent and comparable.
  - Data on female offenders that should be routinely collected includes: *information about their children, social support systems, living arrangements, marital and pregnancy status, income types and amounts, family involvement in the criminal justice system, juvenile court involvement, chemical dependency history, treatment history, education and skill levels, and criminal justice supervision history.*
2. Adequate resources must be allocated to provide for gender-specific programming for female offenders.
  - Ensure that programs for female offenders use interventions that are sensitive to women's unique needs and strengths.

- Develop and maintain programs that encourage female offenders to develop trusting and supportive relationships with other women.
  - Make available to female offenders mentors or supervisors who exemplify individual strength and growth while also providing caring support.
  - Provide programs that build upon and enhance support systems and relationships that are central to women's lives.
  - Provide programs for female offenders that help them in dealing with codependency and abuse/victimization issues as appropriate.
  - Make residential substance abuse programs available for all female offenders whose criminal behavior is clearly related to their serious chemical dependency problems.
  - Facilitate the visitation of children with incarcerated mothers.
  - Make provisions for child care for female offenders participating in community-based programs.
3. Develop collaborative inter-agency partnerships to provide effective interventions that can help to break the intergenerational cycle of criminal behavior.
- Extend the circle of potential partners beyond corrections and human services agencies to include public health agencies, private treatment and service providers, schools, churches and other community groups.
  - Encourage and support local planning and service delivery collaboratives to develop truly community-based sanctions and services for female offenders.
  - Encourage joint case planning by agencies involved with female offenders and their families, particularly Children's Services Division and local and state corrections agencies.
  - Include corrections system representatives on the state and local Commissions for Children and Families.
4. There is a universal and continuing need for professional training in issues about female offenders.
- Involve female offenders in design and delivery of training about female offender issues and compensate them appropriately.
  - Incorporate female offender issues in all orientation and continuing criminal justice training requirements.
  - Offer training in female offender issues at the local level, and encourage participation by a variety of criminal justice and human service professionals.
  - Provide for public education to promote greater community understanding of female offenders and the factors affecting their success in the community.
5. Policy makers and researchers should continue to develop policies and programs that consider the unique characteristics of female offenders and continuously monitor their effectiveness.

- Develop a prospective research agenda permitting collection of necessary information on an ongoing basis to learn which factors affect female offenders' probability of success under community supervision.
- Policy makers and program designers should carefully define their expected and desired outcomes, and use rigorous evaluation research techniques to assess progress in relationship to these defined goals.
- Questions warranting future research include:
  - What are the causes and effects of disproportionate minority representation in corrections programs?
  - What are the most effective ways to respond to female offenders' failures?
  - Which sanctions are most effective in producing desired behaviors changes?
  - What factors lead women to criminal activity, and how can interventions be designed to most effectively respond to these factors?

The Policy Group wants the concern for female offenders that this project has encouraged to continue, and recommends that the proposed Public Safety Planning Group adopt the finds and recommendations of this report, and include the vision statement as part of its mission and values. Local policy planning groups and professional organizations should include female offender issues on their planning, training and evaluation agendas on an ongoing basis. The Policy Group strongly encourages continuing efforts to expand our knowledge of female offenders and to enhance our understanding of the most effective methods of supporting them in becoming law-abiding and productive community members.



# Project Process

## Project Origins

Since 1991, the National Institute of Corrections [NIC] has provided grant funds and technical assistance to selected jurisdictions interested in improving criminal justice decision making and correctional options for women offenders. During the first funding cycle, three counties in three separate states were selected to participate in the national project. Oregon applied for and received a planning grant during the second round of funding and became the first state to participate in the NIC Intermediate Sanctions for Women Offenders Project. Previous efforts funded by NIC to develop intermediate sanction policy for women offenders included a single jurisdiction, either a county or city. Oregon decided, however, that the most effective contribution it could make would be to examine existing policy and practice statewide and develop policy recommendations with statewide application.

### **SNAPSHOT: JUNE 29, 1993**

"Nationally, between 1980 and 1992, the female prison population increased by 275%, compared to an increase of 160% for the male population."

*Source: Testimony of Gail Smith, Executive Director of Chicago Legal Aid to Incarcerated Mothers before Senate Judiciary, June 29, 1993*

Oregon has long been concerned with the growing number of women offenders in its correction's system and with the lack of accessible and appropriate sanctioning options and interventions for women offenders. Even before work on the project began, Oregon data suggested that the number of women incarcerated in state prisons was increasing at a faster rate than the male population. In its 1990 report, the Governor's Task Force on Corrections Planning recommended that policy makers concerned with women offenders address two key objectives:

- Breaking the cycle of dysfunction that women offenders and their children experience.
- Making substance abuse treatment available to women offenders in prison and on community supervision.

In 1991, the Department of Corrections White Paper: Women Offenders in Oregon suggested several approaches to providing appropriate and effective sanctions and interventions for women offenders believed to be associated with improved outcomes for women and their children:

- A holistic approach to the woman offender;
- Programs that are of sufficient duration and continuity to have the desired impact and that an aftercare component;

- Opportunities to improve parenting skills and preserve the family unit;
- Gender-specific services focusing on the special needs of women in a context geared to the experiences of women; and
- Substance abuse treatment geared to the woman offender.

In July of 1992, the Department of Corrections convened a statewide planning session attended by sixty people committed to developing effective correctional responses to women offenders. Participants discussed many issues and agreed on the importance of several principles that are keys to future strategy development:

- Agency collaboration should be based on clearly defined roles and responsibilities and focus on continuity for individual offenders;
- Assessment of women offenders should be coordinated, non-duplicated and individualized;
- The effectiveness of treatment is often dependent on the availability of ancillary support such as child care, transportation and health care;
- Identification and response to the special treatment needs of women offenders should not result in incarceration or supervision beyond the time that is otherwise required by criminal justice system sanctions;
- Prevention and early intervention are vital. A continuum of sanctions and interventions should be available to respond to offenders at every stage of their involvement with the justice system;
- Staff training should be broad-based and should focus on increasing awareness of gender-specific issues including decision making protocols and successful, effective, supportive intervention strategies; and
- Information regarding the effectiveness of particular sanctions and interventions with specific types of women offenders must be systematically obtained and analyzed.

**USA SNAPSHOT: JULY 15, 1994**

"Currently, there are 90,000 women in U.S. prisons and jails, more than any other time in the nation's history. Since 1980 the number of women in prison has increased 300%. Eighty percent of the incarcerated women are mothers of children under age 18, and three out of 4 are serving time for non-violent property crimes or drug offenses."

*Source: National Council on Crime and Delinquency, Criminal Justice Newsletter, Volume 25, Number 14, Published July 15, 1994*


**USA SNAPSHOT: 1993**

Arrests of women increased 4.4% from 1992-1993, while arrests for men increased 1.1%. Total arrests increased 1.8%

*Source: Report of Criminal Offenses and Arrests, 1993/State of Oregon/June 1994*

The Oregon Female Offenders Network was created in part because of this meeting. This group also served as a catalyst for development of Oregon's proposal to participate in the NIC project.

The Board of Parole and Post-prison Supervision in 1992 began a pilot project empowering parole officers by giving them more discretion to impose specified intermediate sanctions in response to violations of parole conditions. During the 1993



legislative session, this process was expanded and codified into a statute as Administrative Probation and Structured Sanctions and now applies to all offenders under community supervision whether on probation or parole. The system is automatic for all offenders who commit their crime after September 1, 1993. The Structured Sanctions Process represents good correctional policy for managing offenders and holding them accountable for their behavior. The law enables the probation/parole officer to impose a sanction without going to court or to the Board of Parole, thus allowing for early intervention in the noncompliant behavior of offenders. The term "structured sanctions" refers to the system's imposition of sanctions determined by the seriousness of the noncompliant

behavior and the risk level of the offender. This structure facilitates consistency in sanctioning decisions statewide.

Elements of the administrative probation/structured sanctions strategy include:

- Swift, sure and short responses to offender violations;
- Sanctions imposed based on risk level and the seriousness of the violation;
- Early intervention to reduce drug use and other criminal behavior and more effectively protect the public;
- Reduction in the use of prison resources to required to punish many non-criminal violations;
- Increased availability of community-based incremental sanctions such as electronic monitoring, day reporting, intensive supervision, work centers, home custody, work crews, and other sanctions; and
- Reductions in court time and associated costs for violation hearings, thus reserving court hearings for violations requiring a revocation to prison.

The 1993 Legislature, faced with a shrinking budget and growing prison population, saw structured sanctions as a tool to reduce revocations to prison and stay within the number of prison beds available in 93-95. Targets of a 50% reduction in non-new conviction revocations were set by the Legislature to preserve prison beds for more violent and high-risk offenders. These targets significantly affect women offenders. From October of 1992 through September of 1993, 74% of all women admissions to prison were probationers or parolees revoked without a new conviction. [Compared with 52% of the male population.]

A central goal of the Oregon Intermediate Sanctions for Women Offenders project has been to examine the characteristics of women on probation or parole and to identify which factors appear related to success on community supervision. The goal-setting and decision mapping activities will equally extend to both genders in the criminal justice system. [See section titled Creating a Vision]

In 1993, the Department of Corrections and the Oregon Criminal Justice Council collaborated in establishing the Intermediate Sanctions for Women Offenders Policy Group. The Group included key decision makers and representatives of agencies and groups influential in policy development around women offender issues. The group has served as the policy and program planning group for the NIC funded policy development project. After an initial slow start, the group has become a cohesive and dedicated group of decision makers who has directed the work of the study and reached consensus on several key recommendations described in the final section of this document.

**USA SNAPSHOT: AUGUST 8, 1993**

A recent study estimates women in prisons are mothers of more than 167,000 children.

*Source: Barbara Bloom and David Steinhart, "Why Punish the Children? A reappraisal of the Children of Incarcerated Mothers." reported in the Chicago Tribune*

---

## Creating a Vision

The Policy Group has been committed to consensus decision making from its inception. One of the first products of the group effort is the following vision statement describing the Group's core values, goals and strategies for accomplishing the goals. Although the Group began its discussion from the perspective of issues particularly relevant to women offenders, the final statement evolved as a vision of an optimal criminal justice system for the State of Oregon without regard to the offender's gender.

### Vision Statement of Criminal Justice System Values and Goals

*Core Values: To preserve personal dignity, honor diversity and support families and communities while promoting public safety.*

### *Criminal Justice System Goals*

- *Sanction offenders equitably, consistently and humanely.*
- *Apply the least restrictive sanctions necessary to reduce the risk of re-offending.*
- *Impose the least intrusive interventions necessary to change behaviors that lead to criminal activity.*
- *Hold offenders accountable for harm to victims and the community.*
- *Facilitate offenders' integration into a healthy and supportive environment.*
- *Promote system accountability, efficiency and cost-effectiveness.*

### *System Strategies and Methods*

- *Balance commitment to individualized responses to offender behavior with concern for consistency and uniformity.*
- *Provide interventions that are both tolerant of and provide for measured and appropriate responses to the phenomenon of relapse.*
- *Employ sanctions that are certain, swiftly administered, and as short as necessary to accomplish sanctioning goals.*
- *Provide for continuity in case management throughout offenders' involvement with the justice system.*
- *Make available the appropriate array of supervision, interventions and sanctions.*
- *Develop and implement programs that are gender and culture-relevant.*
- *Collaborate among justice system agencies with other organizations and across jurisdictions.*
- *Provide staff with training and support necessary to achieve system goals.*
- *Provide for ongoing evaluation of sanctioning and intervention processes and outcomes.*

The Policy Group believes that application of these values, goals and strategies will create an optimal criminal justice and corrections system for offenders, staff and the public.

---

## Information Collection and Analysis

To ensure that policy development is information-driven, the Policy Group supervised and often directly participated in several types of information collection activities;

- **DECISION MAPPING:** The Policy Group, along with other key Oregon decision makers, devoted several lengthy meetings to the task of defining and describing twelve key decision points in Oregon's criminal justice process. For each decision point, the group identified the options available; the decision makers and others who influenced the decisions; the information used to make the decisions and the articulated policies and unspoken rules that guide the decisions. Policy Group members were aware of decision making issues particularly relevant for women offenders, but their description of Oregon's decision making process is applicable for all offenders. [Begins on Page 21 and Appendix B]
- **RESOURCE INVENTORY DEVELOPMENT:** The Policy Group and its staff assembled an inventory of sanction options and treatment and other resources available to women offenders in Oregon counties. This provides a comprehensive view of current resource allocations and can be the foundation for recommendations to enhance and augment the continuum of intermediate sanctions and interventions for women offenders across the state. [Begins on Page 22 and Appendix C]
- **PERSPECTIVES OF WOMEN OFFENDERS:** The Policy Group invited a panel of four women offenders including current prison inmates and women on community supervision to share their perspectives on ways Oregon's human services, criminal justice and corrections systems have affected their lives. The Policy Group found this to be a powerful addition to its perspectives on optimal approaches for intervening successfully with women offenders. [Begins on Page 26]
- **PERSPECTIVES OF PAROLE/PROBATION OFFICERS:** At a separate meeting of the Group, a panel of parole/probation officers representing a diversity of counties detailed their experiences and concerns regarding women offenders. The Policy Group has had the opportunity to explore with line staff approaches that may increase women offenders' probability of success on community supervision [Begins on Page 25].

**SNAPSHOT: AUGUST 1994**

"Although upfront costs may be significant, prison nurseries or community-based programs in which mothers are taught to care for their children can be cost-effective."

"Prison recidivism can be reduced by maintaining strong family ties. If the children can be saved from the criminal justice system and welfare systems, the potential savings are incalculable."

Source: Donna Metzler in "Neglected by the System: Children of Incarcerated Mothers" in *Illinois Bar Journal*/August 1991

- **TREND DATA:** Department of Corrections staff have continued throughout the project to give the Policy Group updated information regarding the numbers of women offenders flowing through key decision points in the corrections system. [Begins on Page 28]
- **CASE REVIEW DATA COLLECTION:** The Policy Group has collaborated actively with DOC staff and consultants in assembling and analyzing information about women who succeed or fail on probation and parole. The profile of women offenders that emerges is summarized in the second section of this document. [Begins on Page 33]

Through these diverse information collection and analysis activities, the Policy Group has refined its knowledge of women offenders in Oregon and sharpened its understanding of the decision making and resource allocation issues that affect the outcome of community supervision for women offenders. A profile of the woman offender emerged from these activities, providing the basis on which final recommendations were developed. It is also important to note that this effort represents the first comprehensive examination of Oregon's women offender population in the community.

---

### **Developing Policy and Program Recommendations**

Based on all of the information assembled during this project and the vision of Oregon's criminal justice system values and goals, the Policy Group has reached consensus regarding some key issues and strategic approaches for improving the availability and effectiveness of intermediate sanctions for women offenders. The Group's recommendations are summarized in the final section of this document. [Begins on Page 65]



# Findings and Observations

---

## Decision Making Process and Policies

The examination of decision making in the criminal justice system was a lengthy and revealing process for the Policy Group [Appendix B] and was complicated by the fact that the system analysis was for the whole state rather than a single jurisdiction. As a result, some observations are at best generalizations. Clearly, practices and policy in metropolitan Oregon may differ from more rural parts of the state. The process did not attempt to articulate these differences. The Group still gained valuable insights. Twelve points in the criminal justice system flow were examined:

- ARREST
- CUSTODY/RELEASE
- CHARGING
- DISPOSITION
- SENTENCING
- PROBATION
- RESPONSES TO BEHAVIOR - PROBATION
- DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS CUSTODY
- PAROLE/POST-PRISON RELEASE
- PAROLE/POST-PRISON SUPERVISION
- RESPONSE TO BEHAVIOR - PAROLE/POST-PRISON SUPERVISION
- DETERMINATION OF CASE CLOSURE

At each point, specific questions were asked:

- What are the decision options?
- Who are the decision makers?
- Who or what has influence on the decision, either overall or case by case?
- On what information is the decision based?
- What are the unspoken rules that guide some of these decisions?
- What are the articulated rules or policies that guide some of these decisions?

To make the discussion as informed and complete as possible, the Policy Group expanded the group by adding a court administrator from a metropolitan county, a public defender, the resource coordinator from a public defender's office, a parole hearing officer, staff from the women's prison, parole/probation officers, and a deputy district attorney. Although NIC had recommended against including additional individuals not involved with the entire policy development process, the need for a statewide perspective made expansion of the group for this process extremely valuable.

### Observations

- After “walking” through several steps in the criminal justice process, it was clear to the Policy Group that the criminal justice system is not a system and does not have a common purpose. The Group found the process confusing and convoluted, observing that the system and its rules must be very confusing for the clients and the public.
- Much of the real understanding of the criminal justice system was found in the unwritten/informal rules at various decision points. Many gender, family, sexual orientation and child issues are more pronounced in the informal system that parallels formal rules, statutes and procedures that guide how people are processed or decisions are made. The Policy Group observed that many rules may remain “unwritten” because they are inherently unfair or inequitable.
- A lack of observation to issues surrounding pregnancy or children may be grounded in a lack of awareness or training by professionals from the law enforcement officer to the prosecutor and judge to the parole/probation officer.

---

## Supervision, Treatment and Other Resources

The Resource Inventory listed in Appendix C was initially developed as a directory for women-specific interventions and sanctions throughout the State of Oregon<sup>1</sup>. This directory evolved into an inventory that includes women-specific interventions and sanctions as well as interventions and sanctions that are accessible to women offenders throughout the State.

This inventory enables comparison of the slots or beds in interventions and sanctions with the total number of women under community supervision or incarcerated in state prisons. Shortfalls or gaps can be identified and examined throughout the state and in each county.

The Women-Specific Services and Sanctions inventory is presented geographically and by type. The program information was obtained through a survey distributed to the Female Offenders Planning Network, the Policy Group, the Department of Corrections

**IS Snapshot: March 1994**

**EVALUATION OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SUPERVISION AND COMMUNITY REHABILITATION PROGRAMS IN OREGON - WOMEN'S PROGRAMS:** Specialized Women's Team-Clackamas; Alcohol and Drug Abuse Pre-natal Treatment [ADAPT]-Multnomah; Women' Transition Services-Multnomah; Council for Prostitution Alternatives [CPA]-Multnomah

“ . . . these programs appear to have a positive impact on criminal arrest and behavior.”

*Source: National Council on Crime and Delinquency*

---

<sup>1</sup> This was the approach identified in the original grant proposal: "explore existing community sanction options for women offenders and identifying the range of sanctions and interventions."

Directory of Correctional Services, the Oregon Office of Alcohol and Drug Programs and the Metropolitan Public Defenders.

### **Observations**

While Oregon is fortunate to have a wide array of interventions, services and sanctions for offenders under community supervision, few are specific to women offenders. No traditional sanctions were found anywhere in Oregon that have an expressed emphasis on the particular needs of the women offenders. While many counties have specialized supervision caseloads for women offenders, little exists to support supervision by providing focused interventions, services or sanctions addressing gender differences. Most of the woman-focused services exist in the metropolitan Portland area with an occasional program outside the more densely populated areas.

Two questions come to mind with this information:

- Why are there so few woman-focused programs?
- What is the potential impact of the lack of programs?

The answers to the first question range from lack of sufficient numbers of women offenders to offer gender-specific services to a lack of understanding of the importance of such services in the successful supervision of women offenders. A common response in many counties is that *all* services are available for *all* offenders. This suggests that there is a lack of knowledge and understanding of the need to provide services and sanctions that address the gender-specific need of female offenders.

The impact of the lack of programs is less clear and more speculative. One possible, but unverified result may be an over-reliance on certain prison resources for supervision violators because of the availability of programs that address the multiple needs of the women offenders. This may be particularly true for in-prison programs such as Turning Point. This may be supported by the reality that the most common way a woman offender reaches prison is via a probation violation.

---

### **Perspectives of Women Offenders and Probation/Parole Officers**

To augment the quantitative analysis of the case file review of women offenders, the Policy Group met with a panel of women offenders and a panel of parole/probation officers who work with women offenders in the community. The panel format encouraged open discussion and perhaps provided a deeper insight into the experiences and concerns facing women offenders in the criminal justice system and the policy and program changes that could address these issues.

The Policy Group met with a panel of four women offenders at the Oregon Women's Correctional Center on April 12, 1994. The offenders represented a mix of women incarcerated in state prison and women under community supervision. The panel

allowed for an exchange between the Policy Group and these offenders with a variety of key issues emerging.

To supplement the information obtained from the first panel, the Policy Group met with a panel of four parole/probation officers on May 19, 1994. These officers had expertise in supervision of women offenders or development of gender-specific programming. The officers were both state and county employees and represented urban, suburban and rural jurisdictions. The panel also explored many issues specific to the women offender population.

Both panels identified chemical dependency as a leading cause of criminal activity and abuse [sexual,

physical, emotional] as the primary causal factor of chemical dependency. To address chemical dependency both panels identified longer-term residential treatment, continuing care programs and transitional housing as essential. Life skills and parent training were also identified as critical needs.

Both panels viewed Children's Services Division [CSD] as integral to services for women offenders. They emphasized the need for improved collaboration with Children's Services Division in the transition of children back to the woman offender. CSD can also assist in providing parent training to give women the skills and tools to make that transition successful.

The panels also agreed that what often makes a crucial difference in ensuring a woman's success is a supportive, committed individual that does not give up. This individual is often a criminal justice professional such as a parole/probation officer.

One notable area of disagreement between the panels was related to sanctions. The women offender panelists believed they were treated inequitably, receiving more supervision and harsher sanctions than men offenders. Parole/probation officer panelists felt because female offenders are frequently assigned to lower supervision, they did not receive all of the benefits of supervision.

**SNAPSHOT: 1990**  
"A profile of ADAPT [Alcohol and Drug Addiction Prenatal Treatment in Multnomah County, Oregon] clients later indicated that 70 to 80 percent had histories of child abuse, victimization as adults, or family drug or alcohol abuse."  
*Source: National Center for Prosecution of Child Abuse UPDATE/Volume 3, Number 11/November 1990*

**SNAPSHOT: 1991**  
Nationally, 12,600 women were serving a sentence for drug offenses in 1991, a 423% increase from about 2,400 women inmates serving time for drugs in 1986.  
*Source: Bureau of Justice/Survey of State Prison Inmates/1991/Published March 1993*

## Summary of Issues from Parole/Probation Officers' Panel

- Most women offenders are under supervision for drug-related offenses. A primary factor leading to the chemical abuse is sexual abuse.
- Negative relationships with men are leading causes of unsuccessful supervision and return to chemical use [co-dependency].

### **SNAPSHOT: 1986**

An estimated 41% of the women in prison reported that they had been previously physically or sexually abused.

*Source: Bureau of Justice/Special Report/Women in Prison/Published March 1991*

### **SNAPSHOT: APRIL 1991**

"Probation officers are more likely to cite women for technical probation violations, such as missing appointments or not reporting to an assigned treatment program. The [members of the Office of the Commissioner of the Department of Probation, New York City] also feel that police officers and judges overlook offenses and let women get away with committing crimes. They therefore believe that women who finally get sentenced are much more deserving of punishment than are men who are sentenced for the same crimes."

*Source: Unmet Needs/Women and Alternatives to Incarceration/A Report by Bill Crawley et al/April 1991*

- There is a high need for chemical dependency treatment services for women offenders with long-term residential/in-patient the highest need.
- Following the primary treatment or release from custody, there is a high need for transitional housing as a part of continuing [aftercare] care.
- There is a need for life skills, parenting, and job training.
- Because women offenders are involved in less serious crimes and receive lower risk assessment scores, they are typically under supervision for too brief a time to benefit fully from community interventions.
- Parole/probation officers feel overwhelmed with paper work that takes a significant amount of time away from direct client interventions through they acknowledge the need to collect data for ongoing evaluation.
- There is a need to develop an improved dialogue with CSD. Often women offenders with children are faced with having them returned to their custody by CSD before the offender has had the time and opportunity to develop needed parenting skills.
- As part of the development of a dialogue with CSD, there is a need for a collaborative effort and coordination of services with other community

agencies such as Adult and Family Services, Employment Division and the court system. These efforts should tie into Oregon Benchmarks.

- There is a need for gender-specific training and chemical dependency training for staff.
- Women offenders typically have multiple problems, making supervision more complex.
- Parole/probation officers should be supportive case managers. They are often seen as the one individual who is there to help, care and "hang in there" with the woman offender and whose presence makes a significant difference in her life.

#### Summary of Issues from Women Offenders' Panel

- Women offenders may be carrying the effects of early physical, sexual and emotional abuse.
- Abuse of alcohol and drugs often begins in early teenage years.
- Intervention did not occur when these women were children. Sometimes their needs were ignored even when the offender [as a child] asked caseworkers for help in getting out of abusive situations.
- Many women offenders have had difficulty developing trusting relationships.

#### **IS** SNAPSHOT: 1991

More than 4 in 10 women inmates reported they had been physically or sexually abused [31% of women in prison had been abused before age 18].

Source: Bureau of Justice/Survey of State Prison Inmates/1991/Published March 1993

#### **IS** SNAPSHOT: 1991

Compared to men in prison, women had used drugs and had committed crimes to buy drugs relatively more often.

Source: Bureau of Justice/Survey of State Prison Inmates/1991/Published March 1993

- Crimes are often committed to purchase drugs.
- Many women offenders have prostituted to obtain money.
- Most women offenders have committed their crimes with someone else.
- Most women offenders have one or more children.

- Sometimes, it may be better for their children to live apart from them. Children can be a distraction from working on issues related to continuing chemical abuse and criminal behavior.
- Many children of women offenders are in state custody under CSD case supervision. Some children are with other family members, but many are in foster care.
- Treatment is best received when the offender is receptive to treatment and ready to try an alternate lifestyle.
- Turning Point [institutional long-term residential chemical dependency treatment program at Columbia River Correctional Institution] has made a difference in the lives of some women offenders.

**📷 SNAPSHOT: 1986**

54% of children under 18 lived with grandparents; 23% lived with the father; 22% lived with other relatives 10.5% were in foster care or some other institutional setting.

*Source: Bureau of Justice/Special Report/Women in Prison/Published March 1991*

**📷 SNAPSHOT: 1991**

Most inmates' children were living with their other parent or grandparents. 10% of the women said that their children were in foster care, children's agency or institutions.

*Source: Bureau of Justice/Survey of State Prison Inmates/1991/Published March 1993*

- Transition programs that allow children can help successfully reunite the family.
- Long-term continuing care is the only way for some offenders to remain drug and alcohol-free.
- Tolerance for relapse is critical. Relapse is a part of recovery and is as much a learning tool as the treatment.
- Many women offenders have not completed high school. The interruption was often due to family dysfunction and non-academic problems.
- Judges can make a positive difference in the life of the woman offender by holding her accountable for her actions when she first appears before the court.
- Fear of prison is not a deterrent to committing crimes.
- Jail can be a positive time out to give the offender an opportunity to clean up, detox and stabilize.
- Equal punishment between men and women is needed. Women are sanctioned more severely and supervised more closely.

**USA SNAPSHOT: FEBRUARY 1994**

According to the national Women's Law Center statistics, eight to ten percent of women are pregnant when they enter prison, while 15% are post-partum.

Source: Renee Pitre, LCSW in *CorreatCare/February, 1994/Published March, 1993*

- Transportation is needed for children of mothers in prison. Children need to be brought to visit their mothers while in prison. A place within the prison must be developed that is suitable for the needs of the child.
- Being in jail custody while pregnant can make a positive difference if support programs are available.

**USA SNAPSHOT: 1991**

6% of incarcerated women entered prison pregnant.

Source: Bureau of Justice/Survey of State Prison Inmates/1991/Published March 1993

- Assistance is needed such as parenting skills training before reuniting the woman offender and children after release from prison. The offender may not have the skills to discipline children without abuse.
- Transportation in the community is often a problem and available public transportation is often time-consuming.
- A caring person, able to make a long term commitment can make a significant difference for women offenders. Seeing something in the offender to nurture and believe in is irreplaceable. This person can be a criminal justice professional such as the parole/probation officer or someone outside the system such as a mentor.


---

## Trend Data

Throughout the process, the Policy Group examined how the system had changed for women offenders over time through examination of trend data. Unfortunately, little general system flow data was available by gender. The most specific information by gender was available through the Department of Corrections and only represented how circumstances had changed *after* the woman offenders enter the corrections system. General information was available for: Reported Crime, Arrests and Court Filings.

## Reported Crime

Crimes per 10,000 Population



## Reported Crime

An examination of crime reported to the Law Enforcement Data Center for the past thirteen years finds that the crime rate for Oregon is in a downward trend. The Crime Rate as a single indicator, however, must be viewed carefully. It is generally believed to be one of a variety of indicators of the workings of the criminal justice system. Because it relies on citizens to report criminal activity to law enforcement, it may also be influenced by confidence that law


enforcement can resolve a situation or that a response may be timely - particularly in very sparsely populated areas.

## Arrest Rates

Generally, arrests per 10,000 population are decreasing and may be trending down. As with crime rates, arrests are only one of several indicators of crime in a community. As an example, arrests are sometimes influenced by local policy, community sensitivity to certain behavior, numbers of law enforcement officers and other circumstances. Recent studies find that women


## Arrests

Rate per 10,000 Population



## Circuit Court Criminal Case Filings

Rate per 10,000 Population



are being arrested at increasing rates, although the crimes continue to be predominantly nonviolent and economic crimes including theft and forgery.

## Circuit Court Criminal Case Filings

Another indicator of what is happening in the criminal justice system is the rate of criminal cases filed with the circuit courts. This is primarily an indicator of


prosecution activity since filings are initiated by the district attorney. In the past thirteen years there has been a dramatic increase in filings in contrast to a decrease in arrest rates. Reasons for this upward trend are unclear. If a relationship is assumed between arrests and cases filed in circuit court, one might anticipate a downward trend more similar to arrest data.

**Prison Commitments**

Prison commitment rates have increased steadily over the past thirteen years. This increase is in part due to an expansion in actual prison capacity and the impact of sentencing guidelines. Little if any relationship can be made between prison commitments and the previous three indicators. Commitment of women to prison has also shown a dramatic increase. Data over ten years from 1980 through 1990 shows more than double the rate from .458 women per 10,000 in 1980 population to 1.083 in 1990. Several

**Prison Commitments**


*Rate per 10,000 Population*



factors may be influential in this increase: the expansion of women prison capacity; sentencing guidelines; lack of community resources for women offenders; less tolerance for technical violations of probation/parole conditions by women offenders; and the implementation of programs in the prison setting that address the multiple needs of the woman offender.

**Prison Commitments of Women**

*Rate per 10,000 Population*




**Sentences to Felony Probation**

The final step in the criminal justice that may provide information about the growth of overall crime or how the system responds to crime is the rate at which offenders are placed on felony probation. Information from the Department of Corrections finds that judges are sentencing to formal felony probation at an increasing rate. This may reflect a straightforward increase due to

**Felony Probation**

*Rate per 10,000 Population*




increases in offenders coming to the attention of the courts or may imply a policy shift away from less formal bench probation.

### **Trends within Corrections**

The following graphs display how corrections system populations have grown or declined through the past twenty months. In most categories probation indicators show a downward trend while parole/post-prison supervision shows an increase.

## *New Probation Admissions*

### *Women Only*



### **The Proportion of Women Inmates is Growing**


- During CY 1991, the women inmate population grew by 12.8% compared with 4.4% for men.
- Of all women admissions to prison in 1991, 72.21% were from four counties: Multnomah, Lane, Marion and Washington Counties
- Women inmates tend to be younger than male inmates.
- Proportionately fewer female than male inmates have been convicted of person or violent felonies.

### **The Proportion of Women Under Community Supervision is Growing**

- During CY 1991, the community supervision population of women grew by 6.9% compared with a growth of 5.5% for men.
- Women offenders represent 19.4% of the total population under community supervision.


### Probation Population

Women Only




### Parole/Post-Prison Supervision

Women Only




### Probation Revocations

Women Only




### Parole Revocations

Women Only




### Parole Revocations Types

Women Only: October, 1993 - October 1994



### Probation Revocations Types

Women Only: October, 1993 - October 1994



## Observations

Drawing conclusions from the trend information is difficult. Much of the corrections system population growth is clearly due to factors other than changes in crime rates that have generally declined since 1980. Growth or declines in incarceration or probation rates may be as much tied to changes in community priorities, increases in resources in various portions of the system, changes in law, change in policy or other less obvious factors. As such, trend information independent of other information should be viewed with caution. While it may help in anticipating growth and need for resources, trends alone provide little information about what is causing the changes. An area that should be carefully considered, however, is the proportion of women offenders who are revoked to prison for probation violations without a new criminal conviction. Although this classification of revocation should not be interpreted to imply only technical violations of supervision conditions - there is often non-convicted criminal behavior involved - it is still a disturbing trend that does not duplicate itself in the male population.

---

## A Profile of Women Offenders on Probation and Parole in Oregon

### Introduction

To develop a more effective continuum of intermediate sanctions for women offenders, Oregon policy makers need to understand the characteristics of women under community supervision and the factors associated with success or failure. The Policy Group therefore invested significant resources in assembling and analyzing information about women who succeed or fail on probation or parole. Beginning in September of 1993 with a preliminary listing of the types of information that would ideally be collected to help in policy development, the Group collaborated closely with technical consultant Teri Martin to develop a women offender profile data collection strategy, a sampling plan and a manual data collection format.

Before completing the manual data collection form and method, existing data sources were examined including the September 1992 *From Community Supervision to Prison: A Study of Felony Probation and Parole Revocations* and the Department of Corrections automated Offender Profile System [OPS]. By early April 1994 a data base containing selected OPS information on 2295 Oregon women offenders discharged from community supervision between September 1, 1992 and August 31, 1993 had been created.

After several drafts, the final manual data collection form was adopted by the Policy Group in April.

#### SNAPSHOT: JULY 1, 1994

#### PROFILE OF WOMEN IN PRISON

Average Age: 33.0 with range of 18 to 76

80.3% have one or more children

Average Number of Children: 2.35

78.6% of the children are under age 18

32.4% of the children are under the care of a relative

11.8% were in care of CSD or foster care

44% of the women said their children had lived with them just prior to incarceration

58.3% reported that none of their children had visited them while in prison

*Source: Female Inmates and Their Children: Oregon Woman's Correctional Center*

*[192 inmates were at OWCC on July 1, 1994. 188 responded to the survey. The total women in prison on that date was 355.]*

Preliminary analysis of the OPS data was discussed at the May meeting. Following pilot testing and final revision of the data collection form [Appendix D], manual data collection on a sample of 473 cases was completed with the assistance of thirty-one probation/parole officers. By mid-June, the manually-collected data had been entered into a data base combining the OPS data with that data extracted from paper case files.

At the July meeting of the Policy Group, preliminary analysis of the manually-collected data was presented and discussed. The following summary data analysis incorporates concerns and suggestions offered by Policy Group members.

### **Sampling Plan and Survey Design**

The Policy Group considered a range of options in selection of the optimal data collection strategy. Consideration of information quality, time and resource constraints influenced the Group's decisions regarding sampling and manual data collection approaches.

#### ***Sampling Plan***

Policy Group members considered several issues and options before final development of a sampling plan:

- *Should the data be collected retrospectively, on a sample of women offenders terminated successfully or revoked from probation or parole supervision during a period in the recent past, or should the data be collected prospectively on women exiting from supervision from a specified date forward?*

Although a prospective sampling would enable collection of information not currently recorded in OPS and paper case files, the Group concluded that a retrospective sampling plan would be more cost effective, provide more timely results and enable the collection of baseline data describing women offender characteristics and system responses immediately before the October 1993 implementation of the new Structured Sanctioning System.

- *Should the data be representative only of probationers and parolees statewide, or should the sample be drawn to enable examination of regional differences [e.g., for the five largest counties plus three other clusters of counties in eastern, northwestern and southwestern Oregon]?*

Statistically adequate comparisons of subgroups, such as probationers and parolees succeeding and failing in each major county or region, requires a data base that includes a minimum of 100 cases from each subgroup. Because the Policy Group found that some critical data elements had to be collected through manual case file review, regional representation [which would have required manual data collection on at least 1,600 cases encompassing at least two years of exits] was deemed infeasible.


The Policy Group chose to develop a retrospective data base representing women convicted of felonies statewide who were discharged successfully or unsuccessfully from community supervision during the year immediately preceding implementation of the Structured Sanctions system. *IT IS IMPORTANT TO NOTE THAT CASES ARE SUCCESSFUL OR UNSUCCESSFUL FOR THIS ANALYSIS BASED ON THE CASE CLOSURE CODES USED IN THE OFFENDER PROFILE SYSTEM.* About three quarters of the "successful" cases were terminated at sentence expiration without a revocation [which means the sentenced ended, but does not necessarily suggest compliance with all conditions of supervision], with another one-sixth terminated early. The remaining successful cases were either converted to bench probation [7%] or discharged from parole by the Board [2%]. A substantial majority of the unsuccessful cases [88%] violated probation or parole and were revoked to prison while 6% were revoked to jail and 6% were "revoked/terminated without sanction."

### ***Survey Design***

A preliminary survey design was developed as an ideal data collection instrument to encompass information believed to be the most relevant to intermediate sanctions policy development and most related to the success or failure of women on community supervision. After deciding which of the various elements were available in the Offender Profile System, the Group developed a strategy to collect the remaining information from the paper files. Based on the collective experience of the Group members familiar with record-keeping practices in the field offices, many desired data elements were modified or eliminated to make data collection from the files more reliable. Some information types were identified as unlikely to be available and were eliminated from the data collection [e.g., number, age and relationship of children for whom the offender is responsible; history of physical or sexual abuse; type of substance abused; mental health history]. Other data element definitions were modified to fit more closely the way in which information is recorded in most paper case files [e.g., living arrangements]. The resulting data collection form is a compromise between the optimal information desirable for policy development and the reality of record keeping priorities in the current system.

A sample of 569 cases was randomly selected from 2,295 probationers and parolees exiting between September 1, 1992 and August 31, 1993 for additional data collection. The sample included all successful parole cases, one-half of parole and one-half of probation failures and approximately 10% of the probation successes. The sampling goal was to obtain data on 100 to 159 cases in each of the four groups while minimizing the total data collection workload.

Data was manually collected from paper files by probation/parole officers on 473 or 83% of the cases selected. Some cases had been 'purged' since more than a year had elapsed between case closure and data collection. This data collection problem occurred primarily in counties other than the four largest [Multnomah, Washington, Lane and Marion]. The following shows the distribution of the cases for which data was available.



Despite the best efforts of the data collectors, the sample obtained under-represents parole failures. Although one-half [106] were randomly selected for the manual data collection, just seventy-five cases were obtained. Results of analysis of factors associated with success or failure on parole should therefore be interpreted cautiously.

Data analysis of OPS variables was conducted using all 2,295 cases exiting during the sample year. OPS data and manually collected data on each of the 473 sample cases were merged into a single data base. So that comparisons across the four subgroups [successes and failures on probation and parole] are valid, sample cases were weighted according to the proportions of each group obtained in the manual data collection process. Because this weighting process was employed, only percentages are reported in tables derived from weighted data.


### Offender Characteristics

Descriptive information about women offenders' demographics, current offense and behavioral and criminal history was compiled from OPS and manually-collected data. In this section, results are presented for probationers and parolees separately. One hundred twenty-two [122] of the 2,295 women [5%] had neither an initial risk assessment nor a risk reassessment. Significant proportions were missing either one or the other type of risk assessment [23% missing initial and 29% missing reassessment]. Because the types of information used in these two assessments differ, comparable data is not available on all cases included in this analysis. For these variables, only the percentages of cases for which data is available - not the number of cases - are reported. For those data elements significantly related to success on probation or parole, additional analyses showing differences across successful and unsuccessful probationers and parolees are presented in a subsequent section.

**DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS**

**Race/Ethnicity:** Nearly twice the proportion of women parolees compared with probationers are Black while most probationers are White. The "other" category is primarily Native American women [among probationers, 80% of this category and parolees 90%] with only a tiny fraction of the sample identified as Asian. The proportion of Black women on both probation and parole is much higher than the percentage in Oregon's general population, while Hispanic women are under represented.

**Race/Ethnicity**




**RACE/ETHNICITY OF PROBATIONERS AND PAROLEES**

RACE/ETHNICITY	PROBATIONERS	PAROLEES	ALL WOMEN CASES	TOTAL CASE-LOAD	OREGON GENERAL POPULATION
Black	8.2%	14.6%	9.2%	8.0%	1.6%
Hispanic	1.8%	2.4%	1.9%	6.0%	4.0%
White	87.3%	76.3%	85.6%	83.0%	92.8%
Other	2.7%	6.7%	3.3%	3.0%	1.6%

**Age:** The mean age of the entire sample of 2,295 women at the time of admission to corrections was 28.6 years. Parolees averaged 30.7 years while probationers averaged 28.6 years of age.

**Education:** Probationers had on average completed more years of education [11.3 years] at the time of termination than had parolees [10.5 years]. Many probationers [38.3%] and most parolees did not graduate from high school.


**Years of Education**



### YEARS OF EDUCATION COMPLETED

YEARS OF EDUCATION	PROBATIONERS	PAROLEES	ALL CASES
Less than 6 years	0%	1.8%	0.3%
6 - 8 years	7.2%	9.8%	7.6%
9 - 11 years	31.1%	47.9%	34.1%
12 or more years	61.7%	41.0%	56.8%

### Level of Verified Employment



*Employment:* As reported in the last risk reassessment<sup>2</sup> of women in the sample, probationers are much more likely than parolees to be employed halftime or more.<sup>3</sup>


### PERCENT OF TIME SPENT IN VERIFIED EMPLOYMENT

EMPLOYMENT PERCENT	PROBATIONERS	PAROLEES	ALL CASES
0 - 39%	39.0%	61.2%	42.3%
40 - 59%	10.5%	6.8%	9.9%
60 - 100%	50.5%	32.1%	47.8%

<sup>2</sup>Offenders are reassessed every six months.

<sup>3</sup>Risk reassessment was not available in the automated system for 28% of the probationers and 36% of parolees for a total of 29% of the total cases. Other data obtained from the risk reassessment will have a similar proportion of missing information.


**Legal Monthly Income:** Manual data collection provided information on the legal monthly income of women under community supervision at termination. Parolees were more likely to have a monthly income of less than \$500 than were probationers.



LEGAL MONTHLY INCOME AT TERMINATION  
[PERCENT OF CASES WITH DATA AVAILABLE<sup>4</sup>]

INCOME LEVEL	PROBATIONERS	PAROLEES
\$250 or less	16.9%	37.0%
\$251 - \$500	22.9%	15.2%
\$501 - \$750	15.8%	8.0%
\$751 - \$1,000	26.1%	28.8%
More than \$1,000	18.3%	11.0%

**Sources of Income**



**Sources of Income:** Offenders may have had more than one source of income. Probationers were much more likely to receive income from employment than either parolees or unsuccessful probationers. Proportionately more parolees than probationers were receiving public benefits.

<sup>4</sup>This information was not available for 65% of probationers and 74% of parolees.


## SOURCES OF INCOME

[PERCENT OF CASES WHERE DATA IS AVAILABLE]

INCOME SOURCE	PROBATIONERS	PAROLEES	ALL CASES
Employment	51.4%	40.8%	50.3%
Spousal Support	13.4%	8.4%	12.9%
Other Relatives	4.7%	5.7%	4.8%
Public Benefits	26.0%	34.0%	26.8%
Other	5.3%	9.2%	5.7%
Unknown	32.8%	60.6%	37.3%

**Marital Status:** Manual data collection found that information was unknown or missing for 43% of sample cases [43% of probationers and 39% of parolees], suggesting that this information is not routinely or reliably recorded in paper case files.


### Marital Status



### MARITAL STATUS AT TERMINATION [PERCENT OF CASES WITH DATA AVAILABLE]

MARITAL STATUS	PROBATIONERS	PAROLEES	ALL CASES
Never Married	33.9%	41.6%	35.2%
Divorced	24.0%	38.4%	26.5%
Separated	4.6%	7.2%	5.0%
Married	37.5%	12.6%	33.2%

### Where Living at Termination




**Living Location:** This data is missing for one-third of all cases. Of those cases for which the information was available, probationers were much more likely to be living in their own home than were parolees. Many parolees were either homeless or living in an institution [e.g., jail, treatment facility] at the time of termination.

WHERE OFFENDER WAS LIVING AT TERMINATION  
[PERCENT OF CASES WITH DATA AVAILABLE]

WHERE LIVING	PROBATIONERS	PAROLEES	ALL CASES
Her Own Home	68.5%	46.8%	65.1%
Someone Else's Home	30.7%	41.4%	32.7%
Institution	0.2%	5.4%	1.0%
Homeless	0.6%	6.4%	1.5%

**Living Arrangement:** Probationers were most likely to be living either with their spouse and children or with their children only. In contrast, parolees were most likely to be living with friends only and much less likely to be living with children. Fifty-three percent of probationers in contrast to 24% of parolees were living with their children. This information was unknown for 40% of all cases.


### Who Offender Lived with at Termination



**WHO OFFENDER WAS LIVING WITH AT TERMINATION**  
 [PERCENT OF CASES FOR WITH DATA AVAILABLE<sup>5</sup>]

MARITAL STATUS	PROBATIONERS	PAROLEES	ALL CASES
Never Married	33.9%	41.6%	35.2%
Divorced	24.0%	38.45	26.5%
Separated	4.6%	7.2%	5.0%
Married	37.5%	12.6%	33.2%

**Number of Address Changes**



*Number of Address Changes:* The number of times an individual changes residence is an indicator of community stability. This information is gathered during the risk reassessment process every six months. A very large proportion of probationers and a smaller majority of parolees had either one or no address changes during the supervision period.


**NUMBER OF ADDRESS CHANGES**  
 [PERCENT OF CASES WHERE DATA IS AVAILABLE]

NUMBER OF ADDRESS CHANGES	PROBATIONERS	PAROLEES	ALL CASES
Two or More	19.0%	32.5%	21.0%
One or None	81.0%	67.5%	79.0%

<sup>5</sup> Categories listed do not represent all possible combinations of living companions so column percentages do not add to 100%. Information was missing for 40% of all cases.

**SUBSTANCE ABUSE PROBLEMS**

**Substance Abuse History**




The *initial* risk assessment [Appendix E] includes an indicator of admitted or documented substance abuse problems occurring during the three years immediately before the commission of the current crime of conviction. Most women in the sample had recent substance abuse problems, but parolees were much more likely than probationers to have a significant substance abuse history.

**SUBSTANCE ABUSE HISTORY<sup>6</sup>**

SUBSTANCE ABUSE IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS	PROBATIONERS	PAROLEES	ALL CASES
Yes	63.0%	92.4%	67.6%
No	37.0%	7.6%	32.4%

**Substance Abuse Problems Under Supervision**



Risk reassessment also yields information about the intensity of substance abuse problems immediately before termination. Parolees were more likely to have frequent abuse problems involving serious disruption of function and/or failure to comply with treatment. This characteristic was found in only 16% of probationers. The proportion of all cases with no reported substance abuse problems while under supervision is twice the proportion that had no substance abuse history. This suggests that supervision and its ancillary activities

may reduce the probability that probationers and parolees would abuse substances.

<sup>6</sup>The initial risk assessment was not available in the automated information system for 23% of probationers and 25% of parolees totaling 23% of the cases examined. Data is missing in the same proportions of cases for all subsequent data elements from the initial risk assessment scale.

## SUBSTANCE ABUSE PROBLEMS UNDER CURRENT SUPERVISION

CURRENT SUBSTANCE ABUSE PROBLEMS	PROBATIONERS	PAROLEES	ALL CASES
Frequent	15.9%	41.8%	19.7%
Occasional	17.3%	18.1%	17.5%
None	66.8%	40.1%	62.9%


### SNAPSHOT: 1993

74% of a sample of 395 women arrestees in Portland from January 1993 to December 1993 tested positive for drugs [73% in 1992, 68% in 1991]

*Source: National Institute of Justice/Drug Use Forecasting Program/1993 Annual Report/Published November 1994*

## CURRENT OFFENSE INFORMATION

### Current Crime of Conviction




**Current Conviction Classification:** The Offender Profile System provides a variety of information types about the current conviction of probationers and parolees. There is no significant difference between probationers and parolees in the proportions convicted of the three major felony types.

## CURRENT CONVICTION CRIME CLASSIFICATION

CRIME CLASSIFICATION	PROBATIONERS	PAROLEES	ALL CASES
A Felony	8.6%	9.7%	8.8%
B Felony	19.7%	20.3%	19.8%
C Felony	71.7%	69.7%	71.4%
Unclassified Felony	--	0.3%	Less than 1%

**Most Serious Crime Type:** As expected only a small proportion of women offenders during the sample year had been convicted of a person offense. The largest proportion of women were convicted of a drug offense as the most serious current conviction.



**MOST SERIOUS CURRENT OFFENSE TYPE**


CURRENT OFFENSE TYPE	PROBATIONERS	PAROLEES	ALL CASES
Person	3.6%	5.7%	3.9%
Property	23.4%	37.8%	25.7%
Fraud	12.9%	14.3%	13.1%
Drugs	47.2%	33.8%	45.1%
Other	13.0%	8.4%	12.1%

**Most Frequent Specific Crime:** Most probationers were convicted of drug offenses, theft or DUII as the most serious offense. Parolees were most likely to have been convicted of drug offenses, theft, burglary or robbery.

## MOST SERIOUS CURRENT OFFENSE

CURRENT OFFENSE	PROBATIONERS	PAROLEES	ALL CASES
Drug Offenses	19.0%	33.8%	44.7%
Theft I	81.0%	14.9%	13.6%
DUII	5.9%	Less than 1%	5.2%
Burglary I, II	3.7%	10.5%	4.8%
Title 811	3.6%	2.7%	3.4%
Assault Offenses	2.6%	3.7%	2.7%
Unauthorized Use of Motor Vehicle	2.3%	2.2%	2.3%
Robbery I, II, III	1.4%	9.5%	2.6%
All Other Offenses	19.9%	22.7%	20.7%

### Co-Defendants in Current Offense




*Gender of Co-defendants:* Data about co-defendants charged in the offender's current offense was available for 61% of all cases. Most probationers and parolees did not have co-defendants.

### CO-DEFENDANTS CHARGED IN CURRENT OFFENSE [PERCENT OF CASES WITH DATA AVAILABLE]

CO-DEFENDANTS	PROBATIONERS	PAROLEES	ALL CASES
Men Only	24.2%	23.5%	24.0%
Women Only	7.9%	6.2%	7.6%
Both Men and Women	10.0%	6.0%	9.4%
None	57.9%	64.1%	58.9%

**Prior Criminal History:** The initial risk assessment includes several items describing dimensions of the offender's prior criminal behavior. Not surprisingly, probationers are much more likely to have no prior convictions than are parolees.

### Prior Felony Convictions




**PRIOR FELONY CONVICTIONS**  
[PERCENT OF CASES WHERE DATA IS AVAILABLE]

NUMBER OF PRIOR FELONY CONVICTIONS	PROBATIONERS	PAROLEES	ALL CASES
Four or More	1.6%	24.6%	5.2%
Two or Three	6.0%	27.2%	9.3%
One	9.6%	22.1%	11.6%
None	82.8%	26.1%	73.8%

Of the cases for which this data is available, 84.7% of probationers, but only 26.1% of parolees had been verified to be conviction-free for the three years before the present supervision period.

### Prior Incarcerations of 90 Days or More



**Prior Incarcerations:** The prior number of incarcerations [resulting from convictions] of 90 days or more as an adult or juvenile is also found in the initial risk assessment. A substantial majority [90%] of probationers have never served a sentence involving incarceration of 90 days or longer. This was true of only one-third of parolees.

**PRIOR INCARCERATIONS OF 90 DAYS OR MORE**  
[PERCENT OF CASES WITH DATA AVAILABLE]

NUMBER OF PRIOR INCARCERATIONS	PROBATIONERS	PAROLEES	ALL CASES
Three or More	1.1%	23.6%	4.7%
One or Two	7.4%	43.8%	13.1%
None	91.5%	32.6%	82.2%

**CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM RESPONSES AND BEHAVIOR UNDER SUPERVISION**

OPS data suggests 59.8% of the 2,295 cases exiting the system during the sample period were not sentenced under sentencing guidelines. This included 57.3% of probationers and 72.7% of parolees.

**Restitution:** A majority of probationers and parolees were ordered to pay restitution amounts of \$1,000 or less.

**RESTITUTION ORDERED<sup>7</sup>**  
[PERCENT OF CASES WHERE DATA IS AVAILABLE]

RESTITUTION ORDERED	PROBATIONERS	PAROLEES
\$100 or less	21.8%	14.8%
\$101 - \$500	19.1%	20.7%
\$501 - \$1,000	12.8%	25.3%
\$1,001 - \$1,500	10.2%	2.9%
\$1,501 - \$2,000	10.5%	10.4%
\$2,001 - \$5,000	13.5%	16.3%
More than \$5,000	10.2%	9.6%

<sup>7</sup>The amount of restitution ordered was either not applicable or missing for 79.6% of parolees and 63.3% of probationers.

**Restitution Paid:** Probationers were more likely to pay the ordered restitution than parolees.

PROPORTION OF RESTITUTION PAID<sup>8</sup>  
[PERCENT OF CASES WHERE DATA IS AVAILABLE]

RESTITUTION PAID	PROBATIONERS	PAROLEES
None	24%	76%
Some	20%	14%
All	57%	10%

**Fines Ordered:** Most probationers and parolees ordered to pay fines had fines of \$250 or less.

AMOUNT OF FINES ORDERED<sup>9</sup>  
[PERCENT OF CASES WHERE DATA IS AVAILABLE]

FINE ORDERED	PROBATIONERS	PAROLEES
\$50 or Less	35.4%	38.4%
\$50 - \$250	18.4%	23.2%
\$251 - \$500	26.3%	19.2%
\$501 - \$1,000	10.7%	15.0%
More than \$1,000	10.2%	4.2%

**Fines Paid:** As with restitution, parolees were much less likely to have paid some or all of their fines than were probationers.

---

<sup>8</sup>Information on restitution paid was either not applicable or missing for 65% of probationers and 88% of parolees.

<sup>9</sup>Data was missing or not applicable for 53% of probationers and 81% of parolees.

PROPORTION OF FINE PAID<sup>10</sup>  
[PERCENT OF CASES WHERE DATA IS AVAILABLE]

FINE PAID	PROBATIONERS	PAROLEES
None	13%	74%
Some	8%	11%
All	79%	15%

**Other Financial Obligations:** Most probationers and parolees had at least \$250 in other court-ordered financial obligations.

AMOUNT OF OTHER COURT-ORDERED OBLIGATIONS<sup>11</sup>  
[PERCENT OF CASES WHERE DATA IS AVAILABLE]

OTHER FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS	PROBATIONERS	PAROLEES
\$50 or Less	21.2%	32.2%
\$51 - \$250	39.0%	31.9%
\$251 - \$500	50.5%	45.8%
More than \$500	10.5%	22.3%

**Other Financial Obligations Paid:** Most probationers paid all other court-ordered financial obligations in contrast to only 30% of parolees.

PROPORTION OF OTHER FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS PAID<sup>12</sup>  
[PERCENT OF CASES WHERE DATA IS AVAILABLE]

OTHER FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS PAID	PROBATIONERS	PAROLEES
None	20%	64%
Some	6%	6%
All	74%	30%

<sup>10</sup>Data is missing or not applicable for 60% of probationers and 90% of parolees.


<sup>11</sup>Data was missing or not applicable for 39.7% of probationers and 70.5% of parolees.

<sup>12</sup>Data was missing or not applicable for 48% of probationers and 82% of parolees.

**Violation Performance:** The risk reassessment includes information about the present supervision including parole or probation violations, failures to appear, escapes or custody violations. Such violations were noted for 33.3% of probationers and 70% of parolees

**Responses to Conditions of Supervision:** The risk reassessment provides information about the offender's general response to the conditions of supervision. Parolees were much more likely to be noncompliant than probationers.

### Responses to Supervision



RESPONSES TO CONDITIONS OF SUPERVISION  
[PERCENT OF CASES WHERE DATA IS AVAILABLE]

RESPONSES TO CON- DITIONS	PROBATIONERS	PAROLEES	ALL CASES
Unwilling to Comply	19.6%	40.5%	22.6%
Some Problems	33.3%	28.3%	32.6%
No Problems	47.1%	31.2%	44.8%

**Sanctions and Services Ordered and Received:** The manual data collection form requested information about which types of sanctions and services were either ordered at sentencing or resulted from violations. Information was also requested about which of these services or sanctions were received or completed. Unlike previous tables, the following tables will display actual numbers of sanctions and/or services ordered and/or received. Clearly there are only a few sanctions and services recorded as ordered or received/completed frequently enough to be statistically significant in analysis of factors associated with success or failure. This may be due in part to the difficulty of collecting such information on a retrospective sample. **IT IS IMPORTANT TO NOTE THAT ORDERING A SERVICE DOES NOT GUARANTEE ITS AVAILABILITY OR ACCESSIBILITY.**

SANCTIONS ORDERED AND RECEIVED

SANCTIONS	AT TIME OF SENTENCING		RESULTING FROM VIOLATION	
	ORDERED <sup>13</sup>	RECEIVED	ORDERED	RECEIVED
Jail	153	127	85	74
Work Center	12	5	9	8
Forest Camp				
Electronic Monitoring	2	1	1	2
Home Custody		1	1	
Work Crew	5	3	1	1
Community Service	130	66	16	8
Day Reporting			1	1
Polygraph	36	4	1	
Restitution	52	27	8	3
Fine	40	23	8	4
Urinalysis	312	110	44	18
Abstain from Alcohol	146	34	21	8

<sup>13</sup>Because the data collection was retrospective, "Ordered" or "Received" may not fully reflect sanction status.

SERVICES ORDERED AND RECEIVED

SERVICES	AT TIME OF SENTENCING		RESULTING FROM VIOLATION	
	ORDERED <sup>14</sup>	RECEIVED	ORDERED	RECEIVED
Alcohol and Drug:				
Outpatient	218	99	39	23
Intensive Outpatient	16	5	12	8
Day Treatment	1	1	2	2
Inpatient	57	22	61	29
AA/NA	13	10	6	12
Mental Health Treatment	39	13	14	8
Anger Management	8	1	3	2
Parenting Training	3	2	3	4
Life Skills Training	3		3	7
Cognitive Restructuring	1			5
Education or Vocational Training	9	4	2	19
Employment Services	8	7	6	10
Health Care		1	2	4
Income Assistance	1	1	1	3
Food, Clothing or Work Tools			1	2
Child Care			1	1
Housing Assistance	2	2	3	4
Transitional Housing	2	1	3	2
Other	111	13	23	6

<sup>14</sup>Because the data collection was retrospective, "Ordered" or "Received" may not fully reflect sanction status.


**Factors Related to Success/Failure on Probation and Parole**

The following information summarizes factors that may be associated with probability of success under supervision. This analysis is limited by the lack of reliable and valid data for large portions of the sample.

The relationship of system responses [sanctions and services imposed or provided] to success on probation or parole is of particular interest to policy makers since these responses can be most easily modified through policy and program changes. Unfortunately, information related to the imposition and completion of sanctions and services was not reliably available for much of the sample. The factors that can be most strongly linked to success for women offenders tend to be elements of the risk assessment scales used by the Department of Corrections for supervision classification. The lack of data on other factors that may also be related to women's success under community supervision hampers the development of information-driven policies and effective gender-specific programs for women offenders.

*Successful and Unsuccessful Terminations:* The definition of "success" for purposes of this analysis should be well understood. OPS data shows that 75% of offenders noted as successful were terminated at sentence expiration. This may be more appropriately viewed as no revocation to prison rather than a clear indicator of successful compliance with all conditions and requirements of supervision.

**Termination Type**




**PROPORTIONS OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL TERMINATIONS**

CLOSURE TYPE	PROBATIONERS		PAROLEES	
	N	%	N	%
Successful	1575	82%	157	42%
Unsuccessful	350	18%	213	58%
Total	1925	100%	370	100%

**Revocations:** Those cases revoked for technical violations only may also have involved new criminal behavior that was not formally charged.

### Revocation Type



REVOCATION TYPE  
[PERCENT OF THOSE REVOKED]

	TECHNICAL VIOLATIONS ONLY	NEW CRIME
Probation	66%	34%
Parole	59%	41%
All Revocations	64%	36%

*Success Rates of Probationers - Types of Behaviors and Actions Taken:* The success rate for all 1,925 probationers was 82%.

SUCCESS RATES OF PROBATIONERS BY VIOLATION BEHAVIOR AND ACTIONS TAKEN

VIOLATION BEHAVIOR <sup>15</sup>	ACTION TAKEN	SUCCESS RATE	NUMBER OF CASES [WEIGHTED]
No Violation	No Action	97%	1,023
Technical Only	Revocation Only	30% [?]	91
	Continued without Court Action <sup>16</sup>	92%	189
	Continued with Court Action <sup>17</sup>	73%	274
	Both	74%	127
	All Cases	73%	680
New Offense Only	Revocation Only	0%	8
	Continued without Court Action	100%	27
	Continued with Court Action	72%	18
	Both	0%	3
	All Cases	72%	55
Both Technical and New Offense	Revocation Only	0%	20
	Continued without Court Action	51%	28
	Continued with Court Action	0%	41
	Both	51%	78
	All Cases	32%	166

<sup>15</sup>Actual behavior as recorded in case file.

<sup>16</sup>Encompasses all cases considered in violation, but continued on supervision without formal court proceedings.

<sup>17</sup>Includes cases brought to the attention of the court for violation behaviors, but continued on supervision.

It is interesting that probationers committing new offense violations only were as likely to succeed as those committing solely technical violations. Probationers committing both types of violations were the least likely to be successful; the largest proportion of these cases had been considered in violation and continued at least twice before termination of their supervision. Probationers considered in violation, but continued without court action were more likely to succeed than those cases brought to the court's attention. Because the type of action taken is generally related to the number and seriousness of violation behaviors that are themselves related to the probability of success, any observed correlations between actions taken and success rates cannot be presumed to be causal.

A multi variate analysis of the relationship of each element in the data base to success/failure on probation/parole reveals that many characteristics of women offenders are significantly associated with their likelihood of success under community supervision.<sup>18</sup> Some factors significantly associated with success/failure are not readily changeable by the actions of policy makers, while others likely represent combined impacts of the system's responses and the seriousness of the offense or violation behavior, making it difficult to draw clear policy implications from these results. Stated another way, *this analysis does not enable causal inferences*, since many listed factors are also correlated with other factors for which reliable data is not available, but also influence women's probability of success under supervision.

The following series of charts summarize this information, first grouping factors associated with probationers' success into four categories:

- those that come from the risk assessment scale [risk factors]
- those that describe sanctions received for the current offense
- those that describe interventions or treatment services provided
- other miscellaneous factors

Factors associated with parolees' success are clustered into two groups:


- Risk factors
- Intervention factors

---

<sup>18</sup>In this context, a significant relationship or association is one that would not likely have occurred by chance.


# Success Rates on Probation

## Various Risk Factors




# Success Rates on Probation

## Various Sanction Factors




# Success Rates on Probation

## Various Intervention Factors




# Success Rates on Probation

## Various Other Factors




# Success Rates on Parole

## Various Risk Factors



# Success Rates on Parole

## Various Intervention Factors



## Observations

Some general observations can be made from the profile data on women offenders:

- Probationers are much more likely to succeed on community supervision than parolees.
- Many of the same factors are significantly associated with success/failure for both probationers and parolees.
- For nearly all factors associated with success under supervision [prevalence of substance abuse problems, level of employment, stability in the community as measured by address changes], the probation and parole population differ significantly.
- The risk assessment instrument, particularly the total score, is significantly associated with probability of success for both probationers and parolees with the largest decline in probability of success for those with scores below eight.
- Some interventions [e.g., alcohol and drug treatment] may be significantly related to the probability of success. The measurable effect, however, appears smaller than many of the risk scale factors examined.

The process of collecting and analyzing this data also provides insights useful to future analysts and information system designers:

- Because they differ significantly on a range of variables, women probationers and parolees should not be aggregated together in future analyses of characteristics of women on community supervision.
- Many profile elements identified by the Policy Group as critical to a full understanding of women offenders [e.g., marital and family status] are not reliably recorded in paper or automated case records.

## Recommendations

---

The Intermediate Sanctions for Women Offenders Policy Group makes a number of recommendations intended to improve the effectiveness of criminal justice system interventions with women offenders. These recommendations were developed through an intensive 18-month consensus-building process, and are based on qualitative and quantitative information compiled and analyzed for this project.

The Policy Group's recommendations focus on four central themes that grew out of its work on this project:

- Comprehensive and accurate information about women offenders and the sanctions and services offered to them must be routinely available to practitioners and policy makers.
- Adequate resources must be allocated to provide for gender-specific programming for women offenders.
- Effective sanctions and services for women offenders that can help to break the intergenerational cycle of criminal behavior can best be provided through collaborative partnerships that include criminal justice and human service agencies and other service providers and community organizations.
- Policy makers and researchers should continue to craft policies and programs that consider the unique needs of women offenders and should continuously monitor their effectiveness.

Policy Group recommendations are summarized in eight areas below.

### **Information System Development**

Through its efforts to collect information about factors related to women offenders' success on probation and parole, the Policy Group learned that many types of information about women, their families and support networks, and their participation in programs and sanctions is not routinely or reliably available in existing automated data bases. Problems with incomplete information and inconsistent formats also are present within paper case files and program records. Policy group members were also concerned with system inefficiencies that result in duplication of information collection efforts. They observed both technological and organizational barriers to information-sharing that hamper coordinated delivery of services and sanctions to women offenders. Based on these findings and observations, the Policy Group recommends several strategies for improving the quality and usability of information about women offenders and their involvement with the criminal justice system.

- Incorporate processes for efficiently collecting essential data about women offenders as new automated information systems are developed and existing ones are revamped,
- System designers should develop standard definitions of terms and variables so that data collected in diverse parts of the state and by various agencies and service providers is consistent and comparable.
- Types of data elements essential to planning, designing and evaluating sanctions and services for women offenders that are not now routinely or systematically collected include: number, ages and legal custody of children; nature of available social support systems; living arrangements; marital and pregnancy status; income types and amounts; family involvement in criminal justice system; the woman's history of juvenile court involvement; chemical dependency history; substance abuse, mental health and medical treatment history; education and skill level; and criminal justice supervision history.
- Information system development efforts should encourage and provide for inter-system communication and information-sharing by criminal justice agencies and human service providers while also making appropriate provisions to protect the confidentiality of some types of information.
- Criminal justice and human service agencies should develop information systems that can serve the needs of case managers, decision makers, planners, policy makers, and evaluation researchers while also streamlining information collection requirements.
- Provide the proposed Public Safety Planning Group with the results of this project, so that it can assist in implementing these information system recommendations.

### **Program and Sanctioning Resource Needs**

The Policy Group affirms the American Correctional Association's policy on women offenders that states that: "Correctional systems must be guided by the principle of parity. Women offenders must receive an equivalent range of services available to men offenders, including opportunities for individualized programming and services that recognize the unique needs of this population." Gender-specific programs are those that take into account real differences between men and women in their learning and relationship styles and life circumstances. They are not those that admit only women and use the same approaches as are applied to men offenders. The Policy Group recommends both that particular types of services be made available to women offenders, and that programs for women offenders use intervention modalities that are sensitive to women's unique needs and strengths. In particular, the Policy Group recommends that:

- Women offenders in the community have access to a full continuum of drug-free, safe housing, from emergency shelters to permanent housing options.
- Remove barriers that prevent inmates from applying and receiving for services such as public housing.
- Residential substance abuse treatment resources are available for all women offenders whose criminal behavior is clearly related to their serious chemical dependency problems.
- Jails provide for gender-specific programming.
- A network of regional correctional institutions to house women offenders closer to their children and home communities be developed by the Department of Corrections.
- All residential corrections programs facilitate the visitation of children with incarcerated mothers.
- Programs to deal with codependency and abuse issues as well as cognitive restructuring be developed or expanded to assist in effective (re)habilitation of many women offenders.
- Community-based programs arrange for child care for women participants with children.
- Women offenders benefit from programs that encourage the development of trusting and supportive relationships with other women.
- Support systems and relationships are central to women's lives. Programs that build upon this strength can help women offenders develop healthy connections.
- Mentors who exemplify individual strength and growth while also providing caring support can be extremely important in helping women offenders to succeed.

### **Partnerships for Planning and Service Delivery**

Because women offenders often need services and treatment provided by non-criminal justice agencies and because they are often on the caseloads of one or more human service providers when they become involved with the justice system, integrated systems of service delivery are particularly important in successfully intervening with women offenders. The Policy Group therefore recommends that:

- The circle of potential partners extends beyond traditional corrections and public human services agencies to include public health agencies, private treatment and service providers, schools, churches, and other community groups.

- Individuals and groups willing to be responsible for designing and facilitate various partnership collaborations be identified. Resources should be provided to encourage development of innovative approaches by local jurisdictions.
- Local planning and service delivery collaborative be encouraged and supported to develop truly community-based sanctions and services for women offenders.
- Joint case planning by agencies involved with women offenders and their families are encouraged, particularly for the Children's Services Division and state and local corrections agencies.
- Staff specialization within agencies is encouraged to assist in service integration for women offenders. As an example, probation/parole officers whose caseloads are only women offenders collaborate more efficiently with CSD staff whose caseloads include only individuals currently under correctional supervision.
- Corrections system representative are included on the local and state Commissions for Children and Families (see section below on Legislative Initiatives).

Many of these recommendations can be carried forward by local and state public safety planning groups.

### **Training and Education on Women Offender Issues**

The Policy Group believes that there is a universal and continuing need for professional training in issues about women offenders. Both the specific content of training and the ways in which it is accomplished will be important to its effectiveness, as reflected in the Policy Group's recommendations.

- In training about women offender issues, provide information and promote positive, productive attitudes toward this population. Topics in training curricula should include:
  - Impacts of criminal justice decision making processes on women offenders;
  - Issues disparately affecting women, including physical, sexual and emotional abuse, bonding and attachment, parenting, codependency, substance abuse, and the intergenerational impact of women offender's behavior;
  - Techniques for preventing future criminal behavior by women offenders and their children;
  - Ways in which the criminal justice and human service systems can avoid contributing to women offenders' failures; and
  - Self-care techniques for staff to help prevent burnout.

- The National Institute of Corrections should continue to develop basic and advanced training curricula on women offenders.
- Involve both women offenders and consumers of the training in its design.
- Consideration should be given to involving women ex-offenders in providing training. If they are involved, they should be appropriately compensated.
- Involve men in designing, delivering and participating in training about women offender issues.
- Offer training at the local level (city, county), and encourage participation by a variety of criminal justice and other professionals.
- Incorporate women offender issues in all orientation and continuing training requirements (e.g., Board on Public Safety Standards and Training).
- Use a variety of statewide and local professional conferences as ongoing training opportunities.
- Encourage community colleges, four-year colleges and universities and graduate schools in relevant disciplines (e.g., law, social work, psychology) to offer courses and information about women offender issues.
- Provide for public education to promote greater community understanding of women offenders and the factors that affect their success in the community.

### **Future Research Directions**

The Policy Group recommends that resources be allocated to support several types of research on issues affecting women offenders, and delineates some basic requirements for useful and credible evaluation research.

- Develop a *prospective* research agenda (in contrast to the retrospective data collection undertaken for this project), permitting collection of necessary information on an ongoing basis, to learn which factors affect women offenders' success/failure under community supervision.
- Policy makers and program designers should carefully define their expected and desired outcomes, and use evaluation research techniques to assess progress in relation to these defined goals.
- Technical assistance may be necessary to help policy makers and practitioners develop adequate outcome measures and design efficient monitoring and information collection strategies.
- Other issues that warrant future research investment include:

- What are the causes and effects of disproportionate minority representation in corrections programs?
- What are the most effective ways to respond to women offenders' failures?
- Which sanctions are most effective in producing desired behavior changes?
- What factors lead women to criminal activity, and how can interventions be designed to address them?

### **Legislative Initiatives**

The Policy Group noted several areas in which legislative action is necessary to enable implementation of suggested reforms.

- Encourage or require that local and state Commissions on Children and Families include a corrections system representative among their members.
- Support the removal of statutory barriers to inter-agency sharing of information about women offenders and their families, consistent with federal confidentiality requirements.
- Redefine "work release" in applicable statutes or administrative rules to permit appropriate transitional residential placements for women exiting the state prison system.
- Resolve the issues raised by sentences that involve consecutive prison and jail terms, so that women exiting prison could be immediately placed in appropriate community-based post-prison supervision programs.

### **Dissemination of Information**

The Policy Group recommends several methods of distributing the results of this project as well as various means of disseminating general information about women offenders and intermediate sanctions to a variety of audiences.

- Distribute copies of the Final Report of this project to key policy makers and interest groups.
- Policy Group members should provide information about the project and its products to the various criminal justice and other professional associations with which they are affiliated, either through presentations at conferences or through providing written summaries of information.
- Establish a Speaker's Bureau comprising Policy Group members to provide presentations to local organizations or groups such as county Commissions on Children and Families and local Public Safety Planning Committees.

- The Department of Corrections should work with a student to develop a concise handbook or brochure describing the decision processes and options within the criminal justice system for distribution to women offenders and their families.
- Inform the media of key findings and recommendations of this project through a press release.

### **Future Women Offender Policy Development Agenda**

This Policy Group wants the concern for women offenders that this project has encouraged to continue after the project's completion. The Policy Group therefore recommends several strategies for continuing and enhancing interest in women offender issues.

- The proposed Public Safety Planning Group should be encouraged to adopt the findings and recommendations of this report, and to include the Policy Group's vision statement as part of its mission and values. It should encourage local jurisdictions and agencies to adopt these values as the basis for designing and evaluating sanctions and services for women offenders.
- Local policy and planning groups, and professional organizations, should include women offender issues on their planning, training and evaluation agendas on an ongoing basis.
- The Oregon Commission on Women should consider adopting women offender issues as part of their organizational agenda.

The Policy Group strongly encourages continuing efforts to expand our knowledge of women offenders and to enhance our understanding of the most effective methods of supporting them in becoming law-abiding and productive community members. Much has been accomplished in this project, yet much remains to be done.



---

## Appendix A: A Glossary of Common Terms

**ABSCOND:** When the location of an offender under community supervision is unknown and subsequent attempts to contact her are unsuccessful.

**ANGER MANAGEMENT:** A program delivered in a group setting that teaches methods to control anger in a productive manner.

**CLASSIFICATION:** A system used to decide how much supervision an offender needed based on her history of criminal history, supervision performance and other risk-defining criteria.

**COGNITIVE RESTRUCTURING:** A program that addresses flaws in how an offender thinks to help in interrupting criminal thinking patterns.

**COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS:** Describes the system of supervising people living in the community who are on probation, parole or post-prison supervision. By using classification tools, treatment and support programs, community corrections professionals help preserve public safety while helping offenders make the transition to useful citizenship.

**COMMUNITY WORK CREW:** Offenders working in a group to provide community service. Crews typically clear trails, maintain parks, paint buildings, collect litter or do other types of manual labor.

**COMMUNITY SERVICE:** These programs assign offenders to work for government or private nonprofit agencies. Manual labor chores might include chopping wood, serving food at senior centers, weeding around public buildings or helping with park maintenance. Those with specialized skills might undertake more technical tasks such as compiling land record inventories or cataloguing books.

**COMMUNITY SUPERVISION:** Provided by community corrections agencies for offenders on probation, parole or post-prison supervision.

**CRIME RATE:** The number of index crimes per 10,000 population.

**DAY REPORTING:** An offender reports to a central location every day. There she files a written daily schedule showing how each hour of the day will be spent - at work, in treatment, in school, etc. A case manager spot checks to see if the offender is where she is supposed to be. The offender must obey a curfew, do community service and submit to random drug tests. Day reporting is often program-intensive, offering such services as alcohol and drug group treatment, employment readiness and job training.

**ELECTRONICS:** Offender spends most of the time at home with a small transmitter attached to wrist or ankle. A very specific schedule is required and a computer notifies staff when the offender is not where she is supposed to be.

**FELONY:** A crime punishable by a prison sentence.

**HOUSE ARREST:** Offenders spend most of the time at home without electronics - A specific schedule is required and verification may occur by telephone.

**INCARCERATION:** Confinement in jail or prison.

**INDETERMINATE SENTENCING:** The court stipulates only a maximum term of imprisonment with the actual time served determined later by the Board of Parole and Post-Prison Supervision. The court may impose such sentences only for crimes committed before November 1989 and may not exceed the maximum term specified in the law.

**INDEX CRIMES:** Those significant crimes selected by the FBI as indicative of the general crime rate. They include violent crimes such as homicide, aggravated assault, rape and robbery and property crimes such as burglary, larceny, arson and motor vehicle theft.

**INTENSIVE SUPERVISION:** The probation/parole officer may see an offender up to five times per week and impose a curfew, check on employment status, require drug testing and make unannounced home visits.

**JAIL:** A facility under the jurisdiction of local government, usually the county, intended for incarceration terms of less than one year. Jails are traditionally used for three purposes: pre-trial detention, short-term incarceration as a condition of probation, and incarceration of misdemeanants.

**MISDEMEANOR:** A crime punishable by incarceration in a county jail for not more than one year.

**OFFENDER:** Anyone in the corrections system whether incarcerated or on probation or parole.

**OREGON PAROLE MATRIX:** A precursor to Sentence Guidelines. It was established in the 1970's and offered greater latitude to judges in sentencing offenders than the current system.

**PAROLE:** A conditional release from prison into the community or to a detainer as authorized by the Board of Parole and Post-Prison Supervision.

**PAROLE/PROBATION OFFICER:** Supervises offenders in the community. Caseloads are typically a mix of probationers and parolees.

**POST-PRISON SUPERVISION:** The part of an offender's sentence served under community supervision after the prison portion of the sentence is completed.

**PRISON:** A state facility intended for felons.

**PROBATION:** A sentence that commits the offender to supervision in the community by a probation officer. Probation may include a jail sentence, but does not involve a prison sentence.

**PROPERTY CRIME:** Involves the theft or destruction of property without the offender confronting the property owner.

**RECIDIVISM:** Repeat or habitual offenses.

**REHABILITATION PROGRAMS:** Programs designed to strike at the root cause of offending behavior. Such programs include drug/alcohol treatment, cognitive restructuring [thinking changes], sex offender treatment, literacy and job training and placement.

**RESTITUTION OR WORK CENTER:** A residential center that houses offenders in a structured setting, allowing them to leave for work or other approved activities such as drug treatment. The purpose is to provide control and support for offenders who are paying victims restitution or other costs from wages earned while working in the community.

**RESTITUTION:** Compensation to a victim from an offender to make up for a crime.

**REVOKE [REVOCAION]:** An action taken to return an offender to prison. The term also refers to action taken to commit probationers to prison. Such actions are usually in response to a recommendation by the offender's supervising probation/parole officer.

**SANCTION:** A punishment imposed for violations of parole or probation. The intent is to take an active remedial action to correct the offenders' behavior while keeping them in the community. Sanctions may include community service, day reporting, electronic monitoring, house arrest or a short stay in jail.

**SENTENCING GUIDELINES:** Also called "truth in sentencing" or "just desserts," these were established in 1989 to provide greater uniformity among the different regions of the state in sentencing offenders. For offenders committing a crime after November 1, 1989, the sentence is determined using a grid that considers the crime and past criminal behavior to assign either a prison or a probation sentence and determining the length of sentence. Sentencing judges retain discretion to depart from Guidelines recommendations if aggravating or mitigating factors are present.

**STATUTE CRIME:** Neither violence nor the destruction or theft of property. Crimes include driving with a suspended license or unauthorized possession of a controlled substance.

**STRUCTURED SANCTIONS:** Imposed as a consequence when an offender fails to abide by the specific terms of supervision. These sanctions may include jail time, community service, house arrest or inpatient drug/alcohol treatment. The structure is a statewide decision-making grid that recommends the severity of the sanction to impose based on specified circumstances and offender behaviors. Since community corrections staff make

these decisions rather than waiting for a court or parole board hearing date, the consequences can be imposed almost immediately when an offender breaks a rule.

**SUCCESSFUL CASE CLOSURE:** Defined by the Department of Corrections data system that includes several case closure types that are "successes": conversion to bench probation, discharge from parole, early termination from supervision, expiration of the sentence or inactive supervision. Performance while on supervision is not considered as part of the definition.

**SUPERVISION FEES:** A fee charged monthly to each person on parole, post-prison supervision or probation to offset some of the costs of supervision. They are assessed by a judge, usually at a rate of \$25 per month, and may be waived due to the offender's inability to pay.

**SUPERVISION LEVEL:** The Oregon Case Management System determines supervision level through a risk assessment process that determines an offender's likelihood of committing a new crime. Supervision levels range from High [four contacts per month] for the highest risk probationers and parolees to Administrative [one contact every three months] for the lowest risk cases.

**TRANSITION SERVICES:** Pre-release services based in the county. Features "reaching in" to the institution to "hook" the offender to housing, treatment, employment and other services before release to reduce likelihood of failure.


**UNSUCCESSFUL OR NEGATIVE CASE CLOSURE:** Defined by the Department of Corrections data system that includes several case closure types that are "failures": Revocation or termination with discharge to jail, housed in jail but not revoked, revoked by the Board of Parole, revoked to federal prison, revoked or terminated with no sanction or parole or probation violation to prison. Abscond is considered a neutral case closure.

**VIOLENT CRIME:** Involves direct contact or confrontation between the offender and the victim. Examples include murder, rape, assault and robbery.

---

**Appendix B: Decision Mapping**

# WHAT ARE THE DECISION OPTIONS?




Charge  
Cite  
What to cite for - may be changed by DA  
Counseling  
Referral to Social Services  
Arrest/Not to Arrest  
Involuntary Mental Health Commitment  
Neighborhood mediation

Security Release (or no)  
Conditional and Third Party Release  
Probable Cause  
Population release  
Matrix release  
Recognizance Release

Prosecute federally  
How many charges to file  
No complaint  
Diversion  
Plea Bargains  
Dropping Charges  
Present to Grand Jury  
Ability to Prove Intent  
Level of Charge - felony v. misdemeanor v. violation

Civil Compromise  
Diversion  
Mediation  
Conviction/Dismissal/Acquit  
Plea Agreement  
Conditional Discharge  
Local Options  
Court-specific Options  
Misdemeanor treatment by J following conviction




Prison  
Jail  
Probation - type, conditions  
In or out of sanctioning pool  
Victim reconciliation  
Misdemeanor treatment of felony offense  
Compensatory fines, restitution, fines  
Sentence of dismissal of charge  
Minimums

Level of Supervision  
Assignment of officer  
Conditions of supervision  
General conditions enacted  
Supervision plan  
Sanctions in/out pool  
Early termination  
Convert to bench probation  
Extension of supervision  
Referral to services  
Punitive vs. service philosophy  
Victim reconciliation

Early termination  
Do nothing  
Court intervention  
Bench probation  
Formal probation violation  
Revocation  
Continued with mod.  
Continued with no mod.  
Extend  
Structured sanctions  
Increase/reduce supervision  
No action by court or Board  
Arrest/not arrest  
PPO interventions  
Response by DA

Sentencing Guidelines/matrix  
Intake  
Transitional leave  
Work release  
Physical custody - Min, Med  
Treatment programs:  
Turning Point  
Counselors at OWCC deter  
Records officers determines release date  
Summit Program  
Release date  
Psychiatric profile  
Job assignments




**GUIDELINES**  
In or out  
Yes or no  
Earned time  
Special conditions  
Transitional release  
Work release  
Medical/hardship release  
Aggravated murder  
Civil commitment  
**MATRIX**  
Release or Extend  
Good Time  
Medical/hardship  
Release

Level of supervision  
Supervision length  
Assignment of officer  
Conditions of supervision  
PO assignment  
Sanctions process  
Revocation alternatives  
Service v. punitive philosophy  
Termination, discharge, inactive  
Service referrals  
Residence  
Notifications

Early termination  
Do nothing  
Court intervention  
Bench probation  
Formal probation violation  
Revocation  
Continued with mod.  
Continued with no mod.  
Extend  
Structured sanctions  
Increase/reduce supervision  
No action by court or Board  
Arrest/not arrest  
PPO interventions  
Response by DA

Death  
Early termination  
Expiration  
Unsuccessful termination  
Revoked without return to pris  
Inactive  
Abscond - close warrant, decid not or unable to extradite  
Commutation  
Conditional discharge  
Reversal on appeal  
Discharge

# WHO ARE THE DECISION MAKERS?




Police/law Enforcement  
Victims and Witnesses  
Suspect - Behavior Reactions  
Policy Makers - Legislators,  
City Counselors, etc.  
District Attorney's Office

Referee or Judge  
Local Correctional Staff  
Policy Makers  
Pre-trial Release Staff

Grand Jury  
District Attorney's Office  
Judge at Preliminary Hearing

Jury  
Judge  
District Attorney  
Defendant




District Attorney  
Defense Attorney  
Parole/Probation Officer  
Judge  
Defendant

Administrators  
Supervisors  
PO's  
Client/Defendant  
Other Correctional Employees

Probation/Parole Officer  
Supervisors [of PO's]  
Program Staff  
Judge  
Defense Attorney  
District Attorney  
Law Enforcement  
Hearings Officer  
Board of Parole/Post-prison  
Supervision

Records Officers  
Counselors  
Board of Parole/Post-prison  
Supervision  
Inmate  
Treatment Providers/Contractors




DOC Counselor  
Board  
Field/CCA Offices

Parole Board  
Supervisors  
PO  
Administrators  
Victims  
Offenders  
Other Corrections Employees  
Elected Officials  
Community Corrections Advisory  
Board/Council  
Hearings Officers  
Treatment Providers

Probation/parole Officer  
Supervisors [of PO's]  
Program Staff  
Judge  
District Attorney  
Hearings Officers  
Board of Parole/Post-prison  
Supervision

DOC Administration  
Governor  
Hearings Officers  
Courts  
Board of Parole

# WHO OR WHAT INFLUENCES THE DECISION?




Victims and Others Present  
Jail Release Policies - matrix,  
booking decisions  
District Attorney Policies  
Over-crowding Mandates

District Attorney Recommend.  
Defense Attorney Recommend  
Federal Orders (Jail Pop.)  
Parole/Probation Officers  
Release and Treatment  
Programs  
Ability to Post Security  
Other Jurisdiction Holds  
Nature of Crime

District Attorney's Workload  
Credibility of Witnesses  
Education of DA's  
Diversion  
Plea Bargains  
Case Law  
Victims  
Media  
Schedules  
Political Environment  
Trial Strategy  
In or Out of Custody  
Facts of the Case  
Intent  
Criminal Justice Subcultures - Chamber of  
Commerce  
Judges Practices  
Police Practices

Defense Attorney  
Victims  
Judges Philosophy and Hist  
Local Sentiment  
District Attorney Philosophy  
Program Availability/Progra  
Options  
Plea Offer  
Statutory Regulations  
Custody Status  
Criminal History  
Cultural Understanding by  
Defendant  
Statute Limitation




Sentencing Guidelines/Old Matrix  
Criminal History  
Crime Severity  
Recommendations of DA  
Substantial and Compelling Reasons  
Judges Sense of Fairness  
Victim(s) Testimony/Input  
External Information/PSI  
Resources Available in Community  
Public Perception  
Media  
Supervision History  
Pregnancy  
Advocacy Groups  
Children  
Substance Abuse History  
Defendants Financial History  
Accompanying Other Cases  
Program Success and Availability  
Stability Factors

Community Corrections Advisory  
Boards/Council  
Resources  
Court Direction/Sentencing  
Orders  
Specific Expertise or Specialized  
Caseloads  
Philosophy or Probation

Family  
Victims  
Defense Bar  
Defendant's Demeanor/attitude  
Perception of What Releasing Authority's  
Decision May be  
Level of Understanding of SSP/SGL  
Options  
Defendant's Attitude Toward PO  
PO's Attitude Toward Defendant  
Matching Sanctions/interventions to  
Behaviors and Needs  
System-wide Communication  
Availability of Services and Sanctions  
High or Low Caseloads  
Understanding of Underlying Issues -  
Codependency, Substance Abuse,  
Domestic Violence, Cultural Differences  
Level of Training of Decision Makers  
PPO and Supervisor  
Law Enforcement

Sentence Length  
Program/Custody Plan  
Statutes (Measure 4, Notificat  
Gun, etc)  
Sentencing Orders  
Jail Records  
Defense Attorney/Team  
Inmate  
Disciplinary Actions  
Medical/psychological  
Pregnancy  
Personal Needs  
Detainer, Warrants, Holds  
Where to Release To




Aggravated Murder  
Measure 4  
Dangerous Offenders  
Gun Minnum  
Measure 10 Notification  
Court  
Victims  
Treatment/Programming  
Media  
Institutional Conduct  
Release Plans  
Stability Issues  
Inmate - Demeanor,  
Family, Psychological  
Evaluation, Criminal  
History

Community Corrections Advisory  
Board/Council  
Resources  
Court Direction/Sentencing Orders  
Specific Expertise or Specialized  
Caseloads  
Philosophy or Probation  
Media  
Victim  
CSD  
Community Pressure  
Caseload/Workload Issues


Family  
Victims  
Defense Bar  
Defendant's Demeanor/attitude  
Perception of What Releasing Authority's  
Decision May be  
Level of Understanding of SSP/SGL  
Options  
Defendant's Attitude Toward PO  
PO's Attitude Toward Defendant  
Matching Sanctions/interventions to  
Behaviors and Needs  
System-wide Communication  
Availability of Services and Sanctions  
High or Low Caseloads  
Understanding of Underlying Issues -  
Codependency, Substance Abuse,  
Domestic Violence, Cultural Differences  
Level of Training of Decision Makers  
Hearings Officer Recommendation  
PPO and Supervisor  
Law Enforcement

Hearings Officer Recommend  
PO Recommendation  
Victim  
DA/Defense Attorney  
Client  
Treatment Providers  
Family/Significant Other/Colla  
Community  
Crime  
Media  
Law Enforcement


# ON WHAT INFORMATION IS THE DECISION BASED?



# WHAT ARE THE UNSPOKEN RULES?



# WHAT ARE STATED RULES OR POLICIES





---

**Appendix C: Resource Inventory**

WOMEN SPECIFIC SERVICES AND SANCTIONS

OREGON INTERMEDIATE SANCTIONS FOR WOMEN OFFENDERS

MARCH 1995

PAGE 86

County	Program Name	Program Type	Area Served	Resid. or Non-Resid.	Tx, Serv., or Sanct.	Women w/ Child. Prog.	Pregnant Wom. Prog.	Program Capacity	Program Length
ALL	INFOCUS @ OWCC	Life Skills	State of OR	Res.	Tx & Serv.			28	6-12 Months
ALL	LIFETRAC @ OWCC	Public Education	State of OR	Res.	Tx & Serv.			14	Min. 1 year
ALL	Turning Point @ CRCI	Sub Abuse	State of OR	Res.	Tx			50	6-15 Months
BAKER	Baker Co. Coun./ A & D Abuse	Sub Abuse	State of OR	Int. Res.	Tx			18	Varies
BAKER	Baker House	Sub Abuse	State of OR	Res.	Tx	Yes	Yes	11	6 Months
BENT	Women's Issues Program-Turning Point	Life Skills/A & D Ed.	Benton County	Outp	Serv.			No Cap	6 weeks
BENT	Women's Issues Program/LivingSpace	Transition/Sub Abuse	Benton & Linn Co.	Res.	Tx			3	Min. 90 Days
BENT	Stronghold Cottage	Transitional Housing	Linn, Bent., Linc. Co.	Both	Tx & Serv.	Yes	Yes	5	3-12 Months
CLAC	Women's Team	Supervision	Clackamas Co.	Both	All			150-210	Varies
JACK	On Track, Inc. (HOME/Teen Program)	Sub Abuse	Roque Valley Area	Res.	Tx	Yes	Yes		3-9 Months
JACK	On Track, Inc. (HOME/Teen Program)	Sub Abuse	Roque Valley Area	Aftercare	Tx	Yes	Yes		180 days
JACK	On Track, Inc. (HOME/Teen Program)	Sub Abuse	Roque Valley Area	Int. Outp	Tx	Yes	Yes		3-6 Months
JOSE	Rogue Recovery Programs	Sub Abuse	So. Oregon	Res.	Tx			4	1-5 Days
JOSE	Rogue Recovery Programs	Sub Abuse	So. Oregon	Res.	Tx			23	30-60 Days
JOSE	Rogue Recovery Programs	Sub Abuse	So. Oregon	Outp	Tx	Childcare		No Cap	Varies
JOSE	Freedom House	Transitional Housing	So. Oregon	Res.	Serv.		Yes		
LANE	Sponsors, Inc.	Abuse Survivors	Lane Co.	Outp	Serv.	Childcare		15	On-going
LANE	Relief Nursery, Inc.	Parenting	Eugene/Springfield Area	Outp	Serv.	Yes		160 families yearly	On-going
LANE	Couer De Lane	Sub Abuse	Lane Co.	Outp	Tx	Yes		15	Varies
LANE	Families in Recovery	Sub Abuse	Lane Co.	Int. Outp	Tx	Yes	Yes	15	Varies
LANE	Families in Recovery	Sub Abuse	State of OR	Res.	Tx	Yes	Yes	24 incl. Child.	5-6 Months
LANE	New Futures	Sub Abuse	Lane Co.	Aftercare	Tx	Yes		No Cap	Varies
LANE	New Hope-Serenity Lane	Sub Abuse	Lane Co.	Int. Outp	Tx	Childcare		8	6-8 wks +
LANE	Sunrise House & Sunrise House Annex	Sub Abuse	State of OR	Res.	Tx			16	5-6 Months
LANE	Sponsors, Inc.	Transitional Housing	Lane Co.	Res.	Serv.	Yes		5 women/6 children	3 Months
MARI	DROP & ISP	Supervision	Marion Co.	Outp	Tx & Sanc.			50+	Varies
MARI	Children's Program	Childcare	Marion Co.						
MARI	Bridgeway-Her Place Safehouse	Sub Abuse	Marion Co.	Both	Tx & Serv.	Yes	Yes	5	Min. 60 Days
MARI	Intensive Outpatient Program	Sub Abuse	Marion Co.	Outp	Tx	Yes		50+	Varies
MARI	Women's Treatment Services	Sub Abuse	Marion Co.	Both	Tx	Yes		50+	Varies
MARI	Freedom In The Son	Transition/Prison Outreach	State of OR	Outp	Serv.	Yes		No Cap	On-going
MULT	Alcohol Treatment & Training Center	Gambling Addiction	Mult., Clack., Wash. Co.	Outp	Tx			8-10	Varies
MULT	Prostitution Alternatives	Prostitution	Mult. Co.	Outp	Tx			50	6-12 Months
MULT	Addictions Recovery Association	Sub Abuse	State of OR	Int. Res.	Tx	Yes	Yes	19	6-9 Months
MULT	Alcohol Treatment & Training Center	Sub Abuse	Mult., Clack., Wash. Co.	Outp	Tx			20	
MULT	Alcohol Treatment & Training Center/SAFE	Sub Abuse	Mult., Clack., Wash. Co.	Int. Outp	Tx	Yes	Yes	18-23	Varies
MULT	Alpha Family Treatment Center (CODA)	Sub Abuse	Portland-Metro/SW Wash. St.	Res.	Tx	Yes	Yes	25	3-6 Months
MULT	ASAP Treatment Services	Sub Abuse	Mult., Clack., Wash. Co.	Int. Outp	Tx	Childcare		30-50	6-9 Months
MULT	ASAP Treatment Services	Sub Abuse	Mult. Co.	Corr. Int. Outp	Tx	Childcare		30-50	6-9 Months
MULT	DePaul Treatment Centers	Sub Abuse	Mult. Co.	Outp/Int. Outp	Tx	Childcare		Unknown	Varies
MULT	DePaul Treatment Centers	Sub Abuse	Wash., Clac., Colu., Clat., Till. Co.	Int. Res.	Tx			16	2-3 Months
MULT	Diversion Associates	Sub Abuse	Mult. Co.	Outp & Int. Outp	Tx	Childcare		No Cap	6-12 Months
MULT	NARA-Pregnant Wom. & Wom. w/ Child.	Sub Abuse	OR, WA	Both	Tx	Yes	Yes	45	Varies
MULT	New Directions Family Tx Ctr. (CODA)	Sub Abuse	Mult. Co.	Outp	Tx	Yes	Yes	30	Varies
MULT	New Directions Family Tx Ctr. (CODA)	Sub Abuse	Mult. Co.	Res.	Tx	Yes	Yes	15	6 Months
MULT	Volunteers of America, Inc./ Residential Ctr.	Sub Abuse	Mult. Co.	Res.	Tx	Yes		40/ 7 w/ children	6 Months
MULT	Women's Intensive Treatment	Sub Abuse	Mult. Co.	Outp	Tx	Childcare		16	3-6 Months
MULT	Women's Residential	Sub Abuse	Mult. Co.	Res.	Tx			8	60 Days
MULT	APADT Program (Mult. Co. Comm. Corr.)	Sub Abuse/Case Mgt.	Mult. Co.	Outp	Tx & Serv.	Yes	Yes	100 (incl. w/ above)	18 Month Avg.
MULT	WICS	Transition/Life Skills	State of OR	Res.	Serv.			20	8 Weeks
MULT	Women's Transition Services (Comm. Corr.)	Transition/Sub Abuse	Mult. Co.	Res. & Outp	Tx & Serv.	Yes		100	18 Month Avg.
MULT	Trans. Opportunities Proj. (TOP)-YWCA	Work Release	Mult. Co. & Surr. Area	Res./Work Rel.	Serv. & Sanc.			30	30-365 Days
MULT	House of Nia (African American)	Transition Housing/Sub Ab.	Mult. Co.	Res.	Tx & Serv.	Yes	Yes	5 Women w/child.	Varies
VARIOUS	Employment Dept./Corr. Clients Placem't Serv.	Employment	Wash., Mult., Clac., Yahm. Co.	Outp	Serv.			No Limit	On-going
WASH	Mountindale Recovery Center	Sub Abuse	Wash., Clac., Colu., Clat., Till. Co.	Res.	Tx	Yes		Unknown	3-6 Months
WASH	Project Cradle	Sub Abuse	Washington Co.	Outp	Tx	Yes	Yes	No Cap	Varies
WASH	Tualatin Valley Mental Health Center	Sub Abuse	Wash. Co.	Int. Outp	Tx	Yes		No Cap	6-12 Months
YAHM	Mother's in Treatment	Sub Abuse	Yamhill Co.	Outp	Tx	Yes			6-12 Months

\*mental health clinics/programs, domestic violence shelters, job/employment/vocational programs and substance abuse programs (coed) are available to women offenders throughout the State.

WOMEN SPECIFIC SERVICES AND SANCTIONS

County	Program Name	Program Type	Area Served	Resid. or Non-Resid.	Tx, Serv., or Sanct.	Women w/ Child. Prog.	Pregnant Wom. Prog.	Program Capacity	Program Length
LANE	Sponsors, Inc.	Abuse Survivors	Lane Co.	Outp	Serv.	Childcare		15	On-going
MARI	Children's Program	Childcare	Marion Co.						
VARIOUS	Employment Dept./Corr. Clients Placem't Serv.	Employment	Wash., Mult., Clac., Yahm. Co.	Outp	Serv.			No Limit	On-going
MULT	Alcohol Treatment & Training Center	Gambling Addiction	Mult., Clack., Wash. Co.	Outp	Tx			8-10	Varies
ALL	INFOCUS @ OWCC	Life Skills	State of OR	Res.	Tx & Serv.			28	6-12 Months
BENT	Women's Issues Program-Turning Point	Life Skills/A & D Ed.	Benton County	Outp	Serv.			No Cap	6 weeks
LANE	Relief Nursery, Inc.	Parenting	Eugene/Springfield Area	Outp	Serv.	Yes		160 families yearly	On-going
MULT	Prostitution Alternatives	Prostitution	Mult. Co.	Outp	Tx			50	6-12 Months
ALL	LIFETRAC @ OWCC	Public Education	State of OR	Res.	Tx & Serv.			14	Min. 1 year
ALL	Turning Point @ CRCI	Sub Abuse	State of OR	Res.	Tx			50	6-15 Months
BAKER	Baker Co. Coun./ A & D Abuse	Sub Abuse	State of OR	Int. Res.	Tx			18	Varies
BAKER	Baker House	Sub Abuse	State of OR	Res.	Tx	Yes	Yes	11	6 Months
JACK	On Track, Inc. (HOME/Teen Program)	Sub Abuse	Roque Valley Area	Int. Outp	Tx	Yes	Yes		3-6 Months
JACK	On Track, Inc. (HOME/Teen Program)	Sub Abuse	Roque Valley Area	Res.	Tx	Yes	Yes		3-9 Months
JACK	On Track, Inc. (HOME/Teen Program)	Sub Abuse	Roque Valley Area	Aftercare	Tx	Yes	Yes		180 days
JOSE	Rogue Recovery Programs	Sub Abuse	So. Oregon	Res.	Tx			4	1-5 Days
JOSE	Rogue Recovery Programs	Sub Abuse	So. Oregon	Outp	Tx	Childcare		No Cap	Varies
JOSE	Rogue Recovery Programs	Sub Abuse	So. Oregon	Res.	Tx			23	30-60 Days
LANE	Couer De Lane	Sub Abuse	Lane Co.	Outp	Tx	Yes		15	Varies
LANE	Families In Recovery	Sub Abuse	State of OR	Res.	Tx	Yes	Yes	24 incl. Child.	5-6 Months
LANE	Families in Recovery	Sub Abuse	Lane Co.	Int. Outp	Tx	Yes	Yes	15	Varies
LANE	New Futures	Sub Abuse	Lane Co.	Aftercare	Tx	Yes		No Cap	Varies
LANE	New Hope-Serenity Lane	Sub Abuse	Lane Co.	Int. Outp	Tx	Childcare		8	6-8 wks +
LANE	Sunrise House & Sunrise House Annex	Sub Abuse	State of OR	Res.	Tx			16	5-6 Months
MARI	Bridgeway-Her Place Safehouse	Sub Abuse	Marion Co.	Both	Tx & Serv.	Yes	Yes	5	Min. 60 Days
MARI	Intensive Outpatient Program	Sub Abuse	Marion Co.	Outp	Tx	Yes		50+	Varies
MARI	Women's Treatment Services	Sub Abuse	Marion Co.	Both	Tx	Yes		50+	Varies
MULT	Addictions Recovery Association	Sub Abuse	State of OR	Int. Res.	Tx	Yes	Yes	19	6-9 Months
MULT	Alcohol Treatment & Training Center	Sub Abuse	Mult., Clack., Wash. Co.	Outp	Tx			20	
MULT	Alcohol Treatment & Training Center/SAFE	Sub Abuse	Mult., Clack., Wash. Co.	Int. Outp	Tx	Yes	Yes	18-23	Varies
MULT	Alpha Family Treatment Center (CODA)	Sub Abuse	Portland-Metro/SW Wash. St.	Res.	Tx	Yes	Yes	25	3-6 Months
MULT	ASAP Treatment Services	Sub Abuse	Mult. Co.	Corr. Int. Outp	Tx	Childcare		30-50	6-9 Months
MULT	ASAP Treatment Services	Sub Abuse	Mult., Clack., Wash. Co.	Int. Outp	Tx	Childcare		30-50	6-9 Months
MULT	DePaul Treatment Centers	Sub Abuse	Mult. Co.	Outp/Int. Outp	Tx	Childcare		Unknown	Varies
MULT	DePaul Treatment Centers	Sub Abuse	Wash., Clac., Colu., Clat., Till. Co.	Int. Res.	Tx			16	2-3 Months
MULT	Diversion Associates	Sub Abuse	Mult. Co.	Outp & Int. Outp	Tx	Childcare		No Cap	6-12 Months
MULT	NARA-Pregnant Wom. & Wom. w/ Child.	Sub Abuse	OR, WA	Both	Tx	Yes	Yes	45	Varies
MULT	New Directions Family Tx Ctr. (CODA)	Sub Abuse	Mult. Co.	Res.	Tx	Yes	Yes	15	6 Months
MULT	New Directions Family Tx Ctr. (CODA)	Sub Abuse	Mult. Co.	Outp	Tx			30	Varies
MULT	Volunteers of America, Inc./ Residential Ctr.	Sub Abuse	Mult. Co.	Res.	Tx	Yes		40/ 7 w/ children	6 Months
MULT	Women's Intensive Treatment	Sub Abuse	Mult. Co.	Outp	Tx	Childcare		16	3-6 Months
MULT	Women's Residential	Sub Abuse	Mult. Co.	Res.	Tx			8	60 Days
WASH	Mountaindale Recovery Center	Sub Abuse	Wash., Clac., Colu., Clat., Till. Co.	Res.	Tx	Yes		Unknown	3-6 Months
WASH	Project Cradle	Sub Abuse	Washington Co.	Outp	Tx	Yes	Yes	No Cap	Varies
WASH	Tualatin Valley Mental Health Center	Sub Abuse	Wash. Co.	Int. Outp	Tx	Yes		No Cap	6-12 Months
YAHM	Mother's in Treatment	Sub Abuse	Yamhill Co.	Outp	Tx	Yes			6-12 Months
MULT	APADT Program (Mult. Co. Comm. Corr.)	Sub Abuse/Case Mgt.	Mult. Co.	Outp	Tx & Serv.	Yes	Yes	100 (incl. w/ above)	18 Month Avg.
CLAC	Women's Team	Supervision	Clackamas Co.	Both	All			150-210	Varies
MARI	DROP & ISP	Supervision	Marion Co.	Outp	Tx & Sanc.			50+	Varies
MULT	House of Nia (African American)	Transition Housing/Sub Ab.	Mult. Co.	Res.	Tx & Serv.	Yes	Yes	5 Women w/child.	Varies
MULT	WICS	Transition/Life Skills	State of OR	Res.	Serv.			20	8 Weeks
MARI	Freedom In The Son	Transition/Prison Outreach	State of OR	Outp	Serv.	Yes		No Cap	On-going
BENT	Women's Issues Program/LivingSpace	Transition/Sub Abuse	Benton & Linn Co.	Res.	Tx			3	Min. 90 Days
MULT	Women's Transition Services ( Comm. Corr.)	Transition/Sub Abuse	Mult. Co.	Res. & Outp	Tx & Serv.	Yes		100	18 Month Avg.
BENT	Stronghold Cottage	Transitional Housing	Linn, Bent., Linc. Co.	Both	Tx & Serv.	Yes	Yes	5	3-12 Months
JOSE	Freedom House	Transitional Housing	So. Oregon	Res.	Serv.		Yes		
LANE	Sponsors, Inc.	Transitional Housing	Lane Co.	Res.	Serv.	Yes		5 women/6 children	3 Months
MULT	Trans. Opportunities Proj. (TOP)-YWCA	Work Release	Mult. Co. & Surr. Area	Res./Work Rel.	Serv. & Sanc.			30	30-365 Days

\*mental health clinics/programs, domestic violence shelters, job/employment/vocational programs and substance abuse programs (coed) are available to women offenders throughout the State.

SERVICES & SANCTIONS/MALE & FEMALE/BY COUNTIES/PURCHASED BY DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS MONIES 93-95 BIENNIUM)

OREGON INTERMEDIATE SANCTIONS FOR WOMEN OFFENDERS MARCH 1995

County	Cog Skills	Comm. Service	Day Reporting	DROP	Education	Electronics	Employm't	Home Custody	Housing	Jail Sanctions	ISP	Mental Health
BAKER		10				2				32		Y
BENT		Y				20	16	Y	8	Y		
CLAC	Y	1440		Y	Y	35	Y		Y		Y	Y
CLAT		100	12			4			3	2		
COLU		30	35	1		4				1		
COOS			25	Y	Y	Y	Y		14	Y	25	5
CROOK/JEFF	20	40				20	4			2		
CURRY	15	100				Y						
DESC	30	85		3		40						6
DOUG		Y	20			Y		7	5	Y		50
GRANT		Y										5
HARN												
JACK		Y	40	Y		26				30		31
JOSE	40	300				20					30	40
KLAMATH/LAKE		50				25				24		
LANE	20	40				39	30		24	Y		200
LINC		275				22	Y			10	50	
LINN		228	50			50				3	50	
MALH			75			10						40
MARI	15	60	25	Y	10	25	Y		Y	13	75	50
MULT		3800	180		40		40				250	50
NORTH CENTRAL*	10	80				15				2		
POLK			15			4				4		
TILL		20	15	20		4				1		
UMAT		200	30	Y	Y	40	Y		Y			
MORR												
UNION/WALLOWA	30	Y				Y	Y	Y	Y			Y
WASH	10	250					100	20	16	6	35	20
YAHM		Y	20				Y		7	Y		5

\*North Central includes Hood River, Gilliam, Sherman, Wasco & Wheeler Counties

Y: program available, but slots/beds unknown or not indicated.

Program Capacity is identified as number of slots/beds available at any one time.

Data is from Counties' 1993-95 Biennium Plans, Plan Amendments, Utilization Reports & Site Review Reports through Sept. 1994.

PAGE 88

SERVICES & SANCTIONS/MALE & FEMALE/BY COUNTIES/PURCHASED BY DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS MONIES 93-95 BIENNIUM)

OREGON INTERMEDIATE SANCTIONS FOR WOMEN OFFENDERS

MARCH 1995

PAGE 89

County	Pretrial	Rest./Prob./ Viol. Center	Sub Abuse Outpatient	Sub Abuse Inpatient	Transiton	Women Services	Work Crew	Work Release	Sex Off Supv	Sex Off Tx
BAKER			10	1	2		8	2		20
BENT			45	25		5+	15		70	20
CLAC	Y	80	99	7	280	210		12	180	15
CLAT			20	6	5			4		26
COLU			25	3						20
COOS			30					7		30
CROOK/JEFF			30	2	20		15			20
CURRY			70				6	1		10
DESC			20		15				20	
DOUG			220	2	5		10	5		
GRANT			20							
HARN										
JACK			126	7	10			Y		30
JOSE		40	30				10			Y
KLAMATH/LAKE			16		40		12	2		Y
LANE	80	76	Y	20	12	5		10	60	70
LINC			Y					Y		
LINN			31	7	20		10		50	140
MALH			50				18			50
MARI	7	76	115		50			6		14
MULT	700	80	135	120	46	50	28			15
NORTH CENTRAL*			29	5	25		30			3
POLK	4		60	2				1		15
TILL			20	2	10		6			20
UMAT		3	70		Y					50
MORR										
UNION/WALLOWA			Y	2				Y		
WASH		20	64	9	70			10	240	100
YAHM			Y		10		15	20		30

\*North Central includes Hood River, Gilliam, Sherman, Wasco & Wheeler Counties

Y: program available, but slots/beds unknown or not indicated.

Program Capacity is identified as number of slots/beds available at any one time.

Data is from Counties' 1993-95 Biennium Plans, Plan Amendments, Utilization Reports and Site Review Reports through Sept. 1994.

TOTAL SERVICE & SANCTION SLOTS/BEDS MALE & FEMALE PURCHASED BY DOC & COUNTY MONIES (1993-95 BIENNIUM)

INSTITUTIONS

Service Area	Program Name	Program Type	Slots or Beds	Other Services
ALL	CRCI	Minimum Security Prison	407 M/F	Release/Work Release
ALL	OR ST. HOSPITAL	Medium Security	120 M/F	SO/MED/Social Skills/Cornerstone
ALL	OWCC	Medium Security Prison	210 F	Vocational Prog./Prison Industries
ALL	SHUTTER CREEK	Minimum Security Prison	200 M/F	Boot Camp

Service Area	Program Type	Slots or Beds
--------------	--------------	---------------

**SANCTIONS**

STATE	COMMUNITY SERVICE	7,079
STATE	DAY REPORTING	570-613
STATE	ELECTRONICS	371-398
STATE	HOUSE ARREST	40
STATE	ISP	2,106
STATE	JAIL SANCTION BEDS	121
STATE	WORK CREW	180-398
STATE	WORKREST. CTR.	443-480

**TREATMENT & SERVICES**

STATE	ANGER MANAGEMENT	147
STATE	COGNITIVE RESTRUCT	255
STATE	EDUCATION	225
STATE	EMPLOYMENT	N/A
STATE	INST. WORK RELEASE	117
STATE	MENTAL HEALTH	757
STATE	SEX OFFENDER TX	664
STATE	SUB ABUSE AFTERCARE	108
STATE	SUB ABUSE INPT	125
STATE	SUB ABUSE OUTP	1,485
STATE	TRANSITION HOUSING	128
STATE	TRANSITION SERVICES	843

**OTHER SERVICES**

STATE	ANTABUSE SUPPORT	N/A
STATE	POLYGRAPH	N/A
STATE	SUBSIDY	N/A
STATE	URINALYSIS	N/A

OREGON INTERMEDIATE SANCTIONS FOR WOMEN OFFENDERS

MARCH 1995

PAGE 90

---

**Appendix D: Data Collection Form**

OREGON FEMALE OFFENDER DATA COLLECTION FORM, May 1994

SID Number: \_\_\_\_\_ Name: \_\_\_\_\_

1. Years of education completed at revocation or discharge: \_\_\_\_\_  
(write in number of years; GED = 12; enter '99' if unknown) (number)

2. Marital status at revocation or discharge: (1) Never married (2) Divorced  
(3) Separated (4) Married (5) Unknown \_\_\_\_\_

3. Where was offender living at revocation or discharge  
(1) Her own home (2) Someone else's home (2) Treatment facility  
(3) Institution (4) Homeless (5) Unknown \_\_\_\_\_

4. With whom was offender living at revocation or discharge: (check all that apply)  
(1) Alone \_\_\_\_\_  
(2) With children \_\_\_\_\_  
(3) With spouse or significant other \_\_\_\_\_  
(4) With other family \_\_\_\_\_  
(5) With friends \_\_\_\_\_  
(6) Unknown \_\_\_\_\_

5. Legal monthly income at revocation or discharge: \_\_\_\_\_  
(write in amount rounded to the nearest ten; write in "9999" if unknown) (amount)

6. Source(s) of income: (check all that apply) (1) Employment \_\_\_\_\_  
(2) Spousal support \_\_\_\_\_  
(3) Other relatives \_\_\_\_\_  
(4) Public benefits \_\_\_\_\_  
(5) Other \_\_\_\_\_  
(6) Sources unknown \_\_\_\_\_

7. Were there co-defendants charged in the current offense incident?  
(1) Yes, male only (2) Yes; female only (3) Yes, male and female.  
(4) Yes, gender unknown (5) No (6) Unknown \_\_\_\_\_

Please answer 8-11 considering all current convictions, not just the most serious offense.

8. If restitution was ordered, what was the total dollar amount? (write in amount;  
enter '8' if not applicable, and '9' if unknown) \$ \_\_\_\_\_

9. If restitution was ordered, how much did offender actually pay? (write in amount;  
enter '8' if not applicable, and '9' if unknown) \$ \_\_\_\_\_

10. If fine was ordered, what was the total dollar amount? (write in amount;  
enter '8' if not applicable, and '9' if unknown) \$ \_\_\_\_\_

11. If fine was ordered, how much did offender actually pay? (write in amount;  
enter '8' if not applicable, and '9' if unknown) \$ \_\_\_\_\_

12. If there were other court-ordered financial obligations, what was the total dollar amount?  
 (write in amount; enter '8' if not applicable and '9' if unknown) \$ \_\_\_\_\_

13. If there were other court-ordered financial obligations, how much did offender pay?  
 (write in amount; enter '8' if not applicable and '9' if unknown) \$ \_\_\_\_\_

14. Treatment and support services may be required as part of the original sentence conditions, required later in response to violations, or simply offered as opportunities: The following tables summarize *types of sanctions and services that may either have been ordered and/or received during the current supervision period*. In the "ordered at time of sentencing" column, all court- (or Parole Board) imposed conditions (sanctions and services) should be checked

	At Time of Sentencing		Resulting From Violation(s)	
	Ordered	Received	Ordered	Received
<b>Sanctions</b>				
Jail				
Work center				
Forest camp				
Electronic monitoring				
Home custody				
Work crew				
Community service				
Day reporting				
Curfew				
Polygraph				
Restitution				
Fine				
Urinalysis				
Abstain from alcohol				

*Services received during the supervision period but not ordered (either at sentencing or resulting from violations) should be indicated by a check in the fourth column only (i.e., no other boxes in that row should be checked).*

	At Time of Sentencing		Resulting From Violation(s)	
	Ordered	Received	Ordered	Received
<b>Services</b>				
Alcohol and drug: outpatient				
intensive outpatient				
day treatment				
inpatient				
AA/NA				
Mental health treatment				
Anger management				
Parenting skills training				
Life skills training				
Cognitive restructuring				
Education or vocational training				
Employment services				
Health care				
Income assistance				
Food, clothing or work tools				
Child care				
Housing assistance				
Transitional housing				
Other (specify)				

15. For probationers only, was the offender ever considered in violation but continued on probation *without* court action? (include 'no action' reports to the court)

- (1) Yes      (2) No      (3) No evidence in file

\_\_\_\_\_

Offender's violation behaviors (*check all that apply*):

- Failure to meet payment schedule
- Failure to report truthfully or notify PO as directed
- Failure to follow directives of court or PO
- Prohibited use of alcohol or drugs
- Possession of controlled substance
- Irregular or unsuccessful participation in treatment programs
- Absconded supervision
- Refusal to comply with imposed sanctions
- New non-person misdemeanor offense
- New DUI offense
- New non-person felony offense
- Prohibited contact with minors/victims/survivors
- Possession or use of dangerous/deadly weapon
- New person to person offense

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

16. For probationers only, number of times during this supervision period found in violation and continued on probation *with* court action?

(enter '88' for not applicable)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(number)

Offender's behaviors/violations that precipitated these actions (*check all that apply*, for all of these incidents):

- Failure to meet payment schedule
- Failure to report truthfully or notify PO as directed
- Failure to follow directives of court or PO
- Prohibited use of alcohol or drugs
- Possession of controlled substance
- Irregular or unsuccessful participation in treatment programs
- Absconded supervision
- Refusal to comply with imposed sanctions
- New non-person misdemeanor offense
- New DUI offense
- New non-person felony offense
- Prohibited contact with minors/victims/survivors
- Possession or use of dangerous/deadly weapon
- New person to person offense

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

17. For parolees (including women on both probation and parole), number of times during this supervision period found in violation and continued on supervision by Board: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (enter '88' for not applicable) (number)

Offenders' behaviors/violations that precipitated these actions (check all that apply, for all of these incidents):

- Failure to meet payment schedule \_\_\_\_\_
- Failure to report truthfully or notify PO as directed \_\_\_\_\_
- Failure to follow directives of court or PO \_\_\_\_\_
- Prohibited use of alcohol or drugs \_\_\_\_\_
- Possession of controlled substance \_\_\_\_\_
- Irregular or unsuccessful participation in treatment programs \_\_\_\_\_
- Absconded supervision \_\_\_\_\_
- Refusal to comply with imposed sanctions \_\_\_\_\_
- New non-person misdemeanor offense \_\_\_\_\_
- New DUI offense \_\_\_\_\_
- New non-person felony offense \_\_\_\_\_
- Prohibited contact with minors/victims/survivors \_\_\_\_\_
- Possession or use of dangerous/deadly weapon \_\_\_\_\_
- New person to person offense \_\_\_\_\_

18. For offenders whose probation or parole status was revoked, indicate the behaviors or violations that precipitated the revocation (check all that apply):

- Failure to meet payment schedule \_\_\_\_\_
- Failure to report truthfully or notify PO as directed \_\_\_\_\_
- Failure to follow directives of court or PO \_\_\_\_\_
- Prohibited use of alcohol or drugs \_\_\_\_\_
- Possession of controlled substance \_\_\_\_\_
- Irregular or unsuccessful participation in treatment programs \_\_\_\_\_
- Absconded supervision \_\_\_\_\_
- Refusal to comply with imposed sanctions \_\_\_\_\_
- New non-person misdemeanor offense \_\_\_\_\_
- New DUI offense \_\_\_\_\_
- New non-person felony offense \_\_\_\_\_
- Prohibited contact with minors/victims/survivors \_\_\_\_\_
- Possession or use of dangerous/deadly weapon \_\_\_\_\_
- New person to person offense \_\_\_\_\_
  
- NOT APPLICABLE = successfully completed supervision \_\_\_\_\_

---

**Appendix E: DOC Risk Assessment Tools**

OREGON DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS  
Community Services

Supervision Level

\_\_\_ High \_\_\_ Low  
\_\_\_ Med. \_\_\_ ~~Admin.~~ <sup>Limited</sup>

ISP Case

RISK REASSESSMENT

NAME:

SID#:

COUNTY:

① A) How many prior felony convictions? SCALE  
0-1 conviction \_\_\_\_\_ 2  
2-3 convictions \_\_\_\_\_ 1  
4 or more convictions \_\_\_\_\_ 0

Data  
#Priors

Override Request  
LEVEL: \_\_\_ High; \_\_\_ Medium; \_\_\_ Low; \_\_\_ Admin. <sup>Limited</sup>

② B) How many prior incarcerations (executed sentences of 90 days or more, felony or misdemeanor, adult or juvenile)?  
No incarcerations \_\_\_\_\_ 2  
1-2 incarcerations \_\_\_\_\_ 1  
3 or more incarcerations \_\_\_\_\_ 0

#Priors

Discretionary	Mandatory
<u>Level Increase:</u> ___ Assault Offender ___ Sex Offender ___ Offender Needs ___ Extreme Criminal Record ___ New Criminal Activity ___ Major Non-Conformance ___ Associations	___ Sex Offense* ___ Assault Offense* ___ Administrative

③ C) Does present supervision include parole, probation, failure to appear, release agreement, escape or custody violation?  
No \_\_\_\_\_ 1  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ 0

Y/N

<u>Level Increase/Decrease:</u> ___ Officer Discretion  <u>Level Decrease:</u> ___ Conformance to Conditions ___ Incustody ___ Inactive ___ Administrative	<u>Information Source</u> ___ Official Documents ___ Offender Statements ___ Law Enforcement Input ___ Clinical Testing ___ Needs Assessment ___ Collateral Sources
---	---

RATE THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS BASED UPON THE OFFENDER'S PERFORMANCE SINCE THE LAST ASSESSMENT

④ D) Substance Abuse Problems  
No use/possession of illegal substance or alcohol abuse \_\_\_\_\_ 2  
Occasional abuse; some disruption of functioning \_\_\_\_\_ 1  
Frequent abuse; serious disruption of functioning; failure to comply with treatment \_\_\_\_\_ 0

Justification

⑤ E) Response to conditions of supervision  
No problems of consequence \_\_\_\_\_ 2  
Some problems of consequence \_\_\_\_\_ 1  
Has been unwilling to comply \_\_\_\_\_ 0

⑥ F) Verified Employment  
(Note: If N/A, enter 101% into Data Box)  
60-100% \_\_\_\_\_ 2  
40-59% \_\_\_\_\_ 1  
0-39% \_\_\_\_\_ 0

%

⑦ G) Number of Address Changes  
0-1 \_\_\_\_\_ 1  
2 or more \_\_\_\_\_ 0

#

OFFICER: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

SUPERVISOR: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_ Accept \_\_\_ Reject

MANAGER: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_ Accept \_\_\_ Reject

TOTAL SCORE \_\_\_\_\_

LAST LEVEL: \_\_\_ High; \_\_\_ Medium; \_\_\_ Low; \_\_\_ Admin.

RISK LEVEL: \_\_\_ High (~~0-6~~); \_\_\_ Medium (~~7-8~~); \_\_\_ Low (~~9-10~~)  
0-6                      7-8                      9-10

\*First 6 months of supervision



