

26651

Evaluation; Loan ①

TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| PREFACE . . . . .                             | 1    |
| OVERVIEW . . . . .                            | 3    |
| Program Goals . . . . .                       | 4    |
| ADMINISTRATION . . . . .                      | 6    |
| Organization . . . . .                        | 6    |
| Personnel . . . . .                           | 7    |
| Training . . . . .                            | 8    |
| CRITERIA FOR SELECTING CLIENTELE . . . . .    | 9    |
| REVOCATION OF WORK RELEASE STATUS . . . . .   | 11   |
| PROGRAMMING . . . . .                         | 12   |
| STATISTICAL AND FINANCIAL RECORDS . . . . .   | 13   |
| COMMUNITY AND PUBLIC RELATIONS . . . . .      | 18   |
| SUCCESS IN MEETING GRANT OBJECTIVES . . . . . | 18   |
| FUTURE PROSPECTS . . . . .                    | 21   |
| APPENDIX: Interview Instrument . . . . .      | 23   |

PREFACE

This evaluation of the Peoria County Work Release Project, ILEC Grant No. 637, covers the period from May, 1973, through March, 1974. The March, 1974, cut off date was used to permit sufficient time to prepare this preliminary evaluation by the May 8, 1974, deadline. In view of the fact that no new residents have been accepted into the Work Release Program since December 3, 1973, and the fact that no additional prospective residents will be screened for the program during April, 1974, this time frame poses no problem.

In the assembly of information and opinions about the Peoria Work Release Program we have been most cordially received by all personnel that were contacted. There has been an apparent willingness to provide information and to express personal opinions with respect to the operation and substantive questions regarding the past year's development of the Peoria County-State of Illinois cooperative work release venture as envisioned in the grant application.

Our overall approach to the evaluation used the following strategy. Information regarding the first year's operation of the Peoria County Work Release Program was obtained through (1) informal and formal interviews, (2) analysis of statistical data, (3) examination of non-statistical information and the (4) projected plans for the year as specified in the original grant application.

Initially an informal interview was held with the Project Director followed by on-site visitations at both the Office of the

Project Director (Peoria County Probation Department) and the current Work Release Center, R.R. 2, Brimfield, Illinois. This served the function of familiarizing us with the developments of the past year.

Prior to arranging formal interviews, an interview format and instrument was prepared covering the key areas for consideration. (See Appendix) Before each interview, careful consideration was given to specific aspects of the program that should be emphasized in the forthcoming interview and appropriate notations were made on the instrument. In all, fifteen interviews were conducted with twelve different persons; one interview was conducted by telephone. Three judges were interviewed. In addition, data sheets for the collection of statistical information about the program were prepared. The content of these data sheets was determined after a careful review of the best resource materials on the subject.

## OVERVIEW

The Peoria County Work Release grant application specifies that the program was in part designed as an alternative to incarceration for probationers with behavior problems and those without families, proper housing or employment. From its inception the program was ostensibly designed to be a joint County-State "cooperative" venture with the State exercising the final control on who entered the program. The first probationer and work release resident was from the Tazewell County Probation Department and entered the program on May 19, 1973.\* There has been a total of twelve county residents in the program, four of whom were from Tazewell County.

The last screening interview to assess the admissibility of a county probationer took place on November 14, 1973, and the last county resident entered the program on December 3, 1973. It is apparent, however, that the decision to terminate the County-State work release relationship was made long before this date. Formally the decision to separate the County from the State program appears to have taken place on December 5, 1973.

Given the limited numbers of county probationary work release residents actually participating in the program over the year, and given the minor role assumed by the professional personnel involved with the program who had a primary commitment to remaining with the Peoria County Program, there is a serious question about the value

\*Information made available on the date the first resident began the work release portion of his sentence is not in agreement. One source gives the date as May 8.

of a detailed discussion and operational assessment of the total program. In fact, it is our opinion that little has been learned about the administration of work release programs which can be transferred to the new facility that is presently being planned by the Peoria County Sheriff's Department. Present plans call for but two of the present staff to join the new work release project in Peoria. One of these is a member of the Peoria County Sheriff's Department and serves as a liaison agent between the Sheriff's Department and the work release program. He appears, however, to have been relegated a minor role in the actual administration of the program. The other staff member who apparently will be staying with the County program is a residence counselor and has been with the County-State program since early September, 1973.

In view of these several features, we will treat the details of the program's operation in much less detailed manner than if the program had fully developed, and instead emphasize (1) those features which may have some transfer value to the independent County program which is emerging and (2) the factors which seem to account for the failure of the program to develop as projected in the formal grant application.

#### Program Goals

Clearly articulated and pragmatic program goals are essential to giving direction to any work release program. Without specific objectives there is the ever present danger that the program will drift into a pattern of confusion and uncertainty. Equally important, however, is to formulate goals in such a manner that they can be translated into concrete program activities and evaluated. As spelled out in the formal grant proposal, we were able to identify four major goals of the program

and several subsidiary goals.

1. Offer Alternative Program of Incarceration to Judiciary for Probation Candidates
  - a. For probation candidates with behavior problems
  - b. For probation candidates without families, proper housing or employment
2. Expand Current Work Release Program in Cooperation with the State Work Release Program
  - a. Increase resident population at state facility
  - b. Provide personnel to administer the program
  - c. Train county personnel for future county operated program
  - d. Evaluate selection criteria
  - e. Provide equipment needed to operate program
3. Reduce Cost Accompanying Conventional Incarceration
  - a. Facilitate work release resident's support of dependents
  - b. Reduce housing and custodial expenses
4. Minimize Problems of Prisoner Re-Entry Into Community
  - a. Facilitate work release resident's contact with family, employers and community
  - b. Facilitate the transfer process from incarceration to the community

With respect to the program's goals as outlined in the grant application, we found them generally vague and inexplicit. A few are stated with clarity and precision but others appear hidden here and there throughout the document. In view of the importance of clearly crystallized goals to any program, this is unfortunate. In the specific section of the proposal dealing with goals these major purposes are initially specified: (1) expand resident population of the Peoria Work Release Center through (a) providing personnel and (b) equipment

and (2) to provide inservice training for staff to equip them for eventual full-time professional service in a work release program to be operated exclusively by Peoria County. All of these are included under item 2 in the above outline and appear to be the highest in the hierarchy of the several objectives. The document is simply not clear on the priority question. If so, however, it can be argued that while all of these are of obvious importance, these objectives should be seen as supportive of broader program objectives such as (1) specific outcome effects on the clientele, (2) meeting certain needs of the clientele, or (3) serving the demands of punishment from the community perspective.

#### ADMINISTRATION

##### Organization

The grant application identifies the Chief Adult Probation Officer of Peoria County as the Project Director and the Peoria County Adult Probation Office as the implementing agency. At no time during the year, however, was the Project Director directly involved in, nor did he have any control over, the actual administration or formation of policies at the Work Release Center. The management of the Center was exclusively the prerogative of the State.

The Project Director was, of course, responsible for the filing of the required reports with ILEC. In addition, the Chief Adult Probation Officer (Project Director) was responsible for (1) interpreting the work release program for the court and for (2) the initial screening of probationers for the work release program.

Not only has the management of the Work Release Center been the exclusive prerogative of the State, but the State Supervisor at



Bartonville and, subsequently, at Brimfield, had complete control and authority over the County staff whose salaries were funded by the grant. In reality the staff funded by the County grant became a part of the State Work Release Center staff and assumed duties and responsibilities incumbent upon their particular positions.

Personnel

All personnel employed under the grant with the exception of the pre-sentence investigator were assigned to the State Work Release Center and placed under the authority of the State Supervisor. The turnover of personnel funded under the grant has been quite high. As early as October 1, 1973, a total of twelve different persons had filled the seven positions funded by the grant (employment counselor, pre-sentence investigator, two resident counselors, secretary and two part-time drivers). During the year at least two secretaries and two residence counselors resigned to be hired by the State as employees at the Work Release Center. The present Employment Counselor who has been on the grant payroll since early May, 1973, also plans to join the State Work Release Program. This summary of turnover represents the outside minimum of staff turnover. The information given us by our informants is not consistent on this point.

The implications and pattern of the staff turnover is clear with respect to those who left or will leave the County program to join the State. For the staff members, the State program offers more money and more job security. And, the State Work Release Center Supervisor has had the best of all possible worlds. He has been able to observe the staff employed under the County grant but without any commitment to them.

If the staff member had strong potential, the Center Supervisor simply hired him when it was possible to do so.

Training

The training of County personnel, funded under the grant for the future work release program to be operated autonomously by the County, was explicitly mentioned in the grant proposal. To the extent training took place there is, as we have suggested above, a serious question whether this was for the benefit of the County or the State. At no time in our discussions with the various staff members did we get the impression that any of the personnel at the Work Release Center were really trying to help in building for the future Peoria County Work Release Program. The commitment clearly seems to have been in terms of the State's interests, to the complete exclusion of County interests.

There is no evidence that the type of training which was ostensibly given was thought out in advance or structured. Reference to training in the monthly narrative reports and other official reports are virtually limited to such references as the following:

1. ". . . went on a training trip to Menard State Penitentiary and Vienna Correctional Center." Report for May 11-June 8, 1973.
2. "In accordance with the goals established in the Project Grant Application that county staff undergo training from the State staff . . . has been assigned to work on transportation two nights a week." Report for June 7-July 6, 1973.
3. ". . . and the two Correctional Counselors [State personnel] began holding weekly staff development meetings. The meetings are designed to instruct the staff in counseling techniques and also provide a meeting ground where problems and policies of the Center can be discussed." Report for August 4-September 6, 1973.

4. The liaison staff member "attended his first Staff Development Meeting. This is a meeting conducted by . . . to train the staff and keep them informed of Center policies." September 11, 1973  
Report for September 7-October 5, 1973.

In the words of one observer:

"Most training of County staff has been informal and incidental to their assuming regular duties at the Work Release Center. There was an attempt at weekly staff development meetings conducted by the Center Supervisor for State and County staff members alike. The meetings lasted three (3) months."

In summary, our clear impression is that the training program envisioned in the grant was never clearly conceptualized, was not actually implemented, and to the extent any training took place, it was motivated by the State's interests in terms of obtaining either personnel or a smooth running State Work Release Program. It was not motivated by any commitment to assisting the County of Peoria in its future efforts to establish a work release program.

#### CRITERIA FOR SELECTING CLIENTELE

Conceptually the grant application leaves no ambiguity on the question of the target population. Specifically, prospective work release subjects are to be probationers with (1) behavior problems and/or (2) those without families, proper housing or employment. The initial screening of probationers was done first by the pre-sentence investigator on the staff of the Peoria County Probation Department in conjunction with the judge who in reality exercised the authority in the sentencing process. Secondly, the State Work Release staff screened candidates and exercised the final decision with respect to the acceptability of the probationer for admission to the program.

The pre-sentence investigator, a probation officer, used conventional pre-sentence social casework procedures for screening probationers. Our interviews with the probation officers did not indicate that they had any special criteria for the initial screening of work release candidates other than those specified in the grant application. Neither did they specify any particular type of "behavioral problem" who would be most likely to be selected. Indeed, the exact nature of criteria used seemed to be rather vague. Early in the program the Project Director, in a memorandum apparently directed to judges, spelled out the sentencing procedures with respect to work release.

1. The defendant is found guilty or enters a tentative plea of guilty.
2. The defendant is referred to the Adult Probation Office for a pre-sentence investigation.
3. If this investigation reveals that the defendant might be compatible with the Work Release Project, the case is discussed with the Clinical Staff of the Work Release Center.
4. Approval by the Work Release Staff will be followed with a recommendation by the investigator, that the Court sentence the defendant to a term of Probation with the specific condition of a term of periodic imprisonment.
5. If the Court concurs, it will sentence the defendant to the Work Release Project.

In addition this memorandum noted that the Peoria County Work Release program "will be guests in the State Program" and that the State personnel had final veto power over who is acceptable and who is not.

It is eminently clear that major problems emerged due to (1) the State having the final veto power regarding admissions to the program, (2) the State's inflexibility and inability to bend with respect to its criteria for selecting clientele and (3) the fact that there was no one

central administrative authority for implementing the Peoria County Work Release Program. The County was interested in serving a clientele with limited or without incarceration experience who had a behavior problem, but who from the point of view of the State Supervisor and his staff, represented high risks. The State, for example, found persons unacceptable who were youthful, immature, unstable, had a drug history, or who had problems with alcohol. In summary, the State was interested in low-risk persons who presented a minimum of problems. Another apparent point of disagreement was the fact that the State was interested in accepting persons for no less than a four month period.

Early in the program, in a formal report dated June 5, 1973, it was noted that there had been "some difficulty . . . in coordinating efforts of all the agencies involved." We suspect, indeed, that this problem focused on the above issues. These differing points of view existed from the inception of the program, were never resolved and immediately set the stage for the rapid demise of the program as envisioned in the grant application.

#### REVOCATION OF WORK RELEASE STATUS

The power of revocation as implemented in the Peoria County-State Work Release venture resided with the State. Twelve county probationers spent some time in the program during the year. Of these, four were terminated for the following reasons: (1) smoking marihuana at the Work Release Center; (2) consumption of alcohol at place of employment; (3) failure to adjust to the program due to "a number of minor rule infractions and continually demonstrated a negative, hostile and unco-operative attitude to the extent his presence in the program was believed

to be seriously interfering with the Center's functioning" and (4) unable to benefit from the program. In the words of one staff member, the latter resident "was found to be an epileptic which created employment problems. He wanted to go back to Court for re-sentencing and accomplished this end."

While it is difficult to assess these four revocations based on limited data, the nature of the revocations does give some idea of the prevailing philosophy dominating the State program. If the reasons for the revocation are as stated, it is apparent that the State program was not equipped nor was it motivated to deal with situations which many persons would see as rather commonplace problems.

#### PROGRAMMING

County work release residents participated in the program and activities of the Work Release Center on an equal basis with the State residents. Counseling activities included mandatory group meetings for eight weeks. Counselors also worked on a "one-on-one" basis with each resident in the establishment of goals for the resident. Periodically these goals were reevaluated. A written budget was developed which the resident was expected to adhere to, with the approval and assistance of the professional staff. An independent checking account was maintained for each resident.

Work release residents were transported to and from work in cars driven by Center staff. Two vehicles purchased by funds from the grant have been used during the past year for transporting both County and State residents at the Center. There is a feeling on the part of some County people that the State has taken advantage of the vehicles

purchased by grant funds and that they have not been cared for properly.

Residents without employment were given assistance in obtaining employment. The Employment Counselor, a position covered by grant funds, has apparently been very successful in developing positive relationships with a number of employers in the Peoria area. Both County and State residents benefited from this relationship. Since the Employment Counselor does not plan on staying with the County program when it is reestablished in Peoria it is not known whether or not the County program will continue to profit from this relationship.

#### STATISTICAL AND FINANCIAL RECORDS

Given the small number of County residents participating in the program during the year there was in fact a limited amount of information to report or keep track of. There apparently was no plan for reporting information about the County residents to either County officials or the press. No independent reports were issued during the year. No summary data was immediately available in the office of the Project Director. When we inquired at the Project Director's office about the record of earnings of County residents, we were referred to the staff at the Work Release Center. The Center is apparently the only source for this information. In view of the fact that one of the project goals was to reduce the costs which accompany conventional incarceration, the absence of this information in the Project Director's office seems somewhat anomalous.

The personnel at the Work Release Center were able to provide all statistical information which we requested. Of three prepared data sheet formats which were submitted for completion, we were successful in

getting two completed. One form given to the office of the Project Director dealing with base population data, screening and classification, program volume and terminations, has not as of this writing been returned. See page 15.

Summary data regarding program volume for May, 1973, through March, 1974, was assembled by the Employment Counselor and may be found on page 16. It will be noted that all information requested was provided. In two instances (the average daily count and the total number of days worked), estimates were provided.

A financial summary of the earnings and disbursements for the twelve County probationers in the program for the period from May, 1973, through March, 1974, is found on page 17. We found this report to be internally consistent. For the May through March period the twelve County probationers earned a total of \$29,511.49 or an average of \$2,459.29. These twelve persons paid a total of \$6,741.17 in taxes, contributed \$5,173.50 in room and board costs, and \$8,885.70 to dependents and creditors. This contribution in taxes, self support, dependents' support and payments to creditors are positive features of the program which are not debatable. Had these persons been incarcerated none of these advantages would have occurred and the State or County would have had to bear the burden of supporting them as prisoners. Similarly had these residents been placed in the community under probationary supervision there is no assurance the dependent support would have been forthcoming or for that matter that employment would have been continued.

Received  
too late to  
include in  
report.



WORK RELEASE POPULATION REPORT

Grupp  
15

Base Population

No. of Convicted Defendants Sentenced in County

Felons . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_  
Misdemeanants . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_

No. Committed

Department of Corrections . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_  
County Jail . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_  
Other (Specify) . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_

No. Placed on Probation

No. Placed on Probation Combined with  
Work Release . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_  
All Other Forms of Probation . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_

Other Disposition . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_

Screening and Classification for Work Release

No. of Defendants Screened for Eligibility . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_

No. Ruled Ineligible . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_  
By County . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_  
By State . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_

No. Ruled Eligible . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_

No. Actually Placed in Work Release Program . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_

Program Volume (County Probationers)

No. of Work Releases During Year

County Jail  
Felons . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_  
Misdemeanants . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_

In State Program  
Felons . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_  
Misdemeanants . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_

Terminations

Work Release Portion of Sentence Successfully Completed . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_

Terminated as Program Failure

New Offense . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_  
Technical Violation . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_  
Absconded . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_

Please return to:

Stanley E. Grupp  
Department of Sociology  
Illinois State University  
Normal, Illinois 61761

Prepared by: \_\_\_\_\_

Peoria County Probationers  
 WORK RELEASE PROGRAM VOLUME REPORT \*  
 May, 1973 through March, 1974

| Month     | Total No. Participating During Month |               | Number Admitted During Month |             | Participating Ch. Last Day of Month | Approximate Avg. Daily Count | Total No. Days Worked | Terminating             |                       |
|-----------|--------------------------------------|---------------|------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
|           | Daily                                | Weekends Only | Felony                       | Misdemeanor |                                     |                              |                       | Successfully Terminated | Terminated As Failure |
| May       | 2                                    |               | 2                            |             | 2                                   | 2                            |                       |                         |                       |
| June      | 4                                    |               | 2                            |             | 4                                   | 4                            |                       |                         |                       |
| July      | 5                                    |               | 1                            |             | 5                                   | 5                            |                       |                         |                       |
| August    | 5                                    |               | 0                            |             | 5                                   | 5                            |                       |                         |                       |
| September | 8                                    |               | 3                            |             | 6                                   | 7                            | 1                     |                         | 1                     |
| October   | 7                                    |               | 1                            |             | 6                                   | 6                            | 1                     |                         |                       |
| November  | 8                                    |               | 2                            |             | 6                                   | 7                            | 1                     |                         | 1                     |
| December  | 7                                    |               | 1                            |             | 6                                   | 6                            | 1                     |                         |                       |
| January   | 6                                    |               | 0                            |             | 5                                   | 6                            |                       |                         | 1                     |
| February  | 5                                    |               | 0                            |             | 4                                   | 5                            |                       |                         | 1                     |
| March     | 4                                    |               | 0                            |             | 2                                   | 3                            | 2                     |                         |                       |

*Total (approximate) number of days worked by County Probationers from May '73 to April 10, '74 is 985. This total includes only actual days worked - not weekends or holidays or sick days.*

*Two County Probationers are in residence at this time (4-10-74).*

Grupp  
16

\*If information is not available please record as N.A.

Pedria County Probationers

WORK RELEASE FINANCIAL SUMMARY \*  
 May, 1973 through March, 1974

| MONTH   | GROSS EARNINGS | TAXES  | ALL OTHER DEDUC. | NET     | Co. Program Costs Rm. & Board | Personal Expense | Dependent Support | Creditors | Court Fines | Other | Balance In Account |
|---|----------------|--------|------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------|-------------|-------|--------------------|
| May   | 565.93         | 147.17 | 49.93            | 368.83  | -0-                           | 20.00            | 100.00            | NA        | NA          | NA    | 248.83             |
| June  | 3067.07        | 765.92 | 120.63           | 2180.52 | 295.00                        | 172.38           | 1162.07           |           |             |       | 551.07             |
| July  | 1717.65        | 419.91 | 51.23            | 1246.51 | 348.00                        | 222.00           | 779.94            |           |             |       | (103.43)           |
| August  | 3554.00        | 882.23 | 196.16           | 2475.61 | 695.50                        | 746.55           | 782.63            |           |             |       | 250.93             |
| September   | 3715.98        | 853.27 | 153.15           | 2709.56 | 482.00                        | 453.80           | 990.78            |           |             |       | 782.98             |
| October   | 2931.32        | 673.70 | 151.08           | 2106.54 | 500.50                        | 264.24           | 986.49            |           |             |       | 355.31             |
| November  | 3726.31        | 794.09 | 74.43            | 2857.79 | 629.50                        | 687.30           | 996.14            |           |             |       | 544.85             |
| December  | 2005.39        | 441.26 | -0-              | 1564.13 | 495.00                        | 443.05           | 380.68            |           |             |       | 245.40             |
| January   | 3297.01        | 590.36 | -0-              | 2706.65 | 610.00                        | 667.20           | 670.03            |           |             |       | 759.42             |
| February  | 3146.22        | 738.44 | -0-              | 2407.78 | 590.00                        | 723.00           | 689.08            |           |             |       | 405.70             |
| March   | 1784.61        | 434.82 | -0-              | 1349.79 | 528.00                        | 428.00           | 1347.85           |           |             |       | (954.07)           |
| Payments to creditors not determined due to fact that residents sent monies to wives and they paid creditors. |                |        |                  |         |                               |                  |                   |           |             |       |                    |

\* If information is not available, please record as NA.

Prepared by: *Carolyn Stone Clark*

Grupp  
17

COMMUNITY AND PUBLIC RELATIONS

We were repeatedly assured by the professional staff we talked with that the program had been positively received by the community. In view of the small number of persons involved in the program over the past year, there is perhaps no reason for any negative public reaction. It is known, however, that when the State originally attempted to locate its Work Release Center in Peoria, it did cause some consternation on the part of the public. The apparent success in locating employment for the work release residents is testimony to a favorable response on the part of a number of employers. With a view to informing employers and criminal justice personnel about the program, early in the County-State cooperative venture an open house was held at the Center. Although an extensive invitational guest list was prepared, the number who actually made an appearance at the Center were very few. This is not, of course, necessarily an indication of a negative reaction to the program.

SUCCESS IN MEETING GRANT OBJECTIVES

Although only a few County probationers participated in the program measured against the objectives as defined in the grant proposal, there were both successes and failures. There seems to be little question, however, that in terms of the totality of objectives as specified on page 5 most were not achieved; indeed, the program as it emerged did not come within striking distance of most of the objectives.

Positively, twelve probationers were placed in the program. For these persons the costs of possible incarceration were avoided and while

in the program they remained employed, self-supporting, tax-paying citizens and contributed to the support of their families. Grant funds also paid for two vehicles which presumably will go with the independent County Sheriff's work release operation when it is relocated in Peoria.

The small number of probationary work releasees in the program unquestionably caused less of an impact on the criminal justice system than would have been the case had there been larger numbers. As the result of the small numbers the program simply did not have the kind of public visibility that it might otherwise have had.

Despite the small numbers there is no question but what the program did have an effect on the pattern and turn of events with respect to the criminal justice system in Peoria County. Of major significance is the decision of the Peoria County Adult Probation Office to get out of the work release business. It is to the credit of the Chief Probation Officer that he has a primary commitment to building a strong and viable Probation Department. The running of a useful work release program requires considerable time and energy and may indeed conflict with the primary obligations of an already overburdened probation staff.

One significant result, but certainly a costly one in terms of the total funds invested in the program, is the realization that County-State cooperation in the area of work release (and very possibly other areas of corrections) cannot simply be brought about by making governmental funds available. While County-State cooperation in the implementation of work release programs is possible and there are examples of such relationships in other areas of the United States, this is not something that can be imposed simply because it sounds like a good idea. Our clear impression is that this was the case in the initiation of the

Peoria County-State venture. There is a need to establish clear lines of authority which are agreed upon by all agencies which are involved. Similarly there is a need to have agreement on the type of clientele that are to be served by the program and on the selection criteria. In addition the administration of the program needs to be centralized. The County-State venture in Peoria had none of these attributes.

There is an indication, and it has been asserted by some, that the County has a point of view regarding the purposes of work release which differs from that of the State. There is a feeling on the part of some of the State professional staff that the County is primarily interested in a holding place for prisoners who are released for purposes of work and that there are no other objectives.\* This observation neglects the fact that the target population as specified in the grant application included probationers with behavior problems. We are confronted, however, with the haunting impression that this rhetoric was placed in the grant application with a view to giving it an aura of professionalism. At least one County official indicated that he felt there was too much emphasis on the counseling mystic in the State program.

While each of the above points may have some validity, we find it inappropriate to speak of a prevailing County philosophy or a County point-of-view regarding work release! One point is clear, there has been little attention given to such questions as, "What do we expect to

\*Perhaps the observation is related to Peoria County's plans to seek grant support for a work release program under the auspices of the County Sheriff's Department. It is not uncommon for those who see themselves as being treatment oriented to hold unfavorable views of work release programs administered by sheriffs.

achieve with a County Work Release Program?" and "What underlying philosophy should be used in rationalizing the County Work Release Program?" We found no evidence that there has been any discussion among County officials regarding these questions. No work release committee exists and no screening committee exists which would provide a natural setting for the pursuit of these all important questions. Indeed, we found that the judges themselves were not clear in their minds regarding a rationale for work release and were unable to give an articulate presentation of their views.

#### FUTURE PROSPECTS

Current plans call for locating a work release "program" in the former Peoria Municipal Tuberculosis Sanitarium. Although there is apparently some opposition on the part of local citizenry, the "program" to be operated under the auspices of the Peoria County Sheriff is now awaiting the approval of the County Board and the Peoria City Council.\* The Peoria County Probation Department will not be involved. It should be noted that there has been a work release "program" operated out of the County Jail but that no grant funds have been used to support this activity. In a very real sense it is this jail work release "program" that is being relocated in the former Municipal Tuberculosis Sanitarium.

As we have observed, apparently only two persons with the present County-State program will be employed under the Sheriff's program. One, a Deputy Sheriff, has served as a Liaison Officer with the Sheriff's

\*Carol Morrissey, "Work-Release Prisoners May Make June Move," Peoria Journal Star, April 23, 1974, B 9 and B 20.

Department and has remained on the Sheriff's payroll. He seems to be a very conscientious worker but does not appear to have assumed any significant role in the County-State venture over the past year. The other staff member has functioned as a Residence Counselor since September, 1973. Present plans call for the Deputy Sheriff to be in charge of the new work release operation at the sanitarium. According to the Peoria Journal Star of April 23, 1974, the staff at the sanitarium in addition to the Deputy Sheriff in charge will "include a clerk-steno, custodial help, a cook and trained people equivalent to civilian jailers." This information suggests that the envisioned program will be definitely of a non-treatment orientation.



Interview Instrument

APPENDIX

a non-presentation orientation.  
Information suggests that the envisioned program will be definitely of  
help; a cook and trained people equivalent to civilian jailers." This  
to the Deputy Sheriff in charge will include a clerk-steno, custodial  
Thomas Star of April 53, 1954, the staff of the sanitarium in addition  
new work release operation at the sanitarium. According to the People  
1953. Present plans call for the Deputy Sheriff to be in charge of the  
staff member has functioned as a Residence Counselor since September,  
1951 role in the County-State venture over the past year. The other  
very conscientious worker but does not appear to have assumed any staff-  
Department and has remained on the Sheriff's payroll. He seems to be a

Interviewee

Date

Position

Interviewer

Objectives-Functions: What do you see as the major purposes-objectives of work release?

During the past year how well did the program meet these objectives?

Areas for Special Attention

Administrative Machinery (Nature and Adequacy)

Personnel-Staffing (Adequacy, Needs)

Training (How successful do you feel the state-county program has been in achieving its staff training objective?)

Employment of work releasees (How obtained?  
Special problems?  
Employer relationships?)

Community (Reaction-Support-Opposition)

Records Kept and Maintained (Nature, Adequacy, Needs)

Processing of work releasees in and out (Routines, transportation, Needs)

Housing (Adequacy)

Program Activities (Nature)

Public Relations (Nature, if any)

Selection Criteria: What specific factors are considered  
in deciding if a person should be placed  
on work release?

Final Decision Authority: (Who makes final decision?)

Extra-judge involvement in the selection decision (To what extent  
is the selection process based on a group decision?)

Revocation of work release status (Any revocations? Criteria?)

Outcomes

Positive (Do you see any positive outcomes as having  
emerged from the first year's experience  
with work release?)

Negative (Do you feel there have been any negative  
consequences of the first year's experience?)

Future (What do you see in terms of the future of work  
release in \_\_\_\_\_?)

**END**