

STANLEY E. GRUPP
414 BRADLEY LANE
NORMAL, ILLINOIS 61761

(EV)

(L)

X

(IL)

WINNEBAGO COUNTY WORK RELEASE PROGRAM

**Evaluation
ILEC Grant 635**

26652
Evaluation; Loan 1

Stanley E. Grupp
414 Bradley Lane
Normal, Illinois
61761

(309) 452-2264
(309) 438-8256

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE	1
OVERVIEW	3
Program Goals	4
ADMINISTRATION	5
Personnel	5
Training	6
Organization	7
CRITERIA FOR SELECTING CLIENTELE	9
REVOCATION OF WORK RELEASE STATUS	10
PROGRAMMING	11
Employment	11
Special Leaves	12
Program Activities	13
Housing	14
STATISTICAL AND FINANCIAL RECORDS	15
COMMUNITY AND PUBLIC RELATIONS	20
SUCCESS IN MEETING GRANT OBJECTIVES	21
APPENDIX: Interview Instrument	24

PREFACE

This evaluation of the Winnebago County Work Release Project, ILEC Grant No. 635, covers the period from May, 1973, through February, 1974. The February, 1974, cut off date was used to permit sufficient time to prepare this preliminary evaluation by the May 8, 1974, deadline.

In the assembly of information and opinions about the Winnebago County Work Release Program we have been most cordially received by all personnel that were contacted. There has been an open willingness to provide information and to express personal opinions regarding the work release program. We are impressed by the interest and commitment shown on the part of key staff members.

Our overall approach to the evaluation used the following strategy. Information regarding the first year's operation of the Winnebago 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 Program Administrator and Co-Project Director at the Work Release Center and the greater part of a day was spent familiarizing us with the program.

Prior to arranging subsequent 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, eighteen interviews were conducted with fifteen different persons; two judges and the States' Attorney were interviewed. The staff made a variety of information available to us. 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 Winnebago County Work Release Program, as funded by ILEC Grant 635, came into existence officially in May, 1973. During the past year's operation, the program has been primarily directed toward misdemeanants although a few felons have been involved. Based on the information provided by the center staff, there has been a total of 163 residents in the program during the past year, 145 misdemeanants and 18 felons.*

Currently the program, which is operated on the second floor of the old county court house, has facilities for approximately twenty-four residents at any given time. A full capacity is maintained whenever possible. The residents of the program are charged a maximum "rent" fee of \$3.50 for each day they spend in the program with appropriate provision for adjusting the "rent" in relation to the individual's ability to pay.

The length of time spent in the program varies considerably from resident to resident. The longest sentence served by any work release resident has been one year and the shortest has been five days. The most common length of sentence is thirty days.

The Work Release Center maintains a staff of ten individuals. The positions are Program Director, Pre-sentence Investigator, a Security Supervisor, four Resident Supervisors, and two secretaries (one full and one part-time). In addition, a Deputy Clerk in the auditor's office is in charge of the finance records of the resident population.

*Information for the total number in the program is not in agreement. This will be discussed later.

Program Goals

The program, in addition to being designed to serve misdemeanants, was developed in accordance with goals specified in the original ILEC grant application. These goals may be divided into three elements: (1) system benefits, (2) offender benefits, and (3) family/community benefits.

1. System Benefits

- a. Reduce the jail population by absorbing that portion of the population which can be better served by the work release program.
- b. Develop positive attitudes on the part of law enforcement personnel in dealing with offenders.
- c. Reduce the cost of supervision in the handling of inmates for the county.
- d. Augment the present inmate educational facilities and programming.
- e. Develop a viable alternative in programming for the local criminal justice system.

2. Offender Benefits

- a. Assist in the rehabilitation of minor offenders who have been ordered into incarceration.
- b. Allow the offender to maintain his source of employment, to support his family, and by so doing, retain his dignity.
- c. Prevent first offenders from developing a negative attitude toward law enforcement.
- d. Prevent exposure of short-term offenders to persons serving sentences for major offenses.
- e. Effect a smooth transition from custody to release.

3. Family/Community Benefits

- a. Allow for the continued support of the offender's family during the incarceration of the inmate, both social and financial.

It is, of course, desirable and pragmatic to clearly define the goals of any Work Release Program prior to its institution and operation. In order for these goals to serve as guidelines and as points of reference for determining the success or failure of the Work Release Program, there must be some means of observing the extent to which the goals are being met. Some of the above goals as stated in the grant application are very specific and provide no problem for the estimation of success; however, others are not easily assessed. Those goals which deal with attitude change, self-feelings, and rehabilitation of residents, while admirable, are difficult to assess.

ADMINISTRATION

Personnel

Four key individuals are involved in the daily policy decisions and central maintenance of the Work Release Program. These are (1) the Program Administrator, (2) the Pre-sentence Investigator, (3) the Employment Counselor (whose title is now that of Security Supervisor), and (4) the Deputy Clerk.

The formal duties of each of these officers are:

Program Administrator--final authority regarding internal decision-making; overall supervision and responsibility for the functioning of the program.

Pre-sentence Investigator--investigate and provide written reports on the significant background information necessary for the selection of residents; liaison between the work release program, the probation department and the judiciary.

Security Supervisor--was previously involved in locating and maintaining the employment of the resident population; currently is in charge of supervising security personnel.

Deputy Clerk--maintains financial records and personal accounts of each resident; responsible for distribution of money for individual accounts, e.g., support payments, withdrawals from accounts, personal expenses, receipt of incoming employment checks; etc.

Training

It was originally planned that the training of the work release staff would be accomplished by observation of several similar agencies in the State. However, only one such trip for the purpose of observation was actually provided. This involved a visit by the Winnebago staff to the State facility at Bartonville, Illinois. Staff members seemed to feel that they profited from this visit. However, due to the State program's focus on pre-released felons with an extensive background of incarceration (a population different from the Winnebago project), there were definite limitations on the extent that the information gained was actually transferable.

The lack of initial training may have been offset by the personal experience of the staff members selected for the operation of the County program. The director of the program, for example, had experience with work release in Wisconsin. In addition, he was also involved in instituting a similar program on a smaller level elsewhere in Illinois prior to his involvement with the Winnebago program. We were impressed by his apparent commitment and exuberance about the Winnebago County Work Release Program. Both the Pre-sentence Investigator and the Security Supervisor have completed academic degrees in related fields. The Pre-sentence Investigator has a Master's degree in Criminology from Southern Illinois University and the Security Supervisor has a Bachelor's degree in a social science. Their qualifications are impressive. The key

administrative personnel selecting staff for the program are to be commended for their selection. We were also impressed by the Deputy Clerk's familiarity with the work release concept and his experience in maintaining financial records.

Organization

Two characteristics seem to pervade the organization of the administrative machinery. First, while each position has definite responsibilities attached to its title, there seems to be a great deal of shared involvement in each major aspect of the program. Secondly, three of the key positions are attached to programs other than strictly work release.

The sharing of involvement, input, and responsibility for the various tasks in the program's operation is most noticeable in the areas of employment and selection of clientele. While the Employment Counselor was originally responsible for assisting residents in obtaining employment, at present both the Pre-sentence Investigator and the Director evidently play major roles in this area. This lack of clearly defined roles for the staff has now been further emphasized by the elimination of the Employment Counselor position. The intake of clientele is similarly diversified. While the Pre-sentence Investigator does have sole responsibility for investigating the prospective residents' backgrounds, there does not seem to be any one, clearly defined mechanism whereby prospective clients are brought to his attention. All of the key staff members are to some extent involved in the location of prospective residents. Even the Deputy Clerk occasionally attends court room procedures in order to identify possible referrals

for the Work Release Program.

This non-specific role element is paralleled by the attachment of some of the Center's key personnel to outside agencies. The Pre-sentence Investigator along with his Work Release Center duties, is attached to the Probation Department where his office is located and occasionally performs duties for that department. The Deputy Clerk is likewise attached to the County Treasurer's Office and has his office located at some distance from the Work Release Center. The Director who is attached to the Sheriff's department, is tied to the jail operation and apparently has some responsibilities there.

These aspects have both positive and negative consequences for the operation of the program. The diversity of the functions of each position may reflect some structural disorganization and should the priority of demands of the position be placed on non-work release duties the program could suffer. But to the extent there is diversity of roles within the program itself allows greater flexibility in programming as well as making it possible to give more attention to specific problems. At the present level of operation and given the low average number of residents supervised, the diversity factor presents no important problems. However, if the program enlarges, as is currently planned, more attention should be given to formalizing the specific duties and responsibilities associated with each position.

The factor of having the Program's staff attached to other concerns should be similarly viewed. This, in large part, has contributed to the program's acceptance and the outstanding interagency communication and cooperation. But as future increases demand greater attention to the internal programming of work release, the staff should be

located in a centralized office and their work release responsibilities should be increasingly clarified so that their exclusive attention can be given to the work release operation.

CRITERIA FOR SELECTING CLIENTELE

The basic criteria used in the selection of clientele for the Winnebago Work Release Program, as indicated in the original ILEC grant application, places an emphasis on (1) misdemeanor status or minor nature of the offense, (2) offender's family status, and (3) the offender's employment status.

Using these criteria, the Center staff prefers to place in the program only those offenders who were convicted of a minor offense. In addition, special attention is given to those individuals who have several dependents, are married, or who have outstanding debts. Employment is, of course, a major factor and the staff attempts to place on the program those offenders who have maintained employment prior to arrest. Special attention is given to those who have the ability to retain their past employment if immediately placed in the program.

It is our impression that, overall, the above criteria were generally adhered to during the past year. Although some felons and probationers have been accepted, these seem to have been occasioned as a courtesy extended to other departments. While the program as defined in the grant application does emphasize the minor nature of the resident's offense as a major criteria, a number of relatively serious offenders have been accepted during the past year. Five, for example, were serving sentences for burglary, one for grand theft, six for robbery, one for indecent liberties with a minor, and one for voluntary

manslaughter.

While the criteria for selecting residents for the program seems to be clearly stated and generally followed, the process of selection leaves an impression of informality. It seems that on the one hand the judiciary places men directly into the program at the time of sentencing. And, according to the judges interviewed they have the final authority in placement. On the other hand the Center staff "recruits" residents by checking the jail population, bailiffs, and court proceedings for likely candidates. Following either of these two initial referrals, by the judge or by staff, the Pre-sentencing Investigator checks into the individual's background for the relevant information. After this investigation is completed and the individual is determined to be fit for the program, he is officially placed on the program by court order. However, even at this stage there seems to be an air of informality. According to our informants the court order and final placement is often a mere technicality.

REVOCATION OF WORK RELEASE STATUS

Termination of an offender's work release status is officially the duty of the sentencing judge. This is accomplished by revocation of the offender's periodic imprisonment order and resentencing.

This termination process is initiated by the work release staff. Upon their determination of the unfitness of an individual, the State's Attorney is requested to bring the case before the sentencing judge for reconsideration. During this hearing, the work release staff presents its evidence showing the problems that have occurred and the judge decides the appropriate action.

According to the staff, requests for revocation are rarely denied. Requests for revocation are, however, only made for the most severe infractions while less severe problems are dealt with by staff through punishment short of revocation of work release status.

There appears to be no problems in this area and the revocation of work release status seems to be conspicuous by its rarity and has occurred only two or three times during the year. We are impressed by what appears to be a practical and pragmatic point of view with respect to the area of discipline and the revocation of the work release status.

PROGRAMMING

Employment

The majority of residents who enter the program are either already employed or have good prospects for employment. Consequently there is not a great demand for staff involvement in the obtaining of employment; however, when the need arises, the staff does have contacts with major employers in the area and seems to have no problem placing men in jobs.

The only minor problem in this area is the arrangement of transportation for the residents to and from work. It is the resident's responsibility to get to and from work. Some residents are allowed to drive private vehicles, some ride on public transportation, others share transportation with fellow residents, or ride with their wives and relatives. Although the Center does have a vehicle, its use is restricted due to the absence of a full-time driver.

Residents are permitted to leave the work release facility to look for work. In addition, the responsibility for assisting the resident obtain employment and supervising the resident's work situation is

shared among the staff members. While an Employment Counselor position was originally included in the grant application, this position has been eliminated due to the lack of need.

Movement in and out of the Center is handled in the usual manner. Each resident is assigned a time he may leave the Center for work and a time for returning with an appropriate adjustment to allow time for travel. The exact time of movement in and out of the Center is recorded daily.

Special Leaves

During the weekends the men remain at the Center. The staff expressed the feeling that it would be desirable to furnish more activities on weekends to break the monotony of these inactive periods.

Special holiday leaves are provided. The Center allowed residents to take special passes over both Christmas and the New Year's holiday in order that they might spend this time with their families. Both of the trial programs were very successful and all residents returned to the Center at the appointed time. More holiday leaves are planned for the future.

This policy is consistent with the goals of the program as stipulated in the grant proposal which centers on the continued support of the offender's family and integration of the offender into the community. The program's staff is to be commended for this special leave policy. However, due to the characteristically short periods of time spent in the program by any one man, special leaves should always be carefully considered.* Work release programs are, after all, primarily

*Of the 147 individuals for whom we have data, 84, fifty-seven percent, were serving sentences of thirty days or less.

intended as punishments and are typically utilized as such by the judiciary. Therefore, new programs including special leaves must be weighed in terms of this and other purposes of the work release program, and every effort should be made to insure that added liberties do not defeat these functions.

Program Activities

Several special programs were operative at the time of our observation. Educational programs include the visitation and holding of remedial adult education classes at the Center two nights per week by two tutors from the outside community. This is a free service provided by Literacy Incorporated, a local social agency. The local Adult Education office has also furnished educational services to the residents as has Hall's Adult School which is currently working with one resident on a nightly basis. In addition to the educational services, two counselors from a local drug abuse clinic are attempting to work with the Center's residents who have had a history of alcohol or drug related problems. The local branch of Goodwill Industries has provided an evaluation and testing program for residents who have very low I.Q.s or learning disabilities and follow up help is provided in locating special employment for these individuals.

We find the receptiveness on the part of the Center staff to outside agencies and supportive programming highly commendable. This demonstrates a genuine concern on their part to provide as much assistance to the resident as is possible in the area of his needs. Beyond this, the acceptance of the Work Release Program as shown by the cooperativeness extended to it by outside agencies can be seen as a sign of community acceptance and support.

Housing

As noted previously, the present facilities of the Winnebago Work Release Center can accommodate 24 residents at the maximum level. The housing provided resembles a small dormitory facility and is located on the second floor of the old county court house. The rooms of the dormitory house from four to six individuals and afford a modicum of privacy which is very desirable.

Meals are furnished to the residents through cooperation with the jail program which is on the next floor of the building. There is also a small half-kitchen in the dormitory itself with a service area furnished with tables nearby. Food preparation is predominantly done in the jail kitchen with the food being brought downstairs at meal time. Snacks, sandwiches, etc. are made available in the half-kitchen as often as is possible to provide for between-meal needs. There is a "bag lunch" service provided for the residents' noon meals eaten away from the Center during the working hours.

While some normal discontent on the part of the residents over the quality of the food provided was observed, there appears to be no severe problems in this area. The staff is, however, quite concerned over the quantity of food served to the men. At this time a man on the Work Release Program is served the same diet and quantities of food as are the men in the jail program. The work release staff is attempting to obtain an increase in the amounts of food served to their men in order to meet the increased needs brought on by the differences in activity levels.

STATISTICAL AND FINANCIAL RECORDS

The program attempts to maintain records on all major aspects of operation. Records are maintained on a daily basis covering such areas as the movement of population, resident movement in and out of the Center, resident accounts, and the status of each resident's sentence.

In addition to filing the formal reports required under the grant, a monthly report is submitted to the judiciary. The latter contains a variety of basic data about each person in the program during the month such as race, age, marital status, number of dependents, offense, length of sentence, sentencing judge, money earned, board paid to County, the date in and, if released during the month, the date out.

We used these reports to abstract basic data about the population of the Work Release Program from May, 1973, through February, 1974. Our analysis indicated that there were 147 residents in the program for these months. The number admitted each month was as follows:

May.....	16	October....	15
June.....	12	November....	15
July.....	15	December....	19
August.....	10	January....	19
September....	12	February....	14

These totals do not agree with the figures on either of the independent data sheets which we provided for the staff's completion. See pages 16 and 17. The data sheet, "Work Release Program Volume," for example, indicates that a total of 316 felons and misdemeanants were admitted to the program from May through February. We are at a loss to explain this or other discrepancies which are apparent upon checking the data in these data sheet summaries.

WORK RELEASE POPULATION REPORT
 May, 1973 through February, 1974

Grupp
 16

Base Population

No. of Convicted Defendants Sentenced in County		
Felons	:	165
Misdemeanants	:	N/A
No. Committed		
Department of Corrections	:	75 (Felony)
County Jail	:	3 *1
Other (Specify)	:	
No. Placed on Straight Probation		88 (Felony)
No. Placed on Periodic Imprisonment		
No. Placed on Probation Combined with Work Release	:	18
No. Placed on All Other--Types of Periodic Imprisonment	:	145
Other Disposition	:	2*2

Screening and Classification for Work Release

No. of Defendants Screened for Eligibility by Work Release Administrator		204
No. Ruled Ineligible	:	41
No. Ruled Eligible	:	163
No. Actually Placed in Work Release Program		163

Program Volume

No. of Work Release Residents During Year		
Felons	:	18
Misdemeanants	:	145
No. of Parolees Placed in Work Release Program		9 (Adult) 3 (Juvenile)
No. of Work Release Residents Placed on Probation After Work Release Sentence		N/A

Terminations

Work Release Portion of Sentence Successfully Completed		151
Terminated as Program Failure		
New Offense	:	3
Technical Violation	:	9
Absconded	:	0

Please return to:
 Stanley Grupp
 Department of Sociology
 Illinois State University
 Normal, Illinois 61761

Prepared by: *Frederick*
Coordinating

*1 - Bridgeway-(Alcoholic Treat)

*2 Conditional Release

WORK RELEASE PROGRAM VOLUME REPORT *
 May, 1973 through February, 1974

Month	Total No. Participating During Month		Number Admitted During Month		No. Participating On Last Day of Month	Avg. Daily Count	Total No. Days Worked	Terminating	
	Daily	Weekends Only	Felony	Misdemeanor				Successfully Terminated	Terminated As Failure
May	16	-----	4	12	12	9	222	2	2
June	21	-----	4	17	12	13	257	8	1
July	30	-----	4	26	18	20	436	16	4
August	31	-----	3	28	16	20	496	14	1
September	32	-----	2	30	20	17	398	12	-----
October	35	-----	3	32	23	20	488	12	-----
November	36	-----	2	34	17	19	508	17	2
December	38	-----	1	37	21	18	929	15	2
January	40	-----	---	40	23	21	559	17	-----
February	37	-----	2	35	24	20	508	13	-----

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

Please return to: Stanley Grupp, Department of Sociology, Illinois State University, Normal, Ill. 61761

Prepared by:

[Signature]

Grupp
17

WORK RELEASE FINANCIAL SUMMARY *
May, 1973 through February, 1974

Earnings

Distribution of Net Earnings

Month	Earnings			Net	Distribution of Net Earnings						
	Gross	Taxes FED W/H	All Other Deductions F.I.C.A. STW/H		County Program Costs Room and Board	All Personal Expenses	Court Order Dependents Support	Creditors	Court Fines	Other	Balance in Account
May					\$588.00	\$65.34	N/A				\$2,648.04
June					\$1,466.50	\$1,954.24	\$170.00				\$4,809.16
July					\$1,910.50	\$4,197.13	\$170.00				\$7,012.59
August					\$1,973.00	\$4,445.60	\$450.00				\$7,297.32
September					\$2,136.00	\$2,715.67	\$279.00				\$11,100.40
October					\$2,039.00	\$4,049.86	\$801.30				\$14,870.57
November					\$2,168.50	\$4,370.86	\$592.00				\$16,960.73
December					\$2,212.50	\$4,874.58	\$330.00	\$40.00			\$17,137.17
January					\$2,324.00	\$3,914.87	\$345.00	\$40.00			\$20,552.30
February					\$2,159.50	\$4,505.02	\$330.00	\$40.00			\$24,012.59
Gross: \$101,295.40 Fed. W/h \$13,623.40					↑ The above Figures also included money to resident families.						
F.I.C.A. \$5,696.97 State W/h \$2,092.15											

*If information is not available please record as NA.

Our analysis of the monthly report forms submitted to the judges indicates that the age range of the 147 residents was 17 to 52 with a mean age of 28. Of the 147 persons, 84 (fifty-seven percent) were serving sentences of thirty days or less. Twenty-three residents were divorced, fifty-five were single and sixty-nine were married.

Monthly financial information (May, 1973, through February, 1974) was requested from the work release staff. A "Financial Summary" format was provided for recording this data. See page 18. A check on the internal consistency of this data indicated that the figures as reported are not in agreement. Either the information made available to the Program Administrator was incorrect or for some reason our data format was not understood.

The residents' personal financial records are supervised and controlled by the Circuit Clerk assigned to the program and residents turn in their checks to the Clerk. The checks are then deposited by the Clerk into an account where it is kept until the resident's release. Residents are encouraged to accumulate their financial resources as much as possible during their period in the program.

Deductions from the accounts are also controlled by the Circuit Clerk. Rent and board are deducted from each account and are based on the individual's ability to pay. In no instance is the charge more than \$3.50 per day. Similarly, court ordered dependent support, voluntary support payments, court fines, etc. are deducted. Each resident is also allowed to retain funds for his personal expenses and may also make special requests for funds.

In view of the obvious inconsistencies in the data which was obtained, we can only conclude that more attention and care needs to be

taken in the assembly and recording of information about the program. The program is, however, to be commended for the efforts that it is making to keep adequate records. Perhaps the use of the type of data sheet which we provided would be of some assistance in the further improvement of the record keeping system. Certainly the maintenance of proper records is a task which should be done primarily by one staff member. If this is not already the case then serious consideration should be given to this suggestion.

COMMUNITY AND PUBLIC RELATIONS

It is the consensus of the work release staff that not much emphasis had been placed on community or public relations during the year. The program appeared, however, to have had some good press coverage by both the television and the local newspapers. In addition, the Pre-sentence Investigator presented several talks to local civic groups. Despite these activities, the Center staff is of the opinion that by and large the local community remains ignorant of the program's existence.

While efforts to gain the support of the general community have been limited, it is our impression that the program has been remarkably well accepted by those most necessary for its proper functioning. Specifically, the program appears to have been embraced by several of the important employers in the community. Community support is also evident in the services offered to the Work Release Program by the several agencies described above in our discussion of "Program Activities". Finally and perhaps most importantly, one could argue that the program's ability to maintain a "low profile" is

indicative of a sound program which is, of course, the best type of community relations effort.

SUCCESS IN MEETING GRANT OBJECTIVES

One of the surprising characteristics of the Winnebago Work Release Program's operation over the past year has been its apparent total acceptance. As we have observed this acceptance extends throughout those governmental agencies which are directly involved in the program's maintenance. There appears to be an absence of conflicts or problems in integrating the Work Release Program with the operation of other agencies in the local criminal justice system.

Those members of the judiciary with whom we spoke were very supportive of the program and expressed firm beliefs regarding its usefulness as a sentencing alternative. There is no question that present housing facilities limit the number of participants in the program. There was a definite desire to expand the work release facilities in the future. The new Public Safety building which is currently being erected will have quarters for 45 work release prisoners, 40 men and 5 women.

The reasons behind the unusually broad acceptance of the program are not easy to pin down. Unquestionably, those responsible for staffing the Work Release Program can take a considerable part of the credit. Certainly the personalities of the Center's staff and their ties to other areas of the criminal justice system in the county are also a positive factor.

Each member of the staff expressed a belief in the value of work release and a sense of commitment to the program's operation, a

commitment which probably did not originate totally from the past year's experience with work release in Winnebago County. Other members of the justice system were also impressed by the staff's commitment to and interest in the Work Release Program.

Beyond this, one cannot overlook the nature of the Center's staffing patterns as a reason for its acceptance. As noted earlier, each member seems to have dual orientations. There are firm attachments to the jail operation, probation department, sheriff's department, and treasurer's office which gives each of these offices a direct stake in the work release operation.

As we have pointed out, however, the existent pattern of staffing can also have an undesirable effect if in fact the multiple staff duties are so alternated that the staff is not able to give proper attention to their Work Release Program responsibilities. As the program expands, the possibility of this development should be continually kept in mind.

It appears that many of the objectives as specified in the grant application are being achieved or at least approached. The achievement of some of the other objectives is difficult to appraise, for example, the lasting rehabilitative effect of participating in the program. Clearly a more detailed cost-benefit study is needed to determine whether supervision costs have in fact been reduced. Additionally better financial records will apparently have to be maintained before a cost-benefit analysis could be undertaken. It is apparent, however, that a considerable sum of money was earned by the residents over the past year and that they not only paid taxes and room and board, but contributed to their dependents' support. Formal reports filed by

the Work Release Coordinator repeatedly stressed that none of the resident's dependents were on public assistance.

We feel that on the whole, the Winnebago Work Release Program has been well operated during the past year and accepted by the "outside" members of county law enforcement system, including the judiciary. If the present pattern continues, we feel that the future for work release in Winnebago County holds great promise.

SECRET
CONFIDENTIAL

APPENDIX
Interview Instrument

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

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