

**A Comparative Analysis of Probation  
Intakes in Illinois**

**Final Report Submitted to the  
Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority**

**by**

**Arthur J. Lurigio, Ph.D.  
Magnus Seng, Ph.D.  
Department of Criminal Justice  
Loyola University Chicago**

**and**

**Thomas Ellsworth, Ph.D.  
Ralph Weisheit, Ph.D.  
Department of Criminal Justice Services  
Illinois State University**

This project was supported by Grant #94-DB-CX-0017, awarded to the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. The Assistant Attorney General, Office of Justice Programs, coordinates the activities of the following program offices and bureaus: Bureau of Justice Assistance, Bureau of Justice Statistics, National Institute of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and the Office of Victims of Crime. Points of view or opinions contained within this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice or the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority.

Printed by the Authority of the State of Illinois, November 1998

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts, Probation Division (AOIC) is responsible for collecting and analyzing juvenile and adult probation data. In May of both 1990 and 1995, AOIC conducted a statewide survey of juvenile and adult probationers' intake data. The survey was designed to collect information that could assist state and local decision makers to serve probation clients more effectively. The present report describes the results of the survey.

The statewide probation intake survey, contained several major categories of variables, including offenders' personal characteristics, current offenses, criminal histories, and court actions. These data provided only a "snapshot" of offenders sentenced to probation in Illinois for one month each (May) during the years 1990 and 1995. The study, therefore, did not investigate the processes by which offenders are placed on probation. The primary purpose of the survey analyses was to determine whether there had been any significant changes in the probation population in the first half of the 1990s. The analyses also examined subgroups of offenders: those placed on probation for drug and violent crimes and those sentenced to probation in urban and rural counties.

This report contains three levels of analysis of the Illinois adult and juvenile probation intake data. The first level of analysis focused on adult probationers--8,105 in 1990 and 3,939 in 1995--and explored information on demographic characteristics, prior criminal histories, current offenses, court-ordered dispositions, and court-ordered treatments. The second level of analysis focused on juvenile probationers. Data were collected on more than 2,600 juvenile offenders--1,577 in 1990 and 1,051 in 1995. A total of 23 variables were analyzed in the juvenile survey, including demographic characteristics, offense types, previous juvenile justice experiences, such as prior custodies, probations, and commitments to correctional facilities, types of petitions, and lengths of court or probation supervision. The third level of analysis explored differences between adult probationers sentenced in urban and rural counties. The 1995 intake data for the 3,939 adults sentenced to probation were analyzed to elucidate the similarities and differences between these two offender populations.

#### Adult Probation Intakes

Adult offenders placed on probation in 1990 were similar in many ways to adult offenders placed on probation in 1995. The samples from both years consisted mainly of three races: White,

African American, and Hispanic. The percentage distribution of offenders from each of the three groups remained virtually unchanged from 1990 to 1995. A small increase, from 1990 to 1995, however, was found in the percentage of female offenders placed on probation; this increase was most pronounced in the percentage of females sentenced to probation for drug crimes.

Intake data on probationer income for 1990 were unavailable. Half of the adult probationers sentenced in 1995 reported incomes of less than \$10,000. Eight in ten had incomes of less than \$20,000. 84% of the adult drug offenders at intake reported family incomes of less than \$20,000. In both 1990 and 1995, almost half of the probationers were unemployed at intake. Hence, unemployment and low wages are significant problems for adult probationers and pose a challenge for the probation officers who supervise them.

In 1995, ages at first arrest were between 10 and 19 for 43% of the adult offenders entering probation. The onset of criminal activity, as measured by arrests, was similar for the drug and violent offenders placed on probation. An increasing number of offenders between 1990 and 1995 entered probation with records of previous arrests. Slightly less than three-quarters of the offenders who entered probation in May 1995 had previous arrests,

up from 66% in May 1990. The increase in the average number of arrests among intakes in 1995 is an important finding, indicating that the probation population in Illinois might be becoming more serious in terms of probationers' prior criminal records.

The population of drug offenders entering probation in 1995 with prior criminal records increased significantly from those entering probation in 1990. Almost three-quarters of offenders in this subgroup had at least one prior arrest, compared with 56% in 1990. The percentage of violent offenders entering probation with a prior record (at least one previous arrest) decreased slightly from 1990 to 1995.

In May 1990, 48% of the offenders entering probation had been sentenced for felonies, a percentage that increased very slightly (49%) in 1995. Half of the offenders entering adult probation in 1995 were misdemeanants or traffic offenders. Nearly half of those entering probation in 1990 for violent offenses were misdemeanants. 43% of the violent offenders in 1995 also were convicted of misdemeanors.

80% of the adult offenders sentenced to probation in 1990 received terms of 24 months or less; in 1995, this percentage increased to eighty-four. As conditions of probation, offenders were ordered to pay probation fees and restitution, complete

community service hours, and be supervised on electronic monitoring. Among 1995 intakes, 60% were ordered to pay probation fees, 17% were ordered to pay restitution, and 22% were required to complete community service hours. Only 2% of the adults entering probation in May 1995 were required to wear electronic monitors.

The data from 1990 probation intakes showed that court-ordered treatment was included in 9 out of 10 cases. In 1995, only 46% of the offenders entering probation had treatment orders. From both the 1990 and 1995 data, probation officers perceived a stronger need for drug and alcohol treatment than was reflected in judges' orders. Probation officers' perceptions of drug and alcohol treatment needs for violent offenders remained unchanged from 1990 to 1995. A significant difference, however, was found in probation officers' perceptions of treatment need for sex offenders, dropping from 50% reporting treatment needs in 1990 to 10% reporting treatment needs in 1995. The data showed a 22% increase in 1995 (over 1990) in the percentage of cases in which probation officers perceived a need for family violence treatment.

## Juvenile Probation Intakes

There were no differences in average ages or in the age distributions of juveniles sentenced to probation in 1990 and in 1995. Although a slight increase was found in the average age of juveniles at intake, this difference was not statistically significant. In Cook County, the percentage of the age-fourteen-and-under population dropped by 6% in 1995 but the over-sixteen age group increased by 4%. The greatest change in age was reported in the collar counties where the age-fourteen-and-under population decreased by 11%. This change might be explained by the sharp drop, which occurred from 1990 to 1995, in the overall number of intakes in the collar counties.

A majority of juvenile intakes were male, although a 10% increase in the number of female probationers was found in the collar counties. A 7% increase in the number of female intakes was also found in the rural counties. A comparison of 1990 and 1995 intakes indicated that the majority of juveniles placed on supervision were White, with the African American population, comprising 36% of the juveniles on supervision, remaining unchanged over the two time periods. A significant decline, between 1990 and 1995, appeared in the percentage of Hispanic juvenile offenders at intake. The distribution of the offender



population is influenced by general population demographics. Specifically, the majority of the juvenile probationers in Cook County were African American whereas the majority of the offenders in the collar, suburban, and rural counties were White. Except for a change in the Hispanic offender population, the ethnic composition of the juvenile probation intake population was largely unchanged from 1990 to 1995.

One-third of the families of juvenile probationers in 1995 received some form of public assistance, a significant increase compared with 1990. The percentage increase varied by county group. For Cook County, approximately one-third of the juvenile intake sample received public assistance in 1990 compared with the 50% who received similar aid in 1995.

Because most juvenile intakes involve school-age adolescents, the study found that 90% of the population in both 1990 and 1995 had completed the seventh or eighth grade but had not completed high school. A significant change was reported in the 1995 survey: 13% of the urban juvenile intake population reported having completed only elementary school, more than double the percentage in 1990. Overall, the percentage of juveniles who attended school declined by 4% (89% in 1990 to 85% in 1995). The percentage of females who attended school declined

even more sharply, from 89 to 78%. Data from urban counties showed a decrease in school attendance from 92% in 1990 to 84% in 1995. A significant increase in the percentage of juveniles who reported their educational status as "truant" was, in 1995, more than double the percentage in 1990. Although there was a decline in the percentage of juvenile probationers who reported their educational status as "drop out", the percentage of female probationers who reported that they were drop outs increased by 3% in 1995 compared with 1990. Among juveniles attending school, the percentage of them enrolled in special education or alternative schools increased in 1995 to 30%, a 10% increase over 1990. The collar counties showed the largest increase in this subgroup.

Placement on probation supervision was most often the result of delinquency petitions. Property offenses was the most common offense group for both years. The exception was for female offenders and those in Cook County where, in 1995, violent offenses were most common. For the entire group, the percentage of juveniles entering probation for drug offenses increased in 1995 compared with 1990. In particular, Cook County experienced a three-fold increase in the percentage of offenders entering probation for drug offenses. Although the percentage of property

offenders in 1995 exceeded all offense groups (except in Cook County), the percentage of property offenders overall dropped from 55% in 1990 to 44% in 1995. A 20% decline appeared in the proportion of probationers entering probation in Cook County for property offenses. A slight increase in property offenses was recorded in the rural counties only.

Among violent juvenile offenders, increases were found for females, for Cook County offenders, and for urban counties. The sharpest increase was among female offenders; the sharpest decline was in the rural counties. Analyses showed an increasing proportion of juvenile offenders entering probation after having been adjudicated for drug offenses. For females in Cook County, the greatest increase occurred for violent offenses.

The data were unclear on the percentage of offenders who had been taken into custody at least once prior to their present offenses. In 1990, this figure was 63%. The dramatic decline in 1995 to 38% of the juvenile offenders with reported prior custody histories might have resulted from unreliable self-report data or from incomplete files. Only a small percentage of juvenile offenders in 1990 and in 1995 were identified as having been on probation previously. Based on prior custody and juvenile court experiences, the 1995 population was not the group of recidivists

that were expected.

Juvenile court judges have several dispositional alternatives. Among these are probation, court supervision, and continued under supervision. Probation is clearly the disposition of choice, but the percentage of juvenile offenders placed on probation in urban counties declined from 64% in 1990 to 45% in 1995. The largest increase in probation use (25%) occurred in Cook County. In Cook and the collar counties, the percentages of offenders continued under supervision declined sharply whereas in urban and rural counties, there was a significant increase in the percentage of juveniles in that category. In 1995, a 43% increase was found in the number of juvenile offenders continued under supervision in the state's urban counties.

The percentage of juvenile intakes ordered to treatment increased in 1995, except in rural areas; and among female offenders, the rate remained the same from 1990 to 1995. A significant increase was noted in the percentage of cases in which probation officers were permitted to use their discretionary power in determining treatment needs.

The 1990 and 1995 juvenile intake cohorts were combined in an effort to determine whether juvenile drug and violent offenders were different from other juveniles. According to the

data, drug offenders were older, they were more likely to be African American, they had higher rates of truancy and dropping out of school, and they were more often placed on probation. There were no significant differences between drug and nondrug offenders on gender, public aid status, prior probation experiences, or length of supervision periods. As expected, drug offenders were more often ordered to obtain treatment than were other juvenile offenders. Violent juvenile offenders also differed from other offenders: they were more often female and African American, they came from families on public aid, they were less likely to receive a court disposition of continued under supervision, and they were more likely than nonviolent offenders to have no treatment ordered by the court. The final analysis focused on identifying urban and rural differences, at intake, among the 3,698 adult probationers. Several departments, usually smaller ones, reported their data through larger departments. Because it was impossible to separate these cases from the larger group, all intakes from those counties were eliminated from analyses. Offenders in the metropolitan and nonmetropolitan groups were equally likely to be male, have a high school diploma (or beyond), to be on public aid, and have a family income of \$10,000 or less. Offenders in nonmetropolitan

counties were more likely to be young and White, and were more often employed than their metropolitan counterparts.

Offenders from nonmetropolitan counties were much less likely to be on probation for drug offenses. Offenders from metropolitan counties were more likely to be on probation for drug sales than were drug offenders from nonmetropolitan counties. Nonmetropolitan probationers had fewer prior arrests but more prior probations than did metropolitan offenders. The average sentence length of 20 months was the same for both metropolitan and nonmetropolitan adult probationers. Violent offenders received shorter probation sentences than either drug or property offenders. Most of the violent offenders placed on probation were sentenced for misdemeanor offenses, which probably explains the shorter overall period of supervision. Finally, treatment needs perceived by the court and probation staff were similar for metropolitan and nonmetropolitan counties.

The statewide probation intake survey data suggested four major recommendations. First, greater emphasis in probation supervision should be placed on assisting probationers to acquire gainful employment and on holding probationers accountable for finding and maintaining jobs. Second, because of shrinking probation resources, other sentencing alternatives should be

sought for the rather large number of offenders placed on probation for misdemeanors. Third, the probation and educational systems should work together to alleviate the serious problem of school failure and under-achievement among juvenile probationers.

Finally, low-level, nonviolent drug offenders, in both the juvenile and adult courts, should be diverted from the criminal justice system and into drug treatment programs.

## CHAPTER 1

### ILLINOIS PROBATION INTAKE STUDY:

#### ADULT OFFENDERS 1990 AND 1995

##### Introduction

A lack of knowledge about juvenile and adult probationers in Illinois has limited the capacity of state policy makers to formulate successful crime control strategies. Noticeably absent are data that would support policy makers in devising useful techniques to supervise an increasing number of probationers sentenced for drug and violent offenses. More information concerning caseloads would help to address probationers' problems and needs, to reduce their likelihood of recidivism, and to promote their successful reintegration into the community.

The efficient use of probation resources and staff is a statewide priority and must be driven by data. On a national level, scholars have cautioned that the inappropriate use of already scarce agency resources can result in higher costs and a wider net of social control. Alternative sanctions, such as intensive probation and intensive drug offender supervision, electronic monitoring, and house arrest, provide the court with a greater variety of sentencing options and alternatives to prison. However, these same sentencing strategies are being used improperly when they involve offenders who can be safely managed on standard probation. The current analyses of



probation intake data will advance our understanding of how sentencing strategies are being used in Illinois counties and circuits, and may point to new directions for using correctional options more carefully and efficiently.

The Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts, Probation Division (AOIC) is responsible for collecting and analyzing juvenile and adult probation data. In 1990 and 1995, AOIC conducted a statewide survey of juvenile and adult probationers' intake data. Because of limited staff and resources, AOIC did not have the time or capability to conduct in-depth analyses of these data. Such analyses would assist state and local decision makers to serve probation clients more effectively. In the aggregate, little is known about juvenile and adult probationers' demographic characteristics, needs, criminal records, treatment histories, and risk to community safety. Of particular importance to probation administrators are the ways in which these data can help them to allocate resources and to target probation populations with special needs.

The Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (ICJIA) contracted with Systems Development Associates (SDA) to code, enter, and analyze the statewide probation survey data and with researchers from Loyola and Illinois State Universities to organize and present the findings. The current report describes the survey results in four chapters. The first two focus on Illinois's adult and juvenile populations, respectively; the

third examines differences between urban and rural probation populations. The fourth summarizes the results and presents recommendations for probation policies and practices. The findings described in this report are intended to assist both AOIC and ICJIA in developing programs and in responding to requests from policy makers and from criminal justice practitioners about the characteristics of the Illinois probation population.

#### Setting

Illinois is one of only nine states in the United States where probation services are administered at the local/county level by the judicial branch of government. In the remaining states, adult and juvenile probation are state or executive functions, or are some combination of state-local administration. Probation in Illinois is funded partly through state subsidies to local departments that operate under administrative oversight from a state judicially-based agency, AOIC. AOIC develops standards for hiring, training, and offender supervision. As a judicial agency, the AOIC is not considered a regulatory agency. Funding to local departments comes in the form of grants-in aid, supporting a salary subsidy for positions that fulfill the minimum hiring requirement. In addition, the AOIC supports 100% of the salaries of specialized positions in the intensive probation supervision, DUI, and juvenile detention programs.

Supporters of this locally-based model of probation, placed under the authority of the courts, argue that probation services are likely to be more responsive to the concerns and needs of the judiciary (McCarthy & McCarthy, 1997). It also argues that judges will be more likely to examine the outcome of their decisions and to follow up to determine whether the offenders complied with the conditions of probation imposed by the court.

Finally, it is argued that by virtue of their positions in the justice system and community, judges will be able to articulate the need for increased probation resources and services.

### Methodology

#### Procedure

This study involves a secondary analysis of data gathered on adult probation intakes in Illinois. ICJIA, in cooperation with the AOIC conducted a survey of all juvenile and adult probation intake cases throughout the state of Illinois for the month of May 1995. Of the 102 counties in Illinois, data were obtained from 93 county probation departments, from which information was reported on a total of 3,939 adult probation intake cases. The nine counties for which information was not provided included four counties, each of which had fewer than 10,000 residents, for which no cases were reported. Five additional counties were too small to have their own probation departments and reported their cases through larger neighboring counties. One of these five small counties divided its cases

between two larger counties.

For each probation intake case, information was recorded about demographics, prior criminal history, the nature of the current offense, and the court disposition of the case, including any court-ordered treatment. A brief statistical overview of all 3,939 cases from the 93 participating departments has been presented elsewhere (Hurley & Hatfield, 1996).

Using probation intakes provides a snapshot of probation cases in the state. Compared with a cross-section of active cases, a study of probation intakes included a larger number of offenders whose time on probation was shorter than the length of probation in the general probation population. Furthermore, although the data include information about criminal history and current offense, it is not possible to use these data to examine the process by which cases are assigned to probation. Nonetheless, the data have the advantage of containing a large number of cases from a variety of community types, ranging from the most urban to the most rural counties in Illinois.

Probation officers in every Illinois county were asked to complete the population survey and risk and needs assessment forms (Appendix A). Following the instructions of the ICJIA, this report analyzed only the population survey data. The data consist of self-reports of offenders elicited during intake interviews. Probation officers were asked to enter the data

gathered from each offender onto data summary sheets that were the source of data for the current study.

SDA staff created a data file and coded and entered the data for analysis on SPSS/PC+. SDA was asked to add three data fields in addition to those provided by the probation officers: probation officer ID# (assigned consecutively beginning with 001; county ID# [from a list provided by ICJIA]; and circuit ID# [taken from the summary data forms].)

#### Findings: Adult Probationers

Chapter 1 survey results provide a descriptive profile of the adult probation population in Illinois. The results are divided into three categories: (1) data for entire adult probation population grouped according to 1990 ( $n = 8,105$ ) and 1995 ( $n = 3,939$ ) intakes, (2) subgroups of 1990 ( $n = 1,861$ ) and 1995 ( $n = 929$ ) probationers sentenced for drug crimes, and (3) subgroups of 1990 ( $n = 1,197$ ) and 1995 ( $n = 623$ ) probationers sentenced for violent crimes.

#### Demographic Characteristics

##### Age

The densest concentrations of ages for the entire intake population were age 16 or below for 1990 (48%,  $n = 3,833$ ) and age 31 and older for 1995 (43%,  $n = 1,694$ ) (Table 1A).<sup>1</sup> For offenders sentenced for drug crimes, there were similar patterns

---

<sup>1</sup>The current sample consisted of adult offenders. Hence, the large percentage of offenders in the age 16 or below category

of age clusters. Almost half (49%,  $n = 910$ ) of the intakes in 1990 were for ages 16 or below whereas the densest concentration of ages for the 1995 sample were for ages 31 and older (39%,  $n = 360$ ) (Table 1B). The same pattern of age clusters was found for offenders sentenced for violent crimes. The densest grouping for 1990 was still ages 16 or below (46%,  $n = 555$ ) and the densest grouping for 1995 was 31 and older (42%,  $n = 259$ ) (Table 1C).

#### Race

The adult probation intake population consisted primarily of three races: White (55% in 1990,  $n = 4,423$ , and 56% in 1995,  $n = 2,191$ ), African American (36% in 1990,  $n = 2,896$ , and 33% in 1995,  $n = 1,279$ ), and Hispanics (8% in 1990,  $n = 641$ , and 10% in 1995,  $n = 397$ ) (Table 2A). The racial make-up of offenders sentenced for drug crimes, however, differed from the overall population. For this subgroup, the largest racial group was African American (58% in both 1990,  $n = 1,065$ , and 1995,  $n = 537$ ), followed by Whites (33% in 1990,  $n = 607$ , and 34% in 1995,  $n = 318$ ), and Hispanics (9% in 1990,  $n = 169$ , and 7% in 1995,  $n = 60$ ) (Table 2B). The largest racial group for probationers sentenced for violent crimes was White (53% in 1990,  $n = 631$ , and 54% in 1995,  $n = 337$ ). This was followed by African American offenders (38% in 1990,  $n = 449$ , and 31% in 1995,  $n = 191$ ), and Hispanics (8% in 1990,  $n = 89$ , and 12% in 1995,  $n =$

---

reflected systematic error in data entry or coding.

73) (Table 2C).

#### Gender

The adult probation intake population was overwhelmingly male, 84% in 1990,  $\underline{n} = 6,819$  and 81% in 1995,  $\underline{n} = 3,162$ . Correspondingly, the percentage of female intakes increased from 16% in 1990 ( $\underline{n} = 1,277$ ) to 19% in 1995 ( $\underline{n} = 759$ ) (Table 3A). For drug offenders sentenced to probation, the increase in female intakes from 1990 to 1995 was even greater. In 1990, the adult drug offender intake population consisted of 82% males ( $\underline{n} = 1,514$ ) and 19% females ( $\underline{n} = 343$ ). The percentage of males decreased in 1995 to 77% ( $\underline{n} = 712$ ) whereas the percentage of females increased to 23% ( $\underline{n} = 215$ ) of the total drug offender population (Table 3B). The gender of probationers sentenced for violent crimes was overwhelmingly male (89% in 1990,  $\underline{n} = 1,067$ , and 86% in 1995,  $\underline{n} = 527$ ). The percentage of females increased from 1990 to 1995 from 11% to 14% of the total ( $\underline{n} = 128$  in 1990,  $\underline{n} = 87$  in 1995) (Table 3C).

#### Income and Public Assistance

Data regarding income level were available only for 1995 adult probation intakes. The distribution of the intake population across income groupings was heavily concentrated in the two lowest income categories. Over one-half of the intake population reported an annual income of less than or equal to \$10,000 (52%,  $\underline{n} = 2,034$ ). Another 27% ( $\underline{n} = 1,045$ ) reported an annual income between \$10,001 and \$20,000. Therefore, a

substantial majority (79%, n = 3,079) of the intake population reported annual incomes of less than or equal to \$20,000 per year. It would appear that the adult probation system is dealing with a population in which criminality and poverty are intertwined (Table 4A).

For offenders sentenced for drug crimes in 1995, the vast majority reported family incomes of less than \$10,000 (60%, n = 548) and between \$10,001-\$20,000 (24%, n = 220). Only 1% of the drug offenders reported incomes between \$40,001 and \$80,001 and were probably reporting the money they earned from illicit drug sales (Table 4B).

For offenders sentenced for violent crimes in 1995, the largest percentage also reported annual incomes less than or equal to \$10,000: the lowest income category was reported by slightly more than half of this subgroup (53%, n = 322). An additional 28% (n = 168) had an annual income ranging from \$10,001 to \$20,000. Hence, 80% (n = 49) had an annual income less than or equal to \$20,000 per year (Table 4C).

Probation officers were also asked to report if "the offender and/or dependents receive any type of public assistance--public aid; food stamps/WIC; aid to dependent children; public housing, Social Security Insurance or other form of public assistance." In 1990, 87% (n = 6,986) of the adult intake population reported that they or their dependents were not receiving public assistance. This number decreased to



81% ( $n = 3,106$ ) in 1995. 13% ( $n = 1,063$ ) in 1990 and 19% in 1995 ( $n = 724$ ) indicated that they presently received such assistance (Table 5A).

The percentage of intakes indicating that they received public assistance was higher for probationers who were sentenced for drug crimes. Over 20% of adult intakes indicated they received public assistance (21% in 1990,  $n = 391$ , and 25% in 1995,  $n = 225$ ). Only 79% ( $n = 1,443$ ) in 1990 and 75% ( $n = 668$ ) in 1995 indicated they did not receive any form of public assistance (Table 5B).

For offenders sentenced for violent crimes, only 13% ( $n = 159$ ) of adult intakes in 1990 and 20% ( $n = 121$ ) of adult intakes in 1995 reported receiving some form of public assistance. The number of intakes who did not receive public assistance dropped from 87% ( $n = 1,032$ ) in 1990 to 80% ( $n = 489$ ) in 1995 (Table 5C).

#### Employment Status

Approximately half (45% in 1990,  $n = 3,662$ , and 49% in 1995,  $n = 1,917$ ) of the adult intake population reported full-time employment (25 hours or more per week) and another 9% (in both 1990,  $n = 690$ , and 1995,  $n = 341$ ) reported part-time employment (less than 25 hours per week). The unemployment rate for the population was 38% ( $n = 3,071$ ) in 1990 and 34% ( $n = 1,341$ ) in 1995, representing the second highest response to the employment item (Table 6A).

For both 1990 and 1995 only 37% ( $\underline{n}$  = 685 in 1990 and  $\underline{n}$  = 343 in 1995) of probationers sentenced for drug crimes were employed full-time (25 hours or more per week) and 10% ( $\underline{n}$  = 178 in 1990 and  $\underline{n}$  = 91 in 1995) reported being employed part-time (less than 25 hours per week). Almost half (47% in 1990,  $\underline{n}$  = 847 and 46% in 1995,  $\underline{n}$  = 430) of the intakes were unemployed and represented the highest response to this item (Table 6B).

Almost half of the probationers sentenced for violent crimes (44% in 1990,  $\underline{n}$  = 525, and 48% in 1995,  $\underline{n}$  = 297) were employed full-time (25 hours or more per week). The next largest group consisted of those who were unemployed (38% in 1990,  $\underline{n}$  = 458, and 35% in 1995,  $\underline{n}$  = 217). 8% ( $\underline{n}$  = 97) in 1990 and 8% ( $\underline{n}$  = 47) in 1995 were employed part-time (less than 25 hours per week) (Table 6C).

#### Educational Attainment

Probation officers also were asked to report the current grade or last grade completed by adult probationers. The percentage of offenders who indicated that they had a twelfth grade education or below decreased from 91% ( $\underline{n}$  = 7,286) in 1990 to 76% ( $\underline{n}$  = 2,941) in 1995. 6% ( $\underline{n}$  = 487) in 1990 and 8% ( $\underline{n}$  = 309) in 1995 indicated they had attained a GED. At the highest end of the distribution, only 3% ( $\underline{n}$  = 249) of the offenders in 1990 reported education beyond the high school level. This increased to 16% ( $\underline{n}$  = 607) of all intakes in 1995 (Table 7A).

Of those sentenced for drug crimes, 92% ( $\underline{n}$  = 1,675) in 1990

reported an education level at or below twelfth grade compared with 80% ( $n = 707$ ) of intakes in 1995. The percentage of those receiving a GED increased from 5% ( $n = 91$ ) in 1990 to 9% ( $n = 78$ ) in 1995. Adult probationers reporting education attainment beyond a high school level increased from 3% ( $n = 48$ ) in 1990 to 11% ( $n = 98$ ) in 1995 (Table 7B).

For those sentenced for violent crimes, 93% ( $n = 1,106$ ) of adult intakes in 1990 reported an education level at or below the twelfth grade level. This decreased to 82% ( $n = 501$ ) in 1995. Only 5% ( $n = 53$ ) of the adult probationers in 1990 reported receiving a GED while 7% ( $n = 43$ ) in 1995 reported doing so. Only 3% ( $n = 31$ ) of adult intakes in 1990 report education beyond the high school level, increasing to 11% ( $n = 69$ ) in 1995 (Table 7C).

### Previous History in Criminal Justice System

#### Age at First Arrest

Data for this variable were available only for adult intakes in 1995. The most frequently reported age at first offense was the grouping of ages 10 to 19 (43%,  $n = 1,645$ ). The next largest concentration was for the grouping of ages 20 to 29 (35%,  $n = 1,326$ ), followed by ages 30 to 39 (15%,  $n = 559$ ), above 40 (8%,  $n = 294$ ), and age 9 or below (.4%,  $n = 12$ ). 12% ( $n = 466$ ) of the adult probation intakes for 1995 report having been arrested as juveniles (ages 16 and under). The average age of first arrest was 24 years ( $SD = 92.3$ ) (Table 8A).

Almost half (48%,  $n = 435$ ) of adult intakes sentenced for drug crimes in 1995 were first arrested between the ages of 10 and 19 years. Thirty-seven percent ( $n = 332$ ) were first arrested between the ages 20 and 29, and the next largest category was 30 to 39, which contained 12% of the intakes ( $n = 107$ ). 10% ( $n = 93$ ) of this subgroup reported having been arrested as juveniles (ages 16 and younger). The average age of first arrest was 22 years ( $SD = 7.3$ ) (Table 8B).

For adult probationers sentenced for violent crimes in 1995, the most common age at first arrest was between 10 and 19 years (42%,  $n = 256$ ), followed by ages 20 to 29 years (33%,  $n = 201$ ), and 30 to 39 years (15%,  $n = 92$ ). According to these data, 15% ( $n = 89$ ) of this subgroup reported having been arrested as juveniles (ages 16 and under). The average age of first arrest was 24 years ( $SD = 10.3$ ) (Table 8C).

#### Presentence Investigations

For the majority of adult probation intakes (87% in 1990,  $n = 7,015$ , and 90% in 1995,  $n = 3,320$ ), no pre-sentence investigation had been performed (Table 9A). A slightly smaller percentage of intakes sentenced for drug crimes had no presentence investigations performed (84% in 1990,  $n = 1,562$ , and 89% in 1995,  $n = 764$ ) (Table 9B). Similarly, of those sentenced for violent crimes, 84% ( $n = 1,005$ ) in 1990 and 87% ( $n = 502$ ) in 1995 had no pre-sentence investigation performed (Table 9C).

Previous Arrests, Probation Sentences,  
and Prison Commitments

Probation officers were asked to indicate whether probationers had any previous involvement with the criminal justice system with respect to the following:

Arrest:	Number of previous times arrested
Probation:	Number of previous probation sentences
Prison:	Number of previous prison sentences

The prior record results are shown for 1990 and 1995 adult intakes in Tables 10A and 11A, respectively. A large percentage of the adult probation population had previous arrests before their current probation sentence (66% in 1990,  $\underline{n} = 5,304$ , and 72% in 1995,  $\underline{n} = 2,807$ ). The average number of previous arrests per probationer in 1990 was 2.67 ( $\underline{SD} = 4.79$ ), in 1995, it was 3.85 ( $\underline{SD} = 6.02$ ).

Most offenders, however, were entering the probation system for the first time. Only 30% ( $\underline{n} = 2,442$ ) in 1990 and 35% ( $\underline{n} = 1,352$ ) in 1995 had previous probations, with 9% ( $\underline{n} = 762$ ) in 1990 and 12% ( $\underline{n} = 479$ ) in 1995 reporting two or more prior probations. In 1990, the average number of previous probations was .46 ( $\underline{SD} = .88$ ) and in 1995, it was .58 ( $\underline{SD} = 1.24$ ).

A small percentage of adult probationers (7% in 1990,  $\underline{n} = 546$ , and 10% in 1995,  $\underline{n} = 373$ ) had previous sentences to prison.

In 1990, the average number of prison sentences per probationer was .10 ( $\underline{SD} = .49$ ) and in 1995 the average number of prison

sentences was .16 (SD = .84).

Tables 10B and 11B show arrest, probation, and prison history data for adult probationers sentenced for drug crimes. More than half (56%, n = 1,041) of this subgroup of adult intakes in 1990 reported previous arrests. That percentage, however, increased to 76% (n = 656) in 1995. The average number of previous arrests per probationer in 1990 was 2.24 (SD = 4.05) and in 1995, it was 4.52 (SD = 6.48).

Similar to the overall population, most intakes in the drug offender subgroup were entering probation for the first time. Only 25% (n = 458) of adult drug offender intakes in 1990 and 32% (n = 292) of adult drug offender intakes in 1995 had previous probations, with a small percentage reporting two or more prior probations (6% in 1990, n = 105, and 10% in 1995, n = 90). The average number of previous sentences to probation in 1990 was .33 (SD = .70) and in 1995, it was .50 (SD = 1.08). A small percentage of drug offenders also had previous prison sentences (7% in 1990, n = 124) and (10% in 1995, n = 93). The average number of prison sentences for drug offenders in 1990 was .08 (SD = .30) and, in 1995, it was .15 (SD = .64).

Tables 10C and 11C show the prior record results for violent offenders. The majority of this subgroup had previous arrest experience (65% in both 1990, n = 772, and 1995, n = 400). The average number of previous arrests per probationer in 1990 was 2.75 (SD = 4.73) and, in 1995, it was 4.03 (SD = 6.45).

The majority of violent offenders were entering the probation system for the first time (70% in 1990,  $\underline{n} = 829$  and 68% in 1995,  $\underline{n} = 415$ ). Only 31% ( $\underline{n} = 364$ ) in 1990 had previous probations, with only 10% ( $\underline{n} = 122$ ) reporting two or more probations. This increased to 33% ( $\underline{n} = 203$ ) in 1995, with 14% ( $\underline{n} = 86$ ) having two or more probations. The average number of previous sentences to probation in 1990 was .46 ( $\underline{SD} = .85$ ) whereas in 1995 the average number of previous sentences of probation was .61 ( $\underline{SD} = 1.22$ ).

A small percentage of intakes sentenced for violent crimes had previous prison sentences (8% in 1990,  $\underline{n} = 95$ , and 13% in 1995,  $\underline{n} = 78$ ). The average number of prison sentences in 1990 was .13 ( $\underline{SD} = .50$ ) and, in 1995, it was .26 ( $\underline{SD} = 1.10$ ).

#### Nature of Criminal Activity

A section of the adult intake survey asked for information on the "most serious offense of which the individual was convicted for the present period of probation" and the relationship between the offender and the victim of the offense.

#### Offense (Petition) Type

The largest number of offenses, by general type, for the entire population, was felonies (48%,  $\underline{n} = 3,877$ , in 1990 and 49% in 1995,  $\underline{n} = 1,915$ ). The distribution across the remaining categories was: misdemeanors (28% in 1990,  $\underline{n} = 2,230$ , and 30% in 1995,  $\underline{n} = 1,156$ ), and traffic (25% in 1990,  $\underline{n} = 1,991$ , and 21% in 1995,  $\underline{n} = 836$ ) (Table 12A). For adult probationers sentenced for drug crimes, a significantly larger percentage of

offenses were felonies, 87% of all offenses in both 1990 (n = 1,613) and 1995 (n = 805), followed by misdemeanors (13% in both 1990, n = 243, and 1995, n = 121) and traffic offenses (less than 1% in both 1990, n = 5, and 1995, n = 1) (Table 12B).

Interestingly, less than half of all intakes for violent crimes were felonies (48% in 1990, n = 569, and 43% in 1995, n = 264) and more than half were for misdemeanors (52% in 1990, n = 621, and 56% in 1995, n = 344). A small portion (.4% in 1990, n = 5, and 1% in 1995, n = 6) were classified as traffic (Table 12C).

#### Offenses

The distribution of offenses was analyzed across all offense categories, including the subgroups of violent and drug offenders (Table 13). The most frequent type of offenses for the adult population were: driving under the influence (20% in 1990, n = 1,633 and 23% in 1995, n = 885); drug possession (16% in 1990, n = 1,313 and 19% in 1995, n = 745); theft/larceny (13% in 1990, n = 1,020 and 11% in 1995, n = 430); aggravated assault/assault/battery (4% in 1990, n = 303 and 11% in 1995, n = 407); other traffic offenses (8% in 1990 n = 613, and 5% in 1995, n = 174); and burglary (7% in 1990 n = 535, and 5% in 1995, n = 190). The distribution across these categories is as follows:

	<u>1990</u>	<u>1995</u>
Sex Offenses (incl. prostitution):	2%	3%
Violent Offenses:	13%	14%



Property Offenses:	25%	21%
Drug/Alcohol-Related:	23%	24%
Traffic Offenses (incl. DUI):	28%	28%

Victims of Adult Probationers

Data on the victim variable were available for 1995 adult probation intakes only. Analysis of the victim-offender relationship indicated that victims were involved in 41% of the offenses committed by this population (n = 1,589). Of those crimes that involved victims, 20% (n = 324) involved crimes against family or household members; 22% (n = 354) were committed against friends or acquaintances; and 57% were committed against strangers (n = 911) (Table 14A).

The victim-offender relationship for probationers sentenced for drug crimes in 1995 was also analyzed. Results indicated that only 8% of the drug crimes involved a victim (n = 70): 14% (n = 10) were crimes against family or household members; 6% (n = 4) involved acquaintances or friends; and 80% (n = 56) involved strangers (Table 14B).

Probationers sentenced for violent crimes differed significantly with regard to the victim-offender relationship from the general probation population and those sentenced for drug crimes. Victims were involved in 95% (n = 585) of the offenses committed by this subgroup. Of those that involved a victim, 40% (n = 232) were committed against family or household

members; 28% ( $n = 161$ ) were committed against acquaintances or friends; and 33% ( $n = 192$ ) were committed against strangers (Table 14C).

### Court Decision-Making and Sentencing

#### Sentencing Period

The most frequently reported probation sentence length for the adult intake population in 1990 was 0-12 months (53%,  $n = 4,294$ ), followed by 13-24 months (28%,  $n = 2,234$ ), 25-36 months (14%,  $n = 1,174$ ), and 37 months or greater (5%,  $n = 403$ ). In 1990, the majority of adult probationers (81%,  $n = 6,528$ ) received sentences of 24 months or less. The average sentence length for 1990 was 19.3 months ( $SD = 11.0$ ).

In 1995, the most frequently reported probation sentence length was 13-24 months (46%,  $n = 1,811$ ), followed by 0-12 months (38%,  $n = 1,496$ ), 25-36 months (12%,  $n = 477$ ), and 37 months or greater (4%,  $n = 155$ ). For 1995, 84% ( $n = 3,307$ ) of the adult intakes received probation sentences of 24 months or less. The average sentence length for 1995 was 20.3 months ( $SD = 10.6$ ) (Table 15A).

For adults sentenced to probation for drug crimes, the most frequently reported probation sentence length for both 1990 and 1995 was 13-24 months (40% in 1990,  $n = 750$  and 59%,  $n = 546$ , in 1995), followed by 0-12 months (29%,  $n = 529$ , in 1990 and 23% in 1995,  $n = 213$ ); 25-36 months (24% in 1990,  $n = 444$  and 15% in 1995,  $n = 137$ ); and sentences of 37 months or greater (8% in

1990,  $\underline{n} = 138$  and 4% in 1995,  $\underline{n} = 33$ ). The average sentence length in 1990 was 23.1 months ( $\underline{SD} = 11.8$ ) compared with a mean of 21.6 months ( $\underline{SD} = 9.9$ ) in 1995 (Table 15B).

For adults sentenced to probation for violent crimes, the most frequently reported sentence length for both 1990 and 1995 was 0-12 months (55% in 1990,  $\underline{n} = 650$  and 43% in 1995,  $\underline{n} = 269$ ).

The next most frequent sentence length was 13-24 months (21% in 1990,  $\underline{n} = 255$  and 34% in 1995,  $\underline{n} = 213$ ) followed by 25-36 months (16% in 1990,  $\underline{n} = 192$  and 15% in 1995,  $\underline{n} = 92$ ); and 37 months or greater (9% in 1990,  $\underline{n} = 100$  and 8% in 1995,  $\underline{n} = 49$ ). The average sentence length for 1990 was 20.4 months ( $\underline{SD} = 12.7$ ) compared with 21.4 months ( $\underline{SD} = 12.6$ ) in 1995 (Table 15C).

#### Probation Orders

Data for the probation order variables were only available for 1995 intakes. A large proportion of adults placed on probation in 1995 were ordered to pay probation fees whereas orders of restitution, community service, and electronic monitoring were much less frequent. 60% ( $\underline{n} = 2,345$ ) of the population were ordered to pay probation fees. 17% ( $\underline{n} = 663$ ) were ordered to pay restitution. Community service was ordered for 22% ( $\underline{n} = 873$ ) and electronic monitoring was ordered for 2% ( $\underline{n} = 59$ ) (Table 16A).

Data from the 1995 survey for adult probationers sentenced for drug crimes also indicated that the largest proportion of offenders were ordered to pay probation fees (50%,  $\underline{n} = 456$ ).

Only 4% (n = 39) were ordered to pay restitution, 24% (n = 219) were ordered to perform community service, and in less than 1% of the intakes, electronic monitoring was ordered (n = 8) (Table 16B).

Data from the 1995 intakes for adult probationers sentenced for violent crimes also indicated that the largest portion of this sample was ordered to pay probation fees (57%, n = 351). 18% (n = 109) were ordered to pay restitution and 21% (n = 132) were ordered to perform community service. In 1% of the intakes, electronic monitoring was ordered (n = 7) (Table 16C).

#### Treatment Recommendations/Probation Officers' Perceptions of Treatment Need

As shown in Tables 17A and 18A, results from 1990 and 1995 differed significantly with regard to both court-ordered treatment recommendations and probation officers' perceptions of treatment need. Court-ordered treatment was included in the sentencing of 91% (n = 7,328) of the intakes in 1990 compared with only 46% (n = 3,610) of the population in 1995. In 1990, there were 0 cases in which treatment was not ordered, and for 9% (n = 731), an evaluation or treatment was ordered at probation officers' discretion. In contrast, in almost half (47%, n = 1,826) of the cases in 1995, treatment was not ordered and for 7% (n = 288), drug assessment and treatment was ordered at probation officers' discretion. Drug/alcohol treatment was ordered for 26% (n = 2,084) of the cases in 1990 and increased

to 39% ( $\underline{n} = 1,524$ ) of the cases in 1995. Whereas 65% ( $\underline{n} = 5,244$ ) of the intakes in 1990 were ordered to treatment for mental illness, only 2% ( $\underline{n} = 83$ ) of this population was ordered in 1995. None of the intakes in 1990 were ordered for sex offender or family violence treatment. In 1995, however, 1% ( $\underline{n} = 45$ ) and 3% ( $\underline{n} = 132$ ) of the intakes were ordered into sex offender and family violence treatment, respectively.

Probation officers were asked in the survey to record their perception of treatment need for each intake. The most striking result is that probation officers perceived the need for drug/alcohol treatment for 38% ( $\underline{n} = 3,080$ ) of the intakes in 1990 and 50% ( $\underline{n} = 1,932$ ) of the intakes in 1995. This was compared with actual court-ordered drug/alcohol treatment, which was 26% and 39% in 1990 and 1995, respectively. Focusing on individual categories within drug/alcohol treatment, probation officers' perceptions were approximately 3 to 5 percentage points higher than the judiciary for each category for both 1990 and 1995.

In 1990, there was a great disparity between probation officers and judges with regard to sexual offender treatment (no perceived need by the judiciary compared to 42%,  $\underline{n} = 3,369$ , of intakes based on probation officers' perceptions). Significantly fewer probation officers than judges perceived needs in the area of mental illness treatment (65%,  $\underline{n} = 5,224$ , court-ordered versus only 20%,  $\underline{n} = 1,593$ , perceived need by the

probation officer). In contrast, in 1995 there was a close match between probation officers' and judges' perceptions of the need for offender treatment in the areas of mental illness, sex offending, and family violence.

As with the overall sample, the data for adult probationers sentenced for drug crimes differed significantly between 1990 and 1995. Court-ordered treatment was included in 91% ( $\underline{n} = 1,675$ ) of the cases in 1995. All drug cases in 1990 were ordered for treatment and in 9% ( $\underline{n} = 170$ ) of the cases, an evaluation or treatment was ordered at the probation officers' discretion. In 1995, however, in 59% ( $\underline{n} = 539$ ) of the cases, no treatment was ordered, and for 9% ( $\underline{n} = 84$ ), an evaluation or treatment was ordered at the probation officers' discretion. Drug/alcohol treatment was ordered for only 13% ( $\underline{n} = 241$ ) of the cases in 1990 compared with 32% ( $\underline{n} = 291$ ) in 1995. The majority (78%,  $\underline{n} = 1,434$ ) of the cases in 1990 were ordered for mental health treatment compared with less than 1% ( $\underline{n} = 1$ ) in 1995. There were no cases ordered for sex offender treatment in either 1990 or 1995. No cases were ordered for family violence treatment in 1990 and less than 1% were ordered ( $\underline{n} = 4$ ) in 1995.

Probation officers' perceptions of treatment need for each intake also differed between 1990 and 1995 for cases sentenced for drug crimes. Probation officers perceived the need for drug/alcohol treatment in only 27% ( $\underline{n} = 501$ ) of the cases in 1990 but almost half (49%,  $\underline{n} = 446$ ) of the cases in 1995 (Table

18B).

Tables 17C and 18C show that the data for adult probationers sentenced for violent crimes differed significantly between 1990 and 1995. Court-ordered treatment was included in 91% ( $n = 1,085$ ) of intakes in 1990 for this subgroup and in 49% ( $n = 303$ ) of the cases in 1995. In 1990, for 9% ( $n = 105$ ) of the cases, an evaluation of treatment was ordered at the probation officers' discretion. In 1995, however, in 43% ( $n = 263$ ) of the cases no treatment was ordered and for 8% ( $n = 51$ ), an evaluation for treatment was ordered at the probation officer's discretion. Drug/alcohol treatment was ordered for only 14% ( $n = 162$ ) of the cases in 1990 compared with 18% ( $n = 110$ ) in 1995. The majority (78%,  $n = 923$ ) of the cases in 1990 were ordered for mental health treatment compared with 6% ( $n = 37$ ) in 1995. There were no cases ordered for sex offender treatment in 1990 but 7% were ordered for such treatment ( $n = 43$ ) in 1995. No cases were ordered for family violence treatment in 1990 but 18% were ordered for such treatment ( $n = 113$ ) in 1995.

Probation officers' perceptions of treatment need for each intake also differed between 1990 and 1995 for violent offenders. Probation officers perceived the need for drug/alcohol treatment in 26% of the cases in both 1990 ( $n = 312$ ) and 1995 ( $n = 160$ ). Probation officers' perceptions of mental health treatment were much higher in 1990 (24%,  $n = 286$ )

than they were in 1995 (6%, n = 37). This was also true for sex offender treatment, which was 50% (n = 594) in 1990 but only 10% (n = 59) in 1995. In 1990, there was no probation officer perceived need for family violence treatment but this increased to 22% (n = 133) in 1995.

### Summary

The data in Chapter 1 are based on a survey of adult probation intakes conducted during May 1990 and May 1995. The survey covered four major areas: (1) demographic data; (2) previous history in the criminal justice system; (3) nature of criminal activity; and (4) court decision-making and sentencing.

Results of three groups of adult probation intakes were analyzed for: (1) all probation intakes from 1990 and 1995; (2) probation intakes sentenced for drug crimes in 1990 and 1995, and (3) probation intakes sentenced for violent crimes in 1990 and 1995.

### Demographic Characteristics

The demographic profile of adult probation intakes for all three groups and the summary of findings is listed below. Unless otherwise specified, percentages are for the entire intake population in 1990 and 1995. When there were differences between the groups, these were indicated:

Densest concentration by age: 16-below for 1990 data (47%) and age 31 and above for 1995 data



(43%);

The largest ethnic concentration was White (55% in 1990 and 56% in 1995), followed by African American (36% in 1990 and 33% in 1995), and Hispanic (8% in 1990 and 10% in 1995);

While the ethnic composition of intakes sentenced for violent crimes was similar to the overall sample, the largest ethnic concentration for intakes sentenced for drug crimes was African American (58% in both 1990 and 1995); White (33% in 1990 and 34% in 1995); and Hispanic (9% in 1990 and 7% in 1995);

Overwhelmingly male (84% in 1990 and 81% in 1995);

For 1995, over half (52%) reported incomes less than \$10,000; 79% reported income less than \$20,000;

13% in 1990 and 19% in 1995 reported receiving public assistance for themselves or a dependent:

A much larger proportion of intakes sentenced for drug crimes indicated receiving public aid (21% in 1990 and 25% in 1995);

Nearly one-half (45% in 1990 and 49% in 1995)

reported being employed over 25 hours/week;

More than one in three intakes (38% in 1990 and 34% in 1995) reported being unemployed; and,

The proportion of intakes unemployed was higher among intakes sentenced for drug crimes (47% in 1990 and 46% in 1995);

Nearly all of the intakes (97% in 1990 and 84% in 1995) reported educational achievement below twelfth grade or GED.

#### Previous History in the Criminal Justice System

The majority of intakes (87% in 1990 and 90% in 1995) reported that presentence investigation had not been performed;

For 1995, 43% reported first arrest between ages 10 and 19, and 35% reported first arrest between ages of 20 and 29;

The majority of intakes (66% in 1990 and 72% in 1995) reported previously being arrested;

Most of the intakes (70% in 1990 and 65% in 1995) were new to the adult probation system;

7% of intakes in 1990 and 10% in 1995 reported prior prison sentences.

#### Nature of Criminal Activity

. Nearly one-half (48% in 1990 and 49% in 1995) of the offenses coming before the court for this population were felonies:

. A significantly higher percentage of offenses for intakes sentenced for drug crimes were felonies (87% in both 1990 and 1995);

. A significant proportion (25% in 1990 and 21% in 1995) were traffic-related offenses (although not all of these offenses were DUI charges);

. The largest percentage of offenses were for DUI offenses (20% in 1990 and 23% in 1995) and drug possession (16% in 1990 and 19% in 1995);

. Over 10% (25% in 1990 and 21% in 1995) were for crimes against property (theft/larceny = 13% in 1990 and 11% in 1995);

. Over 10% of the offenses (11% in 1990 and 13% in 1995) were violent crimes (assault/battery/other violent offenses);

. 2% of the offenses in 1990 and 1995 were sex offenses (not including prostitution);

. In 1995, 41% of the offenses for this population involved victims:

57% of this group involved strangers

43% of this group involved family (8% of total offenses), or friends or acquaintances (9% of total);

In 1995, only 8% of intakes sentenced for drug crimes and 95% of those sentenced for violent crimes involved victims;

For those sentenced for violent crimes among cases involving victims:

33% of this group involved strangers

67% of this group involved family (38% of total offenses), or friends or acquaintances (26% of total).

#### Court Decision-Making Process and Sentencing

The majority of intakes in 1990 (53%) were assigned to probation for a period of 0-12 months compared to only 38% in 1995;

46% of intakes in 1995 probation sentences ranged from 13-45 months compared to 28% in 1990;

For intakes sentenced for drug crimes, the largest proportion of intakes were for 13-24 months (40% in 1990 and 59% in 1995);

In 1995, 60% were ordered to pay probation fees;

In 1995, 17% were ordered to pay restitution;

However, only 4% of those sentenced for drug crimes in 1995 were ordered to pay restitution;

In 1995, 22% were ordered to perform community service, and only 2% were ordered to electronic monitoring.

91% of 1990 intakes and only 46% of the 1995 intakes were ordered to some form of treatment;

While the proportion of intakes sentenced drug crimes to some form of treatment in 1990 was identical to the overall population, only 32% of this group was ordered to some form of treatment in 1995;

Less than 10% (9% in 1990 and 7% in 1995) were ordered for further evaluation or treatment at probation officer discretion;

In 1990, the probation officers' perception of mental illness treatment was lower than court-ordered treatment (65% court-ordered/20% perceived by probation officer in need of treatment) but higher than that which was ordered by the judiciary for drug/alcohol-related treatment (26% court-ordered/38% perceived by probation officer in need of treatment), and for

sexual offending treatment (0% court-ordered/42% perceived by probation officer in need of treatment);

In 1995, the rate of probation officers' perceptions of treatment was consistently higher than which was ordered by the judiciary, most notably for need of drug/ alcohol related treatment (39% court-ordered/50% perceived by probation officer in need of treatment).

Summary of Demographic Profile

Densest concentration by age in 1990: 16-below

For All Intakes: 47%

For Drug Crimes: 49%

For Violent Crimes: 46%

Densest concentration by age in 1995: 31-above

For All Intakes: 43%

For Drug Crimes: 39%

For Violent Crimes: 42%

Second heaviest concentration by age in 1990: 31-above

For All Intakes: 19%

For Drug Crimes: 16%

For Violent Crimes: 20%

Second heaviest concentration by age in 1995: 17-20

For All Intakes: 22%

For Drug Crimes: 24%

For Violent Crimes: 22%

Most frequent ethnicity in 1990:

For All Intakes: White (55%)

For Drug Crimes: African American (58%)

For Violent Crimes: White (53%)

Most frequent ethnicity in 1995:

For All Intakes: White (56%)

For Drug Crimes: African American (58%)

For Violent Crimes: White (54%)

Second most frequent ethnicity in 1990:

For All Intakes: African American (36%)

For Drug Crimes: White (33%)

For Violent Crimes: African American (38%)

Second most frequent ethnicity in 1995:

For All Intakes: African American (33%)

For Drug Crimes: White (34%)

For Violent Crimes: African American (31%)

The population was overwhelmingly male:

	<u>1990</u>	<u>1995</u>
For All Intakes:	84.2%	81%
For Drug Crimes:	81.5%	77%
For Violent Crimes:	89.3%	86%

More than one-half reported incomes less than or equal to \$10,000:

For All Intakes:	N/A	52%
For Drug Crimes:	N/A	60%
For Violent Crimes:	N/A	53%

The majority reported incomes less than or equal to \$20,000:

For All Intakes:	N/A	79%
For Drug Crimes:	N/A	84%
For Violent Crimes:	N/A	80%

A small percentage reported receiving public assistance for themselves or a dependent:

For All Intakes:	13%	19%
For Drug Crimes:	21%	25%
For Violent Crimes:	13%	20%

Almost half reported being employed over 25 hours/week:

For All Intakes:	45%	49%
For Drug Crimes:	37%	37%
For Violent Crimes:	44%	48%

However, a significant minority reported being unemployed:

For All Intakes:	38%	34%
For Drug Crimes:	47%	46%
For Violent Crimes:	38%	35%



Most reported educational achievement below twelfth grade or GED:

For All Intakes:	97%	84%
For Drug Crimes:	97%	89%
For Violent Crimes:	98%	89%

Summary of Previous History in the Criminal Justice System

The majority of intakes to adult probation did not have a pre-sentence investigation performed:

	<u>1990</u>	<u>1995</u>
For All Intakes:	87%	90%
For Drug Crimes:	84%	89%
For Violent Crimes:	84%	87%

About half of the intakes reported a first arrest between the ages of 10 and 19 years:

For All Intakes:	N/A	43%
For Drug Crimes:	N/A	48%
For Violent Crimes:	N/A	42%

Most of the intakes had prior arrest histories:

For All Intakes:	66%	72%
For Drug Crimes:	56%	76%
For Violent Crimes:	65%	65%

Only about a third had been on probation previously:

For All Intakes:	30%	35%
For Drug Crimes:	25%	32%

For Violent Crimes: 31% 33%

A minority of intakes had prior prison sentences:

For All Intakes: 7% 10%

For Drug Crimes: 8% 13%

Summary of the Nature of Criminal Activity

Nearly one-half of all adults placed on probation and those convicted for violent crimes were convicted of felonies. However, a much larger percentage of those convicted for drug crimes were felonies.

	<u>1990</u>	<u>1995</u>
For All Intakes:	48%	49%
For Drug Crimes:	87%	87%
For Violent Crimes:	48%	43%

A significant proportion (28%) of all intakes in 1990 and 1995 were for traffic-related offenses (although not all of these offenses were DUI charges).

A significant proportion were also for crimes against property (25% in 1990 and 21% in 1995). 13% in 1990 and 11% in 1995 were for theft/larceny.

13% in 1990 and 14% in 1995 were for violent crimes. Less than 4% in 1990 were for assault/battery but this increased to 11% in 1995.

Nearly one-quarter (23% in 1990 and 24% in 1995) of

the crimes were drug/alcohol related.

. 2% of the offenses in both 1990 and 1995 were sex offenses

. For 1995 data, 41% of offenses for all intakes involved victims compared to only 8% of those convicted for drug crimes and 95% of those convicted for violent crimes.

Of those crimes which involved victims:

Strangers were involved in: 57% of all intakes  
80% of drug crime intakes  
33% of violent crime intakes

Family was involved in: 20% of all intakes  
14% of drug crime intakes  
40% of violent crime intakes

Friends or acquaintances were involved in:  
22% of all intakes  
6% of drug crime intakes  
28% of violent crime intakes

#### Summary of Court Decision-Making and Sentencing

. In 1990, the majority (53%) of all intakes were sentenced from 0-12 months decreasing to 38% in 1995.

This was also true for those sentenced for violent crimes (55% in 1990) which decreased to 43% in 1995.

. For those sentenced for drug crimes, the largest

proportion of intakes received sentences of 13-24 months for both 1990 (40%) and 1995 (59%).

In 1995, the majority of all intakes (60%) and for those convicted for violent crimes (57%) were ordered to pay probation fees compared to only 50% of those convicted of drug crimes.

In 1995, only 17% of all intakes, 4% of those convicted for drug crimes, and 18% of those convicted for violent crimes were ordered to pay restitution.

Less than 2% of all three groups were ordered to electronic monitoring.

The percentage of intakes court-ordered to some form of treatment differed by group and intake year. Note that almost all of the intakes were ordered into some form of treatment but this was significantly lower in 1995.

	<u>1990</u>	<u>1995</u>
For All Intakes:	90%	46%
For Drug Crimes:	91%	32%
For Violent Crimes:	91%	49%

Less than 10% of intakes in all three groups were ordered for further evaluation or treatment at probation officer discretion in both 1990 and 1995.

The rate of probation officers' perceptions of drug/alcohol treatment need was higher than that which was ordered by the judiciary for all intakes for both 1990 (26% court-ordered/38% perceived by the probation officer in need of treatment) and 1995 (39% court-ordered/50% perceived by the probation officer in need of treatment).

This was also true of those convicted of drug crimes in 1990 (13% court-ordered/27% perceived by the probation officer in need of treatment) and in 1995 (32% court-ordered/49% perceived by the probation officer in need of treatment). Not, however, that despite being sentenced for a drug-related crime, few intakes (only 13%) were ordered into substance abuse treatment in 1990.

The probation officers' perception of drug/alcohol treatment need was also higher than that which was ordered by the judiciary for those convicted of violent crimes in 1990 (14% court-ordered/26% perceived by the probation officer in need of treatment).

In 1990, there was a great discrepancy between court-ordered and probation officers' perceived treatment need for all intakes with regard to mental illness

treatment (65% court-ordered/20% perceived by the probation officer in need of treatment). This was also true for drug crime intakes in which the probation officers' perception of treatment need (31%) was much lower than ordered by the judiciary (78%). The discrepancy was even greater for those convicted of violent crimes in which mental illness treatment was court-ordered in 78% of the cases but in only 24% of the cases did the probation officer perceive a need for such treatment.

In contrast, in 1995 probation officers' perceptions and court-ordered treatment need matched within 1 percentage point as for all groups as both the court-ordered treatment and probation officers' perception of treatment need were less than 7%.

Sexual offending treatment need also differed greatly between probation officers' perception of treatment need and that which was ordered by the judiciary in 1990. For all three groups there were no cases which ordered by the judiciary for sexual offending treatment. However, this percentage increased to 42% of all intakes and those convicted of drug crimes, and to 50% of those convicted of violent crimes. In contrast, in 1995 less than 2% of all intakes or those

convicted for drug crimes were either court-ordered into sexual offending treatment or the probation officer perceived a need for such treatment. For those convicted of violent crimes in 1995, 7% were judiciary ordered and 10% the probation officer perceived a need for sexual offending treatment.

Table 1A

Ages of Adult Probation Intakes

Valid Age	1990 Frequency	1990 Valid % <sup>a</sup>	1995 Frequency	1995 % <sup>a</sup>
16-below	3,833	47	15	.4
17-20	897	11	854	22
21-25	916	11	739	19
26-30	892	11	636	16
31-above	1,557	19	1,694	43
Missing	10	--	1	--
Totals:	8,105	--	3,939	--

<sup>a</sup>Due to rounding error, the percentages do not always sum to 100.



Table 1B

Ages of Adult Probation Intakes Sentenced for Drug Crimes

Valid Age	1990 Frequency	1990 Valid % <sup>a</sup>	1995 Frequency	1995 % <sup>a</sup>
16-below	910	49	1	.1
17-20	222	12	222	24
21-25	214	12	208	22
26-30	208	11	137	15
31-above	301	16	360	39
Missing	6	--	1	--
Totals	1,861	--	929	--

<sup>a</sup>Due to rounding error, the percentages do not always sum to 100.

Table 1C

Ages of Adult Probation Intakes Sentenced for Violent Crimes

Valid Age	1990 Frequency	1990 Valid % <sup>a</sup>	1995 Frequency	1995 % <sup>a</sup>
16-below	555	46	2	.3
17-20	137	11	137	22
21-25	146	12	115	19
26-30	121	10	110	18
31-above	238	20	259	42
Missing	0	--	0	--
Totals	1,197	--	623	--

<sup>a</sup>Due to rounding error, the percentages do not always sum to 100.

Table 2A

Race of Adult Probation Intakes

Valid Category	1990 Frequency	1990 Valid % <sup>a</sup>	1995 Frequency	1995 % <sup>a</sup>
American Indian	24	.3	6	.2
Asian	47	.6	43	1
African American	2,896	36	1,279	33
Hispanic	641	8	397	10
White	4,423	55	2,191	56
Other	38	.5	18	.5
Missing	36	--	5	--
Totals	8,105	--	3,939	--

<sup>a</sup>Due to rounding error, the percentages do not always sum to 100.

Table 2B

Race of Adult Probation Intakes Sentenced for Drug Crimes

Valid Category	1990	1990 Valid	1995	1995
	Frequency	% <sup>a</sup>	Frequency	% <sup>a</sup>
American Indian	3	.2	3	.3
Asian	5	.3	7	.8
African American	1,065	58	537	58
Hispanic	169	9	60	7
White	607	33	318	34
Other	3	.2	2	.2
Missing	9	--	2	--
Totals	1,861	--	929	--

<sup>a</sup>Due to rounding error, the percentages do not always sum to 100.

Table 2C

Race of Adult Probation Intakes Sentenced for Violent Crimes

Valid Category	1990 Frequency	1990 Valid % <sup>a</sup>	1995 Frequency	1995 % <sup>a</sup>
American Indian	5	.4	1	.2
Asian	12	1	12	2
African American	449	38	191	31
Hispanic	89	8	73	12
White	631	53	337	54
Other	6	.5	8	1
Missing	5	--	1	--
Totals	1,197	--	623	--

<sup>a</sup>Due to rounding error, the percentages do not always sum to 100.

Table 3A

Gender of Adult Probation Intakes

Valid Category	1990	1990 Valid	1995	1995
	Frequency	% <sup>a</sup>	Frequency	% <sup>a</sup>
Male	6,819	84	3,163	81
Female	1,277	16	759	19
Missing	9	--	17	--
Totals	8,105	--	3,939	--

<sup>a</sup>Due to rounding error, the percentages do not always sum to 100.

Table 3B

Gender of Adult Probation Intakes Sentenced for Drug Crimes

Valid Category	1990	1990 Valid	1995	1995
	Frequency	% <sup>a</sup>	Frequency	% <sup>a</sup>
Male	1,514	82	712	77
Female	343	19	215	23
Missing	4	--	2	--
Totals	1,861	--	929	--

<sup>a</sup>Due to rounding error, the percentages do not always sum to 100.

Table 3C

Gender of Adult Probation Intakes Sentenced for Violent Crimes

Valid Category	1990	1990 Valid	1995	1995
	Frequency	% <sup>a</sup>	Frequency	% <sup>a</sup>
Male	1,067	89	527	86
Female	128	11	87	14
Missing	2	--	9	--
Totals	1,197	--	623	--

<sup>a</sup>Due to rounding error, the percentages do not always sum to 100.



Table 4A

Family Income Level of Adult Probation Intakes

Valid Income Range	1990 Frequency <sup>a</sup>	1990 Valid % <sup>a</sup>	1995 Frequency	1995 % <sup>b</sup>
0-10,000	--	--	2,034	52
10,001-20,000	--	--	1,045	27
20,001-30,000	--	--	414	11
30,001-40,000	--	--	150	4
40,001-50,000	--	--	52	1
50,001-60,000	--	--	34	.9
60,001-70,000	--	--	13	.3
70,001-80,000	--	--	7	.2
80,001-above	--	--	143	8
Missing	--	--	47	--
Totals	--	--	3,939	--

<sup>a</sup>Data not available.

<sup>b</sup>Due to rounding error, the percentages do not always sum to 100.

Table 4B

Family Income Level of Adult Probation Intakes Sentenced for Drug Crimes

Valid Income Range	1990 Frequency <sup>a</sup>	1990 Valid % <sup>a</sup>	1995 Frequency	1995 % <sup>b</sup>
0-10,000	--	--	548	60
10,001-20,000	--	--	220	24
20,001-30,000	--	--	73	8
30,001-40,000	--	--	14	6
40,001-50,000	--	--	4	.4
50,001-60,000	--	--	5	.5
60,001-70,000	--	--	1	.1
70,001-80,000	--	--	0	.0
80,001-above	--	--	54	6
Missing	--	--	10	--
Totals	--	--	929	--

<sup>a</sup>Data not available.

<sup>b</sup>Due to rounding error, the percentages do not always sum to 100.

Table 4C

Family Income Level of Adult Probation Intakes Sentenced for Violent Crimes

Valid Income Range	1990 Frequency <sup>a</sup>	1990 Valid % <sup>a</sup>	1995 Frequency	1995 % <sup>b</sup>
0-10,000	--	--	322	53
10,001-20,000	--	--	168	28
20,001-30,000	--	--	51	8
30,001-40,000	--	--	27	4
40,001-50,000	--	--	14	2
50,001-60,000	--	--	5	.8
60,001-70,000	--	--	1	.2
70,001-80,000	--	--	1	.2
80,001-above	--	--	21	3
Missing	--	--	13	--
Totals	--	--	623	--

<sup>a</sup>Data not available.

<sup>b</sup>Due to rounding error, the percentages do not always sum to 100.

Table 5A

Public Assistance of Adult Probation Intakes

Valid Response	1990	1990 Valid	1995	1995
	Frequency	% <sup>a</sup>	Frequency	% <sup>a</sup>
Yes	1,063	13	724	19
No	6,986	87	3,106	81
Missing	56	--	109	--
Totals	8,105	--	3,939	--

<sup>a</sup>Due to rounding error, the percentages do not always sum to 100.

Table 5B

Public Assistance of Adult Probation Intakes Sentenced for Drug Crimes

Valid Category	1990 Frequency	1990 Valid % <sup>a</sup>	1995 Frequency	1995 % <sup>a</sup>
Yes	391	21	225	25
No	1,443	79	668	75
Missing	27	--	36	--
Totals	1,861	--	929	--

<sup>a</sup>Due to rounding error, the percentages do not always sum to 100.

Table 5C

Public Assistance of Adult Probation Intakes Sentenced for Violent Crimes

Valid Response	1990 Frequency	1990 Valid % <sup>a</sup>	1995 Frequency	1995 % <sup>a</sup>
Yes	159	13	121	20
No	1,032	87	489	80
Missing	6	--	13	--
Totals	1,197	--	623	--

<sup>a</sup>Due to rounding error, the percentages do not always sum to 100.

Table 6A

Employment Status of Adult Probation Intakes

Valid Description	1990 Frequency	1990 Valid % <sup>a</sup>	1995 Frequency	1995 % <sup>a</sup>
Employed >25 Hours/Week	3,662	45	1,917	49
Employed <25 Hours/Week	690	9	341	9
Not in Labor Force	643	8	327	8
Unemployed	3,071	38	1,341	34
Missing	39	--	13	--
Totals	8,105	--	3,939	--

<sup>a</sup>Due to rounding error, the percentages do not always sum to 100.

Table 6B

Employment Status of Adult Probation Intakes Sentenced for Drug Crimes

Valid Description	1990 Frequency	1990 Valid % <sup>a</sup>	1995 Frequency	1995 % <sup>a</sup>
Employed >25 Hours/Week	685	37	343	37
Employed <25 Hours/Week	178	10	91	10
Not in Labor Force	114	6	63	7
Unemployed	874	47	430	46
Missing	10	--	2	--
Totals	1,861	--	929	--

<sup>a</sup>Due to rounding error, the percentages do not always sum to 100.



Table 6C

Employment status of Adult Probation Intakes Sentenced for  
Violent Crimes

Valid Description	1990	1990 Valid	1995	1995
	Frequency	% <sup>a</sup>	Frequency	% <sup>a</sup>
Employed >25 Hours/Week	525	44	297	48
Employed <25 Hours/Week	97	8	47	8
Not in Labor Force	112	9	59	10
Unemployed	458	38	217	35
Missing	5	--	3	--
Totals	1,197	--	623	--

<sup>a</sup>Due to rounding error, the percentages do not always sum to 100.

Table 7A

Educational Achievement of Adult Probation Intakes

Level of Valid Achievement	1990 Frequency	1990 Valid % <sup>a</sup>	1995 Frequency	1995 % <sup>a</sup>
Grades 0-12	7,286	91	2,941	76
GED	487	6	309	8
Some College	131	7	366	10
Associate Degree	21	.3	53	1
Bachelor Degree	97	1	140	4
M.A. or M.S.	0	0	20	.5
Ph.D. or M.D.	0	0	5	.1
Trade School	0	0	23	.6
Missing	83	--	82	--
Totals	8,105	--	3,939	--

<sup>a</sup>Due to rounding error, the percentages do not always sum to 100.

Table 7B

Educational Achievement of Adult Probation Intakes Sentenced for Drug Crimes

Level of Valid Achievement	1990 Frequency	1990 Valid % <sup>a</sup>	1995 Frequency	1995 % <sup>a</sup>
Grades 0-12	1,675	92	707	80
GED	91	5	78	9
Some College	24	1	62	7
Associate Degree	9	.5	10	1
Bachelor Degree	15	.8	21	2
M.A. or M.S.	0	0	1	.1
Ph.D. or M.D.	0	0	0	0
Trade School	0	0	4	.5
Missing	47	--	46	--
Totals	1,861	--	929	--

<sup>a</sup>Due to rounding error, the percentages do not always sum to 100.

Table 7C

Educational Achievement of Adult Probation Intakes Sentenced for Violent Crimes

Level of Valid Achievement	1990 Frequency	1990 Valid % <sup>a</sup>	1995 Frequency	1995 % <sup>a</sup>
Grades 0-12	1,106	93	501	82
GED	53	5	43	7
Some College	19	2	42	7
Associate Degree	2	.2	4	.7
Bachelor Degree	10	.8	16	3
M.A. or M.S.	0	0	3	.5
Ph.D or M.D.	0	0	2	.3
Trade School	0	0	2	.3
Missing	7	--	10	--
Totals	1,197	--	623	--

<sup>a</sup>Due to rounding error, the percentages do not always sum to 100.

Table 8A

Age at First Arrest of Adult Probation Intakes

Valid Age Groups	1990 Frequency <sup>a</sup>	1990 Valid % <sup>a</sup>	1995 Frequency	1995 % <sup>b</sup>
0-9	--	--	12	.4
10-19	--	--	1,645	43
20-29	--	--	1,326	35
30-39	--	--	559	15
40-	--	--	294	8
Missing	--	--	103	--
Totals	--	--	3,939	--

<sup>a</sup>Data not available.

<sup>b</sup>Due to rounding error, the percentages do not always sum to 100.

Table 8B

Age at First Arrest of Adult Probation Intakes Sentenced for Drug Crimes

Valid Age Groups	1990 Frequency <sup>a</sup>	1990 Valid % <sup>a</sup>	1995 Frequency	1995 % <sup>b</sup>
0-9	--	--	3	.3
10-19	--	--	435	48
20-29	--	--	332	37
30-39	--	--	107	12
40-	--	--	32	3
Missing	--	--	20	--
Totals	--	--	929	--

<sup>a</sup>Data not available.

<sup>b</sup>Due to rounding error, the percentages do not always sum to 100.

Table 8C

Age at First Arrest of Adult Probation Intakes Sentenced for  
Violent Crimes

Valid Age Groups	1990 Frequency <sup>a</sup>	1990 Valid % <sup>a</sup>	1995 Frequency	1995 % <sup>b</sup>
0-9	--	--	6	1
10-19	--	--	256	42
20-29	--	--	201	33
30-39	--	--	92	15
40-	--	--	52	9
Missing	--	--	16	--
Totals	--	--	623	--

<sup>a</sup>Data not available.

<sup>b</sup>Due to rounding error, the percentages do not always sum to 100.

Table 9A

Presentence Investigations of Adult Probation Intakes

Valid Reported	1990 Frequency <sup>a</sup>	1990 Valid % <sup>a</sup>	1995 Frequency	1995 % <sup>b</sup>
Performed	1,088	13	391	11
Not Performed	7,015	87	3,320	90
Missing	2	--	228	--
Totals	8,105	--	3,939	--

<sup>a</sup>Data not available.

<sup>b</sup>Due to rounding error, the percentages do not always sum to 100.



Table 9B

Presentence Investigations of Adult Probation Intakes Sentenced for Drug Crimes

Valid Reported	1990 Frequency <sup>a</sup>	1990 Valid % <sup>a</sup>	1995 Frequency	1995 % <sup>b</sup>
Performed	298	16	94	11
Not Performed	1,562	84	764	89
Missing	1	--	71	--
Totals	1,861	--	929	--

<sup>a</sup>Data not available.

<sup>b</sup>Due to rounding error, the percentages do not always sum to 100.

Table 9C

Presentence Investigations of Adult Probation Intakes Sentenced  
for Violent Crimes

Valid Reported	1990	1990	1995	1995
	Frequency <sup>a</sup>	Valid % <sup>a</sup>	Frequency	% <sup>b</sup>
Performed	191	16	77	13
Not Performed	1,005	84	502	87
Missing	1	--	44	--
Totals	1,197	--	623	--

<sup>a</sup>Data not available.

<sup>b</sup>Due to rounding error, the percentages do not always sum to 100.

Table 10A

Previous CJS Involvement of Probation Intakes in 1990

Description of Previous Involvements	Number of Previous Involvements		
	0	1	2 or More
Previous Arrests (N = 8,091) (Missing = 14)	2,787 35%	1,721 21%	3,583 44%
Previous Probation (N = 8,079) (Missing = 26)	5,637 70%	1,680 21%	762 9%
Previous Prison (N = 8,091) (Missing = 14)	7,545 93%	383 5%	163 2%

Table 10B

Previous CJS Involvement of Adult Probation Intakes Sentenced  
for Drug Crimes in 1990

Description of Previous Involvements	Number of Previous Involvements		
	0	1	2 or More
Previous Arrests (N = 1,857) (Missing = 4)	816 44%	321 17%	720 39%
Previous Probation (N = 1,853) (Missing = 8)	1,395 75%	353 19%	105 6%
Previous Prison (N = 1,858) (Missing = 3)	1,734 93%	111 6%	13 .7%

Table 10C

Previous CJS Involvement of Adult Probation Intakes Sentenced  
for Violent Crimes in 1990

Description of	Number of Previous Involvements		
	0	1	2 or More
Previous Involvements			
Previous Arrests (N = 1,196) (Missing = 1)	424 36%	238 20%	534 45%
Previous Probation (N = 1,193) (Missing = 4)	829 70%	242 20%	122 10%
Previous Prison (N = 1,196) (Missing = 1)	1,101 92%	62 5%	33 3%

Table 11A

Previous CJS Involvement of Adult Probation Intakes in 1995

Description of Previous Involvements	Number of Previous Involvements		
	0	1	2 or More
Previous Arrests (N = 3,890) (Missing = 49)	1,083 28%	727 19%	2,080 54%
Previous Probation (N = 3,906) (Missing = 33)	2,553 65%	874 22%	479 12%
Previous Prison (N = 3,897) (Missing = 42)	3,524 90%	262 7%	111 3%

Table 11B

Previous CJS Involvement of Adult Probation Intakes Sentenced for Drug Crimes in 1995

Description of Previous Involvements	Number of Previous Involvements		
	0	1	2 or More
Previous Arrests (N = 911) (Missing = 18)	215 24%	145 16%	511 61%
Previous Probation (N = 916) (Missing = 13)	624 68%	202 22%	90 10%
Previous Prison (N = 917) (Missing = 12)	824 90%	72 8%	21 2%

Table 11C

Previous CJS Involvement of Adult Probation Intakes Sentenced  
for Violent Crimes in 1995

Description of Previous Involvements	Number of Previous Involvements		
	0	1	2 or More
Previous Arrests (N = 614) (Missing = 9)	214 35%	90 15%	310 50%
Previous Probation (N = 618) (Missing = 5)	415 67%	117 19%	86 14%
Previous Prison (N = 617) (Missing = 6)	539 87%	52 8%	26 4%



Table 12A

Petition Type for Adult Probation Intakes

Valid Petition Type	1990 Frequency	1990 Valid % <sup>a</sup>	1995 Frequency	1995 % <sup>a</sup>
Felony	3,877	48	1,915	49
Misdemeanor	2,230	28	1,156	30
Traffic	1,991	25	836	21
Missing	7	--	32	--
Totals	8,105	--	3,939	--

<sup>a</sup>Due to rounding error, the percentages do not always sum to 100.

Table 12B

Petition Type for Adult Probation Intakes Sentenced for Drug Crimes

Valid Petition Type	1990 Frequency	1990 Valid % <sup>a</sup>	1995 Frequency	1995 % <sup>a</sup>
Felony	1,613	87	805	87
Misdemeanor	243	13	121	13
Traffic	5	.3	1	.1
Missing	0	--	2	--
Totals	1,861	--	929	--

<sup>a</sup>Due to rounding error, the percentages do not always sum to 100.

Table 12C

Petition Type for Adult Probation Intakes Sentenced for Violent Crimes

Valid Petition Type	1990 Frequency	1990 Valid % <sup>a</sup>	1995 Frequency	1995 % <sup>a</sup>
Felony	569	48	264	43
Misdemeanor	621	52	344	56
Traffic	5	.4	6	1
Missing	2	--	9	--
Totals	1,197	--	623	--

<sup>a</sup>Due to rounding error, the percentages do not always sum to 100.

Table 13

Offense Type for Adult Probation Intakes

Offense Type	1990 Frequency	1990 Valid % <sup>a</sup>	1995 Frequency	1995 Valid % <sup>a</sup>
1. Sexual Offense	148	2	83	2
2. Robbery	154	2	54	1
3. Aggravated Assault	303	4	0	0
4. Assault/Battery	0	0	407	11
5. Other Violent Offenses	592	7	79	2
6. Burglary	535	7	190	5
7. Theft/Larceny	1,020	13	430	11
8. Motor Vehicle Theft	184	2	65	2
9. Arson	18	.2	10	.3
10. Other Property Offense	300	4	109	3
11. Any Drug Possession	1,313	16	745	19
12. Any Drug Sale Offense	548	7	184	5
13. Any Prostitution Offense	25	.3	11	.3
14. DUI: Drugs or Alcohol	1,633	20	885	23
15. Other Traffic Offense	613	8	174	5
16. Violation Order of Protection	0	.0	20	.5

Table 13.--(Continued)

Valid Offense Type	1990 Frequency	1990 Valid % <sup>a</sup>	1995 Frequency	1995 % <sup>a</sup>
17. Other Offenses	712	9	392	10
Missing	7	--	101	--
Totals	8,105	--	3,939	--

<sup>a</sup>Due to rounding error, the percentages do not always sum to 100.

Table 14A

Victims of Adult Probation Intakes

Valid Victim	1990 Frequency <sup>a</sup>	1990 Valid % <sup>a</sup>	1995 Frequency	1995 % <sup>b</sup>
Family or Household Member	--	--	324	8
Acquaintance or Friend	--	--	354	9
Stranger	--	--	911	24
Victimless Offense	--	--	2,269	59
Missing	--	--	81	--
Totals	--	--	3,939	--

<sup>a</sup>Data not available.

<sup>b</sup>Due to rounding error, the percentages do not always sum to 100.

Table 14B

Victims of Adult Probation Intakes Sentenced for Drug Crimes

Valid Victim	1990 Frequency <sup>a</sup>	1990 Valid % <sup>a</sup>	1995 Frequency	1995 % <sup>b</sup>
Family or Household Member	--	--	10	1
Acquaintance or Friend	--	--	4	.4
Stranger	--	--	56	6
Victimless Offense	--	--	834	92
Missing	--	--	25	--
Totals	--	--	929	--

<sup>a</sup>Data not available.

<sup>b</sup>Due to rounding error, the percentages do not always sum to 100.

Table 14C

Victims of Adult Probation Intakes Sentenced for Violent Crimes

Valid Victim	1990 Frequency <sup>a</sup>	1990 Valid % <sup>a</sup>	1995 Frequency	1995 % <sup>b</sup>
Family or Household Member	--	--	232	38
Acquaintance or Friend	--	--	161	26
Stranger	--	--	192	31
Victimless Offense	--	--	31	5
Missing	--	--	7	--
Totals	--	--	623	--

<sup>a</sup>Data not available.

<sup>b</sup>Due to rounding error, the percentages do not always sum to 100.



Table 15A

Months of Sentence for Adult Probation Intakes

Valid Number of Months	1990	1990 Valid	1995	1995
	Frequency	% <sup>a</sup>	Frequency	% <sup>a</sup>
0-12	4,294	53	1,496	38
13-24	2,234	28	1,811	46
25-36	1,174	14	477	12
37-	403	5	155	4
Missing	0	--	0	--
Totals	8,105	--	3,939	--

<sup>a</sup>Due to rounding error, the percentages do not always sum to 100.

Table 15B

Months of Sentence for Adult Probation Intakes Sentenced for Drug Crimes

Valid Number of Months	1990	1990	1995	1995
	Frequency	Valid % <sup>a</sup>	Frequency	% <sup>a</sup>
0-12	529	29	213	23
13-24	750	40	546	59
25-36	44	24	137	15
37-	138	8	33	4
Missing	0	--	0	--
Totals	1,861	--	929	--

<sup>a</sup>Due to rounding error, the percentages do not always sum to 100.

Table 15C

Months of Sentence for Adult Probation Intakes Sentenced for Violent Crimes

Valid Number of Months	1990 Frequency	1990 Valid % <sup>a</sup>	1995 Frequency	1995 % <sup>a</sup>
0-12	650	55	269	43
13-24	255	21	213	34
25-36	192	16	92	15
37-	100	9	49	8
Missing	0	--	0	--
Totals	1,197	--	623	--

<sup>a</sup>Due to rounding error, the percentages do not always sum to 100.

Table 16A

Orders to Pay Probation Fees and Restitution, Community Service, and Electronic Monitoring for Adult Probation Intakes in 1995<sup>a</sup>

Orders	Yes		No		Totals
	Frequency	Valid % <sup>b</sup>	Frequency	Valid % <sup>b</sup>	
Pay Probation Fees	2,345	60	1,566	40	N = 3,911 Missing = 28
Pay Restitution	663	17	3,233	83	N = 3,896 Missing = 43
Community Service	873	22	3,023	78	N = 3,896 Missing = 43
Electronic Monitoring	59	2	3,831	99	N = 3,890 Missing = 49

<sup>a</sup>Data not available for 1990 intakes.

<sup>b</sup>Due to rounding error, the percentages do not always sum to 100.

Table 16B

Orders to Pay Probation Fees and Restitution, Community Service, and electronic Monitoring for Adult Probation Intakes Sentenced for Drug Crimes in 1995<sup>a</sup>

Orders	Yes		No		Totals
	Frequency	Valid % <sup>b</sup>	Frequency	Valid % <sup>b</sup>	
Pay Probation Fees	456	50	463	50	N = 919 Missing = 10
Pay Restitution	39	4	869	96	N = 908 Missing = 21
Community Service	219	24	694	76	N = 913 Missing = 16
Electronic Monitoring	8	.9	904	99	N = 912 Missing = 17

<sup>a</sup>Data not available for 1990 intakes.

<sup>b</sup>Due to rounding error, the percentages do not always sum to 100.

Table 16C

Orders to Pay Probation Fees and Restitution, Community Service, and Electronic Monitoring for Adult Probation Intakes Sentenced for Violent Crimes in 1995<sup>a</sup>

Orders	Yes		No		Totals
	Frequency	Valid % <sup>b</sup>	Frequency	Valid % <sup>b</sup>	
Pay Probation Fees	351	57	267	43	N = 618 Missing = 5
Pay Restitution	109	18	510	82	N = 619 Missing = 4
Community Service	132	21	484	79	N = 616 Missing = 7
Electronic Monitoring	7	1	608	99	N = 615 Missing = 8

<sup>a</sup>Data not available for 1990 intakes.

<sup>b</sup>Due to rounding error, the percentages do not always sum to 100.

Table 17A

Comparison of Judicial Recommendation for Treatment and  
Probation Officer Perception of Need for Treatment of Adult  
Probation Intakes in 1990

Categories of Treatment Ordered	Court-Ordered Treatment		Probation Officer Perception of Need for Treatment	
	Frequency	Valid % <sup>a</sup>	Frequency	Valid % <sup>a</sup>
Drug Abuse	295	4	524	7
Alcohol Abuse	1,300	16	1,702	21
Drug & Alcohol	489	6	854	11
Eval./PO Discret.	731	9	N/A	N/A
Mental Illness	5,244	65	1,593	20
Sexual Offending	0	0	3,369	42
Family Violence	0	0	0	0
Not Ordered/ Determined	0	0	0	0
Missing	46	--	63	--
Totals	8,105	--	8,105	--

<sup>a</sup>Due to rounding error, the percentages do not always sum to 100.

Table 17B

Comparison of Judicial Recommendation for Treatment and  
 Probation Officer Perception of Need for Treatment of Adult  
 Probation Intakes Sentenced for Drug Crimes in 1990

Categories of Treatment Ordered	Court-Ordered Treatment		Probation Officer Perception of Need for Treatment	
	Frequency	Valid % <sup>a</sup>	Frequency	Valid % <sup>a</sup>
Drug Abuse	139	8	300	16
Alcohol Abuse	18	1	36	2
Drug & Alcohol	84	5	165	9
Eval./PO Discret.	170	9	N/A	N/A
Mental Illness	1,434	78	567	31
Sexual Offending	0	0	766	42
Family Violence	0	0	0	0
Not Ordered/ Determined	0	0	0	0
Missing	16	--	27	--
Totals	1,861	--	1,861	--

<sup>a</sup>Due to rounding error, the percentages do not always sum to 100.



Table 17C

Comparison of Judicial Recommendation for Treatment and  
Probation Officer Perception of Need for Treatment of Adult  
Probation Intakes Sentenced for Violent Crimes in 1990

Categories of Treatment Ordered	Court-Ordered Treatment		Probation Officer Perception of Need for Treatment	
	Frequency	Valid % <sup>a</sup>	Frequency	Valid % <sup>a</sup>
—				
Drug Abuse	30	3	34	3
Alcohol Abuse	73	6	155	13
Drug & Alcohol	59	5	123	10
Eval./PO Discret.	105	9	N/A	N/A
Mental Illness	923	78	286	24
Sexual Offending	0	0	594	50
Family Violence	0	0	0	0
Not Ordered/ Determined	0	0	0	0
Missing	7	--	5	--
Totals	1,197	--	1,197	--

<sup>a</sup>Due to rounding error, the percentages do not always sum to 100.

Table 18A

Comparison of Judicial Recommendation for Treatment and Probation Officer Perception of Need for Treatment of Adult Probation Intakes in 1995

Categories of Treatment Ordered	Court-Ordered Treatment		Probation Officer Perception of Need for Treatment	
	Frequency	Valid % <sup>a</sup>	Frequency	Valid % <sup>a</sup>
Drug Abuse	246	6	356	9
Alcohol Abuse	851	22	1,022	27
Drug & Alcohol	427	11	554	14
Eval./PO Discret.	288	7	N/A	N/A
Mental Illness	83	2	119	3
Sexual Offending	45	1	70	1
Family Violence	132	3	154	4
Not Ordered/ Determined <sup>b</sup>	1,826	47	1,567	41
Missing	41	--	97	--
Totals	3,939	--	3,939	--

<sup>a</sup>Due to rounding error, the percentages do not always sum to 100.

<sup>b</sup>In this category of the table, the number 1,826 represents those for whom judiciary did not order treatment, while the number 1,567 represents those whom probation officers indicated the need was "Not determined at this time."

Table 18B

Comparison of Judicial Recommendation for Treatment and Probation Officer Perception of Need for Treatment of Adult Probation Intakes Sentenced for Drug Crimes in 1995

Categories of Treatment Ordered	Court-Ordered Treatment		Probation Officer Perception of Need for Treatment	
	Frequency	Valid % <sup>a</sup>	Frequency	Valid % <sup>a</sup>
Drug Abuse	142	16	232	25
Alcohol Abuse	8	.9	26	3
Drug & Alcohol	141	15	188	21
Eval./PO Discret.	84	9	N/A	N/A
Mental Illness	1	.1	9	1
Sexual Offending	0	0	1	.1
Family Violence	4	.4	0	0
Not Ordered/ Determined <sup>b</sup>	539	59	457	50
Missing	10	--	16	--
Totals	929	--	929	--

<sup>a</sup>Due to rounding error, the percentages do not always sum to 100.

<sup>b</sup>In this category of the table, the number 539 represents those for whom judiciary did not order treatment, while the number 457 represents those whom probation officers indicated

the need was "Not determined at this time."

Table 19

Continuation of Report of the Committee on the Progress of the Project for the Period from 1/1/52 to 12/31/52

Item	Quantity	Unit Price	Total	Description
1	10	1.00	10.00	General Supplies
2	5	2.00	10.00	Special Supplies
3	10	1.00	10.00	Travel Expenses
4	10	1.00	10.00	Printing Expenses
5	10	1.00	10.00	Postage Expenses
6	10	1.00	10.00	Telephone Expenses
7	10	1.00	10.00	Miscellaneous Expenses
8	10	1.00	10.00	Travel Expenses
9	10	1.00	10.00	Printing Expenses
10	10	1.00	10.00	Postage Expenses
11	10	1.00	10.00	Telephone Expenses
12	10	1.00	10.00	Miscellaneous Expenses
13	10	1.00	10.00	Travel Expenses
14	10	1.00	10.00	Printing Expenses
15	10	1.00	10.00	Postage Expenses
16	10	1.00	10.00	Telephone Expenses
17	10	1.00	10.00	Miscellaneous Expenses
18	10	1.00	10.00	Travel Expenses
19	10	1.00	10.00	Printing Expenses
20	10	1.00	10.00	Postage Expenses
21	10	1.00	10.00	Telephone Expenses
22	10	1.00	10.00	Miscellaneous Expenses
23	10	1.00	10.00	Travel Expenses
24	10	1.00	10.00	Printing Expenses
25	10	1.00	10.00	Postage Expenses
26	10	1.00	10.00	Telephone Expenses
27	10	1.00	10.00	Miscellaneous Expenses
28	10	1.00	10.00	Travel Expenses
29	10	1.00	10.00	Printing Expenses
30	10	1.00	10.00	Postage Expenses
31	10	1.00	10.00	Telephone Expenses
32	10	1.00	10.00	Miscellaneous Expenses
33	10	1.00	10.00	Travel Expenses
34	10	1.00	10.00	Printing Expenses
35	10	1.00	10.00	Postage Expenses
36	10	1.00	10.00	Telephone Expenses
37	10	1.00	10.00	Miscellaneous Expenses
38	10	1.00	10.00	Travel Expenses
39	10	1.00	10.00	Printing Expenses
40	10	1.00	10.00	Postage Expenses
41	10	1.00	10.00	Telephone Expenses
42	10	1.00	10.00	Miscellaneous Expenses
43	10	1.00	10.00	Travel Expenses
44	10	1.00	10.00	Printing Expenses
45	10	1.00	10.00	Postage Expenses
46	10	1.00	10.00	Telephone Expenses
47	10	1.00	10.00	Miscellaneous Expenses
48	10	1.00	10.00	Travel Expenses
49	10	1.00	10.00	Printing Expenses
50	10	1.00	10.00	Postage Expenses
51	10	1.00	10.00	Telephone Expenses
52	10	1.00	10.00	Miscellaneous Expenses
53	10	1.00	10.00	Travel Expenses
54	10	1.00	10.00	Printing Expenses
55	10	1.00	10.00	Postage Expenses
56	10	1.00	10.00	Telephone Expenses
57	10	1.00	10.00	Miscellaneous Expenses
58	10	1.00	10.00	Travel Expenses
59	10	1.00	10.00	Printing Expenses
60	10	1.00	10.00	Postage Expenses
61	10	1.00	10.00	Telephone Expenses
62	10	1.00	10.00	Miscellaneous Expenses
63	10	1.00	10.00	Travel Expenses
64	10	1.00	10.00	Printing Expenses
65	10	1.00	10.00	Postage Expenses
66	10	1.00	10.00	Telephone Expenses
67	10	1.00	10.00	Miscellaneous Expenses
68	10	1.00	10.00	Travel Expenses
69	10	1.00	10.00	Printing Expenses
70	10	1.00	10.00	Postage Expenses
71	10	1.00	10.00	Telephone Expenses
72	10	1.00	10.00	Miscellaneous Expenses
73	10	1.00	10.00	Travel Expenses
74	10	1.00	10.00	Printing Expenses
75	10	1.00	10.00	Postage Expenses
76	10	1.00	10.00	Telephone Expenses
77	10	1.00	10.00	Miscellaneous Expenses
78	10	1.00	10.00	Travel Expenses
79	10	1.00	10.00	Printing Expenses
80	10	1.00	10.00	Postage Expenses
81	10	1.00	10.00	Telephone Expenses
82	10	1.00	10.00	Miscellaneous Expenses
83	10	1.00	10.00	Travel Expenses
84	10	1.00	10.00	Printing Expenses
85	10	1.00	10.00	Postage Expenses
86	10	1.00	10.00	Telephone Expenses
87	10	1.00	10.00	Miscellaneous Expenses
88	10	1.00	10.00	Travel Expenses
89	10	1.00	10.00	Printing Expenses
90	10	1.00	10.00	Postage Expenses
91	10	1.00	10.00	Telephone Expenses
92	10	1.00	10.00	Miscellaneous Expenses
93	10	1.00	10.00	Travel Expenses
94	10	1.00	10.00	Printing Expenses
95	10	1.00	10.00	Postage Expenses
96	10	1.00	10.00	Telephone Expenses
97	10	1.00	10.00	Miscellaneous Expenses
98	10	1.00	10.00	Travel Expenses
99	10	1.00	10.00	Printing Expenses
100	10	1.00	10.00	Postage Expenses

Table 18C

Comparison of Judicial Recommendation for Treatment and Probation Officer Perception of Need for Treatment of Adult Probation Intakes Sentenced for Violent Crimes in 1995

Categories of Treatment Ordered	Court-Ordered Treatment		Probation Officer Perception of Need for Treatment	
	Frequency	Valid % <sup>a</sup>	Frequency	Valid % <sup>a</sup>
Drug Abuse	17	3	17	3
Alcohol Abuse	45	7	78	13
Drug & Alcohol	48	8	65	11
Eval./PO Discret.	51	8	N/A	N/A
Mental Illness	37	6	37	6
Sexual Offending	43	7	59	10
Family Violence	113	18	133	22
Not Ordered/ Determined <sup>b</sup>	263	43	221	36
Missing	6	--	13	--
Totals	623	--	623	--

<sup>a</sup>Due to rounding error, the percentages do not always sum to 100.

<sup>b</sup>In this category of the table, the number 263 represents those for whom judiciary did not order treatment, while the number 221 represents those whom probation officers indicated the need was "Not determined at this time."

# Adult Probation Population Survey Key

(These variables should all be known at classification stage of probation)

1. Case Number: Sequential number of case in this survey. Each officer begins with 1 and numbers sequentially until the end of the survey period on both the survey instrument and the Risk and Needs Instruments, using the same number for both cases.

2. Age: Age at time of survey

3. Sex: 1 male  
2 female

4. Ethnicity: 1 American Indian  
2 Asian  
3 Black (non-hispanic)  
4 Hispanic  
5 White (non-hispanic)  
6 Other

5. PSI - Pre-sentence investigation: 1 performed  
2 not performed

6. Offense: Use the code representing the most serious offense on which the individual was convicted for the present term of probation.

- 01 sexual offense
- 02 robbery
- 03 assault/battery
- 04 other violent offenses
- 05 burglary
- 06 theft/larceny
- 07 motor vehicle theft
- 08 arson
- 09 other property offenses
- 10 any drug possession
- 11 any drug sale offense
- 12 any prostitution offense
- 13 driving under the influence of alcohol/drugs
- 14 other traffic offenses
- 15 violation of order of protection
- 16 other offenses

7. Victim: Use the code showing the relationship between the offender and the victim.

- 1 family or household member
- 2 acquaintance or friend
- 3 stranger
- 4 victimless offense

8. Offense type: 1 felony  
2 misdemeanor  
3 traffic

9. Months of sentence: enter the number \_\_\_ of months to which the individual was sentenced to probation.

10. Age at first arrest: enter the age \_\_\_ the offender was first arrested as adult or juvenile.

11. # Prev. Arrests: \_\_\_ enter the number of previous arrests.

12. # Prev. Probation: \_\_\_ enter the number of previous terms of probation to which the offender has been sentenced.

13. # Prev. Prison: \_\_\_ enter the number of previous terms of prison to which the offender has been sentenced.

14. Education:  
01 - 12 (highest year completed) 16 Bachelor degree  
13 GED 17 M.A. or M.S.  
14 Some college 18 Ph.D. or M.D.  
15 Associate degree 19 Trade school

15. Employment status:

- 1 employed full time (25 hours or more per week)
- 2 employed part time (less than 25 hours per week)
- 3 not in labor force but a full time student, homemaker, in treatment or disabled
- 4 unemployed

16. Does the offender and/or dependents receive any type of public assistance:  
Public Aid; Food Stamps/WIC; Aid to Dependent Children  
Public Housing; SSI or other form of public assistance  
1 yes  
2 no

17. Income Level:

- 1 \$0 - \$10,000
- 2 \$10,001 - \$20,000
- 3 \$20,001 - \$30,000
- 4 \$30,001 - \$40,000
- 5 \$40,001 - \$50,000
- 6 \$50,001 - \$60,000
- 7 \$60,001 - \$70,000
- 8 \$70,001 - \$80,000
- 9 \$80,001 and over

18. Court Ordered Treatment: record the nature of the court ordered treatment

- 1 treatment ordered for drug abuse
- 2 treatment ordered for alcohol abuse
- 3 treatment ordered for drug and alcohol abuse
- 4 evaluation ordered or treatment at probation officer discretion
- 5 treatment ordered for mental illness
- 6 treatment ordered for sexual offending
- 7 treatment ordered for family violence
- 8 no treatment ordered

19. Probation Off. pers. of treatment needed: please record the perception you (the probation officer) have of the offender's need for treatment

- 1 treatment needed for drug abuse
- 2 treatment needed for alcohol abuse
- 3 treatment needed for drug and alcohol abuse
- 4 need for treatment for mental illness
- 5 treatment needed for sexual offending
- 6 treatment needed for family violence
- 7 not determined at this time

20. Ordered to pay Probation fees: 1 yes  
2 no

21. Ordered to pay Restitution: 1 yes  
2 no

22. Ordered to Community Service: 1 yes  
2 no

23. Ordered to Electronic Monitoring: 1 yes  
2 no  
(If yes, how many days)  
1 Up to 30 days 3 60 to 90 days  
2 30 to 59 days 4 Over 90 days

CHAPTER 2  
ILLINOIS PROBATION INTAKE STUDY:  
JUVENILE OFFENDERS  
1990 AND 1995

Introduction

AOIC has presented annual reports on Illinois juvenile probationers since 1987. These detailed reports provide useful data on the number of juvenile probationers sentenced by county, circuit, month, and year. Little statewide data, however, are available on the characteristics of juvenile probationers. To remedy this situation and to begin systematically studying probation in Illinois, AOIC asked juvenile probation officers throughout the state to collect data on juvenile probation intakes in March and May 1990 and again in May 1995.

AOIC published the findings from the 1995 survey in July 1996. That report, entitled Illinois Probation Intake Study, contains a detailed description of both juvenile and adult probation intakes. But AOIC did not prepare a report based on the 1990 survey data. Chapter 2 compares 1990 juvenile probation intakes with 1995 juvenile probation intakes; its purpose is to identify key differences and trends across those time periods.

Methodology

After juvenile offenders were placed on probation or court

supervision, probation officers completed, at intake, a juvenile probation population survey (Appendix A). Intake information was obtained through interviews with youths and reviews of social history documents. Data were collected on 2,628 offenders, 1,577 in 1990 and 1,051 in 1995. Data were collected by juvenile probation officers from 81 counties in 1990 and from 54 counties in 1995. A list of contributing<sup>1</sup> counties is contained in Appendix B. A total of 23 variables<sup>2</sup> were measured, including demographic characteristics, offense type, previous juvenile justice system experiences, length of court or probation supervision, and other court actions. Specifically, the following variables were measured:

Demographic Characteristics

Age

Gender

Ethnicity

Educational Achievement

Educational Status

Economic Status

Nature of Delinquent Activities and  
Juvenile Justice System Experiences

Type of Petition

---

<sup>1</sup>In some counties, there were no juvenile probation intakes during the months of data collection.

<sup>2</sup>Variables in the 1990 survey differed somewhat from those used



Offense Type

Previous Custody Previous Probation

Previous Department of Corrections (DOC) Commitment

Previous Residential Placement

Court Actions

Type of Disposition

Length of Probation Supervision Period

Length of Court Supervision Period

Length of Continued Supervision Period

Court Ordered Treatment

Probation Officer Perception of Treatment Need

The emphasis of this study is on comparing 1990 juvenile probation intakes with those from 1995 to learn whether there have been any significant changes over time on demographic characteristics, offense types, previous juvenile justice experiences, and court action variables. Changes were examined first for the total group and then by gender and by county, divided into four county groupings: Cook County, collar counties, urban counties, and rural counties as classified by the ICJIA (Appendix B).

The analyses were guided by the following research questions: Has the juvenile probation intake population become older, younger or remained about the same? Has it changed on

---

in the 1995 survey.

race, gender distribution, percentage on welfare, or educational status and achievement? Are there significant changes in the type of offenses committed, in particular, violent and drug offenses? Have juvenile probation intakes become more "system experienced" as reflected in changes in the percentages of juveniles with prior custody, probation, or Illinois Department of Corrections (IDOC) commitments? Are there significant changes in the percentages of juvenile probation intakes placed on probation or court supervision or continued on supervision, and are there changes in the length of supervision ordered? Are there significant changes in the type and frequency of court-ordered treatment? Another focus of this study is on whether juvenile probation intakes convicted of drug or violent offenses differ from other types of intakes.

The data in Chapter 2 are discussed in five sections: demographic characteristics, offense types, and juvenile justice system experience, court actions, drug offenders and violent offenders, and summary and conclusions.

### Findings: Juvenile Probationers

#### Demographic Characteristics

##### Age

There were no real differences in the mean age of probationers or in the distribution of ages between 1990 and 1995. The average age was 15 in 1990 and 15 in 1995. The

majority of juveniles in both years fall within the age interval 14-16. We expected to find little difference in the average age because most court-involved juveniles fall within this age range. We were interested, however, in whether there were significant differences at the extremes (i.e., those under 14 or over 16). The data, presented in Table 1, indicate a slight trend toward older probation intakes. The percentage of juvenile intakes under 14 declined from 18.8% in 1990 to 15.7% in 1995. Similarly, the percentage over 16 years old increased from 7.9% to 8.7%. The same slight decline in the under 14 age group and a slight increase in the over 16 age group was observed for both males and females.

No differences were found either in mean age or in the age distribution between the two years for both male and female probationers. The mean age for males was 15 in both years, and for females as well, it was 15 in 1990 and 15 in 1995.

When differences in the age distribution (Table 2) were examined by county group, a deviation from the above pattern emerged. Although the mean age remained fairly constant across all four county groups, there were differences in the percentages in both the under 14 and the over 16 age groups, especially in Cook County. The percentage of juvenile intakes under 14 in Cook County dropped from 18.8% in 1990 to 13.4% in 1995 and in the over 16 group, it increased from 6.5% to 10.2%.

a significant difference ( $p < .05$ ), suggesting that the age of juvenile probation intakes is increasing in Cook County. This same slight decline in under 14- and slight increase in over 16-year-old probationers, found in the total sample, was also apparent in the rural counties. In the urban county group, however, the pattern was reversed. A slight increase was found in the under 14 age group, from 18.8% in 1990 to 21.6% in 1995, and a slight decline was found in the over 16 age group from 6.3% in 1990 to 3.9% in 1995. The difference on age between rural and urban counties did not reach statistical significance.

The pattern in the collar counties was different from the others. There was a sharp and significant ( $p < .05$ ) decline, from 15.8% in 1990 to 5.2% in 1995, in the percentage of intakes in the under 14 age group. The percentage in the over 16 age group also declined but only slightly, from 14% in 1990 to 13.4% in 1995. In the collar counties, the age of juvenile probationers is apparently shifting to a slightly older age range. It is possible that the difference found in the collar counties might be due to the sharp drop overall in the number of juvenile intakes reported from collar counties, 215 in 1990 compared with 97 in 1995. The largest decreases were in Kane County, which provided data on 82 intakes in 1990 and 22 in 1995, and in DuPage County, which went from 37 intakes in 1990 to 0 intakes in 1995.

On the whole, few real changes appeared in the ages of juvenile probationers from 1990 to 1995, except in Cook County and the collar counties in which the trend appears to be toward somewhat older juvenile probationers.

#### Gender

In both 1990 and 1995, the vast majority of juvenile probationers were males. The percentage of female juveniles, however, increased from 13.9% to 18.3%. Most of this increase was in the collar counties, increasing from 8.9% female intakes in 1990 to 17.7% female intakes in 1995, and also in the rural counties, which showed an increase in the percentage of female intakes from 16.6% in 1990 to 23.6% in 1995. There was no significant change in either Cook County or the urban counties, although both areas showed increases in the percentage of female juvenile probationers. In Cook County, the increase was from 13.6% to 14.6%, and in the urban counties, it was from 14.8% to 18.7%. These data are presented in Table 3.

#### Race

Race of juvenile probationers was recorded as American Indian, Asian, African American, Hispanic, White and Other (not defined). In both years, the frequencies of American Indian, Asian and "Other" are low in all gender and county groups. Hence, data were combined into four ethnic groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and American Indian/Asian/Other.

In both 1990 and 1995, the majority of juvenile probation intakes were white. African Americans constituted the next largest group. There were few significant changes in the racial distribution over the two time periods except for a decline in the proportion of Hispanic probationers. The percentage of African American juvenile probationers remained relatively unchanged from 36.5% in 1990 to 36.2% in 1995. There was a slight increase in the percentage of white juvenile probationers, from 48.9% in 1990 to 51.2% in 1995, and a similar slight increase in the number of American Indian/Asian/Other probationers, mainly Asian. The key difference ( $p < .001$ ) was the decline in the percentage of Hispanic juvenile probationers, decreasing from 13.2% in 1990 to 9.5% in 1995.

This same general pattern was found for both males and females between 1990 and 1995. The percentage of African American male and female juvenile probationers changed only slightly for both gender groups: 36.6% to 36.2% for males and 36.1% to 37.4% for females. Similarly, the percentage of white juvenile probationers increased only slightly: 48.2% to 50.6% for males and 53.4% to 55.3% for females. The American Indian/Asian/ Other category also increased slightly: males went from 1.4% to 3.2% and females went from .9% to 1.1%. But again the main difference appeared to be in the percentages of Hispanic juvenile probationers, decreasing from 13.8% to 10.2%

for males and from 9.6% to 6.3% for females. These data are presented in Table 4.

Differences in ethnicity, when examined among the four county groups, reflected the general population demographics. In both 1990 and 1995, the majority of juvenile probationers in Cook County were African American whereas the majority in both years in the collar counties, urban counties, and rural counties were white. In addition, the percentage of African American juvenile probationers in Cook County increased, from 56.9% in 1990 to 62.5%, but declined in each of the other county groups.

Conversely, the percentage of white juvenile probationers declined in Cook County, from 21.2% in 1990 to 19.4% in 1995, but increased in each of the other county groups.

The decline in the Hispanic juvenile probationers also emerged in the county group analysis. In all four groups, the percentage of Hispanics declined. The percentages of American Indian/Asian/ Other juvenile probationers increased slightly in Cook County and the collar counties, declined slightly in the urban counties, and remained the same in the rural counties. An examination of the raw data indicated that the majority of these youths were classified as "other." These data are presented in Table 5.

Overall, there were few changes in the ethnic composition of the juvenile probation intake population between 1990 and

1995 except for a decline in the percentage of Hispanics. This decline appeared for both males and females and in all four county groupings.

#### Economic Status

The economic status of juvenile probationers was measured by recording the number of individual youths or their families who were on public assistance, defined as "receiving any type of public assistance: public aid, food stamps, aid to dependent children, public housing, Social Security Insurance, or other form of public assistance."<sup>3</sup>

Only about one-third of the families of juvenile probationers were on any form of public assistance but the percentage on public assistance increased significantly ( $p < .01$ ) from 29.7% in 1990 to 37.6% in 1995. Thus, most of the families of juvenile probationers were not on public assistance, but the percentage who reported being on public assistance increased between 1990 and 1995. This pattern was the same for both males and females; however, the change was much more pronounced for females. The percentage of males on public assistance increased from 30% to 35.2% whereas the percentage of females increased from 27.6% in 1990 to 48.7% in 1995. Therefore, the increase in the percentage of juvenile

---

<sup>3</sup>Data on another measure of economic status, family income, were available for 1995 only.



probationers on public assistance was mainly within the female juvenile probationer population.

The percentage of juvenile probation intakes on public assistance varied somewhat by county group. In Cook County, a little over one-third of the juvenile probationers were on public assistance in 1990 but this proportion increased to half (50.4%) in 1995. Increases in the proportion of juvenile probationers on public assistance were also found in the urban and rural counties but the increases were modest: 28.3% to 34.5% in the urban counties and 25.1% to 28.5% in rural counties. In the collar counties, the percentage of juvenile probationers on public assistance declined from 17.3% to 15.5%.

On the whole, there appeared to be a significant increase in the percentage of juvenile probationers on public assistance, particularly for families of females and for families of Cook County intakes (Table 6).

#### Educational Achievement

Information was recorded on the last grade completed by juvenile probationers. Because most juvenile court cases involve adolescents, we expected to find that the majority of juvenile probation intakes had completed or partially completed junior high school (seventh and eighth grade) but had not yet completed high school. Consistent with our expectation, in both 1990 and 1995, approximately 90% of the juvenile probationers

had either completed the seventh or eighth grade but had not yet completed high school. This pattern changed little between 1990 and 1995 for males or females and for all four county groups.

There was a slight change, however, in the percentage of juvenile probationers who had completed only elementary school. Although there was no significant change for the total group (6.9% to 7.1%) or for males (7.2% to 7.1%), there was a slight (4.7% to 5.8%) increase in the percentage of female juvenile probationers who had completed only elementary school. The percentages declined from 8.2% to 4.9% in Cook County and from 5.7% to 2.1% in the collar counties, while there was a slight increase in the rural counties (6.4% to 6.8%). The significant difference ( $p < .01$ ) was in urban counties where the percentage of juvenile probation intakes who have completed only elementary school more than doubled from 6% in 1990 to 13.4% in 1995. Another consistent finding is that the percentage of juvenile probation intakes who have completed high school, albeit small, is declining (Tables 7 and 8).

#### Educational Status

Juvenile probationers were asked at intake to indicate their current educational status as one of the following: attending school, truant, or drop out. In addition, if attending school, they were asked whether their classes were traditional, special education, or alternative. In both 1990

and 1995, approximately 85% to 90% of the juvenile probationers reported being in school with the balance reporting their status as either truant or dropout. There was a consistent decline, however, in the percentages attending school in 1995 compared with 1990 in all the comparison groups. Overall, the percentage of juvenile probationers attending school declined from 89% in 1990 to 85.1% in 1995. For males, the decline was from 88.5% to 86.7%, and for females, the decline was even sharper, from 88.5% to 78.4%. The same decline in the percentage attending school was found in all four county groups. In Cook County, the percentage attending school declined from 86.3% to 82.2%, in the collar counties, from 87.9% to 83.9%, and in the urban counties, from 92.5% to 84.5%. In the rural counties, there was only a very slight decline from 90.8% to 90.2%.

There was a significant ( $p < .01$ ) increase in the percentage of juvenile probationers who reported their educational status as truant and a less consistent decline in the percentage who were dropouts. Although the numbers were low compared with the group attending school, the changes in percentages are notable. Regarding truant status, the overall percentage more than doubled, from 3.9% in 1990 to 8.6% in 1995.

Similar rates of increase were found for males (3.5% to 7.6%) and for females (6% to 13.2%). The same doubling of the rate of truant status was found in Cook County, where it increased from

5.3% to 11.8%, and in the urban counties, where it increased from 3.2% to 7.5%. In the rural counties, the truant status rate jumped from 1.7% in 1990 to 6% in 1995. Only in the collar counties was the increase minimal, from 4.4% to 5.4%.

As indicated above, there was a decline in the percentage of juvenile probationers who reported their educational status as dropout. But this decline was neither as consistent nor as sharp as the increases in truancy status. The overall dropout status rate declined from 7.1% in 1990 to 6.3% in 1995. For males, the decline was from 7.3% to 5.8%. The dropout status rate, however, increased for female juveniles from 5.5% to 8.5%.

Although the dropout status rate declined in Cook County (8.4% to 6%) and in the rural counties (7.5% to 3.9%), it increased in the collar counties (7.8% to 10.8%) and in the urban counties (4.1% to 8%). These findings are presented in Tables 9 and 10.

In both 1990 and 1995, approximately 20% to 30% of the juvenile probationers attending school were in special education programs or in alternative schools. The percentages of juveniles in these categories increased slightly in all comparison groups. Overall, 24% of juvenile probation intakes reported being in special education or alternative school classes in 1990. This percentage increased to 26% in 1995. For male offenders, the increase was from 25% to 27% and, for females, from 20% to 24%. In Cook County, the increase was from

22% to 24%. The collar counties showed the largest increase, going from 24% in 1990 to 34% in 1995. The smallest increases were in the urban counties (28% to 28.3%) and in the rural counties (26% to 26.2%). In general, the increase is attributable to an increase in alternative school placement whereas the percentages receiving special education services declined slightly except in the collar counties, which showed a slight increase in special education status, from 10% in 1990 to 13% in 1995.

#### Nature of Delinquent Activities and Juvenile Justice System Experiences

##### Type of Petition

Virtually all (97% to 99%) of the juvenile probationers' cases resulted from delinquency petitions. The majority of the remaining petitions were for truancy and dependency/neglect, but the percentages in the remaining categories were all less than 2% and many were under 1%. Because of the similarity in distributions, data on this variable were not analyzed.

##### Offense Type

Probation officers were asked to identify "the most serious offense on which the individual was convicted for the present term of probation." Because the list of offenses differed somewhat between years, exact comparisons on all

specific offenses were not possible. The offenses identified were collapsed into five categories: violent offenses (sexual offense,<sup>4</sup> robbery, assault/ battery, and "other" violent); property offenses (burglary, theft/larceny, motor vehicle theft, arson, and "other" property); drug offenses (any drug possession and any drug sale); and other (driving under the influence of alcohol/drugs [5 cases]; other traffic [7 cases]; weapons offenses [41 cases], "other" unspecified [237 cases], and not yet adjudicated [60 cases]).<sup>5</sup>

The most common offense type for both years and across all but two of the comparison groups was property offenses. The two notable exceptions were for female offenders and for Cook County. For females and Cook County intakes, the most common offense type in 1995 was violent offenses. Property offenses for both females and Cook County probationers were a close second. The third most frequent offense type was drugs. Because the "other" category of offense type contained such a wide variety of offenses, we excluded it in our discussion of offense types, although data on this category are included in tables.

---

<sup>4</sup>An example of inconsistency in recording data is that in 1990 only the term "sexual offense" was used but in 1995 "any prostitution offense" was added. The two are combined into one item "sexual offenses" and included under violent offenses.

<sup>5</sup>These were included under "other" in 1990 but as "not adjudicated" in 1995.

The pattern of change in the percentage of each offense type between 1990 and 1995 was very consistent for drug and property offenses but inconsistent for violent offenses (Table 11).

#### Drug Offenses

For the total group, males, females, and all four county groups, the percentage of juvenile probationers convicted for drug offenses increased from 1990 to 1995. Although the drug offense percentages are small compared with violent and property offenses, the increases in some groups were substantial.

Overall, there was a significant increase ( $p < .001$ ) in the percentage of drug offenses, from 5.5% in 1990 to 12.9% in 1995.

There was also a sharp (more than double) increase in the percentage of males convicted for drug offenses (5.8% to 14.5%) but only a slight increase for females (3.7% to 5.8%) (Table 11). In Cook County, there was also a significant (almost triple) increase in the percentage of drug offenses from 7.6% in 1990 to 21.5% in 1995. The increase is much smaller in other county groups. In the collar counties, the increase was from 5.6% to 9.3%. In the urban counties, it was from 4.4% to 8.3%, and in the rural counties, it was from 3% to 4.8% (Table 12).<sup>6</sup>

#### Property Offenses

---

<sup>6</sup>More detail on drug offenders can be found in a later section.

For the total group, males, females, and all but rural counties, the percentage of juvenile probationers convicted of property offenses declined in 1995 compared with 1990. For the total group, the property offense percentage dropped from 54.7% to 44.5%. For males, it dropped from 57.1% to 47.1% and for females, from 39.3% to 33.7% (Table 11). The largest decline in property offenses was in Cook County (48.5% to 28.5%) and the smallest decline was in the collar counties (56.3% to 52.6%). Property offenses declined in urban counties from 62% in 1990 to 49.1% in 1995. Only in the rural counties did property offenses increase, and then only slightly, from 57.1% to 61.9% (Table 12).

#### Violent Offenses

As indicated earlier, the change in the percentage of juvenile probation intakes convicted of violent offenses was inconsistent. The percentage increased for the total group, for females, for Cook County intakes, and urban county intakes. Violent offenses, however, declined for males and for collar county and rural county intakes. For the total group, the increase was negligible (27.1% to 27.6%) and was modest in the other comparison groups, which showed increases. For females, the increase in violent offenses was from 34.2% in 1990 to 40% in 1995; in Cook County, it was from 32.9% to 38.4% and in the urban counties, it was from 19.9% to 26.5%. The decline in



violent offenses was also modest. For males, they went from 26% to 24.4%. In the collar counties, they went from 33% to 28.9%.

The sharpest decline in violent offenses was in rural counties, from 20.8% in 1990 to 11.8% in 1995.<sup>7</sup>

These data indicated that the percentage of juvenile probationers convicted of drug offenses is increasing at a significant rate and that the percentage of female intakes and Cook County probationers convicted of violent offenses are also increasing. The percentage of juveniles convicted of property offenses declined. (Data on offense type are presented in Tables 11 and 12.)

#### Previous Juvenile Justice System Experience

Probation officers were asked to record the number of times a juvenile probationer had been previously taken into custody,<sup>8</sup> placed on probation, committed to one of the Illinois Department of Corrections juvenile facilities, or previously placed in a residential facility. These measures reflect the degree to which the juvenile probation intake population consists of "system-wise" offenders and also the degree to which the system is dealing with repeat offenders.

#### Previous Custody

---

<sup>7</sup>A detailed examination of violent offenders is provided in a separate analysis.

<sup>8</sup>Juvenile offenders are not "arrested" but "taken into custody."

A youth typically gets referred to court only after a number of previous custody contacts with the police or when the offense is very serious. We expected to find that a high percentage of juvenile probationers had at least one previous custody. The 1990 data confirm this. Overall, 63% of the intakes had been taken into custody at least once prior to their present offense. This percentage was fairly consistent across all comparison groups. The data for 1995, however, did not fit the pattern. Overall, the percentages of juvenile probationers who had at least one previous custody was 36% in 1995. In Cook County, the percentage was only 28.7%. These data seem unreliable. Inaccuracies could have resulted from either the fact that the data were obtained through self reports or that the offense history files were unavailable or missing information. These data were not analyzed further but are included in the Tables.

#### Previous Probation

Only a relatively small percentage of juvenile probationers both in 1990 and in 1995 have been on probation at least once prior to their present court referral. In addition, most juveniles who have previously been on probation have only been on once before. The percentage of juvenile probationers with prior probation experience declined significantly ( $p < .01$ ) from 1990 to 1995. For the total group, in 1990, 21.1% had been on

probation at least once, but this percentage dropped to 12.9% in 1995. The same trend was found for both males and females. The percentage of male juvenile probationers with at least one previous probation declined from 21.5% in 1990 to 14.4% in 1995.

For females, the decline was much sharper from 18.9% in 1990 to only 6.9% in 1995 (Table 13). The percentage of juveniles with at least one prior probation also declined sharply in Cook County, from 24.1% in 1990 to 9.3% in 1995. Similar declines were found in the urban (19.6% to 12.1%) and the rural (24.1% to 17.3%) counties. In the collar counties, the percentage of juvenile probationers with prior probation experience increased from 10.3% to 18.1% (Table 14).

#### Previous DOC Commitments

Only 1.5% in 1990 and 1.1% in 1995 of juvenile probationers had been previously committed to the Illinois Department of Corrections. Because of such low percentages these data were not analyzed further.

#### Previous Residential Placement

Only 8% in 1990 and 5% in 1995 of juvenile probationers had been previously in residential placement. Because of these low percentages, these data were not analyzed further.

These data suggest that juvenile probationers both in 1990 and in 1995, were not "system-wise" in terms of prior experiences on probation. Their experience with previous

custody was unclear. These data also suggest that most juvenile probation intakes were not recidivists as measured by previous juvenile court experiences. (Data on previous custody and previous probation are presented in Tables 13 and 14.)

### Court Action

#### Type of Disposition

Offenders before the juvenile court can receive a variety of dispositions or court actions, which usually take one of three forms: placed on probation, placed on court supervision, or continued on court supervision. A majority of juvenile probationers in both years and in all comparison groups were placed on probation and, except in the urban and rural counties, the percentage receiving probation has increased. Overall, the percentage placed on probation increased from 57.4% in 1990 to 62.9% in 1995. There was a similar increase for males (59.5% to 65%) and an even greater one for females (43.9% to 54.3%). In Cook County, the percentage placed on probation increased sharply (55.2 to 79.7%), which was also the case in the collar counties (47.9% to 65.6%). Although it is still the most frequent disposition, the percentage placed on probation in urban counties declined from 63.7% in 1990 to 45.1% in 1995, and in the urban counties, from 63.7% to 45.1%.

The percentage of juveniles placed on probation increased whereas the percentage placed on court supervision decreased in

all groups except in the rural counties. For the total group, the percentage placed on supervision declined from 24.7% in 1990 to 16.3% in 1995. For male probation intakes, the decline was from 23.8% to 15.9%. The percentage of females placed on supervision declined sharply from 30.8% in 1990 to 17.9% in 1995. There was also a sharp decline in Cook County, from 31.9% to 15.8%. The decline was less pronounced in collar (38.6% to 27.8%) and urban counties (16.1% to 10.2%). In the rural counties, the percentage of juvenile probation intakes placed on supervision actually went up from 12.6% to 18%.

The pattern of change in the percentage of juvenile probationers continued on supervision was less consistent. The percentages increased slightly for the total group (17.9% to 20.8%) and for males and females, 16.7% to 19.1% and 25.2% to 27.7%, respectively. But in both Cook County and the collar counties, the percentage of juvenile probationers continued on court supervision declined sharply, from 12.8% to 4.5% in Cook County and from 13.5% to 6.7% in the collar counties. In the urban and rural counties, the percentages increased--quite sharply in the urban counties (20.2% to 44.7%) and less sharply in the rural counties (27% to 33.2%) (Tables 15 and 16).

#### Length of Probation Period

Juvenile probation intakes are placed on probation for varying lengths of time. The overall average number of months

of supervision was 14.4 months in 1990 and 14.5 months in 1990. The most frequent (i.e., the modal length of probation supervision) was for 12 months in both 1990 and 1995 across all comparison groups. There was some variation in the maximum number of months sentenced, ranging from a high of 72 months (6 years), to 36 months (3 years), which inflated the average number of months of supervision above the modal time of 12 months. In general, however, there was very little difference in the length of probation between males and females and among the four county groups and also very little change between 1990 and 1995. Thus, although the percentage of juveniles placed on probation had increased, the length of the probation period imposed by the court had remained fairly consistent (Table 17).

#### Length of Court Supervision Period

The overall average number of months of court supervision ordered for juvenile probationers was 11.7 months in 1990 and 11.3 months in 1995. The most frequent (i.e., a modal period) was 12 months in both years and in all comparison groups, except in the rural counties where the modal period was 9 months. The maximum number of months of court supervision ordered ranged from 54 months to 18 months. In general, there was little difference in the number of months of court supervision ordered either among the various comparison groups or between years. In short, while the percentage of juvenile

probationers placed on court supervision has declined, there was virtually no change in the length of court supervision ordered.

Overall, the maximum number of months for this supervision period was also lower than the other two dispositions, ranging from 36 months to 6 months (Table 18).

#### Length of Continued on Court Supervision Period

The average number of months of continued court supervision was 10.9 months in 1990 and 8.1 months in 1995. This type of disposition had the shortest average supervision period of all the three dispositions and was also the only one to decline in the average supervision period between 1990 and 1995. In addition, the modal number of months for the continued on court supervision period was 12 months in all comparison groups in 1990 but dropped in 1995 to 6 months for males, females, and the urban county intakes and to 9 months for the rural county intakes. There was also a slightly greater amount of variation among groups in the average number of months of the continued on court supervision period (Table 19).

#### Treatment

Data were recorded on two types of treatment decisions: court ordered treatment and the probation officers' perceptions of treatment needed. The treatment options listed on the survey included treatment orders or statements of the need for

treatment of drug abuse, alcohol abuse, alcohol and drug abuse, or a general option "treatment evaluation/or treatment at probation officer's discretion."<sup>1</sup> For the court ordered treatment category, a "no treatment ordered" option was provided. For the probation officers' perception of treatment need category, this option was listed as "not determined at this time." In addition to differences in listings between the two categories of treatment decisions, there were differences in the number of options provided in 1995 compared with 1990. The 1995 survey instrument included options for ordering treatment or identifying a need for treatment of mental illness, sexual offending, and family violence, but these are not listed in the 1990 survey and therefore are not included in comparisons.

Most of the time, in both 1990 and 1995, the court did not order treatment (81.5% in 1990 and 64.9% in 1995), order an evaluation, or left decisions about treatment to the discretion of the probation officer (10.1% in 1990 and 24.2% in 1995). Probation officers' perceptions of need was most often stated as "not determined at this time" (87% in 1990 and 80.1% in 1995) (Table 22). This general pattern was found for both males and females and in all county groups. The court and probation officers selected similar, but not identical, treatment options.

It should be noted that even though the court did not order



treatment, treatment was provided to most juvenile probationers.

In fact, there was a significant ( $p < .01$ ) trend among all groups, except in the urban counties, away from the court ordering treatment to more frequently ordering an evaluation or relying on probation officer discretion about treatment. Data on these trends are presented in Table 20 and 21.

There were some differences in the percentage of juvenile probation intakes ordered to drug, alcohol or drug and alcohol treatment and probation officers' perceptions of treatment needed in those areas. Because the percentages for each separate treatment option were low, this item was collapsed to "substance abuse."<sup>9</sup> The percentage of juvenile probationers ordered by the court to participate in substance abuse treatment increased in all comparison groups except in the rural counties where the percentage declined from 11.7% in 1990 to 8% in 1995 and for females, there was essentially no change (9.1% to 9.6%) (Tables 20 and 21). The percentage of juvenile probationers perceived by probation officers to be in need of substance abuse treatment increased significantly ( $p < .01$ ) in all comparison groups, most notably in Cook County and the collar counties (Table 22).

#### Drug Offenders and Violent Offenders

---

<sup>9</sup>A more detailed examination of drug treatment options may be found in a separate analysis of drug offense cases.

We have observed that the percentage of juvenile probationers convicted of drug offenses has increased significantly and that the percentage of juveniles convicted of violent offenses has also increased, although not as greatly as drug offenses. Because these offender groups are often challenging and of great concern to policy makers, we explored whether juvenile probationers convicted of drug or violent offenses differ from other juveniles in ways that suggest important distinctions about these offender groups. We combined the 1990 and 1995 samples and compared each of these offender groups with all other intakes on those variables that showed change between 1990 and 1995: age, gender, ethnicity, educational status, public aid status, previous probation experience, disposition, and court ordered treatment.

Two types of drug offenses were listed on the survey: "any type of drug possession" and "any type of drug sale." We collapsed the population into a dichotomy of drug offenders and non-drug offenders to identify significant differences between the two groups. Our findings indicated that drug offenders were significantly different from other juvenile probationers on many of the variables studied. They tended to be older: 14% were over 16 compared with 8% of non-drug offenders ( $p < .001$ ). And they were predominantly African American: 66% of drug offenders were African American compared with 34% of non-drug offenders ( $p$

< .001). They had higher rates of truancy (12% vs. 11%) and dropping out (6% vs. 5%) compared with non-drug offenders. A higher percentage of drug offenders than non-drug offenders were placed on probation (76% vs. 56%) and a much smaller percentage were either placed on supervision (12% vs. 22%) or continued on supervision (9% vs. 19%;  $p < .001$ ). And, as we expected, a significantly higher percentage (26% vs. 8%;  $p < .001$ ) of drug offenders than non-drug offenders were ordered by the court to participate in drug treatment. There were no significant differences between drug and non-drug offenders on gender, public aid status, previous probation experience, or length of supervision. We also compared drug offenders convicted of drug possession with those convicted of drug sales. There were no significant differences between these types of drug offenders. Drug offenders, while differing from non-drug offenders, appeared to be a fairly homogeneous group.

There were four types of violent offenses listed on the survey: sexual offenses, robbery, assault/battery, and "other violent offenses." These were combined into a violent offender group and compared with all other intakes. Juvenile probationers convicted of violent offenses also were significantly different from non-violent juvenile probationers on many of the variables studied but the variables were not the same as those for drug offenders. For example, drug offenders

tended to be older, but there was no significant difference in age distribution between violent and non-violent offenders. A significantly higher percentage ( $p < .001$ ) of violent offenders were female than was the case for non-violent offenders (22% vs. to 14%). Also, a significantly ( $p < .001$ ) higher percentage of violent offenders (46%) were African American compared with 33% of non-violent offenders, and a slightly higher percentage were Hispanic (13% vs. 11%). There was a significant ( $p < .01$ ) difference in the percentage of families of violent offenders on public aid (38%) compared with non-violent offenders (31%). A slightly higher percentage of violent offenders than non-violent offenders were placed on probation (64% compared with 56%) but the percentages of both groups that were placed on court supervision were highly similar (21% and 22%). Violent offenders were less likely to receive a disposition of "continued on supervision" (14%) than were non-violent offenders (20%). Violent offenders were also significantly less likely to be ordered to drug treatment and, in fact, were more likely than non-violent offenders to have no treatment ordered by the court.

Juvenile probationers convicted of violent offenses were different from non-violent offenders and from drug offenders. Violent offenders were different from one another in that there were significant differences between sexual offenders, robbery offenders, assault/battery offenders, and "other" violent

offenders on a number of variables. For example, a significantly higher ( $p < .01$ ) percentage of sexual offenders and "other violent" offenders were over 16 compared with those convicted of robbery or assault/battery. Furthermore, a significantly higher percentage of sexual offenders and robbery offenders were male, but a significantly higher percentage of assault/battery offenders were female ( $p < .01$ ). Violent offenders also differed on ethnicity. A significantly ( $p < .001$ ) higher percentage of sexual offenders were white and robbery offenders were African American. Finally, sexual offenders were more likely than violent offenders to be placed on probation. There were no significant differences among violent offenders on educational status, public aid status, previous probation experiences, or court ordered treatments. Violent offenders appeared to be a less homogeneous group than were drug offenders. In fact, juvenile probation intakes convicted of drug offenses or of violent offenses were distinct groups and differed in important ways from other juvenile probation intakes.

### Summary

#### Demographic Characteristics

There were few significant changes in the ages of juvenile probation intakes from 1990 to 1995 except in Cook County and the collar counties where the trend was toward a

somewhat older juvenile probationer.

- . The vast majority of juvenile probation intakes were male, although the percentage of females has increased, especially in the collar and rural counties.
- . The majority of juvenile probation intakes were white with African Americans making up the next largest group followed by Hispanics, and American Indians/Asians/Others. There was very little change in the ethnic composition of juvenile probation intakes except for a decline in the percentage of Hispanics. This decline was found for both males and females and in all four county groups.
- . Most juvenile probation intakes were not on any form of public assistance, but the percentage that are has increased especially for females and in Cook County.
- . The vast majority of juvenile probation intakes have completed or partially completed junior high school but have not yet completed high school. The percentage of juvenile probation intakes who have only completed elementary school was small and showed little change except in the rural counties. The percentage of intakes who have completed high school has declined.
- . The great majority of juvenile probation intakes reported being in school, but the percentage has declined for both

males and females and in all four county groups. There was an increase in the percentage of juvenile probation intakes who reported their educational status as truant, the dropout status in Cook County and the rural counties declines slightly.

#### Offense and Juvenile Justice System Experience

- . The percentage of juvenile probation intakes convicted of drug offenses is increasing at a significant rate.
- . There were only slight increases in the percentage of juvenile probation intakes convicted of violent offenses and then only in Cook County and urban counties. The largest increase is in the percentage of violent offenses committed by females.
- . The percentage of juvenile probation intakes convicted of property offenses is decreasing.
- . Only a small percentage of juvenile probation intakes have been on probation before and even smaller percentages have been previously placed in correctional or residential facilities. Data on previous custody were unclear.
- . Juvenile probation intakes do not appear to be particularly "system-wise" based on the extent of their previous juvenile justice system experience.

### Summary of Key Findings on Court Actions

- . The majority of juvenile probation intakes were placed on probation and, except in the urban and rural counties, the percentage is increasing.
- . Although the percentage of juvenile probation intakes placed on probation is generally increasing, the length of the probation period remained fairly stable, most often 12 months.
- . The percentage of juvenile probation intakes placed in court supervision is decreasing except in the collar counties.
- . The percentage of juvenile probation intakes placed on court supervision is decreasing in most areas but the length of the court supervision period has remained stable, most often 12 months.
- . The least frequently used disposition and the one with the shortest supervision period, at least in 1995, was "continued on court supervision."
- . Most of the time the court did not order treatment for juvenile probation intakes, ordered an evaluation, or left treatment decisions to probation officers' discretion.
- . The trend appears to be away from the "no treatment ordered" option to more frequent ordering of an evaluation



and relying on probation officers' discretion.

The most frequently ordered treatment was for substance abuse.

Although the percentage of juvenile probation intakes ordered to substance abuse treatment was small, the percentage is slightly increasing except in the rural counties.

### Conclusions

Chapter 2 compared 1,577 juvenile probation intakes surveyed in 1990 with 1,051 juvenile probation intakes surveyed in 1995 to learn if there were significant differences over time on key demographic characteristics, offense types, previous juvenile justice system experiences, and court action variables.

In general, the juvenile probation intake population in 1995 was quite similar to the juvenile probation intake population in 1990 but there were important differences indicating a shift in population characteristics. Overall, little change occurred in the age distribution of juvenile probation intakes but juvenile probationers in Cook County and in the collar counties are older. The percentage of female juvenile intakes increased in some areas whereas the percentage of Hispanic intakes decreased in all areas. The percentage of the families of juvenile probationers that was on welfare also increased. Although most

juvenile intakes report being in school, the percentage that was truant increased but the dropout rate slightly declined in some areas.

The percentage of juvenile probation intakes that was convicted of drug offenses increased significantly but there was only a small increase in the percentage convicted of violent offenses. The largest increase was among females. The majority of the juvenile probation intake population has not been through the system before and the percentage that has been, is declining. The majority of juvenile probation intakes were placed on probation and this percentage is increasing. There was little change, however, in the length of the probation period, which is most often for one year. Most of the time, the court does not order treatment and is relying more frequently on probation officers' judgments about treatment needs.

The juvenile probation intake population has remained largely in the same age range. It has also remained mostly male, been convicted of property offenses, and placed on probation for the first time. But the juvenile probation intake population contained fewer Hispanics, and became more truant, more likely to have been convicted of drug offenses and more likely to be ordered to substance abuse treatment than was the case in 1990. Finally, juvenile probation intakes convicted of drug offenses or of violent offenses are distinct groups.

Table 1

Age of Juvenile Probation Intakes by Gender and Year (Percentages)

Age	Gender						
	Total Group		Males		Females		
	1990	1995	1990	1995	1990	1995	
Under 14	18.8	15.7	18.1	15.7	18.7	15.7	
14-16	73.9	75.5	73.5	75.2	76.3	77.5	
Over 16	7.9	8.7	8.4	9.1	5.0	5.2	
	<u>n</u> =	1,577	1,051	1,356	855	219	191
Mean Age		14.9	14.8	14.8	14.8	14.6	14.9

Table 2

Age of Juvenile Probation Intakes by County Group and Year (Percentages)

Age	County Group								
	Cook County		Collar Counties		Urban Counties		Rural Counties		
	1990	1995	1990	1995	1990	1995	1990	1995	
Under 14	18.8	13.4	15.8	5.2	18.8	21.6	18.0	17.9	
14-16	74.8	76.4	70.2	81.4	74.9	74.6	73.4	73.1	
Over 16	6.5	10.2	14.0	13.4	6.3	3.9	8.6	9.0	
	<u>n</u> =	634	432	215	97	367	232	361	290
Mean Age		14.7	15.0	15.0	15.2	14.7	15.9	14.9	14.9

Table 3

## Gender of Juvenile Probation Intakes by Year and County Group (Percentages)

Gender	Total Group		Cook County		Collar Counties		Urban Counties		Rural Counties		
	1990	1995	1990	1995	1990	1995	1990	1995	1990	1995	
Male	86.1	81.7	86.4	85.4	91.1	82.3	85.2	81.3	83.4	76.4	
Female	13.9	18.3	13.6	14.6	8.9	17.7	14.8	18.7	16.6	23.6	
<u>n</u> =	1,575	1,046		634	432	214	96	366	230	361	288
Missing	2	5		--	--	1	1	1	2	--	2

Table 4

Ethnicity of Juvenile Probation Intakes by Year and Gender (Percentages)

Ethnicity	Gender					
	Total Group		Males		Females	
	1990	1995	1990	1995	1990	1995
African American	36.5	36.2	36.6	36.2	36.1	37.4
Hispanic	13.2	9.5	13.8	10.2	9.6	6.3
White	48.9	51.2	48.2	50.6	53.4	55.3
American Indian/Asian/Other	1.4	3.2	1.4	3.1	.9	1.1
<u>n</u> =	1,575	1,047	1,355	852	219	190
Missing	2	4	1	3	--	1

Table 5

Ethnicity of Juvenile Probation Intakes by Year and County Group (Percentages)

Ethnicity	County Group							
	Cook County		Collar Counties		Urban Counties		Rural Counties	
	1990	1995	1990	1995	1990	1995	1990	1995
Black	56.9	62.5	28.8	22.7	34.2	31.6	7.8	4.9
Hispanic	20.2	15.7	24.7	15.5	3.3	2.2	4.2	3.8
White	21.2	19.4	42.2	58.8	61.5	65.4	87.5	88.0
American Indian/Asian/Other	1.7	2.3	2.3	3.1	1.1	.9	.6	6.3
<u>n</u> =	633	432	215	97	366	231	361	287
Missing	1	--	--	--	1	1	--	3

Table 6

Economic Status of Juvenile Probation Intakes by Year, Gender and County Group  
(Percentages)

	Gender					
	Total Group		Males		Females	
	1990	1995	1990	1995	1990	1995
On Public Assistance						
Yes	29.7	37.6	30.0	35.2	27.6	48.7
No	70.3	62.4	70.0	64.8	72.4	51.3
<u>n</u> =	1,560	1,030	1,341	838	217	187
Missing	17	21	15	17	2	4

	County Group							
	Cook County		Collar Counties		Urban Counties		Rural Counties	
	1990	1995	1990	1995	1990	1995	1990	1995
Yes	37.4	50.4	17.3	15.5	28.3	34.5	25.1	28.5
No	62.6	49.6	82.7	84.5	71.7	65.5	74.9	71.5
<u>n</u> =	623	423	214	97	364	229	359	281
Missing	11	9	1	--	3	3	2	9



Table 7

Last Grade Completed by Juvenile Probation Intakes by Gender and Year  
(Percentages)

Last Grade Completed	Gender						
	Total Group		Males		Females		
	1990	1995	1990	1995	1990	1995	
1-6	6.9	7.1	7.2	7.1	4.7	5.8	
7-8	29.6	31.5	29.7	31.5	29.3	31.7	
9-11	60.9	60.8	60.4	60.7	64.2	61.9	
12	2.6	.6	2.7	.6	1.9	.5	
	<u>n =</u>	1,562	1,034	1,345	840	215	189
Missing		15	17	11	15	4	2

Table 8

Last Grade Completed by Juvenile Probation Intakes by Year and County Group  
(Percentages)

Last Grade Completed	County Group							
	Cook County		Collar Counties		Urban Counties		Rural Counties	
	1990	1995	1990	1995	1990	1995	1990	1995
1-6	8.2	4.9	5.7	2.1	6.0	13.4	6.4	6.8
7-8	27.5	25.2	25.5	34.4	37.0	32.0	28.1	39.8
9-11	61.8	69.2	65.6	62.5	54.8	54.1	63.1	53.0
12	2.6	.7	3.3	1.0	2.2	.4	2.5	.5
<u>n</u> =	625	428	212	96	365	231	360	279
Missing	10	4	3	1	2	1	1	11

Table 9

Educational Status of Juvenile Probation Intakes by Year and Gender  
(Percentages)

Educational Status	Gender					
	Total Group		Males		Females	
	1990	1995	1990	1995	1990	1995
Attending School	89.0	85.1	89.1	86.7	88.5	78.4
Truant	3.9	8.6	3.5	7.6	6.0	13.2
Dropout	7.1	6.3	7.3	5.8	5.5	8.5
<u>n</u> =	1,552	1,023	1,334	8.29	217	189
Missing	25	28	22	26	2	2

Table 10

Educational Status of Juvenile Probation Intakes by Year and County Group (Percentages)

Educational Status	County Group							
	Cook County		Collar Counties		Urban Counties		Rural Counties	
	1990	1995	1990	1995	1990	1995	1990	1995
Attending School	86.3	82.2	87.9	83.9	92.5	84.5	90.8	90.2
Truant	5.3	11.8	4.4	5.4	3.3	7.5	1.7	6.0
Dropout	8.4	6.0	7.8	10.8	4.1	8.0	7.5	3.9
<u>n</u> =	622	416	206	93	363	226	360	283
Missing	12	16	9	4	4	6	1	7

Table 11

Offense Type for Juvenile Probation Intakes by Year and Gender (Percentages)

Offense Type	Gender					
	Total Group		Males		Females	
	1990	1995	1990	1995	1990	1995
Violent Offenses	27.1	27.6	26.0	24.4	34.2	40.0
Property Offenses	54.7	44.5	57.1	47.1	39.3	33.7
Drug Offenses	5.5	12.9	5.8	14.5	3.7	5.8
Other	12.2	15.1	11.1	14.0	22.8	20.5
<u>n</u> =	1,575	1,048	1,355	853	219	190
Missing	2	3	1	2	--	1

Table 12

Offense Type for Juvenile Probation Intakes by Year and County Group  
(Percentages)

Offense Type	County Group							
	Cook County		Collar Counties		Urban Counties		Rural Counties	
	1990	1995	1990	1995	1990	1995	1990	1995
Violent Offenses	32.9	38.4	33.0	28.9	19.9	26.5	20.8	11.8
Property Offenses	48.5	28.5	56.3	52.6	62.0	49.1	57.1	61.9
Drug Offenses	7.6	21.5	5.6	9.3	4.4	8.3	3.0	4.8
Other	11.1	11.6	5.1	9.3	13.7	16.1	19.1	21.5
<u>n</u> =	633	432	215	97	366	230	361	289
Missing	1	--	--	--	1	2	--	1

Table 13

Previous Juvenile Justice System Experience of Juvenile Probation Intakes by Year and Gender (Percentages)

Previous Experience	Gender					
	Total Group		Males		Females	
	1990	1995	1990	1995	1990	1995
Custody at Least Once Before	63.0	36.0	63.6	36.5	61.6	35.6
<u>n</u> =	1,577	1,051	1,356	855	219	191
Probation at Least Once Before	21.1	12.9	21.5	14.4	18.9	6.9
<u>n</u> =	1,565	1,047	1,346	852	217	191
Missing	1	4	10	3	2	

Table 14

Previous Juvenile Justice System Experience of Juvenile Probation Intakes by Year and County Group (Percentages)

Counties Previous Experience	County Group							
	Cook County		Collar Counties		Urban Counties		Rural Counties	
	1990	1995	1990	1995	1990	1995	1990	1995
Custody at Least Once Before	61.4	28.7	60.9	41.2	70.6	50.4	60.7	34.5
<u>n</u> =	634	432	215	97	367	232	361	290
Probation at Least Once Before	24.1	9.3	10.3	18.1	19.6	12.1	24.1	17.3
<u>n</u> =	623	432	214	94	367	232	361	289
Missing	11	--	1	3	--	--	--	1



Table 15

Court Action for Juvenile Probation Intakes by Year and Gender (Percentages)

Court Action	Gender					
	Total Group		Males		Females	
	1990	1995	1990	1995	1990	1995
Probation	57.4	62.9	59.5	65.0	43.9	54.3
Court Supervision	24.7	16.3	23.8	15.9	30.8	17.9
Continued on Court Supervision	17.9	20.8	16.7	19.1	25.2	27.7
<u>n</u> =	1,560	971	1,345	794	214	173
Missing	17	80	11	61	5	18

Table 16

Court Actions for Juvenile Probation Intakes by Year and County Group  
(Percentages)

Court Action	County Group							
	Cook County		Collar Counties		Urban Counties		Rural Counties	
	1990	1995	1990	1995	1990	1995	1990	1995
Probation	55.2	79.7	47.9	65.6	63.7	45.1	60.4	48.8
Court Supervision	31.9	15.8	38.6	27.8	16.1	10.2	12.6	18.0
Continued on Court Supervision	12.8	4.5	13.5	6.7	20.2	44.7	27.0	33.2
<u>n =</u>	623	419	215	90	366	206	356	256
Missing	11	13	4	7	1	26	5	34

Table 17

Average Number of Months of the Probation Period for Juvenile Probation Intakes Placed on Probation by Year, Gender and County Group

Year	Total Group	Males	Females	County Group			
				Cook	Collar	Urban	Rural
1990	14.4	14.5	14.0	11.8 <sup>a</sup>	14.4	17.4	15.5
1995	14.5	14.5	14.0	13.8 <sup>b</sup>	14.5	14.9	15.6

<sup>a</sup>Maximum length is 36 months.

<sup>b</sup>Maximum length is 60 months.

Table 18

Average Number of Months of the Court Supervision Period for Juvenile Probation Intakes Placed on Court Supervision by Year, Gender and County Group

Year	Total Group	Males	Females	County Group			
				Cook	Collar	Urban	Rural
1990	11.7	11.9	11.0	11.5	11.4	13.3	11.0
1995	11.3	11.6	10.2	11.1	14.1	11.1	9.9

Table 19

Average Number of Months of the Continued on Court Supervision Period for Juvenile Probation Intakes Continued on Court Supervision by Year, Gender and County Group

Year	Total Group	Males	Females	County Group			
				Cook	Collar	Urban	Rural
1990	10.9	11.2	9.9	9.5	12.1	11.4	11.3
1995	8.1	8.2	8.2	8.6	10.0	7.3	8.9

Table 20

Court Ordered Treatment for Juvenile Probation Intakes by Year and Gender  
(Percentages)

Treatment Ordered	Gender					
	Total Group		Males		Females	
	1990	1995	1990	1995	1990	1995
Substance Abuse Evaluation/Probation Officer Discretion	8.5	10.9	8.4	11.2	9.1	9.6
No Treatment Ordered	10.1	24.2	9.9	23.7	11.4	25.1
	81.5	64.9	81.8	65.1	79.5	65.3
<u>n</u> =	1,569	938	1,349	768	219	167
Missing	8	113 <sup>a</sup>	7	87	--	24

<sup>a</sup>The high number of missing values in 1995 results from the fact that orders for treatment for mental illness, sexual offending and family violence were coded as "missing" to enable comparison with 1990 data which did not contain these options.

Table 21

Court Ordered Treatment for Juvenile Probation Intakes by Year and County Group (Percentages)

	County Group							
	Cook County		Collar Counties		Urban Counties		Rural Counties	
	1990	1995	1990	1995	1990	1995	1990	1995
Treatment Ordered								
Substance Abuse Evaluation/Probation Officer Discretion	4.0	9.8	12.1	24.1	10.9	11.5	11.7	8.0
No Treatment Ordered	90.6	67.7	76.7	32.9	68.9	74.0	81.1	63.3
<u>n</u> =	628	387	215	79	366	208	360	264
Missing	6	45	--	18	1	24	1	26

Table 22

Probation Officer Perception of Treatment Needed for Juvenile Probation Intakes by Year, Gender and County Group (Percentages)

Perception of Treatment Needed	Gender					
	Total Group		Males		Females	
	1990	1995	1990	1995	1990	1995
Substance Abuse	13.0	19.9	13.1	20.6	12.3	16.4
Undetermined	87.0	80.1	86.9	79.4	87.7	83.6
<u>n</u> =	1,568	901	1,348	733	219	165
Missing	9	150 <sup>a</sup>	8	122	--	26

  

Perception of Treatment Needed	County Group							
	Cook County		Collar Counties		Urban Counties		Rural Counties	
	1990	1995	1990	1995	1990	1995	1990	1995
Substance Abuse	6.1	17.4	15.8	28.0	17.5	19.0	18.9	21.9
Undetermined	93.9	82.6	84.2	72.0	82.5	81.0	81.1	78.1
<u>n</u> =	627	384	215	75	366	205	360	237
Missing	7	48	--	22	1	27	1	53

<sup>a</sup>The high number of missing values in 1995 results from the fact that orders for treatment for mental illness, sexual offending and family violence were coded as "missing" to enable comparisons with 1990 data which did not contain these options.



# Juvenile Probation Population Survey Key

(These variables should all be known at classification stage of probation)

<p><b>1. Case Number:</b> Sequential number of case in this survey. Each officer begins with 1 and numbers sequentially until the end of the survey period on both the survey instrument and the Risk Instrument, using the same number for both cases.</p>	<p><b>7. Victim:</b> Use the code showing the relationship between the offender and the victim.                  1 family or household member                  2 acquaintance or friend                  3 stranger                  4 victimless offense</p>	<p><b>17. # Prev. Placements:</b> ___ enter the number of previous residential placements.</p>
<p><b>2. Age:</b> Age at time of survey ___</p>	<p><b>8. Petition type:</b>                  1 Delinquent                  2 MRAJ                  3 Truant/In need of supervision                  4 Addict                  5 Dependent/Neglect</p>	<p><b>18. Family Income Level:</b>                  1 \$0 - \$10,000                  2 \$10,001 - \$20,000                  3 \$20,001 - \$30,000                  4 \$30,001 - \$40,000                  5 \$40,001 - \$50,000                  6 \$50,001 - \$60,000                  7 \$60,001 - \$70,000                  8 \$70,001 - \$80,000                  9 \$80,001 and over</p>
<p><b>3. Sex:</b>                  1 male                  2 female</p>	<p><b>9. Court Action:</b>                  1 placed on probation                  2 placed on court supervision                  3 continued under supervision</p>	<p><b>19. Court Ordered Treatment:</b> record the nature of the court ordered treatment                  1 treatment ordered for drug abuse                  2 treatment ordered for alcohol abuse                  3 treatment ordered for drug and alcohol abuse                  4 evaluation ordered or treatment at probation officer discretion                  5 treatment ordered for mental illness                  6 treatment ordered for sexual offending                  7 treatment ordered for family violence                  8 no treatment ordered</p>
<p><b>4. Ethnicity:</b>                  1 American Indian                  2 Asian                  3 Black                  4 Hispanic                  5 White                  6 Other</p>	<p><b>10. Supervision Period:</b> enter the number ___ of months to which the individual was ordered to probation, court supervision or continued under supervision.</p>	<p><b>20. Probation Off. perc. of treatment needed:</b> please record the perception you (the probation officer) have of the offender's need for treatment                  1 treatment needed for drug abuse                  2 treatment needed for alcohol abuse                  3 treatment needed for drug and alcohol abuse                  4 need for treatment for mental illness                  5 treatment needed for sexual offending                  6 treatment needed for family violence                  7 not determined at this time</p>
<p><b>5. Social History:</b>                  1 performed                  2 not performed</p>	<p><b>11. # Prev. Custodies:</b> ___ enter the number of previous times the individual has been taken into custody.</p>	<p><b>21. Ordered to pay Restitution:</b>                  1 Yes                  2 No</p>
<p><b>6. Offense:</b> Use the code representing the most serious offense on which the individual was convicted for the present term of probation.                  01 sexual offense                  02 robbery                  03 assault/battery                  04 other violent offenses                  05 burglary                  06 theft/harvey                  07 motor vehicle theft                  08 arson                  09 other property offenses                  10 any drug possession                  11 any drug sale offense</p>	<p><b>12. # Prev. Probations:</b> ___ enter the number of previous terms of probation to which the offender has been ordered.</p>	<p><b>22. Ordered to Community Service:</b>                  1 Yes                  2 No</p>
<p><b>13. # Prev. Commitments:</b> ___ enter the number of previous commitments to IDOC.</p>	<p><b>14. Educational Achievement:</b> enter the ___ current grade or last grade completed (01 - 12 highest year completed)</p>	<p><b>23. Ordered to Electronic Monitoring:</b>                  (If yes, how many days ___)                  1 Up to 30 days                  2 30 to 60 days                  3 60 to 90 days                  4 Over 90 days</p>
<p><b>15. Educational Status:</b>                  1 attending traditional school program                  2 receiving special education school services                  3 attending alternative education school program                  4 truant                  5 dropped out</p>	<p><b>16. Does the family and/or the individual receive any type of public assistance:</b>                  Public Aid; Food Stamps/WIC; Aid to Dependent Children;                  Public Housing; SSI or other form of public assistance                  1 Yes                  2 no</p>	

CHAPTER 2, APPENDIX B  
COUNTIES REPORTING JUVENILE INTAKES  
1990-1995

COUNTY	NUMBER	COUNTY	NUMBER
ADAMS	12	KANKAKEE	55
BOND	3	KENDALL	3
BOONE	10	KNOX	28
BROWN	4	LAKE	52
BUREAU	8	LASALLE	38
CARROLL	13	LAWRENCE	1
CASS	9	LEE	25
CHAMPAIGN	26	LIVINGSTON	19
CHRISTIAN	16	LOGAN	6
CLARK	9	MCDONOUGH	20
CLINTON	6	MCHENRY	26
COLES	17	MCLEAN	41
COOK	1066	MACON	44
CRAWFORD	2	MACOUPIN	27
DEKALB	27	MADISON	71
DEWITT	15	MARION	19
DUPAGE	38	MARSHALL	6
EDGAR	7	MASON	8
EDWARDS	2	MASSAC	3
EFFINGHAM	13	MENARD	10
FAYETTE	11	MERCER	6
FORD	5	MONROE	11
FRANKLIN	25	MONTGOMERY	2
FULTON	26	MORGAN	33
GRUNDY	7	MOULTRIE	2
HANCOCK	5	OGLE	13
HENDERSON	3	PEORIA	20
HENRY	14	PERRY	2
IROQUOIS	32	POPE	3
JACKSON	6	PUTNAM	7
JASPER	7	RANDOLPH	9
JEFFERSON	7	RICHLAND	5
JERSEY	7	ROCK ISLAND	40
KANE	104	ST. CLAIR	93

COUNTY	NUMBER
SALINE	2
SANGAMON	72
SCHUYLER	9
STARK	4
STEPHENSON	9
TAZEWELL	26
VERMILION	23
WARREN	8
WAYNE	6
WHITE	1
WHITESIDE	21
WILL	92
WILLIAMSON	2
WINNEBAGO	38
WOODFORD	5

Not all counties reported juvenile intakes in both years.

No Juvenile intakes in 1990 nor 1995 were reported from the following counties:  
Alexander, Calhoun, Clay, Cumberland, Douglas, Gallatin, Greene, Hamilton, Hardin,  
Jo Daves, Johnson, Piatt, Pike, Pulaski, Scott, Shelby, Union, Wabash, and Washington.

## CHAPTER 3

### ILLINOIS PROBATION INTAKE STUDY: UNDERSTANDING RURAL AND URBAN DIFFERENCES

#### Introduction

During the 1980s, probation was the "disposition of choice" among judges faced with sentencing decisions for a growing number of Americans entering the criminal justice system. As a result, the probation population is two and one-half times the size of the prison population, which itself is at a record level. Between 1980 and 1993, the number of offenders on probation more than doubled, from 1.1 million to more than 2.8 million adults. In 1993 alone, more than 1.4 million adult felons entered probation. Furthermore, one-half of those on probation have been convicted of felony offenses (Snell, 1995).

The task of offender supervision is complex and involves interviewing, screening, investigating, and classifying, with each activity contributing to our understanding of the nature and potential causes of individual criminality. Understanding offenders is an integral aspect of case supervision; without it, probation officers are limited in their ability to provide adequate supervision designed to both protect the community and address offenders' needs. An overwhelming number of state and local probation systems have yielded to public and political demands to shift work roles from offender service to community protection (see Crank, 1996). As a result, the work of probation

officers in the 1990s is increasingly focused on such "enforcement" practices as intensive supervision, house arrest, and electronic monitoring. Sentences to probation in many jurisdictions are also likely to include fines, supervision fees, and community service orders. In spite of the growing emphasis on enforcement, there is little evidence that the "service" role of probation staff has been eliminated. Probation staff are likely to engage in such "treatment-oriented" practices as job referral, alcohol and drug treatment, and family crisis counseling, to name a few.

In addition to the steady increases in the number of cases managed by probation staff, widespread consensus exists that offenders entering probation are becoming more difficult to supervise (Gynes, 1988). Increasingly complex cases that require professional assistance are frequently referred or "brokered" to community agencies. In areas with a wide continuum of services, probation staff frequently work closely with service providers, often on a contractual basis in which probation departments purchase counseling, treatment, training, or educational services. Offender supervision strategies that include both community protection and assistance to offenders become complex functions in areas in which service providers do not exist, thus transforming the work role of probation officers from "specialists" to a "generalists" carrying out all of the court requirements as well as fulfilling offenders' service

needs. This problem is most noticeable in rural settings. Probation and other community corrections agencies, including parole, depend on community resources to carry out key responsibilities. A National Institute of Justice survey indicated a need to expand or improve all types of resources, including substance abuse, residential programming, vocational training, and mental health services (Guynes, 1988). By gaining a better understanding of the offender population entering adult probation, policy makers and probation administrators can more clearly articulate agency goals that focus on community protection and service delivery.

This chapter describes one state's cohort of adults entering probation, comparing rural and urban cases. The study examines several variables, including personal characteristics, current offense, criminal history, court action, treatment needs, and conditions of probation, using 3,698 cases in which rural-urban distinctions could be made.

#### What Is Rural?

The concept of rural is one that defies precise quantification (see Weisheit et al., 1996). The general idea is familiar to most, but there are a variety of ways in which the concept can be measured, none of which accurately captures all of its dimensions. Although difficult to precisely measure, rural is an important concept that has serious implications for criminal justice. In general, rural areas tend to have lower

levels of street crime; some other forms of crime, however, including domestic violence and drug use can occur as frequently in rural areas as in cities.

There are great variations among rural areas but rural counties generally have higher levels of poverty and unemployment. In most counties, rural criminal justice systems must operate within a smaller tax base, meaning lower salaries, smaller staff and fewer resources in the community for criminal justice agencies. Moreover, rural communities are more likely to have social networks in which most citizens know one another in a variety of roles. Drawing on what is known about rural police (Weisheit et al., 1996), we might speculate that rural probation officers know and are known not only as probation officers, but in a variety of other roles, including church member, parent, and member of civic organizations. Thus, rural probation officers might be more likely to know a great deal about the people with whom they come into formal contact—they may be more likely to know the "whole person." Weisheit et al. (1996) have argued that the nature of rural communities has a dramatic impact on police work. Similarly, Landon (1990) has documented the substantial differences between lawyering in large cities and small towns. For both police and lawyers, small town work tends to involve less specialization, more personal familiarity with "clients," a lack of personal privacy for police officers and the

attorneys, and a greater consideration of long-term clients and community interests in the handling of individual cases.

Similar work has not been done with probation officers in rural communities. This is unfortunate given the nature of probation work which involves a reliance on community resources and some familiarity with clients. This study does not deal directly with the day-to-day activities of rural probation officers. However, by comparing urban and rural probation cases, this study is an important first step in establishing the broad parameters within which rural and urban probation departments operate.

Although no single measure of rural captures all dimensions of the concept, this study will adopt two measures that are frequently used and that have intuitive appeal. Both measures are county-level measures, which are useful for our purposes because probation departments are generally county-level departments and because a variety of other measures of the local area gathered by the United States Bureau of the Census are county-level measures. One measure used in the study will be a simple dicotomy based on the distinction between metropolitan and non-metropolitan counties.

As defined by the United States Bureau of the Census, a nonmetropolitan county is one that has fewer than 50,000 people.

In this study 80% of the cases come from metropolitan counties, compared with the state population as a whole, for which 84% of



the population resides in metropolitan communities (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996, Table 42). As noted above, several larger counties were dropped from this analysis because their records included cases from adjacent nonmetropolitan counties. If those cases were kept in the study, 81% of the cases would be from metropolitan counties. With either calculation, metropolitan counties contributed somewhat fewer probation intakes than might have been expected given their population, but the difference is not large.

#### Counties

A brief overview of the counties represented in this study is presented in Table 1. The population of nonmetropolitan counties ranges from 4,691 to 49,406 residents, and for metropolitan counties the population ranges from 51,719 to 5,136,877. The unemployment rate is similar for the two county types, but the percentage of the white population is significantly greater in nonmetropolitan counties.

Table 1 also shows the number and rate of probation intakes by county type. The number of cases per county varied from 1 through 51 in nonmetropolitan counties and from 15 through 1,843 in metropolitan counties. Adjusting for population size, the number of admissions per 100,000 people varies from 4.7 to 179 per 100,000 people in nonmetropolitan counties and from 11.6 to 75.3 cases per 100,000 people in metropolitan counties.

Table 1 shows that larger counties have a greater number of admissions to probation, as would have been expected. It also shows, however, that the rate of admission to probation is higher in nonmetropolitan counties and that nonmetropolitan counties have substantially more variation in the rate of admission than metropolitan counties.

A second measure is the 10-category measure of rural developed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (see Appendix A).

This measure ranges from 0 through 9, with 0 representing the most densely populated urban counties and 9 representing the most rural counties. The measure is useful because it is based on a combination of population size and proximity to urban centers and thus provides a more sensitive measure of rural.

### Findings

From the original survey it is possible to distinguish several major categories of variables describing these offenders, including: personal characteristics, current offense, criminal history, and court action. Our focus will first be on personal characteristics of those admitted to probation.

#### Personal Characteristics

Table 2 shows the differences in personal characteristics between offenders from metropolitan and nonmetropolitan counties.

Offenders from both areas are equally likely to be male, to have a high school diploma or beyond, to be on public assistance, and to have a family income of less than \$10,000 a year. Probation

admissions from nonmetropolitan counties are different from those in metropolitan counties in that nonmetropolitan offenders are younger, more often white, and more often employed.

#### Current Offense

The probation intake data report current offense in several ways. First offenses are placed into one of sixteen categories of crime, including a catchall category of "Other." Offenses are also collapsed into five categories: violent, property, drugs, DUI, and other. Finally, offenses are categorized as felonies, misdemeanors, or traffic offenses. The present analysis will focus on the collapsed categories and on the felony-misdemeanor-traffic distinction.

As Table 3 shows, there are substantial differences between metropolitan and nonmetropolitan cases regarding the category of the immediate offense. In particular, offenders from nonmetropolitan counties are much less likely to be on probation for drug offenses and much more likely to be on probation for the catchall category "Other." These findings are not surprising. Although there is evidence that drug use is as frequent in rural areas as in cities (e.g., Donnermeyer, 1992; Weisheit et al., 1996), there is also evidence that drug enforcement is less aggressive in rural areas. For example, Castellano and Uchida (1990) estimate that the rate of drug arrests in urban areas is about four times that of rural areas. They speculate that because most drug enforcement is proactive, variations in arrest

rates among jurisdictions are more the result of differences in enforcement efforts than due to differences in consumption patterns. Compounded with possible variations in arrest practices is the possibility of rural-urban differences in the way in which drug cases are disposed, which directly affects the probation caseload. For example, a lower representation of drug cases in nonmetropolitan counties might indicate fewer arrests or more lenient treatment after arrest. It might also indicate harsher treatment if probation numbers are low because more offenders are sentenced to prison. Unfortunately, neither arrest, prosecution, nor dispositional practices can be examined with the data at hand.

It is possible to say more about the kinds of drug cases probation officers in rural areas must handle. Drug offenders in metropolitan counties are more likely to be on probation for drug sales (27%) than are drug offenders in nonmetropolitan counties (16%).

The higher percentage of cases in the "Other" category is also consistent with what is known about the functioning of criminal justice agencies in rural areas. In general, criminal justice agencies in rural communities must contend with a wider range of problems than is true in urban agencies. This has been observed regarding rural police (Weisheit et al., 1996) and the practice of law in rural areas (Landon, 1990). Although rural probation work has not been studied directly, it is likely that

rural probation officers must also deal with a wider range of issues than do urban probation officers.

Each case also included a code indicating whether the current offense was a felony, misdemeanor, or a traffic offense.

Table 4 shows that there are clear differences between metropolitan and nonmetropolitan counties in the seriousness of the cases admitted to probation. Nonmetropolitan counties had a much higher proportion of their cases classified as misdemeanors—43% for nonmetropolitan counties versus 27 percent for metropolitan counties. Conversely, admissions in metropolitan counties were much more likely to be for felonies, with the proportion of admissions for traffic offenses about the same in both types of county.

Thus, Tables 3 and 4 suggest several areas in which rural-urban differences should be further explored. It must also be remembered that the offenses listed in Tables 3 and 4 represent an official label without much information about the behaviors that led to that label. Myers and Talarico (1986) have cautioned that using an official label for a crime (such as homicide) might mask important rural-urban differences in the nature of the offense. Future research on rural and urban distinctions among probation cases should not only elaborate on official data but should include a study of the mechanism by which official arrest and dispositional data came to be constructed.

Finally, the data include the victim-offender relationship for the current offense. It might be expected that, given the closer social networks that characterize rural communities (see Weisheit et al., 1996), rural offenders would be more likely to know their victims. For this measure, the victim-offender relationship was categorized as "family or household member," "acquaintance or friend," "stranger," or "victimless offense." Although differences were in the predicted direction, they were not significant, probably because approximately 60% of the cases in each type of county were classified as victimless offenses, for which the concept of victim-offender relationship makes little sense.

The results of excluding the category of "victimless offenses" are presented in Table 5. The overall differences between metropolitan and nonmetropolitan cases in the victim-offender relationship were statistically significant, and for the categories of "stranger" and "acquaintance or friend," the differences were in the expected direction. The lower than expected representation of family victims in nonmetropolitan areas might be the result of tougher treatment of these cases in rural counties, leading to dispositions of jail or prison rather than probation. It might also be the result of the tendency of rural citizens to see family problems as none of the state's business combined with a pre-existing friendship between the head of the household and the police, an observation made by Gagne

(1992) who studied domestic violence in a rural community. The present data do not allow us to determine which explanation is more correct but do suggest an important area for future study. Notably, even in nonmetropolitan counties, the offender and the victim(s) are most frequently strangers.

### Criminal History

Several indicators of criminal history were recorded for each case. These include mean age of first arrest, mean number of prior arrests, mean number of prior probations, and mean number of prior imprisonments. The comparison of metropolitan and nonmetropolitan cases on these items is presented in Table 6.

Table 6 shows statistically significant differences for three of the four criminal history items. Nonmetropolitan admissions tend to be somewhat younger, have fewer prior arrests, and more prior probations than do metropolitan admissions. There is no difference between metropolitan and nonmetropolitan cases in the mean number of prior imprisonments.

Although Table 6 suggests that there are statistically significant differences between metropolitan and nonmetropolitan cases, it is less clear that the differences are of substantive significance. For example, for none of these associations is the value of Eta-squared greater than .008, suggesting that the differences explain little of the variation between metropolitan and nonmetropolitan cases. In short, the differences are probably real but quite small.

### Court Action

Finally, the data indicate several aspects of the court actions resulting in the sentence of probation. These measures include months of sentence to probation, whether the court ordered treatment for alcohol or drug problems, whether the probation officer perceived a need for treatment, and whether the sentence of probation included an order to pay probation fees or restitution, serve community service, and remain under electronic monitoring.

### Sentence Length

Probation caseloads are influenced by several factors, including the number of cases admitted to probation and the length of probation sentences. The average sentence length is the same in both metropolitan and nonmetropolitan counties--20 months. The two county types also have similar sentence lengths across categories of crime, including violent crimes (21 months), property crimes (25 months), drug offenses (22 months), and DUIs (17 months). It is unclear why violent offenses correspond with shorter probation periods than property crimes or drug offenses, but it is likely that the most violent offenses lead to imprisonment, leaving only violent offenses of relatively minor seriousness.

### Treatment Needs

The data include measures of treatment needs as perceived by the courts and by probation officers. As Tables 7 and 8 show,



there are few differences between metropolitan and nonmetropolitan counties in the perceptions of need by either the court or the probation officers. A direct comparison of court and probation officer perceptions shows that the two strongly agree. For example, when the court ordered treatment for alcohol or drugs, the probation officer was likely to agree in 93% of the cases. And, when the court did not order treatment, probation officers reported they could not determine if there was a diagnosable problem in approximately 75% of the cases. That is, probation officers and the court generally have the same opinion about the need for treatment for substance abuse or other specific problems. There are several factors that might explain this high degree of concordance. First, for some offenders the problems might be obvious, making concordance very likely. A second possibility is that much of the information the court uses to decide if treatment is necessary is identical to the information received by the probation officer and might have even come to the court's attention because of the probation officer.

An examination of Tables 7 and 8 show that although the courts and probation officers are in general agreement, probation officers are more likely than the courts to see a need for treatment. The data do not allow us to know why these differences exist. It might be that judges and probation officers approach cases differently, or it might be that while probation officers might recognize a need for treatment, the

availability of treatment might be limited, shaping the judge's decision about ordering treatment. The data again point to the need for research to clarify these issues.

#### Conditions of Probation

Finally, the data indicate whether the court imposed any of several conditions of probation. Each probationer's file indicated, by a simple "Yes" or "No" whether the court had required them to pay probation fees or restitution, provide community service, or wear an electronic monitor. As Table 9 shows, probation admissions from metropolitan and nonmetropolitan counties differed in the extent to which each of these conditions was applied.

As Table 9 shows, nonmetropolitan probationers were more often required to pay probation fees or restitution, and to wear an electronic monitor. Metropolitan probationers were more often required to provide community service.

#### An Alternative Measure of Rural

As noted earlier, distinguishing rural and urban counties through the metropolitan and nonmetropolitan distinction has the advantage of simplicity, but this simplicity is at the expense of sensitivity. A more elaborate measure of rural has been developed by the United States Department of Agriculture and includes 10 categories, ranging from 0 (the most urban) to 9 (the most rural). This system of categorization is presented in Appendix A.

Though technically ordinal, for practical reasons this measure will be treated as if it were an interval measure. When this is done, it is possible to correlate this measure of rural with many of the variables reported above, and the outcomes follow the same pattern as those reached using the dicotomous measure of rural (see Appendix B). One variable, number of prior arrests, is statistically significant with the dicotomous measure of rural but not with the more sensitive measure. In this case, however, the absolute size of the difference--3.2 prior arrests in nonmetropolitan cases versus 3.9 prior arrests in metropolitan cases--is not so large that it is likely to be of practical importance. Because the metropolitan-nonmetropolitan dicotomy has the advantage of simplicity with results similar to those for the more sensitive measure, the presentation is based primarily on the simpler measure.

#### Summary and Discussion

Understanding the structure and operation of probation in the United States is important because probation is among the most frequently administered sentences and it is used far more often than incarceration. This study has examined probation intake data for a one-month period in Illinois. The focus of this examination has been to compare intake clients from nonmetropolitan counties with those from metropolitan counties on a variety of social and criminal justice measures. Points of similarity and difference between cases in metropolitan and

nonmetropolitan counties are itemized in tabular form in Appendix C.

Probation admissions in metropolitan and nonmetropolitan Illinois counties tend to be comparable regarding the gender and education level of offenders, and the two county types have a similar percentage of clients on public aid and with incomes under \$10,000 per year. Probation admissions are equally likely in the two county types to have prior imprisonments and to have current offenses that are either for a property crimes or for DUIs. Metropolitan and nonmetropolitan counties are also similar in the length of sentence to probation for various categories of offenses--violent offenses, property offenses, drug offenses, and DUI--and in the treatment needs as perceived by the courts and probation officers. Because probation in Illinois is administered at the local level, the consistency of sentencing and perceived treatment needs across county types was not expected.

Metropolitan and nonmetropolitan counties differed in several areas. Nonmetropolitan counties had relatively fewer minority clients than did metropolitan counties. In addition, nonmetropolitan counties tended to have admission cases that were younger and more likely to be employed. Nonmetropolitan clients were less likely than metropolitan clients to have been admitted for violent or drug offenses, and were more likely to be on probation for a misdemeanor. Intake cases in nonmetropolitan

counties tended to be younger at first arrest, have fewer prior arrests, and more prior probations. In addition, nonmetropolitan intake cases were more likely to have as a condition of probation a requirement that they pay probation fees or restitution and wear an electronic monitor. Metropolitan intakes were more likely to be required to take part in community service as a condition of their probation.

In summary, these data suggest several areas in which probation intakes are different across the two county types. It appears that the client profile will be different for probation officers working in rural and urban settings. Beyond this, interpreting the findings is complicated by the reality that probation is one step in the criminal justice process, a step that is the product of earlier decisions. Thus, the data allow us to describe metropolitan and nonmetropolitan intake cases but do not allow us to explain the processes by which the observed patterns were created. Consequently, the findings we present here are not the conclusion of an inquiry into differences by county type but are instead, a starting point.

## References

Bureau of Economic and Social Research. (1996). 1996 Illinois statistical abstract. Urbana-Champaign, IL: University of Illinois.

Castellano, T. C., & Uchida, C. D. (1990). Local drug enforcement, prosecutors and case attrition: Theoretical perspectives for the drug war. American Journal of Police, 9(1), 133-62.

Crank, J. P. (1996). The construction of meaning during training for probation and parole. Justice Quarterly, 13(2), 265-90.

Donnermeyer, J. F. (1992). The use of alcohol, marijuana, and hard drugs by rural adolescents: A review of recent research. In R. W. Edwards (Ed.), Drug use in rural American communities (pp. 31-75). New York: Haworth Press.

Gagne, P. L. (1992). Appalachian women: Violence and social control. Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 20(4), 387-415.

Guynes, R. (1988). Difficult clients, large caseloads plague probation, parole agencies. National Institute of Justice. Research in Action. Washington, DC: United States Department of Justice.

Hurley, D. J., & Hatfield, J. M. (1996). Illinois probation intake study. Chicago, IL: Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority.

Landon, D. D. (1990). Country lawyers: The impact of context on professional practice. New York: Praeger.

McCarthy, B. R., & McCarthy, B. J. (1997). Community-based corrections (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Myers, M. A., & Talarico, S. M. (1986). Urban justice, rural injustice? Urbanization and its effect on sentencing. Criminology, 24(2), 367-91.

Snell, T. (1995). Correctional populations in the United States, 1993. Bureau of Justice Statistics. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Weisheit, R. A., Falcone, D. N. & Wells, L. E. (1996). Crime and policing in rural and small-town America. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1990 Census of Population: General Population Characteristics, Illinois. Table 5. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1996). Statistical abstract of the United States, 1996. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1996b). State and County Population 1990 and 1995. U.S. Bureau of the Census. [http://www.census.gov/population/estimate-extract/county/co95\\_US.txt](http://www.census.gov/population/estimate-extract/county/co95_US.txt)

Table 1

Characteristics of Counties in the Study

Characteristic	Nonmetropolitan	Metropolitan
Median Population	19,300	139,274
Percentage White	95.9	74.6
Unemployment Rate (%) <sup>a</sup>	6.1	5.2
Median Number of Admissions	9.5	53.0
Minimum-Maximum Number of Admissions	1-51	15-1,843
Median Number of Admissions per 100,000 Citizens	48.2	32.9
Minimum-Maximum Number of Admissions per 100,000 Citizens	4.7 to 179.0	11.6 to 75.3
<u>N</u> of Counties	23	64

<sup>a</sup>Difference is not statistically significant.

Sources: Population data are from the U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1997; Percentage white is from the U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1992; Unemployment data are from the Bureau of Economic and Business Research, 1996.



Table 2

Personal Characteristics of Adult Offenders Admitted to Probation  
in Illinois

Characteristic	Nonmetropolitan	Metropolitan
% <25 Yrs. Old	45.4	39.2*
% Male	80.6	80.5
% White	91.6	46.0**
% W/High School or More	60.6	52.9
% Unemployed	26.0	36.0**
% On Public Assistance	18.4	18.9
% With a Family Income Less Than \$10,000/Yr.	52.9	51.7
<u>N</u> of Valid Cases	733	2,920

\*Gamma  $p < .05$ .

\*\*Goodman & Kruskal Tau = .09;  $p < .000$ .

Table 3

Current Offense of Adult Offenders Admitted to Probation in Illinois

Offense	Nonmetropolitan	Metropolitan
Violent	14.1%	16.8%
Property	19.2	20.3
DUI	23.3	23.6
Drugs	15.6	26.7
Other Offenses	27.8	12.6
Total Percentage	100.0%	100.0%
<u>N</u> of Valid Cases	731	2,873

Goodman & Druskal Tau = .01;  $p < .000$ .

Table 4

Seriousness of Current Offense of Adult Offenders Admitted to Probation in Illinois

Offense Level	Nonmetropolitan	Metropolitan
Felony	32.5%	52.0%
Misdemeanor	43.1	26.6
Traffic	24.4	21.3
Total Percentage	100.0%	100.0%
<u>N</u> of Valid Cases	747	2,920

Goodman & Kruskal Tau = .02;  $p < .000$ .

Table 5

Victim-Offender Relationship in Current Offense of Adult  
Probation Admissions

Relationship	Nonmetropolitan	Metropolitan
Family or Household Member	16.4%	22.1%
Acquaintance or Friend	32.9	19.9
Stranger	50.7	58.0
Total Percentage	100.0%	100.0%
<u>N</u> of Valid Cases	292	1,166

Goodman & Druskal Tau = .01;  $p < .000$ .

Table 6

Criminal Histories of Adult Probation Admissions

Criminal History (x)	Nonmetropolitan	Metropolitan
Age of First Arrest	23.4	24.2*
Number of Prior Arrests	3.2	3.9*
Number of Prior Probations	.8	.5*
Number of Prior Imprisonments	.2	.2
<u>N</u> of Valid Cases	740	2,857

\* $F > 4.8$ ;  $p < .000$ .

Table 7

Court Perception of Treatment Needs of Probationers

Treatment Need	Nonmetropolitan	Metropolitan
Drug/Alcohol Treatment Evaluation Ordered	38.8%	40.1%
Other Treatment <sup>a</sup>	8.6	6.2
No Treatment Ordered	5.0	7.2
	47.7	46.5
Total Percentage	100.0%	100.0%
<u>N</u> of Valid Cases	745	2,913

<sup>a</sup> Refers to treatment for mental illness, sex offending, or family violence.

Goodman & Kruskal Tau = .00; NS.

Table 8

Probation Officers' Perception of Treatment Needs of Probationers

Treatment Need	Nonmetropolitan	Metropolitan
Drug/Alcohol Treatment	53.9%	49.7%
Other Treatment <sup>a</sup>	8.2	9.3
Need Not Determined	37.9	41.1
Total Percentage	100.0%	100.0%
<u>N</u> of Valid Cases	731	2,872

<sup>a</sup>Refers to treatment for mental illness, sex offending, or family violence.

Goodman & Kruskal Tau = .00; NS.

Table 9

Conditions of Probation (Percentage Saying "Yes")

Condition of Probation	Nonmetro- politan	Metropolitan	Value of Gamma
Pay Probation Fees	74.4%	56.4%	.38;p<.00
Pay Restitution	24.2	14.6	.30;p<.00
Provide Community Service	17.1	23.0	-.19;p<.00
Wear an Electronic Monitor	2.7%	1.2%	.39;p<.00
<u>N</u> of Valid Cases	744	1,916	



## APPENDIX A

### U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE RURAL-URBAN CONTINUUM CODES

USDACODE This is a code representing a rural-urban continuum as established by the US Department of Agriculture in 1993. The codes go from 0, which is most urban to 9 which is most rural. According to the USDA:

"These classification codes describe counties by degree of urbanization and nearness to metro areas. The 10 county types identified vary from central counties of metropolitan areas with a population of one million or more to completely rural counties or those with an urban population of less than 2,500."

Thus, the codes are only partly based on population size. For example, in Illinois Grundy County is categorized as a "1" even though the county has just over 30,000 people. It is marked on the urban end of the continuum because of its proximity to a large metropolitan area.

The description that follows, as well as the data giving the code for each county in the U.S. can be downloaded from the following web site:

[www.econ.ag.gov](http://www.econ.ag.gov) (go to the area labeled "Data")

U.S. Department of Agriculture Rural-Urban Continuum Codes

CODE

DESCRIPTION

---

METROPOLITAN COUNTIES

- 0 Central counties of metropolitan areas of 1 million population or more.
- 1 Fringe counties of metropolitan areas of 1 million population or more.
- 2 Counties in metropolitan areas of 250 thousand to 1 million population.
- 3 Counties in metropolitan areas of less than 250 thousand population.

NONMETROPOLITAN COUNTIES

- 4 Urban population of 20,000 or more, adjacent to a metropolitan area.
- 5 Urban population of 20,000 or more, not adjacent to a metropolitan area.
- 6 Urban population of 2,500 to 19,999, adjacent to a metropolitan area.
- 7 Urban population of 2,500 to 19,999, not adjacent to a metropolitan area.
- 8 Completely rural or less than 2,500 urban population, adjacent to a metropolitan area.
- 9 Completely rural or less than 2,500 urban population, not adjacent to a metropolitan area.

APPENDIX B

CORRELATION BETWEEN THE USDA RURAL-URBAN  
CODE AND KEY VARIABLES

Variable

Pearson's r

---

Age

-.07

Age of First Arrest

-.07

Number of Prior Probations

.14

Years of Education

.09

Income

-.13

Ordered to Pay Probation Fees

-.17

Ordered to Pay Restitution

-.15

Ordered to Community Service

.04

Ordered to Electronic Monitoring

-.07

---

N of Cases = 3,698; For all cases  $p < .05$

APPENDIX C

SUMMARY TABLE COMPARING  
NONMETROPOLITAN AND METROPOLITAN CASES

SIMILARITIES BETWEEN NONMETROPOLITAN AND METROPOLITAN CASES

Personal Characteristics

- % Male (81%)
- % w/high school or more (57%)
- % on public aid (19%)
- % w/income <10,000/yr (52%)

Current Offense

- % Property (20%)
- % DUI (23%)

Criminal History

Mean number of prior prisons (.2)

Court Action

- Sentence Length (on probation)
- Overall (20 months)
- Violent crimes (21 months)
- Property crimes (25 months)
- Drug offenses ( 22 months)
- DUI (17 months)

Treatment Needs

- Court Perception
- Drug/Alcohol Treatment (39%)
- Other Treatment (6%)
- Evaluation Ordered (7%)
- No Treatment Ordered (47%)

Probation Officer Perception

- Drug/Alcohol Treatment (52%)
- Other Treatment (9%)
- Need Not Determined (40%)

---

Note: Where nonmetropolitan and metropolitan counties are listed as similar, the differences between the two areas is not statistically significant at the .05 level. The number given represents a midpoint between the two and, for most variables, a rounding of the midpoint.

## DIFFERENCES BETWEEN NONMETROPOLITAN AND METROPOLITAN CASES

### Personal Characteristics

Nonmetro tend to be younger (mean age 29 years vs 30 years)  
Nonmetro have higher % white (92% vs 46%)  
Nonmetro have lower % unemployed (26% vs 36%)

### Current Offense

% Violent (14% vs 17%)  
% Drugs (16% vs 27%)  
% Other (28% vs 13%)  
% Felony (33% vs 52%)  
% Misdemeanor. (43% vs 27%)  
% Traffic (24% vs 21%)  
% Family/household member (16% vs 22%)  
% Acquaintance/friend (33% vs 20%)  
% Stranger (51% vs 58%)

### Criminal History

Mean age of first arrest (23 vs 24)  
Mean number of prior arrests (3.2 vs 3.9)  
Mean number of prior probations (.8 vs .5)

### Conditions of Probation

Pay probation fees (74% vs 56%)  
Pay restitution (24% vs 15%)  
Community service (17% vs 23%)  
Electronic monitor (2.7% vs 1.2%)

---

Note: For the two numbers given in parentheses, the first is always for nonmetropolitan counties and the second is for metropolitan counties in the study. Differences are defined as statistically significant if  $p \leq .05$ .

## CHAPTER 4

### ILLINOIS PROBATION INTAKE STUDY

#### Recommendations

The analyses of the 1990 and 1995 adult and juvenile intake data enabled us to offer a set of recommendations for improving the delivery of services to probationers and for ensuring the protection of Illinois citizens. The data point clearly to a lack of meaningful full-time employment for adult offenders. A 50% rate of unemployment is unacceptable in an era in which many jobs exist and opportunities for employment training are available. Judges and probation staff must hold offenders accountable for securing and holding jobs. Each probation department must also be held accountable for reducing offender unemployment and removing probationers from the public aid roles. Probationers must be restored to a status of productivity in the community through meaningful work, training, and support for families and self. This goal should certainly be an integral component of the strategic plans of Illinois probation departments. In addition, most offenders entering probation are living well below the poverty line. Unfortunately, similar to the rate of unemployment, little changed over the five-year period between 1990 and 1995.

Offenders entering probation in 1995 were more likely to have previous arrests than those entering in 1990. Probation administrators must be aware that, in a time of tight budgets, department resources are woefully scarce and should be allocated in the most efficient ways to serve the interests of the offender population and the surrounding community. Courts should also treat adult probation as a scarce resource.

Case planning should reflect the changing backgrounds of offenders and the problematic nature of many of those entering probation supervision. With a growing probation population, strategies should be considered to eliminate, or to find alternative methods of supervision for, the unusually large number of offenders sentenced to probation for misdemeanor offenses.

Among juvenile offenders, the education picture is quite bleak. Rising truancy and drop out rates must be reversed. The doubling of the percentage of juvenile offenders, from 1990 to 1995, who have completed only elementary school underscores the need for the juvenile justice system to work more closely with mainstream schools and alternatives to meet students' educational needs. Today, schools routinely suspend and expel students for a variety of disruptive and illegal behaviors. The handwriting is clearly on the wall for the large percentage f

juvenile offenders who are forced out, or who voluntarily withdraw from, the educational system. Special attention should be paid to the significant decline in attendance for female juvenile offenders entering probation.

Juvenile drug offenders are flooding the juvenile probation system, particularly in Cook County. The three-fold increase suggests increased criminal activity as well as more stringent enforcement practices. The juvenile probation system should examine its juvenile drug offender population and seek ways to divert many low-level, non-violent offenders from the system in the form of pretrial diversion.



