

FINAL

Monitoring Study of Misdemeanor Probation
Services for Palm Beach County
October 1, 2005 to September 30, 2007 (Two-Year Study)

by

Damir Kukec
Research and Planning Manager
Research and Planning Unit
Criminal Justice Commission

for

Probation Advisory Board
Criminal Justice Commission

Date: April 30, 2008

In accordance with the provisions of the ADA, this document may be requested in an alternative format. Please contact the Palm Beach County Criminal Justice Commission (561) 355-4943.

Acknowledgements

Criminal Justice Commission staff would like to thank Wanda Joiner, Madie Berry, Terry Bell, Maureen Brickous, and all of the helpful staff at Pride Integrated Services, Inc. This study would not have been possible without the openness and helpful directions provided to county staff. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank Ms. Katherine Hatos, Criminal Justice Analyst, for her editorial comments and suggested changes. In addition, Katherine was instrumental in developing the offense categories (based on the National Crime Information Center and Florida Department of Law Enforcement) to report on standard offenses and offense groupings. Thank you.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	i
Introduction.....	1
Review Framework.....	2
Method	4
Findings.....	6
Service Contract.....	6
Payment to the County.....	6
Insurance	6
Access and Audits.....	6
Authority to Practice.....	6
Scope of Work – Exhibit “A”	7
Service Coverage	7
Intake Requirements	7
Sexual Predators and Sexual Offenders.....	8
Employment and Address Verification.....	8
Risk/Needs Assessment	9
Referrals.....	10
Criminal Record Check Prior to Termination.....	12
Probation Supervision.....	13
Violations of Probation.....	14
Outcomes	15
Exploring the Relationship between Risk/Need and Outcomes	16
Staffing.....	21
Staffing Ratio to Caseload	21
Staff Training	22
Administration	22
Restitution.....	23
Recommendations.....	24
Response from Service Provider.....	26
Conclusion	27
Profile Supporting Tables	28

Executive Summary

This report contains the findings of a two year review of misdemeanor cases supervised by Pride Integrated Services, Inc (Pride); the sole misdemeanor services provider in Palm Beach County. Misdemeanor probation services are provided on a cost recovery basis, with a fee collected from the client for the cost of supervision. This means that the service is delivered without *ad valorem* funding. The purpose of the review is to monitor Pride's level of compliance with the Service Contract and Scope of Work. The review of misdemeanor cases is led by the Probation Advisory Board, a sub-committee of the Palm Beach County Criminal Justice Commission. The actual review was completed by the Research and Planning Unit, Criminal Justice Commission staff.

The review framework was guided primarily by the requirements noted in the Service Contract and Scope of Work. More specifically, the review examined client intake procedures, such as background checks and verifications of home address and employment status. The study examined client supervision; related activities and appointments with misdemeanants and pretrial intervention (PTI) clients. The study also reviewed the rate of violations and level of successful completion. Lastly, the study explored administrative requirements concerning staffing, staffing levels and reporting. The study included two components reviewing misdemeanor client case files terminated between October 1, 2005 and September 30, 2007. The first component included a review of 538 randomly selected hardcopy client case files, and the second part included a review of 9,887 electronic client case files maintained by Pride's case management system.

Pride maintains four offices in Palm Beach County to supervise misdemeanor and PTI clients. The West Palm Beach location supervises the majority of misdemeanants in Palm Beach County. Almost three-quarters of the client cases supervised by Pride were sentenced to standard probation (case type): meaning that they are required to report to a probation officer once per month and complete various conditions outlined in the sentence such as treatment/counseling, abstaining from illicit drugs and/or alcohol, or maintaining lawful employment.

Given that Pride is responsible for both supervising clients and helping bring about a positive lifestyle change, Pride is required to implement a risk/need assessment for probation clients (other than "mail-in" or administrative probation clients). From the review of 534 randomly selected case files, 80% of the client case files contained a completed risk assessment form. Standard probation clients reported the highest rate of completion when compared to other probation case types. From the total number of clients who noted one or more risk/need (140), 67% of the case files contained information that a referral was provided or the court had already referred the client to counseling or treatment, or the probation officer offered a referral and the client refused.

With respect to supervision, the study examined the activities and appointments during the review period. Overall, Pride reported over 35,000 walk-in appointments with probation and PTI clients. Eighty-eight percent of the appointments occurred on time or were reported as late. The remaining walk-in appointments were reported as either cancelled or no shows.

From the total number of electronic probation case files, the rate of violation for probation clients only was approximately 50% - excluding PTI clients. From the total number of violations, 37% were for failure to comply with court ordered conditions, 37% were for no shows for appointments, and 26% were for an additional arrest. From the total number of probation clients that reported one or more violation, 36% successfully completed their term of probation. Overall, during the two year review period the rate of successful completion for probation client cases was approximately 67%, with 32% having their cases unsuccessfully terminated. In comparison, the Bureau of Justice Statistics reported a 57% success rate for adults exiting probation in 2006. It is important to note that rates of violation and successful completion also reflect level of supervision and maintenance of public safety.

The review also examined what factors may influence the rate of success for probation and PTI clients. The study found that clients with one or more violations on file were less likely to successfully complete their period of supervision when compared to clients with no violations on file. Annual income, employment status, and previous arrests were also important factors associated with the successful completion of supervision. The less annual income reported by the client the lower the success rate. Not surprising, unemployed clients were the least likely to successfully complete their period of supervision.

The report contains a number of recommendations stemming from the above results. For example, Pride has been asked to include training related to the importance of completing and documenting risk/need assessments. They have also been asked enter into formal (and informal) agreements with local not-for-profit and government social service providers to better facilitate referrals for those with the greatest risks/needs (e.g., unemployed clients).

Lastly, the study found that Pride is in general compliance with the requirements outlined in the contract. However, Pride is also interested and willing to address areas in need of improvement, such as risk/need assessments and referrals for those clients in need of assistance. In response to earlier drafts of this report, Pride has already started to work toward the recommendations found in the report and has remained eager to consult with the Probation Advisory Board, the Criminal Justice Commission and its various Task Forces, the 15th Judicial Circuit, and misdemeanor and PTI clients.

Introduction

This report contains the findings of the monitoring study which is directed by the Probation Advisory Board (PAB). For the first time, this study incorporates two years of client files terminated between October 1, 2005 and September 30, 2007. The PAB was created by the Palm Beach County Board of County Commissioners to monitor and report on the Service Contract with Pride Integrated Services, Inc. (referred to below as Pride) for misdemeanor probation services in the county. As a result, the PAB meets throughout the year on an ad hoc basis to discuss issues concerning misdemeanor probation services and other related criminal justice issues. As well, the PAB directs Criminal Justice Commission staff to conduct an annual monitoring study which examines the efficacy of the misdemeanor probation service vis-à-vis the requirements found in the Service Contract and the Scope of Work, both of which are rooted in Florida Statute 948, Probation and Community Control. The following list contains the individual members of the PAB for the review period (cases terminated by Pride between October 1, 2005 and September 30, 2007):

Judge Laura Johnson, County Court (current chair)
Judge Paul A. Damico, Chair, County Court (past chair)
Elizabeth Parker, Assistant State Attorney
Virginia Cataldo, United States Probation
Theresa Corner, Department of Corrections
Steven Cohen, Criminal Defense Lawyers Association
Kay Oglesby, Director of Criminal Courts Services
John Rivera, Assistant Public Defender
Louis Tomeo, Office Clerk & Comptroller

As part of the monitoring study, Pride was given the opportunity to review and comment on the draft report and to provide a written response to the individual findings and recommendations contained herein. Once Pride's written response was included, the report was vetted by the PAB and the full Criminal Justice Commission. Following this process, the final report was presented to the Palm Beach County Board of County Commissioners for their consideration. The study of misdemeanor probation services is important, as it provides an opportunity to identify challenges and offer solutions. It also provides an opportunity for Pride to ask for specific direction from the PAB and potentially modify service delivery, which may help improve efficiencies and client services, while at the same time reducing costs associated with the delivery of misdemeanor probation services.

Pride is the sole provider for misdemeanor probation services in Palm Beach County and has been since December 1993. Pride's clients include two case types; offenders who are sentenced to a period of misdemeanor probation; and, defendants referred to pretrial intervention (PTI) by the State Attorney's Office through a deferred prosecution agreement. PTI clients have a great incentive to comply with the conditions of the program, because if they successfully complete the conditions, the case is disposed of by way of a *nolle prosequere*; meaning that the client would not have a criminal record.

Both probation and PTI clients must report to Pride in some fashion in order to successfully complete their term of supervision in Palm Beach County. It is important to emphasize that the misdemeanor probation services maintained by Pride includes primarily offenders convicted of one or more misdemeanor offense, which is punishable by a period of probation or jail for up to 12 months. Some clients are also serving their period of misdemeanor probation consecutively; therefore, they can be supervised for a period greater than 12 months. Although rare, some Pride clients are also serving a period of felony probation, which is supervised by the Florida Department of Corrections separately.

Review Framework

The current review framework builds on the previously completed monitoring studies undertaken by the PAB and Criminal Justice Commission staff¹, taking into account the requirements outlined in the Service Contract; as well as, the Florida Statute 948 which regulates Probation and Community Control in the State of Florida. As part of this review, we included previously examined requirements and new items concerning clients who completed a “risk/need assessment” form. In addition, we also examined administrative and reporting requirements noted in the Service Contract (Scope of Work); as well as, Pride’s ability to staff, retain (ratio to caseload), and train probation officers. As part of the Service Contract, Pride must also maintain three misdemeanor probation offices within the county and monitor the completion of conditions attached to either a probation sentence or PTI agreement within the county. The review framework was also developed keeping in mind the day to day operations of supervising cases and meeting with individual clients. Clients that are serving a term of misdemeanor probation are typically classified by the courts on the basis of “level of supervision” which can be maximum, standard, or administrative (often referred to as “mail-in”) probation.

After sentencing, the term of supervision begins immediately with a meeting between a Pride probation officer and the client. The purpose of this initial meeting is to quickly assess the case and set a date for an orientation visit with the client and a Pride probation officer at one of the Pride office locations. These first two interactions are vital as they provide an opportunity to ensure that the client understands the terms and conditions of their probation sentence or deferred prosecution agreement (PTI); and it also provides the Pride probation officer an opportunity to fully assess the case and make recommendations to the court for modifications if required. Following these first meetings, the frequency of contact between clients and Pride probation officers is determined by the “level of supervision” ordered by the court or the State Attorney’s Office for individual clients deferred to a PTI. In general, most PTI clients are required to report to Pride in the same manner as offenders serving a sentence of standard or administrative probation.

¹ Probation Advisory Board, Annual Monitoring Report of Pride Misdemeanor Probation Services (Review Period) October 1, 2003 to September 30, 2004 and October 1, 2004 to September 30, 2005.

Maximum supervision requires clients to report to a Pride probation officer once per month, and mandates that a Pride probation officer conducts a home or place of employment visit once per month as well. Standard probation requires the offender to report to a Pride probation officer at one of the office locations once per month. Offenders who reside outside of the county or state and in some cases outside of the country may be sentenced to a period of administrative (or mail-in) probation. This type of “level of supervision” requires offenders to submit a mail-in form documenting compliance with conditions and proof of completion for courses and/or treatment/counseling ordered by the court. Contact with probation and PTI clients, enables Pride probation officers to monitor their progress and help clients to complete the conditions of their probation or PTI agreement. If individuals fail to meet the conditions of their probation sentence or PTI agreement, Pride probation officers are obligated to begin a “violation of probation” (VOP) proceeding with the court or to “reject” a PTI agreement and inform the State Attorney’s office of the client’s failure to complete the conditions of their agreement.

In general, conditions of probation and deferred prosecution agreement (PTI) may include attending treatment/counseling or mental health evaluations. Other conditions may require the completion of courses related to theft abatement or driving under the influence (drugs or alcohol), and classes that demonstrate the impact that different offenses have on society. Most court ordered conditions also require the offender to pay the court costs, fines, and the cost of supervision (unless clients can show they are unable to pay). If the case involves a victim, the court may also order restitution. All fees collected for fines and court costs are forwarded to the County as part of the Service Contract. All restitution that is collected by Pride is forwarded to the known victim(s). If for any reason the restitution payment to the victim is unclaimed or returned to Pride, the restitution funds must be forwarded to the Crimes Compensation Trust Fund in Tallahassee. Finally, probation and PTI clients are required to pay a monthly fee of \$50.00 for the cost of supervision. Some clients who are found indigent may have the cost of supervision waived by the court, and in some cases, this determination is made by Pride itself. Probation and PTI clients, regardless of the “level of supervision,” pay the same monthly fee for the cost of supervision.

Method

Criminal Justice Commission staff commenced the study by first reviewing previously completed monitoring reports and other documentation related to the implementation of misdemeanor probation services in Palm Beach County (e.g., Service Contract, Pride documentation, etc.). Staff also completed informal interviews with Pride staff and Criminal Justice Commission staff previously involved with the monitoring study and the PAB.

Interviews with Pride staff and Criminal Justice Commission staff were vital to establishing the review method and identifying the various requirements under the Service Contract for misdemeanor probation services. Interviews with staff were also helpful in identifying the types of information currently maintained in Pride's client (or case) management system and hardcopy client files. The review of existing files (both electronic and hardcopy) were used to compile a data collection strategy and form. As a result of the interviews and the initial review of files, it was determined that the review of client files would consist of three components: 1) physical review of hardcopy client files randomly selected from the total number of client files terminated between October 1, 2005 and September 30, 2006; and 2) review of all electronic client records terminated between October 1, 2005 and September 30, 2006; and 3) review of all client records terminated between October 1, 2006 and September 30, 2007. It was also determined that the physical review of hardcopy client files was necessary, since information on some of the needed variables were not available from Pride's client (case) management system (e.g., reported needs assessment). Unless otherwise specified in the study, the unit of analysis for this study is either a hardcopy client file or electronic client record, where one file represents one probation or PTI client.

In order to select the random sample of hardcopy client files for review, Criminal Justice Commission staff received a list of client identification numbers in MS Excel format from Pride, for clients who had their cases "terminated" between October 1, 2005 and September 30, 2006. Using this parameter, the scope of this review included 5,215 unique clients involved in 5,662 unique cases (with corresponding case numbers). Staff used the MS Excel file, which contained a list of 5,215 unique client files, as a sample frame to select a random sample of client files for review at Pride's offices. Prior to selecting the random sample, staff determined that at least 10% of the census would be selected from the sample frame, so that the random sample would possess a confidence interval of four (plus-or-minus) and a confidence level of 95%.² These two statistical terms describe the strength of the random sample (538) in describing the 2005/06 census population overall (5,215). From the above noted confidence interval and confidence levels, we can make inferences about the census population based on the results of the random sample. For example, if the physical review of 538 files found that 95.5% of the

² The Survey System is a free internet site that provides a number of research aids for researchers and statisticians, including a calculator that estimates the sample size, based on a desired confidence interval and confidence level. The actual formulas are also available on the internet site and for more information please see <http://www.surveysystem.com/sscalc.htm>.

client files contained a criminal record check as part of the intake process, we can say that we are 95% “sure” that between 91.5 (-4) and 99.5 (+4) of the overall census population contains a completed criminal record check.” Staff used a simple random sample technique, using MS Excel, to select 538 client files from the four offices terminated during the 2005/06 review period. Table one describes the actual sample size in comparison to the sample frame or census population for both review periods.

Table 1: Number of Clients Files by Location for 2005-06 and 2006-07

	2005-06				2006-07	
	Sample Frame (Census)		Random Sample		Census	
Location	N	Col. %	n	Col. %	N	Col. %
West Palm Beach	3,223	62%	324	60%	3,362	72%
Delray Beach	1,243	24%	134	25%	1,128	24%
Belle Glade	128	2%	9	2%	181	4%
North County	621	12%	71	13%	1	0%
Total	5,215	100%	538	100%	4,672	100%

Source: 2005-06 and 2006-07 census data provided to staff by Pride Integrated Services, Inc. and the random sample was generated by staff using the sampling function in MS Excel, 2002. The file review of hardcopy files included 534 client files. Four of the files could not be located during the physical review – (3) West Palm Beach and (1) in Delray Beach Office. Census data - Daily Monitor Pride Client Management System.

Research methods that rely on administrative or case management files as the primary source of data have a number of limitations. The findings reflect the contents of the files and not necessarily the actions or conduct of study participants. For example, the Service Contract requires probation officers to confirm the home and employment address of the client. If the probation officer does confirm the home and employment address of the client, and they do not record the confirmation in the file in some manner, then the findings would indicate that there was no evidence in the client file that the home and employment address were verified by the probation officer. In some cases, information contained in the client file may go missing inadvertently while being moved from one location to another, such as in this case where closed files are placed in storage and later retrieved for review. From another perspective, file reviews don’t always uncover the circumstances of individual cases or situations. For example, probation officers are required to refer clients to “agencies for counseling employment and social services” or refer unemployed clients to the county and private sector employment assistance and/or educational programs. In some cases, the review uncovered cases where the client identified a social service need, yet the probation officer communicated in the client file notes that no referrals were provided. Ideally, it is not always possible to follow-up with the probation officer to determine the rationale for not referring the client to the appropriate agency, because the probation officer may no longer be employed by Pride, or they may not be able to recall. Regardless of these limitations, this method does allow staff to determine the completeness of each client file and to describe the clients, and documented interactions between clients and Pride probation officers.

Findings

The following describes the major findings of the monitoring study, recognizing that the informal interviews with Pride staff and review of files did not examine each and every requirement found in the Service Contract and Scope of Work. While the review was in-depth, the study is by no means exhaustive. The findings are organized in accordance to the various sections of the Service Contract and its themes, which applied to “terminated cases” between October 1, 2005 - September 30, 2006 and October 1, 2006 and September 2007. It is important to note that from the 538 client files, 4 client files were not reviewed, since they were not available during the review process. Therefore, findings related to the random sample are based on the review of 534 client files, and not the 538 sampled. The Cases that were active during these two timeframes were not included in the review.

Service Contract

Payment to the County

The Criminal Justice Commission financial analyst confirmed that the County did receive two payments for \$2,500 from Pride in order to cover the costs associated during both study periods.

Insurance

Pride conforms to all insurance requirements pursuant to the above noted provision of the Service Contract for the 2005/06 and 2006/07 review period. A copy of the *Certificate of Liability Insurance* is on file.

Access and Audits

Pride maintained adequate records and documentation related to client files, and was very cooperative with Criminal Justice Commission staff; allowing complete access to records and documentation related to the review timeframe.

Authority to Practice

Pride maintained the necessary occupational licenses from the city of Belle Glade, Delray Beach, Jupiter, Lake Park, and West Palm Beach.

Scope of Work – Exhibit “A”

Service Coverage

Pride is required to maintain at least three offices in specific locations of Palm Beach County, including Belle Glade, Delray Beach, and West Palm Beach. During this review timeframe, Pride exceeded this requirement as it maintained one other location in Lake Park, in addition to the three noted above. Regrettably, the Lake Park Office was closed in November 2006 due to a lack of clientele. Since November 2006, Pride has worked with the PAB and various local agencies to re-open a fourth location in the Northern part of the county; even though it is not a requirement in the Service Contract. It is important to note that Pride opened a fourth location in Jupiter (Palm Beach County Sheriff’s Office sub-station) on September 7, 2007.

Intake Requirements

The Scope of Work includes a number of intake requirements for new clients, offenders sentenced to a period of misdemeanor probation and individuals party to a PTI agreement. The Service Contract stipulates that Pride shall complete “intake interviews” with clients “immediately following sentencing”, at the Main Courthouse, North County Courthouse, Belle Glade Courthouse, and the Gun Club Courtrooms. Following the intake interview, clients are given a date and time to report to a Pride probation officer at one of the three locations in the county for an “orientation interview” (or initial appointment). During the “orientation interview” the Pride probation officers are required to become familiar with the client and their case; by collecting personal information, performing a local criminal records check, reviewing the completed “risk/need assessment form”, and verifying the defendant’s employment. The Scope of Work also notes that the “intake officer” is to open a case file for the client and file the result of the local criminal record check, the probable cause affidavit if applicable (i.e., for domestic violence cases or for clients who have been ordered to attend a mental health or substance abuse evaluation by the court), the *court events form*, victim information if applicable, and “any other available offense material relative to the case.”

From the random sample of files reviewed in the Pride office locations (534), we found the files contained a print-out of a local criminal record check in 96% of the sampled client case files. Only a small number (20) of client files did not contain a print-out of the local criminal record check. We also found that 99% of the random sample client case files contained a *court events form* or an order assessing additional conditions.

Sexual Predators and Sexual Offenders

Pride is required to search new “probationer’s name or identifying information against the registration information regarding sexual predators and sexual offenders maintained by the Florida Department of Law Enforcement” (FDLE).³ Table two below describes the number of searches conducted on or after September 1, 2005; as well as, the results of the search of the FDLE database. Pride’s client (case) management system records the result of these checks, and each hardcopy client file also contains the printed results from each record check. The following table shows that a very small percentage of the misdemeanor clients are currently registered with the FDLE as either a sexual predator or sexual offender.

Table 2: FDLE Sexual Predator or Offender Searches (as of September 1, 2005)

Sexual Predator - FDLE Check as of September 1, 2005					
Case Type	Not registered as sexual predator or offender with FDLE		Indicates registered as a sexual predator or offender with FDLE		Total
	N	Row %	N	Row %	N
Maximum	23	100.0%	0	0.0%	23
Standard	4192	99.8%	9	0.2%	4201
Administrative	380	99.7%	1	0.3%	381
PTI	1875	100.0%	0	0.0%	1875
Total	6470	99.8%	10	0.2%	6480

Source: Daily Monitor Pride Client Management System. The above table includes only those clients who began their probation or PTI period of supervision on or after September 1, 2005. As a result, the table does not include the remaining 3,407 clients who started their period of supervision before September 1, 2005.

Employment and Address Verification

The Service Contract (VD(1)(2)(3)(4)) requires Pride to verify the employment and address status provided by probation and PTI clients. Using the random sample data (534), approximately 66% (352) clients reported that they were employed. From this total, the review found evidence on file that employment was verified for 76% (269) clients. This result is very close to the levels reported in the 2003-04 annual review, which reported a 74% verification rate (page 8). From the random sample data (534), the review also examined the rate of address verification. The review uncovered that 74% of the random sample client files contained information to suggest that the address was verified. This is a decline compared to the rate reported in the 2003-04 review, which reported a 95% address verification rate (page 8).

³ Florida Statutes, Title XLVII Criminal Procedure and Corrections, Chapter 943 Department of Law Enforcement, Section 943.04352 came into force on September 1, 2005.

Risk/Needs Assessment

The Scope of Work in Section 5 of the intake process requires Pride to “construct an overview of the probationer’s life style to create a risk/need assessment.” The review of the random sample client files also examined to what extent client’s needs were assessed by Pride probation officers, and if clients were referred to specific agencies to address their needs. Table three below describes the breakdown of case types by the number of client files that contained a completed risk/need assessment form (a sample of risk/need assessment form is attached to this report). The table shows that files for standard probation or PTI clients are more likely to contain a completed risk/need assessment form. Although it is unclear whether administrative clients are required to complete an assessment form, 28% of the administrative clients did in fact have a completed assessment form on file. Some of these clients may have first been placed on standard probation, and later downgraded to administrative probation, hence the completed assessment form.

Table 3: Number of Client Files by Case Type and Risk/Need Assessment Forms

	Completed Risk/Need Assessment Form on File					
	No		Yes		Total	
Case Type	N	Row %	N	Row %	N	Column%
Maximum	1	33%	2	67%	3	1%
Standard	61	16%	323	84%	384	72%
Administrative	29	73%	11	28%	40	7%
PTI	15	14%	92	86%	107	20%
Total	106	20%	428	80%	534	100%

Source: Random sample client files (534) reviewed by Criminal Justice Commission Staff.

In general, the form asks clients to consider 13 questions that relate to risk factors or individual needs. For example, does a client need safe shelter for themselves or their family; do they need assistance feeding themselves or their family; do they need assistance with alcohol or drug abuse (and the court has not referred them to treatment); do they or a member of their family have medical problems for which they do not have medical insurance or coverage, is their spouse currently abusing them physically or emotionally. As well, clients can indicate that they have trouble controlling their temper, that they often feel more depressed or anxious than the average person, and that they need to talk to a counselor about their personal problems. Clients may also note that they are currently unemployed and are having difficulty finding a job or that they are unable to work and are not receiving any type of assistance. Clients can also point out that they are having difficulty reinstating their driver’s license and they are not sure why their license has been suspended.

The client is also given the opportunity to identify other issues not included on the form. Clients can identify as many risk factors or individual needs as they see fit. From the 428 client files that contained a completed risk/need assessment, the majority (67%) of these clients did not identify any risk/need listed on the assessment form. Sixteen percent (70) of the clients identified at least one need, 7% (29) identified two needs, five percent (22) identified three needs, and the remaining four percent (19) identified between 4 and 9 needs. See Table five for more details of the number of needs expressed by clients.

Referrals

There are three places in the Scope of Work that direct Pride to provide referrals for clients with specific programs or services. It is also important to note that Pride's very own probation officer training manual also highlights the importance of providing applicable referrals to clients. Section C of the Service Contract (Orientation Interview) states that "referrals for drug, alcohol, and mental health evaluation and/or treatment, and job service referral shall be made during the orientation interview." Furthermore, the Additional Requirements (Section 9) of the Service Contract states that "Pride shall make referrals to appropriate agencies for counseling employment and social services". Section 20 also notes that "Pride shall encourage and assist unemployed probationers to improve their employability through education and training" and that Pride shall inform the client *about the County and private sector employment assistance and/or educational programs that are available and Pride shall provide direction and assistance in obtaining this education and training.* This section also states that "Job placement information shall also be provided by Pride for all unemployed probationers."

As noted in the method section above, the following results should be interpreted with some caution because the content of the file may not completely reflect the actions or behavior of the Pride probation officer. That being said, the following results do illustrate an issue that may need further study and consideration; and to inform a discussion concerning the extent to which Pride probation officers are expected to document referrals. On another point, the following table also illustrates some instances where there is no evidence of a risk/needs assessment in the file; however, the client is provided a referral. Table four below illustrates the results of the review of referrals in each file.

Table 4: Number of Client Files by Referral Outcomes and Risk/Needs Assessment Indicator

Evidence on file of Risk/Needs Assessment	Referral Provided	No Referral Provided - Already Under Care/Treatment	Referral Provided - Client Refused/Probation Officer Recommendation	No Evidence on File of Referral	No Show/Never Reported	Totals
No	5	11	0	79	11	106
Yes	58	29	30	311	0	428
Total	63	40	30	390	11	534

Source: Random sample client files (534) reviewed by Criminal Justice Commission Staff.

When the referral outcomes are further examined for those clients where one or more need was identified (140) in a completed risk/need assessment form, the findings suggest that not all clients who identify one or more need were referred to a service for assistance. Table five below shows that 67% (94) of the clients are either provided a referral by the probation officer, or they have already been referred to care/treatment by the courts, or they simply refused the recommendation of the probation officer. The remaining 33% (46) of the client files did not contain evidence that a referral was provided. Some cases are of particular concern since there is evidence of a need in the client's file; however, probation officer's notes indicate that no referral was provided.

Table 5: Evidence on file that a Risk/Needs Assessment Form was completed by Offender/Accused by Number of Needs Expressed and Referral Outcomes

Number of Needs Expressed By Offender/Accused	Referral Outcomes				Total
	Referral Provided	No Referral Provided - Already Under Care/Treatment	Referral Provided - Client Refused/Probation Officer Recommendation	No Evidence on File of Referral	
1	14	7	19	30	70
2	13	2	6	8	29
3	12	4	0	6	22
4	3	2	2	1	8
5	2	0	1	1	4
6	5	0	0	0	5
8	1	0	0	0	1
9	0	0	1	0	1
Total	50	15	29	46	140

Source: Random sample client files (534) reviewed by Criminal Justice Commission Staff.

The risk/need assessments and referrals are part of an enhanced program of supervision, which was advocated by Pride and PAB. Pride is more than just a reporting center; it is a place where probation and PTI clients can turn to for help; so that clients can successfully complete the conditions associated with their misdemeanor probation or PTI agreement. However, interviews with Pride staff found that the continued decline in probation cases; along with resource pressures stemming from other aspects of the Service Contract hinders Pride's ability to identify and respond to client needs outside of those conditions imposed by the courts. Providing access to recovery by way of offering assistance and referrals to treatment is challenging given that referrals to agencies are provided in an ad hoc manner. This is especially challenging when clients are not compelled to seek treatment by way of court order. Pride staff noted that the current Probation Services Community Advisory Board facilitates information sharing and informal partnerships among local government and non-government agencies to identify resources in the community to help clients. Lastly, Pride staff stated that some modification should be considered to the Service Contract requirements to ensure that probation officer's time is directed to spending more time with clients; to ensure that they can continue to provide an enhanced program of supervision.

Criminal Record Check Prior to Termination

The Service Contract requires Pride to complete a criminal record check 10 days prior to the termination of the period of supervision (Section VB(3)c and VB(4) b). This is conducted to determine whether the client has completed the terms of their sentence; that they did not commit an offense during their period of supervision. From the total number of files sampled where the client successfully completed their period of supervision (363), 91% (331) of the client files contained evidence that a final record check was completed.

Table six below describes the last recorded date of the criminal check prior to the end date of the period of supervision. From the 331 client files, it was determined that 14% of the criminal record checks were completed within 10 days prior to the end date.⁴ Table six below also provides a breakdown of the remaining client files that contained evidence that a final record check was completed. It is important to point out that checks that occurred more than 10 days prior to the end of the period of supervision include cases that were terminated early, possibly because the client completed their requirements earlier than expected. For clients who completed their period of supervision on the scheduled end date, 54% of the client files had evidence of a completed record check between the same day and 30 days prior to the end date.

⁴ The end date for this calculation used the variable END DATE, defined by the "daily monitor" system maintained by Pride Integrated Services as date the period of supervision, if the probationer was to serve the entire period of supervision.

Table 6: Timeframe for Final Criminal Record Check prior to End of Supervision

	Successful N	Percent	Valid Percent
Same Day	9	2%	3%
1 to 10 days prior case ended	36	10%	11%
11 to 30 days prior case ended	133	37%	40%
31 to 60 days prior case ended	26	7%	8%
61 to 90 days prior case ended	27	7%	8%
91 to 120 days prior case ended	29	8%	9%
121 to 180 days prior case ended	30	8%	9%
181 to 365 days prior case ended	23	6%	7%
Greater than 1 year prior case ended	2	1%	1%
1 to 10 days after case ended	4	1%	1%
11 to 30 days after case ended	3	1%	1%
31 to 365 days after case ended	7	2%	2%
Greater than 1 year after case ended	2	1%	1%
Total	331	91%	100%
Date Missing	32	9%	
Grand Total (Successful Client Cases)	363	100%	

Source: Random sample client files (534) reviewed by Criminal Justice Commission Staff.

Probation Supervision

The Service Contract requires Pride to monitor and supervise probation and PTI clients serving their period of supervision. As part of this requirement, the service provider must keep an accurate record of the caseload and interactions with clients. The quality of probation supervision was assessed based on the review of 534 client files; as well as, the review of the electronic records from Pride’s case management system. The review found that probation officers are actively supervising misdemeanor and PTI clients. The Pride case management system and hard copy files contain extensive notes and records of the interaction between probation officers and clients. During the two year review period, there were approximately 63,650 reported contacts or activities associated with the supervision of probation and PTI clients. Different types of contacts and activities are reported in the case management system, from the initial set-up of the file, walk-in appointments between clients and probation officers; the collection of payments for both appointment and mail-in clients; and final file reviews. The majority (56%) of contacts or activities reported by Pride were for scheduled face-to-face walk-in appointments between a Pride probation officer and probation or PTI client.

Table 7: Number of Walk-in Appointments (face-to-face contact) by Outcomes

Outcomes	Walk-in Appointments					
	2005-06		2006-07		Total	
	N	Col. %	N	Col. %	N	Col. %
On Time	12884	73.9%	13516	75.5%	26400	74.7%
No Show	778	4.5%	649	3.6%	1427	4.0%
Not Applicable	184	1.1%	116	0.6%	300	0.8%
Late	2367	13.6%	2350	13.1%	4717	13.3%
Cancelled	1190	6.8%	1236	6.9%	2426	6.9%
System Missing	35	0.2%	38	0.2%	73	0.2%
Total	17438	100.0%	17905	100.0%	35343	100.0%

Source: Daily Monitor Pride Client Management System. Census Data, based on unique clients that were terminated between October 1, 2005 and September 30, 2007. The frequency of contacts in this table represents scheduled contacts between October 1, 2005 and September 30, 2007 for probation and PTI clients. Visits to place of employment or homes for clients serving maximum probation sentences are not included in this table.

Table seven above reveals that during the two year review period, almost three quarters of the face-to-face walk-in appointments occurred “on time” and 13% were “late.” Seven percent of the appointments were cancelled and another four percent were reported as “no show.” Regrettably, the case management system does not track the monitoring of maximum probation clients, where the probation officer makes contact at the probation client’s place of employment or home. Although Pride does maintain hardcopy records of such contacts, the service provider noted that they did not retain these reports for a specific period of time. In reply to the review, the service provider has now established a protocol to maintain these records for the annual reviews.⁵

Violations of Probation

The review examined reported violations as an indicator of the level of supervision provided by Pride for misdemeanor probation clients only. From the total number of probation clients (7,824) during the two-year review period, almost one-half (3,652) of the clients were reported to have violated their condition of probation. From the total number of clients who violated their period of supervision, approximately 63% had violated only one time, and 27% violated two times, with the remaining 11% of clients violated between 3 to 13 times. Table eight below describes the number of violations by type of violation. It is important to note that the number of violations will exceed the number of violators as some clients violated more than once during their period of supervision. The number of “no shows” or “failure to comply” violations were almost identical, both making up 37% of the total violations for both review periods. Another 26% of the violations were as a result of an “additional arrests.”

⁵ Letter to Probation Advisory Board representative, from Ms. Wanda Joiner, Probation & Quality Assurance Coordinator, Pride Integrated Services, Inc. dated August 9, 2007.

The study found that if a probation client is violated, the average time to violation from the beginning of their sentence is approximately five months.

Table 8: Number of Violations by Type of Violation (Reason)

Type of Violation	N	Col. %
Additional Arrest	1486	26%
Failure to Comply	2130	37%
Failure to Enroll	30	1%
No Show	2174	37%
Total	5820	100%

Source: Census Data, based on unique clients that were terminated between October 1, 2005 and September 30, 2007. The table does not include clients who were serving a period of PTI supervision.

Lastly, from the total number of probation clients that reported one or more violation, 36% successfully completed their term of probation.

Outcomes

The review examined the rate of successful completion for probation and PTI clients. Sixty-seven percent of clients successfully completed their period of supervision during the review period. The remaining 32% of clients failed to have their cases terminated successfully. The success rate was virtually identical when comparing the two review periods. Table nine below illustrates that the success rate for 2006-07 increased slightly from the previous review period (2005-06).

In comparison, the Bureau of Justice Statistics reported a 57% success rate for adults exiting probation in 2006. It is important to note that the Bureau of Justice Statistics report includes both felony and misdemeanor probation clients. Therefore, the success rate may be lower due to the inclusion of felony clients who have committed more serious offenses; and as a result, they may be more likely to commit a violation or re-offend during their period of supervision.⁶

⁶ Glaze, Lauren & Thomas Bonczar., Probation and Parole in the United States, 2006. Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin. December 2007, NCJ 220218, page 2.

Table 9: Number of Clients by General Outcomes by Case Type

	Outcomes All Case Types						Total
	Successful		Unsuccessful		Transferred Vacated		
Case Type	N	Row %	N	Row %	N	Row %	
Maximum	11	50%	10	45%	1	5%	22
Standard	2558	66%	1294	33%	24	1%	3876
Administrative	255	77%	76	23%	1	0%	332
PTI	657	67%	327	33%	1	0%	985
2005-06	3481	67%	1707	33%	27	1%	5215
Maximum	10	56%	8	44%	0	0%	18
Standard	2127	65%	1120	34%	12	0%	3259
Administrative	258	81%	58	18%	1	0%	317
PTI	793	74%	285	26%	0	0%	1078
2006-07	3188	68%	1471	31%	13	0%	4672
Grand Total	6669	67%	3178	32%	40	0%	9887

Source: Daily Monitor Pride Client Management System. Census Data, based on 9,887 clients that were terminated between October 1, 2005 and September 30, 2007.

Exploring the Relationship between Risk/Need and Outcomes

Using the random sample of 534 probation and PTI clients, the review examined the relationship between outcomes and the reported risk/need assessment completed by the probation or PTI client. From the 428 probation and PTI clients that completed a risk/need assessment form, the review examined the relationship between the two variables. Table 10 below suggests that individuals that report a greater number of needs are less likely to successfully complete their period of misdemeanor probation or PTI agreement.

Table 10: General Outcome of the Term of Probation & Pretrial Intervention

		Outcomes All Case Types				
		Successful		Unsuccessful		
		N	Row %	N	Row %	Total
No Form on File		53	50%	53	50%	106
Form on File	0	232	81%	56	19%	288
	1	39	56%	31	44%	70
	2	20	69%	9	31%	29
	3	12	55%	10	45%	22
	4	3	38%	5	63%	8
	5	2	50%	2	50%	4
	6	2	40%	3	60%	5
	8	0	0%	1	100%	1
	9	0	0%	1	100%	1
sub-total		310	72%	118	28%	428
Total		363	68%	171	32%	534

Source: Random sample client files (534) reviewed by Criminal Justice Commission Staff.

The above table illustrates that for client files that did not contain a completed risk/need assessment the rate of successful completion was approximately 50%. From the 428 client files that contained a completed risk/need assessment, the review found that when individuals reported no needs, 81% successfully completed their term of probation or PTI.

The review also examined other factors such as age, sex, race, employment status, marital status, and previous arrest history (independent variables) to better understand the relationship with the outcome (dependant variable). Using the census data, Table 11 below illustrates the success rate for different independent variables that may impact the final outcome of the probation or PTI period of supervision. In addition to the descriptive data, the review included a *Chi-Square* analysis to measure the *statistical significance* and strength of the association between the independent variables and dependent variable. The *Chi-Square* is particularly helpful when analyzing data that are captured at the nominal or ordinal level. These are data that are reflected as categories and not as whole numbers at the interval or ratio level. The statistics that are reported as *statistically significant* indicate that the proportions in the table are likely to occur in future samples or that there is sufficient evidence that they exist in the population, rather than by chance ($p < .05$). The *Cramer's V* statistic is a measure of association for the *Chi-Square* analysis, where 1.0 represents a very strong association and 0.0 suggests a non-existent relationship between the independent variables and independent variable.⁷

⁷ For more information on the Chi-Square technique and definitions of statistical significance, please see Montcalm, Denise & David Royse., Data Analysis for Social Workers. Allyn & Bacon, Boston MA, 2002.

Table 11: Bivariate Analysis – Exploring Select Independent Variables and Outcome

		Outcome: Dependent Variables	
Independent Variables		<u>Successful</u>	<u>Unsuccessful</u>
	<u>Values</u>	Row %	Row %
Reported Violations*	No	88%	12%
	Yes - one or more	36%	64%
Annual Income*	Under \$2,500	56%	44%
	\$2,500 - \$4,999	59%	41%
	\$5,000 - \$9,999	60%	40%
	\$10,000 - \$19,999	70%	30%
	\$20,000 - \$29,999	75%	25%
	\$30,000 +	86%	14%
	Refused	58%	42%
Previous Arrest*	No	76%	24%
	Yes - one or more	61%	39%
Employment*	Employed	74%	26%
	Unemployed	55%	45%
	Other	60%	40%
Race*	White	72%	28%
	Black	50%	50%
	Other	64%	36%
Marital Status*	Single	67%	33%
	Married	81%	19%
	Divorced/Separated	73%	27%
	Other	43%	57%
Risk/Need Identified (n)*	Yes - one or more	56%	44%
	No	72%	28%
Age Group	17 & Under	69%	31%
	18 to 24	60%	40%
	25 to 39	69%	31%
	40 to 59	73%	27%
	60+	86%	14%
Sex	Female	75%	25%
	Male	65%	35%

Source: The proportions related to risk/need identified was taken from the random sample client files (538) reviewed by Criminal Justice Commission Staff. Daily Monitor Pride Client Management System Census Data (N), based on 9,887 clients that were terminated between October 1, 2005 and September 30, 2007. Independent variables with an asterisks (*) denote a *statistically significant* finding. The *p* value for the test of significance was $p < 0.05$ (Asymp. Sig (2-sided)).

Table 11 above provides some insight into the success rates for the various independent variables listed above. The table shows that clients with no reported violation during their period of supervision were most likely to succeed (88%). Furthermore, clients with a reported annual income of \$30,000 plus (86%) were more likely to succeed when compared to other income categories. The table also shows that married clients (81%) are more likely to successfully complete their period of supervision than other marital status categories. Clients who reported no arrest history (76%) were also more likely to successfully complete than those reported one or more previous arrest. Employed (74%) clients succeeded at a higher rate than unemployed clients. The data also show that clients who reported no risk/need on their completed assessment form were more likely to succeed than those who reported one or more need – 72% in comparison to 56%. Lastly, data reveal that White clients (72%) successfully completed their period of supervision at a higher rate than Black clients (50%). With the exception of sex, age group and case type, the differences in the proportions between clients in each of the categories were reported as *statistically significant*.

Table 12 below illustrates the results of the *Chi-Square* analysis. The table also shows the independent variables in order of strength of association with the dependant variable. While these results do not explain causation, they suggest that further research should explore the relationships in the future, perhaps using multivariate techniques. The table also indicates whether the association is *statistically significant* or not, highlighting whether the association is likely to occur in future samples (or exist in the population) or occur by chance. Once again, *statistically significant* (Asymp. Sig) does not prove causation; it provides some evidence that the association is more likely to occur in future samples or in the general population.

Table 12: Bivariate Analysis - Measure of Association and Chi-Square Analysis

	Cramer's V	Chi-Square
<u>Independent Variable</u>	<u>Sample n</u>	<u>Asymp. Sig (2-sided) n</u>
Reported Violations	0.541	0.000
Annual Income	0.300	0.000
Previous Arrest	0.195	0.000
Employment	0.181	0.000
Race	0.176	0.000
Marital Status	0.161	0.003
Need Identified	0.157	0.000
Age Group	0.104	0.219
Sex	0.048	0.271
Case Type	0.021	0.972

Source: Random sample client files (534) reviewed by Criminal Justice Commission Staff. The *p* value for the test of significance was $p < .05$ (Asymp. Sig (2-sided)). The *Cramer's V* association of 1 represents a perfect association, while 0 reflects no association at all.

By analyzing Table 11 and 12 together, the review can provide some further insight into the association between the independent variables and the dependant variable (outcomes). The analysis found that the variables age group, sex, and case types are not *statistically significant* and the strength of their association with outcome is rather weak. The strength of association for the remaining *statistically significant* variables range from weak or weak to moderate, with the exception of reported annual income and reported violators (clients with one or more violations). The latter two variables show moderate to strong associations with outcome, suggesting that there is evidence that violations and reported annual income influence clients' outcome. Table 13 below further illustrates the association of violations and outcome.

Table 13: Number of Violations by Number of Clients (N) and Outcome.

		Outcomes All Case Types					
		Successful		Unsuccessful		Total	
Number of Violations		N	Row %	N	Row %	N	Col. %
	1	932	41%	1348	59%	2280	63%
	2	289	30%	684	70%	973	27%
	3	50	28%	128	72%	178	5%
	4	30	24%	93	76%	123	3%
	5	6	21%	22	79%	28	1%
	6	7	18%	31	82%	38	1%
	7	1	17%	5	83%	6	0%
	8	1	8%	11	92%	12	0%
	9	0	0%	1	100%	1	0%
	10	0	0%	2	100%	2	0%
	11	0	0%	1	100%	1	0%
	13	0	0%	1	100%	1	0%
	Total	1316	36%	2327	64%	3643	100%

Source: Daily Monitor Pride Client Management System Census Data (N), based on 3643 clients that were terminated between October 1, 2005 and September 30, 2007 and that contained one or more violation associated with their file.

The data show an inverse relationship between violations and outcome. As the frequency of violations associated with a client file increase, the number of clients that successfully complete their period of supervision decreases. Table 11 above suggests a positive association between reported annual income and outcome; as the reported annual income increases the number of clients that successfully complete their period of supervision increases as well.

Regardless, the results of the analysis do reflect to some extent the general theories of criminal behavior and studies examining the effectiveness of probation; as well as, the local wisdom and experience with probation clients. Prior involvement with the criminal justice system, lack of adequate income and/or employment, race, and marital status may contribute to a clients' ability to complete their period of supervision. Further the results suggest a need to continue focusing on clients with prior arrest history and those that are unemployed. The results also suggest that black unemployed clients may require greater assistance with finding gainful employment, since the data reveal that black unemployed clients succeed at a far lower rate (39%), when compared to white unemployed clients (61%). It is important to point out that the unemployment rate for white (18%) and black (35%) probation and PTI clients⁸ are higher than the rates reported in the county overall, with rates of 5% and 11% respectively.

Staffing

The study included a review of staff personnel files. The review found no evidence of non-compliance with the service contract requirements, with respect to required criminal background checks and verification of complete level of education (four year degree required). One employee, who did not possess a four year degree; was approved by the Probation Advisory Board given their qualifications and lengthy experience working in the criminal justice system.

Staffing Ratio to Caseload

In addition to the required background and education checks, the service provider is also required to maintain a specific level of staff to caseload ratio. Section F (2a-b) indicates the following:

2. Pride shall agree and continually meet the requirements below regarding the number of clients per officer, regardless of the number of cases:
 - a. Maximum supervision clients shall be supervised by probation officers whose client caseload shall not exceed sixty (60) clients per officer.
 - b. Minimum (Standard) supervision clients shall be supervised by probation officers whose client caseload shall not exceed two hundred (200) clients per officer.
 - c. Administrative (mail-in) supervision clients shall be supervised by probation officers whose client caseload shall not exceed four hundred (400) clients per officer.

⁸ Daily Monitor Pride Client Management System Census Data (5,215) unique clients, includes the other category. The data for Palm Beach County was reported by the 2006 American Community Survey S2301: Employment Status.

The current quarterly reports and review period data do not provide sufficient information to determine whether these ratios were maintained. The quarterly reports provide a breakdown of the quarterly “client count” and “staffing requirements”. Ideally, if possible, the review would require a breakdown of quarterly client counts (by case type) for each probation officer. Furthermore, the quarterly report should only include staff who have primary supervisory responsibilities (and not those who have secondary responsibilities for the actual probation officer). Reporting the ratio at an aggregate level is insufficient to determine compliance per probation officer. It seems that the quarterly report assumes that the number of clients are distributed evenly across the total number of probation officers. Part-time employees will also have an impact on the calculation of caseload ratio. The service contract should also include information describing the required ratio for probation officers to PTI clients. During interviews with Pride staff it was noted that the above requirement was difficult to report on given the way Pride manages its clients and cases. In West Palm Beach, the larger office, this is difficult as clients and cases are often managed as a team, not individual probation officers; especially when probation officers are required to attend court. Given that this is a requirement, further discussions should take place to formulate a method to measure caseload distribution.

Staff Training

The review found that Pride does provide on-going training to staff, mostly conducted as in-house or workshops where various criminal justice experts train employees at the various probation offices. Some of the topics covered in training include “court room protocol, violation of probation and diversity.” Some of the speakers that provided training were “House Arrest Services, Interlock Systems of Florida (breathalyzer ignition locks), and Palm Beach/Treasure Coast 211.” It was also noted that the Program Director and Senior Probation Officer also attended yearly Florida Association of Community Corrections (FACC) training. Regrettably, Pride noted that “sign-in or attendance sheets are not available for in house training workshops.”

Administration

Pride does comply with all administrative reporting outlined in the Service Contract. This includes a quarterly report to the Chief Judge as well as the Executive Director of the Criminal Justice Commission. Furthermore, Pride has completed its required financial report audited and certified by a licensed independent Certified Public Accountant. These reports were received by the Probation Advisory Board Staff, Criminal Justice Commission prior to the 120 day limit after the close of the agency’s fiscal year (December 31). Audits for 2005 and 2006 fiscal year are on file.

Restitution

Section VF(3) a-b of the service contract requires the service provider to collect and disburse restitution payments to individual victims within fourteen (14) days of receipt of payment. If the restitution payment is returned to the service provider unclaimed, they are required to forward these funds to the Crimes Compensation Trust Fund in Tallahassee. In response to a request for data concerning this requirement, Pride submitted the following reply⁹:

“2. Restitution payments are reconciled and deposited in an escrow account each business day. Verified departmental reports are submitted to Administration on the first business day of the week for previous weeks collection and checks are issued no later than the last business day of that week. If a restitution payment is received on a Monday, the payment processing will be completed no later than Friday of the following week (11 days after receipt).

3. If a restitution check remains uncashed [SIC] for five months an inquiry letter is sent to the victim. After six months a stop payment is issued on the original check; a new check is issued and submitted to the Crime Compensation Trust Fund.

If a restitution payment is undeliverable, all attempts to locate the victim are made before the payment is sent to CCTF. There is no established time frame, but typically the payments are sent within 30 days of their return.”

The quarterly reports concerning restitution payments do comply with the requirements outlined in the service contract (VF(3)b-c & VI(27)). However, the review was unable to determine what proportion of restitution payments are in fact sent out within 14 days of receipt.

⁹ Letter to Probation Advisory Board representative, from Ms. Wanda Joiner, Probation & Quality Assurance Coordinator, Pride Integrated Services, Inc. dated August 9, 2007.

Recommendations

The following recommendations stem from the findings of the review. They are intended to generate discussion among the PAB and Pride staff. The review recommends that:

1. PAB and Pride clarify whether administrative clients are required to complete a risk/need assessment form.
2. Pride increases the rate of completed risk/need assessment forms by probation and PTI clients (identifying clients that never show for an initial appointment and follow-up meetings and as a result their period of supervision is either revoked or rejected).
3. in cases where one or more risk/need is expressed by the client, either by completing the risk/need form or during a meeting (or contact) with a probation officer, Pride should provide the client with a referral. This issue was of particular concern in that some client files clearly indicate that the client had a need; however, the client's files state that either no referral was required or given.
4. Pride hold an annual training workshop that addresses recommendation 2 and 3 above, and that both the risk/need assessment results and referrals are documented on file.
5. Criminal Justice Commission Staff and Pride undertake more research to implement an effective risk/need assessment process, in order to better understand the probation and PTI client population; as well as, to explore the on-going decline in misdemeanor probation clients.
6. PAB work with the service provider to develop an enhanced strategy to help unemployed probation or PTI clients to find work; given that the review found that the lack of employment was associated with the client's ability to successfully complete their period of supervision.
7. Pride explore with local social service agencies and Work Force Alliance to develop Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to better channel clients to local service providers. Discussions may be had with the Westgate Community Justice Service Center, which provides local community members with various services including AA meetings and assistance finding employment (e.g., job coach).
8. PAB and Pride work with the judiciary to optimize the use of probation officer time; to ensure adequate coverage of court rooms and to ensure probation officers are able to fully assist probation and PTI clients. This may include the establishment of a permanent working office for misdemeanor probation.
9. the daily monitor system be updated to document contacts with clients serving a maximum probation sentence.

10. the quarterly report be revised to report in more detail the ratio of caseload per individual probation officer or probation team. The rationale for this recommendation stems from the contract requirement that ratios are attributed to individual case types per probation officer. The report should include number and types of cases supervised by a specific probation officer during the quarter. The reported ratio would also be adjusted for part-time probation officers as well.
11. the service provider should maintain a record of the type of training provided to each probation officer, describing the type of training offered, the date, and who attended. This could be accomplished by maintaining sign-in sheets for each training session/workshop.
12. the quarterly report be revised to comply with Section F3b of the Service Contract, and include information concerning the number of days between receipt of payment and sending of restitution to the victim.
13. PAB and Pride develop a set of performance measures for the review period 2007/08. These performance measures would be used to monitor, various items such as violation rates, success rates, and recidivism rates for misdemeanor probation and PTI clients. Furthermore, measures should include other operational measures for probation officers, such as the percentage of fines that are converted to community service hours.
14. PAB and Pride develop a mandate or mission for misdemeanor probation.
15. the Service Contract scope of work be simplified and include performance measures and mandate.
16. the County undertake an independent financial audit of Pride for the last few years.
17. the Contract between the Palm Beach County Board of County Commissioners and Pride Integrated Services, Inc be approved for renewal by the PAB for another three years.

Response from Service Provider

Pride supports the recommendations of the October 1, 2005 to September 30, 2007 audit and we are extremely pleased that the recommendations include renewal of our current three year contract.

Pride's current contract states in Exhibit A, Scope of Work, paragraph V (A.1) "Palm Beach County will assist Pride in identifying and securing interview space within each courthouse and the jail." As recommended by the audit, Pride wishes to extend the above mentioned clause to include establishing permanent office space for Pride in each courthouse. This will allow Pride the ability to optimize the use of probation staff in the courthouse and allow for increased staff time to be dedicated to direct client contact and probationer needs in the Pride offices. In addition, this courthouse space will allow Pride the ability to establish communications with each courtroom and allow direct access by the Court to probation. It will also allow Pride the opportunity for a secure connection to Pride's electronic data base.

Pride has developed and is in complete ownership of our electronic case management database. Pride will continue to work with PAB and modify the program to capture and report additional data that will assist with further research and analysis of our client population and contract compliance.

Pride will increase it's referral of probationers to social service and job placement/training agencies when a probationer need is identified as well as the documentation of the referral. As recommended by the audit, this documentation will enhance additional research regarding the effectiveness of the risk /needs assessment and referral process. Pride will establish a Memorandum of Understanding when possible with agencies that provide services to assist the probationer with efficient access and allow for two way communication between Pride and the referral agency. This process will include written documentation of the referral, which will be given to the probationer and will include contact numbers as well as directions to access services. A copy of this referral will be maintained in the client file.

Pride will continue to sponsor the Probation Community Services Advisory Board, whose mission is to provide a forum to discuss and evaluate misdemeanor probation services, the needs of those individuals on probation and collaborate with various criminal justice and community entities that provide services. This Board will assist in the increased utilization of existing services as well as identify areas where additional services are needed.

Pride would like to thank Damir Kukec, Michael Rodriguez, CJC staff and the Probation Advisory Board for the support, direction, and spirit of cooperation that has been shown to our organization throughout this audit process as well as during our many years of service to the 15th Judicial Circuit. We look forward to our continued work together in serving the needs of our courts, our clients and our community.

Conclusion

Pride Integrated Services, Inc. is in general compliance with the many requirements outlined in the Service Contract and Scope of Work. In some cases, Pride exceeds the requirements of the Service Contract (for example: maintaining a fourth office in Jupiter).

Maintaining a balance between client supervision and assistance is vital, especially when outcomes are examined in association with client salary and employment status.

The study found unemployed or underemployed clients (lower salary categories or those without the determination of indigence) succeed at lower rates than clients who are gainfully employed. The issue of risk/need and other factors that may contribute to the successful completion of probation should be further explored by the Criminal Justice Commission staff under the direction of PAB and the misdemeanor probation service provider.

Pride is focused on not only ensuring that clients complete the many conditions associated with their period of supervision; they are also concerned with guiding and assisting clients who need help to complete their sentence or PTI agreement. Pride also provides access to counseling for clients with alcohol and drug abuse problems. Efforts are made to assist clients by providing referrals for employment opportunities. This can be challenging, especially for clients that are not mandated by the courts to attend treatment or counseling. However, Pride offers clients structure, to help keep them focused on their goals: to make a positive change in their lives with the first step being the successful completion of their period of supervision.

Maintaining the balance noted above is increasingly difficult given the decline in probation client caseload, which does impact Pride's ability to recruit and retain qualified probation officers and fulfill particular requirements of the Service Contract. In addition, the current budget environment in the State suggests that all members of the Criminal Justice System will have to work together to find greater efficiencies, establish formal partnerships/agreements with service providers (governmental or otherwise), and perhaps modify some of the current processes associated with the delivery of misdemeanor probation.

Profile Supporting Tables

Table 1: AgeGroup2 * Sex of Offender/Accused Crosstabulation			
	Sex of Offender/Accused		
	Female	Male	Total
17 & Under	30	96	126
Row%	23.80%	76.20%	100.00%
Column%	1.20%	1.30%	1.30%
18 to 24	711	2357	3068
Row%	23.20%	76.80%	100.00%
Column%	29.50%	31.50%	31.00%
25 to 39	829	2782	3611
Row%	23.00%	77.00%	100.00%
Column%	34.40%	37.20%	36.50%
40 to 59	772	1984	2756
Row%	28.00%	72.00%	100.00%
Column%	32.00%	26.50%	27.90%
60+	71	255	326
Row%	21.80%	78.20%	100.00%
Column%	2.90%	3.40%	3.30%
Total	2413	7474	9887
Row%	24.40%	75.60%	100.00%
Column%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Source: Daily Monitor Pride Client Management System. Census Data, based on 9,887 clients that were terminated between October 1, 2005 and September 30, 2007. The client research database (SPSS database clients.) was used to generate this cross tabulation.

Table 2: Employment2 * Sex of Offender/Accused Crosstabulation			
	Sex of Offender/Accused		
	Female	Male	Total
Employed	1383	5299	6682
Row%	20.70%	79.30%	100.00%
Column%	58.10%	72.00%	68.60%
Unemployed	713	1359	2072
Row%	34.40%	65.60%	100.00%
Column%	30.00%	18.50%	21.30%
Other	283	697	980
Row%	28.90%	71.10%	100.00%
Column%	11.90%	9.50%	10.10%
Total	2379	7355	9734
Row%	24.40%	75.60%	100.00%
Column%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Source: Daily Monitor Pride Client Management System. Census Data, based on 9,887 clients that were terminated between October 1, 2005 and September 30, 2007. The client research database (SPSS database clients.) was used to generate this cross tabulation. The client's employment status was missing for 153 clients.

Table 3: Annual Income Reported by Client * Sex of Offender/Accused Crosstabulation			
	Sex of Offender/Accused		
	Female	Male	Total
Under \$2,500	607	1241	1848
Row%	32.80%	67.20%	100.00%
Column%	25.90%	17.40%	19.50%
\$2,500 - \$4,999	86	161	247
Row%	34.80%	65.20%	100.00%
Column%	3.70%	2.30%	2.60%
\$5,000 - \$9,999	159	363	522
Row%	30.50%	69.50%	100.00%
Column%	6.80%	5.10%	5.50%
\$10,000 - \$19,999	372	1164	1536
Row%	24.20%	75.80%	100.00%
Column%	15.90%	16.40%	16.20%
\$20,000 - \$29,999	359	1194	1553
Row%	23.10%	76.90%	100.00%
Column%	15.30%	16.80%	16.40%
\$30,000 +	533	2124	2657
Row%	20.10%	79.90%	100.00%
Column%	22.70%	29.90%	28.10%
Refused	228	866	1094
Row%	20.80%	79.20%	100.00%
Column%	9.70%	12.20%	11.60%
Total	2344	7113	9457
Row%	24.80%	75.20%	100.00%
Column%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Source: Daily Monitor Pride Client Management System. Census Data, based on 9,887 clients that were terminated between October 1, 2005 and September 30, 2007. The client research database (SPSS database clients.) was used to generate this cross tabulation. The client's annual reported income was missing for 430 clients.

Table 4: Violation of Probation Reason (Type of Violation) * Sex of Client Crosstabulation			
	Sex of Probation Client		
	Male	Female	Total
Additional Arrest	417	414	831
Row%	50.20%	49.80%	100.00%
Column%	24.20%	21.50%	22.80%
Failure to Comply	685	769	1454
Row%	47.10%	52.90%	100.00%
Column%	39.70%	39.90%	39.80%
Failure to Enroll	8	13	21
Row%	38.10%	61.90%	100.00%
Column%	0.50%	0.70%	0.60%
No Show	616	730	1346
Row%	45.80%	54.20%	100.00%
Column%	35.70%	37.90%	36.90%
Total	1726	1926	3652
Row%	47.30%	52.70%	100.00%
Column%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Source: Daily Monitor Pride Client Management System. Census Data, based on probation clients only that were terminated between October 1, 2005 and September 30, 2007. The research database violation of probation by for most recent violation (SPSS database VOPSClientsMostRecentViolation.sav) was used to generate this cross tabulation.

Table 5: Violation of Probation Outcome * Sex of Client Crosstabulation			
	Sex of Probation Client		
	Male	Female	Total
Completed	319	994	1313
Row %	24.30%	75.70%	100.00%
Column %	18.50%	51.60%	36.00%
Dismissed	39	18	57
Row %	68.40%	31.60%	100.00%
Column %	2.30%	0.90%	1.60%
Hearing Scheduled	2	5	7
Row %	28.60%	71.40%	100.00%
Column %	0.10%	0.30%	0.20%
Other	5	4	9
Row %	55.60%	44.40%	100.00%
Column %	0.30%	0.20%	0.20%
Recalled	307	341	648
Row %	47.40%	52.60%	100.00%
Column %	17.80%	17.70%	17.70%
Reinstated without Jail Time	35	19	54
Row %	64.80%	35.20%	100.00%
Column %	2.00%	1.00%	1.50%
Reinstated with Jail Time	52	29	81
Row %	64.20%	35.80%	100.00%
Column %	3.00%	1.50%	2.20%
Revoked without Jail Time	98	80	178
Row %	55.10%	44.90%	100.00%
Column %	5.70%	4.20%	4.90%
Revoked with Jail Time	825	418	1243
Row %	66.40%	33.60%	100.00%
Column %	47.80%	21.70%	34.00%
Warrant Issued	4	1	5
Row %	80.00%	20.00%	100.00%
Column %	0.20%	0.10%	0.10%
Withdrawn	40	17	57
Row %	70.20%	29.80%	100.00%
Column %	2.30%	0.90%	1.60%
Total	1726	1926	3652
Row %	47.30%	52.70%	100.00%
Column %	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Source: Daily Monitor Pride Client Management System. Census Data, based on probation clients only that were terminated between October 1, 2005 and September 30, 2007. The research database violation of probation by most recent violation (SPSS database VOPSClientsMostRecentViolation.sav) was used to generate this cross tabulation.

**Table 6: Offense Grouping - High Level (SPSS) * Sex of Offender/Accused Crosstabulation
(Number of Reported Offenses)**

	Sex of Offender/Accused		
	Female	Male	Total
Crimes against Persons	505	1893	2398
Row %	21.10%	78.90%	100.00%
Column %	17.00%	19.90%	19.20%
Drug Offenses	123	750	873
Row %	14.10%	85.90%	100.00%
Column %	4.10%	7.90%	7.00%
Vice Offenses	75	196	271
Row %	27.70%	72.30%	100.00%
Column %	2.50%	2.10%	2.20%
Property Offenses	642	830	1472
Row %	43.60%	56.40%	100.00%
Column %	21.60%	8.70%	11.80%
DUI Offenses	919	3372	4291
Row %	21.40%	78.60%	100.00%
Column %	30.90%	35.50%	34.40%
Driving Offenses	507	1887	2394
Row %	21.20%	78.80%	100.00%
Column %	17.10%	19.90%	19.20%
Weapons Offenses	14	128	142
Row %	9.90%	90.10%	100.00%
Column %	0.50%	1.30%	1.10%
Public Order Offenses	49	256	305
Row %	16.10%	83.90%	100.00%
Column %	1.60%	2.70%	2.40%
Other Offenses	136	191	327
Row %	41.60%	58.40%	100.00%
Column %	4.60%	2.00%	2.60%
Total	2970	9503	12473
Row %	23.80%	76.20%	100.00%
Column %	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Source: Daily Monitor Pride Client Management System. Census Data, based on offenses that were associated with clients' cases terminated between October 1, 2005 and September 30, 2007. The offense research database (SPSS database OffenseReport.sav) was used to generate this cross tabulation. There are more offenses than clients as one client may report one or more offense.