

**FINAL REPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF
CRIMINAL JUSTICE SERVICES ON**

**EVALUATION OF THE FAIRFAX
DAY REPORTING CENTER
(FDRC)**

**TO THE GOVERNOR AND
THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA**



HOUSE DOCUMENT NO. 33

**COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
RICHMOND
1996**

Prepared by
Criminal Justice Research Center
Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services
Bruce C. Morris, Director

Project Staff:

Dr. Stan Orchowsky
Chief, Evaluation Section

Ms. Jodie Lucas
Evaluation Specialist

Ms. Trina Bogle
Evaluation Specialist

To request additional copies of this report, please contact:

Criminal Justice Research Center
Department of Criminal Justice Services
805 E. Broad Street
Richmond, VA 23219
(804) 371-0530

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. AUTHORITY FOR STUDY 1

II. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 1

III. BACKGROUND 2

Program Description 3

Evaluation Goals And Methodology 4

IV. EVALUATION RESULTS 5

Offender Characteristics 5

Supervision Contacts 6

Use of Sanctions 7

Substance Abuse Services Provided 7

OAR Services Provided 8

Department of Correctional Education Services Provided 9

Offender Outcomes Following FDRC Participation 10

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 12

VI. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS 17

APPENDIX A: ITEM 460 OF 1993 BUDGET BILL

I. AUTHORITY FOR STUDY

Chapter 994, Item 460 of the 1993 Acts of Assembly designated funding for the development and implementation of a pilot day reporting center in Fairfax County. Item 460 also directed the Department of Criminal Justice Services to evaluate the program and provide a final evaluation report to the 1996 General Assembly. Interim reports were submitted to the 1994 and 1995 sessions of the General Assembly. This is the final report as directed for the 1996 General Assembly.

II. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 1993, the General Assembly authorized funding for the development of a day reporting program in the County of Fairfax for probation and parole technical violators. The purpose of this program was to provide non-residential punishment which assured high standards of public safety. Ideally, the day reporting center program would reserve costly correctional bed space for more serious violent offenders. It would also provide the education, drug services, and other assistance necessary to prevent recidivism in offenders.

The Fairfax County Day Reporting Center (FDRC) began accepting offenders on August 2, 1993. The FDRC program was originally conceptualized to target the population of probationers and parolees in Fairfax County who technically violate the conditions of community supervision. The scope of the program was ultimately expanded to include offenders directly sentenced to the program by Fairfax County Circuit Court Judges and inmates released directly to the program by the Virginia Parole Board.

The FDRC is operated by six Department of Corrections (DOC) staff, who supervise and monitor offenders, and four services personnel, who provide educational, drug treatment, and life skills assistance. The program incorporates three levels of treatment and supervision, with each level providing less stringent supervision requirements than the preceding one. In addition, offenders are sanctioned to discourage negative behaviors.

The evaluation was designed to provide information on the offenders participating in FDRC programs, the types of services received by offenders, and the degree of participant success with program requirements. A follow-up study was conducted to examine outcomes for FDRC participants after they exited the program. Data collection instruments were constructed by the evaluators and completed by FDRC staff.

The evaluation results suggest that the FDRC program is achieving its goals of ensuring public safety and providing individualized treatment/rehabilitative services to many of its

clients. However, the evaluators have developed several recommendations that may be useful in improving program effectiveness:

- develop empirically-based criteria for program admission to identify offenders who would most benefit from the program;
- ensure that appropriate sanctions are applied to unsuccessful participants;
- expand resources for substance abuse services;
- increase emphasis on employment and educational needs of the offenders;
- to address potential benefits received by unsuccessful participants, conduct additional research to examine outcomes for offenders who complete the program, are terminated from the program, and do not participate in the program.

III. BACKGROUND

The mission of the Fairfax County Day Reporting program is to ensure public safety and to offset the future growth in incarceration by serving as a comprehensive, non-residential alternative punishment program. Initially designed to target the population of probationers and parolees in Fairfax County who technically violate the conditions of community supervision, the focus of the Day Reporting program was expanded to include offenders directly sentenced to the program by Fairfax County Circuit Court Judges in lieu of incarceration, and inmates released directly to the program by the Virginia Parole Board.

The Fairfax County Day Reporting program has set forth three primary goals relating to its mission:

- to ensure public safety through a program of strict, highly intensive supervision and surveillance of offenders;
- to achieve offender accountability through strong sanctioning of negative offender behaviors;
- to address offender needs by providing on-site, individualized treatment and rehabilitative services or referrals to appropriate community resources.

The Fairfax County Day Reporting Center seeks to function as the last step on a continuum of intermediate punishments prior to probation/parole revocation or incarceration, providing enhanced maximum community supervision while offering increased treatment, rehabilitative services, and support in an effort to reduce the likelihood of recidivism.

The Fairfax County Day Reporting program officially opened its facilities on August 2, 1993, with the capacity to manage up to 100 offenders.

Program Description

A detailed description of the Fairfax County Day Reporting Center (FDRC) program was provided in DCJS' interim report to the 1995 General Assembly (*Evaluation of the Fairfax County Day Reporting Center, Evaluation Status Report, December, 1994*). In brief, the FDRC is operated under the auspices of the District #29 Probation and Parole Office of the Department of Corrections. As of September 1, 1995, the Center was open 5.5 days (57 hours) a week.

The District #29 Chief Probation and Parole Officer is responsible for oversight of the FDRC program. The FDRC program is staffed by six Department of Corrections personnel: the Program Director, one Probation/Parole Case Manager, three Surveillance Officers, and one clerical support staff.

The Program Director is responsible for operation of the FDRC and supervision of its personnel. The Probation/Parole Case Manager is in charge of the development and implementation of the offender supervision and treatment plans, coordination of services provided by the contractual staff, and supervision of the surveillance officers. The primary duties of the surveillance officers include monitoring the daily activities of the FDRC offenders, completing appropriate personal and community contacts, ensuring offender compliance with his/her daily itinerary, monitoring attendance at treatment and educational services, and conducting on-site alcohol and drug screens.

In addition to these staff members, the FDRC program employs four service personnel: a Department of Correctional Education (DCE) teacher, an Offender Aid and Restoration (OAR) staff person, an Alcohol and Drug Services (ADS) counselor supervisor, and an Alcohol and Drug Services (ADS) counselor (part-time).

The DCE teacher is responsible for evaluating and coordinating the educational and life skills training needs of the FDRC offenders. For example, the teacher offers an Affective Life Skills course which addresses such topics as anger management, goal setting, and problem solving. The OAR staff person organizes the development of community service work sites, coordinates placement of FDRC probationers and parolees in community service activities, and assists offenders in developing employability skills, conducting job searches, and securing employment. In addition, OAR staff furnishes important life assistance services for the FDRC participants when needed. Life assistance services may include monetary assistance for housing, food, clothing, transportation, or utilities payments, or knowledgeable referrals to community resources where the offender can receive assistance. The ADS counselors evaluate substance abuse treatment needs and, whenever possible, provide treatment services for the offender at the FDRC facility. On-site services include group therapy, individual counseling, and monitoring of substance use through regular alcohol and drug screenings. When needed, the ADS counselors may refer program participants to treatment resources in the community.

The FDRC program is designed to be 90 to 120 days long. The program is structured to provide three levels of supervision and treatment, with each level providing less stringent supervision requirements than the preceding one. Offenders are initially placed in Phase 1, moving to Phase 2 and Phase 3 as they progress through the program. Phases are defined in terms of the number and types of contacts required. Phase 1, which typically requires two weeks to complete, includes the referral process, intake, orientation, assessment, and development of the treatment plan. In Phase 2, the offender's treatment plan is implemented, while the offender is monitored according to the specifications of his or her supervision plan. Offenders who cooperate and meet the requirements of Phase 2 are transferred to Phase 3 for the last two to three weeks of the program. The focus of Phase 3 is stabilization and reintegration to prepare the offender to return to supervision by District #29 Probation/Parole officers.

Sanctions may be imposed on the program's participants by FDRC staff for violations of program rules or requirements. Sanctions imposed range from performance of community service to Home Electronic Monitoring. An offender who consistently violates program rules and requirements can be terminated at any point during the program. Offenders who are terminated from the program are returned to the Court for sentencing or to the Parole Board for revocation.

All FDRC offenders are initially assigned to one of three probation and parole officers. These officers are physically located in the same building as the FDRC. The officer monitors the status of the offender while (s)he is in the program, and serves as the offender's probation and parole officer when the offender successfully completes the program.

Evaluation Goals and Methodology

The evaluation was designed to provide information on the offenders participating in FDRC programs, the types of services received by offenders, and the degree of participant success with program requirements. A follow-up study was conducted to examine outcomes for FDRC participants after they exited the program.

The following factors were examined:

- Number of offenders participating in the program, and characteristics of these offenders;
- Number of offenders successfully completing the program and unsuccessfully terminated from the program, including reasons for termination;
- Number and types of supervision contacts made;
- Number and types of sanctions imposed for violating program rules, and types of violations;
- Types of services provided to offenders by the FDRC programs.

In addition, outcomes for offenders who exited the FDRC program were assessed by examining arrest records to measure recidivism, defined as a new arrest after leaving the program.

Data used in this evaluation were collected by the FDRC staff. The staff completed data forms for each offender in four areas of program functioning: supervision, substance abuse treatment, vocational assistance (OAR), and educational assistance (DCE). These data were collected on 193 offenders who exited the FDRC, either successfully or unsuccessfully, between July 1, 1994 and June 30, 1995. Additional data forms were used to document re-arrest information for each offender who exited the program between August, 1993 and June, 1995. All data forms were mailed to DCJS, where the data were coded, tabulated and interpreted by the evaluation staff.

IV. EVALUATION RESULTS

Offender Characteristics

The vast majority (89%) of the 193 offenders examined were referred to the FDRC program by the District #29 Probation/Parole Officers and by Parole Hearing Officers. An additional 11% were placed in the program by Fairfax Circuit Court judges. Individual offenders were sometimes referred to the FDRC program for multiple reasons. The most frequently cited reason for referral to the FDRC program was for reporting violations under regular probation or parole (cited in 42% of cases). Other frequently-cited reasons for referral included positive drug screens or problem alcohol use (38% of cases), need for special services (26% of cases), and the need for intensive supervision (24% of cases).

Of the 193 offenders who exited the FDRC program between July, 1994 and June, 1995, 96 (50%) completed the program successfully, while 90 (47%) were terminated as unsuccessful cases. The remaining 3% of offenders left the program as "other exits" for reasons such as death, hospitalization due to injury, transfer, or direct discharge.

FDRC staff were asked to characterize the reasons why unsuccessful offenders were terminated from the program. The most commonly cited reason, continued drug or alcohol use, was offered for 48% of the offenders who failed to complete the program.

The bulk of the unsuccessful terminations (79%) occurred in Phase 2, the longest of the program's three phases, while 16% of the terminations occurred before the offender completed Phase 1. While successful offenders spent just over three months (99 days) in the FDRC program, the median length of time spent in the program by unsuccessful offenders prior to termination was just over two months (69 days).

Nearly three-fourths (74%) of the offenders exiting the FDRC were male. Over one-third of the offenders (36%) were white, while 62% of the offenders were African-American; the remaining offenders were Asian. The age of these offenders upon entering the FDRC program ranged from 17 to 61 years. The average age for offenders who successfully completed the program was 30 years, while those terminated from the program averaged 31 years of age.

Supervision Contacts

Supervision activities generally include personal contacts, community contacts, and itinerary checks. Table 1 presents one method for examining the degree to which program staff maintained the required number of contacts. Entries in the table represent the percentage of offenders for whom at least 90% of the expected contacts were made during the three phases of the program. Expected contacts were calculated by comparing the number of actual contacts reported by FDRC staff to the number that would have been expected given the offender's time in each phase. The expected number was adjusted to take into account contacts which were waived by FDRC staff. The information presented in Table 1 must be viewed with caution, since the number of contacts and number of contacts waived are subject to errors and inconsistencies in reporting.

Table 1: Percentage of Offenders for Whom at Least 90% of Required Contacts were Made			
Type of Contact	Phase 1	Phase 2	Phase 3
Personal	90%	90%	90%
Community	74%	94%	90%
Itinerary Check	98%	95%	92%

Table 1 shows that most of the expected number of contacts were made in the majority of cases. It should be noted that in all categories of contacts and phases, the percentage of contacts routinely exceeded 100%; that is, many offenders received more contacts (in some cases considerably more) than expected based on the requirements reported by FDRC staff. In addition, the FDRC Director has suggested that figures for Community Contacts are likely to be underestimates because the FDRC program and the evaluation team defined this category somewhat differently.

Supervision activities are used, in part, to accomplish the FDRC goal of ensuring public safety. Subsequent analysis revealed that only 2% of the FDRC offenders were re-arrested while they were participating in the FDRC program.

Use of Sanctions

One of the important components of supervision in the FDRC program is the use of sanctions for negative offender behavior. Overall, over two-thirds (68%) of all offenders received at least one sanction while in the program. Of those offenders who successfully completed the program, 43% received at least one sanction while in the program; 26% received more than one. The most common reason for sanctions to be applied was for positive urine screens or breathalyzer tests: 42% of offenders received sanctions for this reason. Failure to report for treatment or services at FDRC was also a common reason for sanctions to be issued: 31% of offenders received sanctions for this reason. Community service time, in four or eight hour blocks, was the most frequent type of sanction used. Curfews were imposed in 10% of all cases, while increasing an offender's reporting requirements was used for 12% of offenders. Home electronic monitoring (HEM), which is the final sanction before termination from the program, was used infrequently.

Substance Abuse Services Provided

One of the prominent features of the FDRC program is the provision of on-site alcohol and substance abuse treatment services. As part of the offender's assessment, the Alcohol and Drug Services (ADS) counselor evaluates the nature and seriousness of the alcohol or drug problem. Over half of the offenders (59%) were evaluated as having an alcohol or drug *dependency* problem, while another 24% were rated as having an alcohol or drug *abuse* problem. The remaining 17% of the offenders were considered not to have a substance abuse or dependency problem.

Analysis showed a very strong relationship between the ADS's ratings of the severity of the offender's substance abuse problem and the rate of successful completion of the FDRC program. Fully 91% of those offenders judged as having no substance abuse problem successfully completed the FDRC program. By contrast, only 48% of those judged to have a drug or alcohol abuse problem, and 43% of those with drug or alcohol dependency, successfully completed the program. These findings are reinforced by the strong relationship observed between successful program completion and scores on the GAF, a scale designed to measure overall functioning of the individual in all areas. Offenders who failed to complete the program had scores which indicated a greater overall degree of problems than those who successfully completed the program.

Of the 193 offenders, alcohol was the drug which caused the most problems for 37% of the offenders, although 78% of offenders used alcohol in addition to other drugs. Cocaine use was reported by 57% of all offenders, and 31% reported it was their most frequently used drug. Marijuana was used by 58% of offenders, and was the drug which caused the most problems for 14% of the offenders. On average, these offenders began using alcohol or drugs between 15 and 16 years of age.

Of the 193 FDRC offenders, 83% were recommended for ADS treatment services at the FDRC facility; of these, 100% actually received some type of substance abuse treatment. ADS services were indicated for 82% of those whose problem was characterized as "abuse," and for 86% of those characterized as drug dependent.

About 11% of offenders were attending Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) or Narcotics Anonymous (NA) meetings at the time of their referral to the FDRC. The ADS staff recommended AA or NA to all offenders with substance abuse problems, and 29% of the offenders reported that they had attended AA or NA sometime during the program. It is important to note that this figure is based on offender self-report; thus, this figure should be interpreted with caution.

A total of 18% of all FDRC offenders were placed on residential care waiting lists while in the FDRC program. These offenders did receive some substance abuse treatment while on the waiting list, but the treatment was less intensive than that received in residential care. All but one of these offenders were judged as being drug or alcohol dependent. About one-third of the FDRC offenders received drug treatment from an outside source while in the FDRC program.

Of those offenders judged to be alcohol or drug dependent, 29% were placed on residential care waiting lists while in the FDRC program. Treatment services beyond those offered by the FDRC were received by 27% of these offenders. Attendance at AA or NA meetings was recommended by FDRC staff to all of the alcohol or drug dependent offenders.

Of those offenders whose failure to complete the FDRC program was judged to be due to continued drug or alcohol use, just over half (51%) had been placed on a waiting list for residential care by FDRC staff. Attendance at AA or NA was recommended to all of these offenders.

OAR Services Provided

One of the objectives of the program is that offenders become employed as soon as possible after entering the program, unless doing so would interfere with required treatment or the offender has a legitimate reason not to work. Of the 193 offenders who exited the program in FY95, half were unemployed when they entered the program. The OAR staff person administered employability classes for 23% of all offenders, and supplied employment advice to 56% of the offenders. OAR services generated job referrals for half of the offenders in the program. Of the offenders who were unemployed when they entered the program, 68% worked either full- or part-time during some part of their stay in the FDRC program.

Of the offenders who were unemployed when they entered the FDRC program, 47% successfully completed the program. When compared to the success rate of offenders who

were employed when they entered the FDRC (57%), it appears that offenders who were unemployed at referral were less likely to successfully complete the program. It is important to note that unemployment is often related to problems such as severe substance abuse and/or mental health issues.

The OAR staff person is also responsible for finding community service placements for offenders who receive sanctions for rule infractions. Two types of placements accounted for the vast majority of community service activities: offenders were placed in the local shelter, answering phones or cooking or serving food, or were placed with the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT), working on road crews. The FDRC seems to have fulfilled its goal of sanctions being served as soon as possible after they were imposed: half of the sanctioned offenders were placed within three days of receiving the sanction. However, in almost one-quarter of the cases, the placement took two weeks or longer due to reasons such as difficulty in finding a placement, waiting for VDOT crew availability, inclement weather, etc.

In addition to the coordination of employment assistance and community service activities, the OAR staff member offers individual counseling to offenders, along with a variety of other services. The percentage of offenders receiving these various kinds of services is presented in Table 2. Almost all offenders received individual counseling. The next most frequent type of service received was assistance with transportation; this usually involved providing bus tokens along with counseling services, often so that the offender could get to and from work or a job interview.

Table 2: Percentage of Offenders Receiving OAR Services	
Type of Service	Offenders Receiving Service
Individual counseling	96%
Housing assistance	6%
Housing referrals	14%
Food assistance	13%
Food referrals	9%
Transportation assistance	37%
Medical assistance	3%
Mental health referrals	6%

Department of Correctional Education Services Provided

About 60% of the offenders who exited the FDRC program had at least a high school education. Another 26% of offenders had some high school; these offenders may be the

group most appropriate for pre-GED or GED services. DCE services were actually indicated in the contracts of almost one-half (48%) of the FDRC offenders.

The most frequent DCE service provided to these FDRC participants was an Affective Life Skills course. About 28% of offenders received the Affective Life Skills course. Other services, each received by fewer than five offenders, included basic life skills, literacy training, and pre-GED training. Only 4% of offenders received any GED training to prepare them to take the GED exam. According to the FDRC director, the program stresses an individualized treatment plan. Often, treatment of severe chemical dependency and other problems precludes emphasis on the educational component, particularly given the short time span of the program.

Offender Outcomes Following FDRC Participation

Follow-up information was collected for all offenders who were discharged from the FDRC, either successfully or unsuccessfully, between the time the program began, in August of 1993, through June of 1995. Follow-up data was obtained for a total of 244 offenders who were discharged during this time period. Information was obtained on the number and nature of subsequent arrests and technical violations, and convictions and sanctions received for these violations.

Of the 244 offenders discharged during the time period under study, 54% (132) had successfully completed the FDRC program, while the remaining 46% (112) had been terminated from the program. Offenders who successfully completed the program spent an average of 103 days in the program, compared with 59 days for offenders who failed to complete the program.

About 41% of those offenders who were terminated from the program received prison or jail sentences as a result of their termination. An additional 26% were awaiting action by either the Parole Board or the Court regarding sanctions. About 12% of the offenders who failed to complete the program received no sanction at all; these offenders were either terminated from probation or administratively discharged from parole. The remaining offenders received other sanctions, including continuation of probation and orders to repeat the Day Reporting Center program.

Follow-up periods for the 244 offenders ranged from 2 months to 22 months, with an average follow-up period of about 11 months. Information on subsequent arrests during this time was available for 240 offenders. Of these offenders, 22% were re-arrested at some point during the follow-up period.¹ Of the 52 offenders who were re-arrested, 22 (44%) were re-arrested for a felony. Thus of the entire 240, about 9% were re-arrested for a new felony offense.

¹This excludes those offenders whose only offense was the failure to complete the FDRC program itself.

There was no difference between the re-arrest rates for those who successfully completed the program and those who did not. Of those who successfully completed the program, 21% were re-arrested, compared with 22% of those who were terminated from the program. This does not take into account, however, the fact that many of those who failed to complete the program had their probation or parole revoked, and spent the follow-up period in prison or jail where they were not subject to re-arrest. When these offenders are excluded, the results of this analysis show that 28% (rather than 22%) of those who were unsuccessfully terminated from the program were eventually re-arrested, compared to 21% for those who successfully completed the program.

Further analysis of the differences between offenders who completed the program and those who were terminated showed that there was a difference in the types of crimes for which the two groups of offenders were re-arrested. Of the offenders re-arrested, 52% of those who terminated unsuccessfully from the program were arrested for a felony offense, as compared to 37% percent of those re-arrested after successfully completing the program.

Classification of the most serious offense at arrest for the 52 recidivist offenders showed that offenses related to drugs and alcohol accounted for the largest percentage (27%) of offenses. Property crimes accounted for 23% of arrests, while offenses against persons accounted for 19% of the most serious offenses committed by these offenders. Most person offenses (60%) were misdemeanors; felony person offenses accounted for 8% of the total re-arrests.

As noted above, 28 of the 130 offenders who successfully completed the program were re-arrested. Of these, 16 were sentenced to prison or jail, with 6 of these receiving less than 30 days in jail. Thus, of all those who successfully completed the program, about 11% were re-arrested and spent some time in prison or jail. Only two offenders received sentences of 1 year or more in prison.

There were 102 offenders who successfully completed the FDRC program and who were not re-arrested. Of these, 22 (21%) violated the conditions of their probation or parole at some time subsequent to completion of the program. Of these, 6 received prison or jail terms.

To summarize, of the 130 offenders who successfully completed the FDRC program, 50 (38%) were either re-arrested or technically violated the conditions of their probation or parole after completing the program. Of the total 130, 21 (16%) spent at least some time in prison or jail after successfully completing the FDRC program. Many of these spent no more than 30 days in jail. Of the total 130, 13 (10%) spent over 1 month in prison or jail after being discharged from the program.

Another way to look at these recidivism rates is by keeping the follow-up period constant; that is, by examining the proportion of FDRC offenders who are re-arrested within six or 12 months after exiting the program. Table 3 presents these rates compared to similar rates for offenders under intensive supervision (ISP) and regular supervision. The latter two rates are

taken from a previous study of the ISP program conducted by DCJS, and include only four localities.

Table 3: Re-arrest Rates for Offenders in FDRC and Other Supervision Programs				
Follow-up Period	FDRC Successful	FDRC Unsuccessful	ISP	Regular Supervision
6-month	16%	15%	14%	6%
12-month	19%	21%	18%	10%

Table 3 shows that re-arrest rates for the FDRC program are comparable to those of ISP. The lower re-arrest rates for offenders in regular supervision probably are due to more "hard-core" offenders being involved in ISP and the day reporting center. These "hard-core" offenders are typically higher risk, multiple-need, career criminals with a long history of criminal justice involvement.

Part of the reason that FDRC re-arrest rates are slightly higher than ISP rates is that the FDRC rates are calculated from the time of exit from the program, while ISP rates are calculated from the time of entry into the program. Since many more offenders are re-arrested while on intensive supervision (which extends for an average of about nine months) than are re-arrested while in the FDRC program, computing re-arrest rates based on termination dates will show the ISP rates to be lower. Re-calculation of the rates for the FDRC shows that the 6-month re-arrest rate for those who completed the program is significantly lower when the follow-up period extends from the time the offender enters the program. This is because these offenders are under the stricter supervision of the DRC program for most of the time period.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following conclusions and recommendations are based upon the data presented in this report. The recommendations highlight issues relevant to improving program efficiency, particularly in the areas of program admissions, service delivery, and demonstration of program benefits.

- **Program Completion Success Rate**

Conclusion: Half of the offenders who exited the FDRC between July, 1994 and June, 1995 completed the program successfully. However, almost half of these offenders were terminated unsuccessfully from the program.

The vast majority of offenders referred to the FDRC program had been performing unsuccessfully on probation or parole. These offenders were referred to the program because, in the opinion of their probation and parole officers, they were high-risk offenders, requiring a greater degree of supervision or rehabilitative services. Given the characteristics of these offenders, it is perhaps not surprising that half would fail to respond to the FDRC program. If we assume that all of the offenders who enter the FDRC program would otherwise be sentenced to jail or prison terms, or have their probation or parole revoked, then a 50% success rate might be considered highly desirable.

Recommendation: The Department of Corrections should consider development of a set of empirically-based criteria for admission into the FDRC program.

The systematic collection and analysis of data similar to that presented in this report might provide referral sources with a set of criteria to be used in determining which offenders would be good candidates for the FDRC. If such criteria could be developed and refined, it might ultimately be possible to screen out offenders who would not benefit from the program.

- **Ensuring Public Safety**

Conclusion: About 2 of every 100 offenders were re-arrested while in the FDRC program.

The FDRC does seem to be fulfilling its mandate to protect public safety. Very few offenders committed new offenses while in the program.

Recommendation: None. Program addresses public safety needs.

- **Re-arrest Rates Following Participation in FDRC**

Conclusion: The vast majority of offenders who successfully completed the FDRC remained arrest-free during the year following their participation in the program. Less than 2% of offenders who successfully completed the FDRC program were re-

arrested for an offense serious enough to warrant a sentence of a year or more in prison.

Conclusion: Almost four of every 10 offenders who completed the FDRC program were either re-arrested or subsequently violated the conditions of their probation or parole. One in 10 spent over 1 month in prison or jail as a result of re-arrest or technical violations.

Conclusion: Re-arrest rates of FDRC offenders are comparable to those of offenders in intensive supervision.

A sizable proportion of offenders who successfully completed the program had further problems, either being re-arrested or technically violating the conditions of their probation or parole. Most of these problems were relatively minor in nature, however, and few offenders spent any significant amount of time in prison or jail. This is an important factor, since part of the value of a day reporting center program is keeping offenders from being incarcerated. The re-arrest rates observed in this study are comparable with those found in a previous study of intensive supervision.

Recommendation: None. FDRC has comparable re-arrest rates to other types of intensive supervision programs.

- **Application of Sanctions**

Conclusion: A sizable minority (30%) of offenders who failed to complete the FDRC program received no prison or jail time as a sanction; almost half of these received no sanction at all.

One of the basic assumptions underlying the use of day reporting center programs is that they are the offender's last chance prior to having his or her community supervision revoked. It is this factor that presumably provides some of the motivation for offenders to obey program rules and participate in program services. When prison or jail sanctions are not applied as a result of failure in the program, or when no sanctions at all are applied, then one of the basic tenets regarding the program's effectiveness is compromised.

Recommendation: Judges and Parole Hearing Officers and Examiners should make every effort to ensure that appropriate sanctions are applied to offenders who fail to complete the FDRC program.

- **Substance Abuse Needs of FDRC Population**

Conclusion: Substance abuse is implicated as a factor in offenders being referred to the FDRC program, failing to complete the program, and being re-arrested after they leave the program.

Substance abuse was a frequently-cited reason for referral to the FDRC. Continued substance use was the most frequently-cited factor in offenders failing to complete the program. Drug and alcohol-related offenses accounted for the largest proportion of re-arrests after completion of, or termination from, the FDRC. Data analyzed for this report showed that the FDRC program is attempting to meet the needs of these offenders in a variety of ways. All offenders with substance abuse problems received at least some services, and those offenders characterized as having more serious problems seemed to be the ones who were receiving more or more intensive services.

Recommendation: The FDRC program and the Department of Corrections should explore ways to enhance the program's delivery of substance abuse services, including hiring additional counselors, increasing the frequency and intensity of groups, and providing additional training for staff.

- **Service Delivery**

Conclusion: For several reasons, delivery of employment and educational services appear to fall behind that of other services such as substance abuse services and supervision.

Employment classes were provided for only about one-fourth of all offenders, although about half were unemployed when they entered the program. However, many offenders did in fact work during at least some of the time they were in the program. It is important to note that factors such as offender disabilities and refusal to attend employability classes affect these figures. Data for other types of employment assistance, such as counseling, job search requirements, etc., were not available; therefore it is not possible to determine the degree to which these other employment services were being implemented.

Also, the majority of FDRC offenders came to the program with a high school education; most of those who had not graduated from high school received no GED training. About a fourth of offenders participated in an Affective Life Skills class; other educational services were offered to no more than a few offenders.

Recommendation: FDRC program managers and staff should re-assess, in light of the findings of this study, the degree to which the services they are providing are

meeting the needs of the offenders they serve. Any gaps in service delivery that are identified, especially in the areas of employment and education, should be addressed by the program managers.

- **Issues for Further Study**

Conclusion: Completion of the FDRC program per se does not appear to affect the likelihood of re-arrest.

The re-arrest rate of offenders who failed to complete the FDRC program was only slightly higher than that of offenders who successfully completed the program. Offenders who were terminated from the program were more likely to be arrested for felony offenses than those who successfully completed the program. It is not known whether this difference is due to program participation or to differences that existed prior to offenders' entry into the program.

Recommendation: Further study should be undertaken to determine the relationship between the structure and functioning of the FDRC program and subsequent re-offending.

Further study is needed to provide a comparison between re-arrest rates for offenders who complete the program, are terminated from the program, and do not participate in the program. This will allow for a more definitive assessment of whether, for example, the program has a positive effect on the re-arrest rate of unsuccessful offenders, which would otherwise be higher than observed here. Further study is also needed, however, to determine the degree to which the goals, structure, policies, and services of the FDRC program are related to subsequent re-offending.

VI. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The evaluation staff would like to acknowledge the following individuals for their cooperation and assistance on this project:

Mark Brownell
Surveillance Officer
Fairfax Day Reporting Center/Virginia Department of Corrections
Fairfax, Virginia

Lesley Bubenhofer
Chief Probation and Parole Officer, District #29
Virginia Department of Corrections/Department of Community Corrections
Fairfax, Virginia

Richard Clowers
Surveillance Officer
Fairfax Day Reporting Center/Virginia Department of Corrections
Fairfax, Virginia

Cheryl Grube
Alcohol and Drug Services Supervisor
Fairfax Day Reporting Center/Alcohol and Drug Services of Fairfax County
Fairfax, Virginia

Connie LeMay
Offender Aid and Restoration Counselor
Fairfax Day Reporting Center/Offender Aid and Restoration of Fairfax
Fairfax, Virginia

Linda Matson
Department of Correctional Education Teacher
Fairfax Day Reporting Center/Virginia Department of Correctional Education
Fairfax, Virginia

Deborah Pounds
Case Manager
Fairfax Day Reporting Center/Virginia Department of Corrections
Fairfax, Virginia

Jane Reedy
Program Director
Fairfax Day Reporting Center/Virginia Department of Corrections
Fairfax, Virginia

Edward Stapleton
Surveillance Officer
Fairfax Day Reporting Center/Virginia Department of Corrections
Fairfax, Virginia

Steve Walenta
Alcohol and Drug Services Counselor
Fairfax Day Reporting Center/Alcohol and Drug Services of Fairfax County
Fairfax, Virginia

	Item Details(\$)		Appropriations(\$)	
	First Year	Second Year	First Year	Second Year

facility(ies) as part of the 1994-96 biennial budget request.

D. The Department of Corrections shall complete a pre-planning study for a 150-bed, minimum security, pre-release and/or return-to-custody facility for adult male offenders, to be operated by the Department of Corrections. This study shall examine the feasibility of utilizing one of the closed field unit sites for this purpose. The Department shall request sufficient funds to design and construct the facility as part of the 1994-96 biennial capital budget request.

E. The Department of Corrections shall study the feasibility and cost of converting one or more existing field units to pre-release and/or return-to-custody facilities. A report on the Department's findings and recommendations with respect to Paragraphs C, D, and E of this Item, including a comparison of the relative costs and benefits of public versus private financing, construction and operation, shall be presented to the Governor and the Chairmen of the House Appropriations and Senate Finance Committees by August 15, 1993.

460. Probation and Reentry Services (3510000).....			\$29,443,570	\$31,125,489
			\$29,480,064	\$32,605,310
Adult Probation and Parole Services (3510100).....	\$29,443,570	\$31,125,489		
	\$29,480,064	\$32,605,310		
Fund Sources: General.....	\$29,443,570	\$31,125,489		
	\$29,480,064	\$32,605,310		

Authority: Title 53.1, Chapters 4 and 5, Code of Virginia.

A. The Department shall seek federal funds from the Department of Criminal Justice Services for adult parole intensive supervision services. Such services shall be for new parolees whose history of substance abuse contributed to the commission of the offense for which they were convicted and individuals with a known history of substance abuse who are subject to probation or parole revocation. The Department of Corrections shall also seek federal funds to provide substance abuse treatment services to such persons.

B. This appropriation includes annual membership dues to the Probation and Parole Compact Administrators' Association, \$300 the first year and \$300 the second year, from the general fund.

C. Included within this appropriation is \$109,200 each year to expand electronic home monitoring of parolees.

D. Included within this appropriation is \$365,175 in the second year to establish a pilot day reporting center in Fairfax County for probation and parole technical violators who are under the supervision of the Fairfax District 29 Probation and Parole Office. This amount includes \$20,000 to contract with Offender Aid and Restoration of Fairfax for social services, vocational and employment counseling and client emergency assistance. The Department of Corrections shall present a preliminary report on implementation of this center to the Governor and the Chairmen of the Senate Finance and House Appropriations Committees by June 4, 1993. The Department of Criminal Justice Services shall evaluate the results of this pilot program and prepare a preliminary report to be presented to the Governor and the Chairmen of the Senate Finance and House Appropriations Committees no later than December 1, 1993.

