

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

**EVALUATION OF THE NORFOLK
DAY REPORTING CENTER
(NDRC)**

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



HOUSE DOCUMENT NO. 61

**COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
RICHMOND
1997**

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

Project Staff:

Ms. Jodie Lucas
Evaluation Specialist

Ms. Trina Bogle
Manager, Evaluation Unit

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
	Mission	2
	Administration and Program Structure	2
IV.	EVALUATION GOALS AND METHODOLOGY	4
	Offender Profiles	4
	Follow-Up Study.....	5
V.	EVALUATION RESULTS	6
	Program Success Rates	6
	Offender Characteristics	7
	Offender Service Needs	8
	Supervision	10
	Sanctioning	12
	Treatment Services.....	14
VI.	OFFENDER OUTCOMES	18
	Follow-Up Information.....	18
VII.	PROGRAM IMPACT	19
	Recidivism.....	19
	Diversion and Net-Widening.....	20
VIII.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	21
	Program Completion Success Rate.....	21
	Substance Abuse Needs of the NDRC Population	22
	Treatment Services and Resources.....	22
	Costs and Savings.....	23
	Ensuring Public Safety	23
IX.	ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	25

I. AUTHORITY FOR STUDY

Item 565 of the 1994 General Assembly Budget Bill directed the Department of Corrections to "establish a day reporting center in the City of Richmond and the City of Norfolk for probation and parole technical violators who are under the supervision of the Richmond and Norfolk Probation and Parole Offices." Item 565 also directed the Department of Criminal Justice Services to evaluate these programs.

II. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 1994, the General Assembly authorized funding for the development of a day reporting center in the City of Norfolk 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, a day reporting center program would reserve costly correctional bed space for more serious violent offenders. It would also provide the drug services, education and other assistance necessary to prevent recidivism in offenders.

The Norfolk Day Reporting Center (NDRC) began accepting offenders on April 3, 1995. The NDRC program was originally conceptualized to target the population of probationers and parolees in the City of Norfolk 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 Circuit Court judges and inmates released directly to the program by the Virginia Parole Board.

The NDRC is operated by six Department of Corrections (DOC) staff, who supervise and monitor offenders, and three services personnel, who provide drug treatment, educational assistance, 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 the NDRC program, the types of services received by offenders, and the degree of participant success with program requirements. A follow-up study was conducted to examine the outcomes for NDRC participants after they exited the program. Data collection instruments were constructed by the evaluators and completed by NDRC staff and district Probation/Parole officers.

The evaluation results suggest that the NDRC 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:

- Attempt to improve the program success rate through improved client selection and individualized treatment.
- Expand the drug treatment services available at the NDRC. If additional funds are not available for expanding the drug treatment program, the NDRC should allocate its treatment resources in the following order of priority: drug treatment; employment services; educational services.
- As reduction of prison costs is a primary goal of the NDRC, the NDRC should attempt to: (1) accept only clients who are prison bed diversions, and (2) reduce the number of days offenders are supervised by the NDRC while maintaining current treatment/program requirements.
- Attempt to qualitatively determine predictors of absconding.

III. BACKGROUND

Mission

The Norfolk Day Reporting Center (NDRC) is a non-residential punishment for probationers and parolees which serves the District #2, District #3, District #23, and District #31 Probation and Parole Offices. The NDRC serves as an alternative to revocation and incarceration among technical violators (and occasionally non-technical violators) of probation and parole. The NDRC seeks to: (1) function as the last step on a continuum of intermediate punishments prior to probation/parole revocation or incarceration, (2) provide enhanced maximum community supervision, and (3) offer increased treatment, rehabilitative services, and support in an effort to reduce the likelihood of recidivism. The NDRC program officially opened its facilities on April 3, 1995, with the capacity to manage up to 100 offenders. Although the program has operated at or below capacity since inception, its capacity is higher than some other day reporting centers in the state (e.g., Richmond Day Reporting Center has a capacity of 75).

Administration and Program Structure

A detailed description of the NDRC program was provided in DCJS' interim report to the 1996 General Assembly (*Evaluation of the Norfolk Day Reporting Center, 1996*). In brief, funding for the NDRC was provided by the 1994 Virginia Acts of the Assembly. Chapter 996 (Item 565) of the Acts authorized \$200,000 for FY1995 and \$375,000 for FY1996 to be apportioned from the Commonwealth's general funds. During the evaluation period, the NDRC was operated under the auspices of the District #2 Probation and Parole Office of the Department of Corrections; however, the NDRC has operated as an independent unit with oversight provided by DOC's Central Regional Office since July 1, 1996. As of June 1996, the NDRC was open 6 days a week (50 hours a week).

Staff

The District #2 Chief Probation and Parole Officer is responsible for the oversight of the NDRC program. The NDRC is staffed by six Department of Corrections personnel: the Program Director, two Probation/Parole officers, two Probation/Parole Technicians (surveillance officers), and one clerical support staff.

The Program Director is responsible for the operation of the NDRC and supervision of its personnel. The Probation/Parole Officers (PPOs) develop and implement the offender supervision and treatment plans, coordinate services provided by contractual staff, and work as a team with surveillance officers. The primary duties of the surveillance officers include monitoring the daily activities of the NDRC 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 NDRC program employs three contracted service providers: a Department of Correctional Education (DCE) teacher, an Offender Aid and Restoration (OAR) staff person, and a Substance Abuse Services (SAS) counselor. The DCE teacher is responsible for evaluating and coordinating the educational training needs of the NDRC offenders. The OAR staff person organizes the development of community service activities, assists offenders with employment and life skills, and provides emergency assistance and/or referrals when needed. The SAS counselor evaluates the substance abuse treatment needs and, when possible, provides treatment services for the offender at the NDRC facility. On-site services include group therapy, individual therapy, and monitoring of substance use through regular alcohol and drug screenings. When needed, the SAS counselor will refer program participants to treatment resources in the community.

Program Operations

The intended length of the Norfolk Day Reporting Program is approximately 90-120 days. 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 One, moving to Phase Two and Phase Three as they progress through the program. Phases are defined in terms of the number and types of supervision contacts required, and treatment and services received. In general, assessment occurs in Phase One, the bulk of offender treatment occurs in Phase Two, and transition back to regular supervision (or, in some cases, preparation for release from supervision) occurs in Phase Three. Offenders graduate to the next level of the program based on the assessments of the NDRC supervision and treatment staffs. Offenders who do not satisfactorily complete the reporting and treatment requirements of the program can be terminated at any point during the program.

The NDRC staff impose sanctions when participants violate 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 after admission into the program. Offenders who are terminated from the program are returned to the Court for sentencing or to the Parole Board for revocation.

Program Referral

The 1996 interim report provides a comprehensive description of the referral process. Briefly, technical violators are referred by their home district Probation/Parole officer instead of beginning revocation proceedings, by a Circuit Court judge at the Violation Hearing in lieu of incarceration, or by a Parole Hearing Officer or Examiner during the parole revocation process. Circuit Court judges also occasionally refer non-technical violators with histories of supervision problems to the program.

Once a case is referred to the NDRC, the case is reviewed to determine if the placement is appropriate. If the case is accepted, the offender is then evaluated by the NDRC supervision and treatment staff. The staff then develop a viable plan for the offender which incorporates the NDRC rules, the supervision and reporting requirements developed for the offender, and the elements of the offender's treatment plan. Cases accepted by the NDRC do not remain part of the referring district's caseload, but are transferred to the NDRC Probation/Parole Officers while the offenders participate in the program.

IV. EVALUATION GOALS AND METHODOLOGY

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

Offender Profiles

Data collection forms were designed by evaluation staff to collect offender profile information. NDRC staff conducted the on-site data collection by compiling information for each offender in four areas of program functioning: supervision, substance abuse treatment, vocational assistance (OAR) and educational assistance (DCE). The following factors were examined:

- Number of offenders participating in the NDRC 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 in the NDRC program.

These data were collected on 176 offenders who exited the NDRC, either successfully or unsuccessfully, between April 3, 1995 and June 30, 1996.

In addition, outcomes for offenders who exited the NDRC program were assessed by surveying the offenders' regular Probation/Parole Officer and examining arrest records to measure recidivism (defined as a new arrest after leaving the program).

Follow-Up Study

The purpose of the follow-up study was to determine, to the degree possible, the outcomes of offenders who had left the NDRC program. Data for this portion of the evaluation was collected for two different samples of offenders from two different data sources. First, current status upon termination information was retrieved from client exit forms. For this group of offenders, the available information only reported the client's status at the time of departure from the NDRC, and each of these offenders had terminated unsuccessfully. Second, subsequent activity information was collected for a sample of clients who had previously exited the NDRC, either successfully or unsuccessfully. This information included client outcomes since leaving the NDRC. In total, some type of follow-up information was collected for 141 clients.

Current Status Upon Termination

Status upon termination was collected for 49 offenders in the NDRC sample. This information was collected via the client exit form, a data collection form constructed by the evaluators which documented each offender's status at the time of termination. For each of these offenders, probation/parole had been revoked for probation/parole violations at the time the exit form was completed, that is, upon each offender's departure from the NDRC. Because this follow-up information was already available and reduction of data collection tasks for NDRC staff/PPOs was important, subsequent activity data (see below) were not requested for these offenders.

Subsequent Activity Information

In Summer 1996, follow-up data were requested for a sample of the offenders who had previously terminated from the NDRC program. These data provided information on client outcomes since leaving the NDRC program. Several factors were considered in selecting the follow-up sample. First, if the offender left the NDRC program during June 1996, then the time between exiting the program and completion of the follow-up survey was deemed too short to provide useful information. Therefore, only offenders who exited prior to June 1, 1996 were included. Second, if the offender terminated unsuccessfully prior to entering the second phase of the NDRC program, follow-up data were not requested. Because unsuccessful completions during the first phase are frequently due to failure to report to the NDRC, it would be inappropriate to evaluate the NDRC based upon the actions of these offenders. In addition, follow-up information was not requested for offenders who had been revoked at program termination (see above). Finally, offenders who left the NDRC program in some way other than a successful or unsuccessful discharge were not considered appropriate for follow-up. These cases

included offenders who were removed by the Parole Board or released from supervision. After accounting for these factors, subsequent activity data were requested for 92 offenders. The average length of time since leaving the NDRC was 220 days (the range was between 81 and 540 days).

Follow-up forms for each offender in the sample were sent to the Probation/Parole Officers who were currently supervising the offenders. The offender's Probation/Parole Officer provided the data for the follow-up study by completing a questionnaire and/or examining arrest records. In the case of offenders who were no longer under supervision or offenders who had warrants out for their arrests, the NDRC director conducted the criminal records checks necessary to complete the forms. Data collected for this portion of the follow-up study included subsequent arrests, probation or parole violations, employment, further treatment services, and a rating of overall adjustment since leaving the NDRC. All offender profiles and follow-up forms were mailed to DCJS, where the data were coded, tabulated, and interpreted by the evaluation staff.

V. EVALUATION RESULTS

Program Success Rates

Of the 176 offenders who exited the NDRC program between April 1995 and June 1996, 88 (or 50%) were terminated unsuccessfully from the program, while 88 (50%) exited successfully. Two (2%) of the above successful offenders left the program under non-typical circumstances (e.g., released from supervision), and one unsuccessful offender (1%) likewise left under non-typical conditions (e.g., removed by the Parole Board). These three offenders were not included in subsequent analyses that compared findings for successful and unsuccessful offenders.

Of the unsuccessful offenders, 15% were terminated in Phase One, 60% were terminated in Phase Two, and 25% were terminated in Phase Three. While successful offenders spent approximately four months (125 days) in the program, the average length of time spent in the program by unsuccessful offenders was about three months (95 days). The NDRC staff were asked their opinions on the primary reasons unsuccessful offenders were unable to complete the NDRC program. The most commonly cited reason, continued drug or alcohol use, was offered for 59% of the offenders who failed to complete the program. Other frequently noted reasons included absconding, reporting violations, and non-compliant attitude.

Offender Characteristics

Demographics

As shown in Table 1, the vast majority of the 176 offenders in this study were African-American males. The average age of the participants in this sample was 29 years. The majority of the offenders were single, and 31% were childless.

Table 1: Characteristics of NDRC Offenders		
Characteristic		% of Offenders
Gender:	Male	80%
	Female	20%
Race:	African-American	83%
	White	16.5%
	Hispanic	0.5%
Age:	Average	29 years
	Range	18 to 51 years
Marital Status:	Single	67%
	Married	6%
	Divorced	8%
	Separated/Estranged	13%
Number of Children:	0	31%
	1 to 2	43%
	3 or more	20%

Note: Marital Status and Number of Children data were missing for 6% of offenders in the sample

Although not shown in the table, 38% of offenders received public assistance.

Referral Information

Offenders were referred to the NDRC from four primary sources: Probation and Parole Officers, Circuit Court judges, Boot Camps, and the Parole Board. Table 2 describes the proportion of offenders from each referral source.

Table 2: Percentage of Offenders Referred to NDRC from Each Source	
Referral Source	% of NDRC population referred
Probation and Parole Officers	60%
Circuit Court Judges	37%
Boot Camps	2%
Parole Board	1%

Across all referral sources, 21% of the offenders were parolees. Of the 104 people referred by PPOs, 64% were supervised under regular probation, 26% were supervised under regular parole, and 6% were supervised under dual probation and parole. The remainder of these referrals were from the Intensive Supervision Program (ISP). A PPO may cite several reasons for referring an offender to the NDRC. The most common reasons cited by the district PPOs when referring technical violators were positive urine screens (cited in 24% of the referrals), alcohol use (cited in 26% of the referrals), and reporting violations (cited in 34% of the referrals). For 89% of the offenders, the NDRC program was reported by PPOs as the final alternative before incarcerating the offender.

Of the 60 people referred to the NDRC by Circuit Court Judges, 93% had suspended prison sentences and 7% had suspended jail sentences. The average length of suspended sentence was 56 months. The few non-technical violators who were served by the NDRC were referred by Circuit Court Judges; however, these violators had a history of technical violations.

Comparison of Successful and Unsuccessful Offenders

Characteristics of successful and unsuccessful offenders were compared to identify differences between the two groups. There were no significant* differences observed between successful and unsuccessful offenders on age, number of children, marital status, or referral sources.

Offender Service Needs

Substance Abuse Services

According to assessments of the Substance Abuse Services counselor, 70% of NDRC offenders were physically dependent upon drugs and/or alcohol and an additional 8% of the offenders abused drugs and/or alcohol but were not physically dependent. On average, program participants started using drugs when they were 17.5 years old. However, age at drug use onset ranged from 11 years to 40 years.

When offenders are evaluated by the SAS counselor, they are questioned about the types of drugs they use and the extent of their use of each drug. The SAS counselor provided a list of drugs used by each offender ranked in order of the seriousness of the problem caused by each drug. A summary of these seriousness rankings across offenders, as well as the percent of offenders who use each drug, is shown in Table 3. Note that percentages for "Total Percentage of Offenders Who Use" include offenders who use at any level, that is, infrequent users to hard-core addicts.

* References to "significant differences" throughout the text refer to a results from statistical tests for significance.

Table 3: Percentage of Offenders' Drug Abuse by Drug Type and Seriousness of Problem

Drug	Most Serious	2nd Most Serious	3rd or More Most Serious	Total Percentage of Offenders Who Use:
Cocaine	39%	9%	2%	59%
Alcohol	20%	23%	9%	60%
Marijuana	10%	13%	9%	38%
Heroin	7%	2%	0%	10%
Prescription Drugs	1%	0%	0%	1%
Other	1%	0%	0%	1%

Note: Frequently the SAS counselor would indicate an offender used a particular drug but did not provide the ranking. These offenders are accounted for in the column "Offenders Who Use", but are not included in figures for seriousness levels.

As depicted in Table 3, individual offenders were most frequently assessed as having more serious problems with cocaine and alcohol. Approximately 60% of the offenders used cocaine and a similar number used alcohol. Slightly more than one-third used marijuana. Not surprisingly, alcohol and drug treatment was required in the contracts of two-thirds of the participants of the NDRC program. At least 49% of the offenders who required drug treatment had received some kind of drug treatment service prior to entering the NDRC program. Table 4 provides a summary of the types of previous drug treatment services received by these 87 offenders.

Table 4: Types of Substance Abuse Treatment Received Prior to NDRC Placement for Offenders Requiring NDRC Drug Treatment

Type of Treatment	Percentage of Offenders
Public provided outpatient services	53%
Prevention (AA or NA included)	49%
Detoxification	28%
Substance Abuse Education	25%
Hospital based services (inpatient)	20%
Other types of services	17%
Problem Identification and Referral	16%
Minimum Interim Services, Outpatient	5%
Relapse Prevention	5%
DOC/Jail programs	3%
Privately provided outpatient services	1%
Minimum interim services (residential)	1%
Intermediate Residential	1%

Educational Services

Educational background was available for 163 offenders in the sample (See Table 5). Although nearly 40% of the sample had graduated from high school or received their equivalency, over 60% of the sample had not completed their high school education.

Table 5: Percent of Offender by Highest Educational Level Completed	
Grade Level	Percentage
3rd grade or less	1%
4th or 5th	1%
6th or 7th	5%
8th or 9th	25%
10th or 11th	25%
Part of 12th	4%
High School Graduate/GED	31%
Some College	8%

Of the total 176 offenders in this sample, 99 (56%) were assigned to a DCE class. The policy of the NDRC required offenders who did not have a high school diploma or GED and who were unemployed to attend DCE classes. Once employment was obtained, class attendance was required as possible with offenders' work schedules. Of the 141 offenders whose literacy levels were tested, the average literacy level was between the 7th and 8th grade level (or 7.4); literacy levels ranged between the 1.2 and 12.9 grade levels.

Employment Services

Employment information was available for 95% of the referrals. Fifty-eight percent of these offenders were unemployed upon referral to the NDRC. In addition, 26% were employed full-time, 10% were employed part-time, and 1% were self-employed. Of those who were employed, 44% worked in manual labor or construction positions, 12% worked in janitorial or maintenance positions, 18% worked in food service, and 26% held other types of positions.

Supervision

To assure high standards of public safety, NDRC participants are monitored through daily surveillance of their activities. Supervision is most intense when a participant initially enters the program. As the offender moves from one phase to the next, the degree of supervision is diminished gradually.

Minimum Contact Requirements

To achieve effective supervision, the NDRC program has established minimum contact requirements (see Table 6). Data on three different types of supervision contacts were collected for each offender. Personal contacts refer to a face-to-face contact with the

offender. A community contact refers to a contact with the offender outside of the NDRC. An employment verification includes speaking with the offender at work, inspecting a paystub, and speaking with the offender's supervisor. Other supervision activities included random itinerary checks, drug screens and records checks.

Table 6: Minimum Contact Requirements			
Type of Contact	Phase One	Phase Two	Phase Three
Personal			
<i>if employed</i>	1 per workday	2 per week	1 per week
<i>if unemployed</i>	1 per workday	1 per workday	2 per week
Community	2 per week	1 per week	1 per week
Employment Verifications			
<i>normally</i>	within 1 week of assignment to NDRC	none, if no changes in work status	none, if no changes in work status
<i>if change in employment status, complete additional contact</i>	within 1 working day of notification	within 1 working day of notification	within 1 working day of notification

Assessment of Supervision Contact Frequency

To assess if the NDRC met the minimum supervisory contact requirements, the NDRC PPOs were asked to submit contact information. Table 7 presents the average percent of the minimum required number of contacts made per offender for each type of contact. When the average percent exceeds 100, the average offender was supervised at a level higher than the minimum required contact frequency. Contacts may frequently be waived for legitimate reasons (such as offender illness or a conflict with an offender's work schedule). The data presented in Table 7 have been adjusted to account for legitimate waivers of contacts.

Table 7: Average Percentage of Minimum Required Contacts Made			
Type of Contacts	Phase One	Phase Two	Phase Three
Personal Contacts	120%	171%	394%
Community Contacts	222%	316%	351%
Employment Contacts	248%	1154%	433%

These data show that the average offender was supervised at a level higher than the minimum required contact frequency. Supervision activities are used, in part, to accomplish the NDRC goal of ensuring public safety. The above data indicate that the NDRC is fulfilling their commitment to providing offender supervision. Furthermore, subsequent analyses revealed that only nine (5%) offenders were re-arrested while supervised by the NDRC.

Sanctioning

When offenders enrolled in the NDRC violate the program rules and requirements, the NDRC staff impose sanctions to promote offender accountability and support positive behavior by swiftly punishing negative behaviors. There are a variety of sanctions which may be imposed upon the offender depending upon the severity of the violation. Types of sanctions include community service, imposition of a curfew, increased reporting requirements, home electronic monitoring, or termination from the program.

Analysis of NDRC Sanctioning Practices

Half of the NDRC participants completed the program without receiving a sanction. Thirty-four percent received one sanction, 12% received two or three sanctions, and the remaining 4% received more than 3 sanctions. Table 8 provides the types of violations and the percent of participants sanctioned at least once for each violation. The categories listed below are mutually exclusive; however, offenders may receive multiple sanctions at the same time.

Table 8: Percent of Offenders Sanctioned at Least Once for Each Type of Violation			
Type of Violation	All Offenders	Unsuccessful Offenders	Successful Offenders
Positive urine screen or breathalyzer	32%	40%	26%
Failed to report or call as scheduled	28%	30%	27%
Absconding	9%	17%	0%
Other	8%	9%	7%
Failure to comply with NDRC rules	6%	8%	5%
Failure to follow daily itinerary	6%	8%	5%
Failure to report to NDRC treatment/services	3%	3%	2%
Failure to complete previously imposed community service	3%	5%	1%
Failure to report to external treatment or services	1%	1%	1%
Failure to secure employment	1%	2%	0%
New arrest/offense	1%	2%	0%

Both successful and unsuccessful participants were most frequently sanctioned for failure to report and positive drug/alcohol screens. This finding is not surprising considering that reporting problems and drug use were most frequently noted by Probation and Parole Officers as the reasons for referral to the NDRC. While successful and unsuccessful offenders were sanctioned similarly for failure to report, unsuccessful offenders were sanctioned more frequently (40%) for positive urine screens than were successful offenders (26%). Finally, 17% of the offenders unsuccessfully terminated from the NDRC were sanctioned for absconding. According to the NDRC program director, absconding is defined as a period of absence of 24 hours or more. In the majority of the cases of the absconding, the offender had stopped reporting but was locatable. There were fewer than 10 instances of absconding where the offender was not located. According to the NDRC Director, most offenders who absconded were in custody within six months.

Half of the total NDRC population was sanctioned with termination from the program. With the exception of termination sanctions for unsuccessful offenders, the most frequently assigned sanction was community service hours. Twenty percent of the successful and unsuccessful offenders were sanctioned with either 4 or 8 hours of community service on at least one occasion. Other types of sanctions issued for successful and unsuccessful offenders were:

- 18% were sanctioned to a detoxification center;
- 18% were placed on home electronic monitoring;
- 12% were given a curfew;
- 4% of all offenders were sanctioned to outside substance abuse services;
- 2% of all offenders received additional NDRC substance abuse services on at least one occasion;
- 1% of all offenders were given increased reporting requirements at least once;
- 19% received a sanction other than the sanctions already mentioned.

A total of 244 sanctions were issued in the period covered by this evaluation. Of these, 64% were issued on the same day as the infraction. An additional 22% were issued within 4 days of the infraction, 10% were issued between days 5 and 14, and 4% were sanctioned more than 14 days after the infraction. As these data show, 14% of the rule violations were not sanctioned until 5 or more days after the violation. While this may imply that the NDRC was lax in imposing sanctions in some cases, there are alternative explanations for this finding:

- In cases which require termination, NDRC cases must remain open until a warrant is issued for the offender's arrest. Termination sanctions are formally recorded as imposed at the time a warrant is issued. The NDRC must submit violation reports to the court or Parole Board, who in turn issue the warrants. The time lapse between submission of the violation report and issuing the warrants may account for documented time between violations and sanctions in termination situations.
- In the case of absconding or reporting violations, an offender may not be available to sanction in a timely manner. At the discretion of the PPO and the Program Director, the NDRC may attempt to return absconding offenders to the program, if possible.

- In some instances, the NDRC may not be aware of a violation for several days (such as failure to report for community service or an arrest). In cases such as this, the sanction may be swift once the violation is known, but these circumstances are not reflected in the available data.
- The number of required supervision contacts are somewhat relaxed for offenders in Phase Three. If a violation occurs during this phase, the program may wait until the offender reports to the program (which generally occurs within one week) before formally imposing the sanction.

Comparison Between Successful and Unsuccessful Offenders

The average number of times sanctioned prior to completing the NDRC program was significantly lower among successful participants (0.6 sanctions) than among unsuccessful participants (1.3 sanctions), even though successful participants generally spent more time at the NDRC (125 versus 95 days). No significant differences were found between successful and unsuccessful offenders on the average number of days between a participant's first violation and the imposition of the sanction for the violation.

Reactions to Unsuccessful Terminations

In discussing sanctions, it is important to consider NDRC program reactions to unsuccessful terminations. Of the 88 cases which terminated unsuccessfully, information on the program responses was available for 85 cases. In each of these cases, the NDRC took action to return the offender to the purview of the criminal justice system, thereby effectively addressing their goal of ensuring public safety.

Treatment Services

The treatment and service needs of offenders who participate in the NDRC are assessed by the contracted treatment staff. The service providers develop an individualized treatment plan for each offender which is compatible with the overall NDRC requirements. Services provided by each of the three treatment personnel are outlined below.

Services Provided by Substance Abuse Services (SAS)

As discussed previously, the majority of offenders referred to the NDRC had drug abuse/dependency problems. Nearly 7 out of 10 offenders who came to the NDRC required SAS services. Approximately half of the offenders who required drug treatment had received drug treatment services prior to coming to the NDRC. The drug treatment services offered at the NDRC consist of 10 weeks of group therapy. Of the 117 offenders whose contracts indicated a need for substance abuse services, 109 participated in the therapy group. Of the remaining eight offenders, three offenders received substance abuse services outside the facility, and five offenders never reported to receive SAS services.

Impact of Services

The SAS counselor provided exit assessments of changes in drug and alcohol use for 79 offenders who participated in the therapy group. Based upon these observations, 34 (43%) of the offenders who participated in the SAS did not change their alcohol or drug use patterns and 3 (4%) of the offenders improved but relapsed back into drug/alcohol abuse.

In contrast, other clients experienced relatively positive outcomes. Twenty (25%) of the offenders who received SAS services abstained throughout the NDRC program, and left the program with a good prognosis. An additional 13 (17%) of the offenders receiving SAS relapsed at least once while at the NDRC (determined by positive urine screens, SAS assessment, or voluntary admission) but left the program drug free. In addition, the SAS counselor indicated that 5 (6%) offenders showed a decrease in use or had periods of abstinence, 2 (3%) offenders improved their attitude (even though they continued to use), and 2 (3%) abstained from illegal drug use. In summary, positive effects were noted for 54% of the offenders which the counselor rated, with 42% of these offenders leaving the NDRC drug treatment program drug free.

Services Provided by Department of Correctional Education (DCE)

The DCE teacher is responsible for evaluating the educational needs of the NDRC clients and coordinating educational training. There were 99 offenders placed in the one of three Adult Basic Education groups (see Table 9). The policy of the NDRC is to require unemployed offenders to attend DCE classes; however, offenders are required to continue attending classes when they do not conflict with their work schedules.

Table 9: Summary of Participation in Department of Correctional Education Classes		
Class Type	Number of Offenders Assigned	Average Pre-Class Literacy Level
Basic literacy	23	3.6
Remedial	39	5.5
GED preparation	37	9.8

Impact of Services

Since the beginning of the program, ten offenders took the General Equivalency Degree exam. Of these offenders, 5 passed, 1 did not pass, and the results were unavailable for 4 offenders. DCE class attendance data were available for 74 of the 99 offenders assigned to a DCE group. The average offender participated in 8 class sessions.

Services Provided by Offender Aid and Restoration (OAR)

The NDRC contracts with OAR of Richmond for offender services. The staff member provided by OAR of Richmond is responsible for coordinating community service

assignments, life skills classes, employment assistance, life assistance, and the impact of crime classes.

Community Service

The community service segment of the OAR responsibilities applies to every offender who participates in the NDRC. Each offender is initially required to complete a mandatory 70-hour community service assignment (about 6 hours per week over the duration of the program). Many offenders complete more than the 70 hours because community service may be assigned as a sanction for negative behaviors. Typical types of community service assignments include maintenance work, janitorial duties, landscaping, etc. According to the NDRC director, the community service hours completed by the NDRC offenders represent a real savings to the community. All of the work done by the NDRC offenders would have been completed by a paid employee or left undone because funds were unavailable to hire an employee.

More than three-fourths of all NDRC offenders completed at least part of their required community service hours. On average, these offenders completed two-thirds of their basic community service requirement. Nine out of ten successful offenders completed all of their required community service hours. Successful offenders completed an average of 58 hours of community service. A subset of successful offenders did not complete all of the required community service for legitimate reasons (exited supervision, etc.). Only one out of ten unsuccessful offenders completed all of their required community service hours. The average unsuccessful offender completed 27% of their assignment and averaged 13 hours of community service.

Impact of services. A total of 5,869 hours of community service were completed over the months of this study. An additional 117 hours of community service were completed as sanctions. Since all of the tasks completed by the offenders would have either been completed by a paid employee or left undone because money was unavailable to hire an employee, the savings to the community can be quantified. Assuming a conservative \$5 per hour wage, the community service completed by the offenders saved the community \$29,930.00.

Life Skills

OAR provides life skills training to offenders throughout the Commonwealth of Virginia. The 24-course curriculum covers the following topics:

- **Personal Growth:** includes sessions on criminality, communication skills, self-esteem, values clarification, anger management, stress management, problem solving, and goal setting.
- **Personal Health:** 1 session covers the topics of AIDS and sexually transmitted diseases, dietary needs of recovering addicts, and resources for medical care in the community.
- **Relationships:** includes sessions on dysfunctional families, children's issues, and romantic relationships.

- **Financial Responsibilities:** includes sessions on budgeting, money management, and consumer issues.
- **Educational Opportunities:** 1 session covers benefits of continued education, educational and vocational program, and identifying community resources.
- **Housing and Shelter:** 1 session covering topics of types of housing, assistance programs, emergency shelters, and the tenant/landlord relationship.
- **Employment Skills:** includes sessions on self-assessment, finding a job, interviewing skills, resumes and cover letters, keeping a job, and job training resources.

Offenders are assigned to specific classes based on the assessment of the OAR counselor. A total of 155 offenders participated in the life skills courses at the NDRC. On average, these offenders participated in 11 life skills classes each. The most frequently attended life skill topic attended was Personal Growth (85% attended), followed by Employment Skills (77%), Financial Responsibilities (54%), Relationships (52%), Personal Health (45%), Shelter (42%), and Educational Opportunities (32%).

Employment Assistance

One hundred nineteen offenders participated in the employment skills courses (see above). Although OAR does not directly provide for job placements, the data available also indicate that 1 offender gained employment through an OAR placement.

Life Assistance

Unless the offender leaves the program prior to being assessed by the OAR staff member, each offender receives some counseling from the OAR staff member. Nearly two-thirds of the offenders received more than one counseling session. During counseling, the OAR staff member identifies needs of the offender. The OAR staff member can then provide life assistance and/or referrals for life assistance as needed. Types of life assistance and levels of provision include: referrals for housing (18 offenders), monetary housing assistance (accessed in one instance for \$563.00), food referrals (9 offenders), transportation assistance (used by 1 offender), and medical assistance or referrals (received by 57 offenders). Seventy NDRC offenders (40%) received at least 1 type of assistance or referral.

Impact of Crime Class

The Impact of Crime class is a seven week, 28-hour course which addresses the impact of crime on crime victims and victims' rights. Crime victims volunteer to speak to the NDRC participants about their experiences. The Impact of Crime course is highly structured and involves a substantial amount of homework. Upon course completion, participants are required to complete a community service project involving what they learned in the course. According to the NDRC program director, approximately 95% of offenders participate in the Impact of Crime course. She estimated that most participating offenders completed half or more of the course.

Comparison of Successful and Unsuccessful Offenders

Treatment-related characteristics of successful and unsuccessful offenders were compared to identify differences. There were no significant differences observed between successful and unsuccessful offenders on employment status at time of entry into the NDRC, or age when drug use began. The only significant difference observed between successful and unsuccessful offenders was in the frequency of attendance at Alcoholics Anonymous or Narcotics Anonymous. The successful offender attended AA or NA approximately 2 times a week while the unsuccessful offender attended about once a week.

VI. OFFENDER OUTCOMES

Follow-Up Information

Of the 141 offenders for whom follow-up data were available, 63 were successful terminations and 78 were unsuccessful terminations. Seven percent were successful terminations who had been discharged from active supervision when they left the NDRC, 35% were successful terminations who were returned to regular supervision, and 2% were successful terminations who had been returned to intensive supervision. Twenty-one percent were unsuccessful terminations who had not had their probation or parole revoked at the time that their profile was submitted to DCJS, and 35% were unsuccessful terminations who were known to have had their probation or parole revoked at the time their offender profiles were submitted to DCJS. The average length of time since leaving the NDRC was 220 days (the range was between 81 and 540 days).

Successful Completions

As mentioned previously, 63 offenders (68% of the population for which subsequent activity data was collected) were successful completions. Of these 63 successful terminations, 35 (56%) were still under active supervision; 14 (22%) were discharged from active supervision; 7 (11%) were in prison or jail; and, 2 (3%) were in a residential drug program. Of the remaining offenders, 1 had moved from the area, 1 could not be located, and 1 had a capias outstanding. The data for 2 offenders were unavailable.

Thirty-nine of these 63 offenders were known to be currently employed (20 of these offenders employed in full-time positions). This number could be higher since the PPOs were not in contact with offenders who had been discharged from supervision. Approximately one-third of the successful offenders in this sample had been employed 100% of the time since their discharge from the NDRC. There were 6 offenders who had required additional drug treatment or mental health services since leaving the NDRC. In addition, nine (14%) of these 63 successful offenders had violated the conditions of their probation/parole. These nine offenders had committed 15 violations: 6 for drug or alcohol use, 5 for reporting violations, 2 for changes in employment without notification, 1 for absconding, and 1 for an unauthorized change in residence.

Finally, Probation and Parole Officers were asked to rate the adjustment of the offenders since their discharge from the NDRC. Of the 49 successful offenders for whom a rating was provided, the PPOs rated the adjustment of 22% as excellent and 41% as good. Only 7 offenders who completed successfully were rated as either poor or very poor.

Unsuccessful Completions

As mentioned previously, 88 offenders did not complete the NDRC program successfully. Ten of these offenders were not selected for follow-up data collection, and data was unavailable for two offenders. Therefore, data for 76 unsuccessful offenders were examined. According to the offender profile information provided by the NDRC for this group, as of July 1996:

- 49 of the offenders were known to have had their probation or parole revoked at the time their offender profiles were submitted to the evaluators;
- 9 additional offenders were in prison or jail;
- 5 offenders were on active probation or parole;
- 4 offenders had been discharged from active supervision;
- 8 offenders had outstanding warrants for their arrest for probation/parole violations;
- 1 offender was out on bond pending a probation violation hearing.

Information for 2 offenders was missing. The remaining 10 unsuccessful offenders were not selected for follow-up data collection.

VII. PROGRAM IMPACT

Recidivism

Recidivism information was available for 92 of the 141 offenders in the follow-up sample. For the purposes of this study, recidivism is defined as an arrest for a new charge after leaving the NDRC. Of the 92 offenders in the follow-up sample, 7% or 6 people were rearrested on new charges after leaving the NDRC. Half of the offenders rearrested had left the NDRC as an unsuccessful completion and had warrants out for their arrest for probation/parole violations when they were arrested on the new charge(s). Two of the offenders rearrested had completed the NDRC program successfully and had returned to regular supervision. The remaining offender had successfully completed the NDRC program and had been released from active supervision. Table 9 summarizes the most serious charges for each offender.

Table 9: Rearrest Charges Received by Recidivist Offenders

Type of Offense	Misdemeanor	% of Recidivating Offenders	Felony	% of Recidivating Offenders
Drug	1	17	1	17
Person	1	17	0	0
Property/Other	3	50	0	0

Note: Cells do not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Four of the 6 rearrested offenders were convicted of the crime for which they were charged and two of the cases were pending when follow-up data was submitted. Of the four offenders who were convicted, the maximum sentence received was 1.5 years in prison. The remainder of the sentences ranged between fines and costs to 30 days in jail. An additional 13 offenders were arrested for probation violations.

Diversion and Net-Widening

An assessment of diversion and net-widening can be a useful tool in assessing the effectiveness of a program such as the NDRC. The NDRC is most effective when the offenders it serves are diverted from costly prison beds. The NDRC is least cost effective when its participants would have received less costly sanctions in its absence (known as net-widening).

The annual operating cost of the NDRC is \$375,000. According to the DOC Management Information Executive Summary for FY93, the daily cost to incarcerate an inmate in DOC is \$44.37, or \$16,195 annually. If 23 offenders who otherwise would have spent one year in DOC were instead diverted to the NDRC, the savings in DOC costs would equal the cost to operate the NDRC for one year. Any number of prison diversions to NDRC greater than 23 per year will result in a lower cost to the Commonwealth than imprisoning these offenders. It was not possible to identify which offenders referred to NDRC were true prison diversions using the data available. However, it was possible to estimate the number of prison diversions among referrals made by Probation and Parole Officers, the largest source of referrals to the program (60% of the offenders examined were PPO referrals). PPO reports showed that 93 (or 89%) of their referrals were sent to NDRC as a last alternative before initiating revocation proceedings and likely return to prison. This indicates that most PPO referrals are true diversions from prison, and that these referrals to NDRC are saving the Commonwealth more money annually in DOC costs than the cost to operate NDRC for one year.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Program Completion Success Rate

Attempt to improve the NDRC program success rate by: (1) identifying client compatibility to programming structure during the initial client evaluation/selection process, particularly in the area of substance abuse; and (2) adjusting programming intensity to meet individual client needs for current clients with severe substance abuse problems.

Half of the offenders who exited the program between April 3, 1995 and June 30, 1996 exited unsuccessfully. Fifty percent successfully completed the program during this time. Probation and Parole Officers rated the adjustment of 49 successful offenders after leaving the NDRC. Of this sample, 63% were judged as having a good or excellent adjustment since leaving the NDRC.

The majority of offenders referred to the NDRC program had been performing unsuccessfully on probation or parole. The offenders were referred to the program because Probation and Parole Officers, judges, or the Parole Board judged them to be high-risk offenders who required a greater degree of supervision or rehabilitative services. Given the characteristics of these offenders (e.g., 21% were parolees), it is perhaps not surprising that many did not succeed in the NDRC program. However, if we assume that all offenders who entered the NDRC program would otherwise have been sentenced to jail or prison terms, or had their probation or parole revoked, then a 50% successful completion rate may be considered an achievement. However, further efforts to increase program success rates should be considered.

To determine where such efforts might be made, evaluators examined differences between successful and unsuccessful offenders. The demographics of successful and unsuccessful offenders were quite similar. However, successful offenders more frequently attended Alcoholics Anonymous or Narcotics Anonymous meetings. In addition, unsuccessful offenders were more likely than successful offenders to be sanctioned for a positive urine screen (40% versus 26%, respectively).

These differences suggest that the NDRC may be able to improve its successful completion rate by: (1) accepting offenders whose level of service needs are more compatible with the range of current services provided by NDRC (e.g., accept only offenders without extreme drug problems), and (2) customizing treatment and supervision services for current clients of the NDRC who have more severe drug problems, as feasible.

Substance Abuse Needs of the NDRC Population

The NDRC and the Department of Corrections should expand the drug treatment services provided at the NDRC.

Substance abuse was consistently revealed as the predominant problem of NDRC offenders. Seven out of ten offenders referred to the NDRC required Substance Abuse Service in their contracts, and nearly one-third of the offenders were sanctioned at least once for a positive drug screen while under supervision of the NDRC. NDRC staff contended that drug abuse contributed to unsuccessful terminations in 59% of the unsuccessful cases. These observations were supported by the fact that there were 35% more sanctions for positive urine screens among unsuccessful offenders than successful offenders.

In addition, drug use seems to be associated with continued difficulties once an offender leaves the NDRC. Six of the nine successful offenders who violated their probation or parole committed drug or alcohol related violations. Two of the six offenders who were arrested on new charges after leaving the NDRC were arrested on drug charges.

It is important to note that SAS services appear to have a positive impact on some offenders. The SAS counselor indicated that 45% of those who received SAS services left the NDRC drug free. An additional 7% of the offenders showed improvements in attitude or decreases in use. Given the magnitude of the problem of the potential impact of the treatment available, NDRC drug treatment services should be expanded as much as possible. This expansion should include hiring additional counselors, and increasing the frequency and intensity of drug treatment groups.

Treatment Services and Resources

The NDRC should allocate its treatment resources in the following order of priority: drug treatment, OAR services, educational services.

As the discussion above indicates, drug abuse is consistently regarded as the most significant problem of NDRC offenders and this should be the priority focus for treatment resources. However, NDRC offenders have other significant problems as well. For example, six of every ten offenders were unemployed when referred to the NDRC. One function of the OAR is to provide employment skills training. This training, as well as other OAR services (e.g., community service placements, impact of crime classes, employment assistance, and life skills training) are widely used. Although data limitations hindered assessments of OAR impact, offender characteristics/profiles indicated that these types of services are clearly needed.

Many NDRC offenders also required educational assistance. Nearly two of every three offenders referred to the NDRC had not completed high school or earned their General Equivalency Degrees. Consequently, 99 offenders were assigned to a DCE class.

More NDRC offenders required drug treatment than educational services; however, the potential obstacle to learning and employment caused by drug involvement indicate drug treatment should be the first priority. While education and employment are important components of offender rehabilitation, neither appears to be the primary treatment need of most offenders at the NDRC. Therefore, the NDRC should allocate its service monies in the following order, if it is are not currently doing so: substance abuse services, OAR services, and DCE services.

Costs and Savings

If reduction of prison costs is a primary goal of this program, the NDRC should, to the degree possible:

- **attempt to accept only clients who are prison bed diversions.**
- **attempt to reduce the number of days an offender is supervised by the program while maintaining current treatment/program requirements, if possible.**

Based upon the current level of funding and a per day cost of imprisonment of \$44.37, successfully diverting 23 offenders from one year of prison confinement would equal the annual operating funds of the NDRC. Acceptance of offenders who would not represent diversions from prison facilities would reduce such cost savings. Realizing that the NDRC is not exclusively responsible for admission decisions, program administrators might consider providing periodic re-education of their mission and goals to referral sources.

Limited data suggested that the NDRC is facilitating some actual diversions. Regarding offenders referred from PPOs only, a majority were judged to be subject to incarceration/revocation in the absence of the NDRC. According to the NDRC director, most offenders who were unsuccessfully terminated from the program were incarcerated, either locally or in a state facility, upon returning to court.

Ensuring Public Safety

The NDRC staff should attempt to identify risk factors which predict absconding, and, if possible, use such information to reduce the incidence of absconding among its offenders. If risk factors for absconding can be reliably determined, the NDRC should make policy adjustments to address the additional supervision needs of these offenders.

The NDRC seems to be fulfilling its mandate to protect public safety. The average offender is monitored at a level much higher than the minimum standard of supervision,

and only nine offenders (5% of the total population) were arrested while under NDRC supervision. In addition, the NDRC fulfilled its responsibility to the community to follow-up on every unsuccessful completion by returning the offender to the purview of the criminal justice system.

However, the data indicate one component of public safety that requires further examination. Fifteen offenders were formally sanctioned for absconding while being supervised by the NDRC. Of those who absconded, less than 10 were not locatable. In addition, NDRC staff indicated absconding as a reason for failure for 32 offenders who terminated unsuccessfully. Absconding offenders were supervised as closely as other offenders, but it is important to recognize that many people in this program had histories of reporting problems. Using available data, evaluators compared characteristics of absconders and non-absconders and found no apparent differences; however, NDRC staff may have access to additional individual data/observations that were not accessible for this research effort. Given the similarities between absconders and non-absconders, the NDRC staff are encouraged to examine the individual cases of absconding offenders to attempt to qualitatively determine factors which might predict absconding. If risk factors for absconding can be reliably determined, NDRC administrators should consider increasing supervision for these offenders, or denying admission of potential absconders into the NDRC program.

IX. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

William Caruso
Department of Correctional Education Teacher
Norfolk Day Reporting Center/Department of Correctional Education
Norfolk, Virginia

Flonia Davenport
Department of Correctional Education Teacher
Norfolk Day Reporting Center/Department of Correctional Education
Norfolk, Virginia

Kathryn Clark Hall
Program Director
Norfolk Day Reporting Center/Virginia Department of Corrections
Norfolk, Virginia

Kent Heinzelman
Substance Abuse Counselor
Norfolk Day Reporting Center/Substance Abuse Services of Norfolk
Norfolk, Virginia

Sabrina High
Offender Aid and Restoration Caseworker
Norfolk Day Reporting Center/Offender Aid and Restoration of Richmond
Norfolk, Virginia

Barry Hoy
Department of Correctional Education Teacher
Norfolk Day Reporting Center/Department of Correctional Education
Norfolk, Virginia

Amber D. Kidd
Probation Officer
Norfolk Day Reporting Center/Virginia Department of Corrections
Norfolk, Virginia

Frank X. Lawler
Probation Officer
Norfolk Day Reporting Center/Virginia Department of Corrections
Norfolk, Virginia

Loree Mara
Offender Aid and Restoration Caseworker
Norfolk Day Reporting Center/Offender Aid and Restoration of Richmond
Norfolk, Virginia

Stan Orchowsky
Senior Researcher
Applied Research Associates
Richmond, Virginia

Meredith Farrar-Owens
Research Associate
Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission
Richmond, Virginia

Christopher F. Pate, District #2 Chief
Chief Probation and Parole Officer, District #2
Virginia Department of Corrections
Norfolk, Virginia

Christina M. Potter
Surveillance Officer
Norfolk Day Reporting Center/Virginia Department of Corrections
Norfolk, Virginia

Steve Squire
Librarian
Department of Criminal Justice Services
Richmond, Virginia

Douglas L. Upshaw
Surveillance Officer
Norfolk Day Reporting Center/Virginia Department of Corrections
Norfolk, Virginia

Elise Willis
Substance Abuse
Norfolk Day Reporting Center/Substance Abuse Services of Norfolk
Norfolk, Virginia

John T. Wren
Probation Officer
Norfolk Day Reporting Center/Virginia Department of Corrections
Norfolk, Virginia

Item	Item Details(B)		Appropriations(B)	
	First Year	Second Year	First Year	Second Year
585.	Community-Based Custody (3500000).....		\$11,197,517	\$13,547,517
	Community Non-Residential Custody and Treatment (3500400).....	\$719,833	\$1,069,833	
	Community Custody and Treatment Services Local Grants and Contracts (3500500).....	\$10,216,130	\$12,216,130	
	Community Custody and Treatment Services Coordination (3500600).....	\$261,532	\$261,532	
	Fund Sources: General.....	\$11,197,517	\$13,547,517	

Authority: §§ 53.1-179 through 53.1-185.1, Code of Virginia.

A. The state payment for the diversion of any misdemeanants beyond the average number of misdemeanants for which state payments were made in either of the fiscal years 1993 or 1994, whichever is greater, shall require cash matching funds from non-state sources equal to 10 percent of the payment the state would otherwise make.

B. The Department of Corrections shall report to the Governor and Chairmen of the Senate Finance and House Appropriations Committees, by September 1, 1994, on implementation of the Fairfax County Day Reporting Center.

C. Included within this appropriation is \$400,000 the first year and \$750,000 the second year to establish pilot day reporting centers in the City of Richmond and the City of Norfolk for probation and parole technical violators who are under the supervision of the Richmond and Norfolk District Probation and Parole Offices. Out of these amounts the Department shall provide \$47,980 the first year and \$90,536 the second year to the Department of Correctional Education for education services. The Department of Corrections shall present a preliminary report on implementation of these centers to the Governor and the Chairmen of the House Appropriations and Senate Finance Committees by October 1, 1994. The Department of Criminal Justice Services shall evaluate these programs.

D. Included within this appropriation is \$50,000 the first year and \$2,050,000 the second year for the Department of Corrections to contract for the private site selection, construction, financing, maintenance and operation of up to four, 500-bed minimum security, pre-release or return-to-custody facilities for adult male offenders. The Department shall request such additional funds as may be necessary for the cost of contract(s) for such a facility(ies) as part of the 1994-96 interim budget request.

