

*Technical Report to Reducing Revocations Challenge:  
The Cook County (Chicago) Adult Probation Department  
and Loyola University Chicago Action Research Team  
Final Report*

Prepared By (in alphabetical order)

Kathryn Bocanegra

Jordan Boulger

Kaitlyn Foust

David Olson

Vinnie Palazeti

Avery Pankratz

Don Stemen

Amanda Ward

June 2021

## Introduction

This technical appendix accompanies the report titled “Reducing Revocations Challenge: The Cook County (Chicago) Adult Probation Department and Loyola University Chicago Action Research Team Final Report” and provides detailed explanations of the methodologies used to perform the research as well as detailed statistical tables and results. The information is presented in two major sections: 1) Methods and findings of case-level data analyses, and 2) Methods and findings of from interviews and staff surveys.

## Methods and findings of case-level data analyses

To examine the outcomes of probation cases in Cook County, Illinois, and the extent and nature of probation violations and revocations, case-level data were obtained for all adults discharged from probation supervision by the Cook County Adult Probation Department from 2017 through 2019. In addition to quantitative analyses of individual and case data, the research plan originally envisioned the need to perform case-file reviews of a sample of cases. Because the research team was able to obtain electronic case notes data, coding methods were developed to translate these narrative case notes into discrete variables that provided some insight into the nature of violations.

### *Univariate/Descriptive Analyses of the Case-level data*

Tables 1, 2, and 3 below provide a description of the characteristics of the cases examined, including the characteristics of the person on probation, the nature of their probation sentence, the conditions of their sentence, and the matriculation of cases from violations being filed to revocation.

**Table 1: Demographic and Case Characteristics**

	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Sex</b>		
Male	21,379	80.4%
Female	5,142	19.3%
Missing/other	59	0.2%
<b>Total</b>	26,580	100%
<b>Race</b>		
White	5,301	19.9%
Black	15,156	57.0%
Hispanic	5,649	21.3%
Other	474	1.8%
<b>Total</b>	26,580	100%
<b>Average Age at Sentencing (in years)</b>	34.5 years of age	
<b>Age Categories</b>		
Under 20	1,150	4.3%
20 to 24	5,389	20.3%

25 to 35	9,196	34.6%
36 to 49	6,782	25.5%
50 and Older	3,928	14.8%
Missing	135	0.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>26,580</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Probation Offense Type</b>		
Property	6,279	23.6%
Drugs	7,610	28.6%
Weapons (Possession)	1,134	4.3%
Person	4,673	17.6%
Sex	461	1.7%
Other	5,924	22.3%
Missing	499	1.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>26,580</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Probation Offense Class</b>		
Class 1 Felony	1,729	6.5%
Class 2 Felony	4,064	15.3%
Class 3 Felony	4,541	17.1%
Class 4 Felony	11,468	42.8%
Class A Misdemeanor	4,407	16.6%
Class B Misdemeanor	117	0.4%
Class C Misdemeanor	101	0.4%
Other	253	1.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>26,580</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Probation Offense Class (Grouped)</b>		
Felony	21,702	81.6%
Misdemeanor	4,625	17.4%
Other/missing	253	1.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>26,580</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Initial Risk Level<sup>1</sup></b>		
Low	2,609	9.8%
Low-Medium	2,207	8.3%
Medium	14,132	53.2%
High-Medium	3,356	12.6%
High	790	3.0%
Very-High	1,345	5.1%
Missing	2,141	8.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>26,580</b>	<b>100%</b>

<sup>1</sup> Originally, 5,148 cases (19.4% of the sample) were missing their original risk assessment scores, primarily because these cases started the probation term in some type of residential treatment placement, including the Cook County Jail, and were not accessible to complete the initial risk assessment. For these cases, the last completed risk assessment was used to determine their risk level. Still, roughly 8% did not have any risk assessment score.

<b>Initial Risk Level (Collapsed Categories)</b>		
Low	2,609	9.8% (10.7% of non-missing cases)
Medium	19,695	74.1% (80.6% of non-missing cases)
High	2,135	8.0% (8.7% of non-missing cases)
Missing	2,141	8.1%
<b>Total</b>	26,580	100%
<b>Average sentence length (in months)</b>	23 months	
<b>Sentence Length (in ranges)</b>		
12 Months or Less	2,885	10.9%
13 to 23 Months	2,902	10.9%
24 Months	18,176	68.4%
25 to 30 Months	1,790	6.7%
31 Months or More	825	3.1%
Missing	2	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	26,580	100%
<b>Reporting Location</b>		
Chicago (1 <sup>st</sup> Municipal District)	14,654	55.1%
Skokie (2 <sup>nd</sup> Municipal District)	2,547	9.6%
Rolling Meadows (3 <sup>rd</sup> Municipal District)	2,360	8.9%
Maywood (4 <sup>th</sup> Municipal District)	2,028	7.6%
Bridgeview (5 <sup>th</sup> Municipal District)	2,014	7.6%
Markham (6 <sup>th</sup> Municipal District)	2,830	10.6%
Other/Missing	147	0.6%
<b>Total</b>	26,580	100%
<b>Discharge Status</b>		
Satisfactory	14,194	53.4%
Unsatisfactory	4,963	18.7%
Revoked	2,375 (2,770 based on notes)	8.9% (10.4% based on notes)
Transferred	375	1.4%
Other	4,673	17.6%
<b>Total</b>	26,580	100%

**Table 2: Court Imposed Conditions of Probation**

	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent (N= 26,580)</b>
<b>Fees (Court, Probation, etc.)</b>	24,936	93.8%
<b>DNA Indexing</b>	15,312	57.6%
<b>Drug Testing</b>	11,692	44.0%
<b>Community Service</b>	7,589	28.6%
<b>Any Treatment (Alcohol, drug, mental health, domestic violence, anger management)</b>	11,180	42.1%
Alcohol Treatment	5,603	21.5%
Behavioral Health	3,512	13.2%
TASC	2,399	9.0%
Domestic Violence	1,417	5.0%
Anger Management	927	3.5%
Sex Offender Services	314	1.2%
<b>Avoid Contact/Restraining Order</b>	4,072	15.3%
<b>Specialized Sentence/Supervision Strategy</b>	2,331	8.8%
<b>Victim Impact</b>	2,336	8.8%
<b>Jail/Prison</b>	1,511	5.7%
<b>Education</b>	1,367	5.1%
<b>Electronic Monitoring</b>	1,284	4.8%
<b>Day Reporting Program</b>	12	Less than 1%
<b>Employment</b>	2	Less than 1%

Overall, roughly 10% of *all* cases, and 14% of the cases *that had a violation petition filed* were revoked. Higher rates of revocation were seen among those petitions filed that included a new arrest compared to those with petitions filed for purely technical violations. Specifically, 18% of the cases that had violation petitions that included a new arrest charge were revoked, compared to 6% of the cases with violation petitions for only technical violations being revoked. Put another way, of the cases that were revoked, 78% had a petition that involved a new arrest, while 22% of the cases that were revoked included only technical violation petitions.<sup>2</sup>

Finally, of those cases that were revoked, almost all (98%) received a subsequent sentence of incarceration, the form of which (i.e., prison or jail) depended on the class of the original probation sentence. The vast majority (72%) resulted in a subsequent sentence to prison and the additional 26% were subsequently sentenced to jail. Of those on probation for a felony-level offense who were revoked, 83% were sentenced to prison as a result of the revocation and an additional 14% were sentenced to jail. On the other hand, of those who were on probation for a misdemeanor-level offense and revoked, 91% were sentenced to jail and 9% were sentenced to

<sup>2</sup> There were a total of 2,770 cases revoked, however, for 254 of these cases no information regarding violation petitions being filed could be found. If these cases are excluded from the analyses, then there were 608 cases revoked with petitions filed for only technical violations out of 2,516 (i.e., 2,770-254=2,516), or 24% of cases revoked.

prison.<sup>3</sup> To place these revocations resulting in a prison sentence into a larger context, the 1,986 revocations that resulted in a prison sentence among the three-year study cohort accounted for 10% of all of the sentences to prison from Cook County during those three years.<sup>4</sup>

**Table 3: General description of case matriculation**

	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent of all discharged cases (N=26,580)</b>
<b>Total discharged cases</b>	26,580	100.0%
<b>Cases with a violation of probation filed in court</b>	19,789	74.5%
New arrest w/ or w/o technical violation	10,397	39.1%
No new arrest, but a technical violation	9,392	35.3%
<b>Cases with a revocation of probation</b>	2,770 <sup>5</sup>	10.4% (14% of cases with a violation filed)
Cases with a revocation committed to prison	1,986	7.5% (10.0% of cases with a violation filed, 72% of revoked cases)
Cases with a revocation sentenced to jail	710	2.7% (3.6% of cases with a violation filed, 26% of revoked cases)

<sup>3</sup> It is possible that the form of incarceration recorded in the information system was not always accurate in the distinction between prison and jail. For example, generally someone on probation for a misdemeanor offense who is revoked cannot be sentenced to prison unless they are *convicted* as a result of a new offense while on probation and that new offense is a felony.

<sup>4</sup> During the period from 2017 to 2019, there were a total of 22,496 admissions to prison in Illinois from Cook County as a result of a court-imposed sentence (i.e., excluding individuals returned to prison for violating parole). Based on statewide data examined for this project, it appears that the rate of revocation for felony cases in Cook County is very similar to the rate in Illinois outside of Cook County, while the proportion of admissions to prison accounted for by probation revocations is also lower in Cook County than the rest of the state. For example, during the period from 2018 to 2019 in Illinois outside of Cook County 9.5% of felony cases closed were the result of a revocation, and probationers sentenced to prison accounted for roughly 20% of all prison admissions.

<sup>5</sup> There were 2,770 cases that were indicated as revoked either as the case discharge status or based on the probation officer's notes regarding the outcome of a court hearing. There were 254 cases that were indicated as revoked but for which a petition to violate probation could not be located. These 254 cases were included as revoked cases but are not included as cases with a petition filed in Table 3. Thus, these 2,770 cases account for 10.4% of all cases included in the sample, 14% of the cases identified as having a petition filed, and 13.8% of the cases that likely had a petition filed assuming that all 254 cases should have had a petition filed.

Of the cases with a petition filed for a new arrest charge, detailed analyses of the probation officer notes resulted in only about 51% of the cases indicating anything about the nature of the new arrest charge (e.g., a felony or a misdemeanor, a traffic offense, drug-law violation, property crime, or a violent offense). Of those cases with an indication of the nature of the new arrest charge, almost one-half (46%) indicated a traffic charge, roughly 25% indicated a violent crime charge, roughly 25% indicated an arrest for a drug-law violation, and 16% indicated an arrest for a property crime. Because violation petitions involving new arrest charges can include multiple arrests these percentages add up to more than 100%.

Of the cases with a petition filed for a technical violation without a new arrest charge, detailed analyses of the probation officer notes resulted in 95% of the cases indicating something about the nature of the violations (e.g., failure to report, failure to comply with probation, failure to pay fees, fines or restitution, failure to comply with treatment, positive drug tests, etc.). Of those cases with an indication of the nature of the technical violation, 76% indicated a failure to pay probation fees, 50% indicated a failure to pay court fees, 30% indicated a failure to comply with probation, 27% indicated a failure to report, and 21% indicated positive drug tests. Because violation petitions can include multiple violations these percentages add up to more than 100%.

Given the importance of risk level in the literature regarding probation outcomes, analyses were also performed to examine whether there was any clear pattern between the characteristics of cases that were missing risk assessment data. As described in Table 1 above, 8.1% of cases were missing risk assessment data. As seen in Table 4, which compares the characteristics of cases with and without missing risk level information, there were no clear or strong patterns in the data. In other words, there did not appear to be any systematic pattern where risk level data were missing for certain types of probation cases.

**Table 4: Relationship between Individual & Case Characteristics and Missing Risk Levels (All Cases Included, N=26,580)**

	<b>Risk Level Not Missing</b>	<b>Risk Level Missing</b>	<b>Percent of Cases (N=26,580)</b>
<b>Sex, V=.02, n.s.</b>			
Male	80.6%	78.7%	80.4%
Female	19.2%	21.2%	19.3%
Missing/other	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Race ***, V=.06</b>			
White	19.3%	27.6%	19.9%
Black	57.2%	54.6%	57.0%
Hispanic	21.7%	16.1%	21.3%
Other	1.8%	1.7%	1.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Average Age (in years), r=.04**</b>	34.4	36.1	
<b>Age ***, V=.05</b>			
Under 20	4.4%	3.9%	4.3%
20 to 24	20.8%	14.1%	20.3%
25 to 35	34.6%	35.0%	34.6%

36 to 49	25.2%	29.7%	25.5%
50 and Older	14.6%	16.5%	14.8%
Missing	0.5%	0.7%	0.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Offense Type ***, V=.06</b>			
Property	23.7%	28.7%	24.1%
Drugs	29.0%	31.3%	29.2%
Weapons	4.5%	3.0%	4.3%
Person	17.8%	19.4%	17.9%
Sex	1.8%	1.8%	1.8%
Other	23.3%	15.9%	22.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Probation Offense Class*, V=.03</b>			
Class 1	6.5%	6.1%	6.5%
Class 2	15.3%	15.3%	15.3%
Class 3	17.1%	17.4%	17.1%
Class 4	42.9%	41.6%	42.8%
Class A Misdemeanors	16.5%	17.2%	16.6%
Class B Misdemeanors	0.4%	0.6%	0.4%
Class C Misdemeanors	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%
Other	0.9%	1.1%	0.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Probation Offense Class, V=.01, n.s.</b>			
Felony	81.8%	80.4%	81.6%
Misdemeanor	17.3%	18.3%	17.4%
Other	0.9%	1.4%	1.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Average Sentence Length (in months), r= -.08**</b>	<b>21.6</b>	<b>18.5</b>	
<b>Sentence Length)***, V=.04</b>			
12 Months or Less	10.6%	14.1%	10.9%
13 to 23 Months	11.1%	8.4%	10.9%
24 Months	68.6%	65.9%	68.4%
25 to 30 Months	6.7%	7.4%	6.75
31 Months or More	3.0%	4.3%	3.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Technical violation filed ***, Phi=-.05</b>			
No	64.0%	72.6%	64.7%
Yes	36.0%	27.4%	35.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>New Offense violation filed **, Phi=.02</b>			



No	61.2%	57.5%	60.9%
Yes	38.8%	42.5%	39.1%
<b>Total</b>	100%	100%	100%
<b>Reporting Location***, V=.04</b>			
Chicago (1st Municipal District)	55.3%	53.2%	55.1%
Skokie (2nd Municipal District)	9.6%	9.2%	9.6%
Rolling Meadows (3rd Municipal District)	8.9%	8.6%	8.9%
Maywood (4th Municipal District)	7.4%	10.2%	7.6%
Bridgeview (5th Municipal District)	7.6%	7.6%	7.6%
Markham (6th Municipal District)	10.7%	10.1%	10.6%
Other/Missing	0.5%	1.1%	0.6%
<b>Total</b>	100%	100%	100%
<b>Petitions by Type***, V=.08</b>			
No Petitions Filed	25.1%	30.2%	25.5%
Only TV	36.0%	27.4%	35.3%
Only New Offense	18.6%	27.5%	19.3%
Both TV and New Offense	20.2%	15.0%	19.8%
<b>Total</b>	100%	100%	100%

Chi-square or Pearson's r test statistically significant at \*=p<.05, \*\* p<.01, or \*\*\* p<.001; n.s.=not statistically significant at p<.05. Strength of association measured by Cramer's V (V) or Pearson's r (r).

### ***Bi-variate and multivariate analyses of case level data to examine violations & revocations***

These case-level data were analyzed using series of statistical techniques that allowed the research team to determine the degree to which individual and case level characteristics were related to the outcomes examined (violations filed, violations specifically involving new arrest charges, and revocation). The first set of analyses examined the case level data using bivariate analyses to examine the patterns evident in the data regarding violations being filed and revocation across the characteristics of those on probation and their sentence. These bivariate analyses were followed by multivariate logistic regression analyses to examine the influence of the characteristics of those on probation and their sentence on the likelihood of a violation being filed and a revocation. The results of these bi-variate and logistic regression models are presented in Appendix 1 and the findings are summarized below.

### Any Violation Filed

Generally, there were no individual or case characteristics that were *strongly* associated with whether or not a violation of probation was filed (Table 5). In fact, only race, age, offense type, risk level, sentence length, and reporting location (e.g., district) had correlations greater than .10 and none were higher than .18. Specifically, 66% of white and Hispanic people on probation had a violation of probation petition filed, compared to 81% of Black people. In general, younger people on probation were more likely to have violations filed, with 80% of those under 25 having violation petitions filed, compared to less than 70% of those over 35. With respect to sentence length, the longer the sentence length the more likely the case had a violation of probation petition filed. For example, of those cases that had a sentence of 12 months or less, 66% had a violation of probation petition filed, compared to 86% of those with a sentence of 25 to 36 months. Finally, cases that were supervised in Municipal District 1 (Chicago) had higher rates of petitions being filed (almost 80% had at least 1 petition filed), compared to Municipal Districts 2, 3, and 6 where under 70% of cases had a violation filed.<sup>6</sup>

Although the correlation between other individual and case characteristics were even weaker, they are worth mentioning. For example, there was a slight difference in the percent of men and women with violations of probation filed (74% compared to 76%, respectively). When the nature of the offense that resulted in the person receiving their probation sentence was examined, the current conviction offense did not appear to have a strong relationship to whether or not a violation of probation petition was filed. Among the offense categories that accounted for the largest share of cases (property and drug-law violations), between 77% and 81% of cases had a violation of probation filed. Among all of the felony probation cases, 75% had a violation of probation filed, slightly higher than the 71% of the combined misdemeanor cases.

**Table 5: Relationship between Individual & Case Characteristics and Violation of Probation Being Filed with Court**

	Percent with No Petitions Filed	Percent with Any Petition Filed	Total	Percent of Cases (N=26,580)
<b>Sex **, V=.02</b>				
Male	26.0%	74.0%	100%	80.4%
Female	23.6%	76.4%	100%	19.3%
Missing/other	27.1%	72.9%	100%	0.2%
<b>Total</b>	25.5%	74.5%	100%	100%
<b>Race ***, V=.17</b>				
White	33.7%	66.3%	100%	19.9%

<sup>6</sup> Although not presented in tabular form, there was also a wide variation across individual courtrooms/judges in the proportion of cases that had a violation petition filed. Among those courtrooms/judges with at least 100 discharged cases, there were nine where 85% or more of the discharged cases had a violation of probation petition filed (all were in District 1/Chicago). At the other end of the continuum, there were nine courtrooms/judges where under 65% of the cases had a violation of probation petition filed (and all but two were *outside* of District 1/Chicago).

Black	19.2%	80.8%	100%	57.0%
Hispanic	33.4%	66.6%	100%	21.3%
Other	44.9%	55.1%	100%	1.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>25.5%</b>	<b>74.5%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Age (Mean, years) **, r=-.12</b>	<b>37.02</b>	<b>33.63</b>	<b>34.50</b>	
<b>Age ***, V=.13</b>				
Under 20	12.2%	87.8%	100%	4.3%
20 to 24	17.9%	82.1%	100%	20.3%
25 to 35	25.4%	74.6%		34.6%
36 to 49	30.8%	69.2%	100%	25.5%
50 and Older	31.0%	69.0%	100%	14.8%
Missing	28.9%	71.1%	100%	0.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>25.5%</b>	<b>74.5%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Offense Type***, V=.13</b>				
Property	22.9%	77.1%	100%	24.1%
Drugs	19.2%	80.8%	100%	29.2%
Weapons	28.6%	71.4%	100%	4.3%
Person	26.6%	73.4%	100%	17.9%
Sex	35.1%	64.9%	100%	1.8%
Other	33.4%	66.6%	100%	22.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>25.4%</b>	<b>74.6%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Probation Offense Class ***, V=.05</b>				
Class 1	23.9%	76.1%	100%	6.5%
Class 2	23.6%	76.4%	100%	15.3%
Class 3	24.4%	75.6%	100%	17.1%
Class 4	25.4%	74.6%	100%	42.8%
Class A	28.3%	71.7%	100%	16.6%
Class B	35.9%	64.1%	100%	0.4%
Class C	33.7%	66.3%	100%	0.4%
Other	38.7%	61.3%	100%	0.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>25.5%</b>	<b>74.5%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Probation Offense Class (Grouped) ***, V=.05</b>				
Felony	24.7%	75.3%	100%	81.6%
Misdemeanor	28.6%	71.4%	100%	17.4%
Other	38.7%	61.3%	100%	1.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>25.5%</b>	<b>74.5%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Initial Risk Level ***, V=.11</b>				
Low	36.6%	63.4%	100%	9.8%
Low-Medium	29.4%	70.6%	100%	8.3%
Medium	24.0%	76.0%	100%	53.2%

High-Medium	19.0%	81.0%	100%	12.6%
High	30.4%	69.6%	100%	3.0%
Very-High	20.5%	79.5%	100%	5.1%
Missing	30.2%	69.8%	100%	8.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>25.5%</b>	<b>74.5%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Initial Risk Level ***, V=.09</b>				
Low	36.6%	63.4%	100%	9.8%
Medium	23.7%	76.3%	100%	74.1%
High	24.2%	75.8%	100%	8.0%
Missing	30.2%	69.8%	100%	8.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>25.5%</b>	<b>74.5%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Sentence Length (Mean, in Months), r=.00</b>	23.0 month	23.0 months	23.0 months	
<b>Sentence Length, V=.01</b>				
12 Months or Less	27.8%	72.2%	100%	10.9%
13 to 23 Months	26.1%	73.9%	100%	10.9%
24 Months	25.0%	75.0%	100%	68.4%
25 to 30 Months	26.8%	73.2%	100%	6.7%
31 Months or More	25.0%	75.0%	100%	3.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>25.5%</b>	<b>74.5%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Specialized Probation **, Phi=-.02</b>				
Probation	25.3%	74.7%	100%	91.2%
Specialized Probation	27.9%	72.1%	100%	8.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>25.5%</b>	<b>74.5%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Reporting Location ***, V=.16</b>				
Chicago (1st Municipal District)	20.3%	79.7%	100%	55.1%
Skokie (2nd Municipal District)	32.7%	67.3%	100%	9.6%
Rolling Meadows (3rd Municipal District)	33.1%	66.9%	100%	8.9%
Maywood (4th Municipal District)	25.9%	74.1%	100%	7.6%
Bridgeview (5th Municipal District)	26.4%	73.6%	100%	7.6%
Markham (6th Municipal District)	36.8%	63.2%	100%	10.6%
Other/Missing	65.3%	34.7%	100%	0.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>25.5%</b>	<b>74.5%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Chi-square or Pearson's r test statistically significant at \*=p<.05, \*\* p<.01, or \*\*\* p<.001;  
Strength of association measured by Cramer's V (V) or Pearson's r (r).

### *New Arrest Violation Filed*

As described earlier, the largest portion of violation of probation petitions filed involved new arrest charges, and these are the petitions that were more likely to result in the revocation of the probation sentence. Because of this, detailed, bi-variate analyses were also performed to determine the individual and case characteristics that were associated with whether or not the case had a violation of probation filed that included a new arrest charge (Table 6). Generally, there were no individual or probation case characteristics that were strongly associated with whether or not a violation of probation was filed. In fact, only race, age, offense type, risk level, and reporting location (e.g., district) had correlations greater than .10 and none were higher than .19.

Overall, 39% of cases closed had a petition filed that included a new arrest charge. When examined by race, 35% of white and 30% of Hispanic people on probation had a violation of probation petition filed that included a new arrest charge, compared to 44% of Black people on probation. In general, younger people were more likely to have violations filed that included new arrest charges, with 50% or more of those under 25 having violation petitions filed that included new arrest charges, compared to less than 33% of those over 35 years old. Concerning sentence length, the longer the sentence length the more likely the case had a violation of probation petition filed that included new arrest charges. For example, 31% of those cases that had a sentence of 12 months or less had a violation of probation petition filed that included new arrest charges, compared to more than 41% of those with a sentence of 24 months. As would be expected, people that were assessed as higher risk were more likely to have a petition filed that included a new arrest charge, with 24% of those classified as low risk having such a petition filed, compared to more than 50% of the cases classified as high risk. When the type of the offense that resulted in the individual receiving their probation sentence was examined, the current conviction offense had a relationship to whether or not a petition involving a new arrest charge was filed. Among the offense categories that accounted for the largest share of cases (property and drug-law violations), roughly 44% to 47% had a petition filed that included a new arrest, compared to less than 38% of the cases involving people on probation for violent offenses or weapon possession crimes. Finally, cases that were supervised in Municipal District 1 (Chicago) had higher rates of petitions being filed that involved new arrest charges (42% had at least one petition filed that included new arrest charges), compared to municipal districts 2 and 3, where under 33% of cases had a violation filed for new arrest charges.<sup>7</sup>

Although the correlation between other individual and case characteristics were even weaker, they are worth mentioning. For example, there was a slight difference in the percent of men and women with violations of probation filed that included new arrest charges (40% compared to 36%, respectively). When the nature of the offense (felony vs. misdemeanor) that resulted in the

---

<sup>7</sup> Although not presented in tabular form, there was also a wide variation across individual courtrooms/judges in the proportion of cases that had a violation petition that included new arrest charges. Among those courtrooms/judges with at least 100 discharged cases, there were seven where 49% or more of the discharged cases had a violation of probation petition that included new arrest charges (all but one in District 1/Chicago). At the other end of the continuum, there were six courtrooms/judges where under 30% of the cases had a violation of probation petition that included new arrest charges (and all were in Districts 2 and 3).

person receiving their probation sentence was examined, the current conviction offense did not appear to have a strong relationship to whether or not a violation of probation petition was filed. Among all of the felony probation cases, 40% had a violation filed that included new arrest charges, higher than the 33% of the combined misdemeanor cases.

**Table 6: Relationship between Individual & Case Characteristics and New Arrest Violation of Probation Being Filed with Court**

	<b>No New Arrest Petition</b>	<b>New Arrest Petition Filed</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Percent of Cases (N=26,580)</b>
<b>Sex ***, V=.04</b>				
Male	60.1%	39.9%	100%	80.4%
Female	64.3%	35.7%	100%	19.3%
Missing/other	59.3%	40.7%	100%	0.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>60.9%</b>	<b>39.1%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Race ***, V=0.13</b>				
White	65.4%	34.6%	100%	19.9%
Black	55.5%	44.5%	100%	57.0%
Hispanic	70.0%	30.0%	100%	21.3%
Other	72.6%	27.4%	100%	1.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>60.9%</b>	<b>39.1%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Age (Mean, years) ***, r=-0.17</b>				
<b>Age ***, V=0.19</b>				
Under 20	35.0%	65.0%	100%	4.3%
20 to 24	49.6%	50.4%	100%	20.3%
25 to 35	61.5%	38.5%	100%	34.6%
36 to 49	67.6%	32.4%	100%	25.5%
50 and Older	70.7%	29.3%	100%	14.8%
Missing	67.4%	32.6%	100%	0.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>60.9%</b>	<b>39.1%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Offense Type ***, V=0.15</b>				
Property	56.3%	43.7%	100%	24.1%
Drugs	53.3%	46.7%	100%	29.2%
Weapons	63.9%	36.7%	100%	4.3%
Person	62.1%	37.9%	100%	17.9%
Sex	69.0%	31.0%	100%	1.8%
Other	72.6%	27.4%	100%	22.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>60.7%</b>	<b>39.3%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Probation Offense Class ***, V=0.06</b>				
Class 1	58.0%	42.0%	100%	6.5%

Class 2	58.5%	41.5%	100%	15.3%
Class 3	59.3%	40.7%	100%	17.1%
Class 4	60.3%	39.7%	100%	42.8%
Class A	66.6%	33.4%	100%	16.6%
Class B	65.8%	34.2%	100%	0.4%
Class C	70.3%	29.7%	100%	0.4%
Other			100%	
<b>Total</b>	60.9%	39.1%	100%	100%
<b>Probation Offense Class (Grouped) ***, V=0.06</b>				
Felony	59.6%	40.4%	100%	81.6%
Misdemeanor	66.6%	33.4%	100%	17.4
Other	68.0%	32.0%	100%	1.0%
<b>Total</b>	60.9%	39.1%	100%	100%
<b>Initial Risk Level ***, V=0.14</b>				
Low	75.6%	24.4%	100%	9.8%
Low-Medium	69.3%	30.7%	100%	8.3%
Medium	61.1%	38.9%	100%	53.2%
High-Medium	53.4%	46.6%	100%	12.6%
High	51.3%	48.7%	100%	3.0%
Very-High	45.9%	54.1%	100%	5.1%
Missing	57.5%	42.5%	100%	8.1%
<b>Total</b>	60.9%	36.1%	100%	100%
<b>Initial Risk Level ***, V=0.12</b>				
Low	75.6%	24.4%	100%	9.8%
Medium	60.7%	36.3%	100%	74.1%
High	47.9%	52.1%	100%	8.0%
Missing	57.5%	42.5%	100%	8.1%
<b>Total</b>	60.9%	39.1%	100%	100%
<b>Sentence Length (Mean, in Months) ***, r=0.03</b>	22.8 months	23.4 months	23.0 months	
<b>Sentence Length ***, V=0.08</b>				
12 Months or Less	69.2%	30.8%	100%	10.9%
13 to 23 Months	65.9%	34.1%	100%	10.9%
24 Months	58.9%	41.1%	100%	68.4%
25 to 30 Months	62.1%	37.9%	100%	6.7%
31 Months or More	54.9%	45.1%	100%	3.1%
<b>Total</b>	60.9%	39.1%	100%	100%
<b>Specialized Probation ***, Phi=.08</b>				

Probation	62.1%	37.9%	100%	91.2%
Specialized Probation	48.6%	51.4%	100%	8.8%
<b>Total</b>	60.9%	39.1%	100%	100%
<b>Reporting Location***, V=.10</b>				
Chicago (1st Municipal District)	57.6%	42.4%	100%	55.1%
Skokie (2nd Municipal District)	70.6%	29.4%	100%	9.6%
Rolling Meadows (3rd Municipal District)	67.7%	32.3%	100%	8.9%
Maywood (4th Municipal District)	61.7%	38.3%	100%	7.6%
Bridgeview (5th Municipal District)	62.0%	38.0%	100%	7.6%
Markham (6th Municipal District)	61.2%	38.8%	100%	10.6%
Other/Missing	81.6%	18.4%	100%	0.6%
<b>Total</b>	60.9%	39.1%	100%	100%

### *Violation of Probation Petition Filed*

When multivariate analyses were performed to examine the degree to which the characteristics of the person on probation and their case were independently related (i.e., statistically controlling for other characteristics) to having a violation of probation petition filed, several patterns consistent with the bivariate analyses were found. There were also a couple that changed (Tables 6 and 7). Presented in Tables 7 and 8 are three different models for violation of probation petitions being filed, including one that examines the characteristics associated with whether any violation petition was filed (Model 1), a second model that examines if a violation petition involving a new arrest charge was filed (Model 2), and lastly, an examination of whether a petition was filed for only a technical violation which excludes the cases where a petition was filed that involved a new arrest charge (Model 3).<sup>8</sup> For example, as with the bi-variate analyses, people on probation who were Black, younger, had higher risk levels, were on probation for a property offense, had District 1 (Chicago) as a reporting location, and had treatment and drug testing as a condition of probation all had a higher likelihood of having a probation violation filed. However, unlike what was seen in the bi-variate analyses, women were no more or less likely than men to have a violation of probation filed after statistically controlling for the other

<sup>8</sup> Models with and without the cases missing the risk level were developed to determine the degree to which the result/findings would change/how sensitive the findings were to the missing cases. The results for Models 1 through 3 did not differ when the cases with the missing risk levels were included or excluded. In the models with the missing cases included, the missing cases were given a value of 1.5. This value—between low (coded as 1) and low-medium (coded as 2) was based on the fact that the missing risk levels that were ultimately determined from subsequent risk assessments averaged between low and low-medium.



individual and case characteristics. Overall, the models explained little of the variation in the likelihood of a person on probation having a violation petition filed (Pseudo  $R^2 = .11$ ). Among the variables included, race, the reporting location (i.e., municipal district), and age had the strongest relationship (based on the Wald statistic) to whether or not a violation petition was filed, as was the case in the bi-variate analyses. Whether or not the individual was supervised on a specialized caseload decreased the likelihood of having a violation petition filed and having community service ordered had no influence over whether or not violation petitions were filed.

When multivariate analyses were performed to examine the degree to which the characteristics of the individual and their case were independently related (i.e., statistically controlling for other characteristics) to having a violation of probation petition filed that included a new arrest charge, several patterns consistent with the bivariate analyses were found, but there were a couple that changed (Tables 7 and 8). For example, as with the bi-variate analyses, individuals who were Black, younger, male, had higher risk levels, were on probation for a property offense, had longer sentences, and were supervised in Chicago (Municipal District 1 relative to each of the other districts) all had a higher likelihood of having a probation violation that included a new arrest charge filed. Overall, the models explained little of the variation in the likelihood of an individual having a violation petition filed that included new arrest charges (Pseudo  $R^2 = .11$ ), and among the variables included, age, probation offense, race, risk level, and the reporting location (i.e., municipal district) had the strongest relationship (based on the Wald statistic) to whether or not a violation petition that included a new arrest charge was filed, as was the case in the bi-variate analyses. Whether or not the person was supervised on a specialized caseload had only a slight relationship to having a petition involving a new arrest charge filed, while probation conditions requiring treatment participation and drug testing has slightly larger, albeit relatively small influence over whether or not violation petitions including new arrest charges were filed. That said, those on specialized caseloads, those ordered to treatment, and those ordered to drug testing were more likely to have a petition filed where a new arrest charge was included.

**Table 7: Logistic Regression Analyses Examining Violation of Probation (VOP) Petition Filed, Including cases with missing Risk Assessment Scores (0=no VOP filed, 1=VOP filed)**

	Model 1: Any Violation Petition Filed (0=no, 1=yes) Pseudo $R^2 = .11$				Model 2: Violation Petition Filed for New Arrest Charge Pseudo $R^2 = .11$				Model 3: Only Technical Violation Petition Filed (excluding cases new arrest) Pseudo $R^2 = .11$			
	B	S.E.	Wald	Odds Ratio	B	S.E.	Wald	Odds Ratio	B	S.E.	Wald	Odds Ratio
Race			510.8				198.4				342.5	
Black relative to White)	0.7	0.0	299.8	2.03***	0.3	0.0	66.3	1.36***	0.7	0.0	227.9	2.03***
Hispanic relative to White	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.99	-0.2	0.0	15.0	0.84***	0.1	0.1	3.5	1.10
Other relative to White	-0.5	0.1	20.9	0.63***	-0.2	0.1	4.5	0.79*	-0.5	0.1	14.1	0.64***

Sex: Female relative to Male	0.1	0.0	2.0	1.06	-0.3	0.0	57.6	0.77***	0.2	0.0	21.4	1.22***
Ordinal age	-0.3	0.0	300.8	0.78***	-0.3	0.0	605.2	0.73***	-0.1	0.0	49.5	0.89***
Offense Type			134.4				215.0				35.0	
Drug relative to property	0.0	0.0	0.8	1.04	-0.1	0.0	2.7	0.94	0.1	0.1	3.0	1.09
Weapon relative to Property	-0.5	0.1	40.8	0.61***	-0.5	0.1	47.7	0.62***	-0.3	0.1	13.2	0.73***
Person relative to Property	-0.3	0.1	35.8	0.74***	-0.3	0.0	48.4	0.73***	-0.2	0.1	8.1	0.85**
Sex relative to Property	-0.6	0.1	27.6	0.56***	-0.7	0.1	44.3	0.48***	-0.2	0.1	2.3	0.83
Other relative to Property	-0.3	0.0	49.2	0.73***	-0.5	0.0	135.9	0.62***	-0.1	0.1	2.6	0.92
Offense Class: Felony relative to Misdemeanor	0.1	0.0	1.7	1.07*	0.1	0.0	2.1	1.07	0.0	0.1	0.7	1.05
Risk level (ordinal, missing=1.5)	0.2	0.0	147.6	1.19***	0.2	0.0	139.1	1.17***	0.1	0.0	65.3	1.15***
Sentence length (ordinal)	0.0	0.0	0.4	1.02	0.1	0.0	23.5	1.14***	0.0	0.0	2.1	0.95
Reporting Location			490.2				135.9				433.8	
District 2 relative to 1	-0.4	0.1	70.1	0.65***	-0.5	0.1	94.0	0.61***	-0.3	0.1	19.0	0.78***
District 3 relative to 1	-0.3	0.1	23.7	0.77***	-0.2	0.1	18.8	0.80***	-0.2	0.1	7.9	0.84**
District 4 relative to 1	-0.1	0.1	2.0	0.92	-0.1	0.1	2.0	0.93	-0.1	0.1	0.7	0.95
District 5 relative to 1	-0.2	0.1	11.1	0.82**	-0.2	0.1	18.4	0.79***	-0.1	0.1	1.8	0.91
District 6 relative to 1	-0.9	0.0	366.3	0.41***	-0.2	0.0	12.5	0.85***	-1.1	0.1	373.5	0.33***
Specialized Probation Sentence	-0.6	0.1	93.6	0.57***	0.2	0.1	8.0	1.16**	-1.0	0.1	170.3	0.37***
Treatment Ordered	0.2	0.0	28.7	1.19***	0.3	0.0	89.6	1.32***	0.0	0.0	1.1	1.04
Drug Testing Ordered	0.2	0.0	19.5	1.16***	0.3	0.0	75.6	1.30***	0.0	0.0	1.5	1.05
Community Service Ordered	-0.1	0.0	3.6	0.93	-0.1	0.0	4.0	0.94*	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.96
Constant	0.4	0.1	8.2	1.50**	-0.9	0.1	50.1	0.39	-0.4	0.2	5.7	0.68*

**Table 8: Logistic Regression Analyses Examining Violation of Probation (VOP) Petition Filed, Excluding cases with missing Risk Assessment Scores (0=no VOP filed, 1=VOP filed)**

	Model 1: Any Violation Petition Filed (0=no, 1=yes) Pseudo R <sup>2</sup> = .12				Model 2: Violation Petition Filed for New Arrest Charge Pseudo R <sup>2</sup> = .12				Model 3: Only Technical Violation Petition Filed (excluding cases new arrest) Pseudo R <sup>2</sup> = .10			
	B	S.E.	Wald	Odds Ratio	B	S.E.	Wald	Odds Ratio	B	S.E.	Wald	Odds Ratio
Race			501.1				161.9				362.1	
Black relative to White	0.7	0.0	291.0	2.09***	0.3	0.0	50.6	1.33***	0.8	0.0	236.6	2.14***
Hispanic relative to White	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.97	-0.2	0.0	13.6	0.84***	0.1	0.1	2.3	1.08
Other relative to White	-0.4	0.1	16.8	0.65***	-0.2	0.1	2.9	0.82	-0.4	0.1	12.3	0.64***
Sex: Female relative to Male	0.1	0.0	3.4	1.08	-0.3	0.0	51.7	0.77***	0.2	0.0	23.7	1.25***
Ordinal age	-0.3	0.0	308.1	0.76***	-0.3	0.0	623.9	0.72***	-0.1	0.0	51.8	0.88***
Offense Type			106.2				162.5				31.3	
Drug relative to Property	0.0	0.0	1.1	1.05	-0.1	0.0	2.0	0.95	0.1	0.1	3.6	1.11
Weapon relative to Property	-0.5	0.1	33.2	0.63***	-0.4	0.1	35.8	0.65***	-0.3	0.1	12.1	0.73**
Person relative to Property	-0.3	0.1	27.4	0.75***	-0.3	0.0	45.8	0.72***	-0.1	0.1	5.0	0.87*
Sex relative to Property	-0.5	0.1	18.0	0.61***	-0.7	0.1	37.3	0.50***	-0.1	0.1	0.8	0.89
Other relative to Property	-0.3	0.0	37.6	0.75***	-0.4	0.0	94.7	0.65***	-0.1	0.1	2.7	0.92
Offense Class: Felony relative to Misdemeanor	0.0	0.1	0.9	1.05	0.1	0.0	1.5	1.06	0.0	0.1	0.4	1.04
Risk level (ordinal, missing=1.5)	0.2	0.0	135.1	1.23***	0.3	0.0	271.5	1.32***	0.1	0.0	24.9	1.11***
Sentence length (ordinal)	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.00	0.2	0.0	28.0	1.16***	-0.1	0.0	5.7	0.92*
Reporting Location			449.9				117.9				420.7	
District 2 relative to 1	-0.4	0.1	64.4	0.65***	-0.5	0.1	88.7	0.60***	-0.2	0.1	16.8	0.78***
District 3 relative to 1	-0.3	0.1	22.0	0.77***	-0.2	0.1	14.9	0.81***	-0.2	0.1	9.1	0.83**
District 4 relative to 1	-0.1	0.1	1.0	0.94	-0.1	0.1	1.2	0.94	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.96

District 5 relative to 1	-0.2	0.1	8.6	0.83**	-0.2	0.1	15.2	0.80***	-0.1	0.1	1.6	0.91
District 6 relative to 1	-0.9	0.0	349.4	0.40***	-0.1	0.0	7.8	0.88**	-1.1	0.1	369.8	0.32***
Specialized Probation Sentence	-0.7	0.1	92.3	0.49***	-0.3	0.1	16.2	0.77***	-0.8	0.1	89.7	0.43***
Treatment Ordered	0.1	0.0	14.4	1.14***	0.2	0.0	43.2	1.22***	0.0	0.0	1.1	1.04
Drug Testing Ordered	0.2	0.0	20.1	1.17***	0.3	0.0	63.9	1.29***	0.1	0.0	3.0	1.07
Community Service Ordered	-0.1	0.0	3.4	0.93	-0.1	0.0	3.6	0.94	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.96
Constant	0.5	0.2	11.1	1.67**	-1.1	0.1	64.6	0.33***	-0.2	0.2	0.9	0.85

*Revocation*

Analyses were also performed to examine the degree to which individual and case characteristics were correlated with whether or not the case resulted in the revocation of the probation. There are two different ways these rates of revocation can be considered or examined: 1) what percent of *all* cases resulted in a revocation, and 2) what percent of *cases that had a violation petition filed* were revoked. The first set of analyses reveal which individual characteristics are associated with ultimately having their case revoked, whereas the second set of analyses limits the analyses to only those cases at risk of revocation as a result of a petition being filed.

With the first set of analyses (percent revoked out of all cases), as with the bi-variate analyses of a petition being filed, few individual or case characteristics that were strongly correlated (i.e., correlation greater than .10) with whether or not the probation case was revoked (Table 9). Specifically, only the individual’s risk level, sentence length, reporting location (e.g., district), and if they had a petition filed for a new offense were correlated with revocation above the .10 level. For example, 4.6% of those with a low-risk level were revoked, compared to 19% among those classified as high risk. Cases supervised in Chicago (Municipal District 1) also had a slightly higher rate of revocation (12.2%) than all other districts except Municipal District 5, where 13% of the cases were revoked.<sup>9</sup> Finally, those who had a petition filed that included a

---

<sup>9</sup> Although not presented in tabular form, there was also a wide variation across individual courtrooms/judges in the proportion of cases that resulted in a revocation. Among those courtrooms/judges with at least 100 discharged cases, there were six where 35% or more of the discharged cases were revoked (all but two in District 1/Chicago). At the other end of the continuum, there were 12 courtrooms/judges where under 5% of the cases were revoked (and all but 4 were *outside* of District 1/Chicago).

new arrest charge had a revocation rate of almost 18%, compared to 6% among those with a petition filed that did not include any new arrest charges.<sup>10 11</sup>

In addition to these relationships, there were also many others that were not as strong. Overall, 10.4% of all cases examined resulted in a revocation of probation, with slightly higher rates seen among men (10.8%), Blacks (11.7%), felony probation cases (10.8%), and cases that were on probation for a property crime (12.4%). On the other hand, substantially higher rates were seen among young people on probation (those under 20 years old had a revocation rate of 17.6%, although they accounted for a small percent of the overall population).

**Table 9: Relationship between Individual & Case Characteristics and Revocation of Probation (All Cases Included, N=26,580)**

	Percent Not Revoked	Percent Revoked	Total	Percent of Cases (N=26,580)
<b>Sex ***, V=.03</b>				
Male	89.2%	10.8%	100%	80.4%
Female	91.3%	8.7%	100%	19.3%
Missing/other	89.8%	10.2%	100%	0.2%
<b>Total</b>	89.6%	10.4%	100%	100%
<b>Race ***, V=.05</b>				
White	90.5%	9.5%	100%	19.9%
Black	88.3%	11.7%	100%	57.0%
Hispanic	91.9%	8.1%	100%	21.3%
Other	92.2%	7.8%	100%	1.8%
<b>Total</b>	89.6%	10.4%	100%	100%
<b>Average Age (in years) n.s.</b>	34.6	34.1	34.5	
<b>Age ***, V=.06</b>				
Under 20	82.4%	17.6%	100%	4.3%

<sup>10</sup> Of the cases with a petition filed for a new arrest charge that were revoked, detailed analyses of the probation officer notes resulted in only about 48% of the cases indicating anything about the nature of the new arrest charge (e.g., a felony or a misdemeanor, a traffic offense, drug-law violation, property crime, or a violent offense). Of those cases with an indication of the nature of the new arrest charge, almost 37% indicated a traffic charge, 28% indicated a violent crime charge, 28% indicated an arrest for a drug-law violation, and 17% indicated an arrest for a property crime. Because violation petitions involving new arrest charges can include multiple arrests these percentages add up to more than 100%.

<sup>11</sup> Of the cases with a petition filed for only technical violations with no new arrest charge and revoked, detailed analyses of the probation officer notes resulted in 98% of the cases indicating information about the nature of the technical violations. Of these cases, two-thirds (68%) indicated there was a failure to report to probation, 43% noted a failure to comply with probation conditions, 20% specifically indicated a failure to comply with ordered treatment, and 36% indicated a positive drug test. In addition, most (77%) indicated a failure to pay probation fees but few noted a failure to pay restitution (only 5%). Because violation petitions involving new arrest charges can include multiple arrests these percentages add up to more than 100%. Further, because most of those who were revoked for technical violations had multiple violations, it was not possible to determine the specific reason for the revocation (i.e., it may not have been a failure to pay supervision fees, but rather failure to report to probation, a positive drug test, *and* the failure to pay fees).

20 to 24	89.1%	10.9%	100%	20.3%
25 to 35	90.6%	9.4%	100%	34.5%
36 to 49	90.4%	9.6%	100%	25.5%
50 and Older	88.7%	11.3%	100%	14.8%
Missing	88.1%	11.9%	100%	0.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>89.6%</b>	<b>10.4%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Offense Type ***, V=.08</b>				
Property	87.6%	12.4%	100%	24.1%
Drugs	88.2%	11.8%	100%	29.2%
Weapons	92.4%	7.6%	100%	4.3%
Person	88.6%	11.4%	100%	17.9%
Sex	90.2%	9.8%	100%	1.8%
Other	93.4%	6.6%	100%	22.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>89.6%</b>	<b>10.4%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Probation Offense Class***, V=.08</b>				
Class 1	89.5%	10.5%	100%	6.5%
Class 2	88.9%	11.1%	100%	16.2%
Class 3	89.5%	10.5%	100%	15.6%
Class 4	89.2%	10.8%	100%	46.0%
Class A Misdemeanors	94.9%	5.1%	100%	14.8%
Class B Misdemeanors	93.1%	6.9%	100%	0.2%
Class C Misdemeanors	89.5%	10.0%	100%	0.3%
Other	93.7%	6.3%	100%	1.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>89.6%</b>	<b>10.4%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Probation Offense Class ***, V=.03</b>				
Felony	89.2%	10.8%	100%	81.6%
Misdemeanor	91.1%	8.9%	100%	17.4%
Other	93.7%	6.3%	100%	1.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>89.6%</b>	<b>10.4%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Initial Risk Level ***, V=.17</b>				
Low	95.4%	4.6%	100%	9.8%
Low-Medium	94.6%	5.4%	100%	8.3%
Medium	91.7%	8.3%	100%	53.2%
High-Medium	85.8%	14.2%	100%	12.6%
High	82.7%	17.3%	100%	3.0%
Very-High	79.5%	20.5%	100%	5.1%
Missing	78.2%	21.8%	100%	8.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>89.6%</b>	<b>10.4%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Risk Level***, V=.15</b>				
Low	95.4%	4.6%	100%	9.8%
Medium	91.0%	9.0%	100%	74.1%
High	80.7%	19.3%	100%	8.0%
Missing	78.2%	21.8%	100%	8.1%

<b>Total</b>	89.6%	10.4%	100%	100%
<b>Average Sentence Length (in months), r= .01</b>	23.0 months	23.3 months	23.0 months	
<b>Sentence Length)***, V=.03</b>				
12 Months or Less	91.6%	8.4%	100%	10.9%
13 to 23 Months	90.0%	10.0%	100%	10.9%
24 Months	89.2%	10.8%	100%	68.4%
25 to 30 Months	88.7%	11.3%	100%	6.7%
31 Months or More	90.9%	9.1%	100%	3.1%
<b>Total</b>	89.6%	10.4%	100%	100%
<b>Specialized Probation ***, Phi=.12</b>				
Probation	90.7%	9.3%	100%	91.2%
Specialized Probation	78.1%	21.9%	100%	8.8%
<b>Total</b>	89.6%	10.4%	100%	100%
<b>Technical violation filed **, Phi=02</b>				
No	90.1%	9.9%	100%	48.3%
Yes	89.1%	10.9%	100%	51.7%
<b>Total</b>	89.6%	10.4%	100%	100%
<b>New Offense violation filed ***, Phi=.13</b>				
No	91.8%	8.2%	100%	76.9%
Yes	82.3%	17.7%	100%	23.1%
<b>Total</b>	89.6%	10.4%	100%	100%
<b>Reporting Location***, V=.11</b>				
Chicago (1st Municipal District)	87.8%	12.2%	100%	55.1%
Skokie (2nd Municipal District)	89.7%	10.3%	100%	9.6%
Rolling Meadows (3rd Municipal District)	89.1%	10.9%	100%	8.9%
Maywood (4th Municipal District)	93.8%	6.2%	100%	7.6%
Bridgeview (5th Municipal District)	87.0%	13.0%	100%	7.6%
Markham (6th Municipal District)	97.3%	2.7%	100%	10.6%
Other/Missing	96.6%	3.4%	100%	0.6%
<b>Total</b>	89.6%	10.4%	100%	100%
<b>Petitions by Type***, V=.22</b>				
No Petitions Filed	96.3%	3.7%	100%	25.5%
Only TV	93.5%	6.5%	100%	35.3%
Only New Offense	78.7%	21.3%	100%	19.3%

Both TV and New Offense	84.6%	15.4%	100%	19.8%
<b>Total</b>	89.6%	10.4%	100%	100%

Chi-square or Pearson's r test statistically significant at \*= $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , or \*\*\*  $p < .001$ ; n.s.=not statistically significant at  $p < .05$ . Strength of association measured by Cramer's V (V) or Pearson's r (r).

When multivariate analyses were performed to examine the degree to which the characteristics of the individual on probation and their case were independently related (i.e., statistically controlling for other characteristics) to the probation case being revoked, the patterns were generally consistent with the bivariate analyses (Table 10 and 11). Presented in Table 10 (all cases) and 11 (excluding cases with missing risk level) are two different models for revocation of probation, one that includes all cases (Model 4), another that only includes cases that had a petition filed (Model 5). As with the bi-variate analyses, two of the strongest factors (based on the Wald Statistic) in the multivariate analyses that predicted whether a case would be revoked or not, and included all cases, was whether there was a petition filed that included a new arrest charge and the reporting district across both models. The individual's risk level was not related to whether or not they would be revoked in the model that included all cases (Table 10), but risk level was related to revocation in the models that excluded those cases with the missing risk level information (Table 11). Those on probation for a property crime were more likely to be revoked than those on probation for either a drug-law violation or a weapon possession offense. People on probation who were male had a higher likelihood of having their probation sentence revoked than did females. The influence of race depended on the specification of the multivariate model. When all cases were included, Blacks had a higher likelihood of revocation than whites. However, this race effect was relatively small compared to other variables (e.g., the influence of the individual's sex was stronger than race). Further, when the analyses only included cases that had a violation of probation petition filed, the influence of race was non-significant. Thus, the small relationship to race in the analyses that included all cases likely reflects the fact that Blacks had a higher likelihood of having a petition filed, but among those with a petition filed, race was not related to revocation. Finally, when analyses were performed to determine if there were differences in the results between the models that included the cases with the missing risk level and the models that excluded those cases, some differences were noted.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Models with and without the cases missing the risk level were developed to determine the degree to which the result/findings would change/how sensitive the findings were to the missing cases. The results for Models 4 and 5 did change slightly when the cases with the missing risk levels were included or excluded. In the models with the missing cases included, the missing cases were given a value of 1.5. This value—between low (coded as 1) and low-medium (coded as 2) was based on the fact that the missing risk levels that were ultimately determined from subsequent risk assessments averaged between low and low-medium. When Model 4 was run excluding the cases missing the risk level, the variable indicating if the case was a felony or a misdemeanor was no longer statistically significant and the variable indicating if the case was a specialized probation sentence was also no longer statistically significant. When Model 5 was run excluding the cases missing the risk level, age was no longer statistically significant and the risk level variable became statistically significant.



**Table 10: Logistic Regression Analyses Examining Revocation of Probation (VOP), Including cases with missing Risk Assessment Scores (0=not revoked, 1=revoked)**

	Model 4: Revocation (0=no, 1=yes), Pseudo R <sup>2</sup> = .14				Model 5: Revocation-with a petition filed, R <sup>2</sup> = .12			
	B	S.E.	Wald	Odds Ratio	B	S.E.	Wald	Odds Ratio
Race			15.5				4.8	
Black relative to White	0.2	0.1	6.6	1.17**	0.1	0.1	1.0	1.07
Hispanic relative to White	0.0	0.1	0.4	0.95	-0.1	0.1	0.8	0.93
Other relative to White	-0.1	0.2	0.6	0.87	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.95
Sex: Female relative to Male	-0.3	0.1	19.3	0.78***	-0.2	0.1	16.1	0.78***
Ordinal age	0.0	0.0	3.6	1.04	0.1	0.0	6.5	1.05*
Offense Type			80.1				56.3	
Drug relative to Property	-0.3	0.1	24.9	0.75***	-0.3	0.1	17.8	0.77***
Weapon relative to Property	-0.4	0.1	12.2	0.65***	-0.3	0.1	6.8	0.71**
Person relative to Property	0.0	0.1	0.4	1.05	0.1	0.1	2.1	1.12
Sex relative to Property	-0.3	0.2	4.0	0.71*	-0.2	0.2	1.8	0.78
Other relative to Property	-0.5	0.1	50.7	0.61	-0.4	0.1	28.3	0.68***
Offense Class: Felony relative to Misdemeanor	0.2	0.1	5.1	1.19*	0.1	0.1	3.4	1.16
Risk level (ordinal, missing=1.5)	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.00	0.0	0.0	0.1	1.01
Sentence length (ordinal)	0.0	0.0	0.2	1.02	0.0	0.0	0.2	1.02
Reporting Location			253.1				243.2	
District 2 relative to 1	0.1	0.1	2.0	1.12	0.1	0.1	1.8	1.12
District 3 relative to 1	0.1	0.1	2.6	1.14	0.2	0.1	6.3	1.24*
District 4 relative to 1	-0.8	0.1	55.1	0.47***	-0.9	0.1	66.7	0.40***

District 5 relative to 1	0.1	0.1	3.0	1.15	0.2	0.1	4.7	1.20*
District 6 relative to 1	-1.6	0.1	176.9	0.19***	-1.7	0.1	151.6	0.19***
Petition Type			930.6				588.8	
Only Tech. Viol. relative to none	0.5	0.1	44.5	1.69***				
Only New Arrest Violation relative to none (rel. to just tech. violation)	1.9	0.1	610.0	6.47***	1.4	0.1	586.1	3.89***
Both New Arrest & Technical Violation relative to none (rel. to just tech. violation)	1.4	0.1	328.1	4.11***	0.9	0.1	233.5	2.48***
Specialized Probation Sentence	0.9	0.1	168.1	2.41***	0.9	0.1	153.0	2.45***
Constant	-3.1	0.2	201.8	0.05***	-2.8	0.3	128.4	0.06***

\*=p<.05, \*\* p<.01, or \*\*\* p<.001;

**Table 11: Logistic Regression Analyses Examining Revocation of Probation (VOP), Excluding cases with missing Risk Assessment Scores (0=not revoked, 1=revoked)**

	Model 4: Revocation (0=no, 1=yes), Pseudo R <sup>2</sup> = .15				Model 5: Revocation-with a petition filed, R <sup>2</sup> = .12			
	B	S.E.	Wald	Odds Ratio	B	S.E.	Wald	Odds Ratio
Race			9.4				2.3	
Black relative to White	0.1	0.1	2.6	1.12	0.0	0.1	0.1	1.03
Hispanic relative to White	-0.1	0.1	1.1	0.92	-0.1	0.1	0.9	0.92
Other relative to White	-0.1	0.2	0.1	0.93	0.0	0.2	0.0	1.03
Sex: Female relative to Male	-0.3	0.1	21.2	0.75***	-0.3	0.1	17.6	0.76***
Ordinal age	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.99	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.00
Offense Type			44.6				29.5	
Drug relative to Property	-0.3	0.1	21.8	0.74***	-0.3	0.1	15.9	0.77***
Weapon relative to Property	-0.3	0.1	6.5	0.71*	-0.3	0.1	3.4	0.78

Person relative to Property	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.99	0.0	0.1	0.3	1.04
Sex relative to Property	-0.4	0.2	4.3	0.68*	-0.3	0.2	1.7	0.78
Other relative to Property	-0.4	0.1	25.7	0.68***	-0.3	0.1	12.6	0.75***
Offense Class: Felony relative to Misdemeanor	0.1	0.1	2.2	1.13	0.1	0.1	1.0	1.09
Risk level (ordinal, missing=1.5)	0.3	0.0	106.8	1.33***	0.3	0.0	94.5	1.33***
Sentence length (ordinal)	0.1	0.0	2.4	1.08	0.1	0.1	2.7	1.09
Reporting Location			227.4				218.2	
District 2 relative to 1	0.1	0.1	0.9	1.09	0.1	0.1	0.8	1.09
District 3 relative to 1	0.2	0.1	7.0	1.26**	0.3	0.1	11.5	1.36**
District 4 relative to 1	-0.8	0.1	51.8	0.44***	-0.9	0.1	56.1	0.39***
District 5 relative to 1	0.2	0.1	6.2	1.23*	0.3	0.1	9.6	1.31**
District 6 relative to 1	-1.6	0.1	145.6	0.20***	-1.6	0.1	124.8	0.20***
Petition Type			721.2				460.9	
Only Tech. Viol. relative to none	0.5	0.1	37.8	1.72***	1.3	0.1	453.6	3.71***
Only New Arrest Violation relative to none (rel. to just tech. violation)	1.8	0.1	460.3	6.25***	0.9	0.1	211.2	2.52***
Both New Arrest & Technical Violation relative to none (rel. to just tech. violation)	1.4	0.1	277.1	4.23***				
Specialized Probation Sentence	0.1	0.1	1.2	1.11	0.1	0.1	1.7	1.14
Constant	-3.9	0.2	259.3	0.02***	-3.6	0.3	180.1	0.03***

\*=p<.05, \*\* p<.01, or \*\*\* p<.001;

These analyses were then followed by a series of multivariate regression (logistic regression and hierarchical linear modeling/HLM) techniques. These statistical models allowed the researchers to add or remove variables from the model in order to determine which variables have the most influence on outcomes and which models have the most explanatory power. The first set of

logistic regression models examined only the case-level data. These first sets of models were then followed by sets of HLM analyses, used to “nest” or group individuals within their neighborhoods and specific courtrooms to account for the impact that neighborhood context and the specific courtroom has on probation outcomes.

### *Influence of Neighborhood Characteristics on Violations & Revocation*

Cook County has a variety of neighborhoods that vary in terms of access to resources and police presence. Individuals on probation living within a neighborhood share a common context that may influence whether an individual violates the conditions of their probation. Therefore, the original analyses that examined only the case-level characteristics were supplemented with an additional set of hierarchical linear models (HLM) that added measures of the neighborhoods within which the cases were grouped/nested. The neighborhood data used for this study draws primarily from the American Community Survey (ACS) 5 Year Estimates and the census tract was used at the geographic unit representing “neighborhood” in the analyses. The specific characteristics of the neighborhoods examined relative to the probation outcomes included concentrated disadvantage,<sup>13</sup> a measure of racial and ethnic diversity,<sup>14</sup> the percent of the population in the neighborhood that was Black,<sup>15</sup> and the rate of probation supervision in the neighborhood.<sup>16</sup> For these analyses, only probation cases where the last address listed was within Cook County were included. This resulted in the elimination of 2,580 cases, for a total of 24,000 cases included in the analyses. The HLM analyses included all of the same variables regarding the characteristics of the person on probation and their sentence as the other models (e.g., age, race, gender, sentence length, risk level, etc.) plus the neighborhood level characteristics. Summarized in Table 12 are the influences of these neighborhood-level characteristics (the case-level variables were not included in the table).

**Table 12: Influence of Neighborhood Characteristics on Violations of Probation Petitions and Revocation (other case-level variables not presented in table).**

---

<sup>13</sup> Concentrated disadvantage was measured using the following variables: percent owner-occupied housing units, percent families living below the poverty level, percent female-headed households, percent unemployed (Hipp et al, 2010; Hipp, 2010). Principal components analyses were conducted to reduce these variables into a single measure of disadvantage.

<sup>14</sup> The Herfindahl-Hirschman Index (HHI) was used to evaluate racial and ethnic diversity at the census-tract level. The Index was calculated using four categories of race/ethnicity: Black, Hispanic, White, and Other. The ACS data identifies a group that crosses two categories: individuals who identify as Black Hispanics. In this study, Black Hispanics were categorized as ‘Hispanic’ to give primacy to language and cultural identity. This decision was informed by recent studies using health data indicating that health-related behaviors of Black Hispanics resemble more closely white Hispanics versus non-Hispanic blacks (LaVeist-Ramos et al, 2012). As health behaviors and health profiles are also contextually construed and correlated with neighborhood-level characteristics, the decision to categorize Black Hispanics as Hispanic within the study was justified. When using four categories the HHI ranges from 2,500 to 10,000. If a census tract has a HHI of 2,500 it indicates that all four groups are proportionally equivalent in terms of their representation. If a census tract has a HHI of 10,000 it indicates there is just one racial/ethnic group represented.

<sup>15</sup> Percent Black was included as a control in this model, as the HHI index is a measure of diversity/ segregation but does not specify the particular groups that may be represented within a tract.

<sup>16</sup> The Neighborhood Supervision Rate was estimated by calculating the number of adult probation cases closed within a census tract within a specific year, divided by the total adult population 18-65 within that census tract. This estimate was then multiplied by 1,000 to generate a rate of probation supervision among adults residing within a census tract.

	Petition Filed		Petition Filed for New Arrest		Revocation	
	<i>B</i>	Odds Ratio	<i>B</i>	Odds Ratio	<i>B</i>	Odds Ratio
Concentrated Disadvantage	0.14	1.15 ***	0.04	1.05	0.05	1.05
Percent Black	0.00	1.00	-0.00	0.99	-0.00	0.99
Herfindahl-Hirschman Index	0.00	1.00 *	0.0	1.00	-0.00	1.00
Neighborhood Probation Supervision Rate	0.01	1.01*	0.01	1.01**	0.00	1.00**

When analyses were performed to examine if neighborhood-level characteristics, along with the individual-level characteristics of the person on probation, influenced whether or not the case had a violation filed, several patterns emerged. First, those on probation in neighborhoods that had higher rates of concentrated disadvantage and higher rates of residents under probation supervision were more likely to have petitions filed for violations of probation. Thus, as rates of poverty in the neighborhood where the person on probation lived increased so too did the likelihood of having a petition filed for a violation of probation. Similarly, as the number of adults under probation supervision increase within a neighborhood, so too did the individual's likelihood of having a petition filed. However, the inclusion of the neighborhood-level variables only marginally improved the explanatory power of the analyses on which cases had violations filed.

When analyses were performed to examine if neighborhood-level characteristics, along with the individual-level characteristics of the person on probation, influence whether a petition involving a new arrest charge was filed, only one of the neighborhood-level characteristics appeared to be related to this outcome. Specifically, those on probation in neighborhoods with higher rates of residents under probation supervision were more likely to have petitions filed for violations of probation.

When analyses were performed to examine if neighborhood-level characteristics, along with the individual-level characteristics of the person on probation, influence whether the case resulted in a revocation, only one of the neighborhood-level characteristics appeared to be related to this outcome. Specifically, those on probation in neighborhoods with higher rates of residents under probation supervision were more likely to have their probation case revoked.

#### *Courtroom-Level Effects*

Finally, another set of hierarchical linear models (HLM) were developed to determine the degree to which the specific courtroom/judge where a person was sentenced (and would subsequently have violations heard) influenced their odds of violations and revocations. The goal of these analyses was to determine how much of the variation in the likelihood that a probation case would have a petition filed or be revoked was related to the specific courtroom/judge overseeing the case, after statistically controlling for the characteristics of the person on probation and their sentence. Given that the only information available was which courtroom the case was sentenced in, it was not possible to determine the influence of any specific characteristics of that courtroom/judge on the outcomes, just the degree to which there were differences in the outcomes. For these analyses, only cases that originated in courtrooms with at least 100 cases discharged during the study period were included, thereby reducing the number of cases slightly (from 26,580 to 24,688). The HLM analyses included all of the same variables regarding the characteristics of the person on probation and their sentence as the other models (e.g., age, race, gender, sentence length, risk level, etc.) plus the courtroom where the sentence was imposed.

Summarized in Table 13 are the results of the HLM models. In Table 13, the  $p$  indicates the amount of variance explained by the sentencing location (i.e., courtroom). For example, in the model that examined if a petition was filed or not, the sentencing location explains very little of the variation in whether any petition is filed (5.8%) or whether a petition for a new arrest is filed (2.3%). However, for the model examining if a case resulted in revocation, the sentencing location explains 18.5% of the variation in revocations. Similarly, when the analyses of revocation only included cases that had a petition filed, sentencing location explains 19.3% of variation in whether or not the case resulted in a revocation. The pseudo  $R^2$  in the models that included the sentencing courtroom did not change much in the analyses of whether petitions were filed, but were substantively higher in the models examining revocation. For example, the revocation model pseudo  $R^2$  was .30 and the pseudo  $R^2$  in the revocation model with only those cases that had petitions was .20.

**Table 13: Unconditional HLM Models of Petitions Filed and Revocation**

<b>Any Petition Filed</b>			
<b>Fixed Effects</b>	b	SE	
Intercept	1.16	0.05***	
<b>Random Effects</b>	$s^2$	SD	$p$
Level 2	0.20	.03***	5.8%
N=25,148			
<b>Petition for a New Arrest</b>			
<b>Fixed Effects</b>	b	SE	
Intercept	-0.42	0.03***	
<b>Random Effects</b>	$s^2$	SD	$p$
Level 2	0.08	.16***	2.3%
N=25,148			
<b>Revocation</b>			
<b>Fixed Effects</b>	b	SE	
Intercept	-2.33	0.11***	
<b>Random Effects</b>	$s^2$	SD	$p$
Level 2	0.75	0.14***	18.5%
N=25,148			
<b>Revocation if Any Petition Filed</b>			
<b>Fixed Effects</b>	b	SE	
Intercept	-2.12	0.11***	
<b>Random Effects</b>	$s^2$	SD	$p$
Level 2	0.79	.15***	19.3%
N=18,597			

\*=p<.05, \*\* p<.01, or \*\*\* p<.001;

Thus, it appears that the specific courtroom the probation case is assigned to plays a substantial role in whether or not the case results in a revocation after statistically accounting for other characteristics of the person on probation and their case, but less of a role in whether or not petitions were filed. This makes sense, since the judge of a courtroom does not directly influence whether or not violation petitions get filed, particularly for new arrest charges that are often determined by the Cook County State’s Attorney’s Office. Still, some judges may have preferences that specific types of technical violations result in the filing of a petition, or that arrests for minor crimes be filed as violations of probation even if the State’s Attorney’s Office’s does not.

## Methods and findings of from interviews and staff surveys

To supplement these quantitative analyses, and to examine how existing legal and administrative policies are interpreted and enacted into practice, the research plan also involved focus groups, interviews and surveys with criminal justice practitioners within three agencies that respond to probation violations. COVID-19 and the “stay-at-home orders” presented a significant challenge to our qualitative data collection efforts. Our approved research protocols to conduct in-person interviews and focus groups had to be redesigned for remote data collection and resubmitted to the Loyola Institutional Review Board and Circuit Court Institutional Review Board.

Additionally, we faced challenges recruiting interview and focus group participants from criminal justice agencies that were themselves adapting to operating remotely.

Despite these challenges, the research team interviewed 24 supervisory-level criminal justice practitioners within three agencies that respond to probation violations: The Cook County Adult Probation Department, Cook County State’s Attorney’s Office and the Cook County Public Defender Office (Table 14). We initially planned to interview practitioners from the Cook County Circuit Court, but were unable to do so.

**Table 14: Interview and Focus Group Participants**

Agency	Data Collection	Participant(s) Title	Participants
Cook County Adult Probation Department	Individual Interviews	Director	1
		Deputy Chiefs	4
	Focus Groups	Supervisors	11
Law Office of the Cook County Public Defender	Individual Interview	Deputy Chief	1
	Focus Group	Supervisors	4
Cook County State's Attorney	Focus Group	Supervisors	3
Total Participants			24

The research team also distributed an online survey to Cook County Adult Probation officers and supervisors and received a total of 39 responses (21% response rate). This survey examined the prevalence of ideas and practices expressed in the interviews and focus groups and elicited structured responses to a broader array of questions and statements regarding officers’ responses to non-compliant behavior (See Tables 15, 16 and 17 for details of sample).



**Table 15: Cook County Adult Probation Survey Participants**

<b>Title</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Probation Officer	25	64.1%
Probation Supervisor	14	35.9%
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	14	35.9%
Female	18	46.2%
Prefer Not to Say	4	10.3%
Missing	3	7.7%
<b>Race and Ethnicity</b>		
White, Non-Hispanic or Latino	18	51.4%
Black, Non-Hispanic or Latino	5	14.3%
Hispanic or Latino	5	14.3%
Other	1	2.9%
Missing	6	17.1%
<b>Age</b>		
Average Age (Years)	44	
20-30	4	10.3%
31-40	4	10.3%
41-50	7	17.9%
51-60	13	33.3%
Missing	11	28.2%
<b>Education</b>		
Bachelor's Degree	22	56.4%
Graduate Degree	12	30.8%
Prefer Not to Say	2	5.1%
Missing	3	7.7%
<b>Subject of Degree</b>		
Criminal Justice/Criminology	24	61.5%
Other	10	25.6%
Prefer Not to Say	2	5.1%
Missing	3	7.7%

**Table 16: Supervisor Demographics**

<b>Years as a Supervisor</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Average Years as a Supervisor	5	
Less Than 1 Year	2	14.3%
One Year or More	12	85.7%
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	6	42.9%
Female	4	28.6%
Prefer Not to Say	1	7.1%
Missing	3	21.4%
<b>Race and Ethnicity</b>		
White, Non-Hispanic or Latino	4	33.3%
Black, Non-Hispanic or Latino	2	14.3%
Hispanic or Latino	2	14.3%
Other	1	7.1%
Prefer Not to Say	2	14.3%
Missing	3	21.4%
<b>Age</b>		
Average Age (Years)	46	
20-30	0	0.0%
31-40	1	7.1%
41-50	5	35.7%
51-60	2	14.3%
Missing	6	42.9%
<b>Education</b>		
Bachelor's Degree	6	42.9%
Graduate Degree	4	28.6%
Prefer Not to Say	1	7.1%
Missing	3	21.4%
<b>Subject of Degree</b>		
Criminal Justice/Criminology	7	50.0%
Other	3	
Prefer Not to Say	1	7.1%
Missing	3	21.4%

**Table 17: Probation Officer Demographics**

<b>Years as Probation Officer</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Average years as an Officer	16	
Less Than 1 Year	0	0.0%
One Year or More	25	100%
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	8	32.0%
Female	14	56.0%
Prefer Not to Say	3	12.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Race and Ethnicity</b>		
White, Non-Hispanic or Latino	16	64.0%
Black, Non-Hispanic or Latino	3	12.0%
Hispanic or Latino	3	12.0%
Prefer Not to Say	3	12.0%
<b>Age</b>		
Average Age (Years)	46	
20-30	4	16.0%
31-40	3	12.0%
41-50	3	8.0%
51-60	11	44.0%
Missing	5	20.0%
<b>Education</b>		
Bachelor's Degree	16	64.0%
Graduate Degree	8	32.0%
Prefer Not to Say	1	4.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Subject of Degree</b>		
Criminal Justice/Criminology	17	68.0%
Other	7	
Prefer Not to Say	1	4.0%
Missing	0	0.0%

Tables 18 through 37 provide the responses to the individual questions and supervision scenarios included in the online survey completed by probation officers and supervisors.

**Table 18: Conditions Statements**

<i>In your experience as a Probation Officer or Supervisor, do you agree with the following statements about conditions?</i>			
<b>Most probationers have reasonable conditions</b>			
	Number	Percent	Valid Percent
Strongly Agree	6	15.4%	16.2%
Agree	24	61.5%	64.9%
Disagree	6	15.4%	16.2
Strongly Disagree	1	2.6%	2.7%
Missing	2	5.1%	-
Any Agreement	30	76.9%	81.1%
Any Disagreement	7	17.9%	18.9%
<b>Most probationers understand the requirements of their conditions</b>			
Strongly Agree	8	20.5%	21.6%
Agree	24	61.5%	64.9%
Disagree	5	12.8%	13.5%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%	0.0%
Missing	2	5.1%	-
Any Agreement	32	82.1%	86.5%
Any Disagreement	5	12.8%	13.5%
<b>Most probationers are capable of complying with their conditions.</b>			
Strongly Agree	4	10.3%	10.8%
Agree	27	69.2%	73.0%
Disagree	6	15.4%	16.2%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%	0.0%
Missing	2	5.1%	-
Any Agreement	31	79.5%	83.8%
Any Disagreement	6	15.4%	16.2%
<b>Most probationers who do not meet the conditions of their probation are unable to do so because they lack motivation</b>			
Strongly Agree	6	15.4%	16.2%
Agree	11	28.2%	29.7%
Disagree	19	48.7%	51.4%
Strongly Disagree	1	2.6%	2.7%
Missing	2	5.1%	-
Any Agreement	17	43.6%	43.6%

Any Disagreement	20	51.3%	54.1%
<b>Most probationers who do not meet the conditions of their probation are unable to do so because they lack the necessary resources (transportation, income, childcare, social support)</b>			
Strongly Agree	13	33.3%	35.1%
Agree	15	38.5%	40.5%
Disagree	9	23.1%	24.3%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%	0.0%
Missing	2	5.1%	-
Any Agreement	28	71.8%	74.7%
Any Disagreement	9	23.1%	24.3%
<b>The CCAPD has adequate resources to provide treatment or treatment referrals to probationers</b>			
Strongly Agree	3	7.7%	8.1%
Agree	11	28.2%	29.7%
Disagree	16	41.0%	43.2%
Strongly Disagree	7	17.9%	18.9%
Missing	2	5.1%	-
Any Agreement	14	35.9%	37.8%
Any Disagreement	23	59.0%	62.2%
<b>Some probationers fail probation because they have too many conditions</b>			
Strongly Agree	8	20.5%	21.6%
Agree	14	35.9%	37.8%
Disagree	11	28.2%	29.7%
Strongly Disagree	4	10.3%	10.8%
Missing	2	5.1%	-
Any Agreement	22	56.4%	59.5%
Any Disagreement	15	38.5%	40.5%

**Table 19: Average Estimates of Caseload Experiencing Difficulty Meeting Requirements**

<b>What percentage of probationers under your supervision have difficulty meeting their _____ requirements?</b>		
<b>Condition</b>	<b>Average Estimate of Percent on Caseload Having Difficulty</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>
Reporting (Currently)	22.08%	22.9%
Reporting (Prior to COVID)	31.0%	25.1%
Treatment (Prior to COVID)	36.8%	19.1%
Fees (Prior to COVID)	67.6%	22.2%
Community Service (Prior to COVID)	35.4%	20.4%
Drug Testing (Prior to COVID)	39.8%	25.4%

Probation officers only, n=25

**Table 20: Grouped Estimates of Caseload Experiencing Difficulty Meeting Requirements**

<b>What percentage of probationers under your supervision have difficulty meeting their _____ requirements?</b>				
<b>Condition</b>	<b>Estimated Percent of Caseload</b>	<b>Number of Respondents</b>	<b>Percent of Respondents</b>	<b>Valid Percent of Respondents</b>
Reporting (Currently)	0-25%	17	68.0%	70.8%
	26-50%	4	16.0%	16.7%
	51-75%	2	8.0%	8.3%
	76-100%	1	4.0%	4.2%
	Missing	1	4.0%	-
Reporting (Prior to COVID)	0-25%	10	40.0%	-
	26-50%	12	48.0%	-
	51-75%	1	4.0%	-
	76-100%	2	8.0%	-
Treatment (Prior to COVID)	0-25%	7	28.0%	-
	26-50%	13	52.0%	-
	51-75%	5	20.0%	-
	76-100%	0	0.0%	-
Fees (Prior to COVID)	0-25%	1	4.0%	-
	26-50%	4	16.0%	-
	51-75%	11	44.0%	-
	76-100%	9	36.0%	-
Community Service (Prior to COVID)	0-25%	8	65.4%	34.8%
	26-50%	11	15.4%	47.8%
	51-75%	4	7.7%	17.4%
	76-100%	0	3.8%	0.0%
	Missing	2	7.7%	-
Drug Testing (Prior to COVID)	0-25%	8	32.0%	-
	26-50%	11	44.0%	-
	51-75%	5	20.0%	-
	76-100%	1	4.0%	-

Probation officers only, n=25

**Table 21: Reasons Why Some Probationers Have Difficulty Meeting their Requirements**

<b>CURRENTLY, which of the following reasons BEST explains why some probationers have difficulty meeting their <u>REPORTING</u> requirements? (Choose 3)</b>					
		Number	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent Total Factors
Lack Technological Resources or Knowledge	Yes	19	48.7%	52.8%	28.4%
	No	17	43.6%	47.2%	-
	Missing	3	7.7%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Lack Organization or Social Skills	Yes	15	38.5%	41.7%	22.4%
	No	21	53.8%	58.3%	-
	Missing	3	7.7%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Do Not Think they will be Punished or Sanctioned	Yes	12	30.8%	33.3%	17.9%
	No	24	61.5%	66.7%	-
	Missing	3	7.7%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Do No Respect Authority, Laws or Rules	Yes	7	17.9%	19.4%	10.4%
	No	29	74.4%	80.6%	-
	Missing	3	7.7%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Work of Family Commitments	Yes	7	17.9%	19.4%	10.4%
	No	29	74.4%	80.6%	-
	Missing	3	7.7%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Do Not Like the Experience of Reporting Remotely	Yes	3	7.7%	8.3%	4.5%
	No	33	84.6%	91.7%	-
	Missing	3	7.7%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Do Not Feel They Should Have To	Yes	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	No	36	92.3%	100%	-
	Missing	3	7.7%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Other	Yes	4	10.3%	11.1%	6.0%
	No	32	82.1%	88.9%	-
	Missing	3	7.7%	-	-



	Total	39	100%	100%	-
	Total Factors Selected	67	-	-	100%
<b>PRIOR TO COVID-19, which of the following reasons BEST explains why some probationers experienced difficulty meeting their <u>REPORTING</u> requirements? (Choose 3)</b>					
		Number	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent Total Factors
Lack Transportation	Yes	30	76.9%	83.3%	39.0%
	No	6	15.4%	16.7	-
	Missing	3	7.7%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Work or Family Commitments	Yes	17	43.6%	47.2%	22.1%
	No	19	48.7%	52.8%	-
	Missing	3	7.7%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Do Not Think They Will Be Punished or Sanctioned	Yes	16	41.0%	44.4%	20.8%
	No	20	51.3%	55.6%	-
	Missing	3	7.7%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Lack Organization or Social Skills	Yes	11	28.2%	30.6%	14.3%
	No	25	64.1%	69.4%	-
	Missing	3	7.7%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Other	Yes	3	7.7%	8.3%	3.9%
	No	33	84.6%	91.7%	-
	Missing	3	7.7%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Do Not Respect Authority, Rules, or Laws	Yes	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	No	36	92.3%	100%	-
	Missing	3	7.7%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Do Not Feel They Should Have To	Yes	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	No	36	92.3%	100%	-
	Missing	3	7.7%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-

	Total Selected Factors	77	-	-	100%
<b>PRIOR TO COVID-19, which of the following reasons BEST explains why some probationers experienced difficulty meeting their TREATMENT condition? (Choose 3)</b>					
		Number	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent Total Factors
Cannot Afford Associated Costs	Yes	28	71.8%	82.4%	60.9%
	No	6	15.4%	17.6%	-
	Missing	5	12.8%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Work or Family Commitments	Yes	7	17.9%	20.6%	15.2%
	No	27	69.2%	79.4%	-
	Missing	5	12.8%	-	-
	Total	100	100%	100%	-
Lack Organization or Social Skills	Yes	6	15.4%	17.6%	13.0%
	No	28	71.8%	82.4%	-
	Missing	5	12.8%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Do Not Respect Authority, Laws, or Rules	Yes	3	7.7%	8.8%	6.5%
	No	31	79.5%	91.2%	-
	Missing	5	12.8%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Other	Yes	2	5.1%	5.9%	4.3%
	No	32	82.1%	94.1%	-
	Missing	5	12.8%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Do Not Think They Will Be Punished or Sanctioned	Yes	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	No	34	87.2%	100%	-
	Missing	5	12.8%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Lack Transportation	Yes	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	No	34	87.2%	100%	-
	Missing	5	12.8%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
	Total Factors Selected	46	-	-	100%

<b>PRIOR TO COVID-19, which of the following reasons BEST explains why some probationers experienced difficulty meeting their FEE condition? (Choose 3)</b>					
		Number	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent All Factors
Cannot Afford to Pay	Yes	35	89.7%	92.1%	41.2%
	No	3	7.7%	7.9%	-
	Missing	1	2.6%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Do Not Think They Will Be Punished or Sanctioned	Yes	22	56.4%	57.9%	25.9%
	No	16	41.0%	42.1%	-
	Missing	1	2.6%	-	-
	Total	29	100%	100%	-
Believe Fees are Unfair	Yes	21	53.8%	55.3%	24.7%
	No	17	43.6%	44.7%	-
	Missing	1	2.6%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Lack Organization or Social Skills	Yes	6	15.4%	15.8%	7.1%
	No	32	82.1%	84.2%	-
	Missing	1	2.6%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Do Not Respect Authority, Laws, or Rules	Yes	1	2.6%	2.6%	1.2%
	No	37	94.9%	97.4%	-
	Missing	1	2.6%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Do Not Know How to Pay	Yes	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	No	38	97.4%	100%	-
	Missing	1	2.6%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Other	Yes	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	No	38	97.4%	100%	-
	Missing	1	2.6%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Total Factors Selected	85	-	-	-	100%

<b>PRIOR TO COVID-19, which of the following reasons BEST explains why some probationers experienced difficulty meeting their <u>COMMUNITY SERVICE</u> condition? (Choose 3)</b>					
		Number	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent Total Factors
Lack Transportation	Yes	28	71.8%	77.8%	29.5%
	No	8	20.5%	22.2%	-
	Missing	3	7.7%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Kicked out of Placement	Yes	19	48.7%	52.8%	20.0%
	No	17	43.6%	47.2%	-
	Missing	3	7.7%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Work or Family Commitments	Yes	16	41.0%	44.4%	16.8%
	No	20	51.3%	55.6%	-
	Missing	3	7.7%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Unable to Find Appropriate Placement	Yes	10	25.6%	27.8%	10.5%
	No	26	66.7%	72.2%	-
	Missing	3	7.7%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Do Not Believe Com Serv is an Acceptable Condition	Yes	5	12.8%	13.9%	5.3%
	No	31	79.5%	86.1%	-
	Missing	3	7.7%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Do Not Think They Will Be Punished or Sanctioned	Yes	7	17.9%	19.4%	7.4%
	No	29	74.4%	80.6%	-
	Missing	3	7.7%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Lack Organization or Social Skills	Yes	5	12.8%	13.9%	5.3%
	No	31	79.5%	86.1%	-
	Missing	3	7.7%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Do Not Respect Authority, Laws, or Rules	Yes	3	7.7%	8.3%	3.2%
	No	33	84.6%	91.7%	-
	Missing	3	7.7%	-	-

	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Other	Yes	2	5.1%	5.6%	2.1%
	No	34	87.2%	94.4%	-
	Missing	3	7.7%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
	Total Factors Selected	95	-	-	100%
<b>PRIOR TO COVID-19, which of the following reasons BEST explains why some probationers experienced difficulty meeting their <u>DRUG TESTING</u> condition? (Choose 3)</b>					
		Number	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent Total Factor
Addicted to Drugs or Alcohol	Yes	36	92.3%	97.3%	41.4%
	No	1	2.6%	2.7%	-
	Missing	2	5.1%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Do Not Want or Do Not Believe They Need to Stop	Yes	30	76.9%	81.1%	34.5%
	No	7	17.9%	18.9%	-
	Missing	2	5.1%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Do Not Think They Will Be Punished or Sanctioned	Yes	9	23.1%	24.3%	10.3%
	No	28	71.8%	75.7%	-
	Missing	2	5.1%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Cannot Access Drug or Alcohol Treatment	Yes	8	20.5%	21.6%	9.2%
	No	29	74.4%	78.4%	-
	Missing	2	5.1%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Do Not Respect Authority, Laws, or Rules	Yes	3	7.7%	8.1%	3.4%
	No	34	87.2%	91.9%	-
	Missing	2	5.1%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Other	Yes	1	2.6%	2.7%	1.1%
	No	36	92.3%	97.3%	-
	Missing	2	5.1%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
	Total Factors Selected	87	-	-	100%

**Table 22: Filing a Violation of Probation Not Related to New Arrest**

<b>Which of the following factors matter the MOST when determining whether to file a Violation of Probation (VOP) for non-compliance that is not related to a new arrest? (Choose 3)</b>					
		Number	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent Total Factors
Judge's Preference	Yes	30	76.9%	81.1%	30.9%
	No	7	17.9%	18.9%	-
	Missing	2	5.1%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Non-compliance is Repeated	Yes	26	66.7%	70.3%	26.8%
	No	11	28.2%	29.7%	-
	Missing	2	5.1%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Sanctions and Incentives Guidelines	Yes	22	56.4%	59.5%	22.7%
	No	15	38.5%	40.5%	-
	Missing	2	5.1%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Attitude	Yes	7	17.9%	18.9%	7.2%
	No	30	76.9%	81.1%	-
	Missing	2	5.1%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Likelihood of Success on Probation	Yes	4	10.3%	10.8%	4.1%
	No	33	84.6%	89.2%	-
	Missing	2	5.1%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Ability to Meet Probation Conditions	Yes	4	10.3%	10.8%	4.1%
	No	33	84.6%	89.2%	-
	Missing	2	5.1%	-	-
	Total	29	100%	100%	-
Risk Level	Yes	3	7.7%	8.1%	3.1%
	No	34	87.2%	91.9%	-
	Missing	2	5.1%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Likelihood of Committing a New Offense	Yes	1	2.6%	2.7%	1.0%
	No	36	92.3%	97.3%	-
	Missing	2	5.1%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
	Total Factors Selected	97	-	-	100%

**Table 23: Use of Sanctions**

<b>In your experience, which of the following sanctions that probation officers can administer are the most EFFECTIVE at persuading probationers to become compliant with the conditions of their probation? (Choose 3)</b>					
		Number	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent Total Factors
Refer to Treatment	Yes	18	46.2%	52.9%	22.2%
	No	16	41.0%	47.1%	-
	Missing	5	12.8%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Problem-Solving Discussion	Yes	14	35.9%	41.2%	17.3%
	No	20	51.3%	58.8%	-
	Missing	5	12.8%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Increase Frequency of Reporting	Yes	13	33.3%	38.2%	16.0%
	No	21	53.8%	61.8%	-
	Missing	5	12.8%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Formal Reprimand	Yes	12	30.8%	35.3%	14.8%
	No	22	56.4%	64.7%	-
	Missing	5	12.8%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Increase Drug Testing Frequency	Yes	10	25.6%	29.4%	12.3%
	No	24	61.5%	70.6%	-
	Missing	5	12.8%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Assign a Curfew or Increase Curfew Hours	Yes	7	17.9%	20.6%	8.6%
	No	27	69.2%	79.4%	-
	Missing	5	12.8%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Assigning Community Service	Yes	2	5.1%	5.9%	2.5%
	No	32	82.1%	94.1%	-
	Missing	5	12.8%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Require a Thinking Report	Yes	3	7.7%	8.8%	3.7%
	No	31	79.5%	91.2%	-
	Missing	5	12.8%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-

Educational/ Vocational/ Job Readiness Program	Yes	2	5.1%	5.9%	2.5%
	No	32	82.1%	94.1%	-
	Missing	5	12.8%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Educational Video in Office	Yes	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	No	34	87.2%	100%	-
	Missing	5	12.8%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
	Total Selected Factors	81	-	-	100%
<b>Which of the following sanctions do you use the MOST often? (Choose 3)</b>					
		Number	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent Total Factors
Refer to Treatment	Yes	19	48.7%	59.4%	29.2%
	No	13	33.3%	40.6%	-
	Missing	7	17.9%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Increase Drug Testing Frequency	Yes	15	38.5%	46.9%	23.1%
	No	17	43.6%	53.1%	-
	Missing	7	17.9%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Increase Frequency of Reporting	Yes	12	30.8%	37.5%	18.5%
	No	20	51.3%	62.5%	-
	Missing	7	17.9%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Problem- Solving Discussion	Yes	9	23.1%	28.1%	13.8%
	No	23	59.0	71.9%	-
	Missing	7	17.9%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Assign a Curfew or Increase Curfew Hours	Yes	4	10.3%	12.5%	6.2%
	No	28	71.8%	87.5%	-
	Missing	7	17.9%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
	Yes	3	7.7%	9.4%	4.6%



Assigning Community Service	No	29	74.4%	90.6%	-
	Missing	7	17.9%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
					-
Require a Thinking Report	Yes	2	5.1%	6.3%	3.1%
	No	30	76.9%	93.8%	-
	Missing	7	17.9%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
					-
Educational/ Vocational/ Job Readiness Program	Yes	1	2.6%	3.1%	1.5%
	No	31	79.5%	96.9%	-
	Missing	7	17.9%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
					-
Formal Reprimand	Yes	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	No	32	82.1%	100%	-
	Missing	7	17.9%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
					-
Educational Video in Office	Yes	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	No	32	82.1%	100%	-
	Missing	7	17.9%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
	Total Factors Selected	65	-	-	100%

**Table 24: Use of Incentives**

<b>In your experience, which of the following incentives are the most EFFECTIVE at encouraging probationers to continue to meet the conditions of their probation? (Choose 3)</b>					
		Number	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent Total Factors
Verbal Praise	Yes	28	71.8%	75.7%	29.8%
	No	9	23.1%	24.3%	-
	Missing	2	5.1%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Recommend Early Termination	Yes	20	51.3%	54.1%	21.3%
	No	17	43.6%	45.9%	-
	Missing	2	5.1%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Decreased Reporting Requirements	Yes	20	51.3%	54.1%	21.3%
	No	17	43.6%	45.9%	-
	Missing	2	5.1%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Provide Bus Passes	Yes	9	23.1%	24.3%	9.6%
	No	28	71.8%	75.7%	-
	Missing	2	5.1%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Reduced Drug Testing	Yes	8	20.5%	21.6%	8.5%
	No	29	74.4%	78.4%	-
	Missing	2	5.1%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Positive Status Report	Yes	6	15.4%	16.2%	6.4%
	No	31	79.5%	83.8%	-
	Missing	2	5.1%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Letter of Support for work, school, court, etc.	Yes	1	2.6%	2.7%	1.1%
	No	36	92.3%	97.3%	-
	Missing	2	5.1%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Written Recognition/ Certificate	Yes	1	2.6%	2.7%	1.1%
	No	36	92.3%	97.3%	-
	Missing	2	5.1%	-	-

when Program Ends	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Referral to Job Training Program	Yes	1	2.6%	2.7%	1.1%
	No	36	92.3%	97.3%	-
	Missing	2	5.1%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Travel Privileges	Yes	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	No	37	94.9%	100%	-
	Missing	2	5.1%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Written Praise	Yes	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	No	37	94.9%	100%	-
	Missing	2	5.1%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
	Total Factors Selected	94	-	-	100%
<b>Which of the following incentives do you use the MOST often? (choose 3)</b>					
		Number	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent Total Factors
Verbal Praise	Yes	30	76.9%	83.3%	39.5%
	No	6	15.4%	16.7%	-
	Missing	3	7.7%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Decreased Reporting Requirements	Yes	15	38.5%	41.7%	19.7%
	No	21	53.8%	58.3%	-
	Missing	3	7.7%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Recommend Early Termination	Yes	11	28.2%	30.6%	14.5%
	No	25	64.1%	69.4%	-
	Missing	3	7.7%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Reduced Drug Testing	Yes	7	17.9%	19.4%	9.2%
	No	29	74.4%	80.6%	-
	Missing	3	7.7%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
	Yes	6	15.4%	16.7%	7.9%

Positive Status Report	No	30	76.9%	83.3%	-
	Missing	3	7.7%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Provide Bus Passes	Yes	5	12.8%	13.9%	6.6%
	No	31	79.5%	86.1%	-
	Missing	3	7.7%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Written Recognition/ Certificate when Program Ends	Yes	2	5.1%	5.6%	2.6%
	No	34	87.2%	94.4%	-
	Missing	3	7.7%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Letter of Support for work, school, court, etc.	Yes	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	No	36	92.3%	100%	-
	Missing	3	7.7%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Travel Privileges	Yes	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	No	36	92.3%	100%	-
	Missing	3	7.7%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Written Praise	Yes	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	No	36	92.3%	100%	-
	Missing	3	7.7%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
Referral to Job Training Program	Yes	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	No	36	92.3%	100%	-
	Missing	3	7.7%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
	Total Factors Selected	76	-	-	100%

**Table 25: Perceptions of Sanctions and Incentives**

<i>In your experience as a Probation Supervisor, do you agree with the following statements?</i>			
<b>Sanctions from PO are effective at encouraging probationers to meet the conditions of their probation</b>			
	Number	Percent	Valid Percent
Strongly Agree	4	10.3%	11.1%
Agree	19	48.7%	52.8%
Disagree	10	25.6%	27.8%
Strongly Disagree	3	7.7%	8.3%
Missing	3	7.7%	-
Any Agreement	23	59.0%	63.9%
Any Disagreement	13	33.3%	36.1%
<b>When a probationer is meeting their conditions of probation, they deserve an incentive or reward</b>			
Strongly Agree	9	23.1%	25.7%
Agree	14	35.9%	40.0%
Disagree	11	28.2%	31.4%
Strongly Disagree	1	2.6%	2.9%
Missing	4	10.3%	-
Any Agreement	23	59.0%	65.7%
Any Disagreement	12	30.8%	34.3%
<b>Incentives or rewards from POs are effective at encouraging probationers to meet the terms of their probation</b>			
Strongly Agree	7	17.9%	19.4%
Agree	19	48.7%	52.8%
Disagree	9	23.1%	25.0%
Strongly Disagree	1	2.6%	2.8%
Missing	3	7.7%	-
Any Agreement	26	66.7%	72.2%
Any Disagreement	10	25.6%	27.8%
<b>I received adequate training on using the Sanctions and Incentives Chart</b>			
Strongly Agree	9	23.1%	25.0%
Agree	10	25.6%	27.8%
Disagree	13	33.3%	36.1%
Strongly Disagree	4	10.3%	11.1%
Missing	3	7.7%	-
Any Agreement	19	48.7%	52.8%
Any Disagreement	17	43.6%	47.2%
<b>I regularly consult the Sanctions and Incentives Chart when probationers under my supervision are noncompliant</b>			

Strongly Agree	6	15.4%	16.7%
Agree	12	30.8%	33.3%
Disagree	15	38.5%	41.7%
Strongly Disagree	3	7.7%	8.3%
Missing	3	7.7%	-
Any Agreement	18	46.2%	50.0%
Any Disagreement	18	46.2%	50.0%
<b>The CCAPD has adequate resources to provide appropriate incentives to probationers</b>			
Strongly Agree	4	10.3%	11.1%
Agree	7	17.9%	19.4%
Disagree	9	23.1%	25.0%
Strongly Disagree	16	41.0%	44.4%
Missing	3	7.7%	-
Any Agreement	11	28.2%	30.6%
Any Disagreement	25	64.1%	69.4%
<b>The CCAPD has adequate resources to provide appropriate sanctions to probationers</b>			
Strongly Agree	3	7.7%	8.3%
Agree	18	46.2%	50.0%
Disagree	11	28.2%	30.6%
Strongly Disagree	4	10.3%	11.1%
Missing	3	7.7%	-
Any Agreement	21	53.8%	53.8%
Any Disagreement	15	38.5%	38.5%

**Table 26: Perceptions of Filing a Violation of Probation**

<b>It is appropriate to consider whether the charges will be dropped before filing a Violation of Probation for misdemeanor level offenses</b>			
Strongly Agree	0	0.0%	0.0%
Agree	6	15.4%	16.7%
Disagree	14	35.9%	38.9%
Strongly Disagree	16	41.0%	44.4%
Missing	3	7.7%	-
Any Agreement	6	15.4%	16.7%
Any Disagreement	30	76.9%	83.3%
<b>It is appropriate to consider the nature of the offense before filing a Violation of Probation for misdemeanor level offenses</b>			
Strongly Agree	0	0.0%	0.0%
Agree	8	20.5%	22.2%
Disagree	13	33.3%	36.1%
Strongly Disagree	15	38.5%	41.7%
Missing	3	7.7%	-
Any Agreement	8	20.5%	22.2%
Any Disagreement	28	71.8%	77.8%
<b>Some judges prefer that probation officers not file a Violation of Probation for lesser misdemeanor arrests such as public intoxication or jumping a turnstile</b>			
Strongly Agree	4	10.3%	11.1%
Agree	6	15.4%	16.7%
Disagree	10	25.6%	27.8%
Strongly Disagree	16	41.0%	44.4%
Missing	3	7.7%	-
Any Agreement	10	25.6%	27.8%
Any Disagreement	26	66.7%	72.2%

**Table 27: Adapted Community Corrections Officer Orientation Scale**

*Our adapted version of the Community Corrections Officer Orientation Scale is a 15-item, self-report, semantic differential scale. It is intended for use with probation and parole officers in understanding how they emphasize the demands of their role. Low scores (more than one standard deviation below the mean) indicate an officer primarily takes a law enforcement approach to their work (emphasizing compliance with supervision rules over rehabilitation). High scores (more than one standard deviation above the mean) indicate that an officer takes an approach similar to a social worker (emphasizing rehabilitation over supervision rules). Scores in the middle reflect a midway point between the two approaches.*

	<b>N</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>Max</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
<b>Total</b>	36	52	105	71.3	10.9
<b>Law Enforcement</b>	5	52	60	56.6	3.1
<b>Synthesis</b>	26	61	82	70.4	6.2
<b>Social Worker</b>	5	84	105	90.2	8.6



**Table 28: Scenario 1**

<b>Scenario 1: Low Risk, Technical Violation*</b>					
Please consider that this probation client is a 25-year-old who is employed full-time at Panera. This person is on probation for a class 3 felony theft and has scored a 14 on the ARA-CST risk assessment. Probation started three months ago. This person has no other criminal history. Client has missed their first two probation appointments, has made only one partial monthly payment toward costs and fees, and has not yet signed up for court mandated community service. If this person were to experience the event below, how would you most likely encourage the PO to respond? Client fails to report for their third probation appointment but called to report that they have lost their bus pass and cannot find transportation.					
<b>How likely are you to encourage the PO to provide support in response to this scenario?</b>					
		Number	Percent	Valid Percent	
Very Likely		9	23.1%	-	
Likely		17	43.6%	-	
Unlikely		11	28.2%	-	
Very Unlikely		2	5.1%	-	
Any Likely		26	66.7%	-	
Any Unlikely		13	33.3%	-	
<b>How likely are you to encourage the PO to administer sanctions in response to this scenario?</b>					
Very Likely		11	28.2%	-	
Likely		14	35.9%	-	
Unlikely		12	30.8%	-	
Very Unlikely		2	5.1%	-	
Any Likely		25	64.1%	-	
Any Unlikely		14	35.9%	-	
<b>How likely are you to encourage the PO to file a technical violation in response to this scenario?</b>					
Very Likely		8	20.5%	21.1%	
Likely		7	17.9%	18.4%	
Unlikely		17	43.6%	44.7%	
Very Unlikely		6	15.4%	15.8%	
Missing		1	2.6%	-	
Any Likely		15	39.5%	-	
Any Unlikely		23	60.5%	-	
<b>Which factors influenced your response(s) above? (Choose 3)</b>					
		Number	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent Total Factor
Being 25 Years Old	Yes	4	10.3%	10.5%	3.7%
	No	34	87.2%	89.5%	-
	Missing	1	2.6%	-	-

	Total	39	100%	100%	-
					-
Having full-time employment	Yes	19	48.7%	50.0%	17.4%
	No	19	48.7%	50.0%	-
	Missing	1	2.6%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
					-
Original Offense was Class 3 Theft	Yes	1	2.6%	23.7%	0.9%
	No	37	94.9%	76.3%	-
	Missing	1	2.6%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
					-
Scored 14 on the ARA-CST Risk Assessment	Yes	9	23.1%	23.7%	8.3%
	No	29	74.4%	76.3%	-
	Missing	1	2.6%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
					-
No previous offenses	Yes	8	20.5%	21.1%	7.3%
	No	30	76.9%	78.9%	-
	Missing	1	2.6%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
					-
One partial payment towards costs and fees	Yes	2	5.1%	5.3%	1.8%
	No	36	92.3%	94.7%	-
	Missing	1	2.6%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
					-
Been on Probation 3 months	Yes	12	30.8%	31.6%	11.0%
	No	26	66.7%	68.4%	-
	Missing	1	2.6%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
					-
Missed first two probation appointments	Yes	20	51.3%	52.6%	18.3%
	No	18	46.2%	47.4%	-
	Missing	1	2.6%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
					-
Failure to sign up for community services	Yes	4	10.3%	10.5%	3.7%
	No	34	87.2%	89.5%	-
	Missing	1	2.6%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
					-
Missed Third Appointment	Yes	20	51.3%	52.6%	18.3%
	No	18	46.2%	47.4%	-
	Missing	1	2.6%	-	-

	Total	39	100%	100%	-
					-
Lost Bus Pass	Yes	10	25.6%	26.3%	9.2%
	No	28	71.8%	73.7%	-
	Missing	1	2.6%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-

**Table 29: Scenario 1 Factors Considered by VOP Response**

Factors Considered	Likely to File VOP		Unlikely to File VOP	
	Number of Identifications	Percent of Total Factors Identified	Number of Identifications	Percent of Total Factors Identified
Age	1	2.2%	3	4.8%
Employment	7	15.6%	12	19.0%
Class 3	1	2.2%	0	0.0%
Risk	2	4.4%	7	11.1%
Crim Hist	1	2.2%	7	11.1%
Fees	1	2.2%	1	1.6%
ProbationTime	4	8.9%	8	12.7%
Appointments	12	26.7%	7	11.1%
ComService	4	8.9%	0	0.0%
ThirdAppt	12	26.7%	8	12.7%
Lost Bus Pass	0	0.0%	10	15.9%
Total Factors Identified	45	100%	63	100%

**Table 30: Scenario 2**

<b>Scenario 2: Low Risk, driving without license Arrest</b>				
<p>For the same person mentioned previously, please consider that this probation client has NOT missed their third appointment. Instead, the client has been arrested for allegedly driving with a suspended license. It's unclear whether the charges will be dropped. Recall that this probation client is a 25-year-old who is employed full-time at Panera. This person is on probation for a class 3 felony theft and has scored a 14 on the ARA-CST risk assessment. Probation started three months ago. This person has no other criminal history. Client has missed their first two probation appointments, has made only one partial monthly payment toward costs and fees, and has not yet signed up for court mandated community service.</p>				
<b>How likely are you to encourage the PO to provide support in response to this scenario?</b>				
		Number	Percent	
Very Likely		6	15.4%	
Likely		16	41.0%	
Unlikely		12	30.8%	
Very Unlikely		5	12.8%	
Any Likely		22	56.4%	
Any Unlikely		17	43.6%	
<b>How likely are you to encourage the PO to administer sanctions in response to this scenario?</b>				
Very Likely		13	33.3%	
Likely		8	20.5%	
Unlikely		7	17.9%	
Very Unlikely		11	28.2%	
Any Likely		21	53.8%	
Any Unlikely		18	46.2%	
<b>How likely are you to encourage the PO to file a technical violation in response to this scenario?</b>				
Very Likely		30	76.9%	
Likely		6	15.4%	
Unlikely		2	5.1%	
Very Unlikely		1	2.6%	
Any Likely		36	92.3%	
Any Unlikely		3	7.7%	
<b>Which factors influenced your response(s) above? (Choose 3)</b>				
		Number	Percent	Percent Total Factor
Being 25 Years Old	Yes	2	5.1%	2.2%
	No	37	94.9%	-

Having full-time employment	Yes	6	15.4%	6.5%
	No	33	84.6%	-
Original Offense was Class 3 Theft	Yes	1	2.6%	1.1%
	No	38	97.4%	-
Scored 14 on the ARA-CST Risk Assessment	Yes	0	0.0%	0.0%
	No	39	100%	-
No previous offenses	Yes	4	10.3%	4.3%
	No	35	89.7%	-
One partial payment towards costs and fees	Yes	0	0.0%	0.0%
	No	39	100%	-
Been on Probation 3 months	Yes	9	23.1%	9.7%
	No	30	76.9%	-
Missed first two probation appointments	Yes	18	46.2%	19.4%
	No	21	53.8%	-
Failure to sign up for community services	Yes	5	12.8%	5.4%
	No	34	87.2%	-
Allegedly driving with suspended license	Yes	33	84.6%	35.5%
	No	6	15.4%	-
Unclear whether charges will be dropped	Yes	15	38.5%	16.1%
	No	24	61.5%	-

**Table 31: Scenario 2 Factors Considered by VOP Response**

Factors Considered	Likely to File VOP		Unlikely to File VOP	
	Number of Identifications	Percent of Total Factors Identified	Number of Identifications	Percent of Total Factors Identified
Age	2	2.4%	0	0.0%
Employment	4	4.8%	2	22.2%
Class 3	1	1.2%	0	0.0%
Risk	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Crim Hist	2	2.4%	2	22.2%
Fees	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
ProbationTime	6	7.1%	3	33.3%
Appointments	17	20.2%	1	11.1%
ComService	5	6.0%	0	0.0%
License	33	39.3%	0	0.0%
ChargesDropped	14	16.7%	1	11.1%
Total Factors Identified	84	100%	9	100%

**Table 32: Scenario 3**

<b>Scenario 3: High Risk, Compliant, Arrested and charges dropped</b>				
<p>For questions below, please consider that this client is a 40 -year-old who is unemployed and does not have a stable residence. This person is on probation for a class 4 felony possession of a controlled substance and scored 23 on the ARA-CST Risk Assessment. This person has been unable to find employment due to their criminal history but is attending job fairs and filling out applications. This client has a criminal history of theft and drug related charges. The court liaison reports that the client has a history of acting impulsively, responding angrily, and having little regard for others. Since starting probation six months ago, this client has attended weekly substance abuse treatment, met with PO regularly, and signed up for GED courses at a local adult learning center. This person denies current drug use and has tested negative on monthly drug screens. If this person were to experience the event below, how would you most likely encourage the PO to respond?</p> <p>Client was arrested for shoplifting, but the charges were dropped due to lack of evidence.</p>				
<b>How likely are you to encourage the PO to provide support in response to this scenario?</b>				
	Number	Percent	Valid Percent	
Very Likely	16	41.0%	-	
Likely	16	41.0%	-	
Unlikely	6	15.4%	-	
Very Unlikely	1	2.6%	-	
Any Likely	32	82.1%	-	
Any Unlikely	7	17.9%	-	
<b>How likely are you to encourage the PO to administer sanctions in response to this scenario?</b>				
Very Likely	3	7.7%	7.9%	
Likely	14	35.9%	36.8%	
Unlikely	12	30.8%	31.6%	
Very Unlikely	9	23.1%	23.7%	
Missing	1	2.6%	-	
Any Likely	17	44.7%	-	
Any Unlikely	21	55.3%	-	
<b>How likely are you to encourage the PO to file a technical violation in response to this scenario?</b>				
Very Likely	14	35.9%	-	
Likely	9	23.1%	-	
Unlikely	10	25.6%	-	
Very Unlikely	6	15.4%	-	
Any Likely	23	59.0%	-	
Any Unlikely	16	41.0%	-	
<b>Which factors influenced your response(s) above? (Choose 3)</b>				
		Number	Percent	Percent Total Factors
Being 40 Years Old	Yes	0	0.0%	0.0%

	No	39	100%	-
				-
Unemployed	Yes	2	5.1%	2.2%
	No	37	94.9%	-
				-
Lack of stable residence	Yes	3	7.7%	3.3%
	No	36	92.3%	-
				-
Seeking employment	Yes	1	2.6%	1.1%
	No	38	97.4%	-
				-
Original Offense was Class 4 possession	Yes	1	2.6%	1.1%
	No	38	97.4%	-
				-
Scored 23 on the ARA-CST Risk Assessment	Yes	3	7.7%	3.3%
	No	36	92.3%	-
				-
Significant Criminal History	Yes	6	15.4%	6.6%
	No	33	84.6%	-
				-
History of Impulsive Behavior	Yes	5	12.8%	5.5%
	No	34	87.2%	-
				-
History of anger towards others with little regard	Yes	2	5.1%	2.2%
	No	37	94.9%	-
				-
Been on probation for 6 months	Yes	0	0.0%	0.0%
	No	39	100%	-
				-
Attends regular probation meetings	Yes	13	33.3%	14.3%
	No	26	66.7%	-
				-
Initially signed up for GED course	Yes	3	7.7%	3.3%
	No	36	92.3%	-
				-
Negative monthly drug screens	Yes	13	33.3%	14.3%
	No	26	66.7%	-
				-
	Yes	23	59.0%	14.3%



Client arrested for shoplifting	No	16	41.0%	-
				-
Charges ultimately dropped	Yes	16	41.0%	17.6%
	No	23	59.0%	-

**Table 33: Scenario 3 Factors Considered by VOP Response**

Factors Considered	Likely to File VOP		Unlikely to File VOP	
	Number of Identifications	Percent of Total Factors Identified	Number of Identifications	Percent of Total Factors Identified
Age	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Employment	0	0.0%	2	5.0%
Residence	1	2.3%	2	5.0%
SeekEmployment	0	0.0%	1	2.5%
Class4	1	2.3%	0	0.0%
Risk	1	2.3%	2	5.0%
CrimHistory	4	9.1%	2	5.0%
Impulsive	3	6.8%	2	5.0%
Anger	2	4.5%	0	0.0%
ProbationTime	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Meetings	4	9.1%	4	10.0%
GED	1	2.3%	2	5.0%
DrugScreen	3	6.8%	10	25.0%
Shoplifting	21	47.7%	2	5.0%
ChargesDropped	3	6.8%	11	27.5%
Total Factors Identified	44	100%	40	100%

**Table 34: Scenario 4**

<b>Scenario 4: high risk, compliant, tested positive for drugs</b>			
<p>For the same person mentioned previously, please consider that instead of being arrested for shoplifting, the client has tested positive for heroin on their most recent drug test. Please remember that this probation client is a 40 -year-old who is unemployed and does not have a stable residence. This person is on probation for a class 4 felony possession of a controlled substance and scored 23 on the ARA-CST Risk Assessment. This person has been unable to find employment due to their criminal history but is attending job fairs and filling out applications. This client has a criminal history of theft and drug related charges. The court liaison reports that the client has a history of acting impulsively, responding angrily, and having little regard for others. Since starting probation six months ago, this client has attended weekly substance abuse treatment, met with PO regularly, and signed up for GED courses at a local adult learning center. This person denies current drug use and has tested negative on previous monthly drug screens.</p>			
<b>How likely are you to encourage the PO to provide support in response to this scenario?</b>			
	Number	Percent	Valid Percent
Very Likely	22	56.4%	57.9%
Likely	12	30.8%	31.6%
Unlikely	0	0.0%	0.0%
Very Unlikely	3	10.3%	10.5%
Missing	1	2.6%	-
Any Likely	34	91.9%	-
Any Unlikely	3	8.1%	-
<b>How likely are you to encourage the PO to administer sanctions in response to this scenario?</b>			
Very Likely	17	43.6%	-
Likely	13	33.3%	-
Unlikely	4	10.3%	-
Very Unlikely	4	10.3%	-
Missing	1	2.6%	-
Any Likely	30	78.9%	-
Any Unlikely	8	21.1%	-
<b>How likely are you to encourage the PO to file a technical violation in response to this scenario?</b>			
Very Likely	11	28.2%	-
Likely	5	12.8%	-
Unlikely	14	35.9%	-
Very Unlikely	7	17.9%	-
Missing	2	5.1%	-
Any Likely	16	43.2%	-
Any Unlikely	21	56.8%	-

<b>Which factors influenced your response(s) above? (Choose 3)</b>					
		Number	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent Total Factor
Being 40 Years Old	Yes	2	5.1%	5.4%	2.4%
	No	35	89.7%	94.6%	-
	Missing	2	5.1%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
					-
Unemployed	Yes	5	12.8%	13.5%	6.1%
	No	32	82.1%	86.5%	-
	Missing	2	2.6%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
					-
Lack of stable residence	Yes	3	7.7%	8.1%	3.7%
	No	34	87.2%	91.9%	-
	Missing	2	5.1%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
					-
Original Offense was Class 4 Possession	Yes	4	10.3%	10.8%	4.9%
	No	33	84.6%	89.2%	-
	Missing	2	5.1%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
					-
Scored 23 on the ARA-CST Risk Assessment	Yes	4	10.3%	10.8%	4.9%
	No	33	84.6%	89.2%	-
	Missing	2	5.1%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
					-
Seeking Employment	Yes	2	5.1%	5.4%	2.4%
	No	35	89.7%	94.6%	-
	Missing	2	5.1%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
					-
Significant criminal history	Yes	5	12.8%	13.5%	6.1%
	No	32	82.1%	86.5%	-
	Missing	2	5.1%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
					-
History of impulsive behavior	Yes	5	12.8%	13.5%	6.1%
	No	32	82.1%	86.5%	-
	Missing	2	5.1%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
					-
History of anger	Yes	1	2.6%	2.7%	1.2%
	No	36	92.3%	97.3%	-

towards others with little regard	Missing	2	5.1%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
					-
Been on probation for 6 months	Yes	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	No	37	94.9%	100%	-
	Missing	2	5.1%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
					-
Attends regular probation meetings	Yes	16	41.0%	43.2%	19.5%
	No	21	53.8%	56.8%	-
	Missing	2	5.1%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
					-
Initially signed up for GED course	Yes	4	10.3%	10.8%	4.9%
	No	33	84.6%	89.2%	-
	Missing	2	5.1%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
					-
Positive drug test for heroin	Yes	31	79.5%	83.8%	37.8%
	No	6	15.4%	16.2%	-
	Missing	2	5.1%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-

**Table 35: Scenario 4 Factors Considered by VOP Response**

Factors Considered	Likely to File VOP		Unlikely to File VOP	
	Number of Identifications	Percent of Total Factors Identified	Number of Identifications	Percent of Total Factors Identified
Age	1	2.6%	1	2.4%
Employment	3	7.9%	2	4.8%
Residence	1	2.6%	2	4.8%
Class4	4	10.5%	0	0.0%
Risk	4	10.5%	0	0.0%
SeekEmployment	0	0.0%	2	4.8%
CrimHistory	3	7.9%	2	4.8%
Impulsive	3	7.9%	2	4.8%
Anger	0	0.0%	1	2.4%
Probation	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Meetings	3	7.9%	12	28.6%
GED	1	2.6%	3	7.1%
Heroin	15	39.5%	15	35.7%
Total Factors Identified	38	100%	42	100%

**Table 36: Scenario 5**

<b>Scenario 5: High Risk, Non-Compliant with Treatment, Drug</b>					
<p>For questions below, please consider that this probation client is a 35-year-old who is unemployed and does not have a stable residence. This person is on probation for class 3 felony theft and scored 22 on the ARA-CST Risk Assessment. This person has been unable to find employment due to their criminal history and has stopped attending job fairs or filling out applications. This client has a criminal history of theft and drug related charges. The court liaison reports that the client has a history of acting impulsively, responding angrily, and having little regard for others. Since starting probation six months ago, this client has not yet signed up for court-mandated treatment for substance abuse. If this person were to experience the event below, how would you most likely encourage the PO to respond? Client tests positive for methamphetamine on their most recent drug test.</p>					
<b>How likely are you to encourage the PO to provide support in response to this scenario?</b>					
	Number	Percent	Valid Percent		
Very Likely	18	46.2%	50.0%		
Likely	13	33.3%	36.1%		
Unlikely	3	7.7%	8.3%		
Very Unlikely	2	5.1%	5.6%		
Missing	3	7.7%	-		
Any Likely	31	86.1%	-		
Any Unlikely	5	13.9%	-		
<b>How likely are you to encourage the PO to administer sanctions in response to this scenario?</b>					
Very Likely	21	53.8%	58.3%		
Likely	10	25.6%	27.8%		
Unlikely	3	7.7%	8.3%		
Very Unlikely	2	5.1%	5.6%		
Missing	3	7.7%	-		
Any Likely	31	86.1%	-		
Any Unlikely	5	13.9%	-		
<b>How likely are you to encourage the PO to file a technical violation in response to this scenario?</b>					
Very Likely	17	43.6%	47.2%		
Likely	9	23.1%	25.0%		
Unlikely	6	15.4%	16.7%		
Very Unlikely	4	10.3%	11.1%		
Missing	3	7.7%	-		
Any Likely	26	72.2%	-		
Any Unlikely	10	27.8%	-		
<b>Which factors influenced your response(s) above? (Choose 3)</b>					
		Number	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent Total Factor

Being 35 Years Old	Yes	1	2.6%	2.9%	1.2%
	No	34	87.2%	97.1%	-
	Missing	4	10.3%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
					-
Unemployed	Yes	2	5.1%	5.7%	2.5%
	No	33	84.6%	94.3%	-
	Missing	4	10.3%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
					-
Lack of Stable Residence	Yes	1	2.6%	2.9%	1.2%
	No	34	87.2%	97.1%	-
	Missing	4	10.3%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
					-
Not seeking employment	Yes	5	12.8%	14.3%	6.2%
	No	30	76.9%	85.7%	-
	Missing	4	10.3%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
					-
Original offense was Class 3 theft	Yes	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	No	35	89.7%	100%	-
	Missing	4	10.3%	-	-
	Total	29	100%	100%	-
					-
Scored 22 on the ARA-CST Risk Assessment	Yes	4	10.3%	11.4%	4.9%
	No	31	79.5%	88.6%	-
	Missing	4	10.3%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
					-
History of impulsive behavior	Yes	1	2.6%	2.9%	1.2%
	No	34	87.2%	97.1%	-
	Missing	4	10.3%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
					-
History of anger towards others with little regard	Yes	3	7.7%	8.6%	3.7%
	No	32	82.1%	91.4%	-
	Missing	4	10.3%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
					-
Having been on probation for 6 months	Yes	5	12.8%	14.3%	6.2%
	No	30	76.9%	85.7%	-
	Missing	4	10.3%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
					-

Failure to sign up for court mandated treatment	Yes	27	69.2%	77.1%	33.3%
	No	8	20.5%	22.9%	-
	Missing	4	10.3%	-	-
	Total	39	100%	100%	-
					-
Positive drug test for methamphetamines	Yes	32	82.1%	88.9%	39.5%
	No	4	10.3%	11.1%	-
	Missing	3	7.7%	-	-
	Total	3	100%	100%	-

**Table 37: Scenario 5 Factors Considered by VOP Response**

Factors Considered	Likely to File VOP		Unlikely to File VOP	
	Number of Identifications	Percent of Total Factors Identified	Number of Identifications	Percent of Total Factors Identified
Age	1	1.6%	0	0.0%
Employment	1	1.6%	1	4.8%
Residence	0	0.0%	1	4.8%
Class4	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Risk	4	6.5%	0	0.0%
SeekEmployment	2	3.2%	0	0.0%
CrimHistory	1	1.6%	0	0.0%
Impulsive	3	4.8%	0	0.0%
Anger	3	4.8%	2	9.5%
ProbationTime	3	4.8%	2	9.5%
Treatment	22	35.5%	5	23.8%
Meth	22	35.5%	10	47.6%
Total Factors Identified	62	100%	21	100%