

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

Collection: Reagan, Ronald: Gubernatorial Papers,
1966-74: Press Unit

Folder Title: [Corrections, Board of] –
Coordinated California Corrections:
Field Services, July 1971 (5 of 5)

Box: P33

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digital-library>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/document-collection>

Contact a reference archivist at: reagan.library@nara.gov

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/citing>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

"The releasee's behavior is highly influenced by the people around him, whether he is participating in groups within the community or as a resident in the treatment center.

"The resident's use and impression of the group experience has been highly significant. It is appropriate, therefore, that this type of treatment not be suddenly cut off when the resident returns to the community. Treatment of the releasee is a total program encompassing the treatment center and field experience. The group experience and the releasee's adjustment to these new experiences while at the treatment center play a major part in determining his readiness for release. Therefore, the continuation of group treatment by field personnel will be an integral part of the releasee's program in the community."³⁰

The NAOP Manual indicates that three types of groups will be provided for releasees:

- . Reality Centered Groups: The purpose of this group, as stated in the Manual, is: "Initially, these groups will be used by the releasee for identification and carry-over of institutional culture." After a period of time, ". . . they will act as a problem-solving arena and supportive body to assist in a positive social orientation."³¹ These groups are held once a week.
- . Unemployed Groups: These sessions have no specific purpose other than, "areas for review during these sessions should include such things as how to look for work, how to act, dress, speak, make proper contacts, etc."³² These groups are held only with unemployed clients, hopefully to serve as a stimulus for job hunting, as the Manual states, "If one isn't working, then one is hard at work looking for a job."³³ Counseling for unemployed clients is mandatory on a weekly basis.
- . Family Groups: "Although family groups will not be a mandatory requirement, they are something which deserve considerable thought."³⁴

"Treatment of persons to whom the releasee is frequently exposed seems essential."³⁵

At first glance, these provisions for group counseling appear to be sound. But in interview situations, both parole agents and clients were of the opinion that the process is much less productive than it should be. One agent, for example, made this observation:

"... if we are grouping, it must be functional in relation to the agency's goals. As it now stands, grouping is not functional but diametrically opposed to some of the other practices of the workers. Specifically, it is opposed to the terms and conditions of association between clients. Furthermore, in many respects it provides the clients with an opportunity to present a united front of opposition to the parole agent and the system which he represents."

There is much to be said for this point of view. If group counseling is to be effective, it must provide an atmosphere conducive to freedom of expression. How this is to be achieved when today's parole agent becomes tonight's group leader is difficult to imagine. There is also the problem that many clients do not respond well to any of the group therapies. Insisting that they attend group sessions may produce temporary compliance, but it will not alter basic patterns of behavior. Those who volunteer for this kind of treatment stand the best chance of changed behavior.

A final comment with respect to group counseling is that this is a specialized field requiring considerable training and experience. Many agents, of their own accord, said they had had no such training and that the process made them "uncomfortable". The implications for training in this area are self-evident.

Detecting Drug Usage. Methods used by NAOP for detecting client drug usage are: (1) naline testing; (2) urinalysis; (3) skin check; and (4) the client/parole agent relationship. Anti-narcotic testing is generally done on a surprise basis, with less than forty-eight hours notice to the client. Routine testing may be administered wherever the parole agent feels this is in the best interest of a particular client. It is expected that urine samples will be taken under the direct observation of the person obtaining the sample.

Chemical anti-narcotic tests are administered by a qualified physician and his decision regarding the results is final. The medical consultant is responsible for developing contracts with testing laboratories, keeping abreast of programs being carried out in other jurisdictions and other states, and for consultation with parole agents concerning any unusual medical aspects of a given case.

Testing objectives are as follows:

1. Deterrent of drug use
2. Early detection
3. Support of abstinence
4. Early treatment of relapse³⁶

This segment of the treatment program is the prime control factor for outpatients, and was viewed by the majority of agents interviewed as the surest method of control available to them at the present time. However, Task Force staff discovered that associated psychological reactions to testing tended in many cases to violate the principle of positive reinforcement (encouragement and reward for new learning, modified behavior, etc.). Not all, but most of the clients interviewed said that they resent the testing programs. They feel that the surprise element is an unfair intrusion on their time and that it implies an unwarranted lack of faith in their own efforts against relapse. One client said: "The whole deal just makes me mad. Sometimes I go back on the stuff just to pay them back." (If true, this is unfortunate, but admittedly the statement may be of doubtful veracity.)

Comment. It is difficult to know how client attitudes of this sort can be counteracted. Like everyone else, addicts need to feel that they have worth. Yet the very act of turning to drugs suggests that they do not have a very high opinion of themselves. In addition, once addicted, many of them see drugs as the "right" way of life and are not at all interested in giving up the habit.

The implications for both addicts and the public at large are clear. Addiction is not only physically harmful but it also leads to unlawful behavior which harms society. Accordingly, there seems to be no recourse but to apply whatever controls appear most promising in efforts to reduce the incidence of re-addiction and the proclivity for continued criminal activity.

The Methadone Maintenance Program. After following the progress of New York's Methadone Program, and in anticipation of the law authorizing methadone maintenance in California, the CDC, NAEA, and NAOP, in 1970, formulated policies and criteria for addict participation in such a program. The full policy statement will be found in Appendix A.

At present time, there are approximately 130 civil addicts on methadone maintenance in California. However, ninety percent of the Civil Addict Program's population are ineligible for methadone treatment due to mixed drug use, heavy use of alcohol, and abuse of amphetamines and barbiturates. For those who do meet eligibility requirements, the Authority has stated that methadone treatment will not be introduced until every effort has been made to help them manage their lives without the aid of drugs. This same effort will be carried over into the methadone program.

Comment. There are those who feel that methadone maintenance is unwise since, like other drugs, it camouflages causative factors leading to addiction. The argument is valid, but it is also applicable to mentally disturbed persons for whom tranquilizing drugs are prescribed daily, and who otherwise would be unamenable to auxiliary treatment services. Another argument against methadone, advanced both by lay persons and many professionals, is that it is foolish to substitute one addictive drug for another.

True, methadone is addictive. But it produces less violent physiological reaction than do the hard drugs and for many addicts it eliminates the need for opiate use. Add to this the likelihood of concomitant reduction in criminal activity and the fact that methadone is applied under tightly controlled conditions, and it would seem that the advantages of methadone maintenance outweigh the disadvantages for a carefully selected group of clients.

In California, the methadone program is just getting underway, and almost certainly various changes and adjustments will be necessary from time to time. Nevertheless, Task Force staff see it as a welcome and important addition to existing treatment methods.

Program Effectiveness

The magnitude and complexity of NAOP makes it very difficult to measure program effectiveness with any precision. In the correctional field, "effective" is usually taken to mean that rehabilitative efforts have been completely successful. Yet NAOP some time ago concluded that a full-fledged "cure" for addiction is highly improbable and that a much more realistic goal was to strive for the highest degree and longest period of abstinence possible.

Toward that end, several additional provisions have been added to the original program. One of them, entitled "Suspend-Reinstatements", has been designed to permit the client's retention in the community wherever it appears that this arrangement will more effectively benefit the individual and society. Another is the "Limited Placement Program" whereby an outpatient may be returned to the institution for a period not to exceed sixty days for structured inpatient treatment, detoxification, or whatever other type of specialized treatment appears necessary.

For some time now, the main thrust of the overall Civil Addict Program has been to release increasing numbers of persons to outpatient status. The figures in Table X, supplied by the NAEA, reflect the results of that endeavor.

TABLE X
CIVIL ADDICT PROGRAM POPULATION MOVEMENT

DATE	TOTAL	INSTITUTION	ACTIVE	INACTIVE
			OUTPATIENT STATUS	OUTPATIENT STATUS
December 31, 1968	6,235	2,856 (46%)	2,314 (37%)	1,065 (17%)
December 31, 1969	7,076	3,132 (44%)	2,867 (41%)	1,077 (15%)
December 31, 1970	8,110	2,705 (33%)	4,001 (50%)	1,404 (17%)

In comparing the 1969 and 1970 figures, it will be noted that there was a 36% increase in persons released to outpatient status in one year and an 11% increase in the proportion of clients in the community.

Other figures pointing to program achievement are as follows:

1. Out of approximately 90,000 drug offense arrests in 1970 in California, only one percent were outpatients from CRC. Of those who do return to inpatient status, only 3.5% come back on a new conviction.
2. Even considering those addicts who have been in and out of CRC several times, 59% of all outpatients have been found to be eventually capable of remaining drug-free and trouble-free for twelve months in the community.³⁷
3. The rate of outpatients returned to the institution during 1970 dropped considerably. By the end of 1970, 1,603 men had been returned to the institution program from outpatient status. This represents 29% of the total men who experienced outpatient supervision during the year, and was the lowest percentage returned since 1963, the second year of the program.

Of the men experiencing outpatient supervision, 1,411, or 25%, were returned without a new civil narcotic commitment and 192 men (3%) were returned with a new civil narcotic commitment.³⁸

4. Figures depicting the number of male outpatients returned to the institution over a three year period are shown in Table XI.

TABLE XI
OUTPATIENTS RETURNED TO INSTITUTION

CALENDAR YEAR	TOTAL MALE CIVIL ADDICTS EXPERIENCING OUTPATIENT SUPERVISION	TOTAL OUTPATIENTS RETURNED	
		NUMBER	PERCENT
1968	3,814	1,641	43
1969	4,553	1,709	38
1970	5,610	1,603	29

The figures show that despite a yearly increase in outpatient population, there has for each of three years also been a decrease in the percent of persons returned to institutional status. They also demonstrate that the Civil Addict Program is making very good progress in its resolve to release individuals to outpatient

status in increasing numbers, and, through close supervision to keep them in the community for the longest possible period of time.

5. In March 1970, a report was released concerning successful discharges from the Civil Addict Program.³⁹ Figures contained in the report indicate that of a total of 11,995 commitments to the program, 15.8% were successfully discharged as of December 31, 1969. As of that same date, 3,891 persons were considered to be discharge "eligible"; i.e., although not eligible for discharge as of December 31, 1969, "many of these persons doubtless will gain discharge before expiration of the seven year program."⁴⁰

Program Effectiveness from the Client's Point of View. Task Force staff made contact with approximately fifty clients through both personal interviews and the administration of questionnaires. In the process, it was discovered that clients fell into two quite distinct groups. One group evidenced great suspicion as to purpose of the study, saw little merit in the parole system, and proved extremely resistant to discussion of any kind. (Client reaction to anti-narcotic test controls will be discussed at a later point.) The second group, on the other hand, talked quite freely about themselves, and about NAOP as well. Several persons in this group showed amazing insight as to the genesis of drug addiction in their observation that life long dependency patterns were associated with addiction. In this connection, those with a long history of addiction, and whose early treatment was strictly institutional, viewed the newer community treatment approach as frightening. They said that whereas earlier they had been able to transfer dependence on narcotics to dependence on the institution, they are now "forced" back to drug dependence.

No attempt can be made here to judge the validity of this argument, but from a psychological point of view, it is not without merit. Also to be taken into account is the fact (as described by NAEA) that relapsed persons (or those fearful of becoming so) come to CRC daily requesting re-entry. Whether this is reflective of dependency needs or a determined effort to ward off re-addiction would have to be assessed on a case to case basis.

In terms of the general addict population, it must be recognized that it is largely composed of persons with whom other agencies have failed and therefore rejected, and of individuals with widely disparate backgrounds and abilities. The one thing they appear to share in common is the lack of motivation for doing anything about their addiction. With these points in mind, it was not surprising that client reactions to treatment were so often found to be negative.

The Narcotic Addict Evaluation Authority View of Program Effectiveness. Next to be considered is how the program looks from NAEA's point of view. Salient findings are as follows:

1. Although the legal criterion for discharge is two drug-free years on an outpatient basis, NAEA administrators do not consider that this alone constitutes success. They would add:
 - a. Any time the program can maintain, at one period or another, some 4,000 persons on outpatient status, then success has been achieved. (The NAEA anticipates a client population of over 7,500 in the community by 1975.)
 - b. Any observable sign of improvement over the addict's prior behavior pattern can be considered a success.

Further:

- c. A person returned to the institution for additional inpatient treatment is not a failure per se.
- d. A person returned for Limited Placement is not considered a failure simply because he requires additional treatment.
- e. A gate turn-in is not considered a failure when he recognizes that he needs additional assistance.
- f. A client who tells his parole agent that he has used drugs once or twice is not considered a failure.
- g. One of the most difficult aspects of rehabilitation is trying to motivate the addict to want to abstain from drug use. Any act on his part to seek further help is construed to mean there has been a change in his attitude, that there is now motivation for abstinence, and that success for him can therefore be claimed.

In sum, program effectiveness is viewed as a relative matter, with the accent on success rather than failure but still avoiding unrealistic expectations.

2. In the early years of the program, the commitment rate was approximately 75% misdemeanants. At present time, over 80% of commitments are felons. Many of these are hard-core cases who support their addiction through criminal involvement. The NAEA stated that California has experienced some success with extremely hard-to-

reach individuals, but at the same time raised question as to whether any authorities, correctional or medical, really know how to deal with the heroin addict who is also primarily criminally oriented.

Comment. NAEA's question is pertinent, and perhaps one to which there may never be a completely satisfactory answer. For example, the fact that by 1975 there will be an anticipated 7,500 persons receiving treatment in the community is heartening in the sense that it gets addicts back into the main stream of community living, where employment, education, and community services are available and can be utilized. But there are other questions to be considered: Does the 7,500 figure refer only to newly addicted (or newly detected) persons not yet involved in the Civil Addict Program, or does it also account for a given rate of relapse among those presently in the program? Is there not some possibility that the predicted sizeable increase in outpatient population will reduce efforts at concentrated supervision and concomitantly increase relapse rates?

Glaser looks to research as at least a partial solution to these troublesome issues.

"Perhaps the most basic problem still to be solved in the evaluation of narcotic addiction treatment is that of maintaining a continuous interaction between research answers and research question. Obviously, as we answer a question, such as 'What is the relapse rate?' we are in a position to raise more sharply qualified questions; e.g., 'What are the differences in relapse rate for different types of addicts?' Perhaps a more important question is: 'What typology of addicts will reveal the largest differences in relapse rate for a given type of treatment?' Always crucial are the questions: 'What can we learn from the negative findings? What treatment would have been more effective with those addicts who do not seem to have been helped by the treatment studied?' For those ex-addicts who appear to have been treated successfully: 'What aspects of the treatment were most beneficial, or were apparent benefits actually independent of treatment? How is the relapse affected by post-treatment circumstances rather than by the treatment? What aspects of these circumstances most crucially affect the outcome of treatment? What are variations in relapse rate according to different criteria of relapse?'"⁴¹

Glaser's message is an important one taken to mean that although there may not now exist any real "experts" in the field of drug addiction, there is, or could be, a vehicle available for developing a much fuller and more concrete body of knowledge about addiction than presently obtains.

Constructing such a vehicle would be hard work and certainly could not be done overnight. But the challenge is there. All that remains is for California to accept the challenge.

VI. SUMMARY

This chapter has dealt with California's Civil Addict Program. A beginning groundwork was laid in which narcotic laws at the Federal level were reviewed along with those of California's civil commitment provisions and procedures.

Following was description of the Narcotic Addict Evaluation Authority, the California Rehabilitation Center, and the Narcotic Addict Outpatient Program, the three bodies responsible for the Civil Addict Program as designated by law. The foremost point here was that although these are separate entities, operationally they are highly interdependent and interrelated. This must constantly be kept in mind in efforts to understand their respective functions. The primary objective was to examine the structure and function of NAOP. Major areas covered were: administrative structure; program philosophy; training needs in connection with the program; treatment methods; and program effectiveness.

Predominant study findings were as follows:

1. Organizational structure, though basically satisfactory, is nevertheless fragmented, and thus tends to interfere with smooth program operation rather than to encourage it.
2. The official philosophical stance is unusually progressive and should provide the base for parole practice throughout NAOP. However, program staff are of divided opinion regarding the current philosophy. Some approve, some do not. Administrative efforts to accommodate to the situation have not thus far proved successful.
3. There is urgent need for an in-service training program which will assist parole agents in their daily practice.
4. Treatment methods are quite well diversified, but many outpatients are distrustful of efforts to help them. They especially resent the anti-narcotic testing aspect of the program.
5. Though success of the program was gauged in considerable part by the increasing numbers of persons released to outpatient status, this was by no means the sole criterion. From NAEA's perspective even the smallest improved change in an addict's attitude and behavior was considered to mean that he had benefitted both from the program and from his own efforts.

From the broad view, however, program administrators questioned whether there exists within any professional setting adequate knowledge as to how best to treat persons who are both drug-addicted and given to criminal behavior. The challenge for California is to set about obtaining this information, the need for which has been amply demonstrated.

FOOTNOTES

¹Colorado Legislative Council, Dangerous Drugs and Drug Abuse Control, report to the Colorado General Assembly, Research Publication No. 127. (December, 1967), p. 33.

²General statutory notes for states applying the Uniform Narcotic Drug Law may be found in the Colorado Legislative Council reference cited above. California and Pennsylvania laws are generally comparable to the Uniform Law except that California law specifically provides for treatment of addicts. Pennsylvania law is unique in its provision for both narcotics and dangerous drugs. Most states handle them in separate statutes.

³Ibid., p. 34 (A.R.S. Sec. 36-1022).

⁴Ibid., p. 34 (16 Del. C. Sections 4714, 4716).

⁵Ibid., p. 34 (Amended by L. 1935, C. 17120; L. 1947, C. 23823, Sec. 2; L. 1949, C. 25035, Sec. 11; L. 1951, C. 26484, Sec. 10; L. 1953, C. 28233, Sec. 4, and L. 1955, C. 29615, Sec. 33, F.S.A. Sec. 398.18).

⁶State of Florida, Chapter 70-183, Committee Substitute for Senate Bills Nos. 246, 268, and 296, June, 1970, 4 pp.

⁷Ibid., p. 1.

⁸President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, "Narcotics and Drug Abuse", The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1967), p. 215.

⁹Ibid., p. 220.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 228, (The President's Commission considered the \$15 million as a bare minimum for the job to be done).

¹¹Ibid., p. 211

¹²Ibid., p. 228.

¹³Ibid., p. 225.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 228.

¹⁵California Penal Code, Chapter 11, Title 7, Part III.

¹⁶Ibid.

¹⁷Roland W. Wood, Fight Against Addiction -- A Pioneering Approach, Department of Corrections, State of California (Sacramento, 1965), p. 2.

Footnotes

¹⁸Robinson v. California, 370 U.S. 660 (1962).

¹⁹California Welfare and Institutions Code, Section 3001.

²⁰Taken from information provided by NAEA, April 1970.

²¹California Welfare and Institutions Code, Division 3, Article I, Section 3000.

²²National Council on Crime and Delinquency, Advisory Council of Judges, Narcotics Law Violations, (New York: NCCD, 1964), p. 13.

²³Department of Corrections, Parole and Community Services Division, "Philosophy", Narcotic Addict Outpatient Program Manual, State of California (Sacramento: 1965), (page number is not supplied in text).

²⁴California Welfare and Institutions Code, Section 3000.

²⁵Department of Corrections, Parole and Community Services Division, Narcotic Addict Outpatient Program Guide, State of California (Sacramento, 1971), p. 9.

²⁶Ibid., p. 10.

²⁷Ibid., p. 29.

²⁸Ibid., p. 30.

²⁹NAOP Manual, op. cit., Chapter II, paragraph II-01.

³⁰Ibid., paragraph II-13.

³¹Ibid.

³²Ibid.

³³Ibid.

³⁴Ibid.

³⁵Ibid.

³⁶NAOP Guide, op. cit., pp. 85-88.

³⁷Information supplied by Department of Corrections, Narcotic Programs.

³⁸Taken from materials provided by the NAEA.

Footnotes

³⁹F. W. Forden and George Sing, "Civil Addict Program Effectiveness as Measured by Successful Discharges: An Administrative Information Report", Program Research Division, California Rehabilitation Center, (March, 1970), 3 pp.

⁴⁰Ibid., p. 2.

⁴¹Daniel Glaser, "Problems in the Evaluation of Treatment and Rehabilitation Programs", Rehabilitating the Narcotic Addict. (Washington: Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1966), pp. 376-377.

CHAPTER VI

COMMUNITY-BASED CORRECTIONAL PROGRAMS

Traditionally, correctional decision-makers have had to choose between total confinement and release to minimal supervision in the community. In recent years, however, a new trend has emerged. This has been the experimentation with unique types of community-based programs, ranging from group homes and halfway houses to non-residential centers which attempt to involve the high-delinquency urban ghettos in the solution of their own problems. The philosophy behind this trend is that institutions are inherently undesirable places to commit people, that people respond more favorably to efforts to help them in an atmosphere of freedom rather than severe restriction and confinement, and that the public is protected just as adequately and far less expensively by the rapid release of most offenders to their homes under close supervision and assistance. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, (already outdated in its discussion of community-based programs), underscores their significance:

" . . . they offer a set of alternatives between regular supervision and incarceration, providing more guidance than probation [and parole] services commonly offer without the various disruptive effects of total confinement. The advent of these programs . . . and their recent growth . . . are perhaps the most promising developments in corrections today."¹

As is true in many aspects of correctional planning and practice, California has been in the avant-garde in developing these types of programs. Both the youth and adult parole systems are committed to devising and putting into operation a range of community-based programs that are effective alternatives to institutionalization. However, the comparative value of such programs is still not documented and their full potential thus remains untapped.

Because of their importance, the Parole Task Force isolated for special study certain community-based programs that differ from traditional parole activities. Most of these programs are housed in facilities operated by the State or by private groups with whom the State contracts for services, and all tend to be located in urban ghetto centers. Those visited by Task Force staff included: (1) all four operated by the Department of Corrections; (2) six of the seven run by the California Youth Authority; and (3) three private facilities. Interviews were held with all levels of staff, including volunteers, and clients.

The following discussion is intended to point out how these programs exemplify progressive correctional planning and practice, to suggest that they be increasingly developed and expanded (not only by the State but also by local correctional agencies), and to offer some recommendations as to how they might be improved. Additional data regarding the value of community-based correctional centers may be found in the Prison Task Force Report.

I. FACILITIES OPERATED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

The Department of Corrections has two Community Correctional Centers for male felons which are essentially halfway house programs. It also operates two similar facilities, one for males and one for females, as part of its civil narcotic program which will be discussed in the following section.

The Rupert Crittenden Center in Oakland and the new Central City Center in Los Angeles have common goals and are operated in a similar manner. Both were established to enable earlier release of some inmates from prison, to provide an alternative, in place of reconfinement, for some parolees who were "slipping" in the community, and to house a work furlough program close to actual job locations. Both centers accomodate sixty men each, thirty parolees and thirty men on work furlough. It should be noted that these facilities were not established to handle only the best risks. Rather, with the exception of work furloughees, residents tend to have a more extensive history of incarceration than most parolees, to have a more established anti-social pattern of behavior, and to be overly dependent and without adequate job skills.² In brief, these two centers house men for whom the alternative would otherwise be longer prison confinement rather than parole.

A short description of each facility is presented below, followed by general comments and observations. More detailed information on the California Department of Corrections Community Correctional Centers, including those for addicts, may be found in its annual report by the same title.³

Crittenden Center

Located in a high-delinquency area in downtown Oakland, Crittenden Center is a dilapidated former State office building. While close to employment, the center resembles a large rooming house in a run-down neighborhood. Residents are crowded three to five in small size rooms. Contraband and liaison between outsiders and residents are constant problems which center staff have not been able to remedy. Staff apologized for the lack of maintenance and the general shabby appearance of rooms and furnishings, but said there was no point in doing anything because the building will be torn down in the next year to make room for a freeway.

This is a sensible point of view at this period of time. However, since the center has been operational for six years, there is reason to question why so little has been done to improve the facility. Certainly its inadequacies are reflected in the low morale of its residents. Most work at menial tasks on temporary jobs, so there is little they can do to improve the situation. Nor is there much motivation for doing so since the average stay is only four weeks. The end result is a passive acceptance of poor living conditions which neither keeper nor kept seem inclined to do anything about.

On the positive side, there is some community involvement at Crittenden. For example, many community organizations and individual volunteers are active at the facility. In fact, this "exposure to citizens of all strata of society" is considered "probably the greatest program assist of the center".⁴ However, some volunteers were critical of what they considered to be the rigid and punitive attitudes of professionals, particularly with regard to sending men back to prison. Of the 133 men released to the center in 1968, 20% were returned to prison within a year--slightly higher than the rate for all felons released for the same period.⁵

Central City Center

This facility is located in a predominately Black area of Los Angeles, close to light industry and transportation. The center is a former residential hotel. Physically, it has excellent potential for becoming a first-class residential treatment center. The facility is new and not yet operating to capacity. Staff, especially the center manager, are enthusiastic and pulling together to develop an outstanding operation.

Private individual rooms are available for each resident. Control is excellent, and is achieved without revealing the usual concern about security and contraband. An outdoor recreation space is provided, and plans are underway to remove presently inadequate kitchen and dining arrangements to a building next door which has been acquired.

Following the example of some juvenile facilities, Central City has recently provided accommodations for up to ten female residents on the administrative floor. This coeducational program is reportedly working well and is viewed by Task Force staff as a worthwhile experiment. Correctional authorities agree that few women need either lengthy incarceration or a high degree of custody. Hence, this type of program is particularly appropriate for women.

General Observations

The Adult Community Center programs can and should provide an excellent vehicle for the transition from a closed structured community to the free competitive community. However, there are respects in which the Department of Corrections has not assigned a high enough priority to this essential phase of contemporary corrections. Following are some of the reasons for this observation.

1. Centers are inadequately staffed. A ratio of one staff to five inmates may be acceptable in an institution, but a smaller operation, intended to provide strong support in the transitional phase, warrants a more generous ratio. The use of vocational rehabilitation as a resource is commendable. However, personality defects found in some clients justify the expense of employing a vocational counselor with specialized training in placing and counseling clients who are emotionally immature and who have a

poor self-concept. Correctional officers who are skilled in counseling should be employed at a higher grade than those who are trained to perform merely custodial duties. Also, at least two officers should be present during evening hours and/or weekends, when the impact of informal face-to-face contacts can be maximized.

2. There is conflict within individual programs. Despite assurances to the contrary by employees concerned, experience has indicated that there is often an incompatibility between those on parole and those still in custody under a work furlough program. It is difficult to apply different regulations and restrictions to one group and to expect the other group to conform to another set of standards. Some of these problems may be minimized by housing post-parole residents on an emergency basis only or, if possible, by keeping parolees and work furlough inmates in separate facilities.
3. The assessment of \$3.00 per day for parolees and \$4.10 per day for those working is again a factor that contributes to poor work furlough morale. It would be resolved if separate facilities were provided. It is perhaps unrealistic to expect work furlough inmates to pay for their custodial supervision.
4. Work furlough inmates are not furnished "dress-out" clothing when transferred to a work furlough base, but are required to seek employment in institution clothing, "hand-me-downs" donated by the community, or clothing purchased from their savings. Since part of the justification for a work furlough program is to bolster an inmate's self-image, the practice of sending work furlough residents out to seek employment or to work in obviously inferior clothing is self-defeating and degrading. What happens to the money saved by the practice? No one at either the Oakland or Los Angeles center could offer any logical explanation.

It should also be noted that although the State has approximately 1,600 work furlough participants, only 60 of them reside in community-based centers. For lack of an adequate supply of community centers, the remainder go to work from prisons or from local jails. This is regrettable since community facilities make for greater ease in getting to and from work, greater accessibility to vocational and educational programs, and greater efficiency in assisting inmates make the difficult transition back to the community. The Parole Task Force joins with numerous previous California studies and with both the Prison and Jail Task Forces in urging the increased use of furlough programs.⁶

II. FACILITIES OPERATED BY THE NARCOTIC ADDICT EVALUATION AUTHORITY

As part of its outpatient program from the California Rehabilitation Center (CRC) for narcotic addicts, the NAEA operates two halfway houses in the Los Angeles area. Their purpose is described as:

"... one means of enabling the timely release of CRC residents to outpatient status after a minimal period of institutionalization and to provide close supervision in a controlled setting for outpatients, particularly during the critical period following release from an institution."⁷

The clientele are clearly "hard-core" in that they have a higher rate of prior outpatient failures, poorer work histories, and lower base expectancy scores than other CRC releasees. Yet, employment levels for residents of both centers tend to be extremely high and return rates to CRC are not much different than those of other releasees.⁸

Both centers are also used as "halfway in" facilities for persons experiencing adjustment difficulties in the community. Vinewood (the women's facility) also serves as a work furlough base in preparation for parole.

Parkway Center

Located in a former two-story motel, Parkway's physical facilities are excellent; they provide maximum control for up to 53 men with a minimum number of personnel. The location is convenient to light industry and public transportation. However, there is little in the way of planned program activities, and recreational opportunities are limited. Most interaction is simply a matter of informal contact between parole agents and clients.

Since this facility is used for civil commitments, the regulations are properly less stringent than at other facilities for adult felons. Urinalysis and other checks for drug use are administered routinely, and the claimed success rate for a 3-year period is about 18%. While this is a rather depressing statistic, it is far better than many other programs designed to cure hard drug addiction.

The main needs at Parkway are more staff, an employment counselor, and a more structured program of activities.

Vinewood Center

Vinewood is an attractive former apartment house in Hollywood for women releasees from CRC. The operation is more permissive than the male facility, but essentially the program is the same. One notable handicap is the lack of employment opportunities in the neighborhood. Another is that residents who

are unemployed may remain at the center throughout the day, a factor which does not encourage maximum effort at job-seeking. This is in contrast with the men's center where residents must vacate the premises and search for employment from 8:00 a.m. until 4:00 p.m. each week day.

General Comments

Morale of employees at both centers appeared to be good, although they mentioned the frustration of working closely with an essentially passive group of persons.

The major values of the NAEA's halfway houses are similar to those operated for adult felons. They enable the Authority to release a number of inmates earlier than would otherwise be the case, and they provide a supportive environment under closer supervision than would be available through straight parole. In brief, the existence of these halfway houses allows NAEA to take greater calculated risks in getting clients back to the community. They also make it possible to temporarily house persons who are starting to fail on parole (extremely common for addicts). Since most residents work and contribute to the cost of the centers, the State is spared not only the more expensive costs of lengthy confinement but also a portion of the expenses in these short-term facilities. The client's increased self-worth and pride in being productive and self-supportive, though difficult to measure, are perhaps of even greater value.

III. FACILITIES OPERATED BY THE YOUTH AUTHORITY

Following a pilot project in Watts, the Youth Authority established an additional six Community Parole Centers in July, 1969. The general program statement for all these centers is as follows:

"Through centralization and concentration of resources, the Parole Center is designed to increase parole effectiveness by focusing on limited caseloads located primarily in economically depressed and socially disorganized urban areas. Parole services and consultation are to be available to wards, their families, community agencies, and institutional staff to enhance the concept of 'treatment continuum'."⁹

Primary program objectives are:

1. "Increased parole effectiveness by initiating relationships with wards, family members, and relevant community resources at intake. Maintaining these contacts through ward's institutional career and assisting institutional staff in programming and release planning.

2. "To modify behavior to enable wards to function delinquency-free and help to correct the distorted perceptions and attitudes of wards, their families and peers toward each other and social institutions.
3. "To alter identification of residents of these depressed areas and educate the larger community to the needs and problems of disadvantaged people to reduce the conflicts that reflect in attitudes and behavior of our target area wards."¹⁰

Since the Youth Authority itself provides an excellent description and evaluation of these programs in its annual progress report, there is no point in duplicating that information here. However, this Report will summarize what Parole Task Force staff perceived as the major strengths and weaknesses of these centers.¹¹

First of all, the Community Parole Centers are making a unique effort to integrate institutional and parole services. Center parole agents are assigned at the time youth from their area are committed to the Youth Authority rather than at the point of parole. Further, while not always possible because of time and distance factors, parole agents at least attempt to participate in reception center and subsequent institutional staffing of wards, and to work with both the ward and his family before his release. Frequently they contact school administrators and prospective employers in an effort to develop a program for the youth prior to his return to the community. Some of these additional services are possible largely because caseloads for center agents have been reduced to an average of 20 parolees and 8 wards in institutions. Since institution-parole ties have been a traditional problem at the State level (largely due to geography alone), this program is viewed as an extremely progressive stride.

The second noteworthy characteristic of these facilities is their aggressive effort to become an integral part of the community they serve. Their "caseload" is all of the Youth Authority wards (averaging 180), their families, and environment in a six to ten square mile area around the centers. While some of these facilities met with strong initial hostility (the first one was fire-bombed), staff determination to "work with people where and as they are" has helped to overcome much of this rejection and to build viable, community-based programs. Staff who fought to develop programs which met client needs, not just those of the system, and who possessed the ability to induce change by consensus rather than by mandate are largely responsible for what now appear to be quite successful operations in some of these centers.

Much has also been gained by involving the community in a wide variety of activities. These have included the opening of center recreational and other facilities to the entire local community; reciprocal participation in and sharing of facilities with other local groups and organizations; hiring of indigenous para-professionals; establishing of citizen advisory committees (in at least two centers); and cultivating a wide range of community resources and assistance, from baking birthday cakes to conducting sophisticated vocational classes.

A third impressive factor is the informal, open relationships between staff and clients fostered by an atmosphere in which there is "give and take" on a personal as well as professional level, i.e., where relationships are not simply "across the desk". A rather touching example was that of a Chicano youth who was obviously eager to discuss something with the Center Manager. Although the manager and Task Force staff were in conference, the Task Force member urged the manager to talk with the boy. What concerned the boy was the fact that he had lost the manager's nail clippers. The conversation was somewhat as follows:

Manager: "Did you find them, Ramon?"

Ramon: "No, Sir, but I worked this week, and wish to replace them."

Manager: "Forget it."

Ramon: "No sir. I have ten dollars left from my pay, and I wish to buy a new pair. Tell me what kind, please."

Manager: "I don't remember, Ramon. A cheap pair--less than a dollar."

The youngster departed, very pleased that he was able to repay a favor.

The above discussion is not meant to imply that all Community Parole Centers are functioning near maximum capacity, or that they are all at the same level of achievement. On the contrary, each of them has certain handicaps and problems. For example, the age span of clients is from 10 to 23 years, and makes it difficult to provide effective programs for all. The rising average age (currently over 19 years) suggests that increasing efforts must be made to program for a young adult population. Also, while theoretical caseload sizes are reasonable, in practice they are often considerably larger than the standard. Staff interviewed seemed to feel that their facilities were on the "bottom of the barrel" with respect to budget, requiring considerable ingenuity on the part of center managers to obtain needed equipment (which may, however, have indirect advantages if this results in a canvassing of the community to provide assistance and resources). Finally, there is still a certain amount of resistance if not bitterness toward the centers (as toward all symbols of the "establishment") by some members of the community. One Task Force member who talked personally with neighborhood residents near one center was told, "It's like having 'pigs' or a prison on your doorstep." Significantly, this assertion implies a negative attitude not only toward the "establishment", but also toward the system's clientele, even though resident and client are from the same neighborhood.

Because of the newness of these centers, little comparative data are available on recidivism or other criteria of effectiveness. However, after 15 months in the project, boys from the original Watts Center had a 34% violation rate, compared to 47% for boys in regular parole units.¹² Also, of the

246 wards released to all parole centers between July 1, 1969 and December 31, 1969, 15% violated parole within 6 months, compared to 28% of all wards statewide. Longer-range follow-up data will be available in the near future.¹³

IV. PRIVATELY OPERATED FACILITIES

One critical need for most parolees is the provision of better living conditions than those experienced prior to entry in the correctional system. It is obvious that the State cannot be expected to provide such living arrangements for all its charges. However, one resource that is being used with increased frequency is the privately-operated halfway house or group home. Task Force staff found several such residences, used partially or totally by the State, in Sacramento, Los Angeles, and the San Francisco Bay Area. Dedication of residence staff and esprit de corps among residents was generally apparent. While adequate financial support tends to be a perennial problem, privately operated facilities have certain advantages over those operated by correctional agencies. They tend to be considerably less restrictive, residents often feel they can trust the staff more than official agents who exercise legal controls over them, and living arrangements more closely resemble normal homes. In light of these advantages, administrators in the Department of Corrections are currently examining the feasibility of increased contractual arrangements with private facilities, with perhaps an accompanying decrease in Department-operated facilities.

V. ADULT PAROLE OUTPATIENT CLINICS

Both San Francisco and Los Angeles have parole outpatient clinics that appear to be adequately staffed, well supported programs. The staff in each consists of nine psychiatrists, eight psychologists, a psychiatric social worker, and clerical help. Each clinic serves about 500 clients per year.

Referrals are made by paroling authorities, parole agents, and courts. Priority is assigned to parole board cases, so that at times other, perhaps more vital, cases must await their turn. Nevertheless, the clinics are performing a needed service. They are essential to an effective community program and should be expanded as funds are available.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

34. *The State should strengthen and expand its Community Parole Center Program for youth with increased emphasis on developing programs that will allow earlier institutional release and fewer returns.*

35. *In the event youth and adult services are consolidated, the State should experiment with using these Community Parole Centers for adults as well*

as for youths. Otherwise, the Department of Corrections should increase its Community Correctional Centers but model them more after the Youth Authority's centers, i.e., with increased emphasis on integrating institutions and parole and on becoming an integral part of the community.

36. The State should expand its use of community-based work furlough centers for inmates, particularly for women, and should use them for other types of furloughs such as vocational training and educational programs.

37. The State should enact legislation permitting inmates on furlough to reside in privately operated facilities via contractual arrangements.

FOOTNOTES

¹President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Task Force on Corrections, Task Force Report: Corrections, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1967), p. 38.

²Department of Corrections, Parole and Community Services Division, Community Correctional Centers: 1970, State of California (Sacramento, December, 1970), p. ii.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., p. 4.

⁵Ibid., p. iii.

⁶Alvin Rudoff, et. al., "Evaluating Work Furlough", (paper submitted for publication to Federal Probation in 1971), (mimeographed); Fred Hoover, "Work Furlough Practices in California: 1968", San Mateo County Sheriff's Department (Redwood City, August, 1968), (mimeographed); California Taxpayers Association, Work Furlough Programs in California Counties, 1967-68: A Workload Study, (Sacramento, June, 1968); California Citizens Council, Work Furlough, A Time-Tested and Tax-Saving Program For Your Community, (Oakland: California Council of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, April, 1966); James Robison, The California Prison, Parole and Probation System: Technical Supplement No. 2, A Special Report to the Assembly, (Sacramento, 1969), p. 112.

⁷Community Correctional Centers: 1970, op. cit., p. iv.

⁸Ibid., pp. v-vi.

⁹Department of the Youth Authority, Division of Rehabilitation, A Guide to Treatment Programs, State of California (Sacramento, April, 1970), p. 8.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 9.

¹¹Department of the Youth Authority, Division of Research, Annual Progress Report of the Community Parole Center Program, State of California (Sacramento, December, 1970).

¹²Department of the Youth Authority, The Status of Current Research in the California Youth Authority, State of California (Sacramento, July, 1970), p. 38.

¹³Annual Progress Report of the Community Parole Center Program, op. cit., p. 90.

CHAPTER VII

CALIFORNIA PAROLING AUTHORITIES

Because of their critical and intertwined roles in institutional and parole decision-making, the various paroling authorities have been mentioned frequently in this and other Task Force Reports. However, there has been no systematic examination of their characteristics and functions. That is the task of this chapter. The approach of this chapter will be to discuss the four boards generically and individually: to describe their similarities and differences in structure, to discuss their various duties and methods of carrying out their respective responsibilities, and to suggest directions for improvement.

I. CHARACTERISTICS

Table XII presents, in capsulized form, a gross descriptive picture of the four paroling authorities. A number of significant differences between the boards may be seen. The Women's Board and Narcotic Addict Evaluation Authority are part-time boards, do not use hearing representatives, and are not confirmed by the Senate. Only the Adult Authority and Women's Board set terms for inmates and both boards are restricted by statutory minimum sentences for every commitment. Most significant are the vast differences in median terms of offenders under jurisdiction of the various paroling authorities. For example, adult male felons average twice as long in confinement as women felons and four times as long as juvenile offenders (many of whom are committed from the same adult courts for similar offenses). Finally, while the number of total actions taken and the parolee caseloads vary markedly from one board to another, only the Youth Authority Board seems to have an excessive number of cases per decision-maker. However, the Adult Authority and Youth Authority rely very heavily on hearing representatives to make individual case decisions.

Structure

The Parole Task Force agrees with the President's Crime Commission that the paroling function should belong to "an independent decision-making group within a parent agency".¹ As with the courts, the parole boards serve both as representatives of the public and as an essential part of the "check-and-balance" structure of criminal justice. Hence, as with the courts, they must have the power to make decisions independent of political pressures, recommendations of professional correctional staff, and any other influences. On the other hand, their job is so interwoven with that of institutional and parole staff that the need for coordination, mutual respect, and a "teamwork" attitude is critical. This is fostered by having the boards within the same "parent agency", viz. the Human Relations Agency, as is the balance of the State correctional apparatus. For the most part, California already complies with these concepts.

TABLE XII
CHARACTERISTICS OF CALIFORNIA PAROLING AUTHORITIES

	ADULT AUTHORITY	YOUTH AUTHORITY	WOMEN'S BOARD	NARCOTIC ADDICT EVAL- UATION AUTHORITY
Jurisdiction	Adult male felons	Juvenile wards; adult offenders under 21	Adult female felons	Civilly committed adult narcotic addicts.
Number of Members Authorized by Statute	8	7	5 (part-time)	4 (part-time)
Number of Hearing Representatives	11	7	Exec. Off. may serve if no Bd. member available	None
Selection Procedure	App'td by Governor (confirmed by Senate)	App'td by Governor (confirmed by Senate)	App'td by Governor	App'td by Governor
Terms of Appointment	4 years	4 years	4 years	4 years
Statutory Authority	Term setting Parole grants Parole revoc. Discharge	Parole grants Parole revoc. Discharge	Term setting Parole grants Parole revoc. Discharge	Parole grants Parole revoc. Recomm. to court for discharge
Number of Actions Taken in 1970	40,177	48,000	4,999	11,086
Actions per Member or Representative	2,115	3,429	2,000*	2,049*
Number of Parolees on March 31, 1971	14,816	13,701	1,008	4,098
Minimum Term for Inmates	Set by statute	No statutory minimum	Set by statute	No statutory minimum
Median Terms in Confinement (1969-70)	36 months	9 months	18 months	11 months

*Workload divided by half the number of board members since they are part-time boards.

Selection and Appointment

Because of the importance of their decisions, in terms of public protection, effects upon the lives of individual offenders, and impact upon the rest of the correctional machinery, proper selection of competent and qualified board members is essential. Task Force staff concur with the suggested standards of the President's Crime Commission relative to board members:

"The nature of the decisions to be made in parole requires persons who have broad academic backgrounds, especially in the behavioral sciences, and who are aware of how parole operates within the context of a total correctional process."²

"(Members should be)...appointed by the Governor through a merit system...or from a list of candidates who meet the minimum requirements of education and experience. None of the parole board's members should be a person who is already a State official serving ex officio."³

Because they represent the public, parole boards should not consist solely of present or former correctional workers; however, members should have both knowledge and ability to utilize that knowledge about causes of law-violating behavior and methods of altering such behavior. In addition to being appointed by the Governor, all board members should be confirmed by the Senate (as is currently the case for two boards) so as to further assure the selection of the most competent individuals. To provide a continuity and evenness of justice and to avoid the sudden creation of totally new and inexperienced boards, an overlapping of terms seems appropriate. Consideration might also be given to extending the length of terms from four to six years to allow for an easier overlapping of terms and to provide greater continuity of parole board practices.

A violation of the above principles of independence, public representation, and elimination of ex officio memberships on parole boards occurs in the juvenile parole system where the Director of the Department of the Youth Authority is, by statute, not only a member of the Youth Authority Board, but its chairman. The problems which arise for parole staff from this combination of roles have been discussed in Chapter III. Quite aside from those issues is the fact that the Directorship of the Youth Authority is, by itself, an extremely demanding, difficult assignment, which would seem to require the undivided attention of even the most competent of administrators.

A more desirable alternative, in the view of Task Force staff, would be the formation of liaison committees (as was discussed in Chapter V relative to the Narcotic Addict Evaluation Authority) and the development of other means of coordination and cooperation. Since the youth parole board and the youth parole supervision department are both within the Human Relations Agency, the mechanics of such a coordinative effort should not be excessively difficult.

Recommendations. 38. All parole board members should be appointed by the Governor, through a process of merit selection, and should be confirmed by the Senate.

39. Appointments should normally be to full-time positions and should be for six year overlapping terms.

40. The Director of the Department of the Youth Authority should be neither the chairman nor a member of the Youth Authority Board.

41. All of the parole boards should form liaison committees with the appropriate institutional and parole staff to discuss and resolve problems of mutual concern.

Number and Size of Boards

The number and size of individual parole boards should be commensurate with their workloads and responsibilities. Some authorities argue that boards should be primarily policy-making in nature and should leave all but highly controversial, contested or appealed cases to hearing representatives. However, as all of California's board chairmen stressed, those persons who make the final decisions and who bear the ultimate responsibility for the paroling function should have as much "face-to-face" contact with their clients as possible. Simply reading folders and "rubber-stamping" case decisions would be both a boring and inane type of activity for highly qualified and highly paid individuals. More importantly, only "face-to-face" contact can provide some of the important "cues" on which to base individual decisions. Also, only through such "face-to-face" contact can there be developed an intimate knowledge about and feeling for the clients and the type of decisions to be made. Furthermore, as some board members pointed out, increasing numbers of cases are now highly controversial; as counties skim off more and more of the less serious offenders, this will be even more true in the future. Hence, the Parole Task Force suggests that full-time board members should hear the bulk of parole cases and should use hearing representatives only as necessary. On the other hand, many hearing representatives do an excellent job and should be available, on request, to each of the boards when workload so justifies.

Narcotic Addict Evaluation Authority. Since its creation, the NAEA has experienced a steady and rapid increase in its workload. With the spiraling rise of drug abuse in California, it appears clear that this workload will continue to expand, both in sheer numbers and in terms of the need for constantly developing new and sophisticated approaches to the problem. These factors, together with the above-mentioned values of having board members rather than hearing representatives hear cases, would seem to justify making the NAEA a full-time board, although the number of members might initially be reduced by one.

Women's Board of Terms and Parole. On the one hand, as will be seen later, the Women's Board is, in many respects, one of the most progressive. Its members are highly dedicated, were perceived by Task Force staff as being most involved with and concerned about its clientele, and tend to be among the most "risk-taking". Its procedural safeguards are also among the best. On the other hand, the issue of whether or not to retain a separate parole board for adult females has been raised repeatedly in California. Insofar as can be determined, California is the only State which operates such a Board, although Illinois and New York formerly had separate parole boards for adult females, but have discontinued them. It is also to be noted that both the Youth Authority Board and the Narcotics Addict Evaluation Authority serve female clients without the necessity of a separate parole board structure.

Historically, the Women's Board of Terms and Parole was created in the late 1920's as a "spin off" of a concentrated effort, led by the California Federated Women's Clubs, to remove female offenders from San Quentin Prison. When female felons were removed from San Quentin and housed separately at the old Tehachapi facility, the program, as well as the parole function, was placed under the direction of a Women's Board. In 1944, however, with the adoption of the California Prison Reorganization Act, all adult institutions were assigned administratively to the Director of Corrections. The Women's Board retained its term-setting and paroling powers. However, it surrendered its administrative responsibility, although it did assume an advisory role in respect to the women's facility.

On at least three occasions, during the terms of three successive Governors, question has arisen as to whether or not the Women's Parole Board (by whatever name it was currently known) should continue. In 1959, legislation abolishing the Women's Board was approved by the Legislature, but was vetoed by the Governor. The following quotation from a 1962 publication of the Youth and Adult Corrections Agency speaks to the issue:⁴

"The role of women in our society has been gradually changing toward increasing equality with men, but there still remains in the public attitude some traditional feeling that women offenders should be dealt with less harshly than men. This probably rests on the fact that women's crimes tend to be less serious than those committed by men. Nevertheless, such attitudes toward female offenders tend to be more vague and far less strongly felt than the feelings and attitudes toward youth.

"The majority of outside consultants concurred in the opinion that there is no real justification for a separate Board for adult women. One stated that the only reasons for a separate women's Board now are historical or sentimental. Many felt that having at least one woman member on an over-all Adult Authority should be mandatory. We concluded that there was little, if any, justification for retaining a separate women's Board.

"Recommendation

INTEGRATE THE WOMEN'S BOARD OF TRUSTEES INTO THE ADULT AUTHORITY.

"While we agree with the concept that "women are different"; we could not find that, within offense groups, the characteristics of the offender, whether he be man or woman, are very different from a treatment standpoint. When the consultants stated that there should be separate decision-making bodies for adults and youth, they pointed out that whatever the differing needs and problems are between youthful male and female offenders, one decision-making body now meets them. It seems reasonable and logical that adults be handled in the same way, provided that one adult body gives appropriate consideration to whatever specialized needs, problems and public attitudes toward women may exist.

"Integration could bring into the Adult Authority some of the concepts which the Board of Trustees are now using.Integration would decrease Board administrative costs; provide a wider exposure to the problems of inmates and institutions; and offer the opportunity to exchange ideas across the State. The presence of "women's members" on the Adult Authority would also provide the same advantages to the present members of the Authority.

"The comparatively high cost of the trustees work and the part-time aspect of the operation which inhibits continuity of both administration and philosophy reduces the efficiency of the Board compared to the two other authorities. The fact that there is only one institution with a one-sex population could foster a provincial philosophy or could create an over-protective or hypercritical attitude on the part of members toward their cases."

As suggested in the 1962 report, a comparison of parole board costs, per action, also raises question as to whether or not the Women's Board should be continued. A comparison between the budget and number of actions heard by the Adult Authority and the budget and number of actions heard by the Women's Board reveals the following:⁵

<u>Budget: 1971-72</u>	<u>Total Actions per Year (1969-70)</u>	<u>Approximate Cost per Action</u>
Adult Authority - \$851,000	40,177	\$21.00
Women's Board - \$130,000	4,999	\$26.00

While the difference in cost per individual action is admittedly small (only \$5), the cumulative savings would appear to be in the vicinity of \$25,000 per year.

In summary, the issue of the future of a women's parole board presents a paradox. The present Women's Board has developed highly commendable practices, some of which might well be adopted by the other boards. Furthermore, elimination of the Women's Board might result in the loss of these progressive practices for women. However, when analyzed in comparison with other boards which successfully handle parolees of both sexes, and when viewed historically, a strong argument emerges for incorporating the present Board into an Adult Parole Board (with such a Board to include at least two female members, supplemented by female hearing representatives if necessary).

Recommendations. 42. Consideration should be given to integrating the Women's Board of Terms and Parole into the Adult Authority, in which case at least two women members should be added to the Adult Authority.

If this occurs, a Women's Advisory Committee should be created to advise the new Department of Correctional Services and all the boards on special concerns relative to women and girls.

43. The Adult Authority, Youth Authority Board, and Narcotic Addict Evaluation Authority should be renamed the Adult Parole Board, Youth Parole Board, and Narcotic Parole Board, respectively.

44. The Narcotic Parole Board should be made a full-time board.

Auxiliary Staff

The preceding section indicated the preference of having board members hear cases to the extent possible. However, to the degree necessary, each board should be able to hire, on a permanent or temporary basis, and through a system of merit selection, hearing representatives. Such representatives should be selected by and be responsible to the board and should assume whatever responsibilities are assigned by the board.

Additionally, each board should, through merit selection, hire an administrative officer to perform whatever duties it wishes to delegate.

Recommendation. 45. Each board should, through a process of merit selection, appoint an administrative officer and whatever number of hearing officers may be necessary, to perform whatever duties it wishes to delegate.

Training

The responsibility for balancing the scales of justice, the rights and needs of the individual versus the rights and needs of society, is an

unenviable assignment. The tasks of assessing readiness for parole, determining the necessity for return to an institution, and deciding on readiness for discharge are extremely difficult and complex. The need for not only proper background and qualifications, but also for relevant and ongoing training is obvious. Such training should include up-to-date knowledge of specific programs and resources both in the community and in each institution, a regular sharing of problems and concerns with institutional and parole staff, familiarization with community attitudes, basic legal training, principles for evaluating and modifying human behavior, instruction in the use of statistical predictive aids such as base expectancy tables, and exchange of information with other parole decision-makers, particularly those outside of California.

While it is true that parole board members in California have occasionally had opportunity to participate in parole institutes or parole seminars, as well as the opportunity to participate in professional conferences, both of a statewide and national level, these chances for training are infrequent, and, in the opinion of the Parole Task Force, do not provide adequate training in the areas previously enunciated.

Recommendation. 46. The proposed Department of Correctional Services and the various parole boards should form a training committee to develop specific training programs in correctional decision-making for all board members and hearing representatives, as well as for any correctional staff for whom it may be relevant.

Public Education

While the paroling authorities are among the most important elements within the correctional continuum, they are, to the general public, the least well-known. The boards should inaugurate a public education program, including publication of informational brochures and the publication and distribution of annual reports. This practice is presently followed by both the Department of the Youth Authority and the Department of Corrections, as well as by numerous local correctional programs; it should now be adopted by all of California's parole boards.

Recommendation. 47. Each California parole board should regularly publish and distribute both informational brochures and annual reports.

II. FUNCTIONS

The primary functions of parole boards are term-setting, granting parole and establishing the conditions of parole, revoking parole, and discharging from parole. An additional function sometimes performed by boards is institutional and program assignment and transfer. As stressed in the Juvenile Institution Task Force Report, this is a highly inappropriate task for the boards and should be left to institutional staff who are in a better position to make

individual treatment and custody decisions.

Term-setting

As Table XII shows, only the Adult Authority and Women's Board fix terms, i.e. set specific dates within the minimum and maximum time allowed by law for the release of each inmate. These terms, however, are only tentative and may be decreased or increased, within statutory limits, at any time. By statute, the minimum term for any felony is one year and for many crimes is five, ten, or more years. In keeping with the overall thrust of the Correctional System Study, only those persons who cannot be handled by local communities, even in local institutions, should be committed to the State. Hence, the minimum term of one year perhaps makes sense in that no one who does not need to be confined for at least one year should ever be sent to the State. On the other hand, progressive correctional thought argues that correctional decision-makers should not have their hands tied with unnecessary restrictions relative to the custody, supervision, and treatment of offenders. It is a common observation that decision-makers err in some cases and that individual offenders change more rapidly than anticipated; in short, what may have been or appeared to be a "good" decision at the time of sentencing or term-setting may subsequently become inappropriate. To be an effective, efficient, and just system, corrections must be flexible, i.e. it must be able to change earlier decisions and substitute alternative programs whenever appropriate. Mass processing or locking people up and in essence "throwing away the key" can no longer be acceptable correctional practice. Hence, excessive minimum terms are an anomaly and an undue constraint to a progressive correctional system. Accordingly, Task Force staff recommends strongly that all minimum terms be reduced to one year. It is important to realize that this is not a recommendation to release all offenders from prison in one year, nor is this likely to happen. Rather, it is viewed as removing unnecessary restrictions constraining the paroling authorities so that they can make the best possible decisions based on the needs and concerns of each individual case. Further support for this argument is found in the operations of the youth and narcotics boards which function without minimum terms, have median terms that are less than one year, and yet are at least as successful as the adult prison systems. In fact, with the exception of certain misdemeanor traffic violations, the prison system is the only part of the entire California correctional continuum in which there is a mandatory minimum period of incarceration which cannot, under any circumstances, be altered. In the opinion of the Parole Task Force, this is an anomalous situation without any real justification.

A major concern about term-fixing is that the boards may at any time re-fix terms for periods longer than those originally set. This occurs without a public hearing, without representation by counsel, and without provision for appeal. Thus the two boards which fix and re-fix terms have a power granted to no court and exercise it in a manner and under conditions not permitted in any court. A number of professionals and citizens view this as excessive discretionary authority.

Another criticism of term-fixing is the uncertainty it leaves in the minds of inmates (and staff), although some argue that this uncertainty or anxiety can often be used constructively to modify inmate behavior or at least to control their behavior within the institution.

To at least partially offset these concerns and yet adequately protect the public, it is suggested that the adult felon boards set terms as early as proper evaluation of inmates can be achieved; that, whatever the term initially set, regular reviews of each case be held (such as every six months after the first year) to determine whether the term can be safely reduced; that institutional staff be able to request such a review at any time they believe it to be appropriate; and that, once a term is set, the burden of proof be on the system to justify extending the term (more than minor violations of institutional rules should be necessary to justify such an extension).

Recommendations. 48. The California Penal Code should be amended to set one year as the minimum term to be served prior to parole for every person committed to state prison.

49. The Adult Authority and Women's Board of Terms and Parole or, if they are consolidated, the Adult Parole Board should set terms as soon as adequate evaluative materials are available. The burden of proof should be on the system to justify any subsequent extension of those terms.

50. All of the parole boards should review each case regularly (such as every six months) to evaluate whether individual inmates are ready for parole.

Granting Parole

The major concern of Task Force staff relative to the granting of parole, aside from minimizing the restrictions on the boards, is the excessively long median terms served by adult male felons. Table XII reveals the vastly longer median terms of inmates under jurisdiction of the Adult Authority (36 months) when compared with those in other parts of the State institutional apparatus (9 months for CYA wards, 11 months for CRC inmates, and 18 months for women felons). The Prison Task Force Report commented upon these excessive terms, pointing out that California incarcerates its adult male felons approximately 50% longer than the national average. The multiple values of reducing those terms were also elaborated on by the Prison Task Force.

Recommendation. 51. The Adult Authority should make every possible effort to reduce its median term for inmates to a period approaching the national average.

Conditions of parole. As discussed in some detail in the Probation Task Force Report, conditions of parole should be kept at a minimum and should be individually tailored to the needs of the specific case. In particular, they should never be so vague as to cause the parolee to violate without realizing that he is doing so.

Traditional practice of the California boards has been to impose a fairly long list of standard conditions and, in many instances, additional specialized conditions. While there has been a general tendency to make parole conditions less restrictive and to leave more discretion to individual parole agents, some standard conditions are still impractical and unenforceable (for example, "Do not associate with former inmates or individuals of bad repute", "Do not move, marry, drive a car, etc. without the prior permission of your parole agent", "Be a good citizen at all times"). Other conditions, notably those dealing with deprivation of civil rights, are so complicated that most parole agents do not understand them.

Recommendation. 52. *Conditions of parole should be clear, kept to a minimum, and tailored to the individual case.*

Revocation of Parole

One of the most controversial aspects of the paroling function today is the revocation process. On the one hand, traditionalists and conservatives frequently argue that the inmate should lose many of his legal rights and that he is, in fact, under a prison sentence until his parole is successfully completed. This argument stems from the accurate assertion that parole is a privilege rather than a right and that it is a trial period in the community in lieu of completion of the maximum term--a trial period that can be revoked by the paroling authority. On the other hand, more liberal elements contend that parolees should have essentially the same legal rights and safeguards as anyone else. One example of this view was the President's Crime Commission, which observed:

"The offender threatened with revocation should . . . be entitled to a hearing comparable to the nature and importance of the issue being decided. Where there is some dispute as to whether he violated the conditions of his release, the hearing should contain the basic elements of due process--those elements which are designed to ensure accurate factfinding. It may not be appropriate to require the heavy burdens of proof required for criminal conviction, or to provide for jury trials. But the hearing should include such essential rights as reasonable notice of the charges, the right to present evidence and witnesses, the right to representation by counsel--including the right to appointed counsel--and the right to confront and cross-examine opposing witnesses. Parole Boards should have the power

to issue subpoenas; and subpoenas should be issued by Boards and courts upon a satisfactory showing of need."⁵

A gross descriptive picture of the revocation procedures followed by each of the boards is presented in summary form in Tables XIII through XV. While there are many variations in these procedures between the boards, each has basically a two-hearing process (except the NAEA) and each has made efforts to increase procedural safeguards that protect the parolee's rights.

Table XIII shows that each board conducts an initial hearing with two members or hearing representatives present to consider whether or not to suspend parole and remand the person into custody. Decisions are based solely on a written and verbal report from parole staff; neither the parolee nor any witnesses are present. These meetings are normally held weekly (with the exception of the Women's Board which meets only once a month), although the locations are very limited.

The major exception to this normal type of initial hearing occurs in the case of the NAEA which also makes a final decision at this hearing. In other words, the NAEA combines both hearings (suspension and revocation) into one. However, this Authority actually returns an estimated 50% of its violators to CRC by a phone decision which replaces a formal initial hearing. Whenever it seems appropriate, a parole agent and his supervisor can request their district or regional administrator to phone a board member and obtain a verbal order to suspend and return an outpatient to the institution. When this occurs, there is a subsequent hearing at the institution by two board members to confirm this decision by phone.

As seen in Table XIV, the parolee receives written notice of the charges against him, except those in the Narcotic Addict Outpatient Program who are informed of the charges orally. If the boards feel there is adequate cause, based on the written and verbal report of parole staff, they may suspend parole, in which case the parolee is almost always ordered into custody (many are already in custody due to action taken by local courts on new charges). A major concern of Task Force staff was the considerable variation in time spent in custody between suspension of parole and the formal revocation hearing. Although based on only a small number of parolees (22), the 38 day average time confined in reception centers awaiting disposition by the Adult Authority seemed particularly excessive. There appears to be no reason why the waiting period in reception centers for adults needs to be so much longer than the 5 to 14 working days set by Youth Authority Board policy for juvenile parolees.

An additional problem is the time spent in custody before delivery to the reception centers. Since the boards do not normally calculate these individual and average time delays, detailed information on time in custody before delivery was not available. However, the NAOP estimated that it requires about 18 days from the time a parole agent writes a violation report

TABLE XIII
INITIAL REVOCATION HEARING

	ADULT AUTHORITY	YOUTH AUTHORITY	WOMEN'S BOARD	NARCOTIC ADDICT EVAL- UATION AUTHORITY*
Scheduled Frequency of Hearing	Weekly	Weekly	Monthly	Weekly
Composition of Board	Two Board Members or Hearing Reps.	Two Board Members or Hearing Reps.	Two Board Members	Two Board Members
Form in which Charges are Submitted	Written Report	Written Report	Written Report	Written Report
Is Parolee Present?	No	No	No	No
Parole Staff Present?	Parole Supervisor	Parole Supervisor	Parole Supervisor or Agent	Parole Administrator or Supervisor
Witnesses Present?	No	No	No	No
Location of Hearings	State Office Build- ings (S.F. & L.A.)	Reception Centers & Youth Training School (Chino)	State Office Build- ings (L.A. & S.F.)	State Office Build- ings (L.A. only)

*This is a one step hearing, i.e. the final disposition is made at this hearing (except in those cases where the initial decision to suspend and return is made by phone).

TABLE XIV
PRE-REVOCATION HEARING PROCEDURES

	ADULT AUTHORITY	YOUTH AUTHORITY	WOMEN'S BOARD	NARCOTIC ADDICT EVAL- UATION AUTHORITY
Does Parolee Receive Notice of Charges?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
How are Charges Communicated?	Written	Written	Written	Orally
May Parole be Suspended?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Remanded into Custody (if suspended)?	Always	Virtually always	Always	Not necessarily but normally
Time in Reception Center Prior to Revocation Hearing	est. avg. 38 days	5 to 14 working days (by policy)	est. avg. 30 days	est. avg. 21 days*

* Since this is a one step hearing, this represents the average time in custody from the parole agent's writing of his report until delivery of the parolee to CRC. Twenty-one days is also the estimated average time spent in the Reception Center for those ordered returned by phone (roughly 50%) until a hearing to confirm the decision by phone.

until the matter is heard by the NAEA and an additional 3 days before the outpatient arrives at CRC. The outpatient is virtually always in custody during this time. The NAOP also estimated that the 18 day period could be reduced by at least 50% if there were adequate clerical assistance (which they have requested). In those instances when outpatients are suspended and returned to the institution by a phone decision of one board member (approximately 50% of the time), it takes about the same length of time (21 days) before a formal hearing is held to confirm the earlier decision. In the case of adult felons, there are also not infrequent instances when a parolee, under the jurisdiction of any board, is given a sentence in a local jail as the result of a new charge, yet parole revocation proceedings are not initiated until all or a large part of the sentence is completed. While it is recognized that the boards do not have control over all of these situations, it would appear that joint board-parole staff efforts could reduce some of the "dead" time spent by parolees awaiting revocation dispositions. Finally, the success of O.R. and other similar pre-trial release programs discussed by the Jail Task Force also raises question as to the necessity of virtually always remanding suspended parolees into custody and/or keeping them there until final disposition has been made of their case.

The nature of the revocation hearings, in which final dispositions or in some cases, recommendations, are made, tends to be informal, non-adversary, and administrative, rather than court-like. In those hearings which Task Force staff attended, parolees had adequate opportunity to make statements and present materials, although some individuals were not particularly adept at speaking for themselves. As Table XV reveals, all boards allow parolees to hire and confer with attorneys prior to the hearing. The attorneys may at least submit a written statement in behalf of their clients; in all except the Adult Authority, attorneys may also talk directly with board members either before or, in the case of NAEA, during the hearing. However, the boards have all avoided turning the hearings into formal, adversary proceedings (although the U.S. Supreme Court is currently considering a California case relative to the use of attorneys in parole revocation hearings⁶). Similarly, any witnesses may at least write to the boards prior to hearings. A strange inconsistency occurs in the case of the NAEA which is the only board which permits attorneys and witnesses to appear at the hearing itself, yet is the only board which does not permit the parolee himself to be present. In those board hearings where an attorney is not permitted, one possibility for assuring that the parolee has adequate opportunity and capability of "stating his case" would be to provide correctional staff, at the parolee's option, who could informally assist the parolee in presenting statements and materials to the board.

Some problems which effect the length of time a parolee spends in custody included infrequent (monthly) hearings by the Women's Board, unspecified time limits on continuances and postponements, and hearing of all cases in very limited locations (normally reception centers). Efforts might also be made, whenever appropriate, to consolidate initial and final revocation hear-

TABLE XV
REVOCATION HEARING

	ADULT AUTHORITY	YOUTH AUTHORITY	WOMEN'S BOARD	NARCOTIC ADDICT EVAL- UATION AUTHORITY
Scheduled Frequency of Hearing	Weekly	Weekly	Monthly	Weekly
Composition of Board	2 Board Members or Hearing Reps.	2 Board Members or Hearing Reps	2 Board Members	2 Board Members
Parolee:	Present	Present	Present	Not present
Attorney:	May write to Board	May write to or confer with Board prior to hearing	May write to or confer with Board prior to hearing	May appear in person at hearing
Witnesses:	May write to Board	Parents may confer with Board prior to hearing	May write to Board	May appear in person at hearing
Location of Hearing	Reception Centers	Reception Centers	California Institu- tion for Women	State Office Build- ing (L. A. only)
How Long can Hearing be Continued?	Unspecified time	Not more than 3 weeks	Unspecified but normally no more than 30 days	Normally 5 - 15 days
Confirmation Required	4 Board Members or Hearing Reps, incl. at least 2 Bd. Members	None	None (but hearing has 2 Board Members)	None (but hearing has 2 Board Members)
Is an Appeal Procedure Available?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Notification of Board's Finding and Disposition	Parolee advised after hearing by CDC Staff	Parolee advised at hearing	Parolee advised at hearing	Parolee advised later by CDC Staff

ings as the NAEA has done. A further inadequacy is the lack of an appellate procedure for civil narcotic addicts.

An excellent practice employed by the Youth Authority and Women's Board is to inform the parolee of the disposition immediately at the end of the hearing. Task Force staff urges that the other boards follow this practice of directly, candidly, and immediately telling the parolee what the board feels is the most appropriate disposition for him and, of perhaps even greater importance, the reasons why (if he is to be reconfined, this should include what is expected of him to maximize his chances of an early parole). Even if, in the case of hearings by representatives, the disposition is not final, but rather is a recommendation which must be confirmed later by two board members, inmates definitely want to know what decision or tentative decision has been made and why. Since clients are subject, throughout the criminal justice system, to recommendations which must be approved by a higher level before becoming final, this would not be a foreign procedure to them.

In summary, Task Force staff believe that current revocation hearings and procedures are basically just and reasonable and offer only the above-noted suggestions for improvement. It is felt that, if the best procedural safeguards and practices used by the various boards are extended to all boards and codified to assure their permanence, the creation of an adversary situation (with hired or appointed attorneys, cross-examination of witnesses, etc.) is not only unnecessary to assure justice but would both cost the taxpayer additional funds and tend to slow down and burden the entire process with undue handicaps.

Recommendations. 53. Although many of the following procedural safeguards already exist in respect to revocation hearings, they should be adopted by all of the boards and should be codified:

- 1. Boards should meet at least once a week to consider revocation matters.*
- 2. Hearings should be conducted by at least two board members or hearing representatives; if hearing representatives are used, their decisions should be confirmed by at least two board members.*
- 3. Written advance notice of the charges should be given to the parolee and, in the case of juveniles, to his parents as well.*
- 4. The parolee should be present at least at his final revocation hearing.*
- 5. The parolee should be able to hire and confer with an attorney prior to the hearing; attorneys should be able to write to and personally confer with board members prior to the hearing.*

6. Any witnesses should be able to write to board members; parents of juveniles should be able to confer with board members prior to the hearing.
 7. Correctional institutional or parole staff should be available, at the parolee's option, to assist him in "telling his story" to the board.
 8. Every effort should be made to minimize the parolee's time in custody before disposition. The final revocation hearing should be held no more than 14 working days after the parolee is delivered to the reception center; hearings should not be postponed unless necessary and should never be postponed beyond 30 days unless it is absolutely crucial.
54. All of the boards should conduct regular hearings in more major population centers of the State.
55. The Adult Authority, Women's Board of Terms and Parole, and Youth Authority Board should make efforts to consolidate initial and final revocation hearings whenever appropriate.
56. The board members or hearing representatives who hear a case should personally notify the parolee of their disposition or recommendation at the end of the hearing.

Discharge from Parole

Section 2943 of the Penal Code specifies that any adult felon who "has been on parole continuously for two years since release from confinement" (with the exception of those serving life terms) must have a board hearing within 30 days to determine whether or not he should be discharged. While this is viewed as progressive legislation, there are further improvements which could be made. First, suspension of parole for any reason, even though followed by reinstatement, is interpreted as interrupting the two years "since release from confinement"; accordingly, the two years must start over at the time of reinstatement. This situation could and should be remedied by specifying that the two years should run from the time of release from a prison or county jail sentence. Second, there is no need to prohibit "lifers" from being eligible for discharge after two years of successful parole, if it is otherwise deemed consistent with public safety. Third, provided that all minimum sentences are reduced to one year, there would be no reason to wait two years to consider dismissal in many cases (this is currently done because parole is considered part of the sentence). The great majority of parolees who violate do so within two years, so that two years should be the longest time anyone should remain on parole in the community without a formal hearing to be considered for discharge. It should be emphasized, however, that many parolees can be evaluated as good risks well before two years and should have the opportunity to be released at the time that is appropriate for them. For

example, the President's Crime Commission found that, on a nation-wide basis:

"Violations on parole tend to occur relatively soon after release from an institution, nearly half of them within the first 6 months after offenders are released, and over 60% within the first year."

Fourth, individual parole agents have the responsibility to inform and make recommendations to the boards at the earliest time that they feel individual parolees can be safely discharged. If minimum time barriers are reduced, parole staff should assume this responsibility to a much stronger degree than is currently the case. Fifth, in the event that a board denies discharge at the end of two years, that parolee should be entitled to another board review at least every six months thereafter. Finally, these conditions should, of course, apply to all the boards.

Recommendation. 57. All of the parole boards should hold a formal hearing to consider discharge for every parolee who has completed two years on parole since release from a prison, juvenile institution, CRC, or county jail sentence. In the event discharge is denied, the board should hold a subsequent hearing on that case at least every six months. In all of these hearings, the "burden of proof" should be on the parole system to justify retention of the parolee under supervision any longer. These requirements should be codified.

FOOTNOTES

¹President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Task Force Report: Corrections (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967), p. 66.

²Ibid., p. 67.

³Ibid., p. 208.

⁴Youth and Adult Corrections Agency, The Paroling Boards, State of California (Sacramento, December, 1962), pp. 142-144.

⁵Op. cit., p. 88.

⁶Larry D. Carnes vs. Walter Craven, Warden, Folsom Prison.

⁷Op. cit., p. 68.

CHAPTER VIII

NATIONAL PROGRAM HIGHLIGHTS

In the belief that systems in other parts of the country were experimenting with specialized parole programs of interest to California practitioners, a questionnaire was developed and mailed to sixty-nine parole agencies throughout the country. Forty-nine jurisdictions responded. The aim of the questionnaire was to discover new or novel parole practices that might exist, especially with reference to treatment techniques, and to determine parole agency relationships with law enforcement, courts, volunteers, and community services.

As anticipated, questionnaire results showed a high degree of commonality among agencies. For example, most of them expressed awareness of the need for good rapport with law enforcement bodies and with vocational rehabilitation personnel, and many of them had developed methods to strengthen these relationships.

This is not to suggest that there were no differences among them. For example, though volunteers were used in many places, sometimes in highly organized fashion, some parole agencies did not utilize volunteers anywhere within their program. Also not all agencies had achieved the same degree of success in their endeavors, even where they were operating similar programs. However, the task here is not to make comparisons, but rather to report programs and projects which suggest a progressive or promising kind of parole programming.

It is recognized that some of the cited programs may be similar or identical to programs which are either in the design phase or already operational in California, and that some of the programs, for a variety of reasons, may not be applicable to California. However, the hope is that the practices of other states may offer some new and constructive directions for California. Highlights selected for inclusion will be presented in accordance with the questionnaire format.¹

I. LAW ENFORCEMENT

1. To improve coordination, cooperation, and communication between the parole board and law enforcement agencies, parole board members in one state suggested to sheriffs and chiefs of police the idea of holding joint, regularly scheduled meetings. Law enforcement officials welcomed the plan and arrangements are now underway for the two groups to meet on a continuing basis.

2. Both probation and parole staff are working together with courts and county sheriffs' offices in connection with the above state's work-release program. A very important aspect of this mutual endeavor is that parole agents provide group counseling services to jail inmates in the state's larger cities.

3. Parole officers in one jurisdiction not only attend police training programs, but also conduct orientation sessions at law enforcement academies, police training institutes, colleges, and other training seminars. In turn, law enforcement officials speak at parole training sessions and provide access to law enforcement investigative information. In varying forms, this method of exchanging information is being used in several states, reportedly with good results.

4. A requirement of one parole training program is that newly employed parole agents must spend several nights out on patrol with local police officers. This program has been in operation for some time and is credited with providing parole agents much keener insight into the policeman's role in the correctional continuum.

5. Again in connection with training, one parole agency plans to establish a seminar, provisions for which specify that there shall be sixty hours of training primarily devoted to the police function, appropriate measures of self defense, court procedures, and related subjects. This plan is more ambitious than most, and could well pave the way for improved communication throughout the state's justice system.

6. In one state, there is a full-time law enforcement consultant on the central office staff of the Department of Corrections. His job is to keep abreast of trends and practices in the state's justice system so that he may then pass along needed information to law enforcement agencies throughout the state. This is another way of furthering the educational process, but perhaps even more importantly, it is a marked departure from the customary rigid barriers between one professional group and another.

7. One state has a group counseling program for juvenile parolees which is jointly handled by the department of probation and parole and local sheriffs' offices. This is an unusual blending of services which suggests excellent potential for reducing polarization between youth and the police, and for the development of different approaches in the group counseling process.

8. At the pre-release level in one jurisdiction, it is routine procedure for law enforcement officers to appear before inmate groups at the institution, and discuss the ways in which police officers can be of assistance to them in the open community. Inmates are encouraged to raise any questions they wish. Depending, of course, upon how skillfully these sessions are handled, this show of interest in the inmate's welfare could do much to reduce his fears and tensions concerning parole and concerning law enforcement.

II. COURTS

1. A plan initiated by superior court judges in one area, and just getting underway, is the formation of a Parole Board Liaison Committee to whom the parole board may turn for mutual consideration of new parole board plans and proposals. The first occasion for the board and the committee to meet

jointly concerned a board proposal that inmates be released directly on parole after they have completed a six-week diagnostic workup. The committee viewed the proposal favorably, a reaction which could well have gone the other way had there been no mutually agreed upon structure for dealing with unique suggestions of this kind.

2. Parole officer appointments in one instance are made by judges of courts of record from a list of eligible candidates submitted by the state's probation and parole board. This system permits a good degree of objectivity in officer selection and makes for amicable working relationships between the judiciary and the board.

3. There is an instance where courts, volunteers, and parole officers all work as a team. The volunteers are called court aides. An orientation program is provided whereby these individuals learn about general court procedures and about probation and parole functions. Following orientation, the volunteers record pre-sentence referrals, special conditions laid down for clients, and related types of paper work. While the program does not entirely relieve officers of courtroom duties, it does permit closer supervision of clients and more time for investigative assignments.

4. Another example of combined endeavor is a program involving the juvenile courts and their staff, institutional staff, and clients. The program is two-pronged: (1) The court provides regularly scheduled group training sessions wherein the various group therapies are studied; (2) On the basis of what has been learned in the training sessions, children recommended by institutional staff are brought into group therapy sessions, along with juvenile court probationers. Since the plan reportedly is producing highly satisfactory results, it would seem feasible to extend it to parolees; e.g., those children from institutions who responded well to the group treatment sessions might be continued in the same program upon release from the institution, thereby providing a continuity of service and perhaps a higher probability of good adjustment in the community.

5. In one state, the regional directors of the youth commission are responsible for setting up joint staff meetings between parole and court personnel. These meetings include line staff from both probation and parole as well as juvenile hall personnel. Reportedly, they have so successfully reduced communication barriers between the departments involved that plans are now underway for establishing a joint in-service training program.

6. Put into operation by a department of corrections is a plan whereby a parole officer is in attendance at each session of the juvenile court, whether or not cases to be heard involve parolees. If they do, it is expected that the parole officer will supply helpful information to the judge. If they do not involve parolees, but the judge's decision is to commit the offender, the officer counsels with the child and with his parents as to what commitment means and what can be expected as a result of the commitment. This approach serves not only to reduce client apprehension but also to relieve parental anxiety and concern.

7. While not new, a method which appears to work well in many jurisdictions is a provision for probation officers originally active on given cases to resume supervisory responsibilities for those now on parole status. The advantage here is that client exposure to several different caseworkers is held to the minimum possible. More importantly, if the original client-probation officer relationship was mutually satisfactory and (at that time) beneficial to the client, the client's chances of success on parole may be considerably improved.

8. The courts in one state began a year ago what will become annual judicial sentencing seminars. These seminars will be open to staff from the department of corrections, a shared training venture which should prove enlightening and helpful to both the judiciary and correctional personnel.

III. COMMUNITY SERVICES

1. A program presently intended only for juvenile probationers, but applicable to parolees as well, concerns the pooling of community resources for the training and rehabilitation of the youthful offender. As a condition of probation, youngsters are assigned to a local treatment center which they attend on a daily basis for approximately six months. At the center, they receive special vocational testing, vocational and related academic training, intensive individual and group counseling, and job placement service. This program is based on the theory that a primary cause of delinquency is poor learning habits and little or no success in the school setting. The basic aim, therefore, is to instill new learning habits and a more positive attitude toward the learning process. The schools, of course, play a major role in this program. Its thrust is definitely more academic than "rehabilitative" in the usual sense of that word. Clients are called students, and they receive academic credit for work done at the center. This program is achieving good results, not only because it is goal-oriented, but also because its rewards are tangible and specific.

2. Recently, one parole board began what are called on-site parole revocation hearings. The hearings are held in or near the community where the parolees reside, and accordingly are less disruptive of job and home activities. An important additional benefit is that parole board members are becoming much more knowledgeable as to what community resources are available to the parole violator. As a result, revocation is being used less frequently and alternative community services used in its stead. For example, not yet producing optimum results, but nevertheless holding good promise, are the local drug self-help rehabilitation programs whose participating members have assisted greatly in the rehabilitation of parole violators whose basic problem is drug addiction.

3. As stated at the beginning of the chapter, most states maintain close ties with departments of vocational rehabilitation. However, some few parole agencies have gone considerably beyond simple referral and consultation. Specifically, they have requested that vocational specialists be assigned on

a full-time basis to departments of probation and parole. Vocational rehabilitation agencies have met this request most willingly. Among the several advantages of this arrangement is the fact that the vocational specialists have an enormous opportunity to learn, at first hand, what the parole function entails. Further, because of numerous daily contacts with a wide variety of parolees, there is opportunity for specialists to create and apply new forms of rehabilitative programs.

4. Most correctional systems involved in the New Careers program have used it as a training and employment vehicle for ex-offenders and persons from minority groups. In one state, the decision was made to restrict the program to ex-offenders only. Within a very short period of time, the number of ex-offenders involved in the program went from five to twenty-two. Their performance has been most satisfactory and it is highly probable that increasing numbers of individuals will be drawn into the program.

5. One state is suggesting that unemployment compensation benefits be provided for released inmates in lieu of gate money. It is understood that the proposed act will ultimately be introduced by executive request. A plan of this sort, (should it offer equitable distribution of monies between parolees and the general public), could be highly beneficial to parolees and prison administrators alike.

6. Frustrated by its inability to work effectively with sexual exhibitionists, one correctional department made arrangements with a medical center whereby the center would accept referral of such cases. Exhibitionism is a complex and difficult psychological problem, so it is not likely, even under medical management, that all treatment outcomes will be favorable. Nevertheless, several persons previously considered "hopeless" cases have made exceptionally good progress at the center. As a result, the corrections department has now begun a similar program for drug addicted persons.

7. In cooperation with a Model Cities agency, one department of corrections is planning to open a community corrections center for thirty adult clients. The facility will be located in the Model Cities area, and will feature a variety of treatment approaches including work-release, pre-release guidance, and general counseling. Since the underlying reason for inaugurating the Model Cities program was to make goods and services equally available to all citizens in all communities, this move on the part of the department seems especially pertinent and very desirable.

IV. VOLUNTEERS

1. Two years ago, a probation and parole agency launched a comprehensive program to recruit and train citizen volunteers in an effort to involve the community in the correctional process. At the outset, the project involved only a small group of citizens who worked primarily with institutional inmates. Now, the program boasts over 600 persons who work with the clients throughout the correctional system. Not only do they serve in a supportive role to clients,

but they also assist professional staff in parole planning, locating employment sources, and providing transportation. This is an unusually large volunteer program, and is producing an observable impact on community attitudes toward parolees and probationers. Offenders and their problems are better understood and the public is more receptive to their needs.

2. Another corrections department is using volunteers in a statewide coordinated effort involving a professional/volunteer team approach to treatment processes. The department is finding that the presence and help of volunteers adds depth to their own supervisory efforts, and that their ideas for improved relationships with clients are often extremely applicable.

3. Another approach to the use of volunteers concerns a more comprehensive view of volunteer services than is normally encountered. Not only are personal services welcomed and used, but so too are those of groups and organizations who are willing to make their own resources available to the department, notably their physical facilities and personnel. The contention of the department is that there is no limit to the ways in which volunteer services can be used to good advantage.

V. SUPERVISION

1. A technique which appears to be working quite satisfactorily in one area is the use of adult ex-offenders as regular employers of youthful offenders. In operation for five years, the program is structured in such manner that the employer's past history is never revealed to the youth. The item does not indicate how many adults are available for this kind of treatment approach, but the program is indeed in keeping with today's trend toward using offenders in the rehabilitation process.

2. One state has developed an experimental program called Automotive Workshop. Initiated in 1969 by the juvenile parole staff, the purpose of the project is to provide an opportunity for parolees, probationers, and non-delinquents, twelve to eighteen years of age, to work together in repairing cars, selling used auto parts, and disposing of used auto equipment. Implementing this program involved the cooperative efforts of law enforcement bodies, the juvenile court, juvenile parole, local labor unions, schools, the YMCA, and many other civic bodies. It is one of the few known instances where community agencies working with both delinquent and non-delinquent children have come together in a common endeavor.

3. Out of concern that correctional personnel are often ill-prepared to deal effectively with specialized problems such as alcoholism, drug addiction, and severe personality disorders, one corrections department is experimenting with a program of assigning just one type of offender to a particular officer. The rationale is that intensive exposure to one kind of problem will bring about greater insight and understanding, and thereby enable the officer to be of more help to the client. Further, should the plan produce favorable results, those officers carrying specialized caseloads could subsequently serve as resource persons for other officers.

4. In another instance, the department of corrections has developed a short-term institutional program involving intensive daily group sessions for a period of approximately ninety days. Called the Institution Community Continuum, the program is handled by field service staff in an institution, is for juveniles, and covers both boys and girls. At the end of the ninety days, wards are released on parole where intensive supervision is continued and is provided by the same field staff who manage the program in the institution.

5. Caseloads are audited in one jurisdiction to provide a systematic recurring evaluation of each officer's performance throughout the department. The primary objective of the audit is to insure that staff are employing uniform and acceptable methods of supervision, and that department policy is followed. At the same time, the audit is not viewed as a policing action but rather as a way to help individual officers improve supervisory skills and techniques.

6. Not frequently, but in some places, the "store front" plan of supervision is being used. This is simply an arrangement whereby parole agents are located in communities and localities where crime rates are high instead of being lodged in a central office type of setting. The plan enables officers to handle crisis situations, avoids long client trips for reporting in, and tends to act as a crime preventive in some areas.

7. One state has taken the position that the more stringent the conditions of probation or parole, the less rewarding the response from clients. Now the prevailing notion is that probationers and parolees can quite safely be allowed to set their own restrictions and limitations without loss of face on either side.

VI. SUMMARY

The foregoing discussion has been based on information supplied by the majority of parole agencies throughout the country in response to a questionnaire designed by the Parole Task Force staff. The intent of the questionnaire was to elicit information regarding new and unusual kinds of parole programs, especially as these pertain to parole agency relationships with law enforcement agencies, courts, community service agencies, volunteer programs, and as they pertain to treatment techniques. Responses selected for inclusion in this presentation were described separately, according to respective questionnaire categories.

It will be noted that although brief editorial comment does appear occasionally, no attempt has been made to evaluate the programs cited. Correctional systems differ quite considerably, and because they do, what works very well in one state may have little or no applicability in another. The basic aim here has been solely to bring together a given body of knowledge some part of which may prove applicable and helpful to California's parole system.

FOOTNOTES

¹It should be noted that some of the items selected were found in only one parole agency or state whereas others apply to more than one agency. In the latter case, the items were usually sufficiently similar to rule out the need for separate listing.

APPENDIX A

NAEA-NAOP-CDC POLICY STATEMENT: METHADONE MAINTENANCE PROGRAMS (PARTICIPATION BY CIVILLY COMMITTED ADDICTS)

1. That the Methadone Maintenance Program should have the approval of the Research Advisory Panel.
2. That the outpatient (civilly committed addict) volunteer for such participation.
3. That, based on the following criteria, the Narcotic Addict may allow a civilly committed addict to participate in Methadone Maintenance:
 - a. The outpatient shall be at least 21 years of age.
 - b. The outpatient will have had a history of opiate drug involvement for at least five years.

(Note: Criteria for length of involvement may be modified in individual cases as necessity warrants.)

- c. The outpatient will have a history of at least one prior detoxification and narcotic treatment failure.

(Note: The detoxification should have occurred under proper medical supervision as opposed to in a "kick-pad", to insure that the outpatient had been substantially addicted to an opiate narcotic.

The Narcotic Authority interprets a "narcotic treatment program failure" to mean a failure on the Civil Addict Program.)

4. The outpatient must have the prior approval of the Narcotic Authority before entering a Methadone Maintenance Program.
5. That the Methadone Program Administrator and staff work in cooperation with the Parole and Community Services Division staff (NAOP) to the effect that information of mutual interest is exchanged. Parole agents will be responsible to maintain regular contact with the program staff as an additional source to obtain collateral information in regard to the participant's conduct and welfare.
6. Regular naline testing shall be discontinued for individuals in this program. Urinalysis testing will be done in accordance with P&CS Division standards, and reports of narcotic use (except methadone) will be submitted to the appropriate paroling authority.
7. That any outpatient accepted for a methadone program shall be prohibited from driving an automobile during the stabilization phase of the program (approximately two weeks). The local office of the Department of Motor

APPENDIX A (Continued)

Vehicles will be notified of the name of each parolee or outpatient accepted into the program.

8. Persons accepted for a methadone program will be expected to conduct themselves according to established parole rules, regulations and policies.
9. That interpretation of these standards and implementation of the program shall be the responsibility of parole district administrators.
10. The goal of the (departmental) methadone program shall be to stabilize the individual's life pattern in such a way that he or she will be a contributing member of society without continuous dependency upon methadone. Thus it is intended that each participant will be encouraged to reduce and ultimately eliminate their need for methadone.

