

Exploratory Study of Interstate Compact Policies and Practices



Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction

Reginald A. Wilkinson
Director

Thomas J. Stickrath
Assistant Director

Office of Management Information Systems
Bureau of Planning and Evaluation

June 1996

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Department of Rehabilitation and Correction

Reginald A. Wilkinson, Director
Thomas J. Stickrath, Assistant Director

Office of Management Information Systems

Peg Ritchie-Matsumoto, Deputy Director

Bureau of Planning and Evaluation

Evalyn Parks, Chief

Project Staff:

Division of Parole and Community Services

John Y. Chin, Researcher 3

Bureau of Planning and Evaluation

R. Craig Bennie
Pat McLaughlin

Technical Assistance:

Interstate Compact

Gail Price, Deputy Compact Adm.

Susan Sheley
Joanne Mounts
Sheila Nichols
Nicole Erb

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

STUDY ONE: IS OHIO FOLLOWING INTERSTATE COMPACT GUIDELINES REGARDING ACCEPTING OR REJECTING CASES?

- ▶ Of the applications we receive, 86 percent involve cases in which the offender was a legal resident of Ohio and/or the offender's family resided here - all mandatory acceptances. We accepted 82.9 percent of these cases.
- ▶ The mandatory cases we turned down were most frequently rejected (65 percent of these cases) because we could not find the offender, the offender decided to return to the sending State, the offender was already in jail, or the proposed home provider refused to accept the offender.
- ▶ Rejection of mandatory cases which involved an exercise of discretion on the part of the investigating Parole Officer accounted for 5.6 percent of the decisions on all mandatory cases.
- ▶ Evidence showed that almost one in four (24.7 percent) of the mandatory cases had traveled to Ohio prior to a decision on their cases. We found that 12.5 percent of the mandatory cases who traveled to Ohio without proper authorization were subsequently rejected for supervision. In almost half of these cases (55.8 percent), the reasons for rejection centered on the offender's unavailability for supervision (whereabouts unknown, in jail, returned to sending State).
- ▶ Cases for which acceptance was not mandatory under Interstate Compact guidelines were rejected 78 percent of the time. We tended to reject probationers, offenders without employment in Ohio, violent offenders, and offenders whose placement plans could not be verified.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

STUDY TWO: WHAT IS THE PROFILE OF THE CURRENT INTERSTATE COMPACT CASELOAD?

- ▶ Interstate Compact supervisees accounted for 13.6 percent of the total current caseload. They were very similar to other supervisees in terms of gender (predominately male), race (predominately White), and supervision type (predominately probationers).
- ▶ About one-third did not have a high school diploma or GED. However, two-thirds were employed either full-time or part-time. Only 4.1 percent appeared to be receiving welfare benefits.
- ▶ About three-fourths were not married. Most (two-thirds) lived with their families or acquaintances.
- ▶ About two-thirds of the Compact cases had been convicted of property or drug offenses. Slightly more than half had no prior adult convictions.
- ▶ About two-thirds of the Compact cases had some type of substance abuse history. About one in six cases were currently abusing alcohol or other drugs. Most of the current substance abusers (three-fourths) were receiving substance abuse treatment services while under supervision.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Page
INTRODUCTION	4
METHODOLOGY	4
STUDY ONE: COMPLIANCE WITH INTERSTATE COMPACT GUIDELINES	6
Purpose	6
Methodology	6
Format for Findings	6
Findings - Mandatory Cases	7
Summary - Mandatory Cases	17
Findings - Discretionary Cases	18
Summary - Discretionary Cases	23
Summary	23
STUDY TWO: INTERSTATE COMPACT POPULATION PROFILE	21
Purpose	21
Methodology	21
Format for Findings	21
Findings	22
Summary	27
APPENDIX A - SUMMARY TABLES ON ALL APPLICANTS FOR SUPERVISION	28

INTRODUCTION

This project was prompted by a combination of internal and external influences. Recently, there has been a substantial amount of publicity, mostly unfavorable, about the supervision and recidivism of probationers and parolees handled under the Interstate Compact. Interest in and concern about these cases has extended to Congress, where hearings have been held by the Senate Judiciary Committee to expose problems with the system. This public scrutiny intensified the desire of Ohio officials to determine exactly what we do, and do not, know about Interstate Compact cases.

Prior to the implementation of this project, several key Division of Parole and Community Services staff members developed an extensive list of potential research questions. In the process of planning this study, the research staff determined that most of the potential research questions could be subsumed under three major categories:

1. Is Ohio properly following the guidelines established in the *Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Parolees and Probationers Manual* regarding accepting or rejecting cases for supervision?
2. What does our active caseload of Interstate Compact offenders look like?
3. What is the recidivism rate of Interstate Compact offenders?

After we had decided on the primary focus areas for the study, we looked at the available sources of data. We found that, while records are kept on Interstate Compact cases both in Central Office and in the Adult Parole Authority region in which the offender is supervised, the files are frequently sketchy or missing. Experiments have been made in the past to develop and maintain a PC-based database of Interstate Compact cases, but this has never been successfully done. A recent database purporting to contain all current cases was found to be incomplete; data for the variable which classifies cases into "accepted for supervision" and "supervision rejected" categories were not accurate. Finally, the files of many recently-closed cases (particularly those cases which closed successfully) had been destroyed.

METHODOLOGY

This study was a joint effort by the Bureau of Planning and Evaluation (Office of Management Information Systems) and the Division Parole and Community Services.

After considering the focus areas for the project, as well as the problems which we would inevitably encounter with data sources, we decided that we would conduct three "mini" research studies:

The first study will focus on the policy question, "Are we following the guidelines in the

Interstate Compact manual in our decision to accept or reject supervision of offenders from other states?" This study will also describe as many of the characteristics of accepted and rejected offenders as we can consistently find in our files.

The second study will provide a demographic look at offenders we currently supervise from other states. We will again examine as many variables as are consistently available.

The third study will give us some idea about the on-supervision performance of Interstate Compact offenders. Because of the way we keep, or do not keep, files on these offenders and because of the lack of any automated historical information about offenders entering or exiting supervision, we cannot conduct a recidivism study in the manner we would have liked. However, we will try to track all offenders accepted for supervision during a one-year time period to determine their status three years later.

This report contains the findings of the first and second studies. The third study is in progress and the findings will be reported in the future.

STUDY ONE: COMPLIANCE WITH INTERSTATE COMPACT GUIDELINES

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to examine the cases of out-of-state offenders who apply to be supervised in Ohio under the Interstate Compact agreement. We are interested in discovering the extent to which the decisions we make are compliant with the guidelines established by Interstate Compact and what variables, if any, might influence those decisions.

Study One Methodology

This study is based on all requests for placement from sending states for the twelve month period from November 1, 1994 to October 31, 1995. The names of offenders requesting placements in this time period were extracted from the current Interstate Compact database. We assumed this to be an exhaustive list, although we were unable to verify the accuracy of that assumption. Our search of Interstate Compact files at Central Office yielded 1,470 requests for placement during the target time period.

The information for this study was gathered from the offender files kept in the Interstate Compact Administrator's area. Data were collected on many variables, including: sending state, the date the request was sent by the sending state, the date the request was received at our office, the date the request was approved or rejected, the investigating unit, the most serious conviction offense, supervision type (probation or parole), application status (accepted or rejected), whether the offender is a resident of Ohio, whether the offender has family residing in Ohio, whether the offender has employment, whether the investigating parole officer can verify the placement information, and whether there was evidence that the offender was allowed to travel to Ohio prior to our decision to accept or reject the case.

Format for Study One Findings

The research findings for the first study are provided in table format and have been divided into three sections. The first section provides aggregate information relevant to all the offenders in our study time period whose acceptance for supervision was mandatory under Interstate Compact guidelines - 1,264 cases. The second section includes data specifically on offenders whose acceptance for supervision was considered discretionary - 206 cases. An Appendix at the end of this report contains data on all of the cases in the population.

FINDINGS

The following analysis focuses exclusively on the Mandatory cases in our population. We operationalized "mandatory" cases as only those cases in which the offender was a legal resident of Ohio and/or the offender's family resided in Ohio. Out of the 1,470 cases in our population, 86 percent (1,264) were considered to be mandatory acceptances under our definition.

We were interested in looking at which operational factor in our definition contributed most to the proportion of cases defined as mandatory. Table 1 shows that more than two-thirds of the mandatory cases are themselves Ohio residents and they have family in Ohio. Slightly more than 22 percent are not themselves legal residents of Ohio but must be accepted because they have family in Ohio.

Q1: What made applicants "mandatory"?

Table 1. Characteristics of Applicants

Characteristic	All Cases		Accepted Cases		Rejected Cases	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Mandatory Applicants						
Applicant is Ohio resident	113	9.5	95	84.1	18	15.9
Applicant has family in Ohio	262	22.1	150	57.3	112	42.7
Ohio resident <u>and</u> family in Ohio	811	68.4	743	91.6	68	8.4
Missing data	78	---				
Total	1264	100.0				
Discretionary applicants	206	---				
Grand Total	1470					

In addition, this table shows that offenders who are themselves residents of Ohio and who have family in Ohio are much more likely to be accepted for supervision. Of the applicants whose only connection with Ohio is the presence of family in the state, slightly more than half are accepted for supervision (57.3 percent).

Q2: What was the rate of rejection for mandatory applicants?

Surprisingly, the rejection rate for the mandatory cases was 17.1 percent (N=216), as Table 2 indicates. This rate is relatively high, considering that all mandatory cases, according to Interstate Compact guidelines, must be accepted.

Table 2. Application Status

Status	Mandatory Cases (n=1264)	
	#	%
Rejected	216	17.1
Accepted	1048	82.9
Total	1264	100.0

Q3: What reasons were given for rejecting 216 mandatory cases?

The previous table (Table 2) indicated that 216 (17.1 percent) mandatory applicants were rejected for supervision. Table 3 shows that the leading reason for rejecting an otherwise mandatory case was that the offender could not be found (23 percent of the rejected cases), followed by the offender returning to the sending state (16.0 percent), poor living conditions in the proposed home placement (14.0 percent) and the home provider refused to accept the offender (14.0 percent). Other reasons cited for rejection were the offender was in jail with pending new charges (12.0 percent), the proposed placement for a sex offender caused concern (11.0 percent), the offender was using drugs (3.0 percent), and the offender was a misdemeanor (2.5 percent).

However, these rejection reasons for mandatory cases deserve further scrutiny. Upon closer examination, we see that the reasons listed in Table 3 can be categorized into two types of cases. In the first type of case, it is clear that, even though the case may meet all of the requirements of a mandatory acceptance, common sense tells us that acceptance of the case is not reasonable. These cases would be those in which the offender cannot be found and therefore cannot be supervised (the "whereabouts unknown" cases), cases in which the offender has decided to return to the sending state, cases in which the proposed home provider refuses to accept the offender, and cases in which the offender is already in jail. Therefore, while these cases, on paper, are mandatory acceptances,

it does not seem reasonable to argue that Ohio should have accepted them for supervision. This type of case accounts for 65 percent of the rejected mandatory cases.

On the other hand, there are mandatory acceptance cases which are rejected by the exercise of discretion on the part of the investigating Parole Officer. There are cases in which the Officer's judgment deems the living conditions in the proposed placement to be inadequate, cases involving sex offenders in which the Parole Officer judges the living arrangements (or employment arrangements) to be unacceptable, or cases in which the Parole Officer determines that the offender has returned to using drugs.

If we look at the rejection of mandatory cases in this light, instead of a 17 percent rate of rejection of mandatory cases, we find only a 5.6 percent rate of rejection of mandatory cases.

Table 3. Reasons for Rejecting Mandatory Applicants

Reasons	Rejected Mandatory Cases (n=216)	
	#	%
Whereabouts unknown	46	23.0
Returned to Sending State	32	16.0
Poor living conditions	28	14.0
Home provider refuses	28	14.0
In jail/pending new charges	24	12.0
Concerns for sex offender	22	11.0
Using drugs	6	3.0
Misdemeanant	5	2.5
Other	9	4.5
Missing data	16	---
Total	216	100.0

Q4: What impact did having employment in Ohio have on the decision to reject/accept mandatory applicants?

An overwhelming majority of those mandatory acceptance cases with employment in Ohio were accepted for supervision. Table 4 reveals that 96.5 percent of those mandatory cases with employment were accepted. In contrast, of those mandatory cases without employment in Ohio, 69.7 percent were accepted and 30.3 percent were rejected.

Table 4. Employment in Ohio by Application Status

Employment in Ohio?	Mandatory Cases (n=1264)					
	Rejected		Accepted		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	23	3.5	628	96.5	651	100.0
No	169	30.3	388	69.7	557	100.0
Missing data					56	----

Q5: Did type of supervision have any impact on the decision to reject mandatory applicants?

As Table 5 shows, there was almost no difference in the rate at which mandatory acceptance probation cases were rejected and the rate at which mandatory acceptance parole cases were rejected.

Table 5. Type of Supervision by Application Status

Type of Supervision	Mandatory Cases(n=1264)					
	Rejected		Accepted		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Probation	145	18.1	658	81.9	803	100.0
Parole	71	15.4	390	84.6	461	100.0

Q6: Did type of crime have any impact on the decision to reject mandatory applicants?

Of the 1,264 subjects in this subset of mandatory cases, sex offenders had the highest rate of rejection for supervision. Table 6 indicates that 39.1 percent of the mandatory sex offender group was rejected, followed by property offenders (17.1 percent), violent offenders (16.6 percent) and drug offenders (14.1 percent).

Table 6. Type of Crime by Application Status

Type of Crime	Mandatory Cases (n=1264)					
	Rejected		Accepted		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Sex	34	39.1	53	60.9	87	100.0
Property	78	17.1	379	82.9	457	100.0
Violent	36	16.6	181	83.4	217	100.0
Drug	57	14.1	347	85.9	404	100.0
*Other	11	11.1	88	88.9	99	100.0

* "Other" includes flagrant non-support of children, child endangerment, child neglect cases and escapes.

Q7: Mandatory Cases - Sending State and Acceptance Rate

Table 7 looks at the distribution of mandatory cases by sending State. The States applying to send the most offenders are Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Michigan, Indiana, Florida and California. As the Table shows, the rejection rates for mandatory cases from these States does not differ markedly from the overall acceptance rate of 82.9 percent.

Table 7. Mandatory Cases - Sending States and Acceptance Rates

State:	Rejected Cases		Accepted Cases		Total Cases	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Alabama	1	5.6	17	94.4	18	1.4
Alaska	2	66.7	1	33.3	3	.2
Arizona	1	4.5	21	95.5	22	1.7
Arkansas	1	12.5	7	87.5	8	.6
California	14	22.2	49	77.8	63	5.0
Colorado	3	9.7	28	90.3	31	2.5
Connecticut	2	40.0	3	60.0	5	.4
Delaware	0	0.0	3	100.0	3	.2
Dist. Of Columbia	1	16.7	5	83.3	6	.5
Florida	11	12.8	75	87.2	86	6.8
Georgia	8	21.1	30	78.9	38	3.0
Hawaii	0	0.0	1	100.0	1	.1
Idaho	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	.1
Illinois	14	34.1	27	65.9	41	3.2
Indiana	11	11.1	88	88.9	99	7.8
Iowa	1	25.0	3	75.0	4	.3
Kansas	4	26.7	11	73.3	15	1.2
Kentucky	21	15.4	115	84.6	136	10.8
Louisiana	4	50.0	4	50.0	8	.6
Maine	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	.1
Maryland	3	23.1	10	76.9	13	1.0
Massachusetts	0	0.0	2	100.0	2	.2
Michigan	24	21.1	90	78.9	114	9.0
Minnesota	0	0.0	6	100.0	6	.5
Mississippi	0	0.0	4	100.0	4	.3
Missouri	3	7.0	40	93.0	43	3.4
Montana	0	0.0	2	100.0	2	.2
Nebraska	0	0.0	5	100.0	5	.4
Nevada	4	30.8	9	69.2	13	1.0
New Hampshire	0	0.0	1	100.0	1	.1
New Jersey	5	16.7	25	3.3	30	2.4
New Mexico	3	50.0	3	50.0	6	.5
New York	10	21.7	36	78.3	46	3.6
North Carolina	6	18.8	26	81.3	32	2.5
North Dakota	0	0.0	2	100.0	2	.2
Oklahoma	0	0.0	6	100.0	6	.5
Oregon	0	0.0	3	100.0	3	.2
Pennsylvania	23	15.6	124	84.4	147	11.6
Rhode Island	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	.1
South Carolina	4	19.0	17	81.0	21	1.7
South Dakota	0	0.0	1	100.0	1	.1
Tennessee	2	10.5	17	89.5	19	1.5
Texas	9	14.3	54	85.7	63	5.0
Utah	0	0.0	1	100.0	1	.1
Vermont	1	25.0	3	75.0	4	.3
Virginia	6	15.8	32	84.2	38	3.0
Washington	0	0.0	1	100.0	1	.1
West Virginia	6	17.6	28	82.4	34	2.7
Wisconsin	5	31.3	11	68.7	16	1.3
Wyoming	0	0.0	1	100.0	1	.1
Total	216	17.1	1048	82.9	1264	100.0

Q8: What evidence is there that mandatory acceptance cases traveled to Ohio prior to the decision to accept or reject the applicants?

We examined the files of all offenders applying for transfer to Ohio supervision for evidence that they had been allowed by the sending state to travel to Ohio prior to either the application or to the Ohio acceptance/rejection decision. We found that almost one in four (24.7 percent) of the mandatory cases had traveled to Ohio prior to acceptance of their cases (Table 8). Furthermore, we found that 12.5 percent of the mandatory acceptance cases who traveled to Ohio prior to a formal decision on their applications (39 cases) were subsequently rejected for supervision.

We were interested in determining whether the mandatory cases who traveled to Ohio prior to acceptance differed from other mandatory cases in any important respects. Table 8A shows some of the characteristics of the offenders who traveled without proper authorization compared with mandatory acceptance cases as a whole. The table shows that the "traveling" cases were much more likely to be probation cases, were more likely to have a job in Ohio, and were slightly more likely to be residents of Ohio who also had family here. The data on most serious offense show no clear-cut differences.

Table 8. Travel Permit by Application Status

Permission to travel?	Mandatory Cases (n=1264)					
	Rejected		Accepted		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	39	12.5	274	87.5	313	100.0
No	174	18.5	769	81.5	943	100.0
Missing data					8	----

The table also shows that more than 60 percent of the mandatory cases who traveled to Ohio without proper authorization came from six states: Florida, Kentucky, Indiana, Pennsylvania, North Carolina and Michigan. And, for Florida, Kentucky and Indiana, particularly, the proportion of unauthorized early travelers accounted for by these states substantially exceeded the proportion of all mandatory cases accounted for by these states.

Table 8A. Cases Traveling to Ohio Prior to Acceptance

Characteristics			Overall Mandatory Cases
	#	%	%
Type of Supervision:			
Probation	267	85.3	63.5
Parole	46	14.7	36.5
Most Serious Offense:			
Drug	98	31.3	32.0
Property	119	38.0	36.2
Violent	54	17.3	17.2
Sex	11	3.5	6.9
Other	31	9.9	7.8
Employment in Ohio:			
Yes	195	64.4	53.9
No	108	35.6	46.1
Missing	10	--	
Reason Why Mandatory Case:			
Offender Is Ohio Resident	32	10.6	9.5
Offender's Family Lives in Ohio	46	15.2	22.1
Both	225	74.2	68.4
Missing	10	--	
Sending States:			
Florida	49	15.7	6.8
Kentucky	49	15.7	10.8
Indiana	46	14.7	7.8
Pennsylvania	19	6.1	11.6
North Carolina	18	5.8	2.5
Michigan	13	4.2	9.0
All Others	116	37.8	51.5

Finally, we looked at the 39 cases who traveled to Ohio without proper authorization and were subsequently rejected for supervision (Table 9). In more than half of the cases (55.8 percent), the reasons for rejection were the unavailability of the offender for supervision: the offender's whereabouts were unknown, the offender was already in jail, or the offender had returned to the sending state. The states accounting for most of these offenders were Kentucky, Florida and Georgia.

Looked at another way, in more than one-third of these cases (38.2 percent), we can be fairly certain that the offender was not freely moving about unsupervised in Ohio (offender was in jail or had returned to the sending state). However, in 61.7 percent of the cases, we either did not know where the offender was or we found his proposed placement or substance abuse behavior, etc. unacceptable; in either case, the offender was not being supervised by our Officers but remained in Ohio.

Table 9. Reasons for Rejection and Sending States of Offenders Traveling without Proper Authorization

Reasons	#	%
Whereabouts Unknown	6	17.7
Poor Living Conditions	8	23.5
In Jail/Pending New Charges	6	17.6
Concerns for Sex Offender	2	6.0
Using Drugs	2	5.9
Returned to Sending State	7	20.6
Home provider Refuses	1	2.9
Misdemeanant	1	2.9
Other	1	2.9
Missing data	5	--
Total	39	100.0
Sending States		
Kentucky	6	15.4
Florida	5	12.8
Georgia	4	10.3
Pennsylvania	3	7.7
California	2	5.1
Indiana	2	5.1
Michigan	2	5.1
North Carolina	2	5.1
New Jersey	2	5.1
Virginia	2	5.1
All Others	9	23.4
Total	39	100.0

Q9: What impact did verification of placement information have on the decision to reject/accept mandatory applicants?

Most of the mandatory acceptance cases where placement information could not be verified by the investigating P.O. were rejected for supervision. Table 10 shows that 61 cases could not be verified. Of these, 44 (72.1 percent) were rejected for supervision and 17 (27.9 percent) were accepted.

Table 10. Verification by Application Status

Can the P.O. verify the placement information?	Mandatory Cases (n=1264)					
	Rejected		Accepted		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	172	14.3	1030	85.7	1202	100.0
No	44	72.1	17*	27.9	61	100.0
Missing data					1	----

*We made an effort to locate these 17 cases in order to determine whether these results were real or were the result of coding or data entry errors. We found nine of the seventeen files; in six cases, verification data were actually missing; in three more cases, the case was reslly rejected; we were unable to find the remaining eight files.

Summary - Mandatory Cases

The primary question addressed in this section of the report was, "Are we following the guidelines in the Interstate Compact manual in our decisions to accept or reject supervision of offenders from other states?"

We found that Interstate Compact guidelines require us to accept the overwhelming majority of offenders who apply for supervision; defining "mandatory" cases as those where the offender is legally a resident of Ohio or the offender's family resides in Ohio, we found that **86 percent of the offenders applying for supervision should have been mandatory acceptances.**

Overall, we rejected 17.1 percent of the cases which we have defined as mandatory acceptances. But, frequently we rejected cases for reasons which are so consistent with common sense that it might seem that we should not have been asked to supervise the case in this first place. These reasons include not being able to find the offender, the offender being in jail, the offender having already returned to the sending state,

and the home provider refusing to accept the offender. If we do not include these kinds of cases in the computation of our rejection rate of mandatory cases, we come up with a **rejection rate of mandatory cases of 5.6 percent.**

Looking at the accept/reject decisions for mandatory cases, we found that we were much more likely to reject offenders who did not have employment in Ohio and offenders whose most serious crime was a sex offense.

We also found **almost one in four (24.7 percent) of the mandatory cases had traveled to Ohio prior to our acceptance or rejection of their application for supervision.** Furthermore, we found that **12.5 percent of the mandatory acceptance cases who traveled to Ohio before we made a decision on their application were subsequently rejected for supervision.**

The cases involving offenders who traveled to Ohio prior to acceptance for supervision were more likely to be probation cases, were more likely to have a job in Ohio, and were slightly more likely to be residents of Ohio who also had family here.

The following section looks at the discretionary cases - those cases involving offenders who were not themselves Ohio residents and did not have family in Ohio. Only 14 percent of the population of applicants were discretionary cases (N=206).

Q10: What was the rate of rejection for discretionary applicants?

A surprisingly high proportion of discretionary cases were rejected in this subsample.

Table 11 indicates that there were 206 Discretionary cases. Of these, 161 (78.2 percent) were rejected compared to only 45 (21.8 percent) that were accepted for supervision.

Table 11. Application Status

Status	Discretionary Cases (n=206)	
	#	%
Rejected	161	78.2
Accepted	45	21.8
Total	206	100.0

Q11: What impact did having employment in Ohio have on the decision to reject/accept discretionary applicants?

The majority of discretionary cases without employment in Ohio were rejected for supervision. Table 12 reveals that there were 131 discretionary subjects with no employment, of whom 90.1 percent were rejected; only 9.9 percent were accepted.

On the other hand, there were 41 cases *with* employment in Ohio, of whom 70.7 percent were accepted and only 29.3 percent were rejected for supervision.

Table 12. Employment in Ohio by Application Status

Employment in Ohio?	Discretionary Cases (n=206)					
	Rejected		Accepted		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	12	29.3	29	70.7	41	100.0
No	118	90.1	13	9.9	131	100.0
Missing data					34	----

Q12: Did type of supervision have any impact on the decision to reject discretionary applicants?

Of the discretionary cases, 61.7 percent were probationers, roughly equivalent to the proportion of mandatory cases who were probationers. Table 13, however, indicates that parole applicants were somewhat less likely to be rejected (73.4 percent) than probation applicants (81 percent), which is a contrast to the pattern with mandatory cases.

Table 13. Type of Supervision by Application Status

Type of Supervision	Discretionary Cases (n=206)					
	Rejected		Accepted		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Probation	102	81.0	24	19.0	126	100.0
Parole	58	73.4	21	26.6	79	100.0
Missing data					1	----

Q13: Did type of crime have any impact on the decision to reject discretionary applicants?

Of the 206 discretionary cases, violent offenders had the highest rate of rejection. Table 14 shows that 83.3 percent of the violent offenders were rejected, followed by drug offenders (77.6 percent), property offenders (75.8 percent) and sex offenders (69.2 percent).

Table 14. Type of Crime by Application Status

Type of Crime	Discretionary Cases (n=206)					
	Rejected		Accepted		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Violent	25	83.3	5	16.7	30	100.0
Drug	45	77.6	13	22.4	58	100.0
Property	69	75.8	22	24.2	91	100.0
Sex	9	69.2	4	30.8	13	100.0
*Other	13	100.0	---	---	13	100.0
Missing data					1	----

* "Other" includes flagrant non-support of children, child endangerment, child neglect cases and escapes.

Q14: What states sent the discretionary acceptance cases?

Table 15. Distribution of Discretionary Cases by Sending State

State	Rejected Cases		Accepted Cases		Total Cases	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Alabama	1	50.0	1	50.5	2	1.0
Arizona	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	.5
California	8	88.9	1	11.1	9	4.4
Colorado	4	100.0	0	0.0	4	1.9
Florida	13	72.2	5	27.8	18	8.7
Georgia	4	80.0	1	20.0	5	2.4
Idaho	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	.5
Illinois	8	80.0	2	20.0	10	4.9
Indiana	9	81.8	2	18.2	11	5.3
Iowa	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	.5
Kentucky	10	76.9	3	23.1	13	6.3
Louisiana	1	50.0	1	50.0	2	1.0
Maryland	3	100.0	0	0.0	3	1.5
Massachusetts	2	100.0	0	0.0	2	1.0
Michigan	13	72.2	5	27.8	18	8.7
Minnesota	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	.5
Mississippi	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	.5
Missouri	5	71.4	2	28.6	7	3.4
Montana	0	0.0	3	100.0	3	1.5
Nebraska	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	.5
Nevada	3	60.0	2	40.0	5	2.4
New Jersey	1	33.3	2	66.7	3	1.5
New York	10	100.0	0	0.0	10	4.9
North Carolina	4	100.0	0	0.0	4	1.9
Oregon	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	.5
Pennsylvania	21	80.8	5	19.2	26	12.6
South Carolina	7	77.8	2	22.2	9	4.4
Tennessee	4	57.1	3	42.9	7	3.4
Texas	15	83.3	3	16.7	18	8.7
Utah	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	.5
Vermont	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	.5
Virginia	3	75.0	1	25.0	4	1.9
West Virginia	2	100.0	0	0.0	2	1.0
Wisconsin	1	50.0	1	50.0	2	1.0
Total	161	78.2	45	21.8	206	100.0

Table 15 above shows that the largest contributors of applications for discretionary cases were Pennsylvania, Florida, Michigan, Texas and Kentucky. Several of the very large contributors of discretionary cases also appear to have relatively high rejection rates: California with an 88.8 percent rejection rate, New York with 100.0 percent, and Texas with 83.3 percent.

Q15: What evidence is there that discretionary acceptance cases traveled to Ohio prior to the decision to accept or reject the applicants?

There was evidence that 40 discretionary cases (19.4 percent) traveled to Ohio prior to acceptance for supervision in this subsample. Of these, 26 (65.0 percent) were rejected for supervision.

Table 16. Travel Permit by Application Status

Permission to travel?	Discretionary Cases (n=206)					
	Rejected		Accepted		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	26	65.0	14	35.0	40	100.0
No	128	80.5	31	19.5	159	100.0
Missing data					7	----

Q16: What impact did verification of placement information have on the decision to reject/accept Discretionary applicants?

The overwhelming majority of discretionary cases that could not be verified by the investigating P.O. were rejected for supervision. Table 17 illustrates that 82 Discretionary cases could not be verified, of whom 80 (97.6 percent) were rejected and only 2 (2.4 percent) were accepted.

Table 17. Verification by Application Status

Can the P.O. verify the placement information?	Discretionary Cases (n=206)					
	Rejected		Accepted		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	81	65.3	43	34.7	124	100.0
No	80	97.6	2	2.4	82	100.0

Summary - Discretionary Cases

The analysis of discretionary cases revealed several patterns. First, an exceedingly large proportion of applicants who did not possess the characteristics to make them mandatory acceptances were **rejected for supervision - 78.2 percent**. Furthermore, **of those discretionary cases (131) with no employment in Ohio, 90.1 percent were rejected**.

Unlike mandatory acceptance cases, discretionary cases involving probationers were more likely to be rejected than similar cases involving parolees.

Again unlike mandatory acceptance cases, discretionary cases involving violent offenders had the highest rate of rejection. Of the discretionary cases for whom there was evidence that they had traveled to Ohio prior to the acceptance/rejection decision, 65 percent were rejected for supervision.

Finally, virtually all of those discretionary cases for whom placement information could not be verified were rejected for supervision.

Summary - Compliance with Interstate Compact Guidelines

The underlying question for this study was whether Ohio is following guidelines in our decisions to accept or reject supervision of offenders from other States. The data reported here suggest that the answer to this question appears to be a qualified "yes" for the mandatory cases. Although we do reject about 17 percent of the mandatory applications, we do so for the most part for good reasons (we cannot find the offender, the offender is already back in jail or back in the sending state, etc.). Rejections of mandatory cases under circumstances where our reason for rejection is discretionary account for 5.6 percent of the applications we receive.

STUDY TWO - INTERSTATE COMPACT POPULATION PROFILE

Purpose

The purpose of the second phase of this study is to look at as much information as we can on the offenders who are currently under Interstate Compact supervision. Here, we are more interested in describing the characteristics of the population than on answering a policy question, as in the previous section.

Study Two Methodology

This study is based on a random sample of all subjects under active Interstate Compact supervision in March 1996. The names of offenders under supervision were extracted from the current Interstate Compact database. The database yielded 3,383 offenders currently under supervision. Since we intended to collect a substantial amount of data on each subject, it was decided that it would be more efficient to collect data on a random sample, rather than on all individuals actively under supervision. To achieve a 95 percent confidence level, with a +/- 3 percent margin of error, we needed to draw a random sample of 527 cases. The files for the randomly selected offenders were located and data were collected on the following variables: gender, race, marital status, employment, education, living arrangements, offense, prior convictions, violent prior convictions, time served in prison, length of probation term, supervision adjustment, supervision type, supervision level, welfare benefits, substance abuse history, substance abuse treatment, and mental illness.

Format for Study Two Findings

The research findings for the second study are provided in table format. Data are presented in frequency distribution or crosstabulation form.

For a few variables, we can compare the characteristics of Interstate Compact offenders with the general caseload of probationers, parolees, and furlougees who are supervised by state Parole Officers. The variables on which we can make such comparisons are gender, race, and supervision level. The figures we are using for comparison to the state probation and parole caseload as a whole come from the *Ohio Parole and Probation Census - January 1, 1995* (Bureau of Research, November 1995). This report tells us that, overall, Interstate Compact parolees account for 4.4 percent of the total caseload and Interstate Compact probationers account for 9.2 percent of the total caseload.

FINDINGS

The overwhelming majority of the subjects in this sample were male - 82.9 percent. Furthermore, the Table indicates that 67.7 percent of the sample were White and 28.3 percent were Black. These distributions by gender and race are very similar to probationers and parolees as a whole.

Table 18 also indicates that most of this sample had a High School Diploma or G.E.D. (44.5 percent). In contrast, 31.2 percent did not have a H.S. Diploma or G.E.D. Further, 17.2 percent of the sample had some college or vocational training; 7.0 percent had a college degree or vocational certificate.

The Table also shows that many (62.9 percent) of the subjects in this sample obtained full-time employment after locating in Ohio. In contrast, 21.9% were unemployed at the time of data collection; 5.7 percent obtained part-time employment; and, 9.6 percent were either students, on disability benefits, or retired. Files showed evidence that only 4.1 percent of the sample were receiving welfare benefits.

The majority of the sample were not married (72.3 percent). The Table also indicates that most of the sample were drug offenders (33.3 percent), followed by property (32.5 percent), violent (23.7 percent), and sex offenders (7.4 percent).

Most of the sample did not have any evidence of a prior adult criminal conviction, 57.5 percent. However, for those for whom details of prior convictions were known, 32.4 percent of the sample had prior *violent* offenses.

Table 18. Distribution of Interstate Compact Population Demographic Characteristics Part I

Variable Characteristics	Frequency	Percent
Sex (n=527)		
Male	437	82.9%
Female	90	17.1%
Race (n=527)		
Black	149	28.3%
White	357	67.7%
Other	21	4.0%
Education (n=458)		
No HS/GED	143	31.2%
HS Diploma or GED	204	44.5%
Some College/Vocational	79	17.2%
College Degree/Voc. Cert.	32	7.0%
Employment Status (n=512)		
Full-Time	322	62.9%
Part-Time	29	5.7%
Unemployed	112	21.8%
Other	49	9.6%
Current Marital Status (n=516)		
Not Married	373	72.3%
Married	143	27.7%
Most Serious Offense (n=526)		
Drug	175	33.3%
Property	171	32.5%
Violent	125	23.7%
Sex	39	7.4%
Other*	16	3.0%
Evidence of a Prior Adult Criminal Conviction? (n=522)**		
Yes	222	42.5%
No	300	57.5%
Was the Prior Criminal Conviction a Violent Offense? (n=222)		
Yes	72	32.4%
No	150	67.6%

* Includes flagrant nonsupport, child endangerment, child neglect, and escapes.
 ** Does not include DUI convictions.

Two-thirds of the subjects were probationers (67 percent). Furthermore, most of the subjects were supervised at the Medium level (36.6 percent) or Minimum level (35.8 percent), followed by Maximum (12.7 percent), Sex Offender Level (8.8 percent), Extended (4.2 percent), and Intensive (1.9 percent) at the time of data collection. Compared with the probation and parole caseload as a whole, Compact supervisees are more likely to be Minimum level and less likely to be Maximum level.

Table 19 also reveals that 68.7 percent of the sample were placed with their families upon arriving in Ohio; 18.0 percent were placed with a friend or acquaintance, and 13.2 percent were residing alone at data collection.

Almost two thirds (64.4 percent) had evidence in their files of some type of substance abuse history; in contrast, 35.6 percent did not have any evidence of an abuse history. In addition, 16.6 percent of the sample had evidence of *current* substance usage at the time of data collection.

Although only one-fourth of the sample were currently in treatment for substance abuse, we found that 74 percent of the current substance abusers were in treatment.

The files of 10.7 percent of this sample indicated a history of mental illness.

More than two-thirds (68.2 percent) of the sample received supervision adjustment ratings of Satisfactory or better at their most recent rating.

Variable Characteristics	Frequency	Percent
Supervision Type (n=527)		
Probation	353	67.0%
Parole	174	33.0%
Current Supervision Level (n=377)		
Maximum	48	12.7%
Medium	138	36.6%
Minimum	135	35.8%
Extended	16	4.2%
Sex Offender Level	33	8.8%
Intensive	7	1.9%
Supervision Adjustment (n=192)		
Excellent	13	6.7%
Good	77	40.1%
Satisfactory	41	21.4%
Average	15	7.8%
Fair	32	16.7%
Poor	14	7.3%
Living Arrangement (n=521)		
Family	358	68.7%
Friends/Acquaintance	94	18.0%
Self	69	13.2%
Evidence of Abuse History? (n=523)		
Yes	337	64.4%
No	186	35.6%
Evidence of Current Substance Usage? (n=517)		
Yes	86	16.6%
No	431	83.4%
Currently in Treatment? (n=513)		
Yes	131	25.5%
No	382	74.5%
History of Mental Illness? (n=524)		
Yes	56	10.7%
No	468	89.3%

Q17: What was the average length of time served in prison and length of supervised probation?

Table 20. Distribution of Interstate Compact Population Demographic Characteristics

Variable	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median
Time Served in Prison				
Probationers (N=4)	10 months	36 months	21.75 months	13 months
Parolees (N=174)	1 month	18.67 years	47.5 months	33 months
Length of Supervision Period (other than normal parole period)				
Probationers (n=353)	1 year	36 years	5 years	5 years
Parolees (N=4)	2 years	7 years	5.5 years	5 years

Table 20 shows that the average time served in prison for parolees in this sample was 47.5 months (3.95 years). Obviously, there was a wide variation in time served in prison for this group - from one month to more than 18 years. Few probationers had served prison time before their supervision.

The average length of supervision period for probationers in this sample was 5 years. Also, the table shows that the mandated lengths of probation periods ranged from 1 year to 36 years.

Q18: What is the age of current supervisees?

Table 21: Age Distribution of Compact Supervisees

Age Ranges	#	%
20 and below	34	7.2
21 - 25 years	89	18.7
26 - 30 years	88	18.5
31 - 35 years	95	20.0
36 - 40 years	68	14.3
41 - 45 years	45	9.5
46 - 50 years	31	6.5
51 and over	25	5.3
Total	475	100.0
(Missing = 52)	Mean = 33.5 years	Median = 32 years

Table 21 shows the age distribution of the current Interstate Compact supervision caseload sample. About one-fourth of the offenders under supervision (25.9 percent) are twenty-five years of age or younger. The average age is 33.5 years.

Q19: From what States do current Interstate Compact cases come?

From Table 22 below, we can see that a relatively small number of States send a large proportion of the cases which come to Ohio. Together, the States of Kentucky (11.4 percent), Pennsylvania (9.9 percent), Florida (8.7 percent), Texas (8.2 percent), Michigan (6.3 percent), Georgia (5.5 percent) and Indiana (5.1 percent) send more than half (55 percent) of the Interstate Compact supervisees which Ohio receives.

Table 22. Frequency of Sending States

State	N	%
Alabama	6	.2
Alaska	1	1.1
Arizona	12	2.3
Arkansas	4	.8
California	22	4.2
Colorado	10	1.9
Connecticut	3	.6
Delaware	3	.6
District of Columbia	2	.4
Florida	46	8.7
Georgia	29	5.5
Hawaii	1	.2
Illinois	8	1.5
Indiana	27	5.1
Iowa	2	.4
Kansas	4	.8
Kentucky	60	11.4
Louisiana	2	.4
Maryland	3	.6
Massachusetts	3	.6
Michigan	33	6.3
Minnesota	6	1.1
Mississippi	1	.2
Missouri	20	3.8
Montana	1	.2
Nebraska	1	.2
Nevada	4	.8
New Jersey	14	2.7
New Mexico	1	.2
New York	18	3.4
North Carolina	13	2.5
North Dakota	1	.2
Oklahoma	4	.8
Oregon	4	.8
Pennsylvania	52	9.9
Puerto Rico	2	.4
Rhode Island	1	.2
South Carolina	8	1.5
Tennessee	15	2.8
Texas	43	8.2
Utah	2	.4
Virginia	17	3.2
West Virginia	10	1.9
Wisconsin	8	1.5
TOTAL	527	100.0

Summary - Current Cases

The purpose of this section was to describe the population of offenders currently under Interstate Compact supervision. Our review of the characteristics of these supervisees revealed that:

- ▶ The Compact caseload looks very much like the regular supervision caseload in terms of gender (predominately male), race (predominately White) and supervision type (predominately on probation). Compact cases, however, are slightly more likely than regular caseload offenders to be supervised at Minimum level. Slightly more than two-thirds (68.2 percent) received supervision adjustment ratings of Satisfactory or better at their most recent rating.
- ▶ Slightly less than one-third of the Compact cases do not have a high school diploma or GED. Almost one in four have at least some college or vocational training.
- ▶ Two-thirds of the Compact cases are employed (full-time or part-time). Files showed evidence that only 4.1 percent of the sample were receiving welfare benefits.
- ▶ Almost three-fourths of the Compact cases are not married. Most (two-thirds) live with their families or with friends or acquaintances.
- ▶ About two-thirds of Compact cases were convicted of drug or property offenses. Violent offenses account for about 24 percent of all cases. Sex offenses account for 7.4 percent of all cases.
- ▶ Slightly more than half of all Compact cases (57.5 percent) have had no prior adult criminal convictions. Of those with prior adult convictions, most (69.1 percent) have never been convicted of a violent offense.
- ▶ About two-thirds of the current Compact cases (64.4 percent) have had some type of substance abuse history. About one in six cases (16.6 percent) have evidence in their files of *current* substance abuse. The files of most of these current substance abusers (74 percent) indicated that they are receiving treatment.
- ▶ Compact parolees have served an average of almost 4 years in prison prior to release on supervision. Compact probationers have an average of 5 years of probation supervision.
- ▶ The average age of offenders under Compact supervision is 33.5 years.
- ▶ More than half of all Compact cases are sent to Ohio from Kentucky, Pennsylvania, Florida, Texas, Michigan, Georgia and Indiana.

APPENDIX A

Summary Tables of All Applicants for Supervision

Note: *The following tables include **both** Mandatory and Discretionary cases.*

Did type of supervision have any impact on the decision to reject applicants?

Table 1a. Supervision Type by Application Status

Type of Supervision	All Cases (n=1470)					
	Rejected		Accepted		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Probation	247	26.6	682	73.4	929	100.0
Parole	129	23.9	411	76.1	540	100.0
Missing data					1	----

Did type of crime have any impact on the decision to reject applicants?

Table 2a. Type of Crime by Application Status

Type of Crime	All Cases (n=1470)					
	Rejected		Accepted		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Sex	43	43.0	57	57.0	100	100.0
Property	147	26.8	401	73.2	548	100.0
Violent	61	24.7	186	75.3	247	100.0
Drug	102	22.1	360	77.9	462	100.0
*Other	24	21.4	88	78.6	112	100.0
Missing data					1	

* "Other" includes flagrant non-support of children, child endangerment, child neglect cases and escapes.

What was the rate of rejection for Compact applicants?

Table 3a. Application Status

Status	All Cases (n=1470)	
	#	%
Rejected	377	25.6
Accepted	1093	74.4
Total	1470	100.0

What impact did Ohio residence have on the decision to reject/accept applicants?

Table 4a. Ohio Residence by Application Status

Ohio resident?	All Cases (n=1470)					
	Rejected		Accepted		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	88	9.4	853	90.6	941	100.0
No	235	56.2	183	43.8	418	100.0
Missing data					111	----

What impact did having family in Ohio have on the decision to reject/accept applicants?

Table 5a. Family in Ohio by Application Status

Family in Ohio?	All Cases (n=1470)					
	Rejected		Accepted		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	196	17.3	938	82.7	1134	100.0
No	141	52.6	127	47.4	268	100.0
Missing data					68	----

What impact did having employment in Ohio have on the decision to reject/accept applicants?

Table 6a. Employment in Ohio by Application Status

Employment in Ohio?	All Cases (n=1470)					
	Rejected		Accepted		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	35	5.1	657	94.9	692	100.0
No	287	41.7	401	58.3	688	100.0
Missing data					90	----

What impact did having permission to travel to Ohio have on the decision to reject/accept applicants?

Table 7a. Travel permit by Application Status

Permission to travel?	All Cases (n=1470)					
	Rejected		Accepted		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	65	18.4	288	81.6	353	100.0
No	302	27.4	800	72.6	1102	100.0
Missing data					15	---

What were the top 7 sending states in issuing travel permits and how many permits were requested and issued?

Table 8a. Top 7 Sending States by Travel Requests and Travel Granted

Sending States	Travel Requests (n=1455)		Travel Granted (n=353)	
	#	%	#	%
Pennsylvania	171	11.8	20	5.7
Kentucky	148	10.2	55	15.6
Michigan	131	9.0	16	4.5
Indiana	110	7.6	49	13.9
Florida	103	7.1	59	16.7
Texas	80	5.5	5	1.4
California	72	4.9	8	2.3
All Other States	640	43.9	141	39.9
Total	1455	100.0	353	100.0

What impact did verification of placement information have on the decision to reject/accept applicants?

Table 9a. Verification by Application Status

Can the P.O. verify the placement information?	All Cases (n=1470)					
	Rejected		Accepted		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	253	19.1	1073	80.9	1326	100.0
No	124	86.7	19	13.3	143	100.0
Missing data					1	----