
2001

Annual Report

Adult Probation and Parole Department
First Judicial District of Pennsylvania
Court of Common Pleas
Trial Division
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Honorable Frederica Massiah-Jackson, President Judge
Honorable John W. Herron, Administrative Judge, Trial Division
Honorable D. Webster Keogh, Supervising Judge, Criminal
Joseph J. DiPrimio, Esq. Court Administrator
Joseph A. Cairone, Court Administrator, Criminal Trial Division
Robert J. Malvestuto, Co-Chief Probation Officer
Frank M. Snyder, Co-Chief Probation Officer

Adult Probation and Parole Department 2001

Co-Chief Probation Officers

*Robert J. Malvestuto
Frank M. Snyder*

Deputy Chief Probation Officers

Charles E. Gregonis

Directors

*Joan Bedell
Patricia L. Blow
James H. Harkins
Linda M. Mathers
Edward V. Quinn
Anthony R. Sasselli
Donald X. Taylor*

Associate Directors

*Frank T. DeFrancesco
Kathleen M. Intenzo
Robert Meenan
Maureen B. Murphy
Kevin W. Reynolds
Richard V. Vinci
C. Bernie White*

The Adult Probation and Parole Department is a community corrections agency within the Philadelphia Criminal Justice System and derives its authority from the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas and Municipal Court for the expressed intent of providing services to the courts, protecting the community, providing opportunities to offenders to improve their lives, and assisting victims.

Service to the Court

The agency will provide presentence investigation reports, mental health evaluations, and any other information to assist in the judicial decision making process.

Protection of the Community through Supervision of Offenders

The agency will ensure compliance of offenders with the rules and regulations of probation and parole and with court imposed conditions.

The agency will provide appropriate supervision and services for offenders aimed at reducing criminal activity. These services are intended to aid offenders in meeting their basic needs and developing their potential skills, through collaboration with community agencies.

Services to Victims

The agency will provide a broad range of services for the benefit of victims and the community.

Mission Statement

❖❖❖ Contents ❖❖❖

	Cover Page
Court Administrators	2
Mission Statement	3
Table of Contents	4
Office of the Chief Probation Officers & <i>2001</i> Highlights	5
Special Projects	10
Office of Professional Responsibility	15
<i>Budget for Fiscal Year 2001 - 2002</i>	17
Criminal Justice Center Operations	17
Intake Unit	17
Court Mental Health Clinic	17
Out of Town Services	18
Operations Division	19
Prison Population Management	19
Violations Unit	19
Parole Unit	21
Records Management Unit	22
General Supervision I	23
East Division	23
South Division	24
West Division	24
Youth Violence Reduction Partnership (YVRP)	24
General Supervision II	25
Northeast Division	25
Northwest Division	25
Courtesy Supervision	26
Accelerated Rehabilitative Disposition	26
Psychiatric Supervision	26
Special Supervision Division	27
Annual Division Results	29
Domestic Intervention Unit	30
Sex Offenders Unit	32
Alcohol Highway Safe Driving Unit (AHSD)	33
Fraud Supervision Unit	35
Community Service Unit	36
Monitored Supervision	37
Intermediate Punishment Unit (IP)	39
Presentence Investigation Unit	42
<i>2001 Philadelphia</i> Adult Probation Parole Department Organizational Chart	44

Robert J. Malvestuto ❖ **Frank M. Snyder**

In 2001, the Philadelphia Adult Probation and Parole Department (APPD) provided supervision and services to over 51,300 people who were sentenced to probation or paroled from county prisons by Judges of the Common Pleas and Municipal Court. The department operated with nearly 400 employees structured into two branches: Supervision Services and Administrative Services.

The Co-Chiefs were responsible for ensuring that their branch fulfilled the department's overall mission and goals. Co-Chief Probation Officer Frank M. Snyder supervised sub-components of APPD's Supervision Services (actual service delivery divisions), including: General Supervision I, General Supervision II, Special Supervision, and FOCIS, as well as the Special Projects Division and Presentence Investigation. Co-Chief Probation Officer Robert J. Malvestuto supervised sub-components of the department's Administrative Services branch, including: Operations, Prison Population Management, Parole, Records Management, Violations/Wanted Cards, and Intake. Deputy Chief Charles Gregonis supervised the Office of Professional Responsibility.

❖ 2001 Highlights ❖

In 2001 APPD implemented many changes to improve service to the Courts, community safety, and supervision of offenders. Part of this ongoing effort included converting 18 retired management positions to new probation officer positions in an effort to reduce increased workloads. Additionally, the department has worked toward improving the equitable distribution of workloads by creating a new South 4 unit due to the increasing number of offenders residing in the South district. 2001 marked the construction of the JAI Irving Memorial Library, accessible to all APPD and Pre-Trial staff. In 2001 APPD again was 100% compliant with State Standards.

In an effort to become more efficient and effective APPD continues to streamline its operations. The prison population management unit now contacts judges directly to schedule violation hearings for offenders who may have otherwise had their detainers certified. The out of county unit was physically moved to the intake unit of the Criminal Justice Center to ensure that transfers to the appropriate jurisdictions could be initiated immediately after the offenders are sentenced. During 2001, the process of assigning a portion of presentence investigations to trained field supervision officers was initiated. This process expands the responsibility for conducting presentence investigations outside of the presentence unit. APPD co-chaired an inter county transfer committee that will design uniform procedures for all inter county transfers in Philadelphia.

The Department has made many technological advances in 2001. The violations unit undertook a project to compare the APPD wanted card database against the state correctional institution data base. This process helped reduce the number of wanted card cases. The presentence investigation unit began experimenting with voice to text software to increase the overall efficiency of the officers presentence caseloads. Personnel procedures were automated in 2001. This automation enables personnel to provide next day updates, in addition to expediting the issuing of employee evaluations.

In 2001, APPD provided mandatory and requested documentation to the judiciary, federal, state and county agencies. The court mental health clinic processes 3,256 orders. The parole unit issued 8,803 petitions to the judiciary and processed 8,017 parole orders. In addition to completing this large number of judicial orders, the personnel unit completed over 15,000 compliance background checks for the Department of Public Welfare.

APPD Collections for victims compensation totaled a record of \$494,548.51. Restitution, fines and costs, and supervision fees totaled \$7,045,780.05 for 2001. The Intermediate Punishment and Monitored Supervision units saved \$17,110,875.00 in unserved jail time in 2001.

In an effort to improve services to the community and offenders under our supervision APPD has cultivated co-operative efforts with the Philadelphia Police Department, the District Attorney's Office, and Juvenile Probation in an effort to reduce community violence. Pennsylvania Crimes Code #5106 requires physicians and hospitals to report injuries caused by firearms, or criminal act, to the local police department. The collection, distribution and analysis of this information is the Weapons Related Injury Surveillance System (WRISS). In conjunction with the implementation of WRISS, APPD initiated a firearms surrender policy. This policy requires that offenders under APPD supervision must surrender their weapons. Utilizing the WRISS system, APPD will be able to develop a data base to conduct future analysis. APPD also

joined with Pretrial Services and Juvenile Probation to conducted an analysis of “Murder is no Mystery” in 2001. The analysis looked at a 100 person random sample of the 25th Police District’s alleged murders from 1996-1999.



Special Projects



The Special Projects Division responsibilities increased to include oversight of all areas designed to enhance the quality of probation and parole supervision, including: the Training Unit, Grant Management, Research and Development, State Standard/Operations Manual, Treatment Coordination, Police Liaison, Community Service Unit, and Department committees including but not limited to: Executive Training and Education Committee, VOP Subcommittee, Urinalysis Subcommittee, and Gun Policy Subcommittee.

Training Unit

During calendar year 2001, with the addition of two supervisors to the training unit, numerous new training courses were developed and implemented. A diverse offering of cognitive, procedural and skill-based programs were offered to staff at all levels. Probation and Pre-Trial Service employees attended both elective and mandatory courses to enhance professional skills and knowledge, learn new policies, procedures, and techniques, and engage in self-improvement. Both in-house staff and consultants were used in course development and delivery. Additionally, APPD facilities were used by Juvenile Probation and Court Administration for training of Juvenile Probation Officers, court clerks and various support staff.

Recognizing the importance of training in the departments continual development, the Training and Education Executive Committee identified numerous training concerns and needs. In an effort to address these concerns, volunteers were recruited from department staff at all levels. Eight Training Subcommittees were formed to evaluate existing training programs and to develop viable solutions to address the concerns and needs identified by the Training and Education Executive Committee. These subcommittees would also develop curriculum and/or recommend training programs that would address the defined needs. The subcommittees are:

Clerical/Support Staff Training	Community Partnership
Mentoring	New Employee Orientation and Training
Probation Law and Ethics	Professional Development/Continuing Education and Training
Supervisor’s Training	Writing Workshop

The Executive Committee selected two Co-Chairs to head each subcommittee. It was decided that the subcommittees would be staggered in their implementation dates to allow for maximum participation and management. The implementation and ongoing operation of these subcommittees augmented the department’s training hours achievement for calendar year 2001 as members received training credit for their time consuming efforts.

The Adult Probation-Parole’s Department yearly training hours achievement continues to improve. A total of **25,207.6** training hours were achieved through employee attendance at more than 583 In-Service courses, unit and/or committee meetings and 197 External training workshops, conferences, and/or graduate and undergraduate courses. The 25,207.6 hours of training were achieved as follows:

Management Staff	4,040.20 hours achieved
Professional Staff	17,040.35 hours achieved
Support Staff	2,170.05 hours achieved
Former Employees	1,957.00 hours achieved

Of the Adult Probation-Parole Department employees on record at year’s end, 99.7% of our staff earned the required

hours mandated by State Standards. We are proud of this accomplishment and the extra effort put forth by the Training Unit, the Training and Education Executive Committee, the Training Subcommittees, Division Directors and the many employees who served as Adjunct Trainers to help us in this achievement.

Training Hours Record Keeping

We continue to utilize the ABRA Record keeping System in maintaining training records and producing reports. Training Hours reports are produced and disseminated to all department staff via Division Directors on a monthly basis. These monthly reports provide an up to date listing of each employee's training achievements and they are a proactive way for managers to determine and address those employees who are not meeting training requirements in a timely manner.

Jai Irving Memorial Library

In 2001, our colleague, James A. Irving, Jr., lost his battle with a serious health condition. Jai, a 17 year employee, worked as an APPD trainer for many years. To honor his dedication and years of service, court administration agreed to the construction of the Jai Irving Memorial Library. Construction began in 2001. The library is located on the 10th floor of APPD and is accessible to all probation and pre-trial staff. Authorization was received for procurement of books, periodicals, and furniture. We look forward to its dedication and opening in 2002.

Grant Management

The Division continued to monitor and report on existing grants as required, and to research and apply for additional funding opportunities when possible. Division staff completed the following in 2001:

Intermediate Punishment (IP) Grant: All IP quarterly, final and additional grant reports required by PCCD were submitted. Monthly meetings of the IP Executive Committee were coordinated and hosted by APPD. Additionally, Intermediate Punishment and Management Staff met on a regular basis on IP-related management issues.

Hospitality House (HH) Day Reporting project: All HH Day Reporting quarterly, final and additional grant reports required by PCCD were submitted. Project management meetings were held as needed to coordinate referrals to the HH Day Reporting program.

Research and Development

The Division continued to coordinate all research-related efforts for the department. Division staff continued to complete and submit Intermediate Punishment Outcomes data for the PCCD-funded study being conducted. External researchers who were considering or actually conducting approved research using APPD data were assisted by Division staff. Assistance is provided to the Co-Chief Probation Officers by conducting research on various topics upon request. The Division staff continue to assist in identifying potential offenders for the Youth Violence Reduction Partnership (YVRP) and statistics are provided on the Weapons Related Injury Surveillance System (WRISS) for YVRP Steering Committee meetings.

In 2001, Special Projects began a cooperative effort with the Philadelphia Police Department, utilizing the WRISS system, to identify shooting victims and determine their involvement in the Criminal Justice System. The Police Department provides APPD with the date, time and location of the shooting, the victims name, age and address, the Detective Division investigating the incident and the hospital where the victim was, or is, being treated. Division staff collects the information, researches each victim to ascertain if they are on probation or parole with APPD, if there are any outstanding warrants, and if they are appropriate for the YVRP program. If there is an active probation or parole, the supervising officer is notified of the shooting and instructed to contact the offender for additional information. The officer attempts to determine the risk of future violence and encourages cooperation with the investigating detective.

The Division completed an analysis of the 100 randomly sampled murders committed in the 24th and 25th police districts from 1996 to 1999 included in a report entitled "Murder is No Mystery". Public/ Private Ventures provided APPD with the Police Photo Numbers of the 100 alleged murderers used in the random sample. Each Photo Number was researched by Special Projects to identify each offender, along with the date of the arrest and criminal act, the offender's probation status at the time of the act, and the disposition and sentence of each Murderer. Special Projects and Pretrial Services found that 25 of the offenders were under APPD supervision at the time of arrest. However, five of the 25 offenders were not under APPD supervision at the time of the murder (criminal act date). Of the 20 offenders who were under APPD

supervision at the time of the murder, 13 were found guilty of murder, 3 not guilty, 3 nolle pros, and 1 prosecution withdrawn without prejudice. Additionally, although 27 of the 100 were in pre-trial status at the time of the murder only 5 were ordered under supervision.

State Standards, Operations Manual and Website

The Division is responsible for monitoring and reporting on APPD compliance with the State Standards for Adult Probation and Parole Services. In October 2001, the Pennsylvania State Board of Probation and Parole conducted the annual compliance audit. Division staff provided required documentation, organized the auditors meetings schedule and met with the auditor personally to discuss all compliance issues, future plans, and goals. APPD achieved 100% compliance with state standards in 2001.

The Special Projects Division also assumed responsibility for updating and maintaining the APPD Operations Manual. Since the Manual reflects many policies and procedures mandated by state standards, the Division developed a system for integrating the respective practice and its corresponding standard in the Operations Manual, and the updates are being inserted in the manual on a regular basis. Complete references to all state standards will be integrated into the Operations Manual on a continuing basis. As new policies are developed, the division is responsible for incorporating all policies into the Operations Manual.

Division staff updates the APPD Website on a quarterly basis, maintaining accurate information in the site's telephone directory and associated text. The information available includes, but is not limited to, APPD's organizational structure, mission statement, brief descriptions of each Division's activities, and how to contact each Division's Director and Associate Director.

Treatment Coordination

The Division continued to send representatives to the monthly FIR meetings held at Philadelphia Health Management Corporation (chaired by Barry Savitz of CODAAP). Coordination of treatment services remains constant through the FIR officers and the Intermediate Punishment unit. Division Director, Linda Mathers regularly served as a resource for all Probation Officers seeking assistance with treatment referrals for offenders.

The Division also continues to host monthly IP Executive Committee meetings at APPD. These meetings serve as a forum for interagency communication, program development and/or problem solving. Members from the Division participated in IP and FIR meetings, and played an active role in implementing IP graduated sanctions. Members from the division also acted as liaisons between APPD staff, CODAAP, the District Attorney's Office, and the Defender's Association on issues surrounding substance abuse, treatment, prison overcrowding, probation/parole case management, and protection of the community. Linda Mathers teamed with representatives of Philadelphia's Behavioral Health System to present on treatment related issues at several conferences.

Community Services Unit

The Community Service Unit assumes responsibility for helping to place clients in meaningful assignments as a way to fulfill court-imposed community service requirements. This unit partnered with existing local service agencies and community-based organizations to develop and maintain placement opportunities for clients. The unit serves as liaison between the agency staff, the client, and the Probation Officers involved, and anticipate, resolve and prevent any issues which may arise. In 2000, this unit merged with the Special Projects Division and began its automation efforts. Mid-year, 2001, the unit was reassigned and aligned with the Special Supervision Division.

Police Liaison

Division representatives continued to serve as APPD Police Liaisons by regularly attending Philadelphia COMPSTAT meetings on Thursday mornings. When possible, representative Supervisors and Probation Officers were asked to attend those COMPSTAT meetings scheduled to cover their unit's assigned district or specific areas of responsibility.

Division staff are responsible for coordinating external agency arrests and interviews. Arrest warrants are received from agencies such as the Immigration and Naturalization Service, Philadelphia's District Attorney's Office, the Philadelphia Police Department, the FBI Fugitive Task Force, and from other Counties and States.

APPD Subcommittees

VOP Subcommittee

During 2001, Committee representatives collected information from court room operations, APPD staff, supervisors, and various judges to facilitate implementation of this project designed to eliminate unnecessary court time. VOP Committee members continue to participate in follow up training and evaluations to ensure that the new VOP form and procedures, such as the "First and Last" policy, are appropriately implemented.

New officers continued to be trained in the "First and Last" policy and the new VOP form. Additionally, the policy was incorporated into the Operations Manual. This policy, along with the VOP template, combined to reduce the amount of time officers were required to spend in court.

Urinalysis Project

The Urinalysis Committee engaged in intensive implementation efforts to establish and develop policy and procedures surrounding the new Urinalysis Collection Station. The First Judicial District continued its existing contract with Penn Services (with Medtox Laboratories conducting urine tests) on October 30, 2001. The new, centralized Urine Screening Center continues to be situated on the eleventh floor of APPD, staffed by three full-time and one part-time Penn Services technicians (three male and one female).

The number of tests has increased significantly since the implementation of the new system, and officers are more consistently complying with court-ordered random drug screening stipulations. During the first full year of operation, January, 2001 to December, 2001, there were 37,135 urine tests collected, resulting in 13,975 positive tests, or 37.84% positive results.

Urinalysis procedures have been repeatedly refined, and now include:

- ▶ Urine Test software installed on all interview booth computers so Officers may order the test directly, therefore making the offender accountable should the individual choose not to appear for the urine sample on the eleventh floor.
- ▶ Identification procedures, using the procured Pinnacle Identification System. Offenders are identified upon arrival for urine sample to ensure integrity in the testing process.
- ▶ Delineated protocols for ordering urinalysis on court-ordered offenders.
- ▶ Safety procedures in event of incidents involving collection staff and offenders.
- ▶ Test Result software installed on all Supervisors management computers for retrieval of urinalysis results and statistical reports. Continued collection and data management using this software will assist APPD management in identifying drug use patterns among APPD offenders.

Committee members assisted the Training Unit and MIS representatives with training APPD staff regarding the use and implementation of the required computer applications.

The system, due to unexpectedly high volumes of daily tests, requires ongoing review, monitoring, and adjustments. The Urinalysis Committee continues to meet monthly to address new issues and draft appropriate protocols. The committee members during 2001 were: Linda Mathers, Joan Bedell, Kevin Reynolds, Maureen Murphy, Bernie White, Gary Cenna, Patrick Austin, and Michael Briscoe.

Gun Policy Subcommittee

The First Judicial Firearm Surrender Policy committee was formed in 2000 as an APPD response to handgun violence in Philadelphia. As Philadelphia leads all major cities in the percentage of homicides committed by handguns, APPD is determined to improve its restriction of firearms by APPD offenders. The committee's work has focused on the creation of a more clearly defined restriction on the possession of firearms, distribution of the legal and verifiable means of divestment of a firearm and a creation of a specific format for bringing firearm violations to attention of the sentencing Judge. Policy and procedure changes have been integrated into the Operations Manual and training began at the end of 2001.

Special Projects

The division continued to manage additional special projects as requested by APPD Co-Chief Probation Officers. Such projects in 2001 included:

- ▶ *Assessing the viability of a computerized resource manual.*
- ▶ *Maintaining, researching and distributing WRISS (Weapons Related Injury Surveillance System) information. Applying WRISS information to caseload management practices.*
- ▶ *Stream lining outside agency arrests.*
- ▶ *Development of policy surrounding the Early Termination of Probation Cases, Firearms Surrender and Violation process.*
- ▶ *Distribution of Staff Development Articles "E-mail News Distribution" began in 2001. This process enables APPD staff to receive valuable current information via e-mail.*
- ▶ *IP + Upgrade: The special projects division has ongoing meetings with Scotia Consulting to ensure the IP+ computerized caseload management system continues to be upgraded as needed.*
- ▶ *Research alternative caseload management systems, such as the Maryland Integrated Offender Management System (C-tag), and CDI.*
- ▶ *Acting as a liaison between APPD and external organizations.*
- ▶ *Murder is No Mystery report, published by Public and Private Ventures (PPV), provided the Special Projects Division with the opportunity to work closely with Juvenile Probation and Pretrial Services to respond to PPV with a full report based on the information obtained during our research. All information and data was given to APPD Administration for review.*



Office of Professional Responsibility



The Office of Professional Responsibility which reports directly to Deputy Court Administrator Joseph A. Cairone has four major areas of responsibility:

- Departmental Collections
- Facilities Management
- Personnel Services
- Professional and Personal Accountability/Labor Relations

The responsibilities of all four functions have been designed as service support systems to enhance the overall quality of work life for the entire staff of the Adult Probation and Parole Department. The objectives are to ensure that revenues are enhanced, the physical plant is comfortable and supportive of staff, personnel services are administered in a fair and consistent manner and that professional standards, FJD policies and procedures are adhered to in a consistent manner throughout all of the subdivisions of the Adult Probation and Parole Department.

Departmental Collections

The collection effects are administered by the Accounting Unit which receives and processes all payments made by offenders under the APPD supervision for Restitution, Fines and Cost payments, and Supervision Fees. Payments are made in person by offenders at APPD's payment center, and can also be mailed directly to the payment center.

The processing of all Third Party Collections is facilitated separately by the support staff within the Office of Professional Responsibility. All Third Party payments are made directly to the vendor; and beginning in November 2001 to a designated Third Party contractor, with bulk checks. The contractor itemizes these receipts by name and by Court Bill and Term monthly, according to CP, MC, and DC/Summary case identifiers. These payments are banked in a special First Judicial District Bank Account; wherefrom checks are generated, net of commission to the contractor, and forwarded with supporting documentation to the Clerk of Quarter Sessions to be applied to the relevant outstanding Fines and Cost Accounts.

During the calendar year 2001, collections for Restitution Fees amounted to \$4,011,166.17; Supervision Fees \$851,875.68; Fines and Costs \$1,708,793.24; and Third Party and Act 84 \$473,944.96, for a total of \$7,045,780.05. This marked an increase of \$1,127,607.54, representing 19.05%, over the prior year total of \$5,918,172.51. Contributing to this increase were

Third Party collections and Act 84 collections which improved by \$410,403.34 over the prior year total, followed by Restitution Fees which went up by \$318,548.21, Fines and Costs by \$230,917.15, and Supervision Fees by \$167,738.84.

In total, there were 104,195 transactional payments processed during the year 2001. This marked a 10.78%, or 10,141 additional processed payments over prior year total of 94,054.

Collections for Victims Compensation Fund continued to be progressively successful in Year 2001 with a total of \$494,548.51. This is \$127,413.90, or 34.7% higher than Year 2000 total of \$367,134.61. For the second consecutive year, APPD exceeded the set goal of \$300,000. While in Year 2000 the overage was \$67,134.61 or 22.38%, year 2001 registered an overage of \$194,548.51 or 64.85%.

Following below are annual collection's schedules, itemized by month, showing the actual monthly collections with their corresponding transactional number of payments, for Restitution Fees, Supervision Fees, Fines and Costs, Third Party, and Grand Total.

In addition, a schedule has been provided to show the Five Year Statistical Comparative Summaries, beginning from 1997 to 2001. It is noted that total collections increased yearly, when compared to prior year. The favorable trend, thus established, generated a total increase from 1997 to 1999 of \$1,465,362; and another \$1,335,715 between 1999 and 2001.

Accomplishments were made in all areas of Collections activities in the Year 2001. Such success was the result of intensified efforts in this regard by Probation Officers, and their Supervisors.

RESTITUTION COLLECTIONS IN THE YEAR 2001

MONTH	RESTITUTION	RESTITUTION PAYMENTS
JANUARY	\$386,112.23	4,392
FEBRUARY	\$371,580.94	4,390
MARCH	\$368,762.64	4,252
APRIL	\$322,623.73	3,763
MAY	\$335,771.79	3,992
JUNE	\$322,803.26	3,772
JULY	\$351,963.49	3,868
AUGUST	\$382,591.44	4,419
SEPTEMBER	\$313,898.62	3,906
OCTOBER	\$363,088.65	4,691
NOVEMBER	\$266,290.05	3,547
DECEMBER	\$225,679.33	3,072
TOTAL	\$4,011,166.17	48,064

SUPERVISION COLLECTIONS IN THE YEAR 2001

MONTH	SUPERVISION	SUPERVISION PAYMENTS
JANUARY	\$74,775.23	1,653
FEBRUARY	\$76,529.21	1,592
MARCH	\$81,055.58	1,700
APRIL	\$68,825.06	1,495
MAY	\$70,211.28	1,611
JUNE	\$72,026.53	1,593
JULY	\$69,620.99	1,632
AUGUST	\$73,685.82	1,644
SEPTEMBER	\$61,902.12	1,382
OCTOBER	\$73,704.37	1,825
NOVEMBER	\$65,073.99	1,558
DECEMBER	\$64,465.50	1,567
TOTAL	\$851,875.68	19,252

FINES & COST COLLECTIONS IN THE YEAR 2001

MONTH	FINES & COST	FINES & COST PAYMENTS
JANUARY	\$134,819.38	2,855
FEBRUARY	\$140,596.50	2,924
MARCH	\$160,462.11	3,025
APRIL	\$149,815.65	2,843
MAY	\$156,874.19	3,102
JUNE	\$147,447.19	2,972
JULY	\$140,864.69	2,983
AUGUST	\$141,491.36	3,159
SEPTEMBER	\$127,148.85	2,746
OCTOBER	\$157,246.00	3,368
NOVEMBER	\$130,585.19	3,021
DECEMBER	\$121,442.13	2,677
TOTAL	\$1,708,793.24	35,783

THIRD PARTY AND ACT 84 COLLECTIONS IN THE YEAR 2001

MONTH	THIRD PARTY COLLECTIONS	THIRD PARTY PAYMENTS
JANUARY	\$ 1,822.03	45
FEBRUARY	\$ 3,356.72	70
MARCH	\$ 1,801.30	48
APRIL	\$ 0.00	0
MAY	\$ 44,216.51	207
JUNE	\$138,407.87	212
JULY	\$ 94,909.90	146
AUGUST	\$ 40,353.37	57
SEPTEMBER	\$ 53,373.64	61
OCTOBER	\$ 417.28	16
NOVEMBER	\$ 9,355.39	158
DECEMBER	\$ 85,930.95	76
TOTAL	\$ 473,944.96	1,096

GRAND TOTAL IN THE YEAR 2001

MONTH	TOTAL COLLECTIONS	TOTAL PAYMENTS
JANUARY	\$597,528.87	8,945
FEBRUARY	\$592,063.37	8,976
MARCH	\$612,081.63	9,025
APRIL	\$541,264.44	8,101
MAY	\$607,073.77	9,020
JUNE	\$680,684.85	8,549
JULY	\$657,359.07	8,629
AUGUST	\$638,121.99	9,279
SEPTEMBER	\$556,323.23	8,095
OCTOBER	\$594,456.30	9,900
NOVEMBER	\$471,304.62	8,284
DECEMBER	\$497,517.91	7,392
TOTAL	\$7,045,780.55	104,195

**ADULT PROBATION AND PAROLE DEPARTMENT FIVE-YEAR
COMPARATIVE STATISTICAL SUMMARIES
FOR COLLECTIONS IN YEAR 2002**

TYPE OF FEES	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	TOTALS
Restitution Fees	\$2,517,882	\$2,820,250	\$3,563,320	\$3,692,618	\$4,011,166	\$16,605,236
Supervision Fees	\$ 566,183	\$ 664,695	\$ 679,197	\$ 684,137	\$ 851,876	\$ 3,446,088
Fines and Costs	\$1,160,638	\$1,336,116	\$1,467,548	\$1,477,876	\$1,708,793	\$ 7,150,971
Third Party	0	0	0	\$ 63,542	\$ 39,592	\$ 103,134
Act 84	0	0	0	0	\$ 434,353	\$ 434,353
Total Amounts	\$4,244,703	\$4,821,061	\$5,710,065	\$5,918,173	\$7,045,780	\$27,739,782
Average Amounts	\$ 353,725	\$ 401,755	\$ 475,838	\$ 493,181	\$ 587,148	\$ 2,311,648
Total Payments	\$ 79,439	\$ 86,860	\$ 96,043	\$ 94,054	\$ 104,195	\$ 460,591

Facilities Management

During the year 2001, the final fit-out for 1401 Arch Street has been completed. All systems are functioning well and the facility continues to be a safe, clean and pleasant work environment for our staff.

The library project was completed this year, which entailed the construction of the library and three private offices all of which are located on the Administrative floor.

As an ongoing process, Facilities Management continued to provide standard building support functions such as:

- Processing ongoing complaints and requests for repair and maintenance service.
- Automated services by maintaining our Fleet Vehicles for Field Visits.
- Telephone Service regarding number changes and problems with service.
- The ongoing messenger/mass mailing system for the building.
- Inventory control including ordering, processing and billing of all supplies and equipment.
- Maintenance and service contracts for equipment.

The following charts reflect the budget for FY2002, and also a chart showing department expenditures for the year 2001.

Adult Probation and Parole Department Budget for FY'02 July 1, 2001 - June 30, 2002					
Program	Staff Positions	City	State	Federal	Total

Grant in Aid					
Continuing Program	228	\$4,539,607	\$5,019,476		\$9,559,083
Match	62	\$2,510,504			\$2,510,504
Federal					
Restrictive IP	10			\$436,689	\$422,242
Victims	3			\$ 98,459	\$98,459
State Welfare					
Welfare Fraud	8		\$293,201		\$293,201
Insurance Fraud	1		\$39,213		\$39,213
Unemployment Fraud	1		\$42,030		\$42,030
City of Philadelphia					
General Fund	60	\$1,743,666			\$1,743,666
Supervision Fee	2	\$44,134			\$44,134
Department Totals	371	\$8,837,911	\$5,393,920	\$535,148	\$14,752,532

Department Expenditures - 2001					
Category	General Fund	Grant	Supervision Fees	Other	Total
Personnel					\$13,388,775.00
Contracts	\$680,095.00	\$434,004.00	\$41,703.00	\$731,236.00	\$1,887,038.00
Supplies	\$140,789.00	\$8,173.00	\$26,160.00		\$175,122.00
Equipment	\$20,085.00	\$18,375.00	\$21,558.00		\$60,018.00
Total Expenses					\$15,510,953.00

PERSONNEL SERVICES

The mission of Personnel Services is to provide services for department employees' needs and to provide support for departmental administration in all areas of personnel administration. In 2001, duties included: counseling and advising, record maintenance, distributing paychecks, disseminating information and various other personnel-related functions. Personnel staff continued to provide the following services to APPD employees:

Counseling/Advising

- Advise departmental administration and all other staff on all aspects of personnel services, including rules and regulations. FJD and department policies, attendance regulations, benefits, deferred compensation, etc.
- Process all new hires, separations, promotions, duty-related injuries, leaves of absence, FMLA, etc.
- Consult with administrative staff in developing internal policies consistent with FJD policies.
- Coordinate FLEX benefits enrollments and assist employees in completing forms. Also, provide benefits information and assistance throughout the year.
- Provide salary/budget information for grant preparation.
- Provide statistical information for APPD's Administration reports, state compliance, etc.
- Provide salary information and attendance updates to employees as needed.
- Meet with new employees and newly promoted supervisors regarding rules, regulations, and policies.

Record Maintenance

- Personnel files, attendance records, and salary histories are maintained for all department staff. These are updated as data are received.
- Process all dockings and overtime as required.
- Distribute and collect employee performance evaluations, and forward completed reports to Court Human Resources.

Other Functions

- Meet with attorneys regarding lawsuits against the department by former or current employees.
- Attend Unemployment compensation hearings.
- Meet with representatives of City Controller's Office as required for attendance audits.
- Issue informational correspondence, such as position vacancies, policy or regulation changes, etc., and conduct policy training when necessary.
- Prepare statistical surveys and reports as required. Reports issued to CPO: EEO, and various statistical reports.
- Issue reports to CPO and Office of Professional Responsibility: Compensation time earnings, Lateness, and Work schedules.
- Issue other statistical reports when requested by APPD Administration.
- Coordinate interview schedules and assemble packages for interviews for all candidates for employment with APPD. Candidate packages include thumbnail biography, short work history, criminal record check, and any other information which assists the interviewers.
- Conduct clerical interviews.
- Distribute paychecks. FLEX benefits checks, W2 forms, and Catastrophic Leave information.
- Distribute all internal position vacancy announcements and collect applications.
- Coordinate distribution, collection and processing of all surveys which originate at Court Administration.
- Coordinate activities such as Combined Campaign.

Highlights

- Personnel procedures were automated in 2001. Attendance recording was networked with Court Human Resources providing next-day updates.
- Streamlined the issuance of employee evaluations, thereby reducing the average time for an evaluation from 2-3 days to 1 day.
- Processed over 15,000 compliance background checks for Department of Public Welfare.

Professional and Personal Responsibility/Labor Relations

In this capacity, the Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR) acts as the on sight labor specialist for APPD as it relates to AFSCME, District Council 47, Locals 2186 and 810 represented employees.

The office is charged with ensuring the uniform application of work rules, the dissemination of information regarding FJD and APPD policy and procedures, and reviewing performance standards and the evaluations as they relate to merit based promotions, increments and longevities. Caseload audits are carried out at our own initiative, or when requested by supervisors and/or managers.

Investigations concerning workplace behavior, time and attendance issues, and use of district electronic and communication equipment, as well as physical inventory are conducted and monitored on a monthly basis. Complaint resolution issues and progressive disciplinary measures are recommended.



Criminal Justice Center Operations



The Criminal Justice Center Operations division is a support service which handles the initiation of ARD, Probation and Bench Parole cases. It provides information to the judiciary concerning the status of an offender's mental health. The court is under contract with Forensic Mental Health Associates, a component of CJC Operations, which prepares psychological reports for sentencing.

Intake Unit

The Intake Unit's primary responsibility is to initiate probation or parole cases electronically by interviewing newly sentenced offenders and entering information into a computer system from the sentencing Judge's court order. The accuracy of this information is critical, since it will be read and used by computer programs which support and manage many other aspects of case supervision. In particular, Intake staff must properly record conditions of probation as ordered by the judge in each case (e.g. treatment services, victim restitution) in order for supervision officers to be aware of and enforce these conditions. This unit is also responsible for staffing ARD court to interview and process cases. **There were 23,805 cases initiated by the Intake Unit this year an increase of 4%.** Of the cases initiated 4,476 were ARD cases.

Court Mental Health Unit

Mental Health evaluations are ordered by the Judiciary to verify the offender's mental competence to stand trial and assist in their own defense. They are also ordered in connection with involuntary commitments, as well as to determine amenability to treatment and to provide the court with other psychological information needed for sentencing.

Out of Town Services

The Out of Town Unit tracks two types of cases: those who offended in Philadelphia but who live in and are actively supervised by other counties; and those who offended in Philadelphia and live in and are actively supervised by other states. Applicable legislation is the Interstate Compact Services Act and the Inter-county Agreement on Supervision of Probationers and Parolees.

Highlights

All Intake and Court Mental Health staff completed training requirements in 2001. All clerical and support staff completed at least sixteen (16) hours required. All professional staff completed the required forty (40) hours necessary to meet state standards.

Court Mental Health's commitment to mentoring has yielded highly positive results. Several interns have been placed in the division and made significant contributions.

Accolades to this fine group of support staffers, they never missed a beat in the day-to-day expectations of clinical operations. The Court Mental Health Clinic Support Staff has worked together basically intact for a number of years. True continuity has developed among them; this is a very valuable asset to the Clinic's demanding schedules and deadlines.

Mental Health Court Orders		
	2000	2001
January	238	290
February	290	233
March	299	274
April	256	282
May	260	275
June	280	332
July	217	258
August	220	296
September	212	235
October	279	285
November	222	272
December	177	224
TOTAL	2,950	3,256 + 10%


Operations Division


The Operations division handles many of the functions which directly support the supervision of Probation and Parole cases by Probation Officers. It consists of the following units: Parole, Records, and Violations, and the prison population management function. The Director and Associate Director along with the Co-Chief Probation Officer and FJD staff are involved in a court wide automation project.

Prison Population Management

This includes Special Release hearings, liaison with the Deputy Managing Director’s Office, Detainer Certification Management, et.al. This is part of the ongoing effort to monitor and, where feasible, check the growth of the prison population.

The Prison Population Management function also includes insuring compliance with rules which govern detainees and violation hearings, and which effect the prison population. Under certain circumstances, detainees can be removed or “certified” by the Deputy Managing Director for Criminal Justice Prison Population Management. In 2001, 1,235 detainees were certified. There were also 47 Special Release Hearings at which 123 APPD cases were considered for release. Of those, 12 detainees were removed.

APPD PPM Managers also effectuated the removal of 707 detainees for cause. Those detainees for which payment of fines were a condition of removal netted \$62,803.

This year, we assumed the responsibility of contacting Judges directly in order to schedule violation hearings for offenders whose detainees may otherwise be certified.

Violations Unit

The Violations unit handles several aspects of probation violations for all cases supervised by the department’s officers, including generating and tracking wanted card and manual detainees, scheduling and staffing detainer hearings and scheduling violation hearings. A “Detainer” is the legal instrument used to hold an offender who is in Violation of Probation. Offenders whose whereabouts are unknown, and whose cooperation and contact with APPD cannot be restored, are placed in Wanted Card status for having absconded from supervision. Such offenders are then listed in local and State databases as being wanted by APPD and a detainer is issued which will hold them in the event that they are apprehended. **In 2001, APPD filed 6,162 wanted card detainees, an increase of 6%, and removed 5,855, an increase of 8%. A special project undertaken this year was to compare the Wanted Card database against the database of inmates in State Correctional Institutions.** This has cleared several hundred wanted cases. The Violations Unit fields calls from agencies all over the United States regarding offenders who are apprehended by other jurisdictions.

For each offender who is placed in Wanted Card status as above, the detainer is kept on file by the Pre-Trial Services Warrant Unit. That detainer can be “lodged” against an offender to ensure incarceration until a hearing is held. APPD also issues manual detainees in order to take probationers into custody whose whereabouts are known. **In 2001, APPD issued 4,600 manual detainees, an increase of 34%.** A Violations Unit staff person represents APPD at all detainer hearings, which are held at the Philadelphia Prisons. Detainers can also be sent to other jurisdictions to hold a wanted offender for transfer to a Philadelphia prison. The Violations Unit generates and tracks all detainees issued on cases supervised by APPD. **There were 9,306 detainer hearings held this year, an increase of 10%.**

Another responsibility of the Violations Unit is the scheduling and tracking of Violation of Probation/Parole hearings. Schedules are published each week which notify Officers and their managers of the hearings which will be held the following week. There were 33,980 violation hearings scheduled during 2001.

Detainers Lodged - 2001	
Automatic	11
Manual	3,966
Wanted Cards	5,327
TOTAL	9,306
Detainer Dispositions	
Held	8,619
Removed	687
TOTAL	9,306 (+10%)
Lodged for 2000	8,474

Wanted Card Statistics	
Wanted Cards Filed in 2001	6,162
Wanted Cards Removed in 2001	5,855
Total No. of Cases on Wanted Cards as of 12/31/01	12,074
Total Cases on Wanted Cards as of 12/31/00	11,767

Manual Detainer Statistics - 2001	
Manuals Issued in 2001	4,600
Manuals Removed in 2001	4,240
Manuals Issued in 2000	3,438
Manuals Removed in 2000	3,430

Violation Statistics -2001	
Violation Hearings Requested	7,666
Violation Hearings Scheduled	33,980
Violations Hearings Continued (CFN)	24,874
Violation Hearings Disposed	11,295
Violation Hearings Disposed 2000	10,581

Parole Unit

The Parole unit is responsible for timely issuance of parole petitions to Judges, who will then either approve or deny parole for the offender who is serving a sentence. Several guidelines and local rules determine when an inmate is considered for parole. These criteria and many other variables are contained in a complex network computer program which is known as the Release Information Network (RIN). The Public Defenders Office is also networked to RIN, and uses RIN data to petition the Court for the parole of inmates which it represents. The Parole Unit processes those petitions.

The Parole Unit is also responsible for generating a parole order when the sentencing Judge has ruled favorably on the parole petition. The RIN system is used for this function as well. Since prison overcrowding has been an historical problem for Philadelphia County Prisons, it is imperative that the Parole Unit stay current with the processing of parole petitions and orders. The Parole unit also maintains close liaison with the Philadelphia Prison system through staff communication, and by the electronic download to the RIN system of information pertaining to the prison population. The Parole Unit is also responsible for conducting prison interviews.

In 2001, the Parole Unit issued 8,083 petitions to the Judiciary and processed 8,017 corresponding parole orders. This represents an increase over 2000 of 8% and 19% respectively.

Parole Petitions Submitted - 2001
--

Petition Type	Cases	People	State
ETGT	2,143	1,405	7
Minimum	1,700	1,125	6
Programs - Non FIR	18	9	0
Programs - FIR	75	42	0
Special*	822	566	6
Resubmitted	391	225	0
Early Parole	2,934	1,660	5
Total	8,083	5,032	24
TOTAL - 2000	7,481	4,508	36

Parole Petition Results - 2001			
Petition Type	Paroled	Denied	Hearings
	cases/people		
ETGT	1,562/1013	462/330	26/20
Minimum	1,305/864	315/224	
Programs - Non FIR	7/4	0/0	0/0
Programs - FIR	91/49	3/3	2/1
Special*	745/506	65/53	7/7
Resubmits	213/136	184/110	1/1
Subtotals	3,923/2,572	1029/720	57/42
Defender Petitions	2,289/1,348	691/428	28/21
Totals	6,212/3,920	1,720/1,148	85/63
TOTAL - 2000	5,138/3,308	1,514/997	100/68

*Special petitions included those in which a Judge has ordered parole only after a certain date, or those petitions filed for the first time after the minimum date.

Records Management Unit

The Records Management unit houses and maintains the master file for each expired probation and parole case. The unit performs the case initiation function on parole and courtesy supervision cases, as the Intake Unit does for probation cases, and performs further processing of cases initiated in the Intake Unit, providing the supervising officer with material pertinent to the case. The Records Unit is responsible for answering subpoenas and testifying on expired cases. They also manage hundreds of requests received from other agencies for information from active as well as expired cases, and performs data entry to keep the computer system current on the status of cases being supervised by APPD.

Records is responsible for handling a number of other case transactions, including risk/need, case transfers, expirations and quality control printouts.

Records is also responsible for microfilming expired cases, cases expired by death and Presentence Reports.

Records Statistics -2001		
Cases Initiated by Records	(+53%)	6,349
Cases Processed	(+54%)	25,678
Cases Terminated	(+16%)	25,691
Courtesy Cases Reviewed	(+4%)	2,285
Cases Microfilmed		13,829
Arrest Notices Distributed	(+17%)	12,785
Cases Initiated in 2000		4,139
Cases Processed in 2000		16,679
Cases Terminated in 2000		22,198

Records, along with the Violations Unit, has been working with the Pre-Trial Warrant Unit by reporting the address of wanted offenders for whom we receive supervision requests from other counties. The Warrant Unit then attempts to arrest these offenders.

SUPERVISION SERVICES



General Supervision I



GENERAL SUPERVISION I underwent many changes during 2001. We underwent several structural changes to the Division. This involved the physical movement of one unit and the creation of a new unit (South 4). This division currently contains eleven general supervision units housed on the 12th and 14th floors of 1401 Arch Street. The division is comprised of one director, eleven supervisors, eighty-one probation officers and eight clerical employees for a total of one-hundred and one employees. We have not had an associate director since July, 2001. This division is responsible for supervising approximately 13,000 people on Probation/Parole with approximately 15,500 cases. While numerous personnel changes had to occur in order to accomplish the structural changes, there were many other personnel changes which were the result of attrition and movement of staff. We continue to add new officers to replace those who assume new positions and move on to other locations. We are fortunate to have the addition of three new supervisors into the division.

EAST DIVISION

The Central area was converted to the East Division in order to follow our plan of aligning more closely with the Philadelphia Police Department Districts. East is comprised of three units, three supervisors and twenty- five probation

officers. The East division is responsible for the supervision of approximately 3800 people, 4500 cases. Alison Bell supervises East 1, housed on the 14th floor, comprised of nine officers, four of whom participate in the Youth Violence Reduction Project (YVRP). John Dunn supervises East 2 located on the 14th floor and Bob Cunningham supervises East 3 located on the 12th floor. Each supervises eight officers. Bob has one YVRP officer.

The census tracts for supervision were changed to mirror the Police Department's East Division encompassing the 24th, 25th and 26th Police Districts. There were numerous changes to the staff of those units. Alison Bell supervises East 1 which is responsible for approximately 1100 people, 1300 cases. John Dunn replaced Yvette Benites and now supervises East 2 which is responsible for approximately 1400 people and 1700 cases. Bob Cunningham supervises East 3 which is responsible for approximately 1300 people, 1500 cases.

In the spring of 2001, the Youth Violence Reduction Project expanded to include five (5) officers within the East division. Each officer was to carry a caseload of 50 clients. This required that the caseloads that they each possessed (approximately 200 cases each) be transferred to other staff. The impact of moving this number of cases in order to achieve this goal was a massive undertaking by officers, supervisors and coders. This took approximately five to six months to actually complete. East division remains one of the busiest, most criminally active sections of the city. The caseloads still average 170- 190 people due to the volume. Intake remains high, as does Wanted Cards and rearrests.

SOUTH DIVISION

This year, South Division expanded with the creation of a new unit, South 4. Prior to South 4, each South unit contained eight officers. They now each contain seven officers. Census tracts were changed to encompass the Police Department's South and Central Divisions, including the 1st, 3rd, 4th, 17th, 6th, 9th, 22nd and 23rd Police Districts. Additional census tracts were acquired from the Northwest area. South contains four units made up of four supervisors and twenty-eight officers. South is responsible for the supervision of approximately 4500 people with approximately 5500 cases.

Joe Harrington supervises South 1, having seven officers responsible for approximately 1300 people, 1600 cases. Two officers from South 1, Claire Durkin and Eric Reiser, have been instrumental in our department's participation in the Police Department's Theft from Auto/Repeat Offender's Project. Ken Mullen replaced Russ Joell in South 2 which has seven officers and is responsible for approximately 1000 people, 1300 cases. Ken Mullen is currently training one Probation Officer to do Presentence Investigations. That officers carries approximately ten cases and is required to complete Presentence Investigations. Ken Hahn supervises South 3 with seven officers and is responsible for the approximately 1100 people with 1300 cases.

In the spring we began the planning for South 4. It was brought into existence in June, 2001. At that time personnel were transferred in, as was a supervisor. The unit is supervised by Jan Drapiewski and contains seven probation officers. The unit has one Forensic Intensive Recovery (FIR) caseload and six regular caseloads, one of which is a combination East/South caseload. The unit is responsible for the supervision of approximately 1100 people with 1300 cases.

WEST DIVISION

West Division is comprised of four supervision units, located of the 14th floor of 1401 Arch Street. There are four unit supervisors and twenty-eight officers. They are responsible for the supervision of approximately 4700 people with 5800 cases.

Harvey Broodno supervises West 1 which contains seven officers and is responsible for approximately 1000 people, 1200 cases. Charles Daigre supervises West 2 which has seven officers responsible for approximately 1100 people, 1400 cases. Marthine Blythe replaced Jan Drapiewski in June to supervise West 3. There are seven officers responsible for 1200 people, 1500 cases. Jim Johnson supervises West 4 with seven officers responsible for 1400 people with 1700 cases.

YOUTH VIOLENCE REDUCTION PARTNERSHIP

During this year this project underwent a name change. Current YVRP staff are: supervisors Alison Bell and Bob Cunningham (East 1 and East 3) and Fred Crawford, Eric Kornberg, Jose Martinez, Xenia Gray and Tom DiLauro. We have somewhat stabilized in that we have not had any staff changes since we expanded to our fifth officer in early 2001. Tremendous effort went into the transfer of cases in order for the officers to reach the number of cases (50) for each caseload. During this year we continued to refine the program's requirements and have reached what seems to be a mutually acceptable required number of cases and contacts for each officer. With the structural changes which were agreed to in the spring, the goal of 50 clients per YVRP caseload with 20 active YVRP clients seems to be manageable. We have spent the final months of the year working on the quality of supervision and the completion of required number of contacts for each client. Emphasis has also been placed on insuring that each officer understands and completes the monthly statistical package as required.

Members of General Supervision 1 continue to participate in many of the department's projects and committees. These are some of the projects still underway: Youth Violence Reduction Partnership, Theft From Auto/Repeat Offenders Project, Forensic Intensive Recovery Project (FIR), Urine Collection Committee, Philadelphia Interdisciplinary Fatality Review Team, Police Advisory Committee, Latino Partnership Committee, Risk/Need Committee, Critical Incident Committee, Executive Training Committee, New Employees Orientation and Training Committee, Weapon's Related Injury Surveillance System (WRISS), Mentoring Committee, COMPSTAT.



2001 was a year of careful placement of personnel, as Division II examined and refined its functions within the department, promoting public safety through effective supervision practices. Many of the department's trial supervision projects continued to be field tested in this division, with the introduction of a presentence investigator trainee to build a Northwest caseload, House Arrest and Electronic Monitoring cases being dispersed to selected officers in regional Northeast caseloads in addition to those already existing in the Northwest Units, computerized caseloads using IP Plus being maintained by all officers in the Northwest 4 Unit, and FIR caseloads being dispersed to selected officers in Northeast and Northwest regions, one officer/one program, in addition to the two total FIR caseloads already included in the division.

BI Profile low-risk cases continued to be assessed for compliance and either brought into compliance or transferred out of BI Profile. A Northeast 4 Unit was formed out of a former Division I. unit and was added to the three existing Northeast Units. Psychiatric Supervision Unit was transferred from Special Supervision Division into General Supervision Division II. The Female Offenders Comprehensive and Integrated Services Network (FOCIS) remained a responsibility of the Division II Director Joan Bedell, and it operated within the division space, promoting case collaboration between probation officers and this federally funded initiative, of clinical case management for substance abusing felony level female offenders, through the conclusion of the grant on September 29, 2001.

On January 1, 2001, General Supervision Division II was comprised of four Northwest and three Northeast regional field service units, supervising a total of 8,485 cases; Accelerated Rehabilitation Disposition (ARD) supervising 3,023 cases; and the Courtesy Supervision Unit supervising 2,696 cases. The total number of cases under supervision by the nine units in the division was 14,204. During the year, the addition of a fourth Northeast field service unit (1,156 cases), the addition of the Psychiatric Supervision Unit (965 cases), and with Intake numbers exceeding the number of cases being expired, the eleven GS II Units ended year 2001 with 18,352 cases under supervision.

Throughout the year, Division II shared in the entire department's concern over the complex management of clients' office visits being accomplished in a limited number of interview rooms. The total number of offenders reporting to the two division floors, 8th and 9th floors, remained fairly constant, with a low of 5257 offender office visits to nine division units during the month of February 2001, and a high of 6790 offender office visits to the eleven division units during the month of October 2001. The division probation officers were successful in holding the 9 a.m. to 1 p.m. rush of office visits to 60 to 65 % of the days' total, and continued emphasis was placed on increasing the before 9 a.m. and after 1 p.m. scheduling of office visits.

New configurations of census tracts were encompassed by the Northeast and Northwest regions, so as to conform to Philadelphia Police Department districts. There was a trade-off of two Central police districts for one Division I. Northeast police district, and there was a switch of one police district from the Northeast to the Northwest regional units. One of our worries was that we would find skyrocketing numbers in the Northwest region as a result of the crime levels in these redistributed census tracts, but this has not been the case according to our monitoring of intake numbers. Associate Director Kevin Reynolds has served as the department's liaison to Philadelphia Police Department's Compstat meetings, consistently representing the department and promoting regional supervisors' attendance at Compstat meetings that focused on police problems within the aligned police district and APPD regional units.

ARD Unit, under a new supervisor, witnessed great strides during the year, in identifying areas needing changes, and creating new systems to address these needs. Solutions, such as a *pro se* petition for expungement, letters of successful completion of ARD, Master ARD Expungement List, successful completion files being retained as per the 'State Standards', all reflected the level of cooperation that was achieved during regular meetings with the District Attorney's Office.

During the year, Courtesy Supervision Unit researched census tracts for all Philadelphia residents who have out of town and out of state conviction cases that those jurisdictions have transferred to Philadelphia for courtesy supervision, in order to establish the numbers of courtesy supervision cases in each of the regions. An innovative step was taken in placing two Courtesy Supervision probation officers in the Criminal Justice Center Intake Unit, to interview out of town and out of state residents, in order to quickly submit transfer of supervision of the Philadelphia conviction to the jurisdiction of residence.

Psychiatric Supervision Unit, which came into the division in June 2001, continued to develop under a new supervisor and mostly newly assigned officers. A particular obstacle presented itself at the end of September 2001, with the retirement of the department's Staff Psychologist, Judith Rimberg. As the year ended, progress was being made in utilizing a Court Mental Health Unit psychologist, to evaluate cases for transfer from other department units into Psychiatric Supervision, and with plans for eventual evaluation of certain cases that may no longer need specialized Psychiatric Supervision.

In light of the goals and progress of these Division II units, personnel assignments throughout the year have been consistent with the effort to speed unit development. The division experienced several retirements, resignations and transfers into other divisions. We also faced the loss of our friend and colleague, Cliff Morrison, who died in December. However, the quality of new officers and the comprehensive training being provided for them has enabled us to place new officers in unit vacancies, being supported by the receiving units which consist mostly of experienced officers. Another technique has been to utilize new officers, while still in training, in very basic administrative case work in the Courtesy Supervision Unit. Credit should be directed to the GS II officers who frequently assumed supervision of the vacant caseloads and provided quality supervision until a replacement was received.

We foresee in the coming year, 2002, that the ARD and Courtesy Supervision Units will continue to move ahead in administrative efficiency and clarification of case status, that the Psychiatric Supervision Unit will develop greater expertise in understanding the pathology specific to that population, as a result of collaboration with the Court Mental Health Unit, and that the regional units will work more closely with the respective Philadelphia Police Department districts, not only in a shared interest in problem offenders but also for recognition and support for all officers while in the field. We also plan for consistent performance standards of case conferences through use by General Supervision Division II supervisors of the computer generated Probation Batch Results program.

We expect that the challenges of more computer managed caseloads, of more electronically monitored cases, of more FIR one officer/one program cases, and of officers learning how to accomplish presentence investigation reports will cause the division's officers to grow in effective supervision skills. The unit supervisors and the division leadership will be asked to learn the necessary skills in managing units and a division that are being presented with increasingly complex tasks.



Special Supervision



Mission Statement:

Over the past year, the reorganization of the Special Supervision Division continued in order to facilitate the effective operation of the Philadelphia APPD. Specifically, the two (2) Fraud Units were merged into one (1) unit, the Psychiatric Unit was incorporated into the General Supervision II Division and, following the reassignment of the Director of the Presentence Investigation Division, his responsibilities were delegated to the Special Supervision Director. Lastly, the Community Service Unit was attached to the division at year's end for an operational overhaul, including its computerization.

Many offenders under the division's supervision possess special problems that make it quite difficult to place them in community-based correctional programs that have been operationalized for the so-called "regular" offender. This is

especially true, for instance, for sex offenders. However, the Sex Offenders Unit continues to secure specialized treatment for this offender population, in addition the provision of in-house counseling by its highly trained staff.

Intellectually impaired offenders with an IQ of seventy (70) or less also present a spectrum of unique problems in terms of their need for survival skills, e.g., the need for money management, sex education and specialized vocational training. The division's Domestic Intervention Unit's partnership with Citizens Acting Together Can Help (CATCH) has ensured the availability of mental health and retardation programming to prepare the mentally impaired offender for reintegration into society.

Of course, offenders under the supervision of the division's Intermediate Punishment (IP) Unit, Monitored Supervision (MS) Unit, Alcohol Highway Safe Driving (AHSD) Unit and Fraud Unit also present unique problems and issues mandating court ordered counseling and/or treatment of a wide variety, as well as the enforcement of special monetary stipulations as is the case for the Fraud Unit.

Judicial decrees accelerating prison depopulation continued to place an additional burden upon caseload size, especially for the MS and IP Units. Moreover, the judiciary's growing reliance upon passive (i.e. telephone) monitoring during the past year is becoming especially problematic for the MS Unit, since it must assume supervision of all cases of this type, in addition to those for offenders sentenced to electronic monitoring.

Once again, the division responded in an outstanding manner to the demands placed upon it, as evidenced by the figures documented, herein, reflecting the intensive nature of the supervision provided to its diverse offender population. Not surprisingly, the division's collection of economic sanctions, including supervision fees, was the highest within APPD and the rearrest rate of probationers and parolees under its supervision was below five (5) percent.

In the year ahead, the division will continue to emphasize the specialized training of its staff to meet the demands of its highly problematic caseloads and to better serve the court and the community.

<u>DIVISION TOTALS</u>		<u>2001</u>
Total Active Cases	11,326	
Total Clients	10,424	
Total Contacts	138,298	
Office Visits	44,877	
Home Visits	5,512	
Hearings	5,807	
Prison	1,038	
Phone	75,257	
Collateral	5,807	
Total Referrals: 9,408		Court Hours: 6,785

**ANNUAL DIVISION RESULTS
Divisional Contacts/Referrals
SPECIAL SERVICES DIVISION: 2001**

Contacts

Type of Contact	AHS	IP	Mont. Supv.	Sex Offn.	Spec. Offn.	Med. Frag.	Dom. Interv.	Fraud	Div. Total
Office Visit	7960	11074	9132	5946	449	509	4568	5239	44877
Home Visit	526	560	2457	987	107	74	423	378	5512
Hearing Contact	754	1163	1066	643	76	48	665	1392	5807
Prison Contact	3	0	1035	0	0	0	0	0	1038
Phone Contacts	11524	3109	2251	6284	1739	1068	7031	42251	75257
Total Contacts	20767	15906	15941	13860	2371	1699	12687	49260	132488
No. Of PO's	7	8	7	6	1	1	5	9	44
Avg. No. Contacts	2967	1988	2277	2310	2371	1699	2537	5473	3011

Referrals

Type of Referral	AHS	IP	Mont. Supv.	Sex Offn.	Spec. Offn.	Med. Fragile	Dom. Interv.	Fraud I	Div. Total
Alcohol	1842	74	64	40	77	60	501	74	2732
Drug	16	1116	275	126	90	55	615	71	2364
Mental Health	3	244	174	180	79	68	481	21	1250
Other	258	964	900	322	104	72	312	130	3062
Total Referrals	2119	2398	1413	668	350	255	1909	296	9408
No. Of PO's	7	8	7	6	1	1	5	9	44
Avg. No. Referral	303	300	202	111	350	255	381	33	214

Collateral Contacts

Type of Contact	AHS	IP	Mont. Supv.	Sex Offn.	Spec. Offn.	Med. Frag.	Dom. Interv.	Fraud	Div. Total
Alcohol	226	64	70	35	4	23	76	82	580
Drug	0	873	146	181	6	15	131	84	1436
Mental Health	3	215	69	351	101	11	161	35	946
Other	632	626	353	593	104	69	196	272	2845
Total Contacts	861	1778	638	1160	215	118	564	473	5807
No. Of PO's	7	8	7	6	1	1	5	9	44
Avg. No. Contacts	123	222	91	193	215	118	112	53	131

Court Hours

	AHS	IP	Mont. Supv.	Sex Offn.	Spec. Offn.	Med. Frag.	Dom. Interv.	Fraud I	Div. Total
Court Hours	568	1409	1997	632	298	77	1074	730	6785

Urinalysis

	AHS	IP	Mont. Supv.	Sex Offn.	Spec. Offn.	Med. Frag.	Dom. Interv.	Fraud I	Div. Total
Urinalysis Taken	200	5119	3157	909	108	39	1016	52	10600

DOMESTIC INTERVENTION

The Domestic Intervention Unit of the Adult Probation Department exists to serve the court through the provision of supervision and services to offenders, while striving for community/victim safety and offender accountability. This is accomplished primarily through the enforcement of court ordered conditions of probation, the provision of information and referral services, direct counseling, the collection of economic sanctions and the swift response to victim/community concerns. The unit supervises three different types of cases. These are cases involving violence within the family, cases where the offender has a diagnosis of mental retardation and cases where the offender has a serious illness that impacts upon his ability to be supervised. Lastly, the Centers for Adult Education (CAE) also provides the unit with documentation of the work it completes in the service of our agency's offender population.

Criteria for Domestic Intervention Supervision:

1-Family Violence Offender:

- ▶ Any case where an individual is convicted of a crime related to violence in the family is appropriate for sentencing to the unit. While always prepared to address judicial concerns through special conditions of probation, a general order for counseling/services can be helpful in the supervision of these complex cases. Staff receive specialized training in family violence related issues and is familiar with available community resources and how to access them.

2-The Offender With Mental Retardation:

- ▶ Any offender with an I.Q. score of 70 or below, the cause of which occurred before the age of 18. This requirement is imposed upon the caseload by funding sources. Working cooperatively with an on site case manager provided by the Philadelphia Office of Mental Retardation, the unit provides intensive supervision and services to all types of offenders with mental retardation.
- ▶ Established in 1985 with special funding from the State Department of Public Welfare on the State Board of Probation and Parole, a partnership was developed between APPD and the Philadelphia Office of Mental Retardation (via a contract with Citizens Acting Together Can Help, Inc.) to service this offender population under the auspices of the Special Offender Project.
- ▶ This partnership stemmed from a recognition that the deinstitutionalization of individuals with a diagnosis of mental retardation would ultimately bring them in contact with the criminal justice system as adults. Since these offenders tend to be at an intellectual and social disadvantage, APPD works to ensure that their rights are protected and that they have equal access to habilitative/rehabilitative services.
- ▶ Every offender in this caseload is assessed and provided with a individualized plan of remediation to ensure that his "special" needs are met. Through the coordination of services between "systems", the goal of successful completion of probation and/or parole is sought, while striving to ensure that these individuals do not "fall through the cracks".

3-The Medically Fragile Offender:

- ▶ This caseload exists for the individual who suffers from a serious and/or life threatening illness that impacts on his ability to be supervised in the "traditional" manner. These illnesses can include, but are not limited to HIV/AIDS, Cancer, Heart Disease, Lupus, Dialysis, Paralysis and Deafness, as well as others. Through an understanding of illness and the death/dying process, the probation officer works to provide compassionate supervision, while maintaining the offender's accountability to the court.

Center for Literacy/Adult Education (CAE)

- ▶ This program is a joint effort between the Philadelphia Adult Probation Department and The Center for Literacy (Philadelphia's oldest adult education provider). This community partnership has been in existence for 12 years. With APPD providing office space, a telephone and supplies, the CAE provides on-site evaluations and referrals to educational programs.
- ▶ CAE staff recruits and trains community individuals who serve as volunteer tutors. Offenders may also be referred to GED programs in the community if they are found to be academically ready.

- ▶ During the latter part of 2001, a process was initiated by APPD and the Center For Literacy to increase accountability in the procedure. Accordingly, all newly sentenced probationers and parolees with GED stipulations are notified, via mail, by the Center for Literacy as follows: the offender is given written information and instructions as to how to enroll for GED programs and other educational opportunities. The sentencing Judge is informed, as well as the Probation Officer, via mail, for follow-up and enforcement.
- ▶ One hundred and ninety-four (194) individuals were evaluated and placed in appropriate educational situations. A total of fifty-one (51) offenders were matched with volunteer tutors in one to one educational/mentor relationships. Three thousand, two hundred and fifty-two (3252) hours of instruction were provided to these individuals during the year.

<u>MEDICALLY FRAGILE</u>		<u>2001</u>
Total Active Cases	40	
Total Clients	40	
Total Contacts	1,817	
Office Visits	509	
Home Visits	74	
Hearings	48	
Phone	1068	
Collateral	118	
Total Referrals:	255	Court Hours: 77

<u>DOMESTIC INTERVENTION</u>		<u>2001</u>
Total Active Cases	864	
Total Clients	773	
Total Contacts	13,251	
Office Visits	4,568	
Home Visits	423	
Hearings	665	
Prison	0	
Phone	7,031	
Collateral	564	
Total Referrals:	1,909	Court Hours: 1,074

<u>SPECIAL OFFENDERS PROJECT</u>		<u>2001</u>
Total Active Cases	37	
Total Clients	33	
Total Contacts	2,586	
Office Visits	449	
Home Visits	107	
Hearings	76	
Phone	1,739	
Collateral	215	
Total Referrals:	350	Court Hours: 108

SEX OFFENDERS UNIT

The Sex Offenders Unit was created in 1989 for the purpose of supervising all offenders convicted of sexual offenses in one unit to better monitor compliance with conditions of probation and, more recently, Megan's Law registrations.*

Criteria for Sex Offender Supervision:

- ▶ A sentence of **reporting** parole or probation
- ▶ The charges are of a sexual nature
- ▶ The offender resides in the City of Philadelphia
- ▶ Sex Offender supervision is recommended due to past history of sexual offending or a mental health report shows a propensity for inappropriate sexual behavior.

Supervision Services Available:

- ▶ Intensive supervision through office visits and field visits to the home and treatment facilities
- ▶ Urinalysis
- ▶ Counseling referrals based on court orders and/or needs of client
- ▶ Megan's Law registrations
- ▶ Monitoring of stay away orders and inappropriate living situations
- ▶ Referrals for educational and vocational needs

***Megan's Law**

The Pennsylvania State Police maintains a database of information on offenders who have been convicted of designated sex offenses. Registration forms are completed by the Probation Officer and mailed to Harrisburg where they are kept active for a period of ten years or lifetime depending on the charges. Mandatory address verifications are done via U.S. mail on a yearly basis by the State Police. The list of applicable charges is as follows:

10 Year Registration:

- ◆ Kidnaping (victim is a minor)
- ◆ Indecent Assault (victim is 12 years or younger)
- ◆ Incest (victim is 12 years or older but under 18)
- ◆ Prostitution (promotes prostitution of a minor)
- ◆ Obscene and Other Sexual Materials, Performances (victim is a minor)
- ◆ Sexual Abuse of Children
- ◆ Unlawful Contact or Communication With Minor
- ◆ Offenders convicted of an attempt to commit any of the offenses under ten year registration or lifetime registration
- ◆ Offenders being released from a state or county correctional facility for any offenses under the ten year registration guidelines

Lifetime Registration:

- ◆ Offenders with two or more convictions of any of the offenses set forth under ten year registration
 - ◆ Rape
 - ◆ Involuntary Deviate Sexual Intercourse
 - ◆ Sexual Assault
 - ◆ Aggravated Indecent Assault
 - ◆ Incest (victim under 12 years)
 - ◆ Offenders designated by court as sexually violent predators
 - ◆ Offenders being released from a state or county correctional facility for any offense under lifetime registration guidelines
- ◆ **Penalties for failure to register or verify registration:**

10 year registration: *felony of the third degree*

Lifetime registration: *felony of the first degree and subject to mandatory minimum sentence of probation for remainder of individual's lifetime and may be sentenced to a period of incarceration of up to the individual's lifetime.*

<u>SEX OFFENDERS UNIT</u>	<u>2001</u>
Total Active Cases	759
Total Clients	668
Total Contacts	15,020
Office Visits	5,946
Home Visits	987
Hearings	643
Phone	6,284
Collateral	1,160
Total Referrals: 668	Court Hours: 632

ALCOHOL HIGHWAY SAFE DRIVING UNIT

The AHSD Unit provides treatment services for those offenders convicted of Driving Under the Influence of Alcohol/Controlled Substances.

First time offenders are mandated by statute to successfully complete Alcohol Highway Safety classes. They receive a period of incarceration of not less than 48 consecutive hours. Multiple offenders receive a period of incarceration of thirty (30) or ninety (90) days (depending on their status) that can be served on consecutive weekends.

If an offender has accepted ARD, a Consent Decree under the Juvenile Act, or, any other preliminary disposition within the seven (7) year period prior to his first DUI conviction, he/she may be sentenced to not less than thirty (30) days incarceration.

If an offender has accepted ARD, a Consent Decree under the Juvenile Act, or, any other preliminary disposition within the (7) year period prior to his second DUI conviction, he/she may be sentenced to not less than ninety (90) days incarceration.

If a defendant has been convicted on three (3) previous occasions, he/she can receive a sentence of not less than one (1) year.

The supervisor of the AHSD Unit works closely with the Deputy Managing Director of the Criminal Justice Population Management Unit, prison personnel, the District Attorney’s Office, the Public Defender’s Office and the APPD Parole Unit to facilitate the successful operation of the weekend sentence policy, including his work upon policy modifications. The court suspends a probationer’s drivers license for one year, in addition to imposing fines and costs. New Legislation (Act 63 & 64) requires the installation of the Ignition Interlock Device on any vehicle an offender operates. This device is to be installed once the offender’s driver’s license has been reinstated. The unit works in tandem with the aforementioned agents, as well as PENNDOT and the Pennsylvania DUI Association, to ensure that the First Judicial District is in compliance with the law.

Finally, repeat offenders are mandated by statute to complete a prescribed program of treatment monitored by the Philadelphia Health Department (NEXUS). The duration of treatment cannot exceed two years and is determined by the treating facility. The supervisor also meets regularly with the DUI Treatment Coordinator of the Behavioral Health Services Initiative (BHSI) to discuss the tracking of probationers at the various treatment facilities, to which they are referred, to facilitate a positive outcome.

A.H.S.D. UNIT 2002	
Total Active Cases	2,115
Total Clients	1,900
Total Contacts	21,628
Office Visits	7,960
Home Visits	526
Hearings	754
Prison	3
Phone	11,524
Collateral	861
Total Referrals: 2,119 Court Hours: 568	

FRAUD SUPERVISION

- ▶ During 2001, APPD’s two (2) Fraud Units underwent a significant reorganization when they were merged into one (1) unit in February with one (1) supervisor. Additionally, two (2) Fraud Officers were transferred to other units, and they were replaced by part-time employees made available to APPD through PreTrial Services.
- ▶ The Fraud Unit continues to supervise Welfare Fraud, Insurance Fraud and Unemployment Compensation Fraud cases prosecuted by the District Attorney’s Office. Its main focus is the collection of court

<u>FRAUD</u>	<u>2001</u>
Total Active Cases	6001
Total Clients	5821
Total Contacts	49,733
Office Visits	5,239
Home Visits	378
Hearings	1392
Phone	42,251
Collateral	473
Total Referrals:	296
Court Hours:	730

ordered monies. All probationers are placed on minimum supervision. They are required to call their officer monthly and to make monthly restitution payments. This supervision level is modified if a probationer is not complying with the court ordered monthly restitution payments or not contacting his/her probation officer as required.

WELFARE FRAUD:

- ▶ Our Welfare Fraud collections for the year 2001 reached \$1,561,085.14. This is a small decrease (4%) from last years total. However, Welfare intake, especially ARD, was down sharply in 2001 which contributed to this decline. Still, this is a considerable amount collected by seven (7)

officers. The main reason for the success of Welfare Fraud is the outstanding job put in daily by its officers. With an average caseload size now at a greater level than ever (670 cases per officer), the officers continue to produce quality work and productive collection rates.

- ▶ Accordingly, 1170 VOP summaries were written during the year. It is this large number of VOP Hearings listed by the Unit that helps increase our collections. Another contributor to its success is the help the unit receives from the APPD Accounting and Records Units. Both of these units provide valuable information to the officers that help with our collection totals. Also, the Fraud Unit works hand in hand with the Pennsylvania Office of Inspector General and the Philadelphia District Attorney’s Office in a combined effort to achieve maximum results.

Unemployment Compensation Fraud

During the year 2001, Unemployment Compensation collections totaled \$659,671.95. This is an increase of 3.5% over last year’s collections. One of the main reasons for this caseload’s high collection rate is the large numbers of VOP hearings done by its supervising officer. There are presently 615 cases assigned to this caseload.

Insurance Fraud

During the year 2001, Insurance Fraud collections totaled \$286,017.36. This is an increase of 45% over last years collections. This caseload is handled by one of the Fraud Unit Officers, and VOP Hearings are handled by a special unit of the District Attorney’s Office.

Overall, all three components of the Fraud Unit collected \$2,507,085.14 in year 2001 for a 2% increase from 2000.

2001 STATISTICS

The average caseload size for each Probation Officer was 670. Officers completed 5617 contacts (office and home visits).

The Accounting and Records Units of the Philadelphia Adult Probation Department are integral in the success of the Fraud Unit. The Records Department handles intake for Welfare Fraud Probation cases and works to ensure the information from court is correct. The Accounting Unit handles all the payments that come in for Welfare Fraud and makes all payments to the Office of the Inspector General.

FUTURE PLANS

In the year ahead, the Fraud Unit is looking forward to the programming of the new computer applications for its Violation and Letter Programs, along with the purchase of a Network Copier/Printer to help increase letter output to offenders with delinquent accounts in a timely manner. These upgrades will make the unit’s supervision of this offender population more effective and will help to maintain and/or increase collections rates.

FRAUD UNIT COLLECTIONS		2001
DPW - Welfare Unemployment		\$1,561,395.83
Compensation Fraud		659,671.95
Insurance Fraud		286,017.36
Total Collections for 2001:		\$2,507,085.14

COMMUNITY SERVICE

UNIT

- ▶ The Community Service Unit (CSU) has the responsibility for making meaningful placements with community partner agencies of probationers/parolees so they can comply with court imposed community service hours. This unit continues to serve as a liaison between the court, these agencies, the probationers/parolees and the supervising probation offices.
- ▶ CSU actively works with existing partnership agencies and seeks to develop working relationships with new community partner agencies to deliver services to our department and our probationers/parolees in the areas of community services, education and employment. CSU staff continue their efforts to secure more timely updates of community service hours from partner agencies. This difficult and time consuming task is often overlooked when determining the effectiveness of the CSU.
- ▶ At the present time, there are 5551 active probation cases with community service stipulations.

<u>Community Service Statistics</u>		<u>2001</u>
New cases		2,400
CS hours completed	93,000	
Probationers who completed		400
Partner Agencies		30

MONITORED SUPERVISION

This unit is an intensive supervision unit that provides a highly structured alternative to incarceration with drug treatment. Referrals to this unit can be made either by a probation/parole officer or by the Court. Those individuals identified as high risk by their supervising officer can be arrested by the Warrant Unit of PreTrial Services for specific violations of their monitoring conditions. The Monitored Supervision Unit is a fully computer automated unit utilizing the IP+ caseload management system.

The Monitored Supervision Unit has two components:

1. House Arrest with Electronic Monitoring.
2. Curfew with Electronic Monitoring.

House Arrest with Electronic Monitoring:

- ▶ House Arrest provides 24 hour monitoring. The offender wears a secure ankle transmitter and must remain within a specified distance of the stationary monitoring unit inside the house unless given permission by the supervising officer to be elsewhere. Before release to this program, the offender is interviewed by a Monitored Supervision Officer. A home visit is conducted to assure that the offender's family is willing to accommodate the electronic monitoring equipment, to assure that there is an operating telephone in the home, and to confirm that the family does not object to the placement of the monitor on their phone. The average length of time that the offender is on a monitor is six months.
- ▶ In addition to electronic monitoring, the offender may also be referred for drug treatment if deemed appropriate through urine screenings, or, via a court stipulation.

Curfew with Electronic Monitoring:

- ▶ Offenders assigned to this option receive a specified curfew. Curfew is usually between the hours of 7:00 PM to 7:00AM. Offenders who are appropriate for this supervision have successfully completed house arrest for 90 days and have no positive urinalysis results.

Deferred Sentences:

- ▶ Cases with deferred sentences are derived from two (2) sources. The first involves defendants that the convicting judge places on electronic monitoring when sentencing has been deferred. Secondly, PreTrial Services transfers cases to the unit after conviction when sentencing has been deferred. Defendants in deferred sentence status are supervised with the same restrictions applied to post-trial cases, including treatment referrals and urine screenings.

House Arrest Step Down with Continuous Electronic Monitoring

- ▶ In an effort to reduce and/or limit caseload size within the unit, offenders who have complied with the conditions of electronic monitoring (EM) over a period of ninety (90) days are evaluated for transfer to General Supervision for assignment to a probation officer trained in EM. Once accepted, these offenders will remain on EM for an additional three (3) month period.

Passive Telephone Monitoring

- ▶ In 2001, the judiciary began to order passive monitoring, in lieu of EM, or, until EM equipment became available for an offender.
- ▶ Passive telephone monitoring only requires the defendant to phone the host computer, at a designated time, once daily. During the same twenty four (24) hour period, the defendant is also required to respond to two (2) random phone calls to his/her home from the host computer. The hours between twelve (12) midnight and 8:00am constitute a dead period, since it is void of any telephone monitoring. Specifically, it is assumed that the probationer is sleeping and, if telephoned at random, would be unable to respond to the call in a timely manner.
- ▶ Passive telephone monitoring provides a very thin layer of detection which really precludes APPD from knowing the probationer's whereabouts, since he/she is not wearing a transmitter and there is no field monitoring device in his/her home. Hence, it cannot determine if an offender is, in fact, confined to his home, minute to minute, in the absence of APPD authorization to be elsewhere.

<u>MONITORED SUPERVISION UNIT 2001</u>	
Total Active Cases	549
Total Clients	440
Total Contacts	16,579
Office Visits	9,132
Home Visits	2,457
Hearings	1,066
Prison	1,035
Phone	2,251
Collateral	638
Total Referrals 1,413 Court Hours 1,997	

INTERMEDIATE PUNISHMENT UNIT (IP)

- ▶ The Intermediate Punishment Unit provides supervision and services to eligible Level 3 and Level 4 felony offenders who would have otherwise received county or state jail sentences. This is the most highly structured form of community supervision offered by the department. Offenders remain in Intermediate Punishment for one year of supervision and, if successful, are transferred to General Supervision units. The unit is fully computerized and automated utilizing the IP+ caseload management system.
- ▶ The Intermediate Punishment program is an ongoing collaboration between the First Judicial District, APPD, the Defender Association, the District Attorney's Office, the Health Department's Coordinating Office for Drug and Alcohol Abuse Programs (CODAAP), the Office of the Director for Criminal Justice Population Management, and the FIR Clinical Evaluation Unit at Philadelphia Health Management Corporation (PHMC). These partners come together in monthly meetings of the IP Operations Committee, as well as in smaller working meetings to address issues that arise in the administration of the program and to provide oversight and monitoring of IP operations.
- ▶ In 2001, 32 inpatient and 31 out-patient treatment programs provided services to Intermediate Punishment clients. These include programs for Hispanic offenders and women with children, in addition to programs for offenders who are dually diagnosed, or, terminally ill. PHMC provides evaluators and case managers who assist in placing defendants in drug -free housing, while providing counseling support and aid in treatment compliance. Job training and placement are also provided to offenders.
- ▶ In 2001, thirty (30) day case conferences commenced that involve the participation of the IP Unit, CODAAP, the Offices of the Public Defender and District Attorney and probationers sentenced to outpatient treatment one (1) month earlier. The goal of this collective effort is to increase the success rate of offenders in outpatient treatment through the early identification and remediation of potential problems during these meeting with probationers.
- ▶ The Intermediate Punishment Program has three options that are described below:
 1. In-Patient Drug and Alcohol Treatment Program:
 - ◆ Short term with a maximum of ninety days, to be followed by ninety days of intensive out-patient supervision with an electronic monitor.
 - ◆ Long term in-patient treatment for a maximum of six months, followed by supervision and aftercare.
 2. House Arrest with Electronic Monitoring has three options that are described below:
 - ◆ Offenders who are sentenced to outpatient drug treatment for the first six (6) months of their sentence are placed on house arrest, concurrently, for the same length of time, at either their home or in a recovery house.
 - ◆ Offenders who are sentenced to short-term inpatient treatment for ninety (90) days or less are placed on house arrest, at their home or in a recovery house, following the successful completion of their residential programming.
 - ◆ Offenders can be sentenced to six (6) months house arrest, without treatment, during the first six (6) months of their sentence.

In 2001, the Intermediate Punishment unit was comprised of eight probation officers and a supervisor. Those offenders with back officers are initially supervised by the back officers who prepare the case for transfer to Intermediate Punishment officers. During the year, 650 offenders were sentenced to Intermediate Punishment. Of the 650 offenders in 2001, 294 (45%) were sentenced to residential inpatient treatment, 326 (50%) were sentenced to Intensive Outpatient or Outpatient Care, and 30 (5%) were sentenced to House Arrest only.

- ▶ To conclude, the success of the IP program was clearly delineated by Governor Mark Schweiker on December 27, 2001, when he stated “Intermediate Punishment is a win-win alternative for everyone”. The Governor went on to say, “Counties are able to protect the public by monitoring the offenders and providing intensive drug and alcohol treatment. The offenders are able to remain in their communities. When we find ways to help nonviolent offenders overcome their addiction, we free up jail cells for violent offenders.”
- ▶ Philadelphia County has also received the largest allocation of state funds for its IP program.

INTERMEDIATE PUNISHMENT 2001	
Total Active Cases	961
Total Clients	785
Total Contacts	17,684
Office Visits	11,074
Home Visits	560
Hearings	1,163
Phone	3,109
Collateral	1,778
Total Referrals:	2,398
Court hours:	1,409

**STATISTICAL DATA REPORT FOR
THE MONITORED SUPERVISION UNIT AND
THE INTERMEDIATE PUNISHMENT UNIT**

JANUARY 1, 2001 TO DECEMBER 31, 2001

- Total Number of People who have been through the programs: 1295
- Total Number of Days Saved from Jail Time: 228,145
- Average Number of Days Saved from Jail Time: 571
- Total Dollars Saved from Jail Time: \$17,110,875.00

EARLY PAROLE	
People	277
Male	235
Female	42
Days Saved	40,108
Average Days Saved	145
Dollars Saved	\$3,008,100.00

VIOLATION OF PROBATION	
People	70
Male	58
Female	12
Days Saved	9788
Average Days Saved	140
Dollars Saved	\$734,100.00

DIRECT SENTENCE	
People	937
Male	802
Female	135
Days Saved	177,178
Average Days Saved	189
Dollars Saved	\$13,288,350.00

DEFERRED SENTENCE	
People	11
Male	9
Female	2
Days Saved	1071
Average Days Saved	97
Dollars Saved	\$80,325.00

Technical Violation	89
Direct Violation	29
Completed	281

Male	1104
Female	191
White	202
Black	866
Hispanic	215

Note: The data contained herein is only for offenders sentenced to MS and IP during 2001. The above-cited figures do not account for offenders sentenced in 2000 and terminated in 2001.

Presentence Investigation

The Presentence Division contributes to the Philadelphia Adult Probation Department in meeting its mission statement by providing information to assist in the judicial decision making process.

Presentence reports are prepared by the division's twenty-four investigators. These reports carefully assess for the Court the character of the offender and the nature of the offense. In addition, a criminal history is compiled and a sentencing guideline prior record score is calculated. Together, the presentence reports, criminal histories, and prior record scores serve as tools to aid the Judge in imposing a sentence in the best interest of the community, the victim, and the offender.

During 2001 the Presentence Division satisfied 3,202 requests for investigations. This represents a 1% increase over the year 2000. Presentence investigators interview many of their assignments by maintaining a daily presence in the Criminal Justice Center. This results in the forthwith initiation of an investigation thereby decreasing the number of FTA's and saving the Court time and money.

Our Victim Impact Unit tries to contact the victims, and/or their families, of all homicide and sexual offenses and gives them the opportunity to make a Victim Impact Statement to the sentencing Judge. During 2001 the unit received 387 cases - 140 homicide and 247 sexual offenses. A total of 290 Victim Impact Statements were given to the Judges prior to sentencing. The staff also received 384 phone calls from victims inquiring about restitution that is owed to them as a condition of supervision.

We are a member agency of the Philadelphia Coalition for Victim Advocacy and our two Victims Services probation officers can act as liaisons within this network and service brokers for all victims of crime in the First Judicial District of Pennsylvania.

2001 Highlights

The voice to text dictating software experiment came to life this year. Expanding its use looks promising and may prove to be a cost efficient option for Court Administration.

Field supervision POs were introduced to the preparation of presentence reports in 2001. Some future probationers and parolees may therefore be supervised by their presentence investigator.

The presentence operation saw improvements this year in the form of equipment upgrades, time management priority resulting in a timelier report delivery, and communication enhancement with many outside agencies including the Sexual Offenders Assessment Board, and other local, state, and Federal Criminal Justice Agencies.

Presentence specialists now lend more of their expertise on a routine basis to the orientation and training of new employees in a variety of areas including drug and alcohol assessment, writing skills, mentoring, and computer program analysis.

Streamlining filing systems is a 2002 objective by microfilming all hard copy reports and computerizing more paper forms. We are excited about the 2002 plan to examine sentencing guideline software and JNET!

2001 PRESENTENCE REPORTS	
JANUARY	300
FEBRUARY	270

MARCH	282
APRIL	288
MAY	286
JUNE	322
JULY	235
AUGUST	264
SEPTEMBER	234
OCTOBER	268
NOVEMBER	245
DECEMBER	208
<i>TOTAL</i>	3,202

Adult Probation and Parole

2001

