

---

---

# 2002 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 James J. Fitzgerald III, 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

**Philadelphia  
Adult Probation/Parole Department  
2002**

**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*

# Mission Statement

*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.*

# ❖❖❖ Contents ❖❖❖

Court Administrators	Cover Page
Mission Statement	3
Table of Contents	4
Office of the Chief Probation Officers & <i>2002</i> Highlights	5
Special Projects	7
Office of Professional Responsibility	9
<b><i>Budget for Fiscal Year 2002 - 2003</i></b>	<b>15</b>
Criminal Justice Center Operations	20
Intake Unit	20
Court Mental Health Clinic	20
Out of Town Services	20
Operations Division	22
Prison Population Management	22
Violations Unit	22
Parole Unit	25
Records Management Unit	27
General Supervision I	28
East Division	28
South Division	30
West Division	30
Youth Violence Reduction Partnership (YVRP)	32
General Supervision II	33
Northeast Division	33
Northwest Division	34
Courtesy Supervision	34
Accelerated Rehabilitative Disposition	34
Psychiatric Supervision	34
Special Supervision Division	36
Annual Division Results	37
Alcohol Highway Safe Driving Unit	38
Sex Offenders Unit	39
Domestic Intervention	42
Intermediate Punishment (IP)	45
Fraud Supervision	48
Community Service Unit	51
Monitored Supervision Unit (IP)	52
Presentence Investigation Unit	42
<b><i>2002 Philadelphia Adult Probation Parole Department Organizational Chart</i></b>	<b>56</b>

❖❖❖ Office of the Chief Probation Officers ❖❖❖  
Robert J. Malvestuto ❖ Frank M. Snyder

In 2002, the Philadelphia Adult Probation and Parole Department (APPD) provided supervision and services to over 51,900 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: Supervision I, Supervision II, and Special Supervision, 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, Intake, and the Court Mental Health Clinic. Deputy Chief Charles Gregonis supervised the Office of Professional Responsibility.

❖ *2002 Highlights* ❖

In 2002 APPD implemented many changes to improve service to the Courts, community safety, and supervision of offenders. The Co-Chief Probation Officers worked extensively on Reentry & Reintegration of Adjudicated Offender Issues. In response to growing caseload demands and to achieve an optimal level of supervision, the department has worked toward improving the equitable distribution of workloads while increasing the safety of the community. One objective was achieved by the creation of a Central I Unit and a second met with the expansion of the Youth Violence Reduction Partnership (YVRP) into the Southwest region of Philadelphia, specifically the 12<sup>th</sup> police district. The recently developed Risk instrument was also introduced and implemented to further stratify caseloads based on the risk of future arrests and/or violence. Accurate stratification of caseloads has become even more imperative as APPD continues to operate under increased budget reductions. Working within these budgetary constraints, APPD was only able to hire 11 new Probation Officer Trainees to fill positions vacated by 17 professional staff members. 2001 marked the construction of the JAI Irving Memorial Library, accessible to all APPD and Pre-Trial staff. Construction was completed in 2002 and the dedication ceremony is being planned for early 2003. In 2002 APPD once again achieved 100% compliance with the State Standards for Adult Probation and Parole Services.

Recognizing the importance of aligning APPD's regional units with the Police Department's regional districts, the Central I Unit was formed as the result of increasing numbers of offenders residing in the 22<sup>nd</sup> police district. This unit will relieve APPD's overburdened South Region by taking several census tracts from that region. The department has also organized a Youth Violence Reduction Partnership Unit, East IV, in response to the expansion of this partnership into the 12<sup>th</sup> police district. YVRP is a partnership of multiple court and city

agencies formed in 1998 to provide intensive supervision and surveillance to youth ages 24 and below who have been identified as “at risk” for killing or being killed. Prior to July, 2002, this partnership was only available in the 24<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup> police districts.

In the continuing 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. Building upon previous cooperative efforts, APPD collaborated with the Youth Violence Reduction Partnership (YVRP) Steering Committee in identifying the 12<sup>th</sup> Police District as in need of intervention due to the increase of violent crime in this district. This was possible as a result of APPD developing a database containing information on all reported instances of firearms violence in Philadelphia. In July of this year, the YVRP concept was successfully expanded to include the 12<sup>th</sup> Police District.

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). Utilizing the WRISS system, APPD has been able to develop a data base to conduct analysis. This system facilitates the notification of officers that their offender has been shot within 24 hours of the shooting. 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. In the 4 months since the implementation of this policy, more than 65 firearms have been removed from the homes of those under APPD supervision.

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, in 2001, to the intake unit of the Criminal Justice Center and in 2002 continues to ensure that transfers to the appropriate jurisdictions can be initiated immediately after the offenders are sentenced. During 2002, the process of assigning a portion of presentence investigations to trained field supervision officers has continued with success. 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 2002. The Director and Associate Director of Operations along with the Co-Chief Probation Officer were involved in a court-wide automation project (CCMS) during all of 2002 which included extensive work on the application development, testing, reporting fault forms and retesting completed forms. They were also responsible for training all APPD staff in the use of this application. The violations unit continues to compare the APPD wanted card database against the state correctional institution database. This process has helped reduce the number of wanted card cases. The Presentence Investigation Unit has experimented with voice to text software to increase the overall efficiency of the officer’s presentence caseloads. Computerization of personnel has enabled next day updates on employees’ time usage and has expedited the issuing of employee evaluations. Special Projects teamed with court MIS and 1401 MIS to place the Annual Report, Operations

Manual, various forms, and a home visit scheduling aid on the computer to be shared by all APPD staff.

In 2002, APPD provided mandatory, and requested, documentation to the judiciary, federal, state and county agencies. The court mental health clinic processes 3,291 orders. The Intake Unit initiated 21,105 probation or parole cases and assumed the initiation of cases that are to be supervised by the State Board of Probation & Parole. The parole unit issued 8,754 petitions to the judiciary and processed 8,206 parole orders. In addition to completing this large number of judicial orders, the personnel unit completed over 16,000 compliance background checks for the Department of Public Welfare.

APPD Collections for the year 2002 increased by \$240,647.21. This represents a very modest increase but total collections continue to exceed seven million dollars. In 2002, \$7,278,375.59 was collected.

◆ ◆ ◆  
**SPECIAL PROJECTS DIVISION**  
◆ ◆ ◆

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

**Training Programs**

During calendar year 2002, numerous new training courses were developed and implemented. The Training Unit continued to offer a diverse collection of cognitive, procedural and skill-based programs 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.

The Training and Education Executive Committee continued to address training concerns and needs. With the aide of the six Training Subcommittees, existing training programs were evaluated and in some instances, revised. Additionally, several of the subcommittees developed new curriculums and/or recommended training programs or curriculums that would address various training needs. The active subcommittees were:

Clerical/Support Staff Training  
Mentoring  
Probation Law and Ethics

Community Partnership  
New Employee Orientation and Training  
Supervisor's Training

The activation of the Professional Development/Continuing Education and Training and the Writing Workshop subcommittees was postponed pending selection completion of tasks by the previously

activated subcommittees.

Training programs presented in 2002 that were recommended by the subcommittees included:

- Mentoring Training
- Utilizing Community Partnerships in Supervising Offenders
- Orientation Training Program for New Clerical/Support Employees
- Proper Use of the Panic Button in Waiting/Interview Areas
- Supervisory Liability
- Revised New Employee Orientation
- Revised Probation Parole Supervision Techniques Training for New POs
- Probation Parole Law
- Revised Probation Officer Ethics

During calendar year 2002, Adult Probation-Parole Department employees achieved a total of 24,267 training hours. This total number of hours is the result of employee attendance at more than 653 In-Service courses, unit and/or committee meetings and 229 External training workshops, conferences, and/or graduate and undergraduate courses. These hours were achieved as follows:

<b>Management Staff</b>	<b>3,433.5 hours achieved</b>
<b>Professional Staff</b>	<b>15,532 hours achieved</b>
<b>Support Staff</b>	<b>2,281.5 hours achieved</b>
<b>Former Employees</b>	<b>3,020 hours achieved</b>

Due to the effort put forth by the Training Unit, the Training Subcommittees, Division Directors and the many employees who served as Adjunct Trainers, **99.97%** of the Adult Probation-Parole Department employees on record at the end of calendar year 2002 achieved the required hours as mandated by State Standards.

### **Training Expenditures**

A total of **\$13,363.51** was utilized to cover the cost of employee travel, lodging, food costs, and registration at 23 conferences, workshops and/or planning/professional organization meetings. It must be noted that the value of these experiences can not be measured in dollars and cents. Department employees are able to interact and network with employees from other criminal justice and social services agencies and organizations while acquiring new knowledge, up-to-date information in the field of Probation-Parole Supervision, law enforcement and criminal justice.

This learning and the opportunity to represent the department at external events transfers to improved job performance and employee morale.



## **Training Hours Record Keeping**

We continued to utilize the ABRA Recordkeeping System in maintaining training records and producing reports. Training Hours reports were produced and disseminated to all department staff via Division Directors on a monthly basis. These monthly reports provided an up to date listing of each employee's training achievements and continued to be a proactive and timely method for Managers to use in determining and addressing employee non-compliance with training requirements.

## **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 2002:

***Intermediate Punishment (IP) Grant:*** All IP quarterly, final and additional grant reports required by PCCD were submitted. The year 2002 saw an increase of almost 100 offenders sentenced to Intermediate Punishment by year end. Six hundred and fifty (650) offenders were sentenced to IP in 2001 and seven hundred and forty-two (742) in 2002. Summary paperwork was completed for each individual who was terminated from Intermediate Punishment, over six hundred (600) in 2002. All relevant information was provided to PCCD. The 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.

***PassPoint Concept Paper:*** In January, members of the division traveled to New York City to see a presentation of the PassPoint Optical Scanning machine. PassPoint is an eye scanning device that can detect illegal drug usage through changes in the reaction of the eye to various stimuli. After much investigation and research it was determined that APPD could reduce the cost of negative urinalysis by using this device to test those offenders who consistently provided negative urine samples. With the approval of Court Administration, Special Projects staff prepared and submitted a concept paper to the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency (PCCD) in June. In July we were notified that the concept paper was accepted and we were invited to submit for grant funding. During the following Special Projects staff worked on preparing the grant application and it was submitted on September 27, 2002. On December 18, 2002, APPD was notified by PCCD that we were awarded the funding for the "Optical Scan Project".

## **Research and Development**

The Division continued to coordinate all research-related efforts for the department. Division staff continued to complete and submit Intermediate Punishment Outcome data for the PCCD-funded study being conducted. Various 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 and analysis on a variety of topics upon request. Division staff continue to provide statistics on the Weapons Related Injury Surveillance System (WRISS) for YVRP Steering Committee meetings and assist in identifying potential offenders for the Youth Violence Reduction Partnership (YVRP)

## **Weapons Related Injury Surveillance System (WRISS)**

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 each 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 and 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 within 24 hours 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. In 2002, a database was developed for collecting and analyzing this information. The ability to ascertain which area of the city had, or has, the most firearms violence has been instrumental in formulating future strategies for offender supervision.

Additionally, division staff completed an analysis of 47 shooting victims between the ages of 18 and 24 years of age. This project was designed to identify any characteristics shared by these individuals and develop recommendations to ensure that the highest risk individuals are targeted for YVRP participation.

## **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 December, 2002, the Pennsylvania State Board of Probation and Parole conducted the annual compliance audit. Division staff provided required documentation, organized the auditor's meeting schedule and met with the auditor personally to discuss all compliance issues, future plans, and goals. APPD achieved 100% compliance with state standards in 2002.

The Special Projects Division also has the responsibility for updating and maintaining the APPD Operations Manual. Since the Manual reflects many policies and procedures mandated by state standards, the Division completed the development of a system for integrating the respective practice and its corresponding standard in the Operations Manual. Complete references to all state standards have been integrated into the Operations Manual as of this year. As new policies are developed, the division is responsible for incorporating them into the Operations Manual. Some of the policies and forms developed and implemented this year were the Firearms Surrender and WRISS Policy, Field Policy, Confidentiality Policy, Restitution Only Policy and the Case Initiation and Manual Detainer forms.

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.

## **MIS Liaison**

During this year division staff worked closely with 1401 and Court MIS to develop supervision aids, manage APPD's numerous report files, and investigate a number of computerized case management systems. APPD's Operation Manual was updated and made available to all staff on the computer. Division staff worked with Court MIS to archive hundreds of thousands of APPD Presentence and Supervision reports which were more than 1 year old. These reports, although archived, are made available to clerical staff for updating through the use of a CD server. A Field Aid was developed with 1401 MIS. This computer application provided Probation Officers with the ability to schedule and plot field visits while checking the address to be visited for active warrants. This application was installed on the IP and YVRP unit's desktop computers for testing in 2002. Members also worked with 1401 MIS to facilitate the electronic file transfer of Active Probation and Parole records to the Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole.

Additionally, in 2002, Division members began investigating alternative Computerized Caseload Management Systems to be used by all supervision caseload carrying officers. Currently, three units have been using Scotia Consulting's IP\_SQL case management system since the mid-nineteen nineties.

In a continuing effort to automate the 60,000 cases supervised by the APPD, Division staff coordinated the researching of various alternative caseload management systems. Together with Co-Chief Snyder, members of Special Projects and MIS traveled to Maryland to observe, first hand, the implementation of the Maryland Integrated Offender Management System. This system, purchased from Syscon, Inc., is named C-tag. Additionally, a presentation by Digital Solutions, Inc. was organized. This company provides the computerized caseload management system used by 28 counties in Pennsylvania.

## **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. Special Projects Division members receive, identify, record, and distribute treatment progress reports for offenders under the supervision of APPD Probation Officers, and report program compliance to CODAAP. Staff members also maintain the list of FIR officers assigned to each FIR treatment program. 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.

## **Police Liaison**

Division representatives continued to serve as APPD Police Liaisons by regularly attending Philadelphia COMPSTAT meetings on Thursday mornings. During this year greater emphasis was placed on Supervisors and officers attending these meetings whenever possible. Representatives attend those COMPSTAT meetings scheduled to cover their unit's assigned district or specific areas of responsibility. This further strengthens the partnership between APPD and Police devoted to the same geographic area.

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. Forms were developed and policy implemented to make these arrests more efficient. Meetings were held with the District Attorney's Office, Philadelphia Police Department representatives, and Immigration and Naturalization Services to ensure the smooth and safe apprehension of wanted offenders.

## **APPD Subcommittees**

### **VOP Subcommittee**

During 2002, Committee representatives worked 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. This policy, along with the VOP template, combined to reduce the amount of time officers were required to spend in court while increasing the amount of information provided to the court.

### **Urinalysis Project**

The Urinalysis Committee continued efforts to establish and develop policy and procedures surrounding the Urinalysis Collection Station. In March, 2002, members of the division, in conjunction with the Urinalysis Committee and 1401 MIS, prepared for a change in urine testing laboratories. Numerous hours were consumed developing new protocols, adjusting the computer program for the acceptance of results, scheduling and presenting training for supervisors and officers, and organizing the change in forms and supplies from MedTox to Scientific Testing Laboratories.

A Saliva drug detection device was researched, tested and added to the traditional urine collection and onsite tests available. This test required new protocols and policies to be created. It also accommodates those offenders who are unable to provide a urine sample due to shy bladder or medical conditions.

In September, 2002, a new Request for Proposal (RFP) was written and reviewed with Court and City Procurement Departments for operation of the Urine Collection Center and laboratory testing of urine samples. The First Judicial District continued its existing contract with Penn Services (with Scientific Testing Laboratories (STL) conducting the urine tests) on a month to month basis pending a new contract. The centralized Urine Collection Center continues to be situated on the eleventh floor of APPD, staffed by three full-time and two part-time Penn Services technicians (three males and one female).

The number of tests continued to increase significantly during 2002. Since the implementation of the new system, officers are more consistently complying with court-ordered random drug screening stipulations. During the second full year of operation, January, 2002 to December, 2002, there were 43,862 samples collected, an increase of 6,727 over last year's 37,135 urine tests collected. The 43,862 samples resulted in 16,527 positive tests, or 37.63% positive results.

Urinalysis procedures have been repeatedly refined, and now include:

- Drug Test software installed on all interview booth computers so Officers may order the test directly, therefore making the offender accountable should the offender 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 and managers 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.
- A Problem Log is produced daily and e-mailed to all supervisors. This log informs supervisors and Probation Officers of those offenders who were scheduled to submit urine samples and failed to do so.

The system, due to unexpectedly high volumes of daily tests, required ongoing review, monitoring, and adjustments. The Urinalysis Committee continued to meet to address new issues and draft appropriate protocols. Members of this committee were instrumental in identifying, investigating and proposing the use of the PassPoint Optical Scanning device. This device can detect illicit drug usage by measuring the reaction of the eye to various stimuli. The committee members during 2002 were: Linda Mathers, Joan Bedell, Kevin Reynolds, Maureen Murphy, Bernie White, Gary Cenna, Patrick Austin, and Michael Briscoe.

### **Gun Policy Subcommittee**

The First Judicial District's 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 the attention of the sentencing Judge. Policy and procedure changes have been integrated into the Operations Manual and training began at the end of 2002.

In the 4 months since the training and implementation of this policy over 65 weapons have been removed from the homes of those under Probation or Parole supervision.

### **Special Projects Miscellaneous Projects**

The division continued to manage additional special projects as requested by APPD Co-Chief Probation Officers. Such projects in 2002 included:

- Assessing the viability of a computerized resource manual
- Maintaining the database, analyzing, 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 and continued in 2002. 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. In 2002, Scotia Consulting was assisted by division staff in introducing and providing training for the IP\_Sql Case management program
- Acting as a liaison between APPD and external organizations

◆◆◆  
**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 environment is comfortable and supportive of staff, personnel services are administered in a fair and consistent manner, and that professional standards, as well as 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 functions are administered by the Accounting Unit which receives and processes all payments, made by offenders under APPD supervision, for Restitution, Fines and Cost, 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.

There was a decrease of \$7,252.93 in third party collections for the year 2002 because of the court-wide upgrading of the mainframe computer system which prohibited the transfer of data to the vendor for the collection process. Hopefully in the future, the third party system will be restored and its potential fully realized.

Total collections for the year 2002 increased by \$240,647.21, a very modest figure, but our overall collections continue to be over seven million dollars, \$7,278,375.59. There were small increases in all categories with the exception of third party collections

Grand Totals for 2002

<u>Type</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Number of Payments</u>
Restitution	4,117,790.61	46,296
Supervision Fees	883,198.70	18,363
Fines and Costs	1,753,650.14	37,718
Third Party Fines and Costs	10,111.71	161
Act 27 Fines and Costs	11,847.10	391
Act 84 Fines and Costs	549,639.54	11
Act 86 Fines and Costs	<u>2,737.79</u>	<u>70</u>
Total	7,278,375.59	103,010

### **Facilities Management**

Year 2002 was very uneventful regarding changes of development with our building. Our ongoing routine has been developed to provide a safe, clean and pleasant work environment for the staffs of APPD and PTS.

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 PROFESSIONAL STAFF  
BUDGET FOR FY 03  
JULY 1, 2002 TO JUNE 30, 2003**

Program	Staff Positions	City	State	Federal	Total
Grant-In Aid	228	\$4,823,962.00	\$4,989,307.00	\$0.00	\$9,813,269.00
Base	62	\$2,649,318.00	\$0.00		\$2,649,318.00
General Fund	N.A				\$0.00
					\$0.00
Federal					\$0.00
Restrictive IP	11			\$570,456.00	\$570,456.00
Victims	3			\$113,982.00	\$113,982.00
State Welfare	8			\$337,181.00	\$337,181.00
Insurance Fraud	1			\$42,515.00	\$42,515.00
Unemployment Fraud	1			\$37,286.00	\$37,286.00
YVRP	4			\$244,198.00	\$244,198.00

**Department Expenditures 2003**

Category	General Fund	Grant	Supervision Fee	Other	Total
Personnel	\$14,836,898.00	\$627,439.00	\$49,344.00	\$0.00	\$15,513,681.00
Contracts	\$754,231.00	\$430,336.00	\$245,012.00	\$0.00	\$1,429,579.00
Supplies	\$101,054.00	\$5,699.00	\$8,333.00	\$0.00	\$115,086.00
Equipment	\$12,857.36	\$0.00	\$12,215.00	\$0.00	\$25,072.36
Total Expenses					\$17,083,413.36

## **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 2002, 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 PAPPD employees:

### ***Counseling/Advising***

- Advise departmental administration and all other staff on various aspects of personnel services, including, but not limited to, rules and regulations, FJD and department policies, attendance regulations, benefits and deferred compensation
- Process all new hires, separations, promotions, duty-related injuries, leaves of absence and FMLA
- Consult with administrative staff in developing internal policies consistent with FJD policies
- Coordinate FLEX benefits enrollments and assist employees in completing forms, as well as, providing benefits information and assistance throughout the year
- Provide salary/budget information for grant preparation
- Provide statistical information for APPD's Administration reports and state standard compliance
- 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 is 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 prepare packets for all candidates interviewing for employment with APPD. Candidate packages include a thumbnail biography, short work history, criminal record check, and any other information which assists the interviewers
- Distribute paychecks, FLEX benefits checks, W2 forms, and Catastrophic Leave information
- Distribute all internal position vacancy announcements and collect applications
- Orchestrate the distribution, collection and processing of all surveys which originate at Court Administration
- Coordinate activities such as Combined Campaign

### Highlights

- Streamlined the issuance of employee evaluations, thereby reducing the average time for an evaluation from 2-3 days to 1 day
- Processed over 16,000 compliance background checks for the 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 ASFCME, 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, use of the district's 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.

## 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



## 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 21,105 cases initiated by the Intake Unit this year. Of the cases initiated, 3,715 were ARD cases. It should be noted that a total of 825 (325) forms were sent to the State Parole Central Office for processing. These cases are classified by the State as Special Supervision cases.

### **Court Mental Health Clinic (Forensic Mental Health Associates)**

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. The Clinic also provides Mental Health Evaluations for the Probation Department as well as additional training and case staffing for the Psychiatric Unit of the Department

### **Out of Town Services**

Physically located in the Intake Unit, the Out of Town Unit is part of General Supervision II and monitors 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 2002. All clerical and support staff completed at least the sixteen (16) hours required. All professional staff completed the required forty (40) hours necessary to meet state standards.

Intake's commitment to mentoring has yielded highly positive results. Interns have been placed in the division and made significant contributions. Several interns, after their college graduations, have met the necessary requirements and returned to our Department as employees.

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 and this is a very valuable asset to the Clinic's demanding schedules and deadlines.

<b>Mental Health Court Orders</b>		
	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>
January	290	278
February	233	266
March	274	252
April	282	282
May	275	256
June	332	253
July	258	243
August	296	309
September	235	310
October	285	318
November	272	271
December	224	253
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3,256</b>	<b>3,291 + 1%</b>



# Operations Division



The Operations division handles many of the functions which directly support the supervision of Probation and Parole cases by Probation/Parole 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 were involved in a court-wide automation project during all of 2002 which included extensive work on application development and testing. We were also responsible for training all APPD staff in the use of this application.

## **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 detainers and violation hearings, which effect the prison population. Under certain circumstances, detainers can be removed or "certified" by the Deputy Managing Director for Criminal Justice Prison Population Management. In 2002, a total of 1,292 detainers were certified. There were also 59 Special Release Hearings at which 106 APPD cases were considered for release. Of those, 6 detainers were removed.

APPD PPM Managers also effectuated the removal of 652 detainers for cause. Those detainers for which payment of fines were a condition of removal netted \$95,226.

This year, we continued the practice of contacting Judges directly in order to schedule violation hearings for offenders whose detainers may otherwise be certified.

## **Violations Unit**

The Violations unit handles several aspects of Probation/Parole violations for all cases supervised by the department's officers, including generating and tracking wanted card and manual detainers, 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/Parole. 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 2002, APPD filed 5,994 wanted card detainers, and removed 5,359. We continue the practice of comparing 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 detainers in order to take probationers into custody whose whereabouts are known. In 2002, APPD issued 5,181 manual detainers, an increase of 13%. 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 detainers issued on cases supervised by APPD. There were 9,425 detainer hearings held this year, an increase of 1%.

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.

<b>Wanted Card Statistics</b>	
Wanted Cards Filed in 2002	5,994
Wanted Cards Removed in 2002	5,359
Total No. of Cases on Wanted Cards as of 12/31/02	12, 127
Total Cases on Wanted Cards as of 12/31/01	12,074

<b>Detainers Lodged - 2002</b>	
Automatic	10
Manual	3,421
Wanted Cards	5,994
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>9,425</b>
<b>Detainer Dispositions</b>	
Held	8,846
Removed	579
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>9,425</b>
Lodged for 2001	9,306

<b>Manual Detainer Statistics - 2002</b>	
Manuals Issued in 2002	5,181
Manuals Removed in 2002	4,667
Manuals Issued in 2002	4,600
Manuals Removed in 2002	4,240

<b>Violation Statistics -2002</b>	
Violation Hearings Requested	7,921
Violation Hearings Scheduled	32,957
Violations Hearings Continued (CFN)	20,427
Violation Hearings Disposed	8,580



## 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 a 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 a 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 2002, the Parole Unit issued 8,754 petitions to the Judiciary and processed 8,206 corresponding parole orders. This represents an increase over 2001 of 8% and 22% respectively.

Parole Petitions Submitted - 2002			
Petition Type	Cases	People	State
ETGT	2,562	1,609	7
Minimum	1,657	1,132	10
Programs - Non FIR	11	4	0
Programs - FIR	9	7	0
Special*	909	618	8
Resubmitted	539	316	2
Early Parole	3,144	1,729	1
Total	8,831	5,415	28
TOTAL - 2001	8,083	5,032	24

Parole Petition Results – 2002			
Petition Type	Paroled	Denied	Hearing
	cases/people		
ETGT	1,627/1,033	666/451	50/37
Minimum	1,198/825	335/243	18/13
Programs- Non FIR	8/2	0/0	0/0
Programs- Fir	11/9	0/0	0/0
Special*	737/498	101/70	18/14
Resubmits	213/152	241/133	9/6
Subtotals	3,794/2,519	1,343/897	95/70
Defender Petitions	2,265/1,342	488/307	48/32
Totals	6,059/3,861	1,831/1,204	143/102
TOTAL – 2001	6,212/3,920	1,720/1,148	85/63

\*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 case 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 on active as well as expired cases, and perform data entry to keep the computer system current on the status of cases being supervised by APPD.

The Records Unit is responsible for handling the data input in a number of other case transactions, including risk/need scores, case transfers, expirations and quality control printouts.

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

Records Statistics -2002		
Cases Initiated by Records	(+13%)	6,492
Cases Processed	(+3%)	24,663
Cases Terminated	(+16%)	29,803
Courtesy Cases Reviewed	(+12%)	2,566
Cases Microfilmed		8,137
Arrest Notices Distributed	(+23%)	15,690

The Records Unit, 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.

❖ ❖ ❖  
GENERAL SUPERVISION 1  
❖ ❖ ❖

GENERAL SUPERVISION I underwent many changes this year, structurally and most dramatically in the personnel area. The eleven units of General Supervision I remain on the 14th and 12th floors of 1401 Arch Street. We have lost many of our newer probation officers to other law enforcement agencies. Several of our older probation officers have retired. We have been fortunate enough to have replaced the majority of those who have left. General Supervision I has lost on the average, two to three officers per month, having had as many as seven vacancies occurring in one month. This year we gained Robert Meenan as our associate director. Bob comes to us after many years as the associate director in the Presentence Investigation Division. He brings much experience and is a welcomed addition to our division.

Training has been a key topic as well as the close supervision and evaluation required with new staff. The training modules have been studied, reviewed and shortened in order to accommodate the need for case carrying officers who can assume supervision of abandoned caseloads quickly. The effects of having an uncovered caseload can be devastating to a unit in that all of the responsibilities normally assumed by the supervising officer must continue to be handled by individuals who already carry their own full caseloads. The uncertainty of replacements and duration of this coverage can also impact greatly on the morale of the remaining unit members.

CLERICAL SUPPORT:

We end the year with a full complement of staff in both Typing Clusters. The 14th floor staff was complete when Mary Pawlowski joined Eleanor Moore, Gail Tippet, and Yvonne (Bonnie) Viney. The 12th floor cluster was complete when LaVerne Yeargins Clark joined Janice McGinnis, Donna Mowinski and Maria Nocille.

EAST DIVISION:

East Division was expanded in early 2002 when it became apparent that at least three general supervision units were needed, apart from the East Unit which contained the Youth Violence Reduction (YVRP) caseloads. As a result, South IV, which was newly created in 2001, was converted to East 1. East 1 became East 4, Youth Violence Reduction Unit. East 4 is comprised of nine YVRP case-carrying probation officers. Four supervise caseloads from the East area while the other five supervise YVRP caseloads from the West area.

East Division is made up of four (4) units currently containing four supervisors and thirty- three probation officers. Only twenty- three of the officers are regular, general supervision case-carrying officers. Nine are YVRP officers and the remaining one is a fulltime FIR officer.

The volume of arrests and resulting cases in East continues to grow due to additional law enforcement efforts in the area. We are still feeling the effects of Operation Sunrise and all of the additional law enforcement drug task force type operations involving this area. East supervises offenders residing in the following Police Districts: 24th, 25th and 26th. East currently supervises approximately 4700 people with approximately 5800 cases.

Currently East Division is as follows:

East 1 is supervised by Jan Drapiewski and contains eight probation officers. Several of these caseloads were converted from the South area as this unit was formerly South 4. Currently there is one Forensic Intensive Recovery (FIR) caseload supervised by Chris Kelly and one bi-lingual caseload which also contains two bilingual FIR programs, supervised by Jose Martinez. East 1 was responsible for the supervision of approximately 1,400 people/ 1,700 cases. The caseload average is 175 people, 213 cases.

East 2 is supervised by John Dunn and contains eight probation officers. At the close of 2002 all of the officers in this unit speak Spanish. East 2 has lost several officers to other agencies and we have been able to replace them with officers who speak Spanish. This unit is responsible for supervising 1,400 people/ 1,700 cases. The average is 175 people per caseload, 213 cases.

East 3 is supervised by Robert Cunningham and contains eight probation officers. This unit has had as many as four bilingual officers however, it currently has two. There have been several personnel changes due to officers leaving. We have been fortunate to have replaced all of them. East 3 is responsible for supervising approximately 1,400 people/ 1,700 cases. The caseload average is 175 people, 213 cases.

East 4 is supervised by Alison Bell. This unit supervises the clients enrolled in the Youth Violence Reduction Partnership. The Unit currently has nine probation officer slots, however due to a large turnover in staff; there are only seven probation officers in the unit at the close of 2002. This unit currently supervises approximately 500 people with approximately 650 cases. In mid 2002 the unit expanded as did the YVRP project. The project now services the 24th and 25th Police Districts in East Division and grew to include Southwest Philadelphia ( 12th Police District).

## SOUTH DIVISION:

During this year South was restructured from four (4) units to three (3). This change was due to having the newly formed Central 1 Unit which assumed supervision of the census tracts which encompass the 22nd Police District. Our South Division continues to contain the following Police Districts: 23rd, 6th, 1st, 3rd, 4th and 17th. Central 1 became a part of General Supervision 2 and its creation allowed us to transform South 4 into an East Unit. Our South units are comprised of three units containing three supervisors and twenty-three probation officers.

The South units are as follows:

SOUTH 1 is supervised by Joseph Harrington. There are seven probation officers in that unit. There have been at least four changes due to losses and one due to a transfer. The caseload numbers have remained fairly constant despite the staff changes. The unit currently supervises approximately 1,200 people, 1,500 cases. The caseload average is 171 people, 214 cases.

SOUTH 2 is supervised by Kenneth Mullen. There are eight officers in this unit. There have been at least five personnel changes in this unit mostly due to officer's leaving. The unit is currently responsible for supervising 1200 people, 1500 cases. The caseload average is approximately 150 people, 188 cases.

SOUTH 3 is supervised by Kenneth Hahn. There are eight probation officers in the unit. There have been at least four personnel changes in this unit during the year due to losses. The unit currently supervises approximately 1300 people, 1500 cases. The caseload average is 162 people, 188 cases.

## WEST DIVISION:

While the West Division remains static with four units, there have also been personnel changes due to staff losses. The expansion of YVRP (Youth Violence Reduction Partnership) to Southwest Philadelphia (12th Police District) has added a dimension to dealing with the growing crime in that area. Several of the personnel changes were due to replacing officers who moved to handle the YVRP caseloads. West currently is responsible for the supervision of approximately 5000 people, 6000 cases. There are currently four units. There are four supervisors and a total of twenty- nine officers. One officer is responsible for a Courtesy Supervision caseload.

The West Units are as follows:

WEST 1 is supervised by Harvey Broodno. There are eight probation officers, one of which carries a Courtesy Supervision caseload. This caseload has individuals who reside in the West Philadelphia area but have committed crimes in another county in Pennsylvania. This caseload has grown to approximately 400 people. There are plans to divide this caseload in early 2003. This unit has had approximately five personnel changes during the past year. The unit has also had to deal with covering caseloads when members are out on extended leaves. The unit is responsible for the supervision of approximately 1000 people, 1100 cases among seven officers. The caseload average is 142 people, 157 cases, once the Courtesy caseload (400 cases) is removed.

WEST 2 is supervised by Charles Daigre. There are seven probation officers in this unit supervising approximately 1,100 people, 1300 cases. During this year there have not been any personnel changes. The unit caseloads average 157 people 186 cases.

WEST 3 is supervised by Marthine Blythe and contains seven probation officers. This unit has not experienced any major personnel changes during this past year. It has had to deal with extended leaves of staff members. The unit currently has one FIR (Forensic Intensive Recovery) caseload handled by Clare Bucciarelli. The unit is responsible for approximately 1,200 people, 1500 cases. The caseload average is 171 people, 214 cases.

WEST 4 is supervised by James Johnson. The unit contains seven probation officers and has undergone two personnel changes during the year. The unit currently supervises 1300 people, 1600 cases. The caseload average is 186 people, 229 cases.

## YOUTH VIOLENCE REDUCTION PARTNERSHIP:

During this year YVRP expanded. It not only includes the 24th and 25th Police Districts in North Philadelphia (East Division) but it now includes the 12th Police District in Southwest Philadelphia. As a result of this expansion, we developed a unit that would be devoted to the YVRP concept. The unit is East 4. It is supervised by Alison Bell who previously supervised a unit that possessed a combination of YVRP caseloads and regular general supervision caseloads. In order to accomplish this task, staff had to be transferred as did many cases. The result was a unit comprised of four East YVRP caseloads (from the previous five) and five West caseloads. The West caseloads were all created from reviewing the active clients in West Division and transferring them into the newly created unit. This process took several months and ended the year with each West caseload being close to the goal of 20 active YVRP clients.

The primary problem experienced in this unit was the turnover in staff. The officers selected for this project have been excellent officers, many of whom have gone on to other law enforcement agencies. Over this past year we have lost Fred Crawford and Xenia Gray both to Federal Probation, John Stanford to the Philadelphia Police Department and Jose Martinez during the year. Our department is not the only department which has experienced this type of turnover in line staff. The other agencies, Philadelphia Anti-drug Anti-violence Network (PAAN), Philadelphia Police Department and Juvenile Probation have all had similar experiences. As a result, the need to constantly reinforce the goals of the project and the continued need to train new staff as they enter the project have become more important. At the close of the year the staffing is as follows: East has Lisette Giron, Tom DiLauro, Eric Kornberg, and one vacancy. West has Donna Ferrigno, Frances Harrison, James Cammarota, Adam Peterson and one vacancy. We hope to fill both vacancies early in the New Year.

❖❖❖  
**GENERAL SUPERVISION DIVISION II**  
❖❖❖

Throughout 2002, General Supervision Division II maintained its commitment to effective case supervision, to staff support and development, and to increased collaboration with other jurisdictions and with social service and law enforcement partner agencies. Trial supervision projects that were carried forward from the previous year witnessed expansion, and new approaches to supervision continued to be field tested in this division. The challenges of staff vacancies were met, for the most part, by distributing cases among regional officers until new officer assignments were made. The concept of ongoing supervision, after the completion of a presentence investigation by a field services officer, was expanded from one regional Northwest caseload to include two Mental Health Unit caseloads. In regional Northwest and Northeast Units and in the Mental Health Unit, Passive Voice Monitoring was added to the existing Electronic Monitoring capabilities of specifically trained officers.

Courtesy Supervision Unit's caseloads for non-Philadelphia county convictions were consolidated by Philadelphia census tract of residence, bringing into reality the long planned placement of Courtesy Supervision officers into regional supervision units: one officer in the Northeast region, two officers in the Northwest region and one in the newly created regional Central Unit. The Courtesy Supervision Unit's Out of Town/Out of State caseloads were transitioned from the 1401 Arch Street unit location to the Intake Office in the Criminal Justice Center, where the interviews and transfer packets to the jurisdiction of residence may be immediately completed when the offender is escorted from the courtroom to Intake, thereby expediting the requests for intercounty transfer and interstate compact supervision.

The Restitution Only caseload, housed within the Courtesy Supervision Unit, investigated the effectiveness of home visits, courtroom visits to offenders with open matters, and the use of Contempt of Court hearings in promoting payments toward owed restitution. An administrative caseload of regional Northwest non-reporting cases was gradually built within the Courtesy Supervision Unit, and with the use of a computer risk instrument and NCIC screenings, this Non-reporting/Low Risk caseload was installed within the regional Northwest Units.

The division's specialized units of Accelerated Rehabilitation Disposition (ARD) and Mental Health maintained their efforts to collaborate with partner agencies with the goal of enhanced case management. By coordinating all ARD community service stipulations with Urban Artscape and all Substance Abuse Education stipulations with Philadelphia Council on Alcoholism, the ARD Unit achieved greater access to documentation of the completion of special conditions imposed. This accomplishment was supported by increased reporting requirements until conditions were met and by separate retention of all case files on which the department recommended denial of expungement due to unmet conditions.



The working relationship that the Mental Health Unit has established with the Court Mental Health Clinic has created mutual dialogue in case staffing sessions and training of Mental Health Unit officers by the clinic's professional staff. A system has been established for requesting evaluations by the Clinic, for offenders to be transferred into Mental Health Unit from general supervision and for offenders who are thought to no longer need mental health supervision to be transferred to the general population. The Mental Health Unit is an active participant on the Philadelphia Forensic Task Force, making significant contributions to this interdisciplinary planning initiative that addresses the needs of offenders with mental health issues.

General Supervision Division II included eleven units until midway through 2002, when one regional Central Unit, aligned with the 22nd Philadelphia Police District, was created, bringing the division total to twelve units. At year end, with Courtesy Supervision cases fielded into the regions, 4,722 cases were being supervised in four regional Northeast Units; 5,715 cases were being supervised cases in four regional Northwest Units; 1,415 cases were being supervised in one Central Unit; 2,738 cases were being supervised in ARD, and Mental Health Unit was supervising 1,141. The caseloads that remained in the reconfigured Courtesy Supervision Unit (Out of State, Out of Town, Restitution Only) totaled 2,438. At the end of December, 2002, General Supervision II was responsible for the supervision of 18,169 cases, which were distributed among the various regional and special supervision caseloads of the division's 87 officers.

The number of offenders reporting for office visits to the division's two floors, 8th and 9th, was monitored each month, with encouragement to officers to schedule office visits throughout the day to address problems with overcrowding in the waiting room and to spread the use of interview booth time. The peak reporting level in 2001 increased by approximately 10% in 2002, with a record number of 7,445 offenders reporting to General Supervision Division II officers in October, 2002. Officers continued to utilize the 8 to 9 a.m. hour for office visits, so that the percentage of offenders reporting during the month for this time period was between 5 and 8%; the 9 a.m. to 1 p.m. time period remained heavy with the range between 56 and 65%; and the percentage of offenders reporting during the month for the 1 to 5 p.m. time period was between 29 and 37%.

Increased communication between the Philadelphia Police Department and Adult Probation and Parole Department was promoted by establishing a schedule for attendance at the weekly police Compstat sessions, first within General Supervision Division II and subsequently involving the entire department. Initiatives for Weapons Related Injury Surveillance System and for the Firearms Surrender Policy emerged from General Supervision Division II's public safety orientation. Certain areas of expertise were emphasized on division caseloads, such as the expansion of FIR programs on regional caseloads in addition to the two full FIR caseloads in the division. A dually diagnosed FIR caseload in the Mental Health Unit carried the additional aspect of the capability of a Spanish speaking officer. The Courtesy Supervision caseload in Central I. Unit also included Spanish speaking capability. The division

continues to share in the development of the Intercounty Transfer Agreement and in the restructuring of the Interstate Compact policies and guidelines that resulted from a 2002 law to adopt a new Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Offenders.

The division has shared in the department's influx of new officers, as replacements for officers who had been reassigned, had retired or had resigned. In November of 2002, planning strategies were explored in order to address the problems created by existing as well as newly uncovered caseloads. With creative problem solving by the division's supervisors, open caseloads were effectively distributed among regional officers, aided by the newly created option of a Low Risk/Non-reporting regional caseload. At the end of December, 2002, only two uncovered caseloads remained in the division, one in ARD Unit and one on the Out of Town caseload.

The coming year brings the challenge of gauging the ratio of intake vs. case closings in our Central Unit, so that this new unit is not overwhelmed. The Courtesy Supervision cases that were identified for East region census tracts remain in the Central Unit until such time as they can be transferred on to a regional East caseload in General Supervision Division I. We look forward to the possibility of initiating a Low Risk/Non-reporting caseload into the Northeast region, promoting the department's vision of stratifying cases within a region of residence according to the parameters of the cases, whether they be courtesy cases for other jurisdictions until local convictions demand general supervision assignment, or Low Risk/Non-reporting cases until new arrests cause reassignment to reporting supervision levels.

The major accomplishments in General Supervision Division II in 2002 have been the successful transition of Electronic Monitored and Passive Voice Monitored House Arrest cases on to general supervision caseloads, the satisfactory matching of one FIR program to one general supervision officer to complement the existing entire FIR caseloads in the division, the effective courtesy supervision in the region of residence of cases for other jurisdictions, and the use of caseload stratification techniques to benefit regional supervision. The combination of effective case management approaches and enhanced collaboration with partner agencies, in General Supervision Division II's regional and specialized units, reflect the department's commitment to public safety and to maximizing the successful reintegration of offenders into the community.



SPECIAL SUPERVISION DIVISION



**Special Supervision Mission Statement:**

Over the past year, the Special Supervision Division continued its oversight of a very diverse offender population. In order to reduce recidivism, improve public safety and expedite offender rehabilitation, the division endeavors to effectively enforce and facilitate offender compliance with Court-ordered conditions, such as substance abuse treatment, anger management counseling and vocational training and employment. Our Community Service Unit also requires offenders to, in effect, compensate neighborhoods through the completion of court stipulated community service hours hopefully to instill a sense of responsibility in these defendants. Relatedly, our presentence investigation units carefully assess the character and background of an offender to assist the judiciary in the formulation of sentences that will facilitate a defendant's reintegration into society.

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 to 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 electronic monitoring over the past year has placed even more responsibility upon the MS Unit.

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.

<b><u>DIVISION TOTALS</u></b>		<b><u>2002</u></b>
Total Active Cases	11,947	
Total Clients	10,947	
Total Contacts	139,384	
Office Visits	47,659	
Home Visits	5,446	
Hearings	7,600	
Prison	896	
Phone	77,783	
Collateral	5,807	
Referrals: 10,904		Court Hours: 8,873

## ALCOHOL HIGHWAY SAFE DRIVING UNIT

### (AHSD)

The Alcohol Highway Safe Driving Unit provides community supervision of those offenders convicted of Driving Under the Influence of Alcohol or a Controlled Substance. It is the goal of this Unit to identify alcohol and drug addicted offenders and to provide educational and treatment referrals for the purposes of offender rehabilitation and license restoration as mandated by the Pennsylvania Motor Vehicle Code.

The Alcohol Highway Safe Driving Unit currently processes an average of 2,500 post-conviction offenders per year. The eight Probation Officers of this Unit provide case management services which include, but are not limited to, referrals to Alcohol Highway Safety Classes, drug and alcohol treatment evaluations, inpatient or outpatient treatment services, housing and recovery programs and Alcoholics Anonymous/Narcotics Anonymous Meetings. The Officers also work closely with the Philadelphia County Prisons and the Probation Department's Parole Unit to assure an offender's compliance with the weekend sentencing commitment.

The Alcohol Highway Safe Driving Unit staff communicates regularly with the Clerk of Quarter Sessions and provides documentation to PENNDOT that all Court stipulations have been satisfied, prior to the reinstatement of driving privileges in the State of Pennsylvania. The Unit also works in tandem with the Pennsylvania DUI Association to ensure that the First Judicial District is in compliance with current DUI legislation.

<u>A.H.S.D. UNIT</u>	<u>2002</u>
Total Active Cases	2,750
Total Clients	2,462
Total Contacts	25,078
Office Visits	11,563
Home Visits	446
Hearings	1,125
Prison	896
Phone	11,944
Total Referrals: 3,083 Court Hours: 1040	

## **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
- Charges are of a sexual nature
- 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 home and treatment facilities
- Urinalysis
- Counseling referrals based on court orders and needs of client
- Megan's Law registrations
- Monitoring of stay away orders and inappropriate living situations and inappropriate employment
- Referrals for educational, vocational and parenting 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:

- ✦ Kidnapping (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 a 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.*

Megan's Law also created the **Sexual Offender Assessment Board** which does comprehensive investigations and evaluations on offenders convicted of Megan's Law offenses. Copies of evaluations done on Philadelphia offenders are sent to the unit supervisor who distributes them to the Master File or Presentence File. Currently, there is no follow-up by the court on offenders who are deemed Sexually Violent Predators by the Board due to challenges against the constitutionality of this provision of Megan's Law by the Public Defenders Office.

## DNA Registration

On June 19, 2002, Governor Schweiker signed Act 57 of 2002 into law which amends the DNA Detection of Sexual and Violent Offenders Act (Act 14 of 1995). The following list of offenses is subject to DNA registration with the PA State Police Laboratory in Greensburg, PA

- Incest
- Prostitution and Related Offenses
- Obscene and Other Sexual Materials and Performances (felony level)
- Unlawful Contact or Communication with Minors (felony level)
- Sexual Exploitation of Children
- Kidnapping
- Luring a Child Into a Motor Vehicle
- Burglary
- Robbery
- Rape
- Statutory Rape
- Statutory Sexual Assault
- Involuntary Deviate Sexual Intercourse
- Sexual Assault
- Institutional Sexual Assault
- Aggravated Indecent Assault
- Sexual Abuse of Children
- Criminal Homicide/Murder
- Indecent Assault (all grades)
- Stalking
- Attempt, Conspiracy, or Solicitation to commit these offenses

Currently, the FJD has no procedure in place for DNA registration.

<b>SEX OFFENDERS UNIT</b>		<b>2002</b>
Total Active Cases	886	
Total Clients	754	
Total Contacts	14,847	
Office Visits	6,209	
Home Visits	1,348	
Hearings	752	
Phone	6,538	
Total Referrals: 503	Court Hours: 769	



## **DOMESTIC INTERVENTION**

The Domestic Intervention Unit of the Adult Probation Department exists to serve the court by providing 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, by providing 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 provide 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 receives 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 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 an 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”.
  - Interdepartmental case transfers to this unit can occur. The offender in question is tested by court mental health and, if the offender test results meet the criteria, he or she is accepted into the Special Offender Project.

### **3-The Medically Fragile Offender:**

- This caseload exists for the offender who suffers from a degenerative, irreversible life threatening medical condition. 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.

### **4-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 13 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 new 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.

- This year, the CAE processed 1321 court ordered GED stipulations and 344 APPD referrals, for a total off 1675.

**MEDICALLY FRAGILE**

**2002**

Total Active Cases	53
Total Clients	48
Total Contacts	2,479
Office Visits	699
Home Visits	35
Hearings	97
Phone	1648

Total Referrals: 507    Court Hours: 277

**DOMESTIC INTERVENTION**

**2002**

Total Active Cases	868
Total Clients	745
Total Contacts	12,533
Office Visits	5,324
Home Visits	364
Hearings	908
Prison	0
Phone	5,937

Total Referrals: 1,368    Court Hours: 1,455

**SPECIAL OFFENDERS PROJECT**

**2002**

Total Active Cases	35
Total Clients	35
Total Contacts	1,897
Office Visits	467
Home Visits	102
Hearings	94
Phone	1,234

Total Referrals: 185    Court Hours: 226

## INTERMEDIATE PUNISHMENT (IP)

- The Intermediate Punishment Unit provides supervision and services to eligible Level 3 and Level 4 felony offenders who would have otherwise received county jail or state prison 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 2002, 35 inpatient and 33 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 2002, thirty (30) day case conferences continued with 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 meetings 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 outpatient supervision with an electronic monitor.
  - ♦ Long term in-patient treatment for a maximum of six months, followed by supervision and aftercare including outpatient treatment.
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 2002, 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, 740 offenders were sentenced to Intermediate Punishment. This number represents an increase of 14% over last year's number. Of the 740 offenders in 2002, 304 (41%) were sentenced to residential inpatient treatment, 414 (56%) were sentenced to Intensive Outpatient or Outpatient Care, and 22 (3%) were sentenced to House Arrest only.

- To conclude, the success of the IP Program was clearly delineated by former 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.

<b>INTERMEDIATE PUNISHMENT</b>	
<b>2002</b>	
Total Active Cases	1,077
Total Clients	908
Total Contacts	17,229
Office Visits	10,735
Home Visits	352
Hearings	1,611
Phone	4,531
Total Referrals: 2,881	Court Hours: 1,872

## **FRAUD SUPERVISION**

- During 2002, the number of officers assigned to the Fraud Unit varied from 9 to 11. At this time, there are 11 officers assigned to the unit, in light of the elimination of its part-time employees.
- This 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 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 2002 totaled \$1,433,187.62. This is an 8% decrease from last year's total. However, Welfare intake, especially ARD, was down sharply in 2002, which contributed to this decline. Still, this is a considerable amount collected by a unit that varied in staff size. The main reason for the success of Welfare Fraud is the outstanding job put in daily by its officers. Even with an average caseload that remained constant at 670 cases per officer, the unit continued to produce quality work and productive collection rates.
- This year, 1275 VOP summaries were written. It is the large number of VOP hearings listed by the unit that facilitates collections. Another contributor to its success is the help the unit received 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 2002, Unemployment Compensation collections totaled \$584,595.53. This is a decrease of 8% from last year's collections. Here, too, the caseload's collection rate is a product of the number of VOP hearings adjudicated by its supervising officer. There are presently 540 cases assigned to this caseload. A second unemployment office was also added to the unit this year.

## **Insurance Fraud**

During the year 2002, Insurance Fraud collections totaled \$288,699.10. This is an increase of 1% over last year's 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 \$2,306,482.25 in 2002 for an 8% decrease from 2001.**

## **2002 STATISTICS**

The average caseload size for each Probation Officer was 670. Officers completed 4616 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  
2002**

Total Active Cases	6,051
Total Clients	5,854
Total Contacts	49,138
Office Visits	4,076
Home Visits	540
Hearings	1,707
Phone	42,815
Total Referrals: 500	Court Hours: 763

**FRAUD UNIT COLLECTIONS  
2002**

DPW – Welfare	1,433,187.62
Unemployment Compensation	584,595.53
Fraud	
Insurance Fraud	288,699.10
Total Collections for 2002	\$2,306,482.25

## COMMUNITY SERVICE UNIT

- ♦ The Community Service Unit (CSU) has the responsibility for making meaningful placements with community partner agencies of probationer/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 probationer/parolees and the supervising probation officers.
- ♦ 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 service, 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.
- ♦ The unit commenced its utilization of a new computer program for the processing of all new cases it received and for the collection of data for record keeping purposes and analyses.
- ♦ At the present time, there are 5686 active probation cases with community service stipulations.

<b>COMMUNITY SERVICE STATISTICS</b>	
<b>2002</b>	
New Cases	2,588
CS Hours Completed	96,000
Probationers who Completed	550
Partner Agencies	45

## MONITORED SUPERVISION

This unit is an intensive supervision unit that provides a highly structured alternative to incarceration with referrals for drug treatment. Referrals to this unit can be made either by a probation/parole officer, the Public Defender's Office, the District Attorney's Office, private council, Pretrial Services or by the Court, via paroles or direct sentencing. Those individuals identified as high risk by their supervising officer can be arrested by the Warrant Unit or 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 usually between the hours of 7 pm to 7 am. 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 Continues 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 2002, the judiciary continued to utilize passive monitoring, in lieu of EM, or, until EM equipment became available for an offender.
- ♦ Passive telephone monitoring only required 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 am 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.
- ♦ All offender's who are sentenced to passive monitoring are processed by the MS Unit for their hook-ups. However, offenders who are not awaiting EM now have their cases transferred to the appropriate General Supervision Division, or, special unit within this division for monitoring and supervision.

MONITORED SUPERVISION UNIT

2002

Total Active Cases	511	
Total Clients	411	
Total Contacts	16,185	
Office Visits	8,586	
Home Visits	2,262	
Hearings	1,305	
Prison	896	
Phone	3,136	
Total Referrals:	1,537	Court Hours: 1,909

**ANNUAL DIVISION RESULTS**  
**Divisional Contacts/Referrals**  
**SPECIAL SERVICES DIVISION: September 2002**

*Contacts*

Type of Contact	AHS	IP	Mont. Supv.	Sex Offn.	Spec. Offn	Med. Frag.	Dom. Interv.	Fraud	Div. Total
Office Visit	964	808	744	478	52	42	318	346	3752
Home Visit	36	23	166	103	-	-	34	43	405
Hearing Contact	120	77	79	66	7	8	68	174	599
Prison Contact	-	0	88	0	0	0	0	0	88
Phone Contacts	978	417	370	451	101	200	568	3500	6585
Total Contacts	2098	1325	1447	1098	160	250	988	4063	11429
No. of PO's	8	7	7	6	-	1	5	9	43
Avg. No. Contacts	262	189	207	183	160	250	197	451	266

*Referrals*

Type of Referral	AHS	IP	Mont. Supv.	Sex Offn.	Spec. Offn	Med. Frag.	Dom. Interv.	Fraud 1	Div. Total
Alcohol	194	4	3	2	4	7	39	15	268
Drug	5	161	24	5	6	6	18	17	242
Mental Health	-	3	4	8	3	4	20	10	52
Other	35	75	160	20	10	50	57	13	420
Total Referrals	234	243	191	35	23	67	134	55	982
No of PO's	8	8	7	6	-	1	5	9	43
Avg. No. Referral	29	30	27	6	23	67	27	6	23

*Collateral Contacts*

Type of Contact	AHS	IP	Mont. Supv.	Sex Offn.	Spec. Offn	Med. Frag.	Dom. Interv.	Fraud	Div. Total
Alcohol	78	4	2	2	3	4	17	18	128
Drug	23	104	18	10	7	8	28	20	218
Mental Health	-	3	3	10	5	1	10	12	44
Other	81	86	54	25	11	14	16	12	299
Total Contacts	182	197	77	47	26	27	71	62	689
No of PO's	8	8	7	6	-	1	5	9	43
Avg. No Contacts	23	25	11	8	26	27	14	7	16

*Court Hours*

	AHS	IP	Mont. Supv.	Sex Offn.	Spec. Offn	Med. Frag.	Dom. Interv.	Fraud 1	Div. Total
Court Hours	82	77	199	66	35	70	121	40	640

*Urinalysis*

	AHS	IP	Mont. Supv.	Sex Offn.	Spec. Offn	Med. Frag.	Dom. Interv.	Fraud 1	Div. Total
Urinalysis Taken	63	468	260	63	2	10	69	4	939