

VERA INSTITUTE
LIBRARY

1510B

Vera Institute of Justice
COMMUNITY SERVICE SENTENCING PROJECTS

Bronx

Brooklyn

Quarterly Statistical Report

January 1 - March 31, 1981

Vera Institute of Justice
Research Department
275 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10016

May 8, 1981

Introduction

In February, 1981, the Bronx Community Service Sentencing Project began its third year of operation. By the end of 1981's first quarter, a total of 346 offenders had been sentenced to the project by the Bronx Criminal Courts. The Vera Institute established its second community service sentencing project in Brooklyn during the fall of 1980, and its first participants entered the program during December of that year. By March 31, 1981, a total of twenty-nine convicted offenders had been sentenced to the project by the Brooklyn Criminal Courts.

This report briefly describes the operation of the two projects during the first quarter of 1981.

Sentencing to Community Service: The Selection Process

Before cases are disposed of in criminal court, the program's court representatives review the complaint papers to locate defendants who appear eligible for program participation. This initial screening selects defendants who have at least one prior adult conviction, who are charged with a non-violent offense, and who appear to be headed for a jail sentence if convicted. Court representatives then begin a process of securing approval for program participation. Consent must be obtained from the district attorney's office, the defense attorney, and the defendant. If all parties approve, an agreement is struck wherein the defendant offers to plead guilty to a misdemeanor in return for a conditional discharge. The case is then presented to a judge. If the judge accepts the agreement, a sentence is imposed requiring

that ten days of community service be performed under the project's supervision. Offenders who are sentenced to the program but never show up or do not complete their ten days are terminated by the project, and notice is sent to the courts. These persons are subsequently resentenced.

Intake: The Bronx Project

The number of offenders sentenced to community service in the Bronx project has declined somewhat since the preceding quarter. During the last quarter of 1980, 193 defendants were found eligible and 49 were sentenced to the program. During the quarter ending March 31, 1981, 172 eligible defendants were identified and 38 were received into the program. (Table 1.) The number of defendants found eligible has varied dramatically over the past six months, with 48 in December, 82 in January, and a low of 42 in March. The rate of rejecting eligible defendants was somewhat more constant during this quarter than last. During the January-March 1981 period, the monthly rate of rejection ranged from 82 to 74%, compared to 86 to 66% in the preceding quarter.

Demographic characteristics of Bronx participants. A comparison of the participants admitted during the last two quarters shows that there has been a slight shift in the type of offenders brought into the Bronx project. Whereas 14% of the participants in the October-December period were women, all in the recent quarter were men. The proportion of hispanics grew 11% (from 49% to 60%), while blacks declined by 12%. The number of participants with legal or "common-law" spouses in-

creased substantially; whereas 71% of the preceding quarter's participants reported themselves to be single, only 42% of those entering during this quarter so described themselves. The number of participants with dependents increased as well, from 36% to 52%. (See Table 2.)

Prior criminal record. There was little change during the last two quarters in the prior criminal records of eligible defendants. To be sure, the average number of previous arrests for all eligible defendants went up slightly (from 5.7 to 6.5 in the recent quarter), but the average number of prior convictions remained unchanged. This indicates that the Bronx court representatives maintained a consistent standard in their selection of eligible defendants. Despite this consistency, however, there were changes in the prior records of defendants who were ultimately sentenced to community service. Participants admitted to the program during the recent quarter had more extensive criminal records than those sentenced during the last quarter. The average number of participants' prior arrests increased slightly (5.5 to 6.2); the average number of prior convictions also increased (2.7 to 3.2). Substantially more participants had been convicted in the recent past. Where only 15% of the October-December participants had been convicted less than seven months prior to entering the program, 47% of this quarter's entrants had been so convicted. This change in participants' prior records appears to be a consequence of how the rejection process operated. That is, during the recent quarter, rejected

defendants had a lower average number of prior convictions than participants, a reverse of the previous quarter's pattern.

This quarter's participants were also somewhat less likely to have gone to jail or prison for the last conviction. During the October-December period, 66% of those defendants entering the program had previously "done time," compared to 40% in the January-March period. This proportion might have actually been somewhat higher in the recent quarter, for 11% of the participants were given the choice of jail or a fine, and which option was taken was not recorded. Even with this adjustment, however, the proportion of persons having prior imprisonment sentences showed a decline over the two quarters.

Arrest charges. There was also a decline in the seriousness of the current charges at arraignment. During the October-December quarter, 37% of the Bronx participants were arraigned on felony charges, compared to 32% in the January-March 1981 quarter. (Table 2C categorizes offenders according to their highest charge.) This difference does not appear to be due to a changed approach in searching for eligible defendants, for 57% of all eligibles in both quarters were arraigned on felony charges. The rejection rates differed during the two quarters, and this accounted for the differences in participants. During the October-December period, one of every six eligible defendants arraigned on felony charges was accepted. In the recent quarter, the ratio slid to one in 8.5. The acceptance ratio was much more favorable for those charged

with misdemeanors, as one would expect. During the recent quarter, one out of every 2.9 eligible defendants charged with misdemeanors was sentenced to the program, which was roughly the same rate as the as the previous quarter's.

Community service sentences continued to be imposed most frequently on those charged with theft-related offenses. Seventy-four percent of this quarter's defendants in the Bronx were so charged, a slight decline compared to the 83% level in the previous quarter. The recent period showed a slight increase in persons charged with disorderly conduct, promoting gambling, and drug offenses.

Rejecting and Accepting Eligible Defendants in The Bronx

During the October-December 1980 quarter, it appeared that the selection process in the Bronx worked against defendants who had longer and more serious criminal records. Of those who were found eligible for community service sentencing by the project's court representatives, persons with more serious criminal records were least likely to be admitted into the program. This pattern did not hold in the January-March quarter.

In the more recent quarter, rejected defendants had a slightly higher average number of arrests but a lower average number of prior convictions. Rejected defendants had an average of 2.6 prior convictions, compared to 3.2 for accepted participants. (Table 2B.) Participants were also more likely to have been convicted during the recent past. Whereas 27% of the rejects had been convicted of another criminal offense within six

months before being screened for eligibility, 47% of the participants had been convicted during this time period. The median length of time since the last conviction was 7 months for the participants, compared to 20 months for rejected defendants. (Table 2B.)

Participants were also more likely to have served stiffer sentences for their last conviction, a reversal of the prior quarter's pattern. Participants were more likely to have been imprisoned or to have served a probation sentence. In contrast, rejected defendants were more likely to have been fined, discharged, or dismissed. (Table 2B.)

Apparently more determinative of acceptance and rejection for community service were the defendants' charges for the instant offense. Defendants facing more serious charges were far more likely to be rejected than defendants charged with more minor crimes. (Table 2C.) Eighty-eight percent of those charged with felonies were not ultimately sentenced to community service, whereas only 36% of those charged with misdemeanors were rejected. Participants as a group therefore had less serious charges. The average charge level for participants was an A misdemeanor; for rejects, the average was a class D felony.

Table 3 shows that the most frequent reason for rejecting an eligible defendant was that the district attorney's office sought a stiffer sentence. Thirty of the 134 rejections were because the prosecutor wanted a jail sentence. In another seven

X cases, defendants were rejected because their criminal records or arraignment charges were too serious; this presumably means that stiffer sentences were sought for these persons as well. Fifteen defendants were rejected because they had other charges pending against them. These persons were probably more likely to get more punitive sentences when these other charges were disposed of. Thus, about 40% of the rejects were not given mandatory community service because harsher penalties were called for, most often by the district attorney's office. A smaller number of persons declined the sentence because they sought more favorable dispositions or because the program's officials thought them unsuitable for various reasons. Slightly more than 10% of the rejections were a result of the defendant not showing up in court when scheduled.

The Fate of Rejected Cases in the Bronx.

By the end of the quarter, 65 of the 134 rejected cases had reached final disposition in the courts. (Table 2C.) Of those 65, 18 (or 28%) were sentenced to jail or prison. An equal number were dismissed or adjourned in contemplation of dismissal. Ten of the disposed cases (or 15%) were given the option of paying a fine or going to jail, but it was not recorded which sentence was ultimately executed. Twenty percent of the disposed rejects were given conditional discharges but without the requirement of community service. Fifty-one of the rejected cases were known not to have reached disposition by the end of the quarter, and in 18 cases there was no record of what happened following

rejection.

Cases which ended with sentences to community service reached disposition sooner than cases found eligible but not so sentenced. Table 2C shows that the median time from arraignment to disposition was three weeks for participants and six weeks for rejects. Twenty-six percent of the participants were disposed of at arraignment in Criminal Court, and another 14% were disposed of within a week. Only 23% of the rejects reached disposition within a week after arraignment. Rejects were also much more likely to take longer than nine weeks to be disposed. Forty-four percent of the rejects reached disposition after more than nine weeks, compared to 26% of the participants.

Participant Performance in the Bronx

More than 2520 hours of work were performed by participants who entered the Bronx Community Service Sentencing Program during the January-March, 1981 quarter. The average number of days to complete the ten-day work assignment increased slightly from last quarter, from 14.2 to 14.6 days. (Table 4A.) Both the number of authorized and non-authorized absences declined slightly, however. (One out of every four absences were authorized.) The average time to complete the program increased despite the decline in the number of absences largely because of latenesses. When defendants arrive late or leave early, they are required to make that time up on another day. On any one day during the January-March quarter, an average of seven participants were performing work in the program.

Types of Work Performed

A description of the types of community service work performed by the Bronx participants is shown in Table 4B. An exact hour-by-hour tally of how many participants worked at each site is not kept, largely because the program staff keeps some flexibility in moving workers from one site to another throughout the day. The number of days shown in Table 4A therefore exceeds the number of actual work days during the January-March quarter.

Maintenance tasks such as sweeping, mopping, and waxing continue to comprise the major portion of the work performed by participants in the Bronx. These jobs were done on a daily basis at the Davidson Senior Center, somewhat less often at the Morris Senior Citizens' Center, and even less frequently for other agencies. Miscellaneous other tasks such as shoveling snow and moving furniture were performed at Davidson and Morris when needed.

Ancillary Services

The Bronx program staff assesses each participant's need for services and refers them to various city and community service providers. Thirty-three of the 36 participants who finished the ten-day work obligation requested one or more services, and a total of 52 referrals were made during the January-March quarter. (Table 4C.) Eighty-four percent of these referrals were for employment. The remainder were for housing, "welfare," educational assistance, drug detoxification, or for obtaining

a social security card. Thirty-seven percent of the referred participants kept their appointments and made contact with the service agencies; another 16% had appointments pending at the end of the quarter. Of the 18 participants who were referred to employment, welfare, housing, or educational services, 83% were accepted by the agencies.

Intake: The Brooklyn Project.

During the Brooklyn project's first full quarter of operation, court representatives found 49 eligible defendants and 19 of those were ultimately sentenced to community service. Fewer eligible defendants were found in Brooklyn than in the Bronx for three principal reasons. Brooklyn's court representatives have been restricted by the district attorney's office to the arraignment parts, whereas representatives are allowed into all parts in the Bronx courts. A second reason is that the project was not fully staffed during the quarter. Finally, the Brooklyn project was undergoing the expected start-up difficulties during this period. Procedures were being developed; court representatives were devoting much time to meeting other courthouse officials and gaining their acceptance and cooperation.

The Brooklyn project appears to be growing at about the same rate as did the Bronx project in its early phases. During the first four months of the Bronx project 23 participants were brought into the program. The recent Brooklyn experience compares favorably with this, for a total of 28 participants were sentenced by the Brooklyn courts to community service during the program's

first four months.

Demographic characteristics of Brooklyn participants.

Offenders sentenced to the Brooklyn project had a different demographic profile from those in the Bronx. (Compare Tables 2A and 5A.) Brooklyn's participants were younger; 79% were between the ages of 16 and 23, and the remaining 21% were between 24 and 29 years old. This compares with 45% of the Bronx participants between 16-23, and 37% between 24-29. None reported having dependents; 74% were single (compared to 42% in the Bronx). More of the Brooklyn participants were black (65% compared to 35% in the Bronx).

Defendants' arraignment charges. The Brooklyn courts sentenced persons to community service who were facing relatively serious charges. Fully 100% of the participants had been arraigned on felony charges; 79% were initially charged with class C and D felonies. Fifty-three percent were charged with burglary, 42 percent with grand larceny or possession of stolen property, and the remaining 5 percent were arraigned on criminal tampering charges. This range of offenses was narrower than those of the Bronx participants. (Compare Tables 2C and 5C.)

Prior criminal records. Brooklyn participants were not only facing serious criminal charges, but they also had lengthy records of prior criminal involvement. (See Table 5B.) Half of the participants had been arrested four or more times before the instant arrest. They had been convicted an average of three times previously. Fifty-six percent of the participants had served

jail or prison sentences before. Another 12 percent had received jail sentences but had been released with credit for time served. A total of 68 percent thus had a record of prior jail/prison sentences. Twelve percent had prior probation sentences. Slightly more than a third (37 percent) of the participants had been convicted of a previous offense within six months of entry into the Brooklyn Community Service Sentencing project.

Accepting and Rejecting Eligible Defendants in Brooklyn

Of the forty-nine defendants found eligible in Brooklyn for community service sentencing, thirty-nine percent were sentenced to the program. This was a higher rate than in the Bronx, where twenty-two percent of the eligibles were ultimately sentenced to the Vera project.

It appears that the prior criminal records of the eligible defendants played a significant role in determining whether to sentence them to community service. Rejected defendants had slightly longer arrest records. The median number of previous arrests for this group was five, compared to four for those sentenced to the program. (Table 5B.) Rejects showed a lower median number of prior convictions (two compared to three for the admitted participants), but this might be a reflection of rejects having other open cases against them. Table 5C shows that five of the thirty rejects in Brooklyn were awaiting final disposition of previous arrest cases at the time of their screening. Defendants whose prior convictions were more recent were also more likely to be rejected. The median time between the last

conviction and screening for program eligibility was ten months for rejects and sixteen months for participants. (Table 5C.)

The sentences received by rejects for their last conviction were not consistently stiffer than those received by participants (Table 5B.) Sixty-eight percent of the rejects received imprisonment sentences, compared to fifty-six percent of the participants, but more rejects received conditional discharges (twenty percent versus twelve percent of the participants). The proportion receiving probation sentences was the same (twelve percent).

The importance of prior record in deciding to reject or accept eligible defendants is indicated by the reasons given for rejection. (Table 6 .) In nine of the twenty-four Brooklyn cases where reasons were recorded, the defendants' prior criminal records were cited. Five of the nine had previous cases against them which were pending disposition. In three cases, the district attorney's office rejected the defendants because their records were "too serious." In one instance, the defense counsel rejected a community service sentence because the defendant's record was "too light."

The nature of the current offense appeared to be less determinative than prior record of the rejection/acceptance decision. Reasons pertaining to the nature of the instant offense were cited in only two of the twenty-four cases. Moreover, the average charge class was lower for rejected defendants than par-

participants. Whereas the average charge for the rejects was a E felony, the average for participants was a class D felony. (See Table 5C.) This was because all defendants facing misdemeanor charges were rejected, leaving only those with felonies as participants. An examination of the case files revealed that of the twelve eligible defendants charged with misdemeanors, only one rejected the option because a lighter penalty was sought. In the remaining eleven cases, the reasons for rejection were unrelated to the nature of the charges (other open cases, defendants didn't appear in court when scheduled, psychological/drug/alcohol problems).

Table 6 shows that the most frequent source of rejection was the prosecutor. Thirty-seven of the rejections were a result of vetos by the district attorney's office, and the reasons given were that the defendants' records or charges were too serious and that a stiffer penalty was sought. Twenty percent of the rejections were made by the program representatives, typically because defendants had other pending cases. Sixteen percent of the rejections were by the defense attorneys.

The Disposition of Rejected Defendants in Brooklyn

Of the thirty defendants found eligible for the program but not sentenced to community service, sixteen reached disposition by the end of the quarter. (Table 5.) Eight of the sixteen received jail sentences, and another two were given the option of jail or a fine. By the end of the quarter, no record was available to show which option these convicted offenders chose.

Two defendants were sentenced to a conditional discharge, one was fined, one was given a jail sentence but was credited with time served. Two defendants had their cases dismissed or adjourned in contemplation of dismissal.

Thirteen of the thirty rejects had not reached disposition by the end of the quarter. (Table 5) Most (62%) of these thirteen had their cases continued for later hearings; three did not show up in court when required and warrants were ordered for their arrest; two cases were transferred to the Supreme Court.

Because the Brooklyn court representatives are restricted to arraignment parts, all participants had their cases disposed at arraignment. (Table 5) Of the sixteen eligible defendants who were rejected but who had reached disposition by the end of the quarter, ten (62%) were convicted and sentenced at arraignment. The remaining six were sentenced within nine weeks.

Participant Performance and Type of Work Done in Brooklyn

Participants who entered the Brooklyn project during the January-March quarter performed about 980 hours of community service. Defendants took an average of fourteen days to complete the seventy hours of required work. (Table 7) The average number of participants working on any one day was 2.7.

Most of the work performed was maintenance and painting at the C.A.B.S. Nursing Home. At this agency, participants also cleared rubble, sorted clothes, moved furniture, did some wiring, and other miscellaneous tasks. Some maintenance work was done

at the Young Minds Day Care Center, and a small amount of work was performed at the Victim Services Agency.

Service Referrals

Of the twelve participants who completed their seventy hour work obligations in the Brooklyn program, eleven requested a total of fifteen referrals for post-release services. All of these were for employment or training, and eight of the fifteen referrals resulted in the participants' making contact with the outside agencies. Three of the appointments were still pending at the end of the January-March quarter. Only four released participants did not take advantage of the appointments made by the Brooklyn Community Service Sentencing Project staff.

TABLE 1

Bronx and Brooklyn
Number of Defendants Eligible for Community Service Sentence,
By Month and Program Status
January 1 -- March 31, 1981

BRONX

Approved for Community Service
Sentencing

		<u>Participants</u>				
		<u>Comple-</u> <u>ted</u>	<u>Termi-</u> <u>nated</u>	<u>Total in</u> <u>Program</u>	<u>Not</u> <u>Approved</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>Eligible*</u>
January:	N	15	0	15	67	82
	%	100%		18%	82%	=100%
February:	N	10	2	12	36	48
	%	83%	17%	25%	75%	=100%
March:	N	11	0	11	31	42
	%	100%		26%	74%	=100%
Quarterly Total:	N	36	2	38	134	172
	%	21%	1%	22%	78%	=100%

BROOKLYN

January:	N	6	1	7	15	22
	%	86%	14%	32%	68%	=100%
February:	N	3	2	5	9	14
	%	60%	40%	36%	64%	=100%
March:	N	5	2	7	6	13
	%	71%	29%	54%	46%	=100%
Quarterly Total	N	14	5	19	30	49
	%	29%	10%	39%	61%	=100%

TOTAL IN PROGRAM, BRONX AND BROOKLYN: 57

*Participants and defendants not approved.

TABLE 2

BRONX

Characteristics of Participants and Eligible Defendants Not Approved for Community Service Sentencing
January 1st to March 31st, 1981*

A. Demographic Characteristics	Participants		Not Approved		Total Eligible	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
1. Sex						
Male	38	100%	133	99%	171	99%
Female	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
TOTAL	38	100%	134	100%	172	100%
2. Age groups						
16-23	17	45%	66	49%	83	48%
24-29	14	37	42	31	56	33
30-35	5	13	21	16	26	15
36-41	2	5	3	2	5	3
42 & over	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
TOTAL	38	100%	134	99%	172	100%
Mean	24.5 yrs.		24.7 yrs.			
Median	24 yrs.		24 yrs.			
3. Ethnicity						
Black	14	37%	33	35%	47	35%
Hispanic	23	60	60	63	83	62
White	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>
TOTAL	38	100%	95	100%	133	99%
4. Marital Status						
Single	16	42%	26	52%	42	48%
Married	10	26	7	14	17	19
Common-law	<u>12</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>33</u>
TOTAL	38	100%	50	100%	88	100%

*Cases missing information not included in base calculations.

TABLE 2 (Continued)
BRONX

	Participants		Not Approved		Total Eligible	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
5. Number of dependants						
None	15	48%	<u>NOT RECORDED</u>			
One	3	10				
Two	6	19				
Three or more	<u>7</u>	<u>23</u>				
TOTAL	31	100%				
6. Reported Source of income during last month						
Employment	6	17%	<u>NOT RECORDED</u>			
Public Assist.	9	25				
Other	6	17				
None	<u>15</u>	<u>42</u>				
TOTAL	36	101%				

TABLE 2 (Continued)
BRONX

B. <u>Criminal Background</u>	<u>Participants</u>		<u>Not Approved</u>		<u>Total Eligible</u>	
1. Number of prior arrests						
Mean	6.2		6.5		6.5	
Median	5		5		5	
2. Number of prior misdemeanor convictions						
Mean	2.4		2.0		2.1	
Median	2		1		1	
3. Number of prior felony convictions						
Mean	.3		.3		.3	
Median	0		0		0	
4. Number of prior violation convictions						
Mean	.5		1.2		.6	
Median	0		0		0	
5. Total number of prior convictions						
Mean	3.2		2.6		2.7	
Median	3		2		2	
6. Number of months since last conviction						
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
0-6	18	47%	31	27%	49	32%
7-12	7	18	14	12	21	14
13-24	6	16	27	24	33	22
25+	7	18	42	37	49	32
TOTAL	38	100%	114	100%	152	100%
Mean	16.1	months	28.6	months	25.4	months
Median	7	"	20	"	20	"

TABLE 2 (Continued)
BRONX

	Participants		Not Approved		Total Eligible	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
7. Disposition of last case						
Dismissed/ACD	0	0%	3	2%	3	2%
Conditional Discharge:						
A. BCSSP	1	3	2	2	3	2
B. Other	4	11	17	14	21	13
Unconditional Discharge	0	0	2	2	2	1
Fine	1	3	15	12	16	10
Probation	9	25	13	11	21	13
Jail/Prison	15	40	56	46	71	45
Jail or Fine	4	11	0	0	11	2
Time Served	3	8	10	8	13	8
No prior conviction	0	0	4	3	4	2
TOTAL	37	101%	122	100%	159	99%
C. Current Case Characteristics						
1. Level of highest arraignment charge						
B felony	0	0%	1	1%	1	1%
C felony	0	0	5	4	5	3
D felony	3	9	38	30	41	25
E felony	8	23	37	29	45	28
A misdemeanor	20	57	42	33	62	38
B misdemeanor	2	6	4	3	6	4
Violation	2	6	0	0	2	1
TOTAL	35	101%	127	100%	162	100%
Average Charge level						
		A misd.		D felony		E felony

TABLE 2 (Continued)
BRONX

	Participants		Not Approved		Total Eligible	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
2. Nature of highest arraignment charge						
Assault			3	2%	3	2%
Burglary	5	14%	27	23	32	21
Crim. mischief	2	6	6	5	8	5
Petit larceny	7	20	17	14	24	16
Grand larceny	7	20	37	31	44	28
Robbery			2	2	2	1
Car theft	1	3	2	2	3	2
Jostling, accosting	0	0	3	2	3	2
Possession of stolen property	4	11	15	13	19	12
Escape/ Absconding	1	3	0	0	1	1
Possession or sale of con- trolled sub- stances	3	9	2	2	5	3
Possess. Hypo- dermic Needle	1	3	1	1	2	1
Weapons possess.	1	3	0	0	1	1
Bad check	0	0	1	1	1	1
Theft of services	0	0	1	1	1	1
Promoting Gam- bling	1	3	0	0	1	1
Disorderly Con- duct	2	6	0	0	2	1
Arson	0	0	1	1	1	1
Reckless Endang. of property	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
TOTAL	35	101%	119	101%	154	101%

TABLE 2 (Continued)
 Bronx

	Participants		Not Approved		Total Eligible	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
3. Disposition of current case						
Disposed:						
Dismissed/ACD			18	28%	18	17%
Unconditional discharge						
Conditional discharge						
--BCSSP	38	100			38	37
--Other			13	20	13	13
Fine			1	1	1	1
Probation			2	3	2	2
Time served			3	5	3	3
Jail			18	28	18	17
Fine/Jail			10	15	10	10
TOTAL	38	100%	65	100%	103	100%
Not Disposed:						
Continued			31		31	
Warrant ordered			19		19	
Transferred to Sup. Court			1		1	
TOTAL (Unknown)			51		51	
(18)			18		18)	
4. Number of weeks between arraignment and disposition (disposed cases)						
Disposed at arraignment	9	26%	6	10%	15	16%
less than one week	5	14	8	13	13	13
1-2	3	9	9	15	12	12
3-4	2	6	4	7	6	6
5-9	7	20	7	11	14	15
10 or more	9	26	27	44	36	37
TOTAL	35	101%	61	100%	96	99%
Mean	7.2		11.8		10.1	
Median	3		6			

TABLE 3

BRONX

Defendants Not Approved for Community Service Sentence:
Reasons for Rejection, by Rejection Source
January 1 -- March 31, 1981

<u>Rejection Reasons</u>	<u>Program Officer</u>	<u>DA's Office</u>	<u>Probation Officer</u>	<u>Defense Attorney</u>	<u>Defen- dant</u>	<u>Judge</u>	<u>Unknown</u>	<u>Total</u>
Appears to have drug, alcohol, or other psychological problems (including "bad attitude")	6	--	1	--	--	--	--	7
Program will interfere with employment, school, or other programs	1	--	--	1	4	--	--	6
Criminal record too light	--	3	--	--	--	--	--	3
Criminal record too serious	1	5	--	--	--	--	--	6
Instant case too serious	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	1
Seeks jail sentence	--	28	1	--	1	--	--	30
Seeks probation sentence	--	4	--	--	--	--	--	4
Seeks restitution	1	2	--	--	1	--	--	4
Has open cases, open warrants, or is on parole	3	8	2	--	2	--	--	15
Seeks more favorable disposition	3	2	--	10	2	1	--	18
Not interested in program	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	1
Case dismissed	--	5	--	--	--	--	--	5
Defendant sentenced before court representative approached him/her	4	--	--	--	--	--	--	4
Case not followed on calendar	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
Defendant did not appear in court	14	--	--	--	--	--	--	14
Unknown	--	--	--	--	1	--	13	14
TOTAL	35	58	4	11	12	1	13	134

TABLE 4

Bronx Community Service Sentencing
Participant Performance, January 1st to March 31st, 1981

A. Work and Attendance indicators, by month	<u>Jan.</u>	<u>Feb.</u>	<u>March</u>	<u>Total</u>	
Average number of days to complete program	14.6	15.6	12.8	14.6	
Average number of authorized absences	0.6	0.3	0.4	0.47	
Average number of non-authorized absences	2.4	1.1	0.5	1.61	
Average daily number of participants working	5.9	6.8	7.4	6.7	
Total days worked	20	18	22	20	
 B. Work Assignments					
1. Number of days worked, by type of assignment, and by site*					
	<u>Maintenance</u>	<u>Painting</u>	<u>Clearing Rubble</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total of days worked</u>
Davidson Sr. Citizen's Ctr.	54	1	2	16a	73
Morris Sr. Citizen's Ctr.	22	--	--	4b	26
Salvation Army	2	--	--	1	3
City Parks	--	--	5	--	5
Community Board #3	5	8	--	--	13
Project Score	--	--	--	3c	3
Bronx Crim. Courthouse	<u>2</u>	<u>---</u>	<u>---</u>	<u>---</u>	<u>2</u>
TOTAL	85	9	7	24	125

* Because of split assignments, the total number of days worked is greater than the number of days in the quarter.

a. Shovelling snow, preparing for party.

b. Moving furniture, miscellaneous assistance.

c. Installing smoke detectors and alarms.

TABLE 4 (Continued)
BRONX

C. Ancillary Services
provided by BCSSP

1. Number of participants requesting services, by number of services requested

	Participants	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
No service requested	4	12%
1	12	36
2	13	39
3	3	9
4	1	3
5	0	0
TOTAL	33	99%

Total number of referrals: 52
Participants requesting referrals: 33

2. Results of referrals requested, according to type of referral

	<u>Number of* referrals</u>		<u>Participant's contact with referred agency</u>			<u>Intake by referred agency</u>		
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Pending</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Pending</u>
Detoxification	1	2%	--	1	-	--	-	-
Employment	43	84	13	22	8	10	1	2
Welfare	2	4	1	1	-	1	-	-
Housing	2	4	2	--	-	2	-	-
Education	2	4	2	--	-	2	-	-
Soc. Sec. Card	1	2	1	--	-	1	-	-
TOTAL	51	100%	19	24	8	16	1	2

* No information on one of the 52 referrals.

TABLE 5

BROOKLYN

Characteristics of Participants and Eligible Defendants Not Approved for Community Service Sentencing
January 1st to March 31st, 1981*

A. Demographic Characteristics	Participants		Not Approved		Total Eligible	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
1. Sex						
Male	19	100	30	100	49	100
Female	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
TOTAL	19	100%	30	100%	49	100%
2. Age groups						
16-23	15	79%	17	59%	32	67%
24-29	4	21	7	24	11	23
30-35	0	0	0	0	0	0
36-41	0	0	3	10	3	6
42 & over	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>
TOTAL	19	100%	29	100%	48	100%
Mean	20.7		23.4			
Median	20		21			
3. Ethnicity						
Black	11	58%	20	69%	31	65%
Hispanic	6	32	7	24	13	27
White	<u>2</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>8</u>
TOTAL	19	100%	29	100%	48	100%
4. Marital Status						
Single	14	74%	8	31%	22	49%
Married	1	5	4	15	5	11
Common-law	<u>4</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>40</u>
TOTAL	19	100%	26	100%	45	100%

*Cases missing information not included in base calculations.

TABLE 5 (Continued)
BROOKLYN

	Participants		Not Approved		Total Eligible	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
5. Number of dependants						
None	14	100%	<u>NOT RECORDED</u>			
One	0	0				
Two	0	0				
Three or more	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>				
TOTAL	14	100%				
6. <u>Reported Source of income during last month</u>						
Employment	3	17%	<u>NOT RECORDED</u>			
Public Assist.	4	22				
Other	0	0				
None	<u>11</u>	<u>61</u>				
TOTAL	18	100%				

TABLE 5 (Continued)
BROOKLYN

<u>B. Criminal Background</u>	<u>Participants</u>		<u>Not Approved</u>		<u>Total Eligible</u>	
1. Number of prior arrests						
Mean	5.1		6.3		5.8	
Median	4		5		5	
2. Number of prior misdemeanor convictions						
Mean	2.1		2.7		2.4	
Median	1		1		1	
3. Number of prior felony convictions						
Mean	.4		0.4		.4	
Median	0		0		0	
4. Number of prior violation convictions						
Mean	1.1		0.8		.9	
Median	1		0		1	
5. Total number of prior convictions						
Mean	3.2		3.6		3.4	
Median	3		2		3	
6. Number of months since last conviction						
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
0-6	5	31%	10	37%	15	35%
7-12	1	6	7	26	8	19
13-24	5	31	5	18	10	23
25+	5	31	5	18	10	23
TOTAL	16	99%	27	99%	43	100%
Mean	27.1 months		18.2 months		21.53 months	
Median			10		10	

TABLE 5 (Continued)
BROOKLYN

	Participants		Not Approved		Total Eligible	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
7. Sentence of last conviction						
Dismissed/ACD	0	0%	--	--	0	0%
Conditional Discharge:						
A. BCSSP	0	0	--	--	0	0
B. Other	2	12	5	20%	7	17
Fine	--	--	--	--	--	--
Probation	2	12	3	12	5	12
Jail/Prison	9	56	17	68	26	63
Time Served	2	12	--	--	2	5
No prior conviction	1	6	--	--	1	2
TOTAL	16	99%	25	100%	41	99%
C. <u>Current Case Characteristics</u>						
1. Level of highest arraignment charge						
B felony	--	--	1	4%	1	2%
C felony	7	37%	3	11	10	21
D felony	8	42	9	32	17	36
E felony	4	21	3	11	7	15
A misdemeanor	0	0	9	32	9	19
B misdemeanor	0	0	3	11	3	6
TOTAL	19	100%	28	101%	47	99%
Average Charge level	D felony		E felony		D felony	

TABLE 5 (Continued)
BROOKLYN

	Participants		Not Approved		Total Eligible	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
2. Nature of highest arraignment charge						
Criminal Trespass	0	0%	1	4%	1	2%
Burglary	10	53	9	32	19	40
Crim. mischief	0	0	4	14	4	8
Criminal tampering	1	5	1	4	2	4
Reckless endangerment of property	0	0	1	4	1	2
Petit Larceny	0	0	6	21	6	13
Grand Larceny	5	26	3	11	8	17
Possession of stolen property	3	15	3	11	6	13
TOTAL	19	100%	28	101%	47	99%

TABLE 5 (Continued)
Brooklyn

	Participants		Not Approved		Total Eligible	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
3. Disposition of current case						
Disposed:						
Dismissed/ACD	--	--	2	13%	2	6%
Unconditional discharge						
Conditional discharge						
--BCSSP	19	100%	--	--	19	54
--Other	--	--	2	13	2	6
Fine	--	--	1	6	1	3
Probation	--	--	--	--	--	--
Time served	--	--	1	6	1	3
Jail	--	--	8	50	8	23
Fine/Jail	--	--	<u>2</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>6</u>
TOTAL	19	100%	16	101%	35	101%
Not Disposed:						
Continued	--	--	8	62%	8	62%
Warrant ordered	--	--	3	23	3	23
Transferred to Sup. Court	--	--	<u>2</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>100</u>
TOTAL	--	--	13	100%	13	100%
(Unknown			1		1)	
4. Number of weeks between arraignment and disposition (disposed cases)						
Disposed at arraignment	19	100%	10	62%	29	83%
less than one week	--	--	2	12	2	6
1-2	--	--	1	6	1	3
3-4	--	--	1	6	1	3
5-9	--	--	2	12	2	6
10 or more	--	--	<u>--</u>	<u>--</u>	<u>--</u>	<u>--</u>
TOTAL	19	100%	16	99%	35	100%
Mean	Arr		1.6		.49	

TABLE 6

BROOKLYN

Defendants Not Approved for Community Service Sentence:
Reasons for Rejection, by Rejection Source
January 1 -- March 13, 1981

<u>Rejection Reasons</u>	<u>Program Officer</u>	<u>DA's Office</u>	<u>Defense Attorney</u>	<u>Unknown</u>	<u>Total</u>
Appears to have drug, alcohol, or psychological problem	1	1	--	--	2
Program will interfere with employment or school	--	--	1	--	1
Poor attitude, physical problems	1	--	--	--	1
Criminal record too light	--	--	1	--	1
Criminal record too serious	--	3	--	--	3
Instant case too serious	--	1	--	--	1
Wants defendants to get jail	--	3	--	--	3
Has open case(s), open warrants, or is on parole	4	1	--	--	5
Seeks more favorable disposition	--	--	3	--	3
Defendant did not appear in court when required	3	--	--	--	3
Unknown	--	2	--	5	7
<u>TOTAL</u>	9	11	5	5	30

TABLE 7

Brooklyn Community Service Sentencing
Participant Performance, January 1st to March 31st, 1981

A. Work and attendance indicators, by month	<u>Jan.</u>	<u>Feb.</u>	<u>Mar.</u>	<u>Total</u>
Average number of days to complete program	13.7	13	21 ^x	14.2
Average number of authorized absences	1.0	0.3	1 ^x	0.4
Average number of non-authorized absences	1.0	0	1 ^x	0.7
Average daily number of participants working	3.7	2.4	2.2	2.7
Total days worked	15	18	20	53
 B. Work Assignments				
1. Number of assignments, by type of assignment, and by site				
	<u>Maintenance</u>	<u>Painting</u>	<u>Clearing Rubble</u>	<u>Othe</u>
C.A.B.S. Nursing Home	30	34	5	30
Young Minds Day Care Center	8	--	--	--
Victim Services Agency	--	--	--	1
TOTAL	38	34	5	31

(x) only one participant completed the program in that month.

* Includes tasks such as sorting clothes, moving furniture, and wiring.

TABLE 7 (Continued)
BROOKLYN

C. Ancillary Services
provided by BCSSP

1. Number of parti-
cipants requesting
services, by num-
ber of services
requested

	Participants	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
No service requested	1	8%
1	7	58
2	4	33
3	--	--
4	--	--
5	--	--
TOTAL	12	99%

Total number of referrals: 15
Participants requesting
referrals: 11

2. Results of referrals
requested, according
to type of referral

	Number of referrals		Participant's contact with referred agency			Intake by referred agency		
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Pending</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Pending</u>
Detoxification	--							
Psychological	--							
Medical	--							
Employment	9	60%	5	4	--	4	1	--
Training	6	40	3	--	3	2	1	--
Welfare	--							
Housing	--							
Education	--							
TOTAL	15	100%	8	4	3	6	2	--