Lecture 27:
Police, Probation, and
Institutionalization

today

• Red Wing debriefing and job openings
  – Minnesota Department of Corrections - Internships
  – Minnesota Department of Corrections - Jobs
  – Hennepin County (Minneapolis) - Current Openings
  – Ramsey County (St. Paul) - Current Openings
  – Dakota County - Current Openings
  – Anoka County - Current Openings
  – City of Minneapolis - Current Openings
  – University of Minnesota - Student Job Postings

• Review sheets

• Police, Probation, and Institutionalization

Police

• Discretion at arrest: Important factors?
  – Offense seriousness
  – Complainant
  – Gender (males for serious, females for status)
  – Race
  – Class
  – Demeanor/Interaction in situation
  – Community preferences/pressures

• Juvenile attitudes toward police?
  – Improvement in last 10 years
  – Big race gap
high school seniors rating police as doing a “good” or “very good” job
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**discretion**

- Release
  - CWR
  - Station adjustment
- Referral
  - Diversion
  - Juvenile Court intake
- Detention

**Probation and Parole/Aftercare**

- Probation: conditional release in community under the supervision of probation officer
  - a SENTENCE imposed by a judge
  - allows juvenile to remain in the COMMUNITY
  - but her freedom is CONDITIONAL (law + rules)
  - and she is SUPERVISED by probation officer
  - Juvenile court orders probation in 58% of cases (58% person, 59% property, 59% drugs; 54% other)
- Parole (aftercare) is supervised conditional release from an institution.
  - decision by corrections or social services,
  - tied to indeterminate sentence
**Probation v. “ISP”**

- **Current functions of probation officer**
  - Intake screening
  - Prepare PSI/Social History
  - Supervise and assist probationers

- **Intensive Supervised Probation (ISP)**
  - Small caseloads (12) + matched officers
  - “Intermediate sanction” (between ...
  - Potentially tough but cheap, often combined with electronic monitoring, urinalysis, restitution, etc
  - Evaluation? No difference between ISP and institutionalization in police arrests, but higher rates of revocation (Lerman 1975; Sherman 1998)

- “Intensive Aftercare Model” for parole
  - May be more promising, esp. for 1st offenders

---

**Institutionalization**

- **108,000 juveniles in institutions (2001)**
  - MN: 1,946 total, half private; 18% for violent offenses
  - State Training Schools: Red Wing, Thistledew
  - Hennepin Co. Home School (Minnetonka)
  - Race: 40% African American; 37% White; 18% Latino; 2% American Indian (high in MN); 2% Asian
  - Gender: 87% male

- **How effective is institutionalization in reducing delinquency?**
  - Suppression effect = (#before - #after) / #before
  - “everything works” over time
  - PROVO: Inst suppressed 61%; community 69%
  - SILVERLAKE: Inst 72%; community 73%

---

**juveniles in institutions, 1999**

- Drugs: 4%
- Theft: 5%
- Shoplifting: 1%
- Public order: 12%
- Violent index: 23%
- Other violent: 13%
- Status: 4%
- Technical: 12%
- Property: 26%
Wolfgang’s Delinquency in a Birth Cohort and Incapacitation

- 6% (18% of contact group) did 52% of official offenses
  - Incapacitation: remove opportunity to commit crime by institution (or death). Punish for FUTURE, not past.
- If we locked up everybody after 1st arrest, we would prevent 66% of offenses. Why not?
  - Half never do another; We can’t predict recidivism well; Very expensive; only 10% are “personal index”
- REPLICATION: WOLFGANG’S 1958 COHORT:
  - 7.5% had 61% of police contacts. Incapacitation after 3 contacts would prevent 43% of offenses, but 28% would be unnecessarily incapacitated
  - A small group of chronics does a lot of delinquency, but we can’t reliably identify them: high error rates, high costs, & long terms for minor offenses
- Conclude: Reserve institutions for serious (violent) offenders with long histories

next

- Thursday: Monster exercise, conclusions
- Tuesday: Review
- Thursday: Midterm #2