



# Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report

August 2008, NCJ 222180

## Characteristics of State Parole Supervising Agencies, 2006

Thomas P. Bonczar  
BJS Statistician

### Overview

State parole supervising agencies employed nearly 65,000 full-time and 2,900 part-time workers on June 30, 2006, according to findings from the 2006 Census of State Parole Supervising Agencies. The average caseload was 38 active parolees for each full-time equivalent (FTE) position devoted to parole supervision. About half of parole supervising agencies had a role in releasing prisoners to parole, setting the conditions of supervision, or conducting revocation hearings.

The census collected information from 52 state agencies which included 2,287 separate administrative, regional, and other offices (table 1). These agencies reported that they supervised 660,959 adult parolees or about 83% of the 798,202 parolees reported at yearend 2006 in the Annual Parole Survey. (See *Probation and Parole in the United States, 2006*, available at <<http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/abstract/ppus06.htm>>.)

### Combined parole and probation agencies supervised 4 times as many offenders on probation as on parole

On June 30, 2006, 35 of the reporting state parole supervising agencies also supervised adults on probation. Parole is a period of conditional supervised release following a prison term. Criminal offenders sentenced to a period of correctional supervision in the community are on probation. These combined parole-probation supervision agencies supervised about 4 times as many offenders on probation (1,200,570) as on parole (269,416).

The 1.2 million probationers represented about a quarter of the estimated 4,237,023 adults on probation on December 31, 2006, as reported in the 2006 Annual Probation Survey. Among the agencies that provided information, 17 supervised paroled offenders only. These agencies had 503 offices—less than a quarter of the total number of offices—but they supervised more than half of the total parole population.

A technical supplement to this report, including an expanded *Methodology*, appendix tables with state-level data, and detailed *Explanatory Notes* is forthcoming.

**Table 1. Number of state adult parole supervising agencies, offices, and adult parole and probation population, by type of agency, June 30, 2006**

Type of agency	Number of parole agencies	Number of parole agency offices <sup>a</sup>	Adult parole population		Adult probation population	
			Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<b>Agency administration<sup>b</sup></b>	52	2,287	660,959	100%	1,200,570	100%
Department of Corrections	38	1,804	454,387	69%	920,203	77%
Independent parole agency	11	369	162,329	25	190,021	16
Other <sup>c</sup>	3	114	44,243	7	90,346	8
<b>Population served<sup>b</sup></b>						
Parolees	17	503	391,543	59%	~	~
Parolees and probationers	35	1,784	269,416	41	1,200,570	100

Note: An expanded *Methodology*, appendix tables with state-level data, and detailed *Explanatory Notes* are forthcoming.

~Not applicable.

<sup>a</sup>Parole offices that comprised the 52 agencies on June 30, 2006, including administrative offices, regional offices, and all separate sub-offices, such as field offices; includes estimates for Illinois, Wisconsin, and Virginia.

<sup>b</sup>Excludes local parole supervision agencies in Alabama and Pennsylvania.

<sup>c</sup>Includes the Arkansas Department of Community Corrections, the Nevada Department of Public Safety, and one response representing Oregon's county-based parole system.

Seven state agencies reported that they supervised juveniles on probation or parole in addition to adults; however, not all agencies reported the number of juveniles on supervision.

State parole supervising agencies located in a department of corrections supervised a smaller percentage of parolees (69%) than probationers (77%). In comparison, agencies that were independent of a department of corrections supervised a larger share of parolees (25%) than probationers (16%). Ten independent agencies were located in the executive branch of government; one (Alabama) was in the legislative branch (see appendix table 1, forthcoming). Other parole agencies supervised nearly an equal share of parolees (7%) and probationers (8%).

### Five agencies supervised half of the parole population

Five state agencies accounted for about half of the adults under parole supervision on June 30, 2006 (table 2). These five agencies include the Departments of Corrections in California (125,067 adults on parole);<sup>1</sup> Texas (101,175); and Illinois (33,354); and two independent agencies, New York (53,215) and Pennsylvania (24,956, excluding adults supervised by county parole offices). Pennsylvania also supervised adults on probation (3,777) at midyear 2006.

### State parole supervising agencies employed nearly 65,000 full-time and 2,900 part-time workers

Including payroll staff, nonpayroll staff, and contract staff, an estimated 65,000 full-time and 2,900 part-time workers were employed by the 52 state parole supervising agencies on June 30, 2006 (table 3). This number includes imputed estimates for parole supervising agencies in Illinois, Wisconsin, and Oregon that did not provide information on staffing in the census. Nonpayroll staff included those on the payroll of other government agencies, unpaid interns, and volunteers.

In the 49 state agencies that provided information, 82% of full-time employees worked for a department of corrections, 16% worked for an independent parole agency, and 1% for another type of agency. Nearly all part-time employees (96%) worked for a department of corrections. When viewed by type of population served, 66% of full-time workers and 81% of part-time workers were employed by an agency that supervised both parolees and probationers.

<sup>1</sup>An additional 67 parolees were under supervision by the California Youth Authority on June 30, 2006.

**Table 2. Characteristics of adult parole supervising agencies, June 30, 2006**

Region and jurisdiction	Agency administration	Number of parole agency offices <sup>a</sup>	Adult parole population <sup>b</sup>	Adult probation population
State total		2,287	660,959	1,200,570
<b>Northeast</b>				
Connecticut	DOC	11	101,413	35,673
Maine	DOC	25	2,838	~
Massachusetts	Independent	12	32	7,986
New Hampshire	DOC	16	3,362	~
New Jersey	Independent	16	1,672	4,674
New York	Independent	13	13,770	~
Pennsylvania <sup>b</sup>	Independent	39	53,215	~
Rhode Island	DOC	27	24,956	3,777
Vermont	DOC	5	512	11,267
		12	1,056	7,969
<b>Midwest</b>				
Illinois <sup>c</sup>	DOC	483	123,870	325,087
Indiana	DOC	**	33,354	~
Iowa	DOC	9	7,863	~
Kansas	DOC	46	3,973	22,318
Michigan	DOC	20	4,882	~
Minnesota <sup>d</sup>	DOC	109	16,267	54,178
Missouri	DOC	110	4,444	127,797
Nebraska	DOC	59	17,089	51,498
North Dakota	DOC	7	697	~
Ohio	DOC	18	380	4,096
South Dakota	DOC	53	16,280	10,112
Wisconsin <sup>e</sup>	DOC	10	2,584	~
		**	16,057	55,088
<b>South</b>				
Alabama <sup>b</sup>	Independent	1,132	243,057	698,956
Arkansas	Other	72	9,014	41,509
Delaware <sup>e</sup>	DOC	49	18,092	32,220
District of Columbia <sup>e</sup>	Independent	13	634	18,333
Florida	DOC	12	5,135	7,009
Georgia	DOC	156	4,832	183,855
Kentucky	Independent	58	23,060	~
Louisiana	DOC	60	10,653	24,330
Maryland	DOC	21	23,905	39,047
Mississippi	Independent	43	14,132	61,558
North Carolina	DOC	81	2,003	24,612
Oklahoma <sup>e</sup>	DOC	228	3,311	112,416
South Carolina	DOC	79	3,506	25,173
Tennessee	Independent	51	4,413	33,437
Texas	Independent	36	9,148	42,731
Virginia <sup>b</sup>	DOC	77	101,175	~
West Virginia	DOC	**	8,609	52,726
		35	1,435	~
<b>West</b>				
Alaska <sup>e</sup>	DOC	512	192,619	140,854
Arizona	DOC	17	1,009	5,888
California <sup>b</sup>	DOC	19	7,473	~
California Youth Authority <sup>b</sup>	DOC	95	125,067	~
Colorado	DOC	17	67	~
Hawaii	DOC	41	8,577	~
Idaho	Independent	6	2,124	~
Montana	DOC	28	2,549	12,741
Nevada	DOC	23	999	9,079
New Mexico	Other	12	3,856	13,320
Oregon <sup>f</sup>	DOC	50	2,964	11,384
Utah	Other	53	22,295	44,806
Washington	DOC	17	3,535	10,676
Wyoming	DOC	110	11,553	30,787
		24	551	2,173

Note: DOC indicates Department of Corrections. An expanded *Methodology*, appendix tables with state-level data, and detailed *Explanatory Notes* are forthcoming.

~ Not applicable.

\*\* Not known.

<sup>a</sup>Includes an estimated 103 offices for Illinois, Wisconsin, and Virginia.

<sup>b</sup>Data may differ from other BJS publications.

<sup>c</sup>Data are for December 31, 2007.

<sup>d</sup>Includes 3,066 adult parolees under active supervision in 16 Community Corrections Act agencies in 65 offices. The state provided direct parole supervision in the remaining counties.

<sup>e</sup>Some or all data estimated.

<sup>f</sup>County government agencies provided adult parole supervision in Oregon.

Among state agencies that provided information about their employees, nearly all full-time workers (94%) and about half of part-time workers (47%) were on the payroll. An equal percentage of the remaining full-time employees were nonpayroll staff and contract staff (3% each). Among part-time workers, 40% were nonpayroll staff and 13% were contractors.

Men (51%) and women (49%) made up nearly equal percentages of full-time employees. Women were 58% of part-time employees.

### Average caseload was 38 active parolees for each FTE devoted to supervision

Respondents were asked to report the portion of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff positions devoted to direct supervision of adult offenders on active parole on June 30, 2006. The census included directions for counting the time that full-time and part-time employees had available for supervising parolees. Respondents were also asked to count just that portion of time available for supervision of parolees among employees who divided their time between supervision of parolees and other responsibilities.

An estimated 14,000 FTE staff supervised about 528,000 adults active on parole on June 30, 2006 in the 52 agencies included in the census (table 4). Staff positions allocated to supervision of offenders on active parole amounted to about 1 in 5 of the estimated 65,000 full-time and 2,900 part-time staff members. This resulted in an average caseload at midyear 2006 of 38 persons on active parole supervision for each FTE staff position devoted to adult parole supervision.

An average of 49 parolees were on active supervision for each FTE position devoted to supervision in agencies that supervised only parolees (based on 16 agencies that provided information). Among agencies that had authority for both parolees and probationers, 28 parolees were on active supervision per FTE position (based on 25 agencies). These caseload calculations do not take into account differences in the offenses for which parolees had been incarcerated or differences in their required levels of supervision.

**Table 3. Full-time and part-time employees of state adult parole supervising agencies, by type of agency and staff, June 30, 2006**

Type of agency and staff	State parole supervising agency employees			
	Full-time		Part-time	
	Number	Percent of persons with a known status	Number	Percent of persons with a known status
Estimated total staff <sup>a</sup>	65,000		2,900	
<b>Agency administration</b>	56,935	100%	2,478	100%
Department of Corrections	46,918	82	2,384	96
Independent parole agency	9,215	16	86	3
Other	802	1	8	--
<b>Population served by agency</b>	56,935	100%	2,478	100%
Parolees	19,348	34	475	19
Parolees and probationers	37,587	66	2,003	81
<b>Type of employment<sup>b</sup></b>	56,935	100%	2,478	100%
Payroll	53,401	94	1,169	47
Nonpayroll	1,791	3	996	40
Contract	1,743	3	313	13
<b>Gender<sup>c</sup></b>	53,757	100%	1,729	100%
Male	27,436	51	731	42
Female	26,321	49	998	58

Note: Data may not sum to total because of rounding. An expanded *Methodology*, appendix tables with state-level data, and detailed *Explanatory Notes* are forthcoming.

--Less than 0.5%.

<sup>a</sup>Includes an estimated 8,065 full-time and 422 part-time staff members in Illinois, Oregon, and Wisconsin.

<sup>b</sup>For state specific data on adult parole supervising agency staff, see table 15.

<sup>c</sup>Among agencies that provided information, gender was not reported for 6% of full-time staff and 30% of part-time staff. For state specific data, see table 16.

**Table 4. Full-time equivalent (FTE) positions supervising active parolees, and average adult parolee caseload per FTE position, by type of agency, June 30, 2006**

Type of agency	Number of full-time FTE positions supervising active parolees	Average active parolees per FTE position
Estimated agency total*	14,000	38
<b>Agency administration</b>	11,089	39
Department of Corrections	7,236	41
Independent parole agency	3,008	40
Other	845	18
<b>Population served</b>	11,089	39
Parolees	5,806	49
Parolees and probationers	5,283	28

Note: Data may not sum to total because of rounding. An expanded *Methodology*, appendix tables with state-level data, and detailed *Explanatory Notes* are forthcoming.

\*Includes an estimated 2,911 FTE positions in 11 agencies that did not report this information; average active parolees per FTE position estimated based on 528,000 parolees on active supervision.

## Two-thirds of paroled offenders were required to meet with a parole officer at least once a month

Two-thirds of adult offenders on parole were required to have face-to-face contact with a parole officer at least once a month, including 14% who were required to have weekly face-to-face contact (table 5). An additional 17% of paroled offenders were required to meet with their parole officers less than once a month or to maintain contact by mail, telephone, or other means. Thirteen percent of paroled offenders were no longer required to report on a regular basis. A reporting frequency had not yet been determined for 3% of paroled offenders. Nearly 8 in 10 adult offenders were on active parole supervision.

## Half of parole supervising agencies had a role in releasing prisoners to parole, setting the conditions of supervision, or conducting revocation hearings

Twenty-six of the 50 state agencies providing information reported that, as of June 30, 2006, they participated in releasing persons from prison to parole supervision, setting the terms or conditions of adult parole supervision, or conducting parole revocation hearings (table 6). Of the 26

Characteristic <sup>a</sup>	Adult parole population	Percent of parolees with a known status
Total number of adults on parole	660,959	
<b>Supervision level</b>	547,844	100%
Required number of face-to-face contacts with a parole officer		
At least once per week	74,877	14
At least once per month	294,246	54
Less than once per month <sup>b</sup>	90,958	17
Regular reporting no longer required	73,582	13
Reporting frequency not yet determined	14,181	3
<b>Status of supervision</b>	611,548	100%
Active <sup>c</sup>	483,791	79
Inactive	26,686	4
Absconder	61,733	10
Supervised out of state	27,455	4
Financial conditions remaining	66	--
Other	11,817	2

Note: Detail may not sum to total because of rounding. An expanded *Methodology*, appendix tables with state-level data, and detailed *Explanatory Notes* are forthcoming.

-- Less than 0.5%.

<sup>a</sup>Each characteristic had persons of unknown status. Jurisdictions did not report data for 17% of supervision level and 7% of status of supervision.

<sup>b</sup>May have included regular contact by mail, telephone, or other means.

<sup>c</sup>An estimated 528,000 parolees were on active supervision on June 30, 2006, including agencies that did not report status of supervision.

agencies that performed at least one of these functions, 14 performed all 3 functions. The remaining 24 agencies that responded performed none of these functions. Two agencies did not provide information.

Nineteen of 50 parole supervising agencies reported at midyear 2006 that they considered prisoners for release. In the census, 13 parole supervising agencies reported that between July 1, 2005, and June 30, 2006, they considered 126,641 prisoners for release and released 57,850—a rate of 46 prisoners released per 100 considered. Some prisoners considered for release may have been released after this period, and some of those released may have been considered for release before the period.

**Table 6. State adult parole supervising agencies that considered prisoners for release, set the terms/conditions of supervision, or conducted parole revocation hearings, June 30, 2006**

On June 30, 2006, did the parole supervising agency—	Number of agencies	Percent of agencies with a known status
<b>Consider prisoners for release?</b>	50	100%
Yes <sup>a</sup>	19	38
No	31	62
<b>Set the terms or conditions of adult parole supervision?</b>		
Yes <sup>b</sup>	20	40%
No	30	60
Who performed the function? <sup>c</sup>		
Parole board	27	
Courts	2	
Other DOC agency	1	
Other independent agency	3	
<b>Have responsibility for conducting parole revocation hearings?</b>		
Yes <sup>d</sup>	18	36%
No	32	64
Who performed the function? <sup>c</sup>		
Parole board	30	
Other DOC agency	1	
Other independent agency	1	
<b>The number of functions performed by the parole supervising agency was—</b>		
None	24	48%
1	9	18
2	3	6
3	14	28

Note: An expanded *Methodology*, appendix tables with state-level data, and detailed *Explanatory Notes* are forthcoming.

<sup>a</sup>Between July 1, 2005, and June 30, 2006, 13 agencies that provided information considered 126,641 prisoners for release (some of whom may not have been released until after June 30, 2006) and released 57,850 (46 per 100 considered), some of whom may have been considered for release prior to July 1, 2005.

<sup>b</sup>In 14 jurisdictions both the parole supervising agency and the parole board set the terms or conditions of supervision.

<sup>c</sup>More than one other entity may have performed a function within a jurisdiction.

<sup>d</sup>All 18 parole supervising agencies that conducted revocation hearings shared the responsibility with a parole board. Seventeen agencies that provided information conducted 67,534 parole revocation hearings between July 1, 2005, and June 30, 2006.

North Dakota released 76 prisoners per 100 considered for release and Connecticut released 71 (table 7). Arizona released 13 per 100. The census did not collect information on the characteristics of prisoners considered for release.

Paroled offenders are frequently required to abide by one or more conditions of supervision when released into the community. Such conditions may include payment of supervision fees, submission to drug testing, finding employment, and fulfilling requirements for treatment. Adult parole supervising agencies in 20 states reported that they set the terms or conditions of adult parole supervision. In 14 of these states, the parole board also had a role. The 30 parole supervising agencies reporting that they did not perform this function most frequently identified the parole board (27 jurisdictions) as the entity that set the terms or conditions of supervision.

Failure to abide by the terms or conditions of supervision may result in revocation of parole. Revocation can result in the return of the paroled offender to incarceration or lead to modification of the conditions of parole supervision.

Seventeen of the 18 agencies that had responsibility for conducting parole revocation hearings held 67,534 hearings between July 1, 2005, and June 30, 2006. Based on the number of adults on parole in these agencies during the year ending June 30, 2006, no more than one in five parolees had a revocation hearing.<sup>2</sup> This is because some parolees may have had more than one revocation hearing.

A total of 317,828 parolees were at risk of re-incarceration in these 17 agencies, including an estimated 203,125 adults on parole on June 30, 2005, plus an estimated 114,703 who entered parole supervision between July 1, 2005, and June 30, 2006 (not shown in table).

Each of the 18 agencies that conducted parole revocation hearings reported sharing this responsibility with a parole board. Thirty of the 32 supervising agencies that did not conduct revocation hearings identified the parole board as the authority performing this function.

### Up to 16% of at-risk parolees in some agencies were re-incarcerated for a failed drug test

All 50 parole supervising agencies that provided information reported testing paroled offenders for the use of illegal drugs during the year ending June 30, 2006. Eight agencies were able to report the number of parolees returned to incarceration between July 1, 2005, and June 30, 2006, due to a drug violation detected during agency testing. These agencies re-incarcerated between less than 0.5% and 16% of those estimated to have been at risk of re-incarceration (table 8). The population at risk of re-incarceration in these agencies included adults who were on parole on June 30, 2005, plus those who entered parole between July 1, 2005, and June 30, 2006.

<sup>2</sup>This was calculated by dividing 67,534 parole revocation hearings by an estimated 301,527 parolees at risk of re-incarceration.

**Table 7. States in which adult parole supervising agencies considered prisoners for release, June 30, 2006**

	Prisoners, July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2006—		
	Considered for release <sup>a</sup>	Number released <sup>a</sup>	Number released per 100 considered
Jurisdictions reporting <sup>b</sup>	126,641	57,850	46
Alabama <sup>c</sup>	9,394	3,111	33
Arizona	411	55	13
California Youth Authority	**	**	**
Connecticut	3,503	2,470	71
Georgia	**	10,794	**
Hawaii	1,797	718	40
Massachusetts	**	**	**
Michigan	20,214	10,365	51
New Jersey	12,859	7,505	58
New York	24,731	10,946	44
North Carolina <sup>d</sup>	7,568	26,457	:
North Dakota	996	752	76
Ohio	12,503	5,793	46
Pennsylvania <sup>c</sup>	19,644	10,368	53
Rhode Island	**	**	**
South Carolina	4,905	1,093	22
South Dakota	1,233	552	45
Tennessee	14,451	4,122	29
Virginia	5,522	**	**

Note: An expanded *Methodology*, appendix tables with state-level data, and detailed *Explanatory Notes* are forthcoming.

\*\* Not known.  
: Not calculated.

<sup>a</sup>Some prisoners considered for release between 7/1/2005 and 6/30/2006 may not have been released until after 6/30/2006, and some released during this period may have been considered for release prior to 7/1/2005.

<sup>b</sup>Excludes Georgia, North Carolina, and Virginia.

<sup>c</sup>Excludes local parole supervision agencies.

<sup>d</sup>Number considered for release restricted to supervised release cases. Number released includes all prison exits, including supervised releases.

**Table 8. Adults on parole returned to incarceration, July 1, 2005, to June 30, 2006, as a result of a drug violation detected during agency testing**

Region and jurisdiction	Total parole population at risk of re-incarceration, on 6/30/2006 <sup>a</sup>	Adult parolees returned to prison, between 7/1/2005 and 6/30/2006, as a result of a drug violation detected during agency testing <sup>b</sup>	
		Number	Percent
Florida	10,971	315	2.9%
Hawaii	2,923	284	9.7
Michigan	31,022	1,958	6.3
Pennsylvania <sup>c</sup>	35,595	1,264	3.6
South Dakota	4,282	675	15.8
Tennessee	12,568	47	--
Utah	5,821	545	9.4
Wyoming	940	51	5.4

Note: An expanded *Methodology*, appendix tables with state-level data, and detailed *Explanatory Notes* are forthcoming.

--Less than 0.5%.

<sup>a</sup>Includes estimates of the number of adults on parole on 6/30/2005, plus those who entered parole between 7/1/2005, and 6/30/2006.

<sup>b</sup>Some parolees returned to prison between 7/1/2005 and 6/30/2006, as a result of a drug violation may have had a drug test prior to 7/1/2005.

<sup>c</sup>Counts varied from those reported in other BJS publications.

Information about the number of paroled offenders tested and whether testing was done upon entry to supervision, randomly, or upon suspicion of use, was not obtained.

**Nearly all agencies report use of drug, sex offender, or mental health treatment programs**

On June 30, 2006, 47 of 49 parole supervising agencies reported having paroled offenders enrolled in a drug treatment program run by a formally trained professional (table 9). In the 21 agencies that provided enrollment counts, an average of 10.9% of all paroled offenders (28,084 of 258,652) were enrolled in such a program.

Nearly all agencies (46) also reported that paroled offenders were enrolled in a self-help or drug awareness program such as Narcotics Anonymous or Cocaine Anonymous. Seven of these agencies, supervising 26,333 parolees, reported that 4,510 parolees (17.1%) were in these programs on June 30, 2006. The other agencies were unable to provide counts.

Nearly all parole supervision agencies also reported having paroled adult offenders enrolled in a sex offender treatment program (46 agencies), or a mental health treatment program (47) (table 10). Twenty-six agencies reported that 3.7% of paroled offenders were enrolled in a sex offender treatment program, and 17 agencies reported that 9.0% of paroled offenders were enrolled in a mental health treatment program operated by a formally trained mental health professional. Among the agencies that provided informa-

**Table 9. Adult supervising agencies' use of drug treatment programs, by type of program, June 30, 2006**

On June 30, 2006, were any parolees enrolled in a—	Number of agencies	Percent of agencies with a known status
Drug treatment program run by a formally trained drug treatment professional?	49	100%
Yes <sup>a</sup>	47	96
No	2	4
Self-help or drug awareness program? <sup>b</sup>	49	100%
Yes <sup>c</sup>	46	94
No	3	6

Note: An expanded *Methodology*, appendix tables with state-level data, and detailed *Explanatory Notes* are forthcoming. Excludes Illinois, Mississippi, and Wisconsin, for which no information was available.

<sup>a</sup>Of 258,652 parolees under supervision in 21 agencies that provided information, 28,084 (10.9%) were enrolled in a drug treatment program operated by a formally trained professional.

<sup>b</sup>Such as Narcotics Anonymous (NA) or Cocaine Anonymous (CA).

<sup>c</sup>Of 26,333 parolees under supervision in 7 agencies that provided information, 4,510 (17.1%) were enrolled in a self-help or drug awareness program like NA or CA.

tion, a greater percentage of paroled offenders were enrolled in drug treatment programs than in sex offender or mental health programs.

**2 in 5 parole supervising agencies operated or contracted a housing service for paroled offenders**

Respondents were asked whether their parole agency had a program that provided assistance to parolees in obtaining housing, beyond an occasional referral by a parole officer to an apartment building or landlord.

Among 50 state supervising agencies that provided information, 7 reported having a working relationship with a state or county housing agency, and 6 had a contract with a private rental agency to refer paroled offenders to landlords (table 11). Four agencies operated an in-house service to provide housing referrals to paroled offenders. Ten other agencies operated other types of programs.

Twenty of the 50 agencies that provided information indicated that as of June 30, 2006, they had some type of formal housing assistance program for paroled offenders (table 12). Four agencies offered two or more types of housing assistance programs.

**Table 10. Adult supervising agencies' use of sex offender and mental health treatment programs, by type of program, June 30, 2006**

On June 30, 2006, were any parolees enrolled in a—	Number of agencies	Percent of agencies with a known status
Sex offender treatment program?	47	100%
Yes <sup>a</sup>	46	98
No	1	2
Mental health treatment program run by a formally trained mental health professional?	49	100%
Yes <sup>b</sup>	47	96
No	2	4

Note: An expanded *Methodology*, appendix tables with state-level data, and detailed *Explanatory Notes* are forthcoming. Excludes states for which no information was available, including Illinois, Mississippi, and Wisconsin for both types of treatment programs, and also Alabama and Maine for sex offender treatment programs.

<sup>a</sup>Of 409,543 parolees under supervision in 26 agencies that provided information, 14,966 (3.7%) were enrolled in a sex offender treatment program.

<sup>b</sup>Of 353,114 parolees under supervision in 17 agencies that provided information, 31,605 (9.0%) were enrolled in a mental health treatment program run by a formally trained mental health professional.

**Table 11. Housing and employment assistance programs provided by adult parole agencies, June 30, 2006**

Type of assistance	Number of agencies
<b>Housing assistance</b>	50
Parole agency—	
• operated a formal housing service that referred parolees to specific landlords or group homes with which the agency had a working relationship	4
• had a contract with a private rental housing agency (or agencies) that referred parolees to specific landlords	6
• had a formal working relationship with a state/county housing agency and regularly received reports on parolees from the agency	7
• offered some other type of program	10
<b>Employment assistance</b>	50
Parole agency —	
• operated a formal employment service that referred parolees to specific job openings or to employers with whom the agency had a working relationship	6
• had a contract with a private employment service that referred parolees to specific job openings or employers	8
• had a formal working relationship with a state or county employment agency and regularly received reports on parolees from the agency	17
• offered some other type of program	6

Note: An expanded *Methodology*, appendix tables with state-level data, and detailed *Explanatory Notes* are forthcoming. Counts limited to state-level reporting. Excludes Illinois and Wisconsin for which no information was available.

### Half of parole supervising agencies offered some type of formal employment assistance

Other than an occasional referral by a parole officer to a job opening or to a particular employer, the most frequent type of formal employment assistance provided by parole supervising agencies involved a working relationship with a state or county employment agency (17 agencies). Nearly equal numbers of parole supervising agencies reported that paroled offenders received employment assistance through a contract with a private employment service (8 agencies), that the parole agency operated an in-house employment service for paroled offenders (6 agencies), or that some other type of employment assistance was provided (6 agencies).

Overall, 25 of the 50 adult parole supervising agencies that provided information had some type of organized program to provide employment assistance to paroled offenders at midyear 2006 (table 13). Seven agencies offered more than one type of employment assistance program.

**Table 12. Number of formal housing assistance programs offered by adult parole supervising agencies, June 30, 2006**

Number of formal housing assistance programs	Adult parole supervising agencies	
	Number	Percent
None	30	60%
1	16	32
2	1	2
3	3	6
Agencies providing information	50	100%

Note: An expanded *Methodology*, appendix tables with state-level data, and detailed *Explanatory Notes* are forthcoming. Counts limited to state-level reporting. Excludes Illinois and Wisconsin for which no information was available.

**Table 13. Number of employment assistance programs offered by adult parole supervising agencies, June 30, 2006**

Number of employment programs	Adult parole supervising agencies	
	Number	Percent
None	25	50%
1	18	36
2	3	6
3	4	8
Agencies providing information	50	100%

Note: An expanded *Methodology*, appendix tables with state-level data, and detailed *Explanatory Notes* are forthcoming. Counts limited to state-level reporting. Excludes Illinois and Wisconsin for which no information was available.

## Methodology

The 2006 Census of State Parole Supervising Agencies, with a reference date of June 30, 2006, was sent to 68 respondents, including 50 central state reporters, the California Youth Authority, and the District of Columbia (table 14). Sixteen local Minnesota Community Corrections Act agencies were asked to provide information on staffing and supervision not available from the state. The purpose of the census was to collect information about parole supervising organizations.

In contrast with the parole census, the 2006 Annual Parole Survey (APS), with a reference date of December 31, 2006, was sent to 54 respondents, including 54 central state reporters, the California Youth Authority, and 1 municipal agency. The APS collected summary counts of the number of adults on parole at the beginning and end of the year, the number of adults entering and exiting parole supervision during the year, and characteristics of the end of year parole population. The APS has been conducted annually since 1977.

Responses to the parole census included one summary response from a central respondent in the Oregon Department of Corrections based on summary data gathered from 36 county governments that independently administered all

adult parole supervision in the state. Illinois provided only counts of the adult parole population on December 31, 2007 for the state as a whole and by parole office. Wisconsin provided no data.

Virginia's report of 8,609 adults on parole supervision on June 30, 2006, included additional groups of offenders that were not previously reported. For the parole census, Virginia included all paroled offenders for whom the state has responsibility, paroled felons who are the responsibility of local jurisdictions in Virginia, and offenders whose parole was originally supervised by the courts that sentenced them. Restricting Virginia's parole count to the groups included in the 2006 Annual Parole Survey would result in an estimate of 4,239 adults on parole on June 30, 2006 — based on an average of the state's adult parole population on January 1, 2006, and December 31, 2006.

A technical supplement to this report is forthcoming. It includes an expanded *Methodology* that discusses estimation procedures. It contains detailed *Explanatory Notes* with definitions, limitations, and counting exceptions in the census. Also, the supplement will contain appendix tables with state-level data and other details on findings in this report.

**Table 14. Comparison of 2006 Census of State Parole Supervising Agency and 2006 Annual Parole Survey data collections**

Topic	2006 Census of Adult Parole Supervising Agencies	2006 Annual Parole Survey
<b>Form</b>	CJ-36	CJ-7
<b>Reference date</b>	June 30, 2006	December 31, 2006
<b>Focus</b>	Parole agency	Parolees, summary counts
<b>Coverage</b>	68 respondents —50 states (excluding Pennsylvania counties) —California Youth Authority  —District of Columbia  —16 Minnesota Community Corrections Agencies (separate responses to collect staff and programmatic information)	54 respondents —50 states (including Pennsylvania counties) —California Youth Authority  —District of Columbia  —Federal parole  —Alabama (one municipality) —Minnesota Community Corrections Act agencies (included with state response)
<b>Non-respondents, imputation procedures</b>	Illinois provided adult parole population on December 31, 2007; used without alteration Wisconsin; parole population imputed from 2006 Annual Parole Survey	Illinois; adult parole population imputed from 2005 Annual Parole Survey
<b>Parole population</b>		
Unadjusted, different coverage and reference dates	660,959	798,202
Adjusted, national estimate, June 30, 2006	795,748	789,409
<b>Adjustment procedure</b>	Added in estimated average parole population on June 30, 2006 from 2006 Annual Parole Survey: —Federal parole —Pennsylvania counties —Alabama (one municipality)	Computed average of parole population on January 1, 2006, and December 31, 2006



**Table 15. Adult parole supervising agency staff, by type, June 30, 2006**

Region and jurisdiction	Number of staff employed by adult parole supervising agency							
	Total		Payroll		Nonpayroll		Contract	
	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time
<b>State total<sup>a</sup></b>	56,935	2,478	53,401	1,169	1,791	996	1,743	313
<b>Northeast</b>	4,503	40	4,488	33	13	4	2	3
Connecticut	186	3	181	3	5	0	0	0
Maine	25	0	25	0	0	0	0	0
Massachusetts	231	7	230	5	0	0	1	2
New Hampshire	103	2	103	2	**	0	~	~
New Jersey	740	4	732	2	8	2	~	~
New York	2,003	17	2,002	14	0	2	1	1
Pennsylvania <sup>b</sup>	1,001	7	1,001	7	0	0	0	0
Rhode Island <sup>c</sup>	13	0	13	0	0	0	0	0
Vermont	201	0	201	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Midwest</b>	16,877	1,101	15,044	581	723	483	1,110	37
Illinois	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Indiana	8,327	0	7,260	0	**	**	1,067	0
Iowa	1,077	75	1,077	75	0	0	0	0
Kansas	153	2	153	2	0	0	0	0
Michigan	1,096	0	1,096	0	**	**	0	0
Minnesota	3,479	788	2,735	268	723	483	21	37
Missouri	1,488	235	1,488	235	**	**	0	0
Nebraska	31	0	31	0	0	0	0	0
North Dakota	92	0	92	0	0	0	0	0
Ohio	1,073	0	1,051	0	0	0	22	0
South Dakota	61	1	61	1	0	0	0	0
Wisconsin	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
<b>South</b>	20,364	354	19,287	135	1,027	199	50	20
Alabama <sup>b</sup>	645	0	644	0	0	0	1	0
Arkansas	364	0	364	0	0	0	0	0
Delaware	355	21	355	21	**	**	**	~
District of Columbia <sup>c</sup>	835	15	791	10	0	0	44	5
Florida	3,409	9	3,409	9	**	**	0	0
Georgia	725	8	725	8	0	0	0	0
Kentucky	544	0	505	0	38	0	1	0
Louisiana	737	~	737	~	~	~	~	~
Maryland	1,234	0	1,234	0	0	0	0	0
Mississippi	3,043	18	3,043	18	0	0	0	0
North Carolina	2,402	~	2,402	~	~	~	~	~
Oklahoma	353	0	353	0	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	758	10	754	0	0	10	4	0
Tennessee	993	16	4	0	989	16	0	0
Texas	2,604	174	2,604	1	0	173	0	0
Virginia <sup>b</sup>	1,319	68	1,319	68	0	0	0	0
West Virginia	44	15	44	0	0	0	0	15
<b>West</b>	15,191	983	14,582	420	28	310	581	253
Alaska <sup>d</sup>	106	~	106	~	0	~	0	~
Arizona	169	0	169	0	0	0	0	0
California <sup>b</sup>	3,651	236	3,101	36	0	0	550	200
California Youth Authority <sup>b</sup>	121	5	121	2	0	3	**	**
Colorado	252	1	240	0	0	0	12	1
Hawaii	50	2	50	2	~	~	~	~
Idaho	1,537	377	1,491	34	28	302	18	41
Montana	182	22	182	8	0	3	0	11
Nevada	438	8	438	6	0	2	~	~
New Mexico	360	0	360	0	0	0	0	0
Oregon	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Utah	554	12	554	12	0	0	0	0
Washington	7,614	308	7,614	308	0	0	0	0
Wyoming	157	12	156	12	0	0	1	0

Note: An expanded *Methodology*, appendix tables with state-level data, and detailed *Explanatory Notes* are forthcoming.

~ Not applicable.

\*\* Not reported.

<sup>a</sup>Excludes an estimated 8,065 full-time and 422 part-time staff in Illinois, Wisconsin, and Oregon.

<sup>b</sup>Data differ from those in other BJS publications.

<sup>c</sup>Some or all data are estimated.

<sup>d</sup>Includes the total number of staff members for the parole and probation agency.

**Table 16. Adult parole supervising agency staff, by gender, June 30, 2006**

Region and jurisdiction	Number of staff employed by adult parole supervising agency							
	Total		Male		Female		Not reported	
	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time
<b>State total<sup>a,b</sup></b>	56,935	2,478	27,436	731	26,321	998	3,178	749
<b>Northeast</b>	4,503	40	2,046	13	2,045	24	412	3
Connecticut	186	3	**	**	**	**	186	3
Maine	25	0	**	0	**	0	25	0
Massachusetts <sup>c</sup>	231	7	112	4	119	3	0	0
New Hampshire	103	2	60	1	43	1	0	0
New Jersey	740	4	411	2	329	2	0	0
New York	2,003	17	903	4	1,100	13	0	0
Pennsylvania <sup>b</sup>	1,001	7	555	2	446	5	0	0
Rhode Island <sup>c</sup>	13	0	5	0	8	0	0	0
Vermont	201	0	**	0	**	0	201	0
<b>Midwest</b>	16,877	1,101	8,273	432	6,839	646	1,765	23
Illinois	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Indiana	8,327	0	4,642	0	2,618	0	1,067	0
Iowa	1,077	75	526	23	551	52	0	0
Kansas	153	2	81	0	72	2	0	0
Michigan	1,096	0	515	0	581	0	0	0
Minnesota	3,479	788	1,358	301	1,445	464	676	23
Missouri	1,488	235	596	108	892	127	0	0
Nebraska	31	0	14	0	17	0	0	0
North Dakota	92	0	39	0	53	0	0	0
Ohio	1,073	0	469	0	582	0	22	0
South Dakota	61	1	33	0	28	1	0	0
Wisconsin	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
<b>South</b>	20,364	354	8,544	70	11,776	106	44	178
Alabama <sup>b</sup>	645	0	312	0	333	0	0	0
Arkansas	364	0	169	0	195	0	0	0
Delaware	355	21	204	4	151	17	0	0
District of Columbia <sup>c</sup>	835	15	276	1	515	9	44	5
Florida	3,409	9	1,298	1	2,111	8	0	0
Georgia	725	8	343	4	382	4	0	0
Kentucky	544	0	305	0	239	0	0	0
Louisiana	737	~	381	~	356	~	0	~
Maryland	1,234	0	367	0	867	0	0	0
Mississippi	3,043	18	1,194	6	1,849	12	0	0
North Carolina	2,402	~	1,179	~	1,223	~	0	~
Oklahoma <sup>c</sup>	353	0	199	0	154	0	0	0
South Carolina	758	10	328	5	430	5	0	0
Tennessee	993	16	420	14	573	2	0	0
Texas	2,604	174	935	0	1,669	1	0	173
Virginia <sup>b</sup>	1,319	68	611	28	708	40	0	0
West Virginia	44	15	23	7	21	8	0	0
<b>West</b>	15,191	983	8,573	216	5,661	222	957	545
Alaska <sup>d</sup>	106	~	47	~	59	~	0	~
Arizona	169	0	98	0	71	0	0	0
California <sup>b</sup>	3,651	236	1,698	23	1,403	13	550	200
California Youth Authority <sup>b,c</sup>	121	5	74	2	47	3	0	0
Colorado	252	1	137	0	115	1	0	0
Hawaii	50	2	28	2	22	0	0	0
Idaho	1,537	377	961	6	530	28	46	343
Montana	182	22	87	10	95	12	0	0
Nevada	438	8	212	0	226	6	0	2
New Mexico	360	0	**	0	**	0	360	0
Oregon	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Utah	554	12	353	6	201	6	0	0
Washington	7,614	308	4,822	160	2,792	148	0	0
Wyoming	157	12	56	7	100	5	1	0

Note: An expanded *Methodology*, appendix tables with state-level data, and detailed *Explanatory Notes* are forthcoming.

~ Not applicable.

\*\* Not reported.

<sup>a</sup>Excludes an estimated 8,065 full-time and 422 part-time staff in Illinois, Wisconsin, and Oregon.

<sup>b</sup>Data differ from those in other BJS publications.

<sup>c</sup>Some or all data are estimated.

<sup>d</sup>Includes the total number of staff members for the parole and probation agency.



**For electronic versions of this report,  
visit the BJS website**

*<http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs>*

To order paper copies of this or other BJS reports —

- Visit

*<http://www.ncjrs.gov/app/publications/bjspubs.aspx>*

- Call 1-800-851-3420

Download datasets and documentation from  
the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data —

*<http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/NACJD/index.html>*

## **Keep current on criminal justice issues**

**Get notices and newsletters:**

### **JUSTSTATS**

E-mail notifications of new statistical materials from BJS, the FBI,  
and the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

To subscribe, see <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/juststats.htm>

### **JUSTINFO**

A biweekly electronic newsletter from the National Criminal Justice Reference  
Service (NCJRS) with news from BJS, NCJRS, and the other agencies in the  
Office of Justice Programs.

To subscribe, see <http://www.ncjrs.gov/subreg.html>



Washington, DC 20531

Official Business  
Penalty for Private Use \$300

---

This report in portable document format ( and in ASCII and its related statistical data and tables are available at the BJS World Wide Web Internet site: <<http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/abstract/cspsa06.htm>>.

**Office of Justice Programs**

*Innovation • Partnerships • Safer Neighborhoods*  
<http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov>

The Bureau of Justice Statistics is the statistical agency of the U.S. Department of Justice. Jeffrey L. Sedgwick is the director.

This Special Report was written by Thomas P. Bonczar, statistician, and verified by William J. Sabol and Todd D. Minton. Nicole S. Adolph, Garry L. Smith, and Adam E. Bacon, Governments Division, U.S. Census Bureau, carried out data collection and processing for the 2006 Census of Adult Parole Supervising Agencies, under the supervision of Latrice M. Brogsdale-Davis and Charlene M. Sebold. Catherine Bird, Tina Dorsey, and Georgette Walsh produced and edited the report. Jayne Robinson prepared the report for final printing, under the supervision of Doris J. James.

August 2008 NCJ 222180