

**A FIELD EVALUATION OF THE
INTERSTATE COMPACT FOR PROBATION AND
PAROLE: FINDINGS FROM AN NIC SURVEY**

January 1998

National Institute of Corrections

Morris L. Thigpen
Director

George M. Keiser
Chief, Community Corrections Division

A FIELD EVALUATION OF THE INTERSTATE COMPACT FOR PROBATION AND PAROLE: FINDINGS FROM AN NIC SURVEY

Constance Clem
Barbara Krauth
Larry Linke

LIS, Inc.
National Institute of Corrections Information Center
Longmont, Colorado

January 1998

This material was prepared by LIS, Inc., NIC Information Center Contractor, under contract J1CO-110 with the U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Prisons.

Contents

Overview	1
Purpose of the Study	1
Project Method	1
General Observations	2
Findings in Brief	3
Nationwide Compact Activity	3
Current Satisfaction With the Compact	3
Respondents' Recommendations for Improving the Compact	4
Survey Findings	5
Context for Compact Policy Review	5
Level of Concern for Compact Issues	5
Data on Compact Activity	7
Cases Supervised	7
Cases Processed	7
Violations of Probation or Parole	10
Respondents' Evaluations of the Compact	11
Internal Factors Within Responding States	11
Factors Related to Interstate Functions	12
Respondents' Recommendations to Improve Compact Operations	17
Suggestions for Comprehensive Change	17
Suggestions for Specific Rule Changes	19
APPENDIX A: Compiled data-Survey A. Compact Administrators	
APPENDIX B: Compiled data-Survey B. NIC Network Participants	
APPENDIX C: Compiled data-Survey C. Probation and Parole Field Administrators	
APPENDIX D: State legislation	
APPENDIX E: Survey instruments	

Overview

Purpose of the Study

The National Institute of Corrections (NIC) Community Corrections Division and Information Center undertook the present study to assess practitioners' views of, and satisfaction with, the Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Probationers and Parolees. The Compact provides statutory authority for the transfer of adult offenders between states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Transfers under the Compact are processed by one or two Compact administrators in each state: one if probation and parole transfers are administered jointly, and two if they are administered separately. At present there are 65 Compact administrators in the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

The project is an initial step in responding to concerns raised about the Compact. An ad-hoc committee of the NIC Advisory Board was convened in 1997 to facilitate an informed discussion of related issues with a view toward recommending strategies for making constructive, long-term improvements to the Compact. This report is intended to illuminate for committee members both the field's current concerns and their relative urgency.

The project also updates a similar study the NIC Information Center completed in 1986 (*Report on the Interstate Compact for Probation and Parole*, 1986). It is clear from a comparison of findings that many of the same discontents still affect the Compact today—slowness of case processing and inappropriate response to violations, for example. Some issues have been resolved, but for a variety of reasons, many needed changes remain unaddressed.

Project Method

Project staff developed three survey instruments, each of which was distributed to a specific pool of corrections agency respondents:

- State Compact administrators for probation and/or parole supervision (N=65) received Survey A, which requested Compact population and case processing data, views on specific aspects of Compact operation, and views on problems with the Compact and ways to resolve them. Follow-up calls were made to non-responding agencies to ensure a high rate of response. Responses to Survey A provided complete data on Compact probation and parole cases from 46 states and the District of Columbia. Three states that separately administer Compact functions for probation and parole provided responses covering either probation or parole cases. One state provided no response to Survey A.

- Agency administrators in several standing NIC networks, such as parole board chairs and directors of large urban probation agencies (N=118), received Survey B. This survey asked respondents to evaluate the Compact, identify major problems, and recommend solutions. The group includes upper-level administrators in a variety of state and local community corrections settings, including state departments of correction (DOCs) with responsibility for probation and/or parole functions. The 38 respondents to Survey B represented probation and parole agencies in 31 states and the District of Columbia.
- Field-level probation and/or parole administrators and staff received Survey C, copies of which were distributed by NIC network participants to up to three respondents in their agencies. Survey C also requested respondents to evaluate the Compact, identify major problems, and recommend solutions. Responses were received from 95 probation and parole field staff in 32 states and the District of Columbia.

Survey responses were analyzed with minimal follow-up among the respondents to clarify data or comments. Findings from each of the three surveys as individually examined are provided in Appendices A, B, and C. Survey instruments are provided in Appendix E.

Findings across all three survey pools were distilled to prepare the main body of this report. Its findings reflect the attitudes of the respondents, which are not necessarily those of NIC or the project team.

General Observations

Project staff identified the following overall themes emerging from the analysis:

- 1. Interstate tensions, policy differences, and serious inefficiencies seem to characterize current Compact operations.*
- 2. There is a philosophical split between those who believe that Compact rules should be strict/y followed and-in addition-enforced, and those who believe the Compact has become too rule-bound, too inflexible to accommodate special circumstances.*
- 3. Very few Compact offices have reliable data on violations of probation or parole committed by Compact transferees.*
- 4. Agency staff are generally satisfied with operations within their own states, but sometimes extreme/y frustrated in their dealings with other states.*

5. Compact administrators are intensely interested in improving the effectiveness of the Compact.

6. There appears to be considerable organizational distance in many agencies between the authority who appoints and/or supervises state Compact administrative staff and actual Compact operations. This separation suggests that information about Compact problems may not always reach the higher decision-making levels. Agency administrators showed mixed interest in contributing to the resolution of the Compact's current problems.

Findings in Brief

Nationwide Compact Activity

Case statistics obtained through the survey were incomplete and often based on estimates. Available figures suggest that agencies submitted more than 67,000 requests for interstate transfer during the year ending June 30, 1997. Depending on the data used, approximately 20 to 30 percent of these cases were denied transfer.

At least 115,000 probationers and parolees were living in locations outside the state of conviction through transfers via the Interstate Compact as of June 30, 1997. Based on a Bureau of Justice Statistics figure of 3.9 million probationers and parolees nationally at the close of 1996, Compact transferees make up approximately 3.0 percent of the nation's probation and parole population.

Current Satisfaction With the Compact

State Compact administrators, probation and parole agency administrators, and field-level probation and parole managers all evaluated the Compact overall as working adequately, though the higher-level agency administrators gave the Compact a slightly better rating.

Despite their overall evaluations of Compact operations as adequate, respondents identified many aspects that pose more than a moderate problem. Primary among these concerns are:

- **Rule violations-Violations** were described as rampant, suggesting a need for methodical review and modification of rules, as well as increased enforcement and accountability among states that are party to the Compact.

- **Slowness of Compact case processing and response**-Respondents observed that delays are common throughout the Compact process, impairing the system's effectiveness, increasing the likelihood of Compact rule violations, and causing gaps in supervision that present a significant risk to public safety.

- **Communications and other technology is underutilized** - Respondents stated that available technology for information systems and telecommunications could be better utilized to improve Compact operations. Both on the level of state or local agencies and nationally, adopting new technologies has the potential to improve agencies' ability to maintain control of offenders and manage and transmit case-specific data.

Respondents' Recommendations for Improving the Compact

Respondents at all levels proposed a range of responses to deal with Compact problems. Chief topics addressed by the recommendations are:

- **Enforcement** - Respondents called for audits or monitoring systems to identify jurisdictions that are not complying with the guidelines of the Compact and better measures to promote compliance and correct deficiencies. Either more standardized procedures are needed to improve consistency and uniformity of Compact activity, or the bureaucracy that inhibits direct interaction between sending and receiving jurisdictions should be reduced. Many respondents believe there is a need for intervention by state policy-makers or even the Federal government to establish the authority or resources to address Compact problems.

- **National automated case tracking system** - A national database of Compact cases should be developed to allow for the electronic transfer of information and to accelerate the transfer process.

- **Education and training of judges, prosecutors, district attorneys, and staff** - Respondents stressed the need for better training, clearer instructions, and more comprehensive reference materials to increase awareness of Compact guidelines, procedures, and requirements.

- **Methodical and informed review of Compact rules** - Respondents said they need better information about proposed rule changes, and that rules should be reviewed more regularly to keep pace with changes in community corrections work.

Survey Findings

Context for Compact Policy Review

The survey sought information on the appointment and supervision of Compact administrators to look for an indication of where communication efforts could be focused to gain support for improving Compact operations. It was also hypothesized that a major organizational distance between the appointing and supervising authority could suggest a potential gap in information flow and/or administrative support for the Compact. However, survey responses were not individually examined for a correlation between these factors.

Appointment of the 65 state-level Compact Administrator positions is by the DOC commissioner in 12 states and by the Governor in six (6) states. Commonly, the governor appoints the Compact Administrator, who in turn designates a Deputy Compact Administrator to actually coordinate the state's Compact operations.

The official appointing the compact administrator also supervises that position in 16 states. Where Compact operations are linked with a combined probation/parole division of the state DOC, the chief or assistant director of field operations frequently is the supervisor for the Compact Administrator or deputy administrator.

In at least 32 of the 57 responding agencies, the survey respondent-usually either the Compact Administrator or Deputy Compact Administrator-is supervised by a different official than the one who appointed him or her to the Compact position. This suggests the potential for a lack of information at a high administrative level about problems with the Compact as well as the possibility of insufficient support for Compact operations. Findings of the present study suggest that higher-level administrators have a more optimistic view of the Compact than those with who work with it more directly.

Level of Concern for Compact Issues

To explore concern for Compact issues at higher levels of agency management, agency administrators were asked about the relative importance of Compact issues to them in the upcoming year. Respondents rated the Compact on a scale from 1 to 9, where 1 is "not important" and 9 is "very important." The group of 38 respondents gave the Compact an overall rating of 5.6, or slightly more than "moderately important." Results are presented in Table 1, page 6.

Table 1. Agency Administrators Views of the Compact's Importance

	Not Important			Moderately Important				Very Important	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Number of responses	0	2	8	3	5	4	6	5	4
Responses as a percent of total	—	5%	21%	8%	13%	11%	16%	13%	11%

The three groups of survey respondents were asked to rate the effectiveness of the Compact by answering the question, “Overall, how well do you think the Compact is working?” Respondents could choose a rating from 1 to 9, or “very poorly” to “very well.” Results showed an overall rating of slightly better than adequate functioning.

A comparison of findings across survey groups shows:

Compact administrators - N=54 responses; mean score = 5.17

	Very Poorly			Adequately				Very Well	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Number of responses	1	3	7	6	10	12	14	1	0
Responses as a percent of total	2%	6%	13%	11%	18%	22%	26%	2%	—

Agency administrators - N=38 responses; mean score = 5.26

	Very Poorly			Adequately				Very Well	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Number of responses	1	2	1	6	12	6	9	0	1
Responses as a percent of total	3%	5%	3%	16%	32%	16%	24%	-	3%

Probation and parole field staff - N=95 responses; mean score = 5.13

	Very Poorly			Adequately				Very Well	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Number of responses	3	3	16	13	20	13	20	5	2
Responses as a percent of total	3%	3%	17%	14%	21%	14%	21%	5%	2%

Data on Compact Activity

To establish a national picture of the scope of the Compact, Compact administrators were asked to provide data on probation and parole populations supervised under the Compact, the number of transfer requests processed in a 1-year period, and reported violations within a year's time.

Survey A also asked Compact administrators to identify any additional case types they transfer using Compact processes. The majority-38 of 56 responding agencies-do not participate in interstate transfers of other types of cases. However, 18 agencies accept or initiate transfers of offender categories other than those formally covered by the Interstate Compact. Most of these agencies process transfers of deferred prosecution cases via the Compact, and a few process diversion cases and non-adjudicated probationers.

Cases Supervised

Data were reported for both probation and parole populations as of June 30, 1997 in most responding states; however, separate data were not always available for probation and parole. Table 1, page 8, presents case data.

Approximate national numbers on June 30, 1997, were:

	Cases Sent	Cases Received
Probationers	82,386	80,251
Parolees	30,586	25,980
Total	115,362	108,439

Table 1 also presents comparative figures on state-by-state case flow. States that gained the most net cases through the Compact were Delaware (2,859), Oklahoma (2,650), Washington (1,530), and California (1,152). Vermont, Delaware, and Washington were the greatest net gainers in percentage terms, where numbers of cases received were three or more times the numbers sent.

States with the greatest numbers of net outgoing cases were Texas (-5,927), New York (-2,312), Virginia (-2,196), and Missouri (-1,614). By percentage, the greatest net outflow of cases occurred in Nebraska, Rhode Island, and Hawaii, where cases received equaled roughly just 25 percent of cases sent.

Cases Processed

Data related to processing of transfer requests also provide indicators of the scope of Compact activity. The survey requested data on transfers requested, accepted, denied, and pending for the 1-year period ending June 30, 1997. Some agencies were not able to provide figures in all categories requested by the survey. Table 2, page 9, presents available figures on transfer requests.

Survey data here were more problematic than the data on cases supervised. Some states couldn't provide separate data on transfer requests received and sent but submitted a total

Table 1. Compact Populations, June 30,1997

	Individual Cases Being Supervised in Other States			Individual Cases Being Supervised for Other States			Net Flow of Cases	
	Probation	Parole	Total	Probation	Parole	Total	Cases gained or (lost)	Case flow ratio
Alabama	814	284	1,098	1,395	463	1,858	760	1.69
Alaska	—	—	380	—	—	208	(170)	0.55
Arizona	1,456	300	1,756	1,295	504	1,799	43	1.02
Arkansas	1,494	580	2,074	2,018	479	2,497	450	1.20
California	5,368	2,432	7,800	7,704	1,248	8,952	1,152	1.15
Colorado	1,979	428	2,407	2,066	319	2,385	(22)	0.99
Connecticut	911	125	1,036	1,264	211	1,475	439	1.42
Delaware	1,289	51	1,340	3,348	851	4,199	2,859	3.13
D.C.	802	212	1,014	945	248	1,193	179	1.18
Florida	5,599	815	6,414	3,726	1,469	5,195	(1,219)	0.81
Georgia	3,618	1,536	5,154	4,418	733	5,151	(3)	1.00
Hawaii	562	128	690	146	46	192	(498)	0.28
Idaho	799	200	999	340	113	453	(546)	0.45
Illinois	3,500	1,336	4,836	3,500	854	4,354	(482)	0.90
Indiana	773	310 ²	1,083	954	630 ²	1,584	501	1.46
Iowa	517	241	758	1,041	225	1,266	508	1.67
Kansas	1,124	948	2,072	868	308	1,176	(896)	0.57
Kentucky	1,313	1,086	2,399	847	496	1,343	(1,056)	0.56
Louisiana	1,472	1,272	2,744	1,615	563	2,178	(566)	0.79
Maine	169	10	179	200	87	287	108	1.60
Maryland	2,041	563	2,604	1,907	657	2,564	(40)	0.98
Massachusetts	950	403	1,353	1,563	286	1,849	496	1.37
Michigan	1,225	411	1,636	1,880	586	2,466	830	1.51
Minnesota	1,191	65	1,256	1,383	283	1,666	410	1.33
Mississippi	963	289	1,252	1,244	540	1,784	532	1.42
Missouri	2,942	1,384	4,326	1,486	1,226	2,712	(1,614)	0.63
Montana	707	100	807	319	87	406	(401)	0.50
Nebraska	307	647	954	79	158	237	(717)	0.25
Nevada	1,560	518	2,078	944	462	1,406	(672)	0.68
New Hampshire	378	173	551	265	67	332	(219)	0.60
New Jersey	—	652	[652]	—	349	[349]	(303)	0.54
New Mexico	733	222	955	848	241	1,089	134	1.14
New York	7,225	2,252	9,477	6,180	985	7,165	(2,312)	0.76
North Carolina	4,948	447	5,395	4,342	1,828	6,170	775	1.14
North Dakota	347	22	369	235	55	290	(79)	0.79
Ohio	1,563	439	2,002	1,655	875	2,530	528	1.26
Oklahoma	1,818	466	2,284	3,451	1,483	4,934	2,650	2.16
Oregon	—	—	2,000	—	—	2,000	0	1.00
Pennsylvania	189	2,111	2,300	1,354	542	1,896	(404)	0.82
Rhode Island	981	166	1,147	217	97	314	(833)	0.27
South Carolina	1,602	641	2,243	1,372	475	1,847	(396)	0.82
South Dakota	390	192 ²	582	375	39 ²	414	(168)	0.71
Tennessee	1,200	635	1,835	1,803	541	2,344	509	1.28
Texas	8,312	3,199	11,511	3,473	2,111	5,584	(5,927)	0.48
Utah	285	226	511	429	143	572	61	1.12
Vermont ²	100	10	110	420	30	450	340	4.09
Virginia	3,724	1,105	4,839	1,890	743	2,633	(2,196)	0.54
Washington	735	30	765	1,600	695	2,295	1,530	3.00
West Virginia	164	225	389	478	178	656	267	1.69
Wisconsin	1,857	623	2,480	1,069	286	1,355	(1,125)	0.55
Wyoming	390	86	476	300	85	385	(91)	0.81
TOTALS	82,386	30,586	115,362	80,251	25,980	108,439		

1. This figure is the ratio of cases received to cases sent. A value of 1.00 indicates balanced flow; values less than 1 represent a net "export" of cases, and figures greater than 1 show a net "import" of cases.
2. Supplemental data for Indiana and South Dakota parole and Vermont probation and parole were obtained from *The Corrections Yearbook* (South Salem, New York: Criminal Justice Institute, 1997). Data are as of January 1, 1997.

Table 2. Probation and Parole Transfer Requests Processed in a 1-Year Period ¹

	Requests to Transfer Individuals to Other States				Requests to Accept Individuals from Other States			
	Total transfers requested	Transfers accepted	Transfers denied	Requests pending at year end	Total transfers ² requested	Transfers accepted	Transfers denied	Requests pending at year end
Alabama	955	—	—	—	1,628	—	—	—
Alaska	106	86	8	12	—	97	10	27
Arizona	1,816	1,042	462	519	—	1,168	690	128
Arkansas	1,543	770	417	370	—	875	350	339
California	4,398	986 (parole)	716 (parole)	360 (parole)	3,033 (prob)	656 (parole)	1,016 (parole)	1,838 (parole)
Colorado	2,335	1,207	619	509	3,930	897	448	250
Connecticut	458 ³	18 (parole)	4 (parole)	234	—	796	110 (parole)	53
Delaware	—	—	—	—	—	775	126	18
D.C.	1,087	737	249	101	—	868	210	45
Florida	4,132	3,019	853	1,239	6,166	3,570	1,792	558
Georgia	4,014	1,307 (prob)	658 (prob)	304 (prob)	—	1,803	472 (prob)	300 (prob)
Hawaii	69 (parole)	88	15 (parole)	52	—	60	14 (parole)	48
Idaho	625	460	135	—	—	365	235	—
Illinois	3,435	—	—	—	2,375 (prob)	—	—	—
Indiana	1,495	978	394	138	—	1,229	316	113
Iowa	775	583	98	94	—	508	258	41
Kansas	1,407	878	325	204	—	639	383	180
Kentucky	622	448	174	80	802	637	165	176
Louisiana	—	—	—	—	—	1,461	51	121
Maine	121	66	35	20	—	111	89	117
Maryland	1,424	1,129	285	20	—	2,600	900	100
Massachusetts	169 (parole)	105 (parole)	22 (parole)	58 (parole)	—	283	158	87
Michigan	—	1,102	—	—	—	1,350	—	—
Minnesota	1,195	493	273	429	—	778	425	358
Mississippi	1,737	1,101	526	—	—	—	—	—
Missouri	—	—	—	—	—	1,596	972	—
Montana	583	466	117	100	391	332	59	50
Nebraska	124 (parole)	—	—	9 (parole)	—	—	—	12 (parole)
Nevada	1,830	1,133	326	495	—	948	572	28
New Hampshire	483	381	129	147	—	263	130	87
New Jersey	2,711	723	344	1,648	1,475 (prob)	473	373	1,108
New Mexico	1,239	557	—	—	—	556	—	—
New York	4,513	1,913	934	1,410	2,740 (prob)	1,245 ⁴	660 ⁴	1,589 ⁴
North Carolina	2,100	1,192	434	—	—	2,258	848	—
North Dakota	359	237	103	19	—	184	53	19
Ohio	1,044	629	238	386	—	2,042	763	—
Oklahoma	1,048	551	222	275	2,061	1,472	477	112
Oregon	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Pennsylvania ⁵	—	1,791	1,554	—	—	370	383	—
Rhode Island	405	330	53	79	—	141	61	21
South Carolina	—	2,178	772	—	—	2,362	531	—
South Dakota	241 (prob)	216 (prob)	25 (prob)	19 (prob)	—	173 (prob)	12 (prob)	21 (prob)
Tennessee	1,318	846	312	—	926 (parole)	1,306	1,113	—
Texas	11,172	4,958	1,734	1,981	—	3,224	1,192	1,390
Utah	—	—	—	—	678	572	106	0
Vermont	(No survey response)							
Virginia	2,720	1,820	405	495	—	1,408	512	267
Washington	1,019	—	—	—	1,996	—	—	—
West Virginia	355	182	129	44	—	273	155	47
Wisconsin	—	1,353	—	—	—	632	—	—
Wyoming	—	476	—	—	—	385	—	—
TOTALS	67,182	38,535	14,099	11,850		43,741	17,190	9,648

¹ Unless indicated, data include both probation and parole cases.

² This question was not asked in the survey; figures reported in this column are as volunteered by some agencies.

³ Connecticut parole data are for 6 months only.

⁴ These New York figures include only 8 months of parole activity.

⁵ Pennsylvania data on this table include state and county probation cases.

figure for both incoming and outgoing requests. They include Missouri (2,568 total transfer requests); Nebraska (1,834); New Hampshire (898); North Carolina (5,747); Oregon (1,500); South Carolina (6,775); Tennessee (2,807); and Texas (18,856).

The types of data reported are likely not consistent from state to state and should not be relied upon for accuracy. Some figures are approximate. Numbers often don't total as expected, suggesting that the use of additional categories such as "cancellations" could have been useful. In fact, the survey did not ask for data on total transfer requests received, on the incorrect assumption that a total of transfers accepted, denied, and pending could be calculated during survey analysis. This suggests potential variability in what the figures mean in each state.

Some specific clarifications were provided by respondents. For example, West Virginia noted that its figures for cases denied transfer include cases that were submitted in pre-parole status and later withdrawn when parole was denied. In New York, 256 transfer requests were canceled or the offenders were released to alternative programs prior to acceptance or rejection by the state to which transfer was requested. New York's figures on pending cases include those that have technically been accepted, but verification of the offender's arrival is missing.

Based on available data, findings suggest:

- Within a 1-year period, state-level Compact offices nationally submitted more than 67,000 requests to transfer offenders to other jurisdictions. State Compact offices reported that they accepted 43,433 out-of-state cases for supervision during the same period.
- Among the 28 states that track the outcomes of their requests for transfer, approximately 30 percent of transfer requests were denied. For the nation as a whole, 57 percent of transfer requests were accepted, and 20 percent were rejected.

Violations of Probation or Parole

The survey sought data for a 1 -year period on the number of violations states reported that involved Compact probationers and parolees, how many cases were returned, and how many cases were pending action at the close of the year. However, only five states were able to report comprehensive data, covering violations of both parolees and probationers occurring among offenders transferred into and out of their states.

For a few states, complete data were available only for parolees. Greater interest in parolees' status may be because these offenders are assumed to be more dangerous. Massachusetts keeps data on parolees its supervises for other states, but not for its own offenders in other states; Missouri, Ohio, and South Carolina have data only on their own cases in other states. Available data are shown in Table A1, Appendix A.

The lack of data can be interpreted in several ways. Perhaps violation data for a state's Compact-transferred offenders tend to be tracked by other entities in the DOC or judicial systems. Perhaps Compact offices have considered tracking violations to be a low priority. Perhaps most likely, Compact offices may lack the information technology to monitor case

status. (Compact administrators ranked their information systems as the greatest problem faced within their states; see p. 11). The importance of maintaining accurate data was emphasized by a number of survey respondents, who advocated a nationwide database to track all aspects of Compact transactions.

A review of the available data gives an indication of the numbers of violations reported for Compact transferees in some states. For example, Florida returned 775 of its offenders in one year for violations while out of state. Florida reported 1,300 violations to other states in that year, of which 626 cases were retaken. Missouri reported that the state returned 2,149 probation or parole cases for violation; their figure includes absconders.

Respondents' Evaluations of the Compact

Compact administrators were asked in Survey A to rate 18 specific areas of possible concern from 1 (not a problem) to 5 (a serious problem). Seven items related to Compact operations within the responding states, and 11 addressed interstate functions. Respondents were also given the opportunity to write in and rate any additional problems.

As indicated by the resulting mean scores, Compact administrators are much more satisfied with operations within their own state than with operations involving other states: the average score across the seven in-state functions was 2.5, compared with 3.2 for the 11 functions involving other states.

Agency administrators and probation and parole field managers were asked to identify problems with the Compact in an open-ended question. Their responses generally corroborated and illustrated the Compact administrators' numeric data, but these groups also identified a variety of other important concerns.

Internal Factors Within Responding States

1. *Information systems/technology are inadequate.* Mean score = 3.18; ranked "serious" by 25 percent of Compact administrators.

2. *Field staff receive inadequate training on Compact operations.* Mean score = 2.81. Field staff also identified this as a major concern.

3. *Judges do not follow Compact regulations.* Mean score = 2.76. These officials often do not know enough about Compact guidelines, though their decisions affect Compact operations. Respondents noted that, for example, when judges fail to follow Compact regulations, it is almost impossible to have violators returned.

4. *Compact office has inadequate resources.* Mean score = 2.56; ranked "serious" by 17 percent of Compact administrators. Five agency administrators also identified this problem,

stating that the Compact does not always have adequate respect or the perceived status that it needs to obtain support; state Compact offices often “don’t have the staffing and equipment resources to operate efficiently.”

5. *Compact is not a priority with policy makers or administrators.* Mean score = 2.56. Field staff and agency administrators tended to cite this as an issue, although Compact administrators themselves did not see it as a serious problem.

Factors Related to Interstate Functions

(Survey respondents had more to say about interstate operations. Three broad categories -rule violations, speed of compact processes, and communications and technology-and miscellaneous.)

■ **Rule violations.** Among responses, there was an overall duality between those advocating more rules with more enforcement vs. those favoring a move toward fewer rules and less structure. For example, two respondents commented:

- “There is clearly a trend toward a ‘black and white’ philosophy, and we’re moving away from considering what’s in the best interest of all parties.”
- “The Compact rules either need to be changed to reflect changes in society and then enforced, or enforced as they stand.”

Far more respondents, however, favored a strengthening and enforcement of Compact rules. One reason may be an awareness of the ways in which Compact operations relate to public safety. As a respondent noted,

“Today more than ever before the Compact must be recognized for its potential as a major link in crime control and community safety and be provided enforcement assistance accordingly. It has not become “outdated” or in need of replacement. Its administrative body . . . has acted responsibly in providing rules and regulations with offender needs and community safety issues in mind. But this is not enough. Until reasonable people are willing to provide enforcement sanctions to this Compact there will continue to be the same problems today that existed from the past.”

Seventeen agency administrators also observed that the level of compliance with provisions and guidelines of the Compact is not consistent among the states. As noted by a Compact administrator, “Rules need to be complied with, and they should be more specific. When we leave them open to interpretation, then we invite states to pass laws specifying the definition. . . . States should not be able to make their own rules or interpretations of the rules.”

Respondents discussed the most serious rule violations as follows:

1. *Agencies send offenders to our state without approval.* Mean score = 3.85; rated “serious” by 33 percent of Compact administrators.

A county administrator of adult probation and parole noted, “Too many bodies show up without advance approval,” and “Rejected bodies end up in the state anyway, and they have no on-site supervision.” A Compact administrator noted, “Sending offenders via a travel permit has become the norm rather than the exception and is contrary to Rule 3-101.” Five agency administrators also identified this as a problem.

2. *Some states are too restrictive in accepting cases.* Mean score = 3.40; rated “serious” by 25 percent of Compact administrators.

Three agency administrators stated that some states are imposing formal laws or policies or creating informal barriers that deter transfers and thereby violate the guidelines and spirit of the Compact. Thirty-three (33) probation and parole field staff also noted this complaint, stating, for example, “Individual states [are] adding additional rules to the Compact or changing the definition of a resident.” A Compact administrator observed, “Receiving states need to recognize that interstate transfer is a right not a privilege.” Appendix D provides examples of laws and policies from two states that are contrary to the spirit of the Compact.

A probation and parole administrator noted that “Some states attempt to deny supervision of cases even though the offender has always been a resident of that state. Education on the Compact agreement is necessary.” Another administrator noted that some states are “refusing to allow their residents to return home prior to an investigation—some offenders are arrested in another state, live in their home state until trial, are placed on probation by [the other] state, but their home state treats them like non-residents.”

A parole agent from a midwestern state observed that some states “are very bad about denying appropriate cases requesting transfer; also, some states refuse high-profile cases (sex crimes, etc.) when the case would be most appropriately supervised by the receiving state.”

3. *States fail to retake their violators.* Mean score = 3.38; rated “serious” by 19 percent of Compact administrators.

“Statutorily the decision to return violators has been conclusive in the sending state and not reviewable in the receiving state. Continued violations reported in the receiving state are often ignored,” one Compact administrator observed. “Offenders realize this and make supervision a waste of time and a mockery to the criminal justice system as a whole.” Another stated, “If a state compacts someone, they should have to come and get them. No exceptions.”

Several agency administrators also noted that some jurisdictions are not responsive to violation reports and are slow to return violators to sending states. Similarly, 24 probation and parole field staff said responses to violations are too slow, causing lengthy detention of viola-

tors awaiting return or offender “limbo” in the community. One probation agent noted, “The case transfer/return process is too long (i.e., 2 to 3 months). This leaves the probationer ineffectively supervised, if at all.”

Many respondents noted that a lack of response to violations compromises the integrity of Compact supervision if no action is taken. A case was cited in which two violation reports had been filed on a probation case, but the sending state had not responded to the receiving jurisdiction’s request for action-for more than a year.

4. *States do not enforce Compact rules.* Mean score = 3.36; rated “serious” by 18 percent of Compact administrators.

Noted one Compact administrator, “It is very difficult to convince the officers in my state to follow policy when they see such abuse from other states.” Another administrator stated, “My agents in the field are totally frustrated. As they call states for reporting instructions under the Compact they are told numerous rules and excuses.” Seven agency administrators observed that there is no accountability within the Compact and that, though states agree to the pact, there is no real system to document compliance levels or impose consequences for non-compliance.

5. *Compact’s conflict resolution process is ineffective.* Mean score = 3.28; rated “serious” by 21 percent of Compact administrators.

Many Compact administrators and agency administrators are frustrated with their inability to enforce compliance with provisions of the Compact; to provide for accountability within its operations; and to resolve conflicts that develop among participating jurisdictions. “The current grievance process takes too long to be effective,” stated one Compact administrator. “Even the filing of a conflict is cumbersome,” noted another. “The end result often favors the sending state-there would not be a conflict if the offender were doing well in the receiving state.”

■ **Slowness of compact processes and response**

1. *Transfer processes are slow and cumbersome.* Mean score = 3.52; rated “serious” by 18 percent of Compact administrators.

2. *Agencies are generally slow to respond.* Mean score = 3.43; rated “serious” by 16 percent of Compact administrators.

Fourteen agency administrators concurred that conducting investigations and other business through the Compact is cumbersome and takes too long. Thirty-eight (38) probation and parole field staff commented that notifications of intended transfers, responses to requests, and other interactions are not completed in a timely manner. A serious consequence is that

offenders are allowed to travel or relocate without proper supervision for extended periods. A field supervisor in a northern state observed that, when the receiving state does not accept/reject transfers in a timely manner, “Some clients are out of supervision and control for 2 or 3 months.”

As a state district administrator noted, “Accountability for standards established by the Compact agreement is also an important issue. It seems that certain states are well known for being very slow in processing interstate transfer requests, both receiving and sending. This is a difficult issue due to structural differences (county vs. state) as well as the complexity of the issue in general.” Staff of a county agency noted that there is typically a “lag time of 60 to 120 days from [the] investigation request to formal resolution of the transfer.”

■ **Communications and technology**

1. Communication technologies are outdated. Mean score = 3.48; rated “serious” by 18 percent of Compact administrators.

Nine agency administrators said the Compact makes inadequate use of existing technology. Twelve field staff noted that improvements are needed in communicating among states, tracking offender movement, and documenting Compact activity. A county probation agent noted, “Phone calls are often misdirected, and letters are often delayed and/or misplaced.”

2. Data exchange is inconsistent. (Not rated by Survey A respondents.)

Five agency administrators and 28 probation and parole field staff stated that there is a lack of standardization of information to be shared through the Compact. The result is inadequate information for evaluating acceptance decisions, properly supervising cases, and making decisions about revocation.

3. Information on case progress is inadequate. (Not rated by Survey A respondents.)

A county probation agent noted, “‘Out of sight, out of mind’ unfortunately occurs with the referring agency. The receiving agency generally acknowledges to provide progress reports on ‘an as needed basis,’ [but] once again, phone calls, letters, and other methods of communication are on a haphazard basis.”

4. State-level communication requirement reduces efficiency. (Not rated by Survey A respondents.)

Several probation and parole field staff noted that routing all paperwork and communications through state Compact offices delays processes and reduces efficiency. One observed, “The system is ‘clumsy’ because there are too many people who have to touch the case.”

Another noted that information on cases could be more quickly and precisely shared if officers could communicate directly.

- Other issues

1. *Volume and need of emergency transfers.* (Not rated by Survey A respondents.)

Sixteen probation and parole field staff noted that overuse of “emergency” travel provisions is causing inadequate transition planning, gaps in supervision because of slow communication, arrival of offenders with unacceptable living plans, and arrival of offenders whom the receiving state would not have accepted.

2. *Crime victim concerns.* (Not rated by Survey A respondents.)

A parole manager observed, “Victim issues need to receive increased attention. For example, the issue of temporary travel to other states in which the victims reside should be addressed. Are victims notified in advance of such travel? Should such travel be allowed? Should victims have the opportunity to comment before an offender is allowed to travel out of state?”

3. *Inadequacy of provisions for high-risk offenders.* (Not rated by Survey A respondents.)

Six agency administrators noted that the Compact does not provide an effective means for transferring high-risk offenders, especially sex offenders. Thirteen probation and parole field staff stated that different procedures are needed for higher-risk and high-profile cases to avoid premature transfers and situations that put public safety at risk. Gaps are evident in acceptance criteria, notice and registration, and continuity of supervision.

A Compact administrator in an eastern state noted that “Interstate material submitted does not adequately provide information needed to assess risk factors and determine proper risk level. . . . Where applicable, a copy of the sending state’s risk level instrument for that individual should be transmitted. Relevant information is critical because of the receiving state’s statutory responsibility to ensure registration occurs within ten days of arrival.”

Respondents' Suggestions for Improving Compact Operations

Respondents' ideas for improving Compact operations fell generally into one of two categories: 1) comprehensive changes affecting Compact operations broadly, and 2) specific changes in rules.

Suggestions for Comprehensive Changes

Improve rule adherence and mechanisms for enforcement. A large number of respondents (20 Compact administrators, plus others) pointed to the need for some external body, preferably with the force of Federal law behind it, to enforce Compact compliance. Without some way to enforce the Compact, states will continue to create and follow their own rules—already viewed as a serious problem.

Suggested approaches included:

- A national audit team could be developed and funding withheld from states that violate Compact rules.
- Enforcement of the Compact could be addressed at the state level or the Federal level. Backing could be sought from governors, legislators, U.S. attorney generals, etc.
- Greater involvement of DOC commissioners in rule review and approval could improve agencies' adherence. "We need to see binding agreements made between the commissioners of each state regarding issues of unapproved transfers and return of violators."

Closely related to the need for enforcement is the need to improve and expedite the grievance process. One suggestion was to develop a grievance panel to review Compact problems informally and/or provide interpretations of Compact rules and regulations.

Establish a national automated tracking and communications system for the Compact.

Recommendations from 17 Compact administrators include:

- Technology should be used to improve accuracy, timeliness, and efficiency within the Compact. An automated system could incorporate many functions that now need to be performed manually, such as tracking and generating past due notices, following up on violation reports, etc.
- There should be a national database of Compact cases, with interstate linkages, to allow for the electronic transfer of information and the acceleration of the transfer process.
- An on-line directory should be developed to identify key Compact personnel in each state (including daily contact person); up-to-date addresses and phone/fax numbers;

reporting requirements; and any special requirements, such as supervision fees, specific probation conditions; availability of certain program and supervision services; and sex offender registration/reporting requirements.

- Attention should be given to standardizing the information collected and reported among the states. All states should be required to use standard forms and definitions.

Improve Compact awareness throughout the justice system. Respondents called for better training, clearer instructions, and more comprehensive reference materials for justice officials, including judges, prosecutors, and district attorneys:

- A brief Compact manual should be developed for justice officials.
- A judicial policy statement from one of the Federal courts or a U.S. attorney is needed to “direct judges to adhere to (be guided by) the Compact.”

Develop materials for training of field staff. Seven respondents recommended more attention to training field staff:

- A training syllabus has been in preparation for over a year and needs to be disseminated to inform field staff of Compact operations.
- A more “user-friendly” manual is needed.
- Federal grant funding could be made available to train probation officers in order to improve compliance, response, and supervision.

Improve responses to violation. Suggestions to improve response to violations and the return of violators were to:

- Establish a fund for returns; or
- Use U.S. Marshals to return violators at a lower cost.

To reduce reliance on revocation and return of offenders, respondents recommended that receiving states develop more alternative sanctions. According to respondents, alternatives are particularly needed for probationers under county jurisdiction in the sending state who have returned to their residences, etc., in the receiving state.

Improve the effectiveness of Compact meetings. Comments stated that DOC directors should be strongly encouraged to attend national Compact meetings at, for example, the annual conference of the American Correctional Association. Respondents also noted that Compact meetings should be made more productive.

Improve the currency of Compact policies. According to several survey respondents, new methods are needed for reviewing and updating Compact rules, so that the rules are kept up with changes in community corrections:

- Policies need more frequent review and updating.
- Proposed policy changes should be fully discussed before a vote is held.

Establish standard Compact staffing in all participating states. Respondents suggested that comparable staffing in all states would help to improve communications. A standard pattern could include both a Compact Administrator and a Deputy Compact Administrator.

Suggestions for Specific Rule Changes

Several respondents commented on the threats to public safety inherent in the Compact's present operations. Although not all the suggestions for addressing this problem were in agreement, there was significant sentiment that inappropriate transfers and weaknesses in current rules jeopardize public safety, as well as undermining the Compact and straining relationships among the states.

Respondents' suggestions include:

Ensure offender compliance before transfer. One suggested rule would require offenders to be in complete compliance with the conditions of their probation in the sending state-e.g., having clean UAs and being up-to-date on restitution-before they are allowed to move to the receiving state.

Provide for more control of offender movement. Several proposed rules directly addressed offender movement:

- Develop rules and procedures which restrict the movement of offenders to other states, particularly for probation cases that have received the court's permission to move.
- Investigation requests for Compact transfer should be submitted during the presentence phase of proceedings. The sending state should retain custody and control of an offender until he/she is accepted for interstate transfer.

Rework Compact requirements for investigations. Respondents noted that Section 3-101 of the Compact rules, concerning investigations prior to movement to the receiving state, should be rewritten in a way that can be approved and implemented by all member states.

Reconsider the availability and use of emergency transfers. Suggestions were that emergency transfers should be eliminated altogether, or limited in use to true emergencies.

Reconsider the availability and use of travel permits. Recommendations to reduce inappropriate use of travel permits included:

- Offenders should not be allowed to travel to another state without prior permission or investigation.
- Travel permits should be eliminated.

Tighten each agency's responsibilities in case of violations. Several respondents stated that taking of an offender in violation of probation or parole conditions should be the prerogative of the jurisdiction where the offender is physically located.

Establish a protocol for resolving states' rights within the Compact. Respondents suggested that the receiving state's rules should take precedence over the sending state's when the two are in disagreement.

APPENDIX A:

Compiled data-Survey A. Compact Administrators

Table A1. Probation and Parole Violations Among Compact Transferees in 1-Year Period

	Violations Among Cases Being Supervised in Other States			Violations Among Cases Being Supervised for Other States		
	Total violations reported	No. of cases returned	Cases pending action at year end	Total violations reported	No. of cases returned	Cases pending action at year end
Alabama	—	—	—	—	—	—
Alaska	—	—	—	—	—	—
Arizona	116	36 (parole)	7 (parole)	177	92 (parole)	5 (parole)
Arkansas	45 (parole)	7 (parole)	10 (parole)	81 (parole)	5 (parole)	35 (parole)
California	404 (parole)	337 (parole)	61 (parole)	—	—	—
Colorado	—	—	—	—	—	—
Connecticut	4 (parole)	3 (parole)	1 (parole)	—	20 (parole)	21 (parole)
Delaware	—	—	—	—	—	—
D.C.	125	86	39	262	102	52
Florida	1,063	775	235	1,325	626	560
Georgia	1,229 total reported violations for all Compact parolees; 44 Georgia parolees returned for violations.					
Hawaii	—	8 (parole)	3 (parole)	—	3 (parole)	0 (parole)
Idaho	—	—	—	—	—	—
Illinois	—	—	—	—	—	—
Indiana	79 (probation)	115	53	54 (probation)	109	63 (probation)
Iowa	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kansas	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kentucky	—	—	—	—	—	—
Louisiana	—	—	—	—	—	—
Maine	—	—	—	—	—	—
Maryland	500	145 (parole)	—	225	50	—
Massachusetts	—	—	—	63 (parole)	34 (parole)	—
Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	—
Minnesota	—	—	—	—	—	—
Mississippi	N/A; combined total of 287 violations reported.					
Missouri	—	2,149	—	—	—	—
Montana	25%	20%	5%	18–20%	10%	5%
Nebraska	—	17 (parole)	11 (parole)	—	22 (parole)	5 (parole)
Nevada	220	175	—	155	130	—
New Hampshire	—	117	—	—	46	—
New Jersey	59 (probation)	30 (probation)	—	55 (probation)	12 (probation)	—
New Mexico	—	79	—	—	117	—
New York ¹	700 (parole)	—	—	120 (parole)	136 (parole)	—
North Carolina	—	—	—	—	—	—
North Dakota	80	—	—	43	—	—
Ohio	—	66	—	—	—	—
Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—
Oregon	—	—	—	—	—	—
Pennsylvania	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rhode Island	39	1	13	4	—	—
South Carolina	—	27	—	—	—	—
South Dakota	7 (probation)	3 (probation)	0 (probation)	11 (probation)	1 (probation)	0 (probation)
Tennessee	—	38 (parole) ²	—	—	39 (parole)	—
Texas	—	—	—	—	—	—
Utah	—	—	—	—	—	—
Vermont	(No survey response)					
Virginia	N/A; parole violations estimated at 28%, probation at 33%.					
Washington	—	—	—	—	—	—
West Virginia	26	18	8	40	26	14
Wisconsin	—	—	—	—	—	—
Wyoming	—	—	—	—	—	—

¹ New York: 700 includes multiple violation reports on some individuals; 120 is new arrests, not including absconders and technical violators. Data are for a 6-month period.

² Tennessee parole violation data are for a 6-month period.

SURVEY A: STATE COMPACT ADMINISTRATORS
Evaluative findings

Part 1. Operations within the state

	1	2	3	4	5
Compact office has inadequate resources	11	9	17	12	8

Mean=2.56

	1	2	3	4	5
Local offices are not responsive	19	22	12	2	2

Mean=2.05

	1	2	3	4	5
Judges do not follow Compact regulations	11	12	15	11	5

Mean=2.76

	Not a problem		Moderate problem		Serious problem
	1	2	3	4	5
Parole board does not follow Compact regulations	30	8	7	0	1

Mean=1.57

	Not a problem		Moderate problem		Serious problem
	1	2	3	4	5
Compact is not a priority with policy makers or administrators	16	12	15	9	5

Mean=2.56

	1	2	3	4	5
Field staff receive inadequate training on Compact operations	8	13	21	12	3

Mean=2.81

		2	3	4	5
Information systems technology are inadequate	5	14	16	10	12

Mean=3.18

Other:

Level 5 --

- Enforcement
- Need additional supervisory aid
- “Return” enforcement for probation
- Keeping of statistics
- Education and train judicial, prosecutors, defense

Level 4--

- Local offices have inadequate equipment
- Lack of tracking ability for Compact cases
- Compact staff receive inadequate equipment

Level 3--

- Training not done frequently

Level 2--

- Accepting pre-signed waivers

Part 2. Operations involving other states

	Not a problem		Moderate problem		Serious problem
	1	2	3	4	5
Compact policies are unclear	12	15	17	10	1

Mean=2.51

	1	2	3	4	5
Compact policies are outdated	9	20	13	6	7

Mean=2.60

	Not a problem		Moderate problem		Serious problem
	1	2	3	4	5
Compact's conflict resolution process is ineffective	5	9	18	10	12

Mean=3.28

	Not a problem		Moderate problem		Serious problem
	1	2	3	4	5
Transfer processes are slow and cumbersome	0	8	21	17	10

Mean=3.52

	Not a problem		Moderate problem		Serious problem
	1	2	3	4	5
Some states are too restrictive in accepting cases	6	9	12	15	14

Mean=3.40

	Not a problem		Moderate problem		Serious problem
	1	2	3	4	5
Agencies send offenders to our state without approval	1	0	19	16	19

Mean=3.85

	Not a problem		Moderate problem		Serious problem
	1	2	3	4	5
Agencies expect services beyond those our state provides for its own	11	26	13	3	3

Mean=2.30

	Not a problem		Moderate problem		Serious problem
	1	2	3	4	5
Agencies are generally slow to respond	0	12	18	17	9

Mean=3.43

	Not a problem		Moderate problem		Serious problem
	1	2	3	4	5
States fail to retake their violators	4	9	15	16	11

Mean=3.38

	Not a problem		Moderate problem		Serious problem
	1	2	3	4	5
States do not enforce Compact rules	1	14	14	16	10

Mean=3.36

	Not a problem		Moderate problem		Serious problem

	1	2	3	4	5
Communication technologies are outdated	2	8	16	18	10

Mean=3.48

Other

Level 5--

- Lack of Compact resources
- Political/media pressure
- Not priority for policymakers
- Border closing attempts
- Judges do not follow rules
- Enforcement
- Volume and need of emergency transfers

Level 4--

- Inconsistency in Compact
- Other states not familiar with rules
- Policy interpretations/national
- Completion of transfer application material
- Adequacy/information on sex offender registration

Level 3--

- Inadequate information

Level 2--

- Routing information
- Policy interpretations-regional
- Other/States impose own interpretations
- Compact does not address new programs

APPENDIX B:

Compiled data-Survey B. NIC Network Participants

Survey B

The second group surveyed regarding Interstate Compact services consisted of members of NIC Community Corrections Division’s networks. These networks consist of selected parole board chairs and community-based corrections administrators. While not intended to be a representative sampling, responses to Survey B were received from officials in 31 states, plus the District of Columbia. Two responses were received from seven jurisdictions and single respondents represented the remaining 25 states. Following is a listing of the states represented by responses to Survey B.

- Alabama
- Arizona
- California
- Connecticut
- Delaware
- Hawaii
- Illinois
- Indiana
- Kansas
- Kentucky
- Maryland
- Massachusetts
- Minnesota
- Mississippi
- Nebraska
- New Hampshire
- New Jersey
- New York
- North Carolina
- North Dakota
- Ohio
- Oregon
- South Dakota
- Tennessee
- Texas
- Vermont
- Virginia
- West Virginia
- Wisconsin
- Wyoming
- District of Columbia
- Unmarked

Survey B included three questions and an open-ended request for comments. Question #1 was the same scale that was included in the surveys of Compact Administrators and probation/parole field staff. Respondents were asked to rate how well the Compact was working on a scale of 1 (very poorly) to 9 (very well). Following is a summary of the 38 responses to the question.

Overall, how well do you think the Compact is working?

<i>Very Poorly</i>				<i>Adequately</i>				<i>Very Well</i>
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1 (3%)	2 (5%)	1 (3%)	6 (16%)	12 (32%)	6 (16%)	9 (24%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)

The network members’ average rating of the overall working of the Compact was 5.3, near the mid-point rating of “adequate.”

The second question of the network members was to rank the importance of the Compact in relation to other issues that administrators will be dealing with during the next year. A similar 9-point scale (1 = not important, to 9 = very important) was used for this rating. Following are the results from 38 responses.

Of the issues you will be dealing with next year, where does the Compact rank?

<i>Not Important</i>				<i>Moderately Important</i>				<i>Very Important</i>
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
0 (0%)	2 (5%)	8 (21%)	3 (8%)	5 (13%)	4 (11%)	6 (16%)	5 (13%)	4 (11%)

The administrators average rating of the importance of the Compact was 5.6 on the 9-point scale.

The third question asked respondents to identify the most pressing issues or problems facing the Compact, and to offer any recommendations to deal with those issues. Following is a summary of the responses, including the number of times an issue was addressed by the 38 respondents.

1. The level of compliance with provisions and guidelines of the Interstate Compact is not consistent among states.
(17 respondents)
2. Conducting investigations and other business through the Compact is cumbersome and takes too long.
(14 respondents)
3. The Interstate Compact should be making better use of existing technology, including simply the use FAX machines and direct agency-to-agency phones calls or more sophisticated national databases and computer networks.
(9 respondents)
4. Some jurisdictions are not responsive to violation reports and are slow to return violators to sending states.
(8 respondents)
5. There is no accountability within the Compact. Even though states agree to the pact, there is no real system to document compliance levels or impose consequences for non-compliance.
(7 respondents)
6. The Compact does not provide an effective means for transferring high-risk offenders, especially sex offenders.
(6 respondents)

7. There is a lack of standardization in the Compact that results in incomplete and inconsistent sharing of vital information that should be made available to both sending and receiving states.
(5 respondents)
8. The Interstate Compact does not always receive the respect or status needed to insure that justice officials or corrections managers comply with Compact and provide needed support.
(5 respondents)
9. Some state Compact offices, as well as the national Compact network, do not have the resources (staffing and equipment) to efficiently or effectively conduct their work.
(5 respondents)
10. The practice of authorizing or allowing offenders to relocate to another jurisdiction prior to review and approval of the transfer presents problems for receiving jurisdictions.
(4 respondents)
11. Some states are imposing formal (laws or policies) or informal barriers to transfers that violate the guidelines and spirit of the Interstate Compact.
(3 respondents)
12. Each of the following issues were identified by two respondents:
 - Current information regarding local agencies and unique state requirements needs to be maintained and distributed to local officials.
 - Better training regarding Compact guidelines and procedures needs to be provided to local agencies and officials.
 - A better process is needed to resolve conflicts and grievances between states.
 - Some type of federal intervention would be appropriate to resolve policy issues and provided needed resources.
13. Each of the following issues were identified by one respondent.
 - Supervision of non-adjudicated cases presents a problem through the Compact.
 - Compact procedures do not adequately address victim notification requirements.
 - There is inadequate supervision of transferred cases within some states.
 - The Compact forces states to accept supervision of some misdemeanor cases that are not supervised within the receiving state itself.
 - There are problems resulting from dual jurisdiction of cases.
 - There is generally poor communication with the Compact network.
 - Some states provide for early release of inmates whose status (neither probation or parole) is questionable through the Compact.
 - There should be some type of audit or inspection of Compact operations.
 - The Compact procedures regarding emergency reporting instructions is unclear.

APPENDIX C:

**Compiled data: Survey C. Probation and Parole Field
Administrators**

Survey C

The third survey instrument of the Interstate Compact project solicited opinions from probation and parole field staff. Members of NIC’s Community Corrections Division’s networks were asked to distribute the survey to field staff within their agencies who were involved with, or familiar with, Compact operations. While this selection process provided a broad and diverse group of respondents, it was not intended to provide a systematic or representative sample.

Ninety-five field staff from thirty-two states and the District of Columbia submitted responses to Survey C. The group generally consisted of field officers and supervisors. Following is a list of the number of respondents from the thirty-three jurisdictions.

1 Alabama	4 Nebraska
4 Arizona	3 Nevada
3 California	2 New Hampshire
2 Florida	10 New Jersey
1 Hawaii	3 New York
3 Illinois	3 North Carolina
1 Indiana	3 North Dakota
3 Kansas	3 Ohio
1 Kentucky	2 Oregon
2 Louisiana	3 South Dakota
3 Maryland	7 Tennessee
3 Massachusetts	4 Utah
3 Michigan	3 Virginia
1 Minnesota	3 Washington
2 Mississippi	2 Wisconsin
3 Missouri	1 Wyoming
3 District of Columbia	

Survey C consisted of two questions. The first was the same rating of Compact functions that appeared in the survey instruments of Compact Administrators and NIC network members. The respondents were asked to rate how well the Compact was working on a scale of 1 (very poorly) to 9 (very well). Following is a summary of the 95 responses to the question.

Overall, how well do you think the Compact is working?

<i>Very Poorly</i>	2	3	4	<i>Adequately</i>	6	7	8	<i>Very Well</i>
1				5				9
3 (3%)	3 (3%)	16 (17%)	13 (14%)	20 (21%)	13 (14%)	20 (21%)	5 (5%)	2 (2%)

The mean rating on the 9-point scale from the field staff respondents was 5.13 in the “adequate” range, slightly lower than the ratings of the other two survey groups.

The second question on Survey C was open-ended: *“What are the most pressing problems or issues facing the Compact and what could you recommend to address them?”*

For purposes of analyzing responses, similar themes or central ideas were identified and prioritized based on the frequency of appearances. Following is a listing of the most common issues identified by field staff responding to Survey C.

1. The process of conducting business through the Compact takes too long. Notifications of intended transfers, responses to requests, and general interactions are not completed in a timely manner. One of the most serious consequences of these delays is that offenders are allowed to travel or relocate without proper supervision for extended periods.
(38 respondents)
2. Some states do not comply with the rules of the Compact. Informal policies and practices related to such functions as accepting transfers are often contrary to the rules or guidelines of the Compact. Some states may also pass laws or establish formal policies that result in inconsistencies from state to state, or more restrictive acceptance criteria by some states.
(33 respondents)
3. The types of case records and information shared among states is not consistent, resulting in inadequate information to evaluate acceptance decisions, properly supervise cases, or to make decisions such as revocations. There should be standardized formats to insure that sufficient information is provided to sending and receiving states, along with well-defined protocols and time frames for completing Compact activities.
(28 respondents)
4. Some jurisdictions do not respond in a timely or appropriate manner when violations are reported and revocations are recommended. This problem results in lengthy detention of violators waiting return, offenders in “limbo” in the receiving community while awaiting action from the sending states, and compromises to the integrity of supervision if no action is taken in response to serious violations. One response cited a case in which the sending jurisdiction had not responded in over one year regarding a violation report sent by the receiving agency.
(24 respondents)
5. Communications and processing of paperwork require local jurisdictions to first communicate with their instate Compact office, who then communicates with another Compact office before the local office of the second state is contacted. Involvement of these third and fourth parties (Compact offices) delays the process and reduces the efficiencies of direct contacts between local offices.
(17 respondents)

6. The Compact policy of allowing offenders to relocate or return to a state prior to the receiving state's review and approval of the transfer needs review. The practice presents several problems, including gaps in supervision due to slow communication; arrival of offenders to locations with unacceptable plans; arrival of offenders whom the receiving states would not accept; and inadequate transition planning.
(16 respondents)
7. While the Compact may function adequately for less serious offenders, different procedures are needed for higher-risk and high profile offenders. Issues such as reviewing acceptance criteria, ensuring notice or registration when required, maintaining continuity of supervision, and other special provisions for serious offenders require a more streamlined and efficient track to avoid premature transfers or situations that risk public safety.
(13 respondents)
8. The Compact needs to make better use of technology in its communications among states, in tracking offender movement, and in documenting Compact activity. Suggested technology applications include using FAX communications between local agencies, use of the Internet with restricted access codes, use of national databases such as NCIC, and use of common software for state administrators.
(12 respondents)
9. Training programs need to be developed for field staff, judges, parole boards and other local officials whose decisions or actions are governed by the Compact. Some of the problems of the Compact are due to lack of understanding by such officials of the guidelines and scope of the Compact.
(8 respondents)
10. Even though the Compact has included transfers of misdemeanants within its scope of authority, there are still unresolved issues related to misdemeanor cases such as the definition of such offenses, willingness to return violators, and the high volume of misdemeanor transfers in some jurisdictions.
(5 respondents)
11. There should be sanctions or consequences for states that do not comply with the provisions of the Compact.
(4 respondents)
12. Some of the provisions or guidelines of the Compact (such as who is eligible for transfer) should be defined with more clarity.
(4 respondents)
13. Transfers through the Compact do not always result in attention to victims' issues such as notification of transfer, release from supervision, or restitution payments.
(3 respondents)

14. Transfer of cases sometimes results in inconsistent levels of supervision. Out-of-state cases may not receive the same levels of service that in-state cases receive.
(3 respondents)
15. Policies related to issuing travel permits were of concern to some field staff, even though their concerns were contradictory. One respondent believed that permits should be issued on a more limited basis, while another believed that some states were too restrictive in approving travel permits.
(3 respondents)
16. The following issues were identified by two respondents.
- The Compact should revise or clarify transfer acceptance criteria.
 - A process or authority should be established to resolve grievances or conflicts between states.
 - Some states are too eager to revoke cases for minor violations, rather than continue supervision with modified conditions.
 - States should consider or allow early discharge of offenders who have demonstrated a period of stable adjustment to supervision.
 - Newsletters or bulletins should be produced to keep the field informed of changes or developments within the Compact.
17. The following issues were identified by single respondents.
- States should be allowed to consider offender risk as a factor in approving or rejecting transfer requests.
 - There should be more regional or state-to-state meetings of jurisdictions involved in frequent Compact activity.
 - There are still problems (undefined) with supervision fees.
 - Technical assistance or direction should be provided by the federal government.
 - Audits of Compact operations should be conducted to determine compliance levels with Compact policies.

APPENDIX D:

State legislation



State of Minnesota
Minnesota Department of Corrections

July 16, 1997

To: All Compact Administrators/Deputy Compact Administrators

Re: Interstate Compact Legislation - Minnesota

Below is Minnesota legislation that becomes law effective August 1, 1997:

Sec. 19. [243.161] [RESIDING IN MINNESOTA WITHOUT PERMISSION UNDER INTERSTATE COMPACT; PENALTY.]

Any person who is on parole or probation in another state who resides in this state in violation of section 243.16, may be sentenced to imprisonment for not more than five years or to payment of a fine of not more than \$10,000, or both.

This law refers to section 243.16, which is Minnesota's statute regarding the Interstate Compact for the supervision of parolees and probationers. This new law is attaching a penalty to Compact rule 3-101, which is already in existence.

This rule would not apply to any offender who meets the criteria for emergency reporting instructions and is given those instructions by Minnesota. The position Minnesota is taking is that if an offender is charged under this statute, we will not do an investigation as he is already presumed to be in violation of his/her probation or parole due to this felony charge. Please notify all of the agents in your state of this new law.

Please contact my office if you have any questions. I thank you in advance for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Rose Ann Bisch".

Rose Ann Bisch
Acting Deputy Compact Administrator
Minnesota Department of Corrections

The Executive Office and the General Assembly in a joint effort have developed some placement criteria for Interstate Compact Parole and Probation. These requirements were made after a series of hearings with testimony by various state officials and victims groups. These executive orders and legislative enactments were within the framework of the compact and only deal with areas where the compact is silent. It is an attempt not to hinder or impede movement of individuals under the compact but rather to offer some definition and structure to the process. These criteria are common sense safeguards to prevent abuse of the system and to protect the citizens of Tennessee. The state of Tennessee supports the use of the compact and would hope in the future to see it expanded to monitor all interstate movement of convicted felons supervised by any official agency.

The following summary of legislation applies to all persons requesting supervision in Tennessee under the compact:

Public Chapter 288

Definitions that are not mandated by the compact:

- **Family:** Defined as parent, grandparent, sibling, adult child, or lawful spouse.
- **Requirements for family member:** The family must be in permanent residence in Tennessee for at least three (3) continuous years. This will provide for stability in the residence and ensures a system of support in the state.
- **Changing residence:** The parolee must live at the approved residence for one (1) year. A number of parolees are using a family member to transfer into the state and immediately moving which defeats the reason for a home investigation.
- **Parolees in state prior to acceptance:** Tennessee will no longer approve an application if the person is already in the state. This does not mean we will not re-investigate after the individual returns to the sending state.

Public Chapter 289

Certain sex offenders must submit a biological specimen for DNA analysis. The specimen shall be gathered by the approved testing agency and submitted to the Tennessee Bureau of Investigation as used in the statute. DNA analysis means deoxyribonucleic acid in a human biological specimen for identification.

Public Chapter 457

Applicants who have been convicted of any homicide, aggravated assault, or any offense involving domestic violence shall be required to enroll at the offender's expense, in a mental health program, to address violent behavior within thirty (30)

TENNESSEE

days of arrival in Tennessee. However, if such treatment has already occurred in the sending state and can be documented, the parolee can be accepted if they meet the other requirements for acceptance.

TDOC will determine the standards for any mental health treatment.

Public Chapter 458

- **SEX OFFENDERS:** Sex offenders are defined in 40-39-1023 of the Tennessee Code Annotated.
- Applicants from sending state who have been convicted of a sexual offense shall, at the offender's expense be required to enroll in a sex offender treatment program within thirty (30) days.
- The offender will be considered for acceptance if they have already attended documented sex offender treatment and meets all other criteria for acceptance.
- Offenders whose sex offense was reduced by virtue of a plea agreement shall be treated as a sex offender for treatment and supervision.
- Sex offenders will at their expense provide a DNA sample to the Tennessee Bureau of Investigation.
- Sex offenders will be subject to electronic monitoring.
- Offenders with sexual offense in their history will be treated as sex offenders for the purpose of treatment and supervision.
- Any sex offender present in Tennessee prior to investigation approval will be automatically denied, but the offender may re-submit a request.

The effective date is July 1, 1997.



State of Tennessee

RE 457

HOUSE BILL NO. 760

By Representatives Jackson, Hargett, Haley, Pleasant, Ford, Patton, McDaniel, Roach, Kent, McMinn, Williams

Substituted for: Senate Bill No. 1365

By Senator Rochele

AN ACT to amend Tennessee Code Annotated, Title 40, Chapter 28, relative to the compact for out-of-state probation and parole supervision.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF TENNESSEE:

SECTION 1. Tennessee Code Annotated, Title 40, Chapter 28, Part 4 is amended by adding the following as a new section:

(a). Applicants from a sending state who have been convicted of any type of homicide, aggravated assault, or any offense involving domestic violence shall be required to enroll, at the offender's expense, in a mental health program to address violent behavior within thirty (30) days of arrival in Tennessee. If no appropriate treatment program is available in the county or adjacent counties in which the applicant plans to reside, the application shall be denied. However, the offender will be considered if such offender:

(1) completes such a program in the sending state prior to acceptance into the State of Tennessee;

(2) can provide documentation of such treatment; and

(3) meets all other criteria for acceptance.

Offenders whose violent offense was reduced by virtue of a plea agreement shall be treated as a violent offender for treatment and supervision purposes.

(b) The Department of Correction shall by rule promulgated in accordance with the provisions of Tennessee Code Annotated, Title 4, Chapter 5, establish minimum standards that a mental health treatment program addressing violent behavior must meet in order to satisfy the requirements of this section. Upon establishing such standards, the department shall compile and make available a list, by county, of all providers offering treatment programs that meet such minimum standards.

SECTION 2. This act shall take effect upon becoming a law, the public welfare requiring it.



PC 438

State of Tennessee

HOUSE BILL NO. 761

By Representatives Jackson, Hargett, Haley, Pleasant, Ford, Patton, Roach, Kerr, McMullen, Williams

Substituted for: Senate Bill No. 1366

By Senator Rochelle

AN ACT to amend Tennessee Code Annotated, Title 40, Chapter 35 and Title 40, Chapter 28, relative to probation and parole.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF TENNESSEE:

SECTION 1. Tennessee Code Annotated, Title 40, Chapter 28, Part 4, is amended by adding the following as a new section:

Section ___

(a) As used in this section "sexual offense" has the same meaning as defined in Tennessee Code Annotated, Section 40-39-102(3).

(b) Applicants from a sending state who have been convicted of a sexual offense shall be required to enroll, at the offender's expense, in a sex offender treatment program within thirty (30) days of arrival in Tennessee. If no appropriate treatment program is available in the county or adjacent counties in which the applicant plans to reside, the application will be denied. However, the offender will be considered if such offender:

(1) completes such a program in the sending state prior to acceptance into the State of Tennessee;

(2) can provide documentation of such treatment; and

(3) meets all other criteria for acceptance.

Sex offenders who have completed a treatment program will be required to participate in an aftercare program while under supervision.

(c) Offenders whose sexual offense was reduced by virtue of a plea agreement shall be treated as a sex offender for treatment and supervision purposes.

(d) Sexual offenders shall be required to provide, at the offender's expense, a DNA sample to the Tennessee Bureau of Investigation.

(e) Sexual offenders shall be subject to electronic monitoring.

(f) Offenders with sexual offenses in their criminal history shall be treated as sexual offenders for treatment, tracking, and supervision purposes.

(g) Any sexual offender present in the receiving state prior to approval will be automatically denied.

SECTION 2. This act shall take effect upon becoming a law, the public welfare requiring it.

State of Tennessee

PUBLIC CHAPTER NO. 288

SENATE BILL NO. 1388

By Rochelle

Substituted for: House Bill No. 758

By Jackson, Kent, Ralph Cole, Hargett, Ford, Patton, McDaniel, Roach, McMillan, Williams

AN ACT To amend Tennessee Code Annotated, Title 40, Chapter 28, relative to the compact for out-of-state parole and probation supervision.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF TENNESSEE:

SECTION 1. Tennessee Code Annotated, Title 40, Chapter 28, Part 4, is amended by adding the following new section:

Section ____ For purposes of the State of Tennessee as the receiving state interpreting the provisions of Tennessee Code Annotated, Section 40-28-401:

(a) "Family" means the parent, grandparent, sibling, adult child or lawful spouse of the probationer or parolee applying for transfer of supervision to the State of Tennessee.

(b) The family member with whom the probationer or parolee intends to reside must have been a permanent Tennessee resident for at least three (3) continuous years prior to the date of such probationer's or parolee's application for transfer of supervision to the State of Tennessee.

(c) A probationer or parolee applying for transfer of supervision to the State of Tennessee must reside with the named family member for a minimum of one (1) year unless a change of residence is approved by the supervising probation or parole officer.

(d) The application of a probationer or parolee applying for transfer of supervision to the State of Tennessee shall not be considered for approval if such probationer or parolee is residing in this state prior to this state's approval of such application.

SECTION 2. This act shall take effect upon becoming a law, the public welfare requiring it.

State of Tennessee

PUBLIC CHAPTER NO. 289

SENATE BILL NO. 1369

By Rochelle

Substituted for: House Bill No. 757

By Jackson, Kent, Ralph Cole, Hargett, Haley, Plessart, Beavers, Brooks, Ford, Patton,
McDaniel, Roach, McKillen, Williams

AN ACT To amend Tennessee Code Annotated, Title 40, Chapter 28, relative to sexual offenders and the compact for out-of-state parole and probation supervision.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF TENNESSEE:

SECTION 1. Tennessee Code Annotated, Title 40, Chapter 28, Part 4, is amended by adding the following new section:

Section _____

(a) No application for the transfer of parole or probation supervision to this state of any probationer or parolee who was convicted of an offense that would constitute a violation of Tennessee Code Annotated, Sections 39-13-502, 39-13-503, 39-13-504, 39-13-505, 39-13-522, or 39-15-302 if committed in this state shall be approved unless the probationer or parolee provides or agrees to provide a biological specimen for the purpose of DNA analysis as defined in subsection (c).

(b) The biological specimen shall be gathered in a manner and by an agency or entity acceptable to the parole board or probation department of this state and the applying probationer or parolee shall be responsible for the cost of gathering such specimen. The biological specimen shall be forwarded by the approved agency or entity collecting such specimen to the Tennessee Bureau of Investigation which shall maintain it as provided in § 38-6-113.

(c) As used in this section "DNA analysis" means the process through which deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) in a human biological specimen is analyzed and compared with DNA from another biological specimen for identification purposes.

SECTION 2. This act shall take effect upon becoming a law, the public welfare requiring it.



STATE OF TENNESSEE
EXECUTIVE ORDER
BY THE GOVERNOR

No. 12

AN ORDER ESTABLISHING GUIDELINES FOR THE INTERSTATE COMPACT

WHEREAS, the Interstate Compact regulates the transfer and supervision of parolees and probationers across state lines;

WHEREAS, the Interstate Compact provides community protection by monitoring the interstate travel of parolees and probationers;

WHEREAS, the Interstate Compact promotes rehabilitation by ensuring supervision of parolees and probationers;

WHEREAS, Tennessee has been a member of the Interstate Compact since 1939 pursuant to Tennessee Code Annotated Section 40-28-401 et seq.;

WHEREAS, the Governor has both the responsibility and the authority under Tennessee law to administer the Interstate Compact;

WHEREAS, it has been determined that certain terms should be defined to strengthen the requirements for transfer under the Interstate Compact;

WHEREAS, it has been determined that certain procedures should be adopted to provide for the prompt arrest of parolees in violation of the terms and conditions of their supervision under the Interstate Compact;

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Don Sundquist, Governor of the State of Tennessee, by virtue of the power and authority vested in me by the Tennessee Constitution and by the laws of the State of Tennessee do hereby direct the following:

1. That any "family" member who provides the basis for satisfying the residency requirement for a transfer pursuant to the Interstate Compact shall be a parent, grandparent, sibling, adult child or lawful spouse.
2. That any family member who provides the basis for satisfying the residency requirement for a transfer pursuant to the Interstate Compact shall have resided permanently in Tennessee for three (3) continuous years prior to the parolee or probationer submitting a request for supervision in Tennessee unless otherwise waived by the Compact Administrator.
3. That the Director of Paroles shall be authorized to issue a warrant to retake a parolee paroled by another state who is residing in Tennessee pursuant to the Interstate Compact if there is reasonable cause to believe that such parolee has violated the terms and conditions of supervision as imposed by Tennessee under the authority of the Interstate Compact.

4. That this Order supersedes all previous executive orders to the extent that those orders are inconsistent.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have subscribed my signature and caused the Great Seal of the State of Tennessee to be affixed this the 13th day of February, 1997.

Don Siegrist
GOVERNOR

ATTEST:

Riley C. Darnell
SECRETARY OF STATE



APPENDIX E:

Survey instruments

Survey A

-State Compact Administrators' Survey-

NIC Survey on Interstate Compact for Probation and Parole

U.S. Department of Justice
 National Institute of Corrections
Community Corrections Division and Information Center
 August 1997

Agency Identification

Survey respondent name & title _____
 Agency _____
 City & state _____
 Phone: _____

Please respond by Wednesday, August 27, 1997

Fax or mail to:
Connie Clem, Project Coordinator
NIC Information Center
1860 Industrial Circle, Longmont, CO 80501
Fax (303) 682-0558
Call (800) 877-1461 with any questions on the survey

1. On June 30, 1997, how many offenders from your state were being supervised through the Compact in other states?
 Probationers _____ Parolees _____
2. On June 30, 1997, how many offenders from other states were being supervised through the Compact in your state?
 Probationers _____ Parolees _____
3. How many transfer requests did your office process in the year ending June 30, 1997? (If data are available for a different 12-month period, please indicate the period reported: _____)

a. Requests to transfer cases to other states-

Total requests submitted	cases
Number of cases approved for supervision	cases
Number of cases denied transfer	cases
Number of cases pending at year end	cases

b. Requests to accept cases from other states-

Number of cases approved for supervision	cases
Number of cases denied transfer	cases
Number of cases pending at year end	cases

4. Please provide the following data on Compact cases supervised in your state that were reported to their sending states for violations:

Total cases reported to other states for violation	cases
Number of cases returned to sending states	cases
Number of cases pending at year end	cases

5. Please provide the following data on Compact cases originating in your state that were reported by receiving states for violations:

Total cases reported by receiving states for violation	cases
Number of cases returned to your state	cases
Number of cases pending at year end	cases

6. Are the numbers reported in Questions 3 through 5 actual data from a tracking system, or estimates?

Actual data _____ Estimates _____

7. Does your state initiate or accept transfers of any offender populations other than those formally addressed in the Compact?

Yes _____ No _____

If yes, please indicate types of offender cases processed through the Compact for transfer:

_____ Deferred prosecution

_____ Diversion

_____ Other (identify: _____)

7. Please provide the title and agency (not the name) of the official who appointed you to your position.

If you are directly supervised by a different position, provide the title and agency of this person.

8. Overall, how well do you think the Compact is working? (Circle one.)

Very poorly	Adequately						Very well	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

9. Please rate each of the following factors in terms of its importance as a problem affecting Compact policy and practice. Identify and rate additional problems/factors, if desired.

a. Operations within this state-

	Not a problem		Moderate problem		Serious problem
Compact office has inadequate resources	1	2	3	4	5
Local offices are not responsive	1	2	3	4	5
Judges do not follow Compact regulations	1	2	3	4	5
Parole board does not follow Compact regulations	1	2	3	4	5
Compact is not a priority with policy makers or administrators	1	2	3	4	5
Field staff receive inadequate training on Compact operations	1	2	3	4	5
Information systems/technology are inadequate	1	2	3	4	5
Other (identify):	1	2	3	4	5
Other (identify):	1	2	3	4	5
Other (identify):	1	2	3	4	5

b. Operations involving other states-

	Not a problem		Moderate problem		Serious problem
Compact policies are unclear	1	2	3	4	5
Compact policies are outdated	1	2	3	4	5
Compact's conflict resolution process is ineffective	1	2	3	4	5
Transfer processes are slow and cumbersome	1	2	3	4	5
Some states are too restrictive in accepting cases	1	2	3	4	5
Agencies send offenders to our state without approval	1	2	3	4	5
Agencies expect services beyond those our state provides for its own offenders	1	2	3	4	5
Agencies are generally slow to respond	1	2	3	4	5
States fail to retake their violators	1	2	3	4	5
States do not enforce Compact rules	1	2	3	4	5
Communication technologies are outdated	1	2	3	4	5
Other (identify):	1	2	3	4	5
Other (identify):	1	2	3	4	5
Other (identify):	1	2	3	4	5

10. What recommendations could you offer to address any problems identified in Question 9, or to generally improve the operations of the Compact?

11. Please provide any additional comments:

Thank you very much for your participation.

Survey B

-NIC Network Participants' Survey-

NIC Survey on Interstate Compact for Probation and Parole

U.S. Department of Justice
 National Institute of Corrections
Community Corrections Division and Information Center
 August 1997

Agency Identification

Survey respondent name & title _____
 Agency _____
 City & state _____
 Phone: _____

Please respond by Wednesday, August 27, 1997

Fax or mail to:
Connie Clem, Project Coordinator
NIC Information Center
1860 Industrial Circle, Longmont, CO 80501
Fax (303) 682-0558
Call (800) 877-1461 with any questions on the survey

1. Overall, how well do you think the Compact is working? (Circle one.)

Very poorly	Adequately	Very well
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		

2. Of the issues you will be dealing with next year, where does the Compact rank? (Circle one.)

Not important	Moderately important	Very important
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		

3. What are the most pressing problems or issues facing the Compact, and what could you recommend to address them?

4. Please provide any additional comments:

Survey C

-Probation and Parole Field Contacts-

NIC Survey on Interstate Compact for Probation and Parole

U.S. Department of Justice
 National Institute of Corrections
Community Corrections Division and Information Center
 August 1997

Agency Identification

Survey respondent name & title _____
 Agency _____
 City & state _____
 Phone: _____

Please respond by Wednesday, August 27, 1997

Fax or mail to:
Connie Clem, Project Coordinator
NIC Information Center
1860 Industrial Circle, Longmont, CO 80501
Fax (303) 682-0558
Call (800) 877-1461 with any questions on the survey

1. Overall, how well do you think the Compact is working? (Circle one.)

Very poorly	Adequately						Very well	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

2. What are the most pressing problems or issues facing the Compact, and what could you recommend to address them?

Thank you very much for your participation.

