



COURT SOCIAL SERVICES IN GRAND RAPIDS AND KENT COUNTY

by

S. Jerome Roach

A PROJECT REPORT

Submitted to the School of Social Work, Michigan State
University of Agriculture and Applied Science
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK

November

1956

Approved

Bernard Ross

Chairman, Research Committee

James H. Ottaviano

Head of School

Director

64721
12-28-67

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many individuals in the field of corrections have given valuable advice and information in the conduct of this study. I am indebted especially to the judges in Kent County for their excellent assistance in preparing schedules and for their encouragement of court staff participation and cooperation. Special appreciation is extended to the Honorable Raymond W. Starr, Judge of the Federal District Court, and the Honorable Thaddeus B. Taylor, Judge of the Grand Rapids Superior Court, whose personal interest and support was invaluable.

I wish also to express my gratitude to Hugh P. Ree,¹ ✓
Midwestern Director of the National Probation and Parole Association, and Dr. Lawrence K. Northwood, Director of the Grand Rapids and Kent County Agency Self-Evaluation Project, for their help in solving methodological problems of data collection and interpretation.

Professor Bernard Ross of Michigan State University has been of great assistance in directing the course of the study and in advising the writer in the presentation of materials. To Mr. Manfred Lilliefors and to Professor Frances Hetznecker for their thoughtful criticism and encouragement I am most grateful.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.	11
LIST OF TABLES	v
 CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of the Study.	1
Procedures of the Study.	2
Criteria for NPPA Standards	2
Criteria for Educational Preparation	4
Background of the Study.	5
Methodology.	13
II. FEDERAL SOCIAL SERVICES	16
Supervision Objectives	17
Geographical Boundaries.	17
Conclusions.	20
III. KENT COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT.	21
Constitutional Provisions	21
Jurisdiction	21
IV. GRAND RAPIDS SUPERIOR COURT	23
Statutory Provisions.	23
Jurisdiction of Court	23
Use of Probation in Superior Court.	23
Probation Services	25
Qualifications and Duties of Court Workers	26
Needs.	28
V. SERVICES TO JUVENILES	31
Juvenile Court.	31
Probate Code	31
Personnel	32
Volume of Work.	33
Salary Schedule	34
Additional Professional Workers.	35
Statistical Data	36
Parole Service.	37
Interpretation of the New Foster Care Law	38
County Welfare Department	39

CHAPTER	Page
VI. MUNICIPAL COURT OF GRAND RAPIDS.	41
Structure and Function	41
VII. GRAND RAPIDS POLICE COURT.	43
Statutory Provisions.	43
Jurisdiction	43
Structure	44
Possible Change	45
VIII. PROBATION AND PAROLE (STATE OF MICHIGAN)	49
IX. CASE RECORDING	53
X. FINDINGS	55
Caseloads	55
Educational Preparation.	56
Supervision.	56
Additional Findings	57
Records	57
Statistics	57
Psychiatric Service	58
Family-Centered-Problems	58
XI. RECOMMENDATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS	59
Concluding Statement.	62
APPENDICES	67
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	83

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I.	People With Problems Requiring Court Social Service.	65
II.	Adult and Juvenile Offenders from Arrest to Disposition	66

.....

.....

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of Study

This study is concerned with the social services which are available to clients within the jurisdiction of the courts in Kent County and Grand Rapids, Michigan. Specifically, it undertakes to determine the actual caseloads of court workers, and the educational qualifications these court workers bring to their positions. A comparison is then made from the findings with recommended "ideal standards" established by the National Probation and Parole Association.¹ Although no attempt to evaluate specific services has been made, of necessity, the adequacy and inadequacy of some of the services were reviewed in terms of ideal-type standards.

This study was conceived as a part of the larger Agency Self-Evaluation Project sponsored by the Grand Rapids and Kent County Council of Social Agencies which had as one of its goals the determination of community needs and resources to meet those needs. The material comprising this study was utilized by the Evaluation Committee as part of the data upon which some of the specific recommendations were based. In

¹National Probation and Parole Association shall be referred to as NPPA in all subsequent material.

the portion of the project with which this study is concerned, with the exception of Circuit Court in Kent County, the various court staffs took an active part in supplying data herein considered.

Procedures of the Study

In order to accomplish the purposes of this study, the following procedures were employed:

1. A questionnaire was submitted to all workers which elicited factual information such as length of service, salary, workloads, and general identifying data.

2. A schedule which served as the basis of interviews conducted by the writer with all agency heads. These interviews sought to collect information about such factors as program, budget, facilities, and statistics.

3. A review of published reports and professional literature in order to collect information of services and standards which might be compared with the services and standards in Kent County and Grand Rapids.

4. Conferences with resource-persons such as Hugh P. Reed, Will Turnblad, and Sol Rubin of the National Probation and Parole Association for the purpose of interpretation of the NPPA standards.

Criteria for NPPA Standards

The NPPA standards accepted as measures in this study were used in a study made in 1954 under the direction of Hugh

P. Reed, mid-western director of the NPPA. In a section entitled "Case Loads and Staff Needs" references are made to the use of these standards.

To estimate the staff needed to serve each of the above courts in Michigan a weighting of five work units was given for each pre-sentence investigation made per month and the number of convictions was used to determine this figure as the probation statute requires a pre-sentence investigation in every felony conviction. A weighting of one work unit was given each supervision case active on February 1, 1954.¹

A difference of opinion among leaders in the correctional field as to the amount of work one officer can handle successfully in one week made the consensus selection of fifty work units as a basis necessary. Experience in both adult and juvenile fields in such states as Wisconsin and California suggested the possibility that with caseloads of over fifty units the work accomplished was not fully effective. In some agencies such as the California Adult Authority workers who do intensified supervision function at the fifteen case level with parolees during the first three months following release.

Staff needs have been estimated until recently through a consideration of the volume factor. The tendency currently is toward decreased caseload if the factors of area covered, travel conditions, number of courts served and intensity of supervision indicates such reduction.

¹ Hugh P. Reed et al, Adult Probation and Parole in Michigan (New York: NPPA, 1954), p. 100.

Mr. Sol Rubin, Counsel for the NPPA, believes that the standard of fifty cases was mentioned as early as 1923 in a paper describing the standards used for juvenile courts.¹

"The key words are 'not more than 50 cases should be under the supervision of one probation officer at any one time'."²

"In other words this is not a statement that 50 cases may generally be carried successfully by a probation officer, but rather that a probation officer can not carry more than 50 cases successfully."³ Mr. Will C. Turnbladh, Director of NPPA states, "On the basis of the experience of the staff members of NPPA and its Professional Council, consisting of leading practitioners in corrections, we have adopted certain standards in the conduct of scores of surveys of courts and departments throughout the country."⁴ Mr. Turnbladh looks upon the fifty unit basis of operation as maximum.

A study made at the suggestion of the governor of California in 1948 by a Special Crime Study Commission approved the use of the fifty unit workload standard by a subcommittee composed of local leaders who worked in conjunction with NPPA staff members.⁵ Staff needs were defined in terms of the

¹See Appendix D.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid.

amount of work to be done and staff members of the NPPA were convinced that the presentation of needs to administrators and appropriating bodies could be more easily accomplished through the use of the unit norm. Since the completion of the California study in June, 1949, the Professional Council of the NPPA, composed of about 100 members who are probation and parole administrators throughout the country, has accepted the methods used by the Special Crime Study Commission in weighting units of work and computing staff needs.

The NPPA does not consider the standard it has used in a number of surveys infallible. Further study is underway which will attempt to refine methods and validate conclusions. There is strong evidence from application, however, that the standard is probably what it should be. It must be remembered that in measuring human effort toward the establishment of acceptable and reliable standards, such factors as educational background, ability, experience, time limitation, areal of travel, and job interest must be given full consideration. Effort on the part of individuals differs greatly and the standards used to evaluate such effort must be somewhat flexible.

Criteria for Educational Preparation

The minimum educational qualifications suggested by the NPPA are as follows:

A Bachelor's Degree from a college or university of recognized standing with a major in the social sciences. In addition, applicants should have one

year of paid full time experience under competent supervision in an approved social agency either probation, parole, or a related field. A probation or parole officer must be a person of sound health, good character, and balanced personality and, above all, must be intelligent and industrious. Any administrative or supervisory personnel should have, in addition to the above minimum qualifications, demonstrated leadership ability by an outstanding record of growth in a related social agency with high professional standards, preferably a probation department.¹

Once collected, the data concerning the court social services in Kent County and Grand Rapids, were compared with the ideal-type standards developed by the NPPA. The application of this method of comparison provided observations and generalizations which were utilized by the Evaluation Committee.

Background of the Study

In January, 1953 the Board of Directors of the Community Chest of Grand Rapids and Kent County requested that the Council of Social Agencies consider the value of undertaking a survey of services offered by the Chest-affiliated agencies. The Council appointed a study committee composed of five members of its board to consider the feasibility of such a survey, to determine the best methods of procedure, and to make its recommendations to the Chest Board. As a result of its investigation of studies made in other communities, the study committee advised that a self-survey would have several advantages over a study by experts and that all

¹Hugh P. Reed and C. Boyd McDivitt, "Report of Brief Survey of Kent County Juvenile Court," Part I (New York: National Probation and Parole Association, July 1955), p. 3.

community agencies, public and private, Chest and non-Chest, should be included if the survey were to have any value as a planning instrument.

The Chest Board then delegated the responsibility for organizing and conducting the study to the Council of Social Agencies. The Agency Evaluation Study Committee was renamed the Project Administrative Committee and was charged with setting up the appropriate machinery for the survey. The first procedural step was to appoint the Evaluation Committee, a kind of citizen's grand jury, to coordinate and evaluate all data and preliminary recommendations made by the five service survey committees. This committee was composed of fifteen members, five selected by the Project Administrative Committee, five elected by the delegate body of the Council, and five elected by a combined vote of the first two groups.

A questionnaire Committee was appointed by the Evaluation Committee to formulate the principal data collection tool. A twenty-four page questionnaire was sent to all participating agencies covering the following areas: history and purpose of the organization, current and projected program, personnel qualifications and practices, budgetary and financial practices, record keeping and statistics, board composition and policy, and deficiencies in the agency's and/or the community's resources.

Five Survey Committees were established to evaluate the reports of the individual agencies by field of service.

Prior to the consideration of the various survey committee reports, i.e.; Services to Children, Services to Families and Adults, Health Services, and Recreation Services, the Evaluation Committee called in nationally known consultants to advise them on next steps, tentative goals, standards, and methods of evaluating the community's resources and deficiencies in terms of their data. Among these experts were Hugh P. Reed, National Probation and Parole Association; Virginia Speirs, Child Welfare League of America; Harry Serotkin, Director, Regional Social Welfare Planning, Council of Social Agencies, Kansas City, Missouri; Solomon J. Axelrod, M.D., Bureau of Public Health Economics, University of Michigan, and John R. Mauff, Family Service Association of America.

The survey of Court Social Services was classified with services to families and adults. Other agencies in this category included five homes for the aged, one agency for the blind, five sectarian agencies, seven general service agencies, and two agencies concerned with veteran's affairs. At the start of the evaluation of court social services, a special subcommittee agreed that no inquiry would be made concerning board of administrative body or finances and budgeting.

There are several court systems with jurisdiction in Grand Rapids and Kent County. These include the Federal District Court, Circuit Court, Superior Court, Juvenile Division of Probate Court, Municipal Court, and Police Court. There are also various justice courts in outlying parts of the county. These courts deal with a variety of problems

such as: criminal action, divorce, separate maintenance, non-support, bastardy, cruelty to children, and juvenile delinquency. It was the object of the survey to have each court make an evaluation of its services and to make suggestions concerning a possible improvement in services or a change in the type of service offered.

It was a general purpose of the study to make a quantitative evaluation of adult and juvenile services and to review the court social services as they relate to domestic relations matters.

Several other surveys within the past three years have dealt at least in part with the social services to the court. A survey in January, 1955, Adult Probation and Parole in Michigan, by the NPPA had as its purpose to:

- (1) determine the extent of use of probation in Michigan;
- (2) evaluate both local and state adult probation and parole field services, including selected aspects of the pre-parole planning phase of the correctional institution programs; and
- (3) make an administrative study of the Bureaus of Probation and Parole in the State Department of Corrections.¹

The strengths and weaknesses of the probation and parole services were reviewed thoroughly and a summary of the review showed quite clearly excessive caseloads and the lack of educational qualifications of some personnel.

The economics of incarceration and treatment revealed the cost of inmate care and the comparative costs of treatment

¹Hugh P. Reed, et al, Adult Probation and Parole in Michigan, op. cit., p. 1.

processes outside of the prisons. The study outlines the need for additional staff, methods of improving probation and parole services, and a description of the initial activities of parole and probation before the service is used by the offender. Throughout the entire study the standards set by NPPA were used as norms.

Two studies completed in July of 1955 gave detailed information about the Kent County Juvenile Court. The first, reviewed the organization and administration of the court and staff needs. This report outlined the weakness of inter-agency relationships. The authors suggested the immediate separation in detention of delinquents from dependent and neglected children, and the introduction of protective case-work services.¹ The second study² investigated the needs of children in detention and shelter situations. It is concerned, chiefly, with the proper use of institutional facilities and in the institutional population problem which has been a major problem in Kent County for a period of several years.

The number of exploratory studies concerning social services to the courts in Kent County and elsewhere is limited by its newness as a considered problem. Various studies have reviewed parts of the problem and some have taken into consideration the full problem of service but with the single

¹Reed and McDivitt, "Report of Brief Survey of Kent County Juvenile Court," op. cit., passim.

²Sherwood Norman, The Detention and Shelter of Children in Kent County (New York: NPPA, 1955), passim.

aspect of court work (such as the Juvenile Division) as the focal point.

Early in 1955, a Citizens Advisory Council was appointed by the judge of Juvenile Court. This council, soon after its organization, made an unscheduled visit to the Children's Home and verified what had long been suspected by several community groups. They discovered the use of antiquated methods of detention and a disregard for the segregation of delinquents from the dependent and neglected groups. Led by the League of Women Voters, the Council invited the participation of about fifty community groups and were encouraged by the interest shown by thirty of the invited groups. The community was told of the conditions at the home and the inadequacy of the services offered. The Council was direct in its approach to the County Supervisors and the City Commission, and in a few short months, backed by public opinion, positive changes brought about better service, separation of types of clients handled, increased use of foster-home care, inauguration of casework methods, more discreet form of public relations, and establishment of policies which invited community opinion.

This study attempts a description of the jurisdiction of Courts serving Grand Rapids and the social services available to these courts in the form of adult and juvenile probation and parole. This investigation has been directed toward obtaining information on the extent and use of probation in the adult courts, and the quantity of services provided in

criminal, quasi-criminal, domestic relations, and juvenile cases. There is a correlative examination of the quality of staff providing these services.

With community interest in services to juveniles came a related interest in services to adults. The Council of Social Agencies planned a county-wide Self-Evaluation Project and, with the Citizen's Advisory Council's achievement as a guide, the Council invited all of the agencies which served the courts to participate.

The general objective was the evaluation of services in effect. The court agencies were given an opportunity to evaluate their goals and to express, through staff and administration, fact and opinion concerning methods of improving services to the courts. Specifically, it was believed that a true evaluation would portray overlapping activity and gaps in court services. It was further believed that all staff members would gain insight concerning the job to be done and the best methods of achieving their goals.

Evaluation brought with it an evidence of insecurity on the part of some workers. Resistance, chiefly in the area of disclosures of educational qualifications, became a major hurdle, but, as the project advanced, most of the workers took part honestly and with some enthusiasm.

The worth of this investigation into court services cannot be exactly estimated. In Kent County, the value of community opinion has been demonstrated in the improvement

already seen in Children's Services. The wider goals are not yet realized, but the movement toward better treatment of children is well under way. Further, the Self-Evaluation Project has brought to the attention of the community a need for improvement in adult services to the court. Several major agencies have moved toward the acceptance of adequate service standard, while in most court agencies, a new self-awareness has helped to remove apathy.

Hopefully, the pattern of transition will lead to a wider interest in other counties throughout the State in matters having to do with acceptable social service to the courts. Community-wise, Kent County and Grand Rapids have become aware of a need for increased service. This experience may lead other communities to review their needs and move toward a more enlightened treatment of violators.

To facilitate the best use of schedules, questionnaires, and available statistics, the Courts in Kent County have been approached separately. Members of the staffs participated individually in the discussions. From this material certain general ideas have been drawn which seem to indicate a need for change and improvement. A consideration of statements made, which had only a related implication to the framework of the evaluation project, suggest in some instances a need for tangent studies.

Methodology

Information has been obtained through a review of constitutional and statutory provisions establishing the courts and their services. So that there might be an inclusion of opinion and experience, interviews were arranged with judges, probation and parole staffs, juvenile authorities, and police workers.

The workers in departments and bureaus were asked to fill in questionnaires which give background data.¹ Each worker discussed a schedule which was arranged to disclose specifics about his qualifications.² This technique was used to bring the correctional job into clearer focus for the evaluation committee.

The questionnaire used for the evaluation of workload and job qualifications sought identifying data with additional questions concerning the method and date of appointment, previous experience in related fields, salary, education, case-load for the period between July 1, 1954 and June 30, 1955, numbers and types of investigations, and total numbers of transfers.

In addition to the written questionnaire, a schedule was employed which included six of the eight major points requested in the outline by the evaluation committee. Point

¹See Appendix A.

²See Appendix B.

number four in the outline was concerned with the board or administrative body, and point number six pointed out the methods of financing and budgeting. Because the correctional agencies are operated under statute and because they are financed by taxes, these points were not considered in the schedule. The general aim of discovering the standards under which courts operate, the size of workloads, the amount of training, salaries, the volume of work beyond the criminal category, the particular types of services offered, and the opinions of staff concerning deletion of or change in services could be established, hopefully, through the medium of discussion.

Embodied in the general content of the inquiry was a series of direct and indirect questions alluding to the need for additional social services. Opinions were offered more or less freely, and as they were expressed, they became part of the material later used in formulating recommendations. It was the aim of the writer to gain from free discussion and direct questions, the opinions, attitudes, and personal goals of the court worker in his job and in his relation to the other workers engaged in related endeavor. The discussion was not limited to the program outline by the Self-Evaluation Project committee and individual members of the judiciary were encouraged to express personal preferences, reactions to relationships with other workers, views on the use of casework principles in corrections, and plans for change in the future.

Studies used in the preparation of background material were limited to investigations of social service practices in communities which had faced similar or related problems. The chief basis of comparison for this study, Adult Probation and Parole in Michigan, was made by the NPPA in 1954. The same bases for the definition of workloads and qualifications used in that study were employed in this project. For additional background, the worker reviewed the constitutional and statutory provisions creating the courts. He considered the types of cases handled, the geographic boundaries of the court, the concurrency of jurisdiction, the number of judges, the services offered, the number and qualifications of personnel, the duties of the staff, and the needs and problems as seen by the staff.

The field worker, in his search for information from all members of the staff, sought to estimate the unmet needs of the court insofar as social services are concerned.

CHAPTER II

FEDERAL SOCIAL SERVICES

The Federal probation officer performs a social service at the Federal level which is in reality a combination of service to several Federal departments. Federal probation officers, by statute, serve the United States District Courts. They serve as supervisors of probation cases and prepare pre-sentence investigations. These officers are also agents of the Department of Justice and as such are parole officers. They serve the Federal Parole Board of the United States and are required to make pre-parole investigations and supervise parolees from Federal institutions. In 1946, a third duty was added in the supervision of those who are released from military disciplinary barracks. This duty also calls for the preparation of progress reports and evaluations which might change the course of future treatment of such cases.

When narcotic offenders are released from the United States Public Health Service at Lexington, Kentucky, they report to the Federal probation officer who then becomes responsible for their supervision. The Federal Parole Board has also a Youth Correction Division. Releases are made by this authority after proper investigation by the probation officer and youths releases are supervised on parole in their home communities.

Supervision Objectives

No distinction is made between Federal probation and parole services. The Federal philosophy embraces the belief that both involve the same basic investigative and treatment skills. The objectives include the following essentials:

1. Full appraisal and understanding of each offender and the behavioral circumstances from which his offense grew.
2. Selective process in permitting some offenders to remain in the community with the resultant economy and the preserving of family and work patterns.
3. The confinement of those who need to be protected and treated especially or for those who need to be removed so that society might be protected.
4. A supervisory relationship which helps the probationer and parolee back to the best possible citizenship adjustment.

Geographical Boundaries

At the present time, the Western Michigan Federal District probation officers serve forty-nine counties which cover the entire Western half of the Lower Peninsula and all of the Upper Peninsula. The distance from the Ohio border to the Minnesota border approximates 600 miles. Because of the large territory covered, it has been necessary for the officers to plan the use of time fully and to avoid "backtracking" whenever possible. Aside from the routine duties in this territory

it is frequently necessary to make special trips when emergencies arise. It is essential that full consideration be given the size of this territory in evaluating the caseload. The use of travel time in the Federal service is a prime factor.

The Annual Report of the Proceedings of the Judicial Conference in the United States for the year 1954, shows that the Western Michigan District of the Sixth Circuit had a total of 135 probationers, parolees, conditional release cases, and military parolees under supervision on June 30, 1954. There are two men employed in this Federal office; therefore, the caseload at that time was officially sixty-eight clients per worker.¹ On the same date, the average caseload per worker throughout the nation was ninety-four.² The caseload per worker in the Detroit area which is the Eastern District of the Sixth Circuit showed that the worker's caseload was nine-two; however, there were nine workers involved in this service which permitted adequate planning and reduced the problem of travel. It is interesting to note that in the State of Arizona workers carried caseloads as high as 151 per man. The workers in the far West are also faced with the problem of covering a large geographical territory while servicing large caseloads.

¹Annual Report of the Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States, 1954 (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1955), Table E2, p. 202.

²Ibid., p. 201.

The Grand Rapids Federal office in the year 1954 supervised 142 cases making the average per worker seventy-one. This is an increase in the course of one year of four supervision cases per man. In addition to the cases supervised, each man was expected to do his part of the 131 pre-sentence investigations and the forty-five pre-parole investigations. There is no exact statistical information showing distribution of this work between the individual officers.

In considering the caseloads carried in the Western Michigan District, it is estimated that there is a need for four men. Currently, the services are being performed by two men. The formula used in estimating the number of men needed is based on the values established in the NPPA report of 1953. Each case under supervision is given a value of one unit and each pre-sentence completed a value of five units.¹

If the standards set by the NPPA are followed there is, therefore, a need for an additional 2.3 men to perform the services adequately and this does not include any adjustment which should be made for the geographic factor.² In the fiscal year of 1955, there were ninety convictions and of this number thirty-nine were given probation. The NPPA

¹This work load of 50 units has been equaled in a number of juvenile courts and in the adult field, at least, the Wisconsin State system and the probation department for the Court of General Sessions, New York City.

²Federal workers travel greater distance in the supervision of cases than workers in the local and state courts.

report of 1954 shows the use of probation in Circuit Courts in Michigan to be fifty per cent. The federal average is lower at forty-three per cent.

If additional men are added in the Federal probation area in Grand Rapids, facilities should be increased. It is difficult to obtain space in the Federal Building but if confidentiality and privacy of interview are to be maintained, a plan should be made for the rearrangement of office space. Two additional workers would bring the staff to four workers and two stenographers. It is believed that the entire staff should be housed in adjoining offices which is not the case at the present time. One officer is located across the hall from his stenographer.

The present staff meets the NPPA minimum personnel standards. Both workers in the service in the Federal Court at Grand Rapids are college graduates. One also has obtained the Master of Social Work degree.

Conclusions

The Federal workers do a thorough job considering the territory covered, the number of cases handled, the investigations made, and the physical handicaps under which they work. Currently, the United States Government has made staff additions in various parts of the country and it is hoped that in the near future, the Western Michigan district will have a staff increase sufficient to meet its needs.

CHAPTER III

KENT COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT¹

Constitutional Provisions

The State shall be divided into judicial circuits in each of which there shall be elected one circuit judge. The legislature may provide by law for the election of more than one circuit judge in any judicial circuit. A circuit court shall be held at least four times in each year in every county organized for judicial purposes. Each circuit judge shall hold court in the county or counties within the circuit in which he is elected, and in other circuits as may be provided by law. The legislature may by law arrange the various circuits into judicial districts, and provide for the manner of holding courts therein. Circuits and districts may be created, altered or discontinued by law, but no such alteration or discontinuance shall have the effect to remove the judge from office.²

Jurisdiction

Circuit Court shall have original jurisdiction in all matters, civil and criminal, not excepted in this constitution and not prohibited by law and appellate jurisdiction from all inferior courts and tribunals and a supervisory control of the same. They shall also have power to issue writs of habeas corpus, mandamus, injunction, quo warranto and certiorari and to hear and determine the same; and to issue such other writs as may be necessary to carry into effect their orders, judgments and decrees and give them

¹In the agency Self-Evaluation Project the Courts in Kent County and Grand Rapids were invited and encouraged to participate. Circuit Court elected not to take part and it was, therefore, necessary to make a brief evaluation of staff needs based on published statistical materials obtained from the State Department of Corrections.

²Michigan, Constitution (1908), Art. VII, sec. 8.

general control over inferior courts and tribunals within their respective jurisdictions and in all such other cases and matters as the Supreme Court shall by rule prescribe.¹

The NPFA Report of 1954 shows that there were ninety-two convictions in Circuit Court in Kent County in 1953. The probation caseload, as of February 1, 1954, was sixty-seven and it was estimated that the staff needed 2.2 persons. With the time of the equivalent of one-half man being given to probation work, it was estimated that 1.7 additional professional workers are needed.

Statistics of the Michigan State Department of Corrections show that in 1954 there were 112 convictions and the probation caseload, as of February 1, 1955, was seventy-three. During this year 1.1 persons acted as full time probation officers. The final estimate, therefore, shows that this court needs at least 1.4 additional staff. Circuit Court use probation on forty-one per cent of its cases in 1953. In 1954 this amount is shown as forty-six per cent which is slightly less than the average for other circuits in Michigan.

¹Michigan, Constitution (1908), Art. VII, sec. 10.

CHAPTER IV

GRAND RAPIDS SUPERIOR COURT

Statutory Provision

The People of the State of Michigan enact: That there shall be a Municipal Court in and for the City of Grand Rapids which shall be called the Superior Court of Grand Rapids, which shall be a court of record and have a seal to be provided by said city and whose first term shall commence the first Tuesday of June in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and seventy-five.¹

Jurisdiction of Court

The said Superior Court shall have original jurisdiction, concurrent with the Circuit Court for the County of Kent, in all civil actions of a transitory nature, when the debt or damage claimed is over one hundred dollars (\$100.00) in which both parties reside in the City of Grand Rapids or in which either the plaintiff or defendant resides in the City of Grand Rapids, and the service of a copy of the declarations or process by which suit is begun shall be had within said city.²

Use of Probation in Superior Court

The NPPA report of 1954, Table I, shows that Superior Court had 321 convictions in 1953. Of that number 155 were granted probation or forty-eight per cent of the total number. This use of probation comes very close to the state average

¹Michigan, Statutes Annotated, Compiled Laws, (1948), 2.3611.

²Michigan, Statutes Annotated, Compiled Laws (1948), 27.3623.

of fifty per cent for the year 1953. In 1954 there were 316 convictions of which 137 were given probation. Once again, Superior Court has equaled the state level of forty-two per cent use of probation.

The foregoing figures have to do with criminal cases only. Superior Court also handled during the year 1955, 111 civil cases and 591 chancery cases. There is one judge.

There are many reasons why probation has not been used to a greater extent in the past in Superior Court. Number one is the lack of professional staff to properly supervise such cases. The caseloads in Superior Court are now too large to meet the standards suggested by NPPA so that supervision in the full sense of that term has been impossible. The probation officer's time is used meeting the needs of emergency cases and in giving assistance in that area wherever such is possible. The second reason for the curtailment of probation is the lack of stenographic help. One of the probation officers in Superior Court uses most of her time doing clerical work. Currently, state help is used in the pre-sentence work and in February of 1956, an additional state man is to be used in Superior Court to assist in supervision and to take over part of the pre-sentence investigations. This additional help will permit a wider use of probation and a more complete supervision of the present caseload.

The judge of Superior Court believes that the community is well aware of the service of this Court and the heavy load it carries in civil and criminal matters. He sees a very

definite need for a better psychiatric service and expressed the hope in the near future psychiatric service would be available to the court anytime it is needed. Currently, it is necessary to hire a private psychiatrist or to ask the psychiatrists who are employed by the county to observe the patient in the Receiving Hospital. Occasionally, the court has used the services of the State Department of Corrections by sending the individual in need of psychiatric service to the Ionia Reformatory for observation. The Court expressed dissatisfaction with the short reports that are returned from some of the psychiatrists.

In speaking of wayward minors, the Court holds the belief that there is a serious need for some type of vocational training for those who are in difficulty between the ages of fifteen and nineteen. While he favors the probation camp which is planned for the near future for the Department of Corrections, he said that he does not believe that this will offer adequate service unless it incorporates the use of trade training as a definite preparation for work. Statistics have been kept in a cursory fashion in Superior Court and there seems to be little interest at the present time in a change of this policy.

Probation Services

Currently there are two workers in Superior Court with the title of probation officer. The chief probation officer spends his entire time in supervision of probation cases and

administration of his office and the office of Friend of the Court. His deputy officer does clerical work at least one-half the time. In addition, there is one full-time State man who compiles all pre-sentence investigations. An additional State man is to be added in February of 1956 and when he joins the staff, the two State men will share the pre-sentence and supervision activities of the Superior Court probation office. One man is assigned full time to Friend of the Court work in Superior Court carrying a file of 1200 alimony cases which he considers active. However, he spends his entire time working on only that part of the caseload which demands immediate attention. This is more than a full-time job. This worker claims to average about 400 calls per month. There were no statistics available showing whether the calls were investigations, employment calls, or violation investigations. In addition he is called at times to fill in as probation officer when the probation work is excessively heavy or when one of the officers is off duty.

Qualifications and Duties of Court Workers

Of the five workers involved in Superior Court, two State officers have college degrees. One has a graduate degree and is currently engaged in a graduate program which will lead to the Master of Social Work degree. The other officers have no college training. They have had lengthy experience in probation work or police work. There are no civil service qualifications set up for the job of probation officer in

Superior Court. The personnel are nominated by the judge and are appointed by the Department of Corrections Commission. Recently the Commission established a minimum educational requirement of a Bachelor's degree for all future appointments.

Workers in Superior Court are called upon to do an investigative and supervisory job in handling of the large probation loads. Investigations are completed by the State Department and are used in probation work or sent on to the prison if that disposition is made. The workers are aware of the necessity for frequent contacts with the probationers. All of the workers involved stated that they cannot possibly do a proper supervisory job and keep up the proper client contacts because of the heavy load and because of the tremendous backlog in clerical work. Records at the present time are kept in a somewhat chronological fashion--with little more than the date of contact noted. There is no process dictation as such. It is necessary for the chief probation officer to turn in reports to the State of Michigan concerning his caseload, transfers, and discharges. While the workers believe they are making a fair attempt to meet the needs of their clients, they readily admit that there may be some shortcomings in the present service and until there are proper physical facilities and a large enough staff, service will have to continue on a "critical" and "emergency" basis.

The NPPA report of 1954 shows that the load carried, when measured against NPPA standards, called for an additional

staff of 5.7 persons. If one were to assume that the officers in Superior Court could spend full time in the supervision of probation cases (with no time consumption in Friend of the Court matters), the court would still face a serious understaffing. In 1955, the chief probation officer and his assistant averaged a load of 100 each per month. This load under ordinary circumstances would call for an additional two men. The state worker averaged twenty-two pre-sentences each month which according to NPPA standards of five units per pre-sentence totals to 110 work units. This job would call for 2.2 workers. With the addition of one state worker who is to spend his entire time in Superior Court, the staff is still faced with the shortage of three workers. In February of 1956, the service will add an additional stenographer. This should relieve the deputy probation officer of some of her clerical duties.

Needs

Members of the Superior Court Probation Staff offered some very pertinent suggestions concerning the possible changes which would bring about better service and which could eventually lead to a fuller use of probation in the court. Without sacrificing cooperation in any way, it is evident that the separate positions in this court are in need of definition. There is a tendency "to help the other fellow" which results in a juggling of work patterns which could in the ultimate prove to be detrimental to court

service. The workers are anxious to offer better supervision but are aware that the "emergency" type of service must prevail in the Court until proper clerical and professional staff in sufficient quantity are available. The chief probation officer expressed an interest in a wider social service so that the court might properly handle all family relation problems. The only consultant service available at the present time which is used by the court infrequently is the Legal Aid. In the matter of records, it is admitted that a more adequate picture of case process might be achieved if and when loads are made smaller and in-service training has brought the workers a better insight into the use of casework techniques. The Superior Court probation office keeps only the statistics sent to the state, but the workers there believe that additional statistics could be very useful and are hopeful that some plan will be inaugurated soon so that figures will be available for an analysis of all court work. One of the greatest needs in the Court at the present time is a full psychiatric service which could be available for use by all of the workers whenever needed. The present system of "farming out" psychiatric cases has proven time-consuming and only mildly helpful.

It may be realistically concluded that Superior Court is faced with a weighty task of serving caseloads, civil and criminal, which would tax the capacity of a court staff of two judges and more than double the number of workers. The

court has shown an interest in recent years in the use of casework techniques and in the services of professional workers. There seems to be a definite desire on the part of all who are connected with the court to improve the services and to bring about a better correlation of work through planning. There is, however, little interest shown in in-service or academic training programs.

Improvement will be seen in Superior Court services when the caseloads are reduced to at least the NPPA standards and when caseloads are such that they can be handled without pressure. The quality of record making should be improved in this court. It is recognized that there is a great need for improved counseling and guidance services in domestic relations cases.

CHAPTER V

SERVICES TO JUVENILES

Juvenile Court

In each county organized for judicial purposes, there shall be a probate court. The jurisdiction, powers and duties of such courts and of the judges thereof shall be prescribed by law, and they shall also have original jurisdiction in all cases of juvenile delinquents and dependents.¹

Probate Code

Section 712A. (1), of the juvenile code, states that the Probate Court shall have a juvenile division and that the proceedings of such a division shall not be deemed to be criminal. The juvenile division is interested in securing for

each child coming within the jurisdiction of the court the proper care, guidance and control, preferably in his own home, as will be conducive to the child's welfare and the best interest of the state and that when such child is removed from the control of his parents the court shall secure for him care as nearly as possible equivalent to the care which should have been given to him by them.²

Chapter 712A (2) states "Juvenile division of probate court; jurisdiction, prior order of another court, notice, service upon prosecuting attorney; transfer to county of residence."³ In this section the law states that this

¹Michigan, Constitution (1908), Art. VII, sec. 13.

²Michigan, Compiled Laws (1948) 712A, Probate Code, p.1.

³Ibid.

division of the court shall have original jurisdiction superior to and regardless of the jurisdiction of any other court in proceedings concerning any child under seventeen years of age found within the county who have: deserted their homes, repeatedly truanted, associated with immoral persons, remained habitually idle or patronized taverns or places where alcohol is sold.

The court is further concerned with any child found within the county:

(1) Whose parent or other person legally responsible for the care and maintenance of such child, when able to do so, neglects or refused to provide proper or necessary support, education as required by law, medical, surgical, or other care necessary for his health, morals or well-being, or who is abandoned by his parents, guardian or other custodian, or who is otherwise without proper custody or guardianship; or

(2) Whose home or environment, by reason of neglect, cruelty, drunkenness, criminality or depravity on the part of a parent, guardian or other custodian, is an unfit place for such child to live in, or whose mother is unmarried and without adequate provision for care and support.¹

Personnel

It has been suggested in several reports that personnel in the probation office and detention home should be selected from an eligible list based on competitive examinations. The NPPA standards require a bachelor's degree from a college or

¹Michigan, Compiled Laws (1948) 712A., Probate Code p. 2.

university of recognized standing, with a major in the social sciences.¹ Applicants would have one year of training in a graduate school of social service or one year of paid full-time experience under competent supervision in a field related to corrections. These conditions are considered a minimal. Until recently, juvenile workers in Kent County have been appointed with no definite inquiry concerning educational requirements. Low salaries severely limited the court in recruiting qualified personnel.

Trained personnel in the Kent County Juvenile Court has become a recognized necessity. The new full-time director of social services holds a Masters of Social Work degree and has wide experience in the children's field. Two supervisory positions, one casework and one intake, have been created requiring professionally trained workers. In the future four qualified probation officers are to be added which will necessitate additional stenographic help. Adequate staff will decrease caseloads and it is expected a more effective children's program will be realized.

Volume of Work

In 1954, Kent County Juvenile Court and Children's Services handled a total of 1,816 cases. Probation was granted to 305 persons; 105 were committed to private agencies,

¹Reed and McDivitt, "Report of Brief Survey of Kent County Juvenile Court," op. cit., p. 3.

one went to Michigan Children's Institute for observation and six were committed there. Boys Vocational School received seventeen and Girls Training School twenty.

Altogether it is estimated that there were 1170 active cases on probation (delinquency) and under supervision (neglected and dependent) during the course of the year. There were eight workers with varying caseloads. However, this number averaged 146 cases for each person. Because statistics were few it was impossible to learn how many cases were handled by each worker or how many visits were made on a single case during the year. Records concerning intake, supervision, client contact, and progress were incomplete and were compiled differently by each worker.

The statistics for 1954 show that there were 736 delinquent and non-delinquent complaints received and reported (less than total intake). Of these, 367 were delinquency cases and 369 were non-delinquency complaints. Of the 367 delinquency cases, 305 were given probation. Probation is used, therefore, in approximately eighty-three per cent of reported delinquency cases.

Salary Schedule

The salaries budgeted for the Juvenile Court workers are \$4,000 and \$4,500. At \$4,000 the court is attempting to hire personnel with some graduate training in social work and fully trained workers at \$4,500. At the present time, an attendant with no professional training receives \$3,200.

Plans have been made to raise the salary for this job classification to \$3,700. While it is necessary for attendants to have some skill in handicraft; to be physically fit and have ability to relate to disturbed children, the education required of applicants does not nearly approximate that required of a caseworker. The salary differential varies from \$200 to \$300 which seems rather small when the years needed for professional preparation are considered.

Supervisors in the probation department are to receive \$5,000 and \$5,500. They must hold the Master of Social Work degree and must be experienced and mature enough to provide professional leadership to the staff. No arrangement has been made at the present time concerning salary increments for any of the staff.

Additional Professional Workers

The judicial duties of the Juvenile and Probate Court take the entire time of the judge. It is impossible for him to perform the multiple administrative duties and at the same time consider the details of the many cases which pass before him. The new director of court social services by direction of the judge will absorb the administrative function of the court. The intake supervisor under the director will be in charge of the types of cases handled and will decide on acceptance, referral, or rejection. This responsible task will determine, to some degree, the quality and quantity of services performed.

The supervisor of the field service division will direct the study and casework treatment phase of the probation department's work. To the supervisor of the detention home will be delegated authority and responsibility for the day-to-day administration of the detention home.

With the creation of the new children's service in the county welfare department, almost all of the probation department's former work with dependent and neglected children, including protective casework and foster care, will be transferred to the new division.¹ Thus the treatment aims of the Juvenile Court have been redirected. The goal of correctional casework can now be applied primarily to the delinquent child. With efficient in-service training programs for present staff and the addition of professional personnel, children will receive more intensive and effective study and treatment.

Court workers point out the need for more psychiatric service. Some use is made of the Grand Rapids Child Guidance Clinic where psychological and psychiatric services are available. The cost, however, of that service is very high.

Statistical Data

During the course of the study, each worker on the juvenile staff was asked to fill in a schedule which would give full factual information concerning position, experience,

¹ See section on County Welfare Department.

work in related fields, salary, education, minimal qualifications for the job and information concerning caseloads. Since there is no centralized case accounting and control system in operation, the records kept by each officer of his own caseload varied and were not comparable. There was, therefore, no way of knowing the exact amount of work done by each officer. Future plans call for the keeping of a master record of cases active and closed. All of the data from referral to closure are to be kept in perpetual inventory form.

Parole Service

Boys who are eventually admitted to the Boys' Vocational School are committed to the Department of Social Welfare prior to institutionalization. Inmates of Girls' Training School and Michigan Children's Institute are committed directly to the superintendents of those institutions and are subject to the rules and regulations thereof.

When the institution considers the child ready for placement,¹ parole letters are written to the Juvenile Court stating that fact. The institution then asks an investigation of the home situation to see whether or not it is acceptable and satisfactory. If not, the institution asks any county agent in any part of the state to investigate for home placement. There are instances in which relatives living at a distance are contacted in this manner.

While on parole the child is under the supervision of a single juvenile court worker. At first he reports weekly

¹Michigan Children's Institute is excepted since it is not a correctional institution.

and later monthly, if he has made some adjustment. Many of the children released from the institution are seventeen. Both Boys' Vocational School and Girls' Training School retain children under nineteen years of age. However, if violation of parole takes place in the last part of this span, the case is usually tried under the criminal code and the child ceases to be a juvenile charge.

Interpretation of the New Foster Care Law

"Section 2. This amendatory act shall become effective April , 1956 in respect to liability by the state for any part of the cost of care of children admitted to foster care subsequent to June 30, 1955."¹ Basically, the law has been amended so that children who are in need may be given foster home care and protection through the County Welfare Department and the use of private agency services. Financial arrangements concerning matching funds have been made so that those counties which cannot afford to pay the full amount of such care may be helped despite this inability.

The Juvenile Division of the Probate Court has jurisdiction over children in need of Court services. While the Welfare Department has been given responsibility for the placement of non-delinquent juvenile clients, such placement remains a matter for court consideration. An infant two years of age or younger receives attention within a twenty-four

¹Michigan, Statutes Annotated, Act 112, P.A. 1955, sec.2.

hour period. In emergency, older children may be held for seventy-two hours. The referee decides whether there is a need for petition. On occasion the children remain under welfare supervision until the time of hearing. The threat to children of institutional confinement for long periods of time, without good reason, has been removed. In the integrated program, the welfare department uses the community resources and leans heavily upon the professional advice and services of the private agency.

County Welfare Department

The County Department of Social Welfare may under the powers it has through the Poor Law and the powers vested in it by the Welfare Act "provide foster care to the children not within the jurisdiction of the Juvenile Court and found to be in need according to standards established by the County Department."¹ It is necessary for parents or custodians to apply for the child. In the case of an emergency which leaves a child without a responsible person to care for him, the County Department may make a temporary plan for care up to a period of one week. Should a long term plan be necessary and there is no responsible relative, the case must be referred to the Juvenile Court. The Department of Welfare may also provide foster care as a service to the Court upon the request of the judge for any child under the jurisdiction of the court.

¹Ibid.

The County Welfare Department does not become a Court. The department does accept responsibility for the child directly from parents, guardian, or custodian if such adults apply and request assistance in meeting foster care expense. Such applicants must agree not to interfere with the plans made for the child and they are not allowed to remove the child without consulting welfare authorities. When it is possible, reimbursement must be made to the welfare for the care of the child.

In Kent County, temporary shelter care facilities are being provided at St. John's Home. This center is to care for emergency cases only on a temporary basis. The responsibility for eligibility in this program rests squarely with the County Welfare Department. The need for foster home care after a full investigation is determined according to the needs of a child rather than to the needs of the parents.

CHAPTER VI

MUNICIPAL COURT OF GRAND RAPIDS

Structure and Function

Statute 27.3751 of the Michigan Statutes Annotated brought into being a Municipal Court in cities of over 100,000. The original legislation creating Justice Courts states as follows:

An Act to provide for justice courts in all cities of not less than one hundred thousand (100,000) population incorporated prior to the enactment of act number two hundred seventy-nine (279) of the public acts of nineteen hundred nine (1909), whose justice courts acts are included in their present charters, and to repeal all acts and parts of acts inconsistent with this act.¹

Originally, courts of this type were set up for cities of over 100,000 population. However, a 1945 act was amended to include cities of over 80,000 population and in 1947 the title was changed from "Justice Court" to "Municipal Court." The purpose of the court is, primarily, to handle civil disputes with the exception of disputes over titles of land. The jurisdiction was increased to that litigations up to \$500.00 are considered. Municipal Court also handles investigations of felony cases which may be later bound over to Circuit Court.

¹Michigan, Statutes Annotated, Act 299, 199; 522; 1md. eff. May 3.

Collections constitute the largest group of cases handled in Municipal Court. The court has the power to issue writs of garnishment and suits for money damages. It has no jurisdiction over family relation cases. The judge of Municipal Court may sit in Police Court when requested to do so. He is also empowered to act as a Circuit Court Commissioner if requested to do so. There is an overlapping of services with the Justice Courts in the townships adjacent to the Grand Rapids Townships. Some lawyers find it inconvenient to use the outlying courts and so start their cases in the Municipal Court of Grand Rapids.

One of the judges of the Municipal Court made the statement that

the public is not fully aware of the policies we follow here. Eighty per cent of our cases are collection cases. A man in debt should come in when he is summoned so that we might make an arrangement with him to see his creditor and work out a plan of payment. If he cannot make a satisfactory arrangement with his creditor, we are happy to set the amount he should pay and to make arrangements for payment through the Court.¹

Accordingg to the Municipal Court judge, it is sometimes necessary to use other agencies, especially the Legal Aid. This agency is used when a special investigation is needed. There is no policy of official follow-up with the exception of bankruptcy cases, when payments are made through the Court clerk. The judge does not believe there is a necessity for planning with other agencies "because all of our work is done according to statute."²

¹Interview with Robert Burns, Judge of Municipal Court, June 6, 1956.

²Ibid.

CHAPTER VII

GRAND RAPIDS POLICE COURT

Statutory Provisions

The People of the State of Michigan enact: That there shall be established and organized a municipal court in and for the City of Grand Rapids, to be known as and called "The Police Court of Grand Rapids" and there shall be elected a judge and clerk of said court, as herein and after provided. The Police Justice of the City of Grand Rapids, now officiating, shall continue and hold his office, and exercise the power and duties herein conferred, under the title of "Police Judge" until the expiration of the time for which he was elected.¹

Jurisdiction

Said Police Court shall have exclusive original jurisdiction to issue process for, hear, try and determine all cases against persons charged with violations of provisions of the charter of said city, . . . said Police court shall have also exclusive original jurisdiction to issue process for, hear, try and determine all cases of misdemeanor, and of quasi-criminal nature, committed within the corporate limits of the city heretofore or hereafter within the jurisdiction of Justices Courts, anything otherwise herein or in any other law of this state contain to the contrary thereof in any wise notwithstanding. Said Police Court shall have the authority to sentence any person convicted therein of a commission of a misdemeanor and triable in Justice Courts of this state, the same as Justices of the Peace may by law do.²

¹Michigan, Statutes Annotated, Compiled Laws (1948), 2.3711.

²Michigan, Statutes Annotated, Compiled Laws (1948), 27.3716.

Structure

The Police Court of the City of Grand Rapids started operation October 16, 1879. There is one presiding judge. He is assisted by a clerk, bailiff, clerk typist, and a court police officer. The police officer is supplied by the Grand Rapids Police Department. This court operates under the same statutes as the Justice and Municipal Court. The criminal cases handled are those which involve incidents within the city limits of Grand Rapids. Cases of similar type are handled by the Justice Courts throughout the county. Police Court disposes of cases in which the maximum penalty does not exceed \$100.00 in costs or ninety days in jail. This court handles hearings and arraignments on cases which are not recognizable in a Police Court. The bastardy cases heard in this court are bound over to Circuit Court. No reason was given for this particular process except that it is ordered by statute.

From a table compiled by the City Attorney's staff in 1955, the total number of warrants has almost doubled in four years. In 1951, there were 3,636 warrants while in 1955 there were 7,246. The Police Court also collects fines from those who fail to comply with the city ordinances governing smoke inspections, electrical inspection, refrigeration, weights and measures, licenses and violations of the health laws. It should be noted the largest number of cases are traffic violations. In 1951 there were 1,153 traffic violations.

In 1955 there were 4,257. Misdemeanors in the same period have not increased at the same rate. There were 2,483 in 1951, a number which rose to 3,170 in 1954, and receded to 2,989 in 1955.

The Court keeps no formal statistics nor is it required to do so by law. The Judge of the court, however, is in favor of keeping statistics and plans to inaugurate that discipline in the near future if and when the clerical force is enlarged.

Possible Change

Intake in Police Court is the responsibility of the Prosecutor and City Attorney. The total volume of cases in this Court has quadrupled in the past five years and there is need of an additional judge and an increased staff to handle the large number of cases processed. The court has a backlog of trials and contested matters. Each morning new cases are heard. Three afternoons a week are used for examinations. The other two afternoons a week are used for trial.

Toward improvement of service court quarters should be enlarged so that there would be another court room to accommodate the ever increasing docket. Secondly, court personnel should be increased. Although exact caseload figures were not available, a minimal estimate indicates the need for two probation officers and one secretary.

Perhaps no other court in the area is in greater need of social services than the Police Court of Grand Rapids. Into this court come many cases in which there are incipient

family or domestic problems. Misdemeanors such as drunkenness and assault have frequently domestic roots. Some are symptomatic of behavior which could have been improved through casework techniques. The eighteen and nineteen year old first offenders appears in Police Court and often presents problems which are indicative of poor family relations or personal maladjustment. The Police Court is an important court in another respect. It is the court in which many persons make their first appearance. If problems could be detected and treated at this early stage, it might be possible to prevent later appearances in divorce and criminal courts.

The police court has, on occasion, referred cases to private agencies or to the Alcoholism Center which is jointly sponsored by state and county. For lack of a better plan it has placed individuals on probation to police officers or to the court. There is a real need for psychiatric service, but no funds are available to purchase such service. When psychiatric diagnosis is needed, the Prosecutor is notified and arrangements are made for the use of the Receiving Hospital where the patient is observed. Existing referral procedures have been limited and needed specialized services have not been readily available.

The writer believes, and the belief is shared by others, that most of the persons coming before the Police judge, with the exception of traffic or similar ordinance violators, could benefit from the application of social

service techniques at least on the investigation, counselling, and referral level. If a professional social service were created, a referral resource to which the court might send many first offenders and those with family difficulties would then be available. This, in turn, would relieve the tremendous pressure on probation and parole services.

Studies of other communities have shown that a probation department in Police Court can be effective in bringing into clear focus symptomatic behavior which had led to the commission of misdemeanor or crime. In Gary, Indiana, with a population of at least 125,000 there is a probation office with two officers and one clerk. Both of these officers are well trained and manage their caseloads efficiently, but still they are overburdened. Probation service could be provided to Police Court by the creation of a probation department or officers could be assigned to the Police Court from a county-wide probation department serving all adult local and state courts in Kent County. Such departments have proved successful in a number of communities. St. Paul, Minnesota (Ramsey County) and White Plains, New York (Westchester County) are notable examples.

Recidivism is an every-day court experience and to reduce this repetition, several steps should be taken: (1) the provision of an adequate probation service; (2) more effective institutional treatment for those in need of a restrictive type of help; (3) parole service for those who are released after institutional treatment, and (4) a full social

work-counselling service for use of court workers and as a direct means of treating misdemeanants.

Serious consideration should be given to the large number of misdemeanants who pass through Police Court and who are simply fined or sent to jail in lieu of a fine. It would be within the competence of a professional caseworker to screen the chronic cases or those in need of institutional treatment. The probation department could concern itself with those to whom treatment would mean a better understanding of family and an appreciation of social place in the community.

CHAPTER VIII

PROBATION AND PAROLE (STATE OF MICHIGAN)

Probation service on the state level in Kent County is offered by the Grand Rapids office of the Department of Corrections. The district supervisor of probation has charge of nineteen counties in the southwestern part of Michigan in which there are nine state field supervisors working in conjunction with local officers in the Circuit Courts throughout the district and in Superior Court, Grand Rapids. A separate staff of parole officers serves approximately the same area. The parole effort is directed toward assisting those who have served time in a penal institution to readjustment in the community.

Workers in probation and parole are selected from eligibility lists after competitive examination. There is a definite movement toward the raising of standards in the Department of Corrections so that those involved in crime and behavior unadjustment may have the protection of professional service and treatment.

Since the completion of the study made by the NPPA, Adult Probation and Parole in Michigan, 1954, steps have been taken to meet the minimum requirements of the NPPA throughout the state. At least forty additional state and local officers

have been employed. Several workers with the Master of Social Work degree have been hired in various counties and the interest in training at the professional level has been accentuated. State officers attend two in-service training institutes each year, three district staff meetings, and the Michigan Probation, Parole, and Prison Association conference which is a state-wide meeting of correctional workers. A special course at the University of Michigan has been started for district state supervisors and other selected members of the staff. Recently the department initiated a new staff development program with a training consultant in charge. Uniform services are maintained through directives, bulletins, and a departmental manual. A new manual will be released in 1956.

The Department of Corrections was reorganized in 1937. A major objective has been to provide qualified workers to serve the counties upon request in matters pertaining to investigation, supervision, and transfer of probationers.

In Kent County services have been utilized in Circuit and Superior Court. Juvenile and Police Courts are not served. There is no duplication of state and local services, but there is, rather, a correlation of effort in which the state workers accept responsibility for part of the work-load in some centers and all of the service in others.

The state probation officer must concern himself with a pre-sentence history-making of felony cases referred for

investigation. While the definite goal has been to investigate all cases as required by law, the lack of staff has permitted the completion of only part of the job.

Collateral agencies are used by the state probation office whenever additional service or referral is indicated. Among those agencies most frequently contacted in Grand Rapids and Kent County are the American Red Cross, Legal Aid, Grand Rapids Police Department (Juvenile and Adult Divisions), Sheriff's Department, Bureau of Identification, Public Welfare, and several private agencies such as Catholic Service Bureau, St. John's Home, Blodgett Home, Evangeline Home, Salvation Army, Volunteers of America and others.

Facilities in the division of probation in Grand Rapids are inadequate at the present time and will have to be enlarged as staff is added. The increased staff will include enlarged stenographic service. Supplies, office rental, and salaries are requisitioned and the costs for the following year are presented to the state auditor each year in the form of a budget by the Lansing office.

Department of Corrections workers, other than clerical, throughout the state have the standard forty-hour work week. They are, however, available at any time and must frequently work with clients in the evenings and weekends. The salary paid is scheduled according to Civil Service classification.

Statistics are compiled in the Department of Corrections for all court levels and information concerning case

count, caseload, case change, new cases, transfer, termination, and institutional data are recorded on International Business Machine cards for future reference.

The supervisor of probation of Grand Rapids feels that there are limitations in services to the "wayward minor." A similar deficiency is known to exist throughout the entire state. This study revealed that there were no tax-supported psychiatric services in Kent County available to corrections agencies. Currently, cases calling for psychiatric observation are transferred to the Ionia Reformatory where the prison psychiatrist makes an examination and reports his findings to the court.

The parole service is offered to the Grand Rapids community through the Bureau of Pardons and Paroles. Officers are hired on the basis of examination and appointment. The same job qualifications hold and the same standards of performance are expected in both bureaus.

The district supervisor is in charge of parole services in seventeen counties and the supervision of eight parole officers. He carries a caseload of 106 which is a job requiring 2.12 men. In addition to this caseload, he and his staff are required to make pre-parole field investigations, job placements, job checks, and emergency contacts. One assistant has a caseload of ninety-two which according to NPPA standards requires 1.84 men and the other has a caseload of eighty-two which could meet service standards with 1.66 men. The parole service is both constructive and protective community-wise.

CHAPTER IX

CASE RECORDING

The Statutes clearly signify that there should be a complete and accurate record kept of all cases which flow through the various courts. With the loads the court workers are carrying, it is very difficult to keep adequate records. In certain problem cases, or in matters of urgency, the dictated record seems to be more complete. In most instances, however, there is a chronological form of recording. There is little or no uniformity in the method of recording in the local agency case records. The State and Federal agencies have achieved a better quality of summary recording which tends to become process at times.

Officers on the state level are required to meet certain standards of recording which are set up somewhat formally in directives from the office at Lansing. The field report in parole must contain full details about the offender's proposed home, his job, the physical surrounds, the likelihood of his success in the community in which he plans to live, and many other details which are not only pertinent but essential if the parolee is to be launched into his new situation with success. Home calls which are made monthly and job checks which are accomplished bi-monthly are likewise

recorded clearly so that the details of "the process" are ascertainable, at least in part.

Again on the state level, the probation worker is required in his pre-sentence investigation to include all salient details of a defendant's social history. In addition to factual information, the probation presentence must contain an evaluation of the individual as a person, his view of himself, his thoughts in respect to his home situation, work, leisure-time activities, and a complete analysis of how the offender estimates his own rehabilitation potential if probation is extended.

A major fault in recording in some of the agencies on the state and local levels can be attributed to heavy caseloads. Because of excessive caseloads, caseworkers frequently record only in part and rely on memory for material which should have been formally recorded. Consequently the continuity of records is destroyed and follow-up work is impaired.

Case records were not examined for this survey but the attitudes toward recording were discussed with individual workers and the foregoing conclusions seem true and fair. Good recording could be a measure for judging the needs of staff as well as the quality of staff function. Some calls are made on clients which are never recorded. It was noticed in the discussion of record making that inadequacy of stenographic help was at least part of the cause for a failure to dictate records covering the facts. If casework techniques are introduced and used by all workers, there must be an increase in clerical staff.

CHAPTER X

FINDINGS

A review of the work done by the several court systems which have jurisdiction in Grand Rapids and Kent County in terms of the NPPA standards shows some deficiencies, quantitative and qualitative. This study has had as a chief interest the caseloads of court workers in Kent County and Grand Rapids. A secondary concern has been the educational background with which the court workers come to the job. Although additional court needs in service have been suggested in the process of this survey, they are not in direct line with the subject matter covered and they have been considered, therefore, subject, for further investigation.

Caseloads

Caseloads in all of the courts studies are heavier than the load recommended as maximum by NPPA.¹ Within the past few years there has been a movement toward the employment of larger staffs, but there has been, also, an increase in numbers of court cases, so that workloads remain proportionately heavy. This condition is especially evident in Grand Rapids Superior Court, where there is a need for three additional workers, if NPPA standards are to obtain.

¹See Appendix D.

Educational Preparation

Lack of educational preparation and seeming disinterest in on-the-job training programs constitute a serious blocking of the hoped-for acceptance of social casework methods in the treatment of offenders. While movement in this direction is looked upon as necessary by correctional authorities it will be achieved only gradually as the notion of educational preparation is accepted. At present, most court workers in the area studied look upon casework skills and techniques as non-essential to court work. One federal worker, one probation officer, and two juvenile workers have degrees in social work. This total of four constitutes less than ten per cent of the court workers now employed. Some have college degrees and some have wide experience but the individual qualifications do not meet the NPPA educational qualification standard used as a norm.

Supervision

Supervision of workers at the professional and administrative levels is about non-existent in Grand Rapids and Kent County courts.¹ Workers arrange schedules and do the job without the benefit of formal consultation. This manner of operation reflects the lack of use of social casework methods as part of court procedure.

¹Federal and state workers are supervised but not at casework level.

Additional Findings

The Police and Municipal Courts handle a large number of offenders and a wide variety of problems. Crime is viewed in these courts in its incipient stage, and the need for extensive social casework service is obvious. These courts receive and process many first offenders and they also handle the chronic type of misdemeanor. There is a definite need for screening, history-making and evaluation by competent professional workers in cases of this type.

Records

The law requires that there be a complete and accurate case record for each probationers. Since the inferior Courts have not the needed probation service, no records are kept. Some of the courts use a chronological-contact type of entry, with no diagnosis, evaluation or summary. Where state workers are involved in supervision, record-making approaches the desirable quality.

Statistics

Several court agencies keep a variety of statistics, which may be used to point up some of the successes and failures of court work. There is, however, no over-all plan nor conformity so that a composite is impossible to achieve. At this time there is no way to ascertain, statistically, paths which should be followed toward improved services.

Psychiatric Service

Offenders who are in need of psychiatric service must rely upon family or relative support through this oftentimes expensive period of observation. If treatment is suggested, the courts has neither plan nor financial arrangement to offer outside of the prisons.

Family-Centered-Problems

Family relation problems, which affect many innocent individuals, are handled chiefly in Superior and Circuit Courts, although some of the examinations of such problems are made in Municipal and Police Courts. There is an urgent need for a court social service to meet the problems of families directly or indirectly affected by the advent of crime into the home.

CHAPTER XI

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Because of excessively heavy caseloads and the resultant inadequacy in service and record keeping, it is recommended that at least fifteen officers be added to the probation and parole staffs of agencies serving the courts of Grand Rapids and Kent County.

2. Immediate steps should be taken to arrange on-the-job training courses and additional formal education. Some combination of the two is essential if all the present staff are to reach the NPPA minimum qualifications and thus be prepared to offer better service. The in-service program should be arranged so that the professional staff members might have access to some of the current literature in the field and a better knowledge of case work practices in general.

3. As there seems to be no supervision of workers other than at the federal and state level, it is believed that supervisory personnel should be provided to direct staff and to review problems and records of field workers. The casework supervisor should be selected on the basis of training, background, and knowledge concerning treatment in the authoritarian setting. Seniority in this area should not outweigh aptitude and training. The supervisor should have, in addition to administrative ability, a mastery of social work techniques and methods.

4. The lack of probation service in two major courts dealing with family problems, Police and Municipal Courts, indicates the need for a county-wide social service to which these courts might make referrals. A large number of cases in Police Court have behavior implications. There should be a thorough screening of chronic cases so that persons who might later become active in crime could be helped to an adjustment and the prevention of personal tragedy attendant on criminal activity.

5. It is urged that case recording be recognized as an essential method of casework and that it be fully utilized by all probation and parole services.

6. It is necessary that statistics be kept in all of the agencies serving the courts. At the present time statistics are kept at the State Probation and Parole Office, the Federal Probation and Parole Office and the City Attorney's Office. It is necessary to know the needs of the various court agencies through the review of useable statistical material.

7. Psychiatric service should be available for the use of all court agencies. Disturbed persons who come before the courts should have the benefit of medical observation and psychiatric opinion before final disposition. All of the courts are in need of a centralized psychiatric service to which cases could be referred and from which reports could be available for use by the judges.

8. Problems involving family relations such as divorce, separate maintenance, non-support, bastardy, contributing to

delinquency of a minor, cruelty to children, and abandonment are handled by both Circuit and Superior Courts. Also some of these matters are examined in Municipal and Police Courts. Police Court disposes of cases involving neglect and contributing to the delinquency of minors. It is believed that social services which meet the needs of families in difficulty might be provided in one of four ways:

(a.) Separate social service departments might be established in each court handling family problems. This would not involve alteration of jurisdiction or enabling legislation. It would mean, however, additional staff in Circuit and Superior Courts to afford casework services to Friend of the Court and casework staff in Police and Municipal Courts.

(b.) Another possibility is to create an integrated family court which would centralize jurisdiction in one court. The latter course would necessitate statutory change, but if the need were proved great enough, it is possible that legislation could be initiated to create an integrated court of domestic relations. However, it probably would be unrealistic to consider establishing such a court for Kent County alone. The pattern, if accepted, should obtain throughout the state.

(c.) A third alternative would be to transfer some types of cases such as neglect, contributing to the delinquency of a minor and illegitimacy to the Probate

Court, leaving divorce, separate maintenance and non-support cases in the Circuit and Superior Courts. If this plan is pursued, the geographical basis should remain as it is at present, but existing social services in these courts should be strengthened to permit a full scale casework program, including marital counselling and systematic referral, for persons with family-centered-problems.

(d.) A fourth and preferable method would be to proceed as in (c) above, but to create two county social service departments. One would be a probation department which would serve Circuit, Superior, Police, and Municipal Courts. The other, a domestic relations department offering social services to the same courts in family-centered, non-criminal matters, but including criminal non-support and the payment of alimony.

Concluding Statement

The standards of the NPPA represent a consensus of responsible leaders in the field of corrections. These standards are, therefore, entitled to respect as the product of broad professional experience in the field both as to the maximum caseload which may be safely supervised by a trained worker and as to the minimum education qualifications which that worker must bring to the complex human behavior problems he handles. NPPA standards have been evolved from a wide geographic survey of experience, tested by a critical staff

analysis, and supported by the conclusions of the NPPA Professional Council. In a study such as this these standards form a sound foundation upon which to measure court social services in any state or community.

It is perhaps significant to observe that to this time the social seriousness of each particular crime is the sole condition which results in the employment of court social services. Social misconduct must reach the proportions of that which we have legislatively defined a felony before the individual is exposed to any inquiry concerning his environment, heritage, education, moral training or any of the social pressures which make the offender what he is. To cling to this archaic rule as the sole criterion of need for treatment is to ignore the vast fields of petty crime and misdemeanor which may reflect in many cases social maladjustment of more serious import to the community. It is at this level that the most effective and far-reaching benefits of court social services could be rendered. The general lack of awareness of what should be a basic target of court social services, namely, reaching the disordered individual at the first point of deviation, seems to have caused the apathy and indifference to this fundamental social need. Since the attitudes of our social institutions, including the courts, are the products of community thought, the initial recognition of the need for court social service in the so-called inferior courts, must come from thoughtful study by

community leaders, citizen's advisory groups, and such others equipped to give impetus to public consciousness.

The material in this survey and the findings were used as part of larger study of community social resources. This inquiry has pointed up directions for additional studies and community action. General awareness of the judicial case-load, inadequate court staffs, absence of statistical analyses, poor physical facilities, and the paucity of individual case histories are factors which could be easily overcome by determined community effort.

Of equal importance for further study, but perhaps not so easily solved, are those problems initiating attitudes toward the treatment process, quality and standards of supervision and a planned psychiatric program. Legislative attention should be focused on minimum standards of education and the personal qualities of those who are working with human maladjustment. The corrective process will function at its optimum efficiency only when it is extended to and fully reaches the individual at his first point of departure from acceptable social conduct.

TABLE I

PEOPLE WITH PROBLEMS REQUIRING COURT SOCIAL SERVICES

Types of Problems	Circuit Court	Superior Court	Municipal Court	Police Court	Probate Court	Juv. Div.
Adoptions						D
Abandonment	D	D	E	E		
Bastardy	D		E	E		
Contributing to the Delinquency of a Minor			D	D		
Contributing to the Dependency and Neglect of a Minor			D	D		65
Cruelty to Children	D	D	E	E		
Divorce	D	D				
Enforced Support of a Relative	A					D
Non-Support	D	D	D*	D*		
Reciprocal Support Act	D					
Separate Maintenance	D	D				

D--Disposed (Final Court Action)

D*--May be disposed of as wisdemeanor in this court.

E--Examined (Review and analysis of case prior to disposition by court.)

A--Appeal (From prior ruling)

TABLE II

ADULT AND JUVENILE OFFENDERS FROM ARREST TO DISPOSITION

Type of Case	Detection	Initial Court Procedure	Court Jurisdiction	Disposition
Adult Felony** Occurring in Kent County but not Grand Rapids	Sheriff's Dept.	Municipal Ct. Prosecutor- Warrant	Circuit	Prison; Pro- bation; Acquittal; Jail; Fine
Adult Felony Occurring in City of Grand Rapids	Police Ct. Detective Bureau	Police Court	Superior Court	Prison; Pro- bation; Acquittal Jail; Fine
Adult Felony Occurring Elsewhere	F.B.I.; Police; Sheriff	U.S. Marshall Jury Indict- ment	Federal Court	Prison; Probation; Acquittal; Fine
Probate Court Juvenile Div. Delinquent Children	Sheriff Police Welfare	Hearing	Probate Court Juvenile Division	Released; Family; Foster Home; Institu- tion (Welfare)
Probate Court Juvenile Div. (Delinquent)*	Sheriff Police	Hearing	Probate Court Juvenile Div.	Probation; De- tention; Poster Home; Institu- tion; family
Juvenile Parole	Released from Institution	Plans: Institu- tion and Proba- tion Officer	Probate Court Juvenile Div.	Aim: Adjust- ment Failure: Return to institution

* The Juvenile Authorities may waive the young offender, fifteen or older, to an adult court at the Probate Judge's discretion.

** A felony in any criminal offense punishable by a year or more in prison.

APPENDIX A

Sample Questionnaire--Study of Kent County Court Procedures

I. Agency - Personnel Data

- (1) Name _____ (2) Agency _____
- (3) Title of Present Position _____
- (4) Date of Present Appointment _____
- (5) How was appointment made? _____
- (6) Previous Experience in Social Work or Related Fields
- (1) _____
- (2) _____
- (3) _____
- (7) Present Salary _____ (8) Starting Salary _____
- (9) Highschool (Circle one) 1 2 3 4 Degrees _____
- (10) What are the agency qualifications for this job?
- Minimum qualifications:
- (11) How is personnel obtained (Examination, Appointment, etc.)

II. Caseload under Supervision July 1, 1954 through June 30, 1955.

- (1) List number of cases (by month) under your supervision between July 1, 1954 and June 30, 1955.

Jan. Feb. Mar. Apr. May June

July Aug. Sept. Oct. Nov. Dec.

- (2) Total number of Investigations completed during this period.

Felony Misdemeanor Other

- (3) Total number of cases received during this period.
- (4) Total number of cases transferred out during this period.

APPENDIX B

Sample Interview Schedule

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Name of agency or organization reporting?
2. Address of central office in Grand Rapids?
3. Name of person interviewed?
4. What is the original purpose of this agency according to statute?
5. Have there been major changes in service since establishment?
6. What are the past agency services not now offered?
7. What is the present purpose of agency?
8. Are there limitations of functions or services with respect to creed, color, age, or sex?
9. What is the type and degree of interagency contacts?

PROGRAM

10. What services are offered?
11. Do you keep statistics concerning age, sex, numbers, religious affiliations and race of persons in relation to type of offense?
12. What are the intake procedures?
13. What basic considerations or problems must be met in planning and carrying out the kinds of services and activities you offer?
14. What are the changes in services or new services contemplated?
15. How do you determine community need for more services?

16. When was need last determined?
17. What group or groups of persons pointed up the need?
18. How do you see the role of the correctional agency in the community?
19. What is the relation of your program to other agency programs?
20. What agency resources are used?

Kinds of inter-agency contacts:

- (1) Referrals (turning over cases to other resources)
- (2) Follow-up or implementation contacts.
- (3) Consultation (contacts with other groups initiated by your agency for purpose of information, advice, or other, which do not require service from the other agency).
- (4) Other

21. How often do you make contacts?
22. Are your contacts adequate?
23. How are the resources of your agency used by other agencies and organizations?

Kinds of contacts:

- (1) Referrals
- (2) Follow-up or implementation contacts
- (3) Consultation?
- (4) Other

24. In what ways could other agencies and organizations make additional or better use of your services?
25. Does your agency belong to any local joint planning group or groups?
26. Describe such memberships or activities.
27. In what specific ways are there associations meaningful and helpful and in what ways could they be more so?

FACILITIES

28. What are the facilities used in the operation of your program?
29. What is the condition (age; needs for repairs, replacement, alterations; plans for repairs, replacement, alterations) of the facilities?
30. Are present facilities adequate in size for current program needs?
31. Are your facilities suitable or adaptable in relation to current program?
32. Are your facilities flexible enough to accomodate normal changes in activities or normal growth?
33. What are proposed changes in or additions to facilities or equipment needed to carry out proposed future program and the actual plans for changes?

PERSONNEL**First Ranking Executive**

34. Title, qualifications, Salary Range?
35. Who selects this person? How? Who gives final approval?
36. What standards of selection are used?
37. Are standards met?
38. Is there a present vacancy? If so, state reasons.
39. What are the assigned areas of function (job description)? What special functions are the prerogative of the executive only and what functions require approval of the board?
40. Number of years current executive has served in present position?

Assistant Executive

41. Who selects such assistant(s)? How? Who gives final approval?
42. What are the qualifications and salary range of the assistant executive?

43. What standards of selection are used?
44. Are the standards met?
45. What are the assigned areas of function of the assistant? What special functions, if any, are the prerogative of this person only, and what functions require the approval of his superior?
46. Number of years current assistant executive has served in present position?
47. Is there a vacancy? If so, state reasons.

Professional Staff

48. What positions are filled at all times?
49. What are the salary ranges for different positions and qualifications of the professional staff?
50. What standards are used?
51. Are standards met?
52. Are there any vacancies? If so, state reasons.
53. Number of years service with agency of current personnel (as professional)?

Non-Professional Staff

54. What positions are filled at all times?
55. What are salary ranges and qualifications for different positions?
56. Are there any vacancies? If so, state reasons.
57. Number of years current personnel has been with agency?

PERSONNEL PRACTICES

58. Do you have a 40 hour week?
59. Are promotions based on time and seniority?
60. Do you have regular increases in salary?
61. Do you have vacations, leaves of absence, retirement,

insurance plans, Social Security, Workman's Compensation or other employee benefits?

62. Do you have a manual for employees? If so, who devised it and how is it used?

Volunteer Personnel

63. Do you every use volunteer personnel?

RECORDS AND STATISTICS

64. What kinds of records are kept by your agency?
65. Who keeps them?
66. How are records kept? What is your practice regarding revision of records (in content and form)? How often do you look over records with view to possible revisions?
67. How long do you usually maintain each kind of record and what is your basis for this? How far back do records used in your current operation go?
68. What kind of records are confidential? Describe briefly policies governing confidentiality.
69. Describe uses made of each kind of records, such as: critical or analytical study of services, training of staff, budget considerations, publicity and public relations, etc.
70. What kinds of statistics are currently compiled by your agency? Is this practice elective or required? If required, by whom?
71. Who is responsible for compiling statistical material? How much time do they spend on it?
72. Who uses each kind of statistics and for what purposes? How frequently? Are they published? By whom, and to whom distributed?
73. How far back does each kind of statistics go?
74. Does your agency use the Social Service Exchange? If so, in what ways? Do you have a contractual agreement with the Exchange?
75. What are your regular practices with regard to:

- (1) Clearings (for information only, or clearings and registrations)?
- (2) Registrations (new cases only, identified, or clearings and registrations)?
- (3) Special services (e.g. Holiday Bureau, Camp clearings and registrations, Exchange Club Shoe and Rubber Project, etc.)?

APPENDIX C

**NATIONAL PROBATION and PAROLE ASSOCIATION
Midwestern Office**

**Hugh P. Reed
Director**

1601 Halsted Street
Chicago Heights, Illinois
Telephone: skyline 4-6623

March 1, 1956

**Mr. Paul Moore
Agency Self-Evaluation Project
Grand Rapids Council of Social Agencies
Association of Commerce Building
Grand Rapids, Michigan**

Dear Mr. Moore:

In 1953 the Council of Social Agencies in Kent County and the City of Grand Rapids authorized a self-evaluation of the Health, Welfare, and Recreation services in the community. By the middle of 1955, factual data had been collected. At that time a number of "experts" were called in as consultants. Very little information had been obtained on the correctional area, therefore, the National Probation and Parole Association asked me, as Midwest Director and consultant in this area, to compile information and submit findings and recommendations.

Fortunately, at this time, an experienced, mature, state probation officer, S. Jerome Roach, was seeking a thesis project, in order to complete his requirements for a Master's degree in Social Work at Michigan State University. The material in this report has been compiled, analyzed, organized and the report written by Mr. Roach under my supervision. I accept the responsibility for the suggested recommendations contained herein.

I am certain that the devoted interest shown by you and the members of your committee during this study will result in a substantial stride forward in the correctional field in the immediate future. You may be assured of the Association's continued interest in service to the people of Kent County and Grand Rapids.

Yours truly,

NATIONAL PROBATION & PAROLE ASS'N.

HPR:mia

Hugh P. Reed, Director

APPENDIX D

NATIONAL PROBATION AND PAROLE ASSOCIATION
Midwestern Office. Hugh P. Reed, Director

1601 Halsted Street
Chicago Heights, Illinois

August 14, 1956

Mr. Jerome Roach
540 Shirley, N.E.
Grand Rapids, Michigan

Dear Jerry:

I will do my best to answer the questions raised by your thesis committee. . . .

To start from the beginning, in 1948 a "Special Crime Study Commission" was appointed in California by the governor. This commission appointed several subcommittees, each charged with studying a phase of the administration of criminal justice. One of these committees was the committee for the study of probation services in California, and John Schapps, our western director, was chairman of this committee. Other members there were Ronald Beattie (Research Director for the Department of Corrections), F. Harold Butterfield, Heman Stark (now director of the Youth Authority), Walter Stone (now director of the Bureau of Parole), and Malcolm E. Harris, Secretary. While John's official connection with this study was chairman of the committee, I know that a great deal of the field work was done by John Schapps and Milt Rector of our western office and that much of the report was written by them. Time has obscured my memory concerning the planning of this study and I do not have a complete set of the questionnaires and schedules which were used.

A report of this study was issued on June 30, 1949. For the first time, to my knowledge, in this report the device of estimating staff needs on the basis of work units was used. Pre-hearing and Pre-sentence investigations were given a rating of five work units while each supervision case was given a rating of one unit.

I do not know how they arrived at these figures or whether they were validated. However, it was obvious to the staff of the Association that the basing of staff needs on the amount of work to be done was a very sensible approach and one which could be readily interpreted to administrators and appropriating bodies. We therefore have, in most of our studies since

that date, used this method of estimating staff needs. Subsequent to that time the weighting, units and this method of computing staff has been approved by Professional Council members. Our Professional Council is composed of approximately 100 of the better probation and parole administrators in this country. Their approval was based upon opinion and their knowledge of the amount of work involved in the usual department.

In using this ratio of one to five work units, we have merely said that in any given month five times more work is involved in making a pre-sentence investigation than in supervising an active case. We recognize this as a rough yardstick and one which must be qualified when we encounter a department which has substantial duties other than the investigation and supervision of probationers, such as the Ohio courts, which also make financial ability and custody investigations, or some of the western states which place children, certify eligibility for ADC, etc. We also recognize that the standard as used by us does not take into account the geographic area covered by an officer of a department, the qualifications of staff, or their ability to work with a small case load, etc.

As indicated, we have always recognized that our work load standard is not the last word and, in fact, at our last annual meeting the Professional Council approved the appointment of a committee to study this very problem and we have funds available which will make possible a study which should include validation of the conclusions. Despite the crude nature of the standard, we have observed from its application that it is probably close to what it should be. In the state system in Wisconsin the officers carry an average supervision caseload of 42 cases plus investigations. The supervision case load includes juveniles while confined in the state training schools as the officers are expected to maintain contact with these children while in the institution. With good leadership and the employment of fully trained personnel, Wisconsin has found that case loads of this size, which correspond to our standard, are all that an officer can handle. We feel at this time that if our standard errs in any way it is in the direction of being too high. Again the quality of personnel enters into this. I know of one department that has experienced a dramatic increase in personnel since our survey but has not grown proportionately in providing qualified supervision to this increased staff. While the officers have smaller case loads, they do not know what to do with them, and therefore we are beginning to hear complaints about them not having enough to do. On the other side of the coin I know of a juvenile court with which we have worked and which has its work loads down to 50 units per officer, and they feel that this work load is too high. In that situation the juvenile court only accepts aggravated behavior problems which come

within its jurisdiction, referring others to county welfare or private agencies. This means that they do not have any cases on which they can coast. They therefore feel that 35 work units is all that they should have.

In answer to the question, where have they been accepted or practiced, I can state that a number of juvenile courts have case loads which approximate our standard, but to my knowledge very few adult departments meet this goal. While my information is not current, I do know that several years ago the Adult Probation Department, Court of General Sessions, New York, averaged 35 supervision cases and, as previously mentioned, Wisconsin has case loads which meet the standard. Many other courts where we have worked, while they have not met the goal which we have set, have gained additional staff and lower caseloads. The state system in Michigan is a classic example of these, where your state probation program has increased from 17 to 69 officers in two or three years, but the case loads are still far above what they should be because, as I recall, Michigan, at the time of the study, needed over 200 additional officers.

I hope that the above will be of some help to you. . . .

Kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

Hugh P. Reed

NATIONAL PROBATION AND PAROLE ASSOCIATION
John Schapps, Western Director.

821 Market St.--829 Pacific Bldg.
San Francisco 3, California

September 18, 1956

Mr. S. Jerome Roach
540 Shirley St., N.E.
Grand Rapids, Michigan

Dear Mr. Roach:

.

In any event, the fact of the matter is that the time-honored case load of 50 maximum was a long-standing "fixture" with NPPA when I joined the staff some years ago. The details of its establishment as well as the move to substitute 50 units for 50 cases (at 5 units per investigation: 1 unit for supervision) is best known and best recorded in the files of our home offices where staff, Professional Council, Board of Trustees and other stand-setting groups are centered.

.

Very sincerely,

John Schapps
Western Director

NATIONAL PROBATION AND PAROLE ASSOCIATION
1790 Broadway, New York 19, New York

September 21, 1956

Mr. S. Jerome Roach
540 Shirley St., N.E.
Grand Rapids, Michigan

Dear Mr. Roach:

I have received a memorandum from John Schapps, director of our western office, asking for material on NPPA's approach to workload standard. I assume this refers to the workloads of probation officers.

In 1923 a standard of 50 cases was suggested in a publication Juvenile Court Standards issued by the National Probation Association and the Children's Bureau. I do not believe any documented controlled study was made upon which the statement was based. The key words are "not more than 50 cases should be under the supervision of one probation officer at any one time." In other words this is not a statement that 50 cases may generally be carried successfully by a probation office, but rather that a probation officer can not carry more than 50 cases successfully.

If anything, the suggested standard of 50 is higher than it should be but undoubtedly anything less than that would not have been realistic. For example Will C. Turnbull in an article in May 1954 Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science pointed out that if the probation officer's job is analyzed a caseload of 25 may be nearer the reality in terms of casework efforts. He wrote as follows:

If probation is to approach its optimum use and if it is to provide the full measure of protection to the public, we must establish case-load standards through a realistic appraisal of the duties and responsibilities of the probation officer toward the convicted offender and the time and working conditions required to perform these duties effectively. Certainly the probation officer, working on an individual basis with offenders, should be able to devote at least thirty or forty minutes a week to each probationer and a similar amount of time to case-related contacts such as the family, relatives, clergymen, employers, and other agency representatives who can re-enforce the probationer in his community adjustment. When to this we add the

time consumed in travel, minimum administrative detail, participation in training, and the cultivation of neighborhood and community resources, it is obvious that the probation officer has a full-time job with a case load of twenty-five probationers. While this degree of intensity of service and treatment is not required for all offenders, we should not continue to permit such a rationale to justify the prevailing situation.

The limitations of any dogmatic statement of caseload standards are evident when we consider the factors which enter into variation in caseload. Some but not all of the variants would be--the training and experience of the office, the kinds of cases assigned, the density of cases within a geographic area, the degree of supervision required, the level of seriousness of the offense, etc.

I hope this is of some use to you. If there is anything else, would you let me know. We would be very much interested in having a copy of your study when it is completed, for our library.

Sincerely yours,

Sol Rubin
Counsel

NATIONAL PROBATION AND PAROLE ASSOCIATION
1790 Broadway, New York 19, New York

October 11, 1956

Mr. S. Jerome Roach
 540 Shirley Avenue
 Grand Rapids, Michigan

Dear Mr. Roach:

This is in reply to your inquiry regarding probation caseload standards.

On the basis of the experience of the staff members of NPPA and its Professional Council, consisting of leading practitioners in corrections, we have adopted certain standards in the conduct of scores of surveys of courts and departments throughout the country. With respect to caseload and work units, we apply the standard of 50 cases under supervision as the maximum acceptable load for a properly qualified officer applying recognized work techniques. This is based on typical caseloads. A specialized caseload involving intensive treatment cannot be as high at 50. Other factors, such as geographical territory, prevalence or lack of other resources in the community, quality of supervision, clerical help and others, may affect the caseload which can be carried, again rendering a caseload of 50 excessive.

Again based on this experience we have considered a presentence investigation as the equivalent in work load to 3 to 5 cases under supervision, the variation being related to the type of cases under investigation, and other staff assistance available or not.

These standards have been found to be valid in operation and in their use in our surveys.

Sincerely yours,

Will C. Turnbladh
 (Director of NPPA)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Agency Self-Evaluation Project." Council of Social Agencies of Grand Rapids and Kent County, 1954.

Annual Report, 1954. Grand Rapids Police Department. 25 pp.

Annual Report of the Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1954. 249 pp.

Dunbar, Willis Frederick, Ph.D. Michigan Through the Centuries, Vols. I, II. New York: Lewis Historical Publishing Company, Inc., 1955.

"Family Board Homes" Rules and Regulations for Inspection and Licensing. State of Michigan, Department of Social Welfare, 1955. 11 pp.

"Federal Prisons, 1954"; A report of the Work of the Federal Bureau of Prisons. Leavenworth Kansas: Department of Justice, Bureau of Prisons, 1955. 105 pp.

Hiller, Francis H. Probation in the Municipal Court, Toledo, Ohio. New York: National Probation and Parole Association, 1952. 44 pp.

Lamberts, Austin (Mrs.). Unpublished report on the Children's Services and Kent County Juvenile Home, 1956. 14 pp.

Larzelere, Claude S. Government of Michigan. Hillsdale, Michigan, 1952.

Michigan, Statutes Annotated, Constitution (1903), Art. VII, sec. 1.

Michigan, Compiled Laws (1948). Probate Code, Juveniles and Juvenile Division. Chapter 712-A.

Michigan, Statutes Annotated, General Statute.

Montgomery, D. H. The Leading Facts of American History. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1917.

Norman, Sherwood. The Detention and Shelter of Children in Kent County (Grand Rapids) Michigan. New York: National Probation and Parole Association, 1955. 23 pp.

the first of these is the fact that the
the second is the fact that the
the third is the fact that the
the fourth is the fact that the
the fifth is the fact that the
the sixth is the fact that the
the seventh is the fact that the
the eighth is the fact that the
the ninth is the fact that the
the tenth is the fact that the
the eleventh is the fact that the
the twelfth is the fact that the
the thirteenth is the fact that the
the fourteenth is the fact that the
the fifteenth is the fact that the
the sixteenth is the fact that the
the seventeenth is the fact that the
the eighteenth is the fact that the
the nineteenth is the fact that the
the twentieth is the fact that the
the twenty-first is the fact that the
the twenty-second is the fact that the
the twenty-third is the fact that the
the twenty-fourth is the fact that the
the twenty-fifth is the fact that the
the twenty-sixth is the fact that the
the twenty-seventh is the fact that the
the twenty-eighth is the fact that the
the twenty-ninth is the fact that the
the thirtieth is the fact that the
the thirty-first is the fact that the
the thirty-second is the fact that the
the thirty-third is the fact that the
the thirty-fourth is the fact that the
the thirty-fifth is the fact that the
the thirty-sixth is the fact that the
the thirty-seventh is the fact that the
the thirty-eighth is the fact that the
the thirty-ninth is the fact that the
the fortieth is the fact that the
the forty-first is the fact that the
the forty-second is the fact that the
the forty-third is the fact that the
the forty-fourth is the fact that the
the forty-fifth is the fact that the
the forty-sixth is the fact that the
the forty-seventh is the fact that the
the forty-eighth is the fact that the
the forty-ninth is the fact that the
the fiftieth is the fact that the
the fifty-first is the fact that the
the fifty-second is the fact that the
the fifty-third is the fact that the
the fifty-fourth is the fact that the
the fifty-fifth is the fact that the
the fifty-sixth is the fact that the
the fifty-seventh is the fact that the
the fifty-eighth is the fact that the
the fifty-ninth is the fact that the
the sixtieth is the fact that the
the sixty-first is the fact that the
the sixty-second is the fact that the
the sixty-third is the fact that the
the sixty-fourth is the fact that the
the sixty-fifth is the fact that the
the sixty-sixth is the fact that the
the sixty-seventh is the fact that the
the sixty-eighth is the fact that the
the sixty-ninth is the fact that the
the seventieth is the fact that the
the seventy-first is the fact that the
the seventy-second is the fact that the
the seventy-third is the fact that the
the seventy-fourth is the fact that the
the seventy-fifth is the fact that the
the seventy-sixth is the fact that the
the seventy-seventh is the fact that the
the seventy-eighth is the fact that the
the seventy-ninth is the fact that the
the eightieth is the fact that the
the eighty-first is the fact that the
the eighty-second is the fact that the
the eighty-third is the fact that the
the eighty-fourth is the fact that the
the eighty-fifth is the fact that the
the eighty-sixth is the fact that the
the eighty-seventh is the fact that the
the eighty-eighth is the fact that the
the eighty-ninth is the fact that the
the ninetieth is the fact that the
the ninety-first is the fact that the
the ninety-second is the fact that the
the ninety-third is the fact that the
the ninety-fourth is the fact that the
the ninety-fifth is the fact that the
the ninety-sixth is the fact that the
the ninety-seventh is the fact that the
the ninety-eighth is the fact that the
the ninety-ninth is the fact that the
the hundredth is the fact that the

- 'Professional Standards Endorsed by the Federal Probation Officer's Association. 1956. (William C. Nau, Chairman, Professional Standards Committee.)
- Reed, Hugh P. and McDivitt, C. Boyd. "Report of Brief Survey of Kent County Juvenile Court." Part I. New York: National Probation and Parole Association, July 1955.
- Reed, Hugh P., et al. Adult Probation and Parole in Michigan. New York: National Probation and Parole Association, 1954.
- 'Social Services of the Circuit Court.' County of Muskegon, Bureau of Probation, State Department of Corrections, Michigan. October, 1945.
- "Michigan Juvenile Court Reporting 1945-54." Tenth Anniversary Issue. Department of Social Welfare, in cooperation with the Michigan Probate Judges Association.
- "The Judicial System from the Earliest Colonial Period to the Present Time," Magazine of Western History, Vol. IV, 1886.
- Virtue, Maxine Boord. Basic Structure for Children's Services in Michigan. Ann Arbor: The American Judicature Society for the James Foster Foundation, 1956.
- Virtue, Maxine Boord. Survey of Metropolitan Courts, Detroit Area. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Law School, 1950.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



3 1293 03196 7619