

Elements of an EB Violation Policy

- One size does not fit all
 - Adjusted level of risk
 - Severity of violation
 - Nature of the Condition: Treatment or Control
 - Extent of Prior Compliance
- Graduated continuum of both sanctions and services
- Swift, certain, and proportionate sanctions for technical violations
 - Administrative sanctions policy allowing flexibility by the probation department
- Incentives for compliance
 - 4 rewards for every sanction

Revocations: rationale & research		
Concept	Rationale	Research
Certainty	Increased certainty deters future deviance	Grasmack & Bryjak, 1980; Nichols & Ross, 1990; Paternoster, 1989
Celerity	Reduced violations when reduce time delay	Rhine, 1993
Consistency	Similar decisions increase compliance	Paternoster, Brame, Bachman, & Sherman, 1997
Parsimony	No punishment that is more intrusive than necessary	Tonry, 1996
Proportionality	Commensurate with severity of behavior	Von Hirsch, 1993
Progressiveness	Continued violations increase response	Altschuler & Armstrong, 1994
Neutrality	Responses viewed as impartial and logical	Burke, 1997

How violations of conditions of supervision and probation revocations are handled has major implications for reducing risk of reoffense (as well as the use of limited jail and prison space and budget resources.) Social learning theory, research, and procedural fairness (discussed later) suggest that certain justice system responses should be applied to behaviors that violate conditions of supervision. In an article entitled *Graduated Sanctions: Stepping Into Accountable Systems And Offenders* by Faye Taxman, Ph.D., published in *Prison Journal*, 1999, 79(2): 182-205, the key principles are listed as guidance for the court when addressing violation and revocation matters.