

95373

THE 1984 CENSUS OF ADULT
STATE CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES:
RATIONALE AND ISSUES FOR INCLUSION

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

Public Domain

Bureau of Justice Statistics

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

PHYLLIS JO BAUNACH, Ph.D.

Statistician

Bureau of Justice Statistics

July, 1983

1. Background of the Census of Adult State Correctional Facilities

The first Census of State Correctional Facilities was conducted among approximately 600 facilities in January, 1974, for LEAA. The information obtained in this Census includes type and security status of institution, population size, age of physical plant, staff complement, payroll and operating expenses, and programs and services provided. This information was presented in an Advance Report published in July, 1975, (Census, 1975).

The second Census of State Adult Correctional Facilities was conducted in November, 1979, among roughly 568 secure confinement facilities and 223 community-based facilities. The variables collected in this Census included security classification of facility; functions of facility; rated capacity; inmate count as of November 14, 1979; number of inmates by security classification and race and sex; veterans status of inmates; confinement space; nature of programs, employment (ie., nature of position by payroll status; race of staff by payroll status); level of health care evaluation provided to inmates; nature of medical facilities; number of inmates on medication; and number of inmate deaths during calendar year 1978. To date, there have been no publications specifically devoted to these data.

Both of these Censuses were conducted in tandem with the Survey of inmates of Adult State Correctional Facilities. Presumably, the rationale for conducting these two efforts simultaneously was twofold: (a) to enable a linkage between the Census and Survey data bases; and (b) to allow for weighting the Survey data by the universe of inmates as represented in the Censuses. However, to date, there has been no systematic attempt to link the two data bases. Moreover, as discussed at a previous review panel with American Statistical Association members, it may be more beneficial in selecting the

95373

sample for the Survey to conduct the Census at least one year in advance. The need for weighting Survey data is then eliminated and staff time may be concentrated on the development of the Census and Survey one at a time, rather than jointly and more hastily. Thus, the 1984 Census will vary from previous efforts in that it will be conducted a year before the Survey of Inmates of State Correctional Facilities. Census data will then be used to draw the sample for the Survey.

The following pages present a rationale, objectives and specific questions to be addressed in the 1984 Census of State Adult Correctional Facilities.¹ The questions are framed as they relate to major issues in corrections today. In this sense, this paper defines the boundaries of the Census in terms of its relevance in obtaining information which will be useful to policy-makers, practitioners, researchers and academicians. In addition, the questions posed reflect, to some extent, an interest in updating information collected in prior Census efforts to enable an analysis of changes over time.

Finally, there may be additional issues of importance to the corrections field that should be addressed in the upcoming Census that have not been mentioned herein. The reader is thus invited to submit for consideration, additional such issues along with a rationale for their inclusion and specific questions to be raised and analysis approaches to be used. Please send this information along with comments on the proposed Census no later than August 30, 1983 to:

Phyllis Jo Baunach, Ph.D.
Bureau of Justice Statistics
Room 1158-D
633 Indiana Avenue N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20531

Phone: 202/724-7759 or 7760

¹The Census of State Adult Correctional Facilities is hereafter referred to as the Facilities Census or simply the Census

II. Why Study the Institutions?: Census Objectives

Within recent years there has been a dramatic increase in the numbers of men and women incarcerated in prisons across the country. For instance, in 1981, there was a 12.5% increase (roughly 40,000 inmates), in the incarcerated population, the largest increase in the nation's history (Gardner, 1982: 6; Minor - Harper, 1982: 1). Similarly, in 1982 there was an 11.6% increase in the prison population size, bringing the total of incarcerated persons well over 412,000 (Minor - Harper, 1983: 1; Gettinger, 1983: 6). These staggering increases in the size of the incarcerated population have exacerbated already crowded prisons throughout the country, and have stimulated resounding cries for additional reforms in sentencing policies, ceilings on prison population sizes, greater use of alternatives to incarceration and, among a more conservative faction, more prison construction.

In planning for much needed reforms in the corrections processing and handling of offenders, some have argued for a need to "selectively identify" (Montilla and Harlow, 1979: 28) the problems to be addressed. An accurate identification of problems such as housing and controlling inmates and of points to be made in the hotly debated prison construction issue (Sherman and Hawkins, 1981), begins with a clear understanding of both the inmate and environment within which he lives.

Since the Census concentrates on a profile of the facilities, the unit of analysis is the institution, not the inmate. Companion BJS programs consider the inmates more fully; these programs include the Survey of Inmates of State Correctional Facilities, the Annual Prisoner Counts and Admissions and Releases. Taken collectively, BJS corrections programs provide information on both inmates and their environment.

Within this framework, the primary purpose of the Census is to describe the facilities housing inmates under the jurisdiction of the state. This Census has been and remains the only source of comprehensive information about state correctional facilities nationwide. More specifically, the objectives of the Census are as follows:

(1) To obtain and update a profile of characteristics of facilities that house primarily inmates who are under the jurisdiction of the state². This profile will be used, in part, to assess changes in the nature and characteristics of these facilities on factors related to inmate population size; capacity and confinement conditions; institutional programs; and staffing patterns.

(2) To obtain information on major issues of concern to the corrections community related to facilities that may be of importance during one time period. For instance, in the past, BJS collected information on inmates as veterans and on specific aspects of health care evaluation afforded inmates in state correctional facilities. However, these issues appear of less importance for the current Census.

(3) To provide public use data tapes for use by interested practitioners, planners, academicians and researchers through the Criminal Justice Archive and Information Network (CJAIN) at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

With a focus on the collection and dissemination of information about facilities, the purpose of the Census is not to make moral judgments or declare policies about, for instance, the appropriateness of construction or the standards for prison cell size.

²A more complete definition of the facilities to be included in the universe is discussed in Section III. A.2.

Rather, the purpose is to gather accurate information about current conditions that may be used by administrators, practitioners, and planners in making informed policy decisions in their own jurisdictions and by researchers in their examination of specific corrections issues. In this sense, the Census data provide a national picture of the prison environment, a backdrop against which decision-makers may gauge the conditions of their own jurisdictions relative to the rest of the country. This information may thus be used at the federal, state and local levels to assess existing conditions within state correctional facilities and the need for change.

III. Issues in the Development of the 1984 Census

In developing the 1984 Census, there are a number of issues that must be resolved in terms of the methodology, topics for inclusion and analysis approaches. The following sections address each of these issue areas separately:

A. Methodology

(1) Definition of the Universe: Background:

Issue: How should the universe of facilities be defined to provide the most accurate and comprehensive picture of facilities housing inmates under state jurisdiction and to be compatible with previous Census efforts?

The 1974 and 1979 Censuses used different definitions of the universe. The 1974 universe included facilities that were:

1. operational on January 31, 1974;
2. administratively capable of providing a unique inmate count, staffing pattern, payroll figure, and budgetary information; and
3. defined as a state correctional facility for adults or youthful offenders; or, a non-state operated facility where the clear majority or residents were state inmates.

Within this definition, both private and local facilities housing mainly inmates under state jurisdiction were included. Most of the non-state facilities were classified as community centers, as they were privately operated but funded through the state on a per diem basis. Except as noted above, federal, county, municipal and local facilities were not included (Advance Report, July, 1975: 15).

For the 1979 Census, the universe of facilities was defined as follows:

1. Prisons
2. Prison farms
3. Classifications/diagnostic/reception/medical facilities
4. Hospitals exclusively for state prisoners
5. Drug/alcoholic treatment facilities exclusively for state prisoners
6. Road camps
7. Forestry camps
8. Special function facilities
 - a) youthful-offender facilities³
 - b) vocational-training facilities
 - c) honor camps
 - d) state operated jails in Alaska, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Rhode Island, and Vermont
9. Community-based pre-released facilities
 - a) halfway houses
 - b) pre-release/parole facilities
 - c) work-release facilities
 - d) study-release facilities

³The 16 facilities operated by the California Youth Authority which house both juveniles and youthful offenders are included in the Census of Public Juvenile Detention, Correctional, and Shelter Facilities and therefore, were not included in the 1979 Census.

Facilities excluded from the universe were:

1. Privately operated facilities which house state prisoners even if supported with state funds (on a contractual or per diem basis);
2. Facilities financed and operated by the military, the Federal government, and local governments even if they house state prisoners;
3. Facilities located in U.S. territories;
4. Treatment facilities for drug addicts and/or alcoholics not exclusively for state prisoners;
5. Hospitals that have wings or wards reserved exclusively for state prisoners.

In addition to being staffed with state employees, the facility must have been in operation on July 31, 1979 as a "functionally distinct entity in a separate physical location under the executive control of its own warden, superintendent, director, etc." (Governments Division, 1979: 2). The key to this distinction lies in the separate administration for each facility: a women's prison, for instance, physically located within the same walls as the men's prison but which had its own warden was classified as a separate facility rather than as a part of the men's prison. This distinction then allowed for considering the women's facility in conjunction with other such facilities across the country.

The two previous Censuses differed in their definitions of the universe in several respects. First, as defined in the Advance Report, the universe used in the earlier Census was not so specific in listing the types of facilities to be included as the more recent Census. Second, the later Census also clearly distinguished between community-based and more security-oriented facilities. In carrying out this distinction, the later Census included two questionnaires, one for each type of facility. Third, the 1974 Census included private and local facilities in which most of the inmates were under the jurisdiction of the state; the later Census specifically excluded facilities that were not

run by staff hired directly by the state. Fourth, the earlier Census specifically consolidated institutions that were unable to provide an inmate count, staffing pattern, payroll or budgetary information; the 1979 Census definition of the universe made no specific mention of this consolidation.

From discussions with Census Bureau staff, the primary reason for the distinctions in definitions were brought about by at least two factors. First, the earlier Census was conducted by the Demographic Surveys Division and the later Census, by the Governments Division. These two separate branches of the Census Bureau have their own approaches to problem areas: the former tended in the 1974 Census to focus on the inmates and the latter, to focus on the facilities. Thus, the earlier Census universe included private or local facilities wherein most inmates were under state jurisdiction and the later Census limited the universe to facilities that were state funded and operated. If a facility had inmates under state jurisdiction but was funded by the state on a contract basis, (ie., per diem), that facility was not included in the universe for the 1979 Census.

The second factor that accounts for differences in definitions of the universe is what was learned from the earlier Census. This was the case, for instance, with the distinction between community-based and more secure facilities. Community facilities differ from more secure ones in many respects such as employment (ie., in community facilities staff are not called guards; executive administrators are directors, not wardens); confinement units (ie., inmates live in rooms not cells); medical facilities (ie., medical staff and equipment are usually not located within the community facility itself); recreational areas (ie., recreation is more frequently found in the community, not the facility); furloughs or weekend passes (ie., usually a part of the program itself in community facilities); and prison industry (ie., not part of a community program). With these

distinctions in mind, a separate questionnaire was designed for community facilities in the 1979 Census (Governments Divisions, 1979: 6)

2. Proposed Definition of the Universe for the 1984 Census

In order to obtain the most accurate picture of the facilities that house primarily inmates under state jurisdiction, the proposed definition of the universe for the 1984 Census will include elements of the approaches used in both of the earlier Censuses. In general, the universe will include correctional and penal facilities in which most of the inmates are under the jurisdiction of the state.

More specifically, the universe will include correctional and penal facilities:

(1) operational on January 31, 1984.

(2) that house primarily adult inmates under state jurisdiction.

(3) that are state owned and operated as well as private and local facilities that are under contract with the state or that receive state funds to house primarily state inmates (ie: 90% of their inmate count).

(4) that are functionally distinct in that they are administered by their own warden, superintendent, director etc., and can provide their own unique inmate count, payroll figures, staffing patterns and budgetary information.

Within this framework, the types of facilities to be included are:

1. Prisons
2. Prison farms
3. Classification/diagnostic/reception/medical facilities
4. Hospitals exclusively for state prisoners
5. Drug/alcoholic treatment facilities exclusively for state prisoners

6. Road camp

7. Forestry camps

8. Special function facilities

- a) youthful-offender facilities⁴
 - b) vocational-training facilities
 - c) honor camps
 - d) state operated jails in Alaska, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Rhodes Island, and Vermont
9. Community-based pre-release facilities
- a) halfway houses
 - b) pre-release/parole facilities
 - c) work-release facilities
 - d) study-release facilities

Facilities that will be excluded from the universe are:

1. Facilities financed and operated by the military, or the Federal government, and facilities operated by local governments that house only a small number of state prisoners (ie., 10% of their total count)
2. Facilities located in U.S. territories;
3. Treatment facilities for drug addicts and/or alcoholics not exclusively for state prisoners;
4. Hospitals that have wings or wards reserved exclusively for state prisoners.

As was done in the 1979 Census, facilities will be classified into one of two types: 1) confinement facilities; and 2) community-based facilities⁵. These types of facilities will be defined as follows:

⁴Facilities such as the 16 facilities operated by the California Youth Authority which house both juveniles and youthful offenders that are included in the Census of Public Juvenile Detention, Correctional, and Shelter Facilities will not be included in the Census.

⁵The inclusion of community-based corrections facilities in this Census is not intended to imply that we are conducting an exhaustive study of these facilities. Community-based correctional facilities are also used to house pre-trial, ~~pre~~-sentence and probationed offenders, none of which come under the jurisdiction of the state. Although a Census of the entire spectrum of community corrections facilities that house offenders at every stage of the criminal justice process and at all levels of government would be interesting and would provide insights as to the nature of the population, staffing patterns, use and

1) Secure Confinement Facility: at least half of the residents are not allowed to depart, unaccompanied by an official, for the purpose of seeking and holding employment and/or making daily use of community resources such as schools or treatment programs.

2) Community-Based Facility: in contrast to the above restrictions, at least half the population are allowed to leave the grounds unaccompanied by an official, for the purpose of seeking and holding employment and/or making daily use of community resources such as schools or treatment programs.

The criteria used to define these facility types were developed^{ed} for the 1979 Census, and based on those employed in a previous national survey of prisons and jails conducted by Abt Associates.

In addition to the basic classification of secure confinement versus community-based facilities as was done in 1979, each confinement facility will be further classified by function such as classification, diagnostic and/or reception center, and further by security level of the facility if the facility functions mainly for the confinement of a general adult population.

By including private and local facilities that house primarily state inmates, the proposed definition will more accurately reflect a description of those facilities that house mainly inmates under state jurisdiction than was used in the 1979 Census.

To ensure the possibility of comparisons among institutions over time, codes will be used to earmark those facilities that were included in both the 1974 and 1979 Censuses.

Moreover, questionnaire items and codes will enable distinctions to be made among

costs of these facilities, this kind to study is beyond that scope of the present effort.

facilities that are more secure as opposed to those that are community-based and funded by contract with the state but private; state owned and operated; or funded by other state monies. Thus, researchers who wish for example, to subsequently analyze data only for state owned and operated or for community-based facilities may distinguish these groups from the total universe. In this sense, inclusion of private and local facilities will provide a broader range of analysis possibilities.

B. Data Collection

Issue: What is the most appropriate way to collect data for the 1984 Census that will ensure the highest response rate and the most accurate data available?

1. Data Collection in the 1974 and 1979 Censuses

For the 1974 Census, data were obtained through a mail canvass in which the warden or his designated representative was requested to complete a questionnaire for the facilities. Telephone followups were made to obtain missing data items or to clarify inconsistent entries. Responses were received from all facilities except for two in Georgia and a majority of Massachusetts' 14 (Advance Report, 1975: 15-16).

In 1979, the universe listing of state adult correctional facilities from the National Justice Agency Survey List (formerly called the Criminal Justice Directory), was updated for each state using inhouse sources and information supplied by Abt Associates from their 1978 Survey of State Correctional Facilities. Once the listing was revised, each state's department having responsibility for adult corrections was contacted to review the listing. In addition, each department was asked if there were any plans to add or close any facilities before August 1979. The universe listing was further updated to

incorporate the inmate population counts (total and female) on March 31, 1978, which were supplied by Abt Associates. A tape of the updated listing with 1978 population counts was supplied to the Demographic Surveys Division for use in drawing their sample for the Survey of Inmates.

Facilities on the universe list were then classified as confinement or community-based facilities accordingly. Classification of the facilities for mailing purposes was made from the final Abt study universe listing that had been clerically verified against the Directory listing and the published ACA directory of correctional facilities. Moreover, it was confirmed through informational calls to central state departments of corrections. The classification criterion was included on each questionnaire for verification by the facility respondent. Therefore, changes in classification were identified either during data collection if the respondent indicated a classification difference, or during the clerical edit. During this editing process, the specific criterion defining each type of facility was measured for each respondent facility to determine what proportion of the inmate population was actually allowed to be released into the community routinely.

The data collection phase consisted of two mail-outs and telephone followups. The initial mailout occurred between November 9-14, 1979 and included 129 questionnaires sent to individual facilities in 11 states and 672 to central locations in 40 States. The questionnaires sent to the central sources were either completed at the state department of corrections or distributed to the individual facilities after receipt (28 States). A second mailout was done on December 13, 1979 and included only 79 questionnaires sent to individual facilities; although no second mailout was made to central reporters, a telephone reminder was made to non-respondents during January 1980. The final non-response followup was made by phone from March 7 through April 7, 1980. At the request of the state departments of corrections for Florida and North Carolina, a staff

member was sent to complete the questionnaires for these States using central records. The efforts culminated in a 100 percent response rate on April 15, 1980.

During the clerical edit, a central contact in each state department of corrections was telephoned and asked for the following information:

- 1) plans for altering existing facilities and/or for building or acquiring new facilities before December 31, 1982;
- 2) whether there existed a furlough program, inmate participation in any existing programs, and eligibility criteria for such a program;
- 3) whether there existed written rules of conduct and/or grievance procedures for inmates.

In addition, published furlough eligibility criteria, rules of conduct and grievance procedures were requested. Written materials from about half of the States were received; there was no follow-up done for missing information. (Governments Division, 1979: 3-4; 6-7). To this author's knowledge, this information has not yet been analyzed or published. In fact, it is unclear why the information was obtained.

2. Proposed Data Collection Approach for the 1984 Census

Given that the Census concerns facilities characteristics, the most appropriate means of data collection is through a mail-out and follow-up telephone calls as was done in both the 1974 and 1979 Censuses. In addition, any information requested about future renovation should be done with a supplemental questionnaire sent directly to the central offices in state Departments of Corrections as these offices most likely control these affairs.

C. Topics for Inclusion in the 1984 Census

As noted in the objectives, the main purpose of the Census is to provide a profile of correctional and penal facilities housing primarily adult inmates under state jurisdiction. Facility profile characteristics that will be useful in developing cohesive corrections policies include the following:

- 1) Inmate Population Size
- 2) Capacity and Confinement Conditions
- 3) Institutional Programs
- 4) Expenditures and Construction/Renovation Plans
- 5) Staffing Patterns

Each of these topics will be discussed briefly in terms of specific questions to be raised and the types of measures to be obtained in the Census.

1) Inmate Population Size

Inmate population size, also called the inmate count, refers to the number of inmates in a facility on a given day. Obtaining this information by such factors as inmate race, sex and detention status (ie., sentenced/unsentenced) will enable us to determine the distribution of the inmate population by selected characteristics across the country and within regions and states. More specifically, the following questions will be addressed:

- 1) What is the distribution of inmates (on a given day) in various regions across the country?

2) How do regions or states within a region compare in terms of the composition of inmates by race/sex?

3) What proportion of the inmate population within each region was sentenced/unsentenced?

4) What proportion of the inmate population by region, sex or race is able to leave the facility to use community resources such as school, work or treatment program? Information on this question will be helpful in determining the proportion of the inmate population in secure facilities that use community resources on a regular basis and thus, might be housed in less secure facilities.

2. Capacity and Confinement Conditions

One of the most significant issues related to the increased number of incarcerated offenders is the adequacy of living space in confinement units within correctional facilities. The first research effort to systematically measure actual and rated confinement space as indices of crowding was the NIJ sponsored study, American Prisons and Jails⁶. The study was undertaken in response to a congressional mandate to NIJ to determine, in part, the adequacy of space in federal state and local correctional facilities. The concepts and questions raised in that study form the basis of the questions to be raised in the present Census about capacity and confinement space. Some of these questions were raised in the 1979 Census. However, to date, this information has not been analyzed. Thus, the nature and quality of responses to items about confinement

⁶This study, undertaken by Abt Associates, Cambridge, Massachusetts, resulted in five volumes covering topics including population trends and projections, conditions and costs of confinement adult pre-release (community-based) facilities and case studies of revised sentencing approaches to determine impacts on policies related to inmate population sizes and flow. This study will hereafter be called the Abt study.

space on the previous Census are unknown at the present time. Yet, inclusion of this information on the 1984 Census will provide an update and means to track physical indices of crowding in state facilities.

As defined in the Abt final report, American Prisons and Jails, Volume III, and as used here, the following concepts deal with capacity and confinement conditions:

1) Capacity: the number of inmates a confinement unit, facility, etc., can hold. As the Abt study points out, capacity may be measured in at least two ways. One traditional way is determined administratively by correctional officials and may be called "rated" or "design" capacity. The second way is to actually measure the physical dimensions or to request physical measurements (ie., square feet) of floor space each confinement unit holds. The Abt study found that the rated capacity (slightly more than a half million beds), exceeded the measured capacity (374,700 beds) (Mullen and Smith, 1980: 43).

2) Density: the number of square feet of floor space per inmate (Smith, 1979: 19).

3) Occupancy: the number of inmates per confinement unit (Smith, 1979: 16).

4) Crowding: a joint consideration of density and occupancy: as the number of square feet of floor space per inmate decreases (high density), and the number of inmates per confinement unit increases (high occupancy), the level of "crowding" increases (Mullen and Smith, 1980: 70).

5) Confinement Unit: the housing units in a facility within which inmates spend the night. The Abt study distinguished between cell and dormitory space. Cell space includes confinement units of less than 120 square feet and dormitories include space of

more than 120 square feet. Using the often cited standard of 60 square feet per inmate as a yardstick, the Abt study rated confinement units having less than 120 square feet as having a capacity of one inmate. Similarly, the Abt study rated the capacity of confinement units of more than 120 square feet as being either the total number of square feet of floor space divided by 60 or as the administratively defined capacity, whichever is smaller (Mullen and Smith, 1980: 42).

With these concepts in mind, the following questions will be explored in the 1984 Census:

A. Capacity

1) What are the administratively rated and empirically reported levels of capacity for different confinement unit types in secure confinement facilities and in community-based facilities? To what extent do these measures of capacity differ nationally, regionally, by sex of inmates housed, by age or by security level of the institution?

2) To what extent do the administratively rated and reported capacity measures differ from the standard of 60 square feet per confinement unit? How do these measures vary by region, sex of inmates housed, age and security level of the institution?

B. Density

1) What is the average number of square feet of floor space per inmate for each type of confinement unit? How do these figures vary by region, sex of inmates housed, age and security level of the institution?

2) Considering floor space per inmate (rather than per confinement unit) how frequently are inmates housed in less than 60 square feet of floor space? How do these figures vary by region, sex of inmates housed, age and security level of the institution?

C. Occupancy

1) How many inmates are housed per confinement unit by region, sex of inmates housed, age and security level of the institution? To what extent is there more than one inmate per cell?

2) How long do inmates usually occupy their confinement unit per day, by region, sex of inmates housed, age and security level of the institution? This question is important because crowding may be a function not only of the actual space allocated per inmate but also of the amount of time a person spends in that space within a 24 hour period.

D. Crowding

1) Taking into account both density and occupancy, ^(0/1 inmate) how frequently do inmates occupy confinement units with one or more other inmates and have less than 60 square feet of space per inmate?

2) How do these figures vary by region, sex of inmates housed, age and security classification of the institution?

The results of the Census for these questions will be compared with the results obtained by the Abt study for their 1978 survey of adult state correctional facilities and, to the extent possible, with the as yet unreported results of the 1979 Census. In addition, comparisons of results will be made for secure confinement facilities and the

community-based facilities to determine the extent of discrepancies. One would expect to find that the less secure the facility, the more floor space allocated per inmate, the fewer inmates housed per confinement unit and the fewer hours inmates will be confined in the unit. The rationale for this hypothesis is simply that with fewer inmates in the facility and in a less secure environment, inmates may move out of their sleeping areas and around the facility more freely. They should thus spend less time in their confinement unit. On the other hand, if the confinement unit or facility houses more inmates than its capacity (however measured) allows, then regardless of the security level of the institution, there may be greater restrictions on inmate movement and thus, inmates may spend roughly the same amount of time in their quarters. We will also determine whether or not these results vary by region.

Finally, the information generated about these questions and variables in this Census will, for the first time, enable a reporting of the extent of crowding in single sex facilities as well as in facilities that house both male and female inmates. Despite the fact that women constitute only about 4% of the incarcerated population, the number of women confined in state facilities has risen sharply over the past decade. Considering both incarcerated men and women, between 1974 and 1982, there was an increase of only 0.9% in the proportion of incarcerated women in this country. However, considering only imprisoned women, there was an increase of 111.8% in the number of women incarcerated between 1974 (8,091) and mid-1982 (12,142) (Cantwell, 1982: 3).

Thus, despite the fact that there are fewer women than men incarcerated in this country, the number of women incarcerated is rising dramatically. There is, therefore, a need to understand the needs of incarcerated women in order to deal more effectively with this increasing population.

Taken collectively, these data will update and extend our understanding of physical indices related to current confinement conditions in adult correctional facilities. This information will be useful in understanding the extent of crowding and in providing a foundation for administrators, reformers and researchers to deal with these issues.

3 . Institutional Programs

From roughly the end of World War II through the mid-1970's, the focus in corrections had been on "rehabilitation" of offenders. Within this context, the medical model of treatment, positing that treaters must do something "to" or "for" offenders, led to the development of a myriad of programs designed to change behavior patterns both within and beyond the confines of the prison walls. However, the publication of Martinson's research which suggested the failure of prison programs to "rehabilitate" offenders or to reduce subsequent criminal behavior (Martinson, 1974), coupled with disaffection with indeterminate sentencing as a fair and effective means of imposing sanctions (Von Hirsch, 1976; Goldfarb and Singer, 1973; Dershowitz, 1976; Hood and Sparks, 1970), and with dwindling funds to support programs, ushered in a new era of correctional treatment. More recently, the functions of deterrence, incapacitation and punishment have dominated correctional philosophy. Although perhaps on the decline as a major source of treatment for "rehabilitative" purposes, institutional programs remain important as a means of providing inmates with opportunities for voluntary advancement (Morris, 1974), and perhaps in some jurisdictions where parole boards determine release decisions, as a means of enhancing the possibility of release.

In addition, within recent years, there has been growing concern over the disparities in the nature and extent of treatment programs and medical services provided for female as opposed to male inmates in state correctional facilities (Glick and Neto, 1977; Neto,

community-based facilities to determine the extent of discrepancies. One would expect to find that the less secure the facility, the more floor space allocated per inmate, the fewer inmates housed per confinement unit and the fewer hours inmates will be confined in the unit. The rationale for this hypothesis is simply that with fewer inmates in the facility and in a less secure environment, inmates may move out of their sleeping areas and around the facility more freely. They should thus spend less time in their confinement unit. On the other hand, if the confinement unit or facility houses more inmates than its capacity (however measured) allows, then regardless of the security level of the institution, there may be greater restrictions on inmate movement and thus, inmates may spend roughly the same amount of time in their quarters. We will also determine whether or not these results vary by region.

Finally, the information generated about these questions and variables in this Census will, for the first time, enable a reporting of the extent of crowding in single sex facilities as well as in facilities that house both male and female inmates. Despite the fact that women constitute only about 4% of the incarcerated population, the number of women confined in state facilities has risen sharply over the past decade. Considering both incarcerated men and women, between 1974 and 1982, there was an increase of only 0.9% in the proportion of incarcerated women in this country. However, considering only imprisoned women, there was an increase of 111.8% in the number of women incarcerated between 1974 (8,091) and mid-1982 (12,142) (Cantwell, 1982: 3).

Thus, despite the fact that there are fewer women than men incarcerated in this country, the number of women incarcerated is rising dramatically. There is, therefore, a need to understand the needs of incarcerated women in order to deal more effectively with this increasing population.

Taken collectively, these data will update and extend our understanding of physical indices related to current confinement conditions in adult correctional facilities. This information will be useful in understanding the extent of crowding and in providing a foundation for administrators, reformers and researchers to deal with these issues.

3 . Institutional Programs

From roughly the end of World War II through the mid-1970's, the focus in corrections had been on "rehabilitation" of offenders. Within this context, the medical model of treatment, positing that treators must do something "to" or "for" offenders, led to the development of a myriad of programs designed to change behavior patterns both within and beyond the confines of the prison walls. However, the publication of Martinson's research which suggested the failure of prison programs to "rehabilitate" offenders or to reduce subsequent criminal behavior (Martinson, 1974), coupled with disaffection with indeterminate sentencing as a fair and effective means of imposing sanctions (Von Hirsch, 1976; Goldfarb and Singer, 1973; Dershowitz, 1976; Hood and Sparks, 1970), and with dwindling funds to support programs, ushered in a new era of correctional treatment. More recently, the functions of deterrence, incapacitation and punishment have dominated correctional philosophy. Although perhaps on the decline as a major source of treatment for "rehabilitative" purposes, institutional programs remain important as a means of providing inmates with opportunities for voluntary advancement (Morris, 1974), and perhaps in some jurisdictions where parole boards determine release decisions, as a means of enhancing the possibility of release.

In addition, within recent years, there has been growing concern over the disparities in the nature and extent of treatment programs and medical services provided for female as opposed to male inmates in state correctional facilities (Glick and Neto, 1977; Neto,

1981; GAO, 1980; Pendergrass, 1975; Bowker, 1978; Stoller, 1982). Arguments for fewer training programs for women inmates have focused on the fact that women comprise such a small proportion of the incarcerated population. In addition, the nature of training programs for women have, most frequently, emphasized cosmetology, key punch, secretarial skills, sewing, cooking or other skills closely related to a stereotyped belief about the role of women in our society. However, given that many incarcerated women are single heads of households (Baunach, 1982; Lundberg, et.al., 1975; McGowan and Blumenthal, 1976; DuBose, 1975), it is important that they be able to learn transferable, marketable skills as well as enhance parenting skills during incarceration.

With these issues in mind, the Census will obtain information on the nature and extent of currently operational programs and medical services provided within single sex adult correctional facilities and within facilities for inmates of both sexes and the extent to which inmates are able to employ similar resources in the community. More specifically, the following questions will be raised:

- 1) What kinds of educational, vocational, counseling, parenting or other programs are provided for men and women incarcerated in adult correctional facilities across the country, by region and by state? To what extent are there discrepancies in the number and nature of programs provided for offenders of both sexes?
- 2) How much access do inmates confined in secure facilities have to these programs in the community across the country, by region and by state?
- 3) What kinds of medical services are provided for male and female inmates across the country by region and by state?

4) What proportion of the inmate population is eligible to participate in each of these programs by sex of inmates, across the country, by region and by state?

5) What proportion of the population has participated in these programs during calendar year 1983 by sex of inmates across the country, by region and by state?

Questions 4 and 5 are important to determine not only whether or not programs exist during a specified time period, but whether or not they are being used by inmates. Particularly in those states that have abolished parole, the incentive for inmates to participate in programs may have also diminished. Since we can determine which states have abolished parole, we may also learn if there is a relatively low rate of involvement in programs as compared with involvement in similar programs: a) as reported in the 1979 Census; and b) in other states as reported in the 1984 Census. Although comparability of responses and specific programs over time and across states poses problems, we may still ascertain some idea of variations in the level of inmate participation.

To the extent possible, the analyses of programs will be compared with the information provided in the 1979 Census for inmates of both sexes and both secure and community based corrections facilities. The information obtained in the Census about these issues will be useful in understanding the nature of programs provided, current differences, the nature and extent of programs provided for male and female offenders in both secure and community-based facilities and will provide a basis for developing requisite changes.

4. Expenditures and Construction/Renovation Plans

The costs in maintaining and operating correctional facilities include several components. Chief among these are capital expenditures and operating costs. Capital

expenditures refer to the costs of renovating or building additional facilities. Operating costs refer to the cost of personnel, utilities, supplies, and food to maintain the operations of the facility over a specified time period. Since most construction or renovation decisions are made at the state level rather than within each individual facility, items relating to the capital expenditures for each facility cannot be appropriately collected in the Censuses. Operating expenses were obtained in the 1974 Census and subsequently in the Expenditure and Employment Data for the Criminal Justice System series. However, this information is no longer collected systematically. Thus, there is a need to obtain updated expenditure information.

Since the only information that may be obtained with some degree of accuracy at the institutional level relates to operating expenses, the question is whether or not any cost information should be collected through the Census.

In addition, given the current raging debate over the appropriateness of constructing new facilities, renovating old ones or acquiring additional facility space elsewhere, there is a need to compile a compendium of information regarding plans along these lines on both a regional and national level.

However, since most information concerning expenditures and construction/renovation/acquisition plans for facilities resides in the central state office, this Census may not be the most appropriate vehicle to obtain it. Thus, an alternative possibility is to develop a supplemental questionnaire for completion by administrators in state Departments of Corrections central offices.

The appropriateness and viability of allocating Census Bureau staff time and resources to the development of such a supplemental questionnaire require careful consideration. Comments on this issue are therefore welcomed.

5. Staffing Patterns

The nature and level of staffing and staff/inmate ratios in a correctional facility may be indicative of the level of freedom and movement and services afforded the inmates. An institution in which there are few treatment, educational or service staff for instance, may be one in which the movement of inmates may be restricted. Similarly, an institution with primarily custodial staff (ie., guards) may provide few services or programs for inmates.

Moreover, institutions that house more offenders and tend to be "crowded" may be unable to provide many programs or services because the majority of their staff positions are, of necessity, devoted to security personnel (ie., guards, not program staff). Thus, not only the number of staff but also the relative proportion of staff of various types (ie., security vs. program/treatment) and their level of employment (ie., full-time vs. part-time) are important determinants of the extent to which facilities provide adequate staffing levels for various purposes. In terms of correctional officers (ie: guards) the often quoted figure of one staff member for every six inmates (Mullen and Smith, 1980: 94) appears to be the desirable standard to maintain security and safety within the facility.

There may also be a relationship between the security classification of the institution and the level and type of staffing. That is, one might expect more secure facilities to retain more custodial than treatment or educational staff. On the other hand, if more secure facilities have roughly the same proportion of treatment or educational staff as

less secure facilities, this may be indicative of a philosophy favoring treatment rather than simply punishment or warehousing for inmates requiring more secure confinement. This type of philosophy pervaded the creation of the Patuxent Institution in Maryland in the 1950's. At its inception, this institution housed the most "dangerous" inmates in the state who presumably required especially secure confinement. Yet, the staff complement was (and continues to be) primarily treatment-oriented because of the administrator's philosophy regarding handling offenders.

In addition to considering the type, level and employment status of staff, the race and sex of staff members are significant factors in defining staffing patterns. Since 1974 when women were first hired in California as correctional officers in men's prisons, there have been numerous court cases by male inmates demanding rights to privacy in cells. On the other hand, there has also been scholarly interest as well as court cases demanding the rights of women of all races to work as correctional officers, or administrators in prisons for men on an equal par with their male counterparts (Baunach and Rafter, 1982; Chapman, et. al., 1983).

With these points in mind, the Census will address the following questions:

- 1) How many staff members work in custodial, treatment, administrative, clerical, maintenance or other positions by race and sex of staff members, for single-sex and co-educational institutions across the country, within regions and by state?
- 2) What is the staff/inmate ratio in institutions? How does this ratio vary by security classification of the institution and by population size? How does the staff/inmate ratio vary by sex of inmates housed in the institution across the country, by region and within states?

3) What proportion of female custodial staff work in all-male or coeducational institutions across the country, within regions and by state?

4) In terms of employment status, what proportion of staff hired in various roles (ie., administrative, security, etc.) and by race and sex work full or part-time? Are there differences in these figures by region and by state? To the extent possible, data pertaining to staffing patterns will be compared with information obtained in the 1979 data to underscore changes.

Specific analyses of interest include changes by region and state and by type of facility (secure vs. community) in the type of staff employed (ie., security vs. program/treatment), staff/inmate ratios (particularly as a function of security level of the institution and type of institution--security vs. community-based facilities), and employment status of staff members (ie., part-time vs. full-time). Crosscutting these analyses will be consideration of these data by race and sex of staff. Thus, we will obtain information on changes in staffing patterns by race and sex of staff members over time as well.

6. Identifiers

In addition to these five major topic areas, data will be collected on identifying characteristics for each facility. These identifiers include the security classification of the facility, (ie., maximum, medium, minimum); function of the facility, (ie., hospital, diagnostic center, etc.); extent to which inmates are allowed to be released into the community to attend programs or employment; the age of the facility; and if the institution is a single-sex or coeducational facility. A coeducational facility refers to one which not only houses male and female inmates on the same grounds but one in which

inmates of both sexes may use the facilities, attend programs and recreation together. These identifiers along with factors such as region and state, will be used in analyzing the data.

F. Other Issues

There are three additional issues of importance in corrections today which will be addressed. One issue is the extent and nature of inmate deaths occurring within a specified time period. This information was collected in the 1979 Census and will be updated in the 1984 Census and analyzed by such factors as institutional capacity, "crowding", staff/inmate ratio, sex of inmates housed, and security level of institution. The second issue relates to inmate violence. Although it is not possible to obtain accurate measures of inmate victimization within prisons, it may be possible to obtain a measure of inmate unrest by using such data sources as number and nature of incident reports. The area of inmate violence is important given the increased levels of tension as population sizes grow. Thus, obtaining some measure of inmate unrest is presented open endedly for discussion.

Finally, given the increasing numbers of institutions under court order because of crowded conditions, the 1984 Census will also request information on whether or not the institution has been under court order in the past and whether or not it is currently under court order to reduce its population size. This information will be analyzed by the identifiers noted earlier as well as by such factors as level of "crowding" and staff/inmate ratios.

The issues for inclusion in the Census presented in this section may not be exhaustive of all possible issues that should be explored in the 1984 Census. Therefore, additional

issues of importance to the corrections field today, along with a rationale for their inclusion and proposed means of analysis are welcomed.

D. Analysis Approaches

An analysis of data entails two distinct parts. These are: 1) a selection of the variables by which the analyses should be done; and 2) a selection of the appropriate statistical techniques to be used in computing results. In terms of the first part, the specific variables by which questions on each of the topics to be included in 1984 Census will be analyzed have been specified in the questions themselves. As the development of the Census progresses, these questions will be refined more fully. In general, depending upon the questions raised, the variables by which data will be analyzed include region and state, security confinement facility vs. community-based facility, race and sex of inmates housed, race and sex of staff and the other identifiers noted previously. In addition, to the extent possible, data from the 1984 Census will be compared with data from the previous Censuses.

In terms of the second part of analysis, the statistical techniques most appropriate for much of this data are simple frequencies, cross tabs and chi square analyses, since variables such as state, region or security classification of facility are only nominal level. However, whenever possible, more powerful tests such as correlations or regression analysis will be employed. Comparisons of nominal data may also be done using non-parametric statistics. Specific analysis techniques will be determined when questions are finalized.

IV. Final Products

The final products for the 1984 Census will consist of an advanced report and a series of special reports/bulletins covering each of the topics included in the Census. The advanced report will be issued no later than March, 1985 to provide consumers with a general overview of the findings. More specifically the advanced report will cover population size by race and sex of inmates, number of secure confinement facilities and community based facilities, number of staff in each type of facility, staff/inmate ratios in each type of facility, number and type of programs in each type of facility and rated capacity for each type of facility. This data will be presented by state and region.

Subsequent reports will cover the individual topics raised in the Census. There will thus be a report on capacity and confinement conditions, institutional programs and staffing patterns. Data for each of these reports will be presented in the context of current correctional issues. Specific contents of each report will address the questions raised in the issues section of this paper. As with the advanced report, individual reports will be issued as quickly as possible to maximize their utility by consumers.

REFERENCES

- Advance Report: Census of State Correctional Facilities - 1974
(1975) National Prisoners Statistics Special Report. Washington, D.C.: National Criminal Justice Information and Statistics Service.
- Baunach, P.J. (1982) "You can't be a mother and be in prison...can you?: impacts of the mother-child separation." in The Criminal Justice System and Women, Price B. and Sokoloff, N. (ed.) New York: Clark Boardman Company.
- Baunach, P.J. and Rafter, N., (1982) "Sex-role operations: strategies for women working in the criminal justice system," in Judge Victim, Lawyer, Thief Rafter, N. and Stanko, E. (ed.). Boston: Northeastern University Press, 305-340.
- Bowker, L. (1978) Women, Crime, and the Criminal Justice System. Lexington: D.C. Health and Company.
- Cantwell, M. (1982) Prisoners at Midyear 1982. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Chapman, J., Minor, E., Ricker, P., Mills, T. and Bottum, M. (1983) Women Employed in Corrections. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice.
- Dershowitz, A. (1976) Fair and Certain Punishment Report of the Twentieth Century Task Force on Criminal Sentencing. New York: McGraw-Hill Company.
- Du Bose, D. (1975) "Problems of children whose mothers are imprisoned." New York: Institute of Women's Wrongs.
- Gardner, R. (1982) "Prison population jumps to 369,725." Corrections Magazine. 8(3): 6-14.
- General Accounting Office (1980) Women in Prison: Inequitable Treatment Requires Action. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Gettinger, S. (1983) "The prison population boom: still no end in sight." Corrections Magazine. 9(3): 6-11, 47-48.
- Glick, R. and Neto, V. (1977) National Study of Women's Correctional Programs. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice.
- Goldfarb, R. and Singer, L. (1973) After Conviction: A Review of the American Correctional System. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Governments Division (1979) 1979 Census of State Adult Correctional Facilities: Documentation, U.S. Bureau of the Census, unpublished paper.

- Hood, R. and Sparks, R. (1970): Key Issues in Criminology. University Library Series. New York: McGraw-Hill Company.
- Lundberg, D., Sheckley, A. and Voelkar, T. (1975) "An exploration of the feelings and attitudes of women separated from their children due to incarceration." Masters Thesis. Portland: Portland State University.
- Martinson, R. (1974) "What works? questions and answers about prison reforms." The Public Interest (35): 22-54.
- McGowan, B. and Blumenthal, K. (1976) Why Punish the Children?: A Study of Children of Women Prisoners. Hackensack: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.
- Minor-Harper, S. (1982) Prisoners in 1981. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Montilla, M. and Harlow, N. (1979) Correctional Facilities Planning. Lexington: D.C. Heath and Company.
- Morris, N. (1974) The Future of Imprisonment. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Mullen, J. and Smith, B. (1980) American Prisons and Jails, Volume III: Conditions and Costs of Confinement. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice.
- Neto, V. (1981) "Expanding horizons: Work and training programs for female offenders." Corrections Today 43(6): 66-72.
- Pendergrass, V. (1974) "Innovative programs for women in jail and prison: trick or treatment." in The Female Offender. Brodsky, A. (ed.) Beverly Hills: Sage, 67-76.
- Sherman, M. and Hawkins, G. (1981) Imprisonment in America. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Smith, B. (1979) "Crowding in prisons and jails in the United States." Paper presented at the Special National Workshop on "Crime Control: The State of the Art".
- Stoller, N. (1982) "Female patients and medical profession in jails and prisons." in Judge, Victim, Lawyer, Thief. Rafter, N. and Stanko, E. (ed.). Boston: Northeastern University Press, 261-276.
- Von Hirsch, A. (1976) Doing Justice: The Choice of Punishments. New York: Hill and Wang.

END