

138331

Compendium of Correctional Research in the States, 1986-91

Justice Research and Statistics Association

September 1992

138331

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 material has been granted by

Public Domain/OJP/BJA

U.S. Department of Justice

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

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

NCJRS

JAN 25 1993

ACQUISITIONS

Acknowledgments. This report was prepared by the Justice Research and Statistics Association (JRSA), a national nonprofit organization of State Statistical Analysis Center (SAC) directors and other criminal justice policy professionals.

Overall project supervision at JRSA was provided by Joan C. Weiss, executive director, and James R. Coldren, Jr., Ph.D., director of research. This report was prepared by Melissa A. Ruboy, research analyst, with assistance from Lisa Stolzenberg, Terrence Blair, and Loyce C. Craft. Members of the JRSA Research Committee who reviewed portions of this report include Ernest Cowles, Ph.D., Southern Illinois University; Robert Friedmann, Ph.D., Georgia SAC; Richard Kern, Ph.D., Virginia SAC; and Richard Oldroyd, Ph.D., Utah SAC.

This report was prepared by the Justice Research and Statistics Association under Bureau of Justice Statistics grant number 90-BJ-CX-K022.

Findings and conclusions of the research reported here are those of the researchers and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Table of Contents

Introduction ix

Alaska

- Alaska Correctional Requirements: A Forecast of Prison Population Through the Year 2000 1
- Alaska's Participation in the Interstate Compact for Probation and Parole 3
- An Analysis of Offense Patterns, Recidivism, and Emergency Detention of Children Accused of Delinquent Acts in Alaska in 1985 6
- Department of Corrections Personnel Survey: Final Report 9
- A Descriptive Study of Alaska Correctional Officers and Their Attitudes Toward Inmates 10
- Discretion, Due Process, and the Prison Discipline Committee 13
- Evaluation of the Alaska Pre-Trial Intervention (PTI) Program 16
- Jails and Judicial Review: Special Problems for Local Facilities 19
- Juvenile Detention Monitoring 22
- Prison Visiting: Is It Time To Review the Rules? 26
- Prison Visiting Policies and Practices 31

Arizona

- Arizona Mandatory Sentencing Study 34

California

- Blue Ribbon Commission on Inmate Population Management: Final Report 37

Colorado

- Classification for Custody and the Assessment of Risk in the Colorado Department of Corrections 38
- Colorado Parole Guidelines Commission Report to the Legislature 41
- Community Corrections in Colorado: Why Do Some Clients Succeed and Others Fail? . . . 43
- Custody Needs and Public Risk of Colorado's Prisoners: An Assessment 45
- The Effect of Public Opinion on Correctional Policy: A Comparison of Opinions and Practices 47
- Evaluation of Multijurisdictional Task Forces in Colorado 50
- Getting Tough on Crime in Colorado 52
- Individual Crime Rates of Colorado Prisoners 54
- Sentencing Trends in Colorado 1983-1989 55
- Validation of the Iowa Risk Assessment Scale on a 1982 Release Cohort of Colorado Inmates 57

Connecticut

- Offender Profiles: Those in Prison and in the Community Compared 59

Delaware

- Delaware Incarceration Factbook 63
- Delaware Inmate and Detention Population Forecast 1991 to 1996 64
- DOC Forecast Monitoring Report: 4th Quarter 1991 65
- Impact of the Drug Trafficking Law on the Delaware Criminal Justice System 66
- Level IV Sentencing Options—Part II: Statistical Evaluation 67
- Lifers in Delaware 71

Florida

- Boot Camp: A Twenty-five Month Review 73
- Control Release Authority Decisions for Habitual Offenders: A Pilot Simulation 74
- Control Release Populations: Changes in Advanceable and Non-Advanceable Pools 76
- Growth Orientation Inc. Personal Development (GODEV) at New River Correctional Institution: A Psychological Measure of the GODEV Effectiveness 77
- Mandatory Minimum Sentencing in Florida: Past Trends and Future Implications 78
- Psychological Impact of Tier Programs: An Outcome Evaluation 79
- Tier Programs Outcome Evaluation: A Recommitment Study 80

Illinois

- Crowding at Cook County Jail 82
- Education and Criminal Justice in Illinois 83
- Electronically Monitored Home Confinement in Illinois 85
- The Jail I-Bond Program 85
- Repeat Offenders in Illinois 87

Indiana

- Indiana Boys' School Tracking Study: Recidivism Among Boys Released From 1984-85 Through 1988-89 89

Massachusetts

- Impact of Drug Offenders on County Houses of Correction 92

Minnesota

- Corrections Crowding in Minnesota 95
- Sentencing and Correctional Policies 96

Missouri

- Assaults and Other Major Violations: Perpetrators and Victims 98
- A Comparative Analysis of Inmates Released Under Director's Release and Parole During the Years 1986 Through 1988 99
- Criminal Justice Attitudes—Missouri 100
- Felony Probation: A Comparative Analysis of Public Risks in Two States 101
- Handling Long-Term Offenders: The Missouri Project 102
- Missouri Sexual Offender Program (MOSOP): Inmate Characteristics and Recidivism ... 106
- Parole and Probation Violators as a Component in Missouri's Escalating Prison Population 107
- Probation Cases Opened FY 1985 to FY 1988: Driving-While-Intoxicated (DWI) and Non-DWI Probationers Compared 108
- Protective Custody: The Missouri Experience With Comparative State Analysis 109
- Recent Changes in Sentencing Practices as Evidenced by Inmate Commitment Characteristics 110
- A Study of Employee Turnover in the Missouri Department of Corrections 111
- Success or Failure in Halfway House and Honor Center Placement: A Study of Rollbacks During Calendar Years 1985 to 1989 113

New Jersey

- Contingent Intermediate Sentences: New Jersey's Intensive Supervision Program (ISP) ... 115
- Progress Report: New Jersey's Intensive Supervision Program 116

New Mexico

- Analysis of Adult Felony Sentencing in New Mexico 117

North Carolina

- The Seroprevalence of Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) Infection in All Incoming Inmates Admitted to the North Carolina Department of Correction 122

Oklahoma

- Analysis of the Oklahoma Department of Corrections Substance Abuse Offender Population 123
- Oklahoma Criminal Justice Computerization Study 124
- Oklahoma Department of Corrections: Recidivism of Selected Groups of Offenders Survival Analysis Tables 125

Oregon

- First-Year Report on Felony Sentencing Guidelines 127
- 1986 Felony Sentencing Practices 128
- Validation of Oregon's Risk Classification System Used in the Parole Matrix 130

Texas

- Analysis of Criminal History and Offense Characteristics of Aggravated Offenders Admitted to Prison 132
- Female Offenders in Prison: Trends and Issues 134
- 1988 Texas Prison Admissions Survey 135
- Special Alternative Incarceration Program (SAIP) Enhanced Substance Abuse Treatment Evaluation 138
- Uniform Recidivism and Revocation Calculation 141
- Uniform System Cost Project, FY 1989-90 143

Virginia

- The Awaiting-Trial Population in Virginia 146
- Department of Criminal Justice Services Evaluation
of New River Community Sentencing, Inc. 150
- Department of Criminal Justice Services Evaluation
of the Offender Aid and Restoration (OAR) Jail Services Program 152
- Department of Criminal Justice Services Evaluation
of the Peninsula Marine Institute, Inc. 153
- Electronic Offender Monitoring in Virginia: Evaluation Report 155
- Final Report of Virginia's Commission on Prison and Jail Overcrowding 159
- Health Locus of Control of Female Inmates From the Virginia Correctional Center
for Women (VCCW) Measured by the MHLC Scale 162
- Jail Population Management Study for Winchester, Frederick, and Clarke 163
- A Methodology for Forecasting Local Jail Populations in Virginia 166
- Parole Risk Factor Scale for Estimating Parole Risks in Virginia 169

Canada

- Cognitive Skills Training 173
- Computerized Lifestyle Assessment Instrument 174
- Field Test of the Community Risk/Needs Management Scale:
A Study of Offenders on Caseload 176
- The Prevalence, Nature and Severity of Mental Health Problems
Among Federal Male Inmates in Canadian Penitentiaries 178
- Sex Offender Population Study 180
- Staff Commitment and Aspirations Study 182

Introduction

The Justice Research and Statistics Association (JRSA) is pleased to present the *Compendium of Correctional Research in the States: 1986-91*, the first such compilation of research information from the States. The *Compendium* includes research conducted from 1986 to 1991 and covers topics such as sentencing guidelines, crowding, population forecasting, correctional treatment programs, jail issues, and risk assessment. The *Compendium* was compiled by the State Statistical Analysis Centers (SAC's) and JRSA to share information on correctional research that is useful, but that often does not reach beyond a State's boundaries. A special section with submissions from Canada follows the States' abstracts.

The abstracts represent the important contributions being made by States in their efforts to research and evaluate correctional policies and programs. In addition to the wide range of topics covered, readers will find a rich variety of methods and techniques being used in policy development.

The *Compendium* is organized alphabetically by State, and the abstracts are alphabetized by title within each State. Each abstract includes the following information: project title, objectives of the research, research methodology, findings of the research, policy impact or implications based on the research findings, prior instate studies, timeframe of the study, agencies involved, and cost of the study. Missing headings indicate that the information was not available. Names, addresses, and phone numbers have also been provided as a resource for obtaining more information on the projects.

In June 1991, JRSA announced the *Compendium* project and sent a letter to the State SAC's requesting abstracts on correctional research conducted from 1986 to 1991 in universities, agencies, and organizations in their States. Followup phone calls were made to ensure broad representation of States' research efforts, and a format for submitting the abstracts was provided. The abstracts were then reviewed by JRSA staff and the JRSA Research Committee. Ninety abstracts from 19 States and Canada are included in this *Compendium*, representing the information submitted by the State SAC's and other agencies that responded to the request for abstracts.

This report is the first attempt to gather information about State-based corrections research. It does not present information from all States, nor does it represent the full range of correctional research conducted in the States over the past 6 years. Although much important research could not be included in this first report, the *Compendium* provides a solid base of useful information about State-based correctional research, one that will be built upon in the future. Readers are encouraged to contact the National Criminal Justice Reference Service at 1-800-732-3277 or the Justice Research and Statistics Association at 202-624-8560 for further information about correctional research being conducted in the States.

Alaska

Alaska Correctional Requirements: A Forecast of Prison Population Through the Year 2000

Allan R. Barnes, Ph.D., and Richard McCleary, Ph.D.
Justice Center
University of Alaska at Anchorage
3211 Providence Drive
Anchorage, AK 99508
(907) 786-1811

Objectives of the research: To provide a forecast of the prison population as part of a wider study that will determine the feasibility of constructing a prison on Fire Island in Cook Inlet.

Research methodology: The model used in the population forecasts was developed by Richard McCleary, who has developed similar models that have been successfully used to predict prison population growth. The McCleary model is constructed from factors that (1) historically have had an impact on the prison population in a statistically significant manner (for example, length of sentences) and (2) have shown a statistically significant relationship with the prison population (for example, unemployment rates). Various assumptions about past and future State population growth, unemployment rates, and historic prison growth were also incorporated within the model. Those assumptions about future prison population growth that presume only a continuation of current socioeconomic patterns and existing influential factors are referred to as status quo assumptions.

Findings of the research: The number of prisoners incarcerated by Alaska nearly tripled between 1980 and 1985, from approximately 750 in 1980 to approximately 2,200 in 1985. At the time of the study, correctional facilities in Alaska were overcrowded, and construction and renovation projects had been initiated in an effort to relieve the situation. As a basis for long-range programs and capital planning, officials of the Alaska Department of Corrections sought to obtain reliable forecasts of the size and makeup of the population who would be under custody in future years.

Table 1. Alaska Prison Population Forecasts, 1985 through 2000*

Year	Total	Unsentenced	Sentenced
1985	2,084	521	1,563
1990	4,080	863	3,217
1995	6,421	1,158	5,263
2000	8,914	1,429	7,485

*Based on status quo assumptions. Forecasts are mean yearly populations. Includes Federal Bureau of Prisons population.

Status quo forecasts

The forecast of the most probable yearly prison population of Alaska that is presented in Table 1 was derived from a model based on status quo assumptions (that is, assumptions that no structural or substantially disruptive change such as a code revision, an unanticipated population shift, or a major policy change in the criminal justice system will occur). In other words, these forecasts were based on the assumption that, aside from normal evolution and growth, the situation in Alaska would be more or less the same through the year 2000. Without changes from the status quo, Alaska's total long-range prison population, both sentenced and unsentenced, would total nearly 9,000 inmates by the year 2000. The larger portion of the corrections population, those actually sentenced to a prison term, would increase almost fivefold from 1985 levels.

Status quo assumptions were also used to forecast the expected characteristics of the prison population by type of offense (felony or misdemeanor), sex of prisoners, and region of incarceration in the State. Overall, the largest increases would occur in the male sentenced-felon category within the south-central region. Throughout the State, the number of sentenced female felons would also continue to increase, to over 400 females by the year 2000.

The status quo model included three factors that have been identified as affecting prison population growth. Foremost among these factors were the criminal code revisions of the early 1980's. These revisions, which affected the length of sentences (by an average increase of 1.35 years), parole eligibility, and prosecutorial prioritization of crimes, accelerated corrections population growth in almost all areas. Perhaps the most dramatic example of this growth was the increase in sentenced sexual abuse offenders since 1982, from approximately 50 to nearly 500.

The other two factors found to have a statistically significant effect on Alaska prison population levels were the State's unemployment and armed robbery rates. Increases in these rates resulted in an almost immediate increase in the prison population; however, decreases in these rates were followed by only a gradual reduction in prison population.

Alternative scenarios impact

The study also explored the effects of certain hypothetical scenarios upon the future Alaska Department of Corrections population. These scenarios involved changes in criminal codes, unemployment, and armed robbery. One scenario, requiring complete repeal of the 1980 code revisions and substantial reductions in both the unemployment and armed robbery rates, would result in a corrections population of more than 3,000 inmates by the end of the century. The likelihood of such substantial changes in Alaska was very low. At the other extreme, the scenario indicated that if the code were neither repealed nor significantly altered, or its effects on the corrections population mitigated in some substantial fashion, and if the unemployment and armed robbery rates increased significantly, the Department could have over 20,000 prisoners and an extremely serious facilities deficit by the year 2000. The probability of this scenario being realized was also low because the State could probably not afford to maintain such an enormous correctional population and because policy and administrative officials would be forced by economic realities to develop methods for deinstitutionalizing many potential prisoners.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: The status quo forecast, which was used to generate the most likely future prison population situation in Alaska, lies between the best- and worst-case scenarios illustrated above. The researchers were confident of the accuracy of this "most likely" forecast as long as there were no major changes in the assumed patterns of the State's overall population, economic situation, or crime rates. However, it was very likely that some changes would occur, and in planning for future bedspace needs, the Alaska Department of Corrections might want to consider other possible futures from the range of scenarios presented in this report.

Timeframe of the study: 1985-86

Agencies involved: Justice Center, University of Alaska at Anchorage; Alaska Department of Corrections

Alaska's Participation in the Interstate Compact for Probation and Parole

N.E. Schafer, Leslie Wenderoff, and Peter Mirc
Justice Center
University of Alaska at Anchorage
3211 Providence Drive
Anchorage, AK 99508
(907) 786-1810

Objectives of the research: To assess the impact upon caseloads of those requiring supervision under the compact.

Research methodology: The Interstate Compact for the supervision of parolees and probationers is an agreement whereby one State agrees to provide supervision for offenders on community release from other States. Participants in the Interstate Compact agree that any State will accept supervision of a parolee or probationer providing that the offender is either a resident of that State or has family who are residents and that he or she is able to find employment. If these conditions are not met, the receiving State can choose not to accept the offender. The supervising, or receiving, State must use the same standards of supervision for interstate cases as it does for its own parolees and probationers.

Major increases in Alaska's prison population have been accompanied by corresponding increases in the number of persons under probation or parole supervision. Between 1976 and 1986, the number of offenders under community supervision by the Division of Probation rose from an annualized figure of 1,010 to 2,153. This dramatic growth in the total population has resulted in proportional increases in the caseloads of individual probation officers. A perception among many officers that there has been an increase in the number of offenders requiring supervision under the Interstate Compact led to an interest in assessing the impact upon average caseloads of participation in the compact.

Clearly, a number of factors must be considered in assessing Alaska's involvement in the Interstate Compact. This preliminary assessment was hampered by inadequate historical data; no records of interstate transactions have been kept by either the Department of Corrections or its former parent agency, Health and Social Services. Because a major change in computer information systems was undertaken in 1984, much-needed information from prior years is no longer retrievable.

Fortunately, a printout of all persons under the jurisdiction of the Department of Corrections prior to 1983 was available for this research. The data were maintained for case management purposes and did not include information that was considered crucial to a thorough assessment of the impact of the State's participation in the Interstate Compact. Nevertheless, this was the only information available, and it was used to draw some preliminary conclusions that were based on aggregate numbers and could not, for the most part, be refined. The information available included State of original jurisdiction (sending State), destination (receiving State), date of birth, date supervision ends, sex, age, race, and status (probation or parole).

Data on interstate transfers were extracted from the printout and processed by computer. Several pertinent questions could not be answered by the available data. Intake date and instant offense were not available and are essential for a detailed impact study. Knowledge of the intake date would allow a determination of the length of supervision by subtracting it from the supervision end date. Without knowing the length of supervision for each offender under the compact, it is impossible to get an accurate picture of the changes in interstate caseloads on an annual basis. Length of supervision is also a factor in determining the caseload of the Division of Probation.

Findings of the research: Between 1975 and 1984, Alaska processed 1,551 offenders through the Interstate Compact; 999 were received for supervision (64.4% of the total) and 552 (35.6%) were sent to other States. It is significant that 45% more offenders entered the State than left it.

An effort was made to compare this figure with the total field supervision cases for the same years, but similar data were not maintained. Although aggregate annual caseload data for these years are available from the Department of Corrections, there is no way to break down this information into a count of individuals. The data collected for the present study involved information on 1,551 individuals. Because length of supervision varies from 2 years to as many as 20, the yearly overlap of individuals on the annualized caseload is considerable. At the same time, because the case management information for the study did not contain intake dates, annualized caseloads could not be measured.

The researchers expected that the outgoing transfers would tend to be on parole rather than on probation. A current investigation of case records indicated that a substantial number of State offenders who were incarcerated in Federal prisons chose to be on parole in the States where they had been incarcerated. In fact, parolees constituted fewer than 25% of the total sample and proportionally fewer of the outgoing offenders than of the incoming ones. Probationers were more likely to have been first offenders or to have been involved in less serious crimes than parolees; therefore, this proportion might be viewed as positive in assessing impacts on total caseloads.

The movement of Interstate Compact offenders to and from Alaska was largely a regional one. The major exchange was with States on the West Coast. Of the 999 offenders received by the State, more than half (50.8%) were from the States of Washington, California, and Oregon. Of those sent out of Alaska (N = 552), 51.8% went to these same three States. Five States—Washington, California, Oregon, Texas, and Florida—appear as both States of original jurisdiction and as States of destination in the same order and in approximately the same proportion. The regional nature of the exchange was not unexpected. Movement between Alaska and Washington, California, and Oregon is common for persons other than offenders. Many jobs in Alaska require skills that can be acquired in these States (for example, forestry, fishing, and construction). Many Alaskans go to these States for education and training, and many have relatives in these States. The inclusion of Texas among the top five exchange States is not surprising either; during the period under study, the oil fields were being developed and the trans-Alaska pipeline was under construction.

The ratio of males to females in the sample was 9:1 and held constant for both incoming and outgoing offenders. The proportion is different for the State's incarcerated population, in which females constitute closer to 6% of the total, but comparison with supervised populations cannot be made for reasons already noted.

Racially, the offenders in the sample are overwhelmingly white, which reflects the total urban population of the State. It was expected that Alaska Natives would constitute the largest minority in the sample because this group represents 33% of the incarcerated population in Alaska. Alaska Natives include both Eskimos and several Indian groups (Athabascan, Tlingit, and others), but even when these two groups are combined they constitute a smaller percentage of the totals than do blacks. Some Alaska Natives prefer not to label themselves Indian and may be included as others. However, this group is so undefined that we cannot make this an assumption.

It is interesting that the number of blacks in the incoming group is identical to that in the outgoing group. As a proportion of the totals, twice as many blacks leave the State as enter it under the compact.

The average age of Interstate Compact offenders during the 7-year data collection period was 30.5 years; the mode was 23. A small number of offenders were born before 1920 (N = 26); therefore, during supervision they ranged from age 58 to 80. The oldest offender was born in 1902, and the youngest in 1964. The largest percent of offenders (55.5) were in their twenties, and the next largest percent (28) were in their thirties. The remainder were older, except for 2% who were younger than 20.

The impact of compact participation by Alaska cities is of special interest. As Alaska's largest city, Anchorage processed the largest number of Interstate Compact participants: 482 incoming and 258 outgoing. Anchorage had a larger number of employment opportunities than most other cities and, with the largest population, the greatest possibility that an incoming offender would have relatives residing there. The ratio of incoming to outgoing offenders in Anchorage during the course of this study was 1.86:1.

Fairbanks is the second largest city in Alaska and had the second largest number of incoming (N = 772) and outgoing (N = 111) offenders. During the years encompassed by this study, the city of Fairbanks experienced rapid growth in both population and development because it was a hub of pipeline activity.

Other cities experiencing a high rate of flux were Juneau, Kenai, Ketchikan, and Kodiak. The draw to these cities was likely due to job opportunities in commercial fishing, refineries, canneries, and timber industries.

Based on our data, the Interstate Compact has not yet been an equitable arrangement for any city in Alaska. Each city has seen a greater number of incoming than of outgoing transfers.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: If the addition of Interstate Compact transfers to caseloads has a significant impact on the cost and quality of supervision in the State, more careful processing of transfer requests might be undertaken to reduce the inflow.

Agencies involved: Justice Center, University of Alaska at Anchorage; Alaska Department of Corrections

An Analysis of Offense Patterns, Recidivism, and Emergency Detention of Children Accused of Delinquent Acts in Alaska in 1985

David L. Parry
Justice Center
University of Alaska at Anchorage
3211 Providence Drive
Anchorage, AK 99508
(907) 786-1810

Objectives of the research: To provide information on juvenile offense patterns, recidivism, and emergency detention practices.

Research methodology: The report presents the results of an analysis of juvenile delinquency referrals handled by the Division of Family and Youth Services (DFYS) and the Alaska Department of Health and Social Services in 1985, the first year in which DFYS was responsible for provision of intake services in juvenile delinquency cases on a statewide basis. Baseline data for this research were derived from intake logs and case files maintained by the Division. The principal findings and recommendations are highlighted below.

Findings of the research: Intake logs maintained by DFYS revealed that 4,800 children, or about 3% of all children in the State, were arrested at least once in 1985 for an act that would be a crime if committed by an adult. Of these, 1,002 (21% of all children arrested, or less than 1% of all children in the State) were arrested more than once, bringing the total number of juvenile arrests in 1985 to 6,464.

Nearly two-thirds of all referrals were for minor property offenses or liquor violations. Misdemeanor thefts accounted for 29% of all offenses reported to DFYS in 1985. Another 19% of all offenses were liquor violations. Other misdemeanor property offenses contributed another 17% to the total. About 18% of referrals were for felonies, but only 159 referrals, or about 2.5% of all referrals, were for violent felonies.

Based on these figures, there were 3,818 arrests per 100,000 children in 1985. This is about 36% higher than the comparable national rate, which was computed to be 2,801 per 100,000 children in 1984, the last year for which complete statistics are available. The arrest rate for violent felonies, however, was only 94 per 100,000 children in Alaska, 44% lower than the estimated national rate of about 135 such arrests per 100,000 children. The rate of arrest for all felonies combined was calculated at 692 per 100,000 children in Alaska, but because no comparable national figures are available, comparison with rates of arrest for all felony-level offenses among juveniles nationally was not possible.

Using a weighted sample of 648 children referred to DFYS intake officers between January 1 and June 30, 1985, to assess the probability of rearrest for children whose cases were handled informally (that is, without filing a petition for delinquency adjudication), it was found that 6% of these children were arrested for new offenses within 30 days and 23% were arrested within 6 months following a base period referral. In both cases, more than one-third of all rearrests were for the offense of a minor consuming alcohol.

Children in the districts served by the field offices in Barrow and Ketchikan were more likely than those in other districts to commit new offenses during both tracking periods. Districts with low rearrest rates during both periods included Anchorage, Fairbanks, Palmer, and Kodiak.

Base-period offenses differed very little between children who were subsequently rearrested and those who were not. Similarly, none of the demographic characteristics examined—age, sex, and race—differed substantially between reoffenders and others. Factors that did differ somewhat between children who were subsequently rearrested and those who were not, included the number of offenses or counts with which the child was charged, the number of times the child had previously been arrested, and the use of 48-hour detention or emergency placement following initial screening by an intake officer for the base-period offense. However, while these factors all differed noticeably between reoffenders and others during both tracking periods, in no case was the difference an especially large one.

Using a sample of 618 children detained at the discretion of intake officers to assess compliance with detention criteria mandated by DFYS, it was found that 29% of such detentions statewide were in compliance with a narrow interpretation of the detention policy, with compliance levels in individual districts ranging from 10% in Ketchikan and Juneau to 48% in Anchorage and Kenai. Forty-one percent of discretionary detentions statewide (18%-76% in individual districts) were found to be in compliance with an expanded interpretation of the policy under which a larger range of offenses was encompassed within the definition of detainable offenses than in the initial analysis.

Forty percent of all children detained at intake officer discretion, and more than half of all children who were detained in violation of the policy, were charged with liquor violations. If all of these cases had been in compliance with the policy, 74% of detentions overall would have satisfied the expanded version of the criteria, and 64% would have satisfied the more restrictive interpretation as well.

In one-third of discretionary detentions in Anchorage, Fairbanks, and Juneau, the child's parent could not be located or, when located, refused to accept custody of the child. Had these cases been in compliance with the detention criteria, the overall level of compliance with the narrow interpretation of the policy in these districts would have been 54%, and compliance with the expanded interpretation would have been 64%. If these cases and also those involving liquor violations had been consistent with the policy, overall compliance in these districts would have been 78% with the expanded interpretation and 70% with the narrow version of the policy.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: The study made the following recommendations: State resources would be most effectively utilized by continuing the DFYS policy of diverting minor offenders out of the juvenile justice system and concentrating available services on those children who commit serious or multiple offenses or repeatedly come to the attention of intake officers.

It is recommended that detention policy be revised as follows:

- The meaning of the terms "serious offense" and "serious property offenses" should be clarified.
- Specific provisions should be made for responding to situations in which detention criteria are not satisfied, but less restrictive alternatives have been determined to be unavailable or inappropriate.
- Specific instruction in interpretation and application of detention standards should be incorporated into intake officer training.

Further efforts to standardize intake records and upgrade the quality and accessibility of case information are needed. Specific recommendations are as follows:

- A standardized format should be used in all districts to record basic information about client characteristics (for example, age, sex, race, current residence, and living situation), offenses, detention, dispositions, current probation status, and so forth, in case files.
- Standardized procedures for recording case information, including the kinds of information to be included in intake logs and case files, as well as the terminology to be employed, should be explained in detail to each intake officer as a routine component of his or her training.
- A central, computerized system for maintenance of information currently recorded on intake logs and in card files should be adopted. A network of microcomputers connected to a central unit by modem would be sufficient for this purpose.

There appears to be a critical need to develop viable alternatives to detention of children who do not meet mandated detention criteria.

Agencies involved: Alaska Division of Family and Youth Services

Department of Corrections Personnel Survey: Final Report

N.E. Schafer
Justice Center
University of Alaska at Anchorage
3211 Providence Drive
Anchorage, AK 99508
(907) 786-1810

Objectives of the research: (1) To compile educational profiles of employees, (2) to assess educational goals and needs of personnel, (3) to gather information about the type and extent of corrections experience, and (4) to compare personnel profiles with stipulated State job qualifications.

Research methodology: A personnel survey that sought self-reported data on education, experience, and training was developed and distributed with the cooperation of the Alaska Department of Corrections (DOC). The survey forms were distributed by the Department in October, November, and December 1984 to all employees in institutions and agencies throughout the State in all position categories, from clerk to commissioner. Coding and analysis were later completed by the Justice Center.

To assess the response rate, official figures from the most up-to-date personnel report (June 1984) were used as a base. These figures were neither more nor less accurate than those for the following June because personnel recruitment continued during the fiscal year as prison populations grew. There were 816 employees in June 1985. Among corrections officers the response rate was 75.6% (N = 353), and among probation officers, 85.7% (N = 72).

Findings of the research: Approximately 66% of all DOC employees participated in the survey (N = 636). Of this number, 47.8% reported having at least a 2-year college degree, and 35.1% had 4-year degrees. The categories of correctional officer, probation officer, administrator, and treatment personnel were considered corrections-specific employees. Their numbers totaled 475; nearly half (48%) had at least an associate's degree, while more than a third (N = 170) had a bachelor's degree.

Two items were considered indicative of commitment to education: intent to continue and current enrollment. Results seem to indicate that Department of Corrections employees place a high premium on education: more than two-thirds (69.3%) of all employees hoped to continue their educations. Among correctional officer respondents, 73% planned more education; among probation officer respondents, 77%. However, this seemed to be a long-term rather than an immediate goal. Only 5% of the respondents were enrolled in college classes at the time of the survey (N = 29). It was concluded that a combination of access and scheduling made class attendance difficult.

Data were assembled on the prior experience of respondents in only corrections-specific employee classifications. More than 40% of the 475 corrections-specific respondents reported having prior experience in other justice agencies. The type of prior experience was especially interesting. It was assumed that the respondents would report prior correctional experience and prior military experience. Military experience was the least reported, while prior experience in law enforcement was nearly as common as prior experience in corrections. Among correctional officers, corrections was the least frequently reported, while prior experience and law enforcement were most frequently reported.

Because of changes in the Department of Corrections training operation, indepth analysis of the training was not attempted. Sixty percent of all personnel received training provided by the Department of Corrections. Seventy-five percent of correctional officer respondents reported attending such training.

A comparison of survey responses with position descriptions shows that a substantial proportion of Department of Corrections employees have more than the minimum qualifications required. This suggests that staff are highly qualified.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: Education, experience, and training of personnel are frequently used as measures of quality in correctional agencies. The use of the survey to assess corrections in Alaska would lead to the conclusion that Alaska ranks high nationally in these measures of personnel quality.

Timeframe of the study: 1984-85

Agencies involved: Justice Center, University of Anchorage at Alaska; Alaska Department of Corrections

A Descriptive Study of Alaska Correctional Officers and Their Attitudes Toward Inmates

Cheryl A. Easley
Justice Center
University of Alaska at Anchorage
3211 Providence Drive
Anchorage, AK 99508
(907) 786-1810

Objectives of the research: (1) To describe the correctional officer population and (2) to determine whether a relationship exists between individual workers' attributes or organizational factors and the attitudes toward inmates.

Research methodology: Data were collected from 1986 to 1988 at every adult correctional facility in the State. These institutions together housed 2,069 adult inmates and employed 518 correctional officers. Arrangements were made for researchers to visit as many facilities as possible and personally distribute the surveys. Before the questionnaires were distributed to officers, the researcher attended shift orientation meetings at each facility to explain the purpose of the survey, answer questions, and assure confidentiality of the responses. Initially, there was a great deal of mistrust on the part of most officers because the study was being conducted by an outsider. Most wanted assurances that the researcher was not an employee of the Department of Corrections and that their comments and responses would remain confidential. Once reassured, most participants became very interested in the project and were willing to cooperate.

After discussion with the superintendents, it was decided that officers who wished to participate would have more free time to complete a survey during early morning hours. Consequently, surveys were distributed at the beginning of the evening shift. Because correctional officers work a rotating shift of 1 week of nights followed by a week off, then a week of days followed by a week off, it required 1 month to complete survey distribution.

Facilities located in rural areas (Nome, Bethel, Juneau, and Ketchikan) were not visited because funding was not available for transportation. Instead, a letter of introduction and questionnaires were mailed to these facilities. Each survey included a self-addressed, stamped envelope that officers individually sealed and returned to the researcher. Two weeks after the initial mailing of the surveys, a letter was sent encouraging participation in the study.

At each of the seven facilities visited (Cook Inlet, Wildwood, Palmer, Goose Bay, Fairbanks, Sixth Avenue, and Hiland Mountain/Meadow Creek), the researcher spent time with officers on the job. Informal conversations and participant observation provided much of the descriptive data for this study.

Findings of the research: The research questions were based on two opposing theories found in the literature on corrections and in the sociology of work. The first is the belief of many prison reformers that changing the demographic composition of the correctional officer work force to more closely reflect that of the inmate population will result in improved officer-inmate relationships. If relationships between officers and inmates improve, the rehabilitation process for inmates will be more effective. The opposing perspective is that organizational factors are more powerful than personnel changes in determining officers' attitudes toward inmates.

The results of this analysis do not lend support to either of these theories. Explanations for attitudes toward inmates were found neither in the individual characteristics of the correctional officer work force nor in the organizational factors of the work environment.

Minority officers did not have more positive attitudes toward inmates. In two Alaskan facilities where the majority of officers and the majority of inmates were Alaska Natives, the same number of Native and non-Native officers had negative attitudes toward inmates. The findings, then, do not support the theory that racial integration of the correctional officer work force will, in itself, bridge the gap between inmates and officers. Even though there was a slight tendency for officers with education beyond a 4-year college degree to have more positive attitudes toward inmates, this variable was not statistically related to attitudes toward inmates. While many have suggested

increased education for officers, these findings suggest that more education is not related to more positive attitudes toward inmates.

Sex was not related to positive attitudes toward inmates. Females in this sample exhibited largely the same attitudes toward inmates as male officers.

A large portion (65%) of correctional officers in this sample had experience in the military, and it was assumed that this background characteristic would negatively influence attitudes toward inmates. The analysis, however, did not support this conclusion. The attitudes of these former military personnel toward inmates were as positive as those of officers who had not spent time in the service.

Age was the only personal attribute that approached statistical significance when compared with the index that measured attitudes toward inmates. However, the results were the opposite of what was expected: the hypothesis that younger officers would have more positive attitudes toward inmates was not supported.

Organizational factors did not appear to have the predicted effect on officers' attitudes toward inmates. Slightly more officers employed less than 3 years had positive attitudes toward inmates, but the relationship was not statistically significant. These findings suggest that continued work in the prison environment produces or attracts those officers who view inmates more negatively.

No relationship was found between the type of facility and attitudes toward inmates. When grouped together, officers employed at custodial facilities were as likely to have positive attitudes toward inmates as officers employed at treatment facilities. These findings do not correspond with those of previous researchers, which suggested that the staff tend to conform to the organizational goals (rehabilitative versus custodial) of their superiors.

Differences in the composition of the work force and organizational variables considered unique to the Department of Corrections in Alaska do not appear to be related to attitudes toward inmates among correctional officers.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: The lack of statistical support for the hypotheses, most of which were rooted in conventional wisdom as well as in the correctional literature, does not necessarily mean that the hiring of minorities or women, the need for educated officers, military experience, or the age of the applicant is irrelevant. The assumptions surrounding the hiring practices and retention of correctional officers need to be given more thought and examined more closely by those in policymaking roles.

Timeframe of the study: The survey was conducted in 1986.

Agencies involved: Justice Center, University of Anchorage at Alaska; Alaska Department of Corrections

Discretion, Due Process, and the Prison Discipline Committee

N.E. Schafer
Justice Center
University of Alaska at Anchorage
3211 Providence Drive
Anchorage, AK 99508
(907) 786-1810

Objectives of the research: To determine the degree to which the discretion of one prison disciplinary committee (PDC) has been affected by court rulings.

Research methodology: Data were collected from daily reports of the prison disciplinary committee of a maximum security facility in Indiana over an 11-month period from July 1980 to June 1981. The data included prisoner identifiers, prisoner housing unit, the violation, the date of the violation, the plea, and the disposition.

Findings of the research: Prison discipline received considerable attention from both the courts and professional organizations during the decade of the 1970's. It was widely assumed that the due process requirements that resulted from judicial review, coupled with the promulgation of model discipline standards and procedures, would limit the broad discretionary authority traditional in the prison discipline process. A case study of the activities of one prison discipline committee suggests that these external pressures have had less impact on decisionmaking than such internal pressures as overcrowding. Due process requirements have not greatly inhibited the exercise of discretion in the prison discipline process.

The prison discipline process has been characterized as arbitrary and capricious and a suitable area for court intervention. Federal courts have mandated minimal due process requirements for prison discipline proceedings but have not dealt with the nature of prison rules and regulations or the appropriateness of the sanctions for violations. The discretionary decisionmaking power of the PDC has not been weakened by these court decisions, although an appeal process may alter their decisions.

The PDC under study clearly retained broad discretion in the exercise of its power. The dispositions available, the possibility of combining dispositions, and the authority to set the duration of each sanction provided a broad base for the exercise of discretion. The data reflect this, but do not provide proof that the change in the use of substantial penalties was impacted by court decisions.

Because the PDC under study had not been directly affected by judicial review, that is, had not been part of any suit related to prison discipline, it seems more likely that the change can be attributed to institutional realities—the pressure of major population increases. A major question raised by such a conclusion is whether disposition patterns will change when the crowding problem is resolved. Crowding is not desirable, and few prison employees would object to actions designed to relieve it. If a major reduction in population were to occur, there might be an increase in the use of the "substantial penalties" of extension of release date and punitive segregation. The creative use of alternative dispositions demonstrated in Figures 1 and 2 suggests this possibility.

Figure 1. Dispositions Imposed by Category of Offense

Dispositions Ranked by Severity	Class A	Class B	Class C	Class D	Total
Extension of release date	61	134	49	6	250
A. (Change of credit class)	(53)	(121)	(46)	(3)	(223)
B. (Loss of time earned)	(8)	(13)	(3)	(3)	(27)
Punitive segregation	127	389	128	193	837
Restriction with loss of privileges	4	38	27	41	110
Restriction	49	523	418	718	1,708
Loss of privileges	4	112	139	297	552
Restitution/pay damages	1	38	13	12	64
Time served ¹	3	6	3	2	14
Warning, ² reprimand	0	137	133	377	647
Acquittal ²	1	21	48	87	157
Total	250	1,398	958	1,733	4,339

¹Detention time served awaiting disciplinary court was equivalent to disposition time.

²There may be an overlap here. Many acquittals were accompanied by verbal warnings or reprimands that led to coding confusion.

The PDC made broad use of sanctions that did not require additional space and used its discretion to combine these sanctions to increase their severity. The double sanction of in-cell restriction with loss of privileges appears to be an effort to assign a penalty as severe as punitive segregation. Reassignment to the maximum restraint unit restricted prisoner movement but did not include loss of privileges. Confinement to one's cell (or dormitory) also restricted movement; when combined with loss of privileges, this disposition is quite substantial. This combined disposition often included separate lengths for each part, with restriction being the longer portion of the sanction. For this reason, and because there were only 110 cases of double penalty, these were coded under in-cell restriction in Figure 2. The maximum length was coded, and the 110 double-sanction cases have been included in the duration table (Figure 2) under the in-cell restriction category.

Figure 2. Length (in Days) by Disposition and Type of Offense

Disposition and Type of Offense	Number of Cases	Range	Mean	Departmental Guidelines
Punitive segregation				
Class A	127	30-1,095	392.32	365-1,095
Class B	389	1-365	98.53	30-180
Class C	128	2-180	40.07	15-45
Class D	193	1-1,095	61.28	1-30
In-cell restriction				
Class A	53	2-60	35.57	Not suggested
Class B	560	1-90	22.70	15-60
Class C	443	1-60	16.33	15-30
Class D	761	1-60	9.41	1-30
Loss of privileges ¹				
Class A	4	7-60	27.75	NA
Class B	112	1-90	25.71	NA
Class C	139	1-60	24.38	NA
Class D	297	1-30	18.09	NA

¹Loss of privileges is not included in the *Disciplinary Procedures Manual*.

It should also be noted from Figure 2 that what is considered the mildest penalty (loss of privileges) is imposed for considerably longer periods than in-cell restriction for all but Class A violations. Although there is a hierarchy of penalties, ranging from substantial to mild, the duration assigned implies an effort to equalize the lesser penalties. The duration data thus reflect broad use of discretionary authority and are a very useful means of assessing the discretion exercised by PDC's. Future studies of the prison discipline process should include this measure. The discretion data collected in the study cannot indicate the basis of each kind of discretion exercised by the PDC, but they do demonstrate that discretion was being exercised and was intended to increase the penalty in some cases and to mitigate the harshness of prescribed penalties in others.

For nearly every category of violation, the range of durations assigned has a lower minimum than that prescribed by the departmental guidelines (Figure 2). The differentials at both ends of the ranges suggest decisionmaking on a case-by-case basis. Not all discipline cases are simple and straightforward; many require careful consideration, and some charges require interpretation. Assault, a Class A violation, serves as an example.

The charge of assault is entered whether the victim was a prisoner or a staff member, but the disposition may not be the same. The initial charge is entered regardless of the outcome of the hearing. It may be determined from witnesses that what an officer saw as an assault was actually the end of an unequal fight (a Class B violation), and sanctions must be altered accordingly. Where the assault occurred adds another dimension to the complexity of the case. In this study, assaults occurred in cell blocks and dormitories, the school, and the infirmary. One occurred at a discipline hearing, and another in the superintendent's office. Disposition decisions will take into account a variety of factors.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: The PDC at the Indiana Reformatory operated under procedures that went beyond the minimum due process mandated by court decisions. All violators, not just those in danger of substantial penalties, had the opportunity for a hearing. None of the committee members interviewed could recall a case where security had been invoked to prevent the calling of witnesses as *Wolff v. McDonnell* (1974) permits. The procedures as written in the *Department of Corrections Manual* (1982) fully conformed to the model discipline procedures specified by professional organizations. While conformance to court decisions and published standards did provide procedural safeguards, they did not greatly limit the broad discretionary authority of this prison discipline committee as evidenced by the duration data. These data suggest that the committee was impacted to a greater degree by the internal institutional reality of increased population than by external pressures to provide a "just" disciplinary process.

Evaluation of the Alaska Pre-Trial Intervention (PTI) Program

N.E. Schafer
Justice Center
University of Alaska at Anchorage
3211 Providence Drive
Anchorage, AK 99508
(907) 786-1810

Objectives of the research: (1) To examine extralegal and legal characteristics of program clients; (2) to analyze program conditions, compliance, and dispositions; and (3) to analyze achievement of program goals.

Research methodology: The pretrial data base was collected over a 4-year period (1983 to 1986) from specially designed self-duplicating admission and release forms. The duplicated page was designed to obliterate personal identifiers (name, address, and so on) and provide only codable data for the project.

The admission data included legal, personal, and treatment requirement information for all clients. The legal data included the instant offense, type of offense, prior record, type of attorney, type of victim, jurisdiction, and so forth. Personal information included such demographic data as age, sex, race, marital status, length of residence, and education and employment histories as well as information gleaned from the intake interview: whether the client had been a victim of physical or sexual abuse, whether he or she had problems with alcohol or drugs, whether he or she had attempted suicide, and so forth. Elements of the treatment plan were also included on the admission form: the amount of monetary restitution owed, the number of hours of community service required, the designation of a counseling program, the requirements to attend school or to seek or maintain employment, and the requirements to remain in contact with the PTI counselor.

The release forms addressed the extent to which the client had complied with the requirements of his or her treatment plan: restitution dollars paid, service performed, completion of counseling program, and so forth. The release form included final disposition of the client—satisfactory or unsatisfactory

compliance with the program contract—as well as any charge filed against clients arrested during program participation.

The addition of criminal histories to the data base was accomplished with the cooperation and assistance of the Alaska Department of Public Safety, whose crime files were searched for arrest data for all PTI clients. Care was taken in matching privacy guidelines specified in Alaska Administrative Code 6.60.090, "Research Use of Criminal Justice Information," which were strictly followed in this process. Complete criminal histories were obtained, including the pretrial intake offense as well as any previous arrests. Arrest charge, arrest date, conviction charge, and conviction date were included as well as a total count of all arrests for each client. Recidivism was defined as an arrest subsequent to the client's intake date; thus, clients could be counted as recidivists whether they reoffended while still in the PTI Program or after termination. PTI admission data were recoded to conform to the National Crime Information Center (NCIC) criminal history data.

Findings of the research: The Alaska PTI Program operated successfully based on a variety of measurements throughout the period of its existence. It met intake goals and was available to a broad spectrum of Alaska citizens; two-thirds of the clients admitted to the program have no record of any subsequent law violations.

A basic policy governing the program was to admit only prosecutable offenders, and available evidence shows this policy was followed; the PTI Program did not increase the number of persons caught in the criminal justice net. In this regard, it achieved a goal of "minimum penetration" and avoided potential strain at further points in the Alaska criminal justice system.

One of the keys to successful avoidance of net widening was that the program operated under the same agency that governs prosecution throughout the State. Because the program was a part of their own organization, Alaska prosecutors tended to view PTI as an alternative rather than as a program to which nonprosecutable cases could be referred. This is a major difference between the Alaska PTI Program and those reported in the literature: most were operated by agencies with no direct links to the prosecutors' offices, and as a result, prosecutor referrals were not governed by program policies, but were dependent on prosecutor perceptions of the utility of the program.

The Alaska program was successful in providing alternatives to more severe sanctions for nearly 1,900 Alaskans throughout the State. The opportunity to avoid a criminal conviction was not directed at specific population groups, but was available to a variety of Alaskans of all ages, races, and socioeconomic levels as long as their offenses were not violent or, in the case of property crimes, not of a serious or threatening nature.

PTI clients were as young as 17 and as old as 66 at intake date, with an average age of 26 years. One-fourth of the clients (25.2%) had not completed high school—although some were quite well educated—454 (24.3%) had been to college, and 34 had advanced degrees. At intake, 31.9% of the clients (N = 595) were unemployed, and 40.9% (N = 763) were employed full-time.

A substantial proportion of the men and women in the program were long-term Alaska residents; their average length of time in residence was 13.8 years. The program was, however, also available to newcomers; approximately a quarter of the clients had been in residence for less than 4 years. While whites constituted the overwhelming majority of PTI clients (69.5%), the program served

a substantial number of Alaska Natives. Their representation in the sample (21.3%) was greater than their representation in the general population (16%), as was the representation of blacks (5% in the program, compared to 3.3% in the general population).

This heterogeneity of PTI clients reveals that admission to the program was not based on a determination that some people are more deserving of an opportunity to avoid a criminal conviction than others, but rather on published guidelines regarding offense eligibility and case quality.

More than a third of the program's participants had been charged as felons (36.8%) and almost as many (36.3%) were not first offenders. All of the charges were within the Department of Law's established policies for PTI Program eligibility. Program guidelines required that, except for domestic violence offenses, eligible clients would be charged with less serious property or public order offenses. The data show that theft, drug offenses, burglary/trespass, assault, and minor consuming were the most frequent offenses charged to clients in the program, but there were several offenses that appeared more rarely—some only once, others as many as 76 times. The appearance of some of these offenses in the data base indicates that local prosecutors were free to make referrals based on local problems and needs.

The statewide nature of the program permitted a variety of Alaskans to take advantage of this alternative sanction. Participation in the program permitted them to remain in their communities, to the benefit of those communities. Community needs that would otherwise have gone unmet were fulfilled through the community service requirements of the PTI Program. Placement into work service depended upon client abilities and community needs. Placement included youth work, janitorial work, work for nonprofit agencies, hospitals, and so forth. The work performed could not be work normally done by someone in a paid position. Statewide PTI participants completed 65,302 hours of community service between 1983 and mid-1986. In addition, the 1,864 clients paid a total of \$435,081 in monetary restitution to victims.

PTI clients also participated in a number of treatment programs to which they were referred, including alcohol, psychological, and domestic violence counseling as well as career counseling. A substantial portion of them were apparently helped by these programs because 65% of the PTI clients had not been rearrested 2-4½ years after entering the program.

All available evidence from this complete and detailed data base shows that the Alaska PTI Program operated successfully for more than 3 years—1983 to mid-1986. Ironically, this program, which provided a desirable and cost-effective disposition to a broad spectrum of the State's citizens, was phased out when Alaska's economy began to falter.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings:

- The office of the prosecutor should be a cosponsor or partner in pretrial diversion programs, with the responsibility to ensure that only prosecutable cases are referred for admission. While the centralization of the Alaska program under a State prosecutorial agency resulted from a special feature of the organization of Alaska's criminal justice system not seen elsewhere, its advantages could be incorporated into local programs. Adding nonprosecutable cases to the criminal justice system is not cost effective. Only the office of the prosecutor can ensure that net-widening is avoided.

- Eligibility guidelines should be clear and specific and should be based primarily on offense behavior and defendant record, rather than on personal or social characteristics. Because participants are assured that charges will be dropped upon completion of their diversion contracts, pretrial diversion is viewed as a mild sanction that allows offenders to avoid the stigma of a criminal conviction. Personal and social characteristics may be used to decide whether a conviction is inappropriate. While this is an acceptable function of diversion programs, attention to legal variables will help ensure that all erring citizens have access to the program and that diversion is a true alternative to more severe penal sanctions.
- Because minorities are overrepresented in the Nation's jail and prison populations, minority clients should also be overrepresented in diversion populations. Attention to the minority composition of diversion clients can help ensure that the program is serving as an alternative disposition, and that legal as well as social variables are included in the referral decision.
- Rates of client recidivism should be used to assess adherence to program guidelines as well as program effectiveness. Diversion programs that serve nonprosecutable offenders will have artificially low recidivism rates; diversion programs that serve only prosecutable offenders will have recidivism rates comparable to other community-based programs.
- Ongoing evaluation research by an independent agency should be incorporated into the program at its initiation. Both researchers and staff should be involved in the design of the evaluation and in data collection. The model developed by the Department of Law and the Justice Center can ensure an accurate basis for program decisions, including policy changes and changes in priorities.

Agencies involved: Justice Center, University of Alaska at Anchorage; Alaska Department of Public Safety

Jails and Judicial Review: Special Problems for Local Facilities

N.E. Schafer
 Justice Center
 University of Alaska at Anchorage
 3211 Providence Drive
 Anchorage, AK 99508
 (907) 786-1810

Objectives of the research: To examine the compliance history of one Indiana jail in light of jail officials' responses.

Research methodology: Case analysis

Findings of the research: The local character of county jails leaves them more susceptible to court intervention than State prisons, yet less prepared to respond. Their participation in remedy formulation tends to be reactive rather than proactive, and their compliance with court orders is often marked by delay and confusion. A case study of the jail suit brought against Marion County Jail in Indiana in 1972 illustrates the problems caused by the jail's local perspective and isolation from other corrections systems. (See "Partial Chronology of Events" below.)

Partial Chronology of Events

Date	Court Action	Compliance Activity
September 1972	Suit filed	
November 1972	Amended complaint	
March 1973	Order to proceed as class action suit	
1974-75		New jail rules formulated for submission to court resulting in Consent Decree and Partial Judgment
June 1975	Consent Decree and Partial Judgment— contact visiting out of cell; block recreation overcrowding	
March 1976	Court order	
April 1976		Steering Committee appointed to select consultants
June 1977		Consultants' report submitted
January 1978	Mayor's memorandum regarding compliance	
February 1978	Sheriff's memorandum regarding compliance	
August 1978	Plaintiffs' interrogatories to sheriff	
September 1978	Sheriff's response to interrogatories	
April 1979		Consolidation of jail and city/county lockup
Fall 1979		Jail sends letters to facilities around the country seeking assistance and advice
December 1979	Motion for order to show cause; motion to appoint special master; motion to restrain further incarceration	
January 1980		Ad Hoc Jail Committee recruited
February 1980		New classification system in operation
May 1980	Stipulation and order programs ordered; commissioners appointed	GIPC begins to monitor the appointed compliance commission
July 1980		Contact visits begin
August 1980		Indoor recreation area opened; outdoor exercise begins; TV's installed; cubicles for attorney-client conferences
April 1981		City-County Special Resolution to commence expansion of jail
March 1982	Stipulation and order 1979 motions held in abeyance until July 1982	
June 1982		Architect's drawings
July 1982	Commission report filed	
December 1982		Jail addition construction contracts signed
April 1983		Construction begins

Remedy formulation in judicial orders vis-à-vis prisons and jails includes remedial abstention, court imposition, court selection, master-supervised formulation, and negotiation. The first of these is the most common and reflects the judge's willingness to rely on the defendant institution to formulate remedies to correct the problems established in the suit. In effect, the court retains jurisdiction and orders responsible officials to submit plans that address the facts of the suit.

In the Marion County suit, remedial abstention was the first of three methods of remedy formulation attempted by the court. The only response by jail officials was a new set of jail rules based specifically on the facts of the case that they submitted to the court in 1975. No plan for implementation of the rules was included. Personnel involved in the submission state that the intent was to mollify the court and persuade the judge to terminate the case. The process of putting the new rules into practice was never considered. Although the submission of new rules resulted in a consent decree and partial judgment, the court retained jurisdiction. By 1979, so little had been done by way of implementation that the court turned to two other judicial prerogatives: a special master was appointed, and negotiations between defendants' and plaintiffs' counsels were ordered. These methods of remedy formulation began to produce results. Probably one or the other should have been tried much earlier in the process.

While defendants in all jail or prison lawsuits may be unwilling to cooperate in remedy formulation, defendants in jail units may be unwilling and unable to cooperate. Lawsuits rise, after all, out of conditions in the defendant jail, and the defendant officials' expertise in jail management is usually based on experience in that jail alone. Participation in the formulation of remedies requires the defendant sheriff to criticize his own prior performance and to do so in isolation, because he has seldom had an opportunity to compare his facility with others. Prison officials, on the other hand, have traditionally had access to a network of information and expertise that has enabled them to respond rapidly and rationally to court orders and to participate knowledgeably in remedy formulation.

In jail suits, very soon after the plaintiff's need for relief has been established, the court should consider appointment of a special master to assist jail officials in remedy formulation. In the suit studied here, there was confusion over expectations. For example, the court ordered contact visiting at least equal in quality and frequency to that provided for convicted felons in a nearby State prison. Jail personnel were unfamiliar with these visiting facilities, and some were unaware that contact visitation was not a euphemism for conjugal visitation. The search for advice from other defendant jails, which was undertaken in 1979, illustrated the sheriff's uncertainty about how to deal with judicial review. It also reflected the new realization that this suit was not a local quarrel with the Federal court but part of a national trend.

In the case of Marion County, the initial resentment and outright antagonism engendered by the suit made negotiation an unacceptable early method of remedy formulation. However, a special master could have been ordered to negotiate remedies between counsels for the plaintiffs and defendants. Early appointment of such a master might have kept the attention of jail personnel focused on the suit even during the transition between changing administrations.

The master finally appointed in 1980 was a person of such prestige in the community that he might have been able to influence the local governing body to appropriate funds for at least partial compliance. No requests for compliance funds were included in the sheriffs' budgets until 1979.

Earlier budget requests, even though denied, might ultimately have underscored the need for compliance and resulted in earlier acquiescence by the City-County Council. This is, of course, speculation. Because the Council officially inserted the word "reluctantly" into its approval of new jail construction in 1981, it was clearly resistant to the idea of allocating funds for improvement of the jail. The Council might have been moved to action only by the threat of contempt-of-court citations or an imposed moratorium on acceptance of prisoners at the jail.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: Judicial intervention on behalf of pretrial prisoners has helped to focus national attention on county jails. The result has been a growing professionalism among jail administrators and increasing interest among local sheriffs in quality jail management. The National Sheriffs' Association published a jail administration manual in 1974. The American Correctional Association and the National Institute of Corrections offer assistance and training to local facilities, and more and more jails have taken advantage of these opportunities.

The jail that was studied remained outside this opportunity network for many years after the suit was filed. Some jails continue to operate in isolation; if they fall under judicial review, they will be unable to formulate remedies. Courts should consider defendant jails' involvement in professional networks before deciding on a method of remedy formulation.

In Marion County, defendants were plagued by handicaps to compliance caused by isolation and were, in large measure, unable to find ways to comply with the orders of the court. For some of the defendants, the compliance process was a learning experience. They moved through several responses: defiance and anger, "sitting-tight," and finally, active involvement. According to one of the originally named defendants, the hardest part about responding to the court order was changing attitudes, "including my own." Pleased with the new professionalism among jail personnel and anticipating completion of the new jail extension, he acknowledged that the court order "may have been the best thing that ever happened to us."

Agencies involved: Justice Center, University of Alaska at Anchorage

Juvenile Detention Monitoring

David L. Parry, N.E. Schafer, and Emily E. Read
Justice Center
University of Alaska at Anchorage
3211 Providence Drive
Anchorage, AK 99508
(907) 786-1810

Objectives of the research: (1) To design a State monitoring plan and (2) to perform annual monitoring activities.

Research methodology: The project design for annual monitoring of juvenile detention throughout the State includes on-site visitation and inspection as well as verification of logs at facilities in which juveniles might be detained, with the use of statistical projection for missing or unavailable data.

Findings of the research: The State of Alaska has made substantial progress in meeting the requirements of the Federal Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act of 1974 regarding incarceration of juveniles. The act authorized the distribution of funds through the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) to States that have made progress toward certain goals: the deinstitutionalization of status offenders and sight-and-sound separation of all types of juveniles from adults in adult correctional facilities. A more recent goal, removal of all juveniles from adult facilities, was mandated by the 1980 continuation of the act.

To ensure compliance with the provisions of the act, the OJJDP requires monitoring of all secure facilities in which juveniles might be detained. The Justice Center, under contract with the Alaska Division of Family and Youth Services, developed the Alaska monitoring plan and since 1988 has carried out compliance monitoring activities. Data for 1987-89, collected from 114 jails, lockups, and juvenile institutions, revealed marked progress toward the goals of the act.

Three types of juveniles were defined under the act: status offenders who engage in behaviors that would not be criminal if committed by adults; accused criminal-type offenders who are facing criminal charges; and adjudicated criminal offenders whose cases have been through the court process.

Legislation mandated that status offenders not be held in any form of secure confinement. A 24-hour grace period is permitted. As Table 1 illustrates, recorded violations of the deinstitutionalization of status offender (DSO) mandate have decreased dramatically with each year's monitoring. In a 1976 baseline study, 486 DSO violations were recorded in Alaska. By 1987, the first year of the Justice Center's monitoring, the statewide total of DSO violations was only 41, a 91.6% decline. By 1988, the statewide number had been further reduced to nine, and by the next year, only three DSO violations were recorded in Alaska—altogether a 99.59% decrease from the baseline figure.

Table 1. Total Annual JJDP Violations in Alaska

	Deinstitutionalization	Separation	Jail Removal
Baseline 1976	485	824	—
Baseline 1980	—	—	864
1987	32	806	601
1988	9	564	409
1989	3	336	249

Regardless of their offender status, juveniles detained in any type of facility that houses adults must be separated from the adults by both sight and sound. This standard allows for nothing more than haphazard contact between adults and juveniles; adhering to it can be difficult in small jails and lockups because of the facility design. Currently, there are two adult jails and no adult lockups designed to provide sight-and-sound separation.

Nevertheless, Alaska shows a significant decline in the number of sight-and-sound separation violations. Since 1976, when 824 violations were noted, there has been a 59% decrease, to 336 violations in 1989.

Whereas the deinstitutionalization provision of the act addresses the handling of status offenders and nonoffenders, the jail removal provision also covers the treatment of juveniles accused of, or adjudicated on, criminal offenses. The essence of the jail removal mandate is also similar to the sight-and-sound mandate: juveniles will not be placed in secure detention in adult facilities. There is one exception to this provision—a grace period of 6 hours is allowed for the secure detention in adult facilities of juveniles accused of criminal offenses. (The jail removal standard overlaps the sight-and-sound standard because nearly all jail removal violations are also separation violations. Thus, in Table 1 the separation data also include most of the jail removal data.)

The baseline study of Alaska's jail removal violations, completed in 1980, showed 864 cases involving juveniles held in adult facilities. Appreciable and consistent declines in the occurrence of this type of violation have been demonstrated in each of the 3 years of Justice Center monitoring. In 1987, when the next measure was taken to chart Alaska's compliance with the removal mandate, the statewide total of jail removal violations stood at 601; by 1988, the number was 409. From the 1988 level, an additional 39.1% decline was recorded in the 1989 monitoring results, with 249 of these violations. By 1989, jail removal violations in Alaska had declined by 71.2% from the 1980 baseline.

In assessing jail removal violations in 1989, data were collected from, or projected for, two Department of Corrections pretrial facilities, 17 contract jails, and 87 lockups. Table 2 illustrates 1989 jail removal violations by type of offender and type of facility. The status offender/nonoffender category of violations constituted 42.6% of all jail removal violations for 1989.

More than 95% of the juveniles in this category were in jail because of violations of alcohol laws. Federal guidelines include the offense of a minor consuming alcohol as a status offense, while the State of Alaska has defined it as a criminal offense. (Underage drinking is a Class A misdemeanor under Alaska Statute 04.16.050.) This difference in definition creates problems in achieving compliance with the jail removal goal because juveniles detained for the criminal offense of a minor consuming alcohol are recorded for monitoring purposes as detained status offenders. An additional complication is presented by the protective custody statute (AS 47.37.170), which requires police to take inebriates into custody for their own safety. Juvenile inebriates are included under this statute. Most nonoffenders included with status offenders in Table 2 were protective custody cases who could have been charged as minors consuming alcohol.

Table 2. 1980 Jail Removal Violations in Alaska

	Status Offender/ Nonoffender	Adjudicated Criminal	Accused Criminal	Total
Adult jails	79	25	68	172
Department of Corrections	1	15	14	30
Adult lockups	26	0	21	47
Total	106	40	103	249

Table 2 also shows that 40 of the 1989 jail removal violations were caused by confining juveniles on probation violations of various types, and 103 violations resulted from detaining accused criminal-type offenders for periods in excess of 6 hours. The crimes with which these juveniles were charged varied widely and included person, property, and public-order offenses.

Because the three types of violations overlap, it is common for a single instance of juvenile detention to result in simultaneous deinstitutionalization, separation, and jail removal violations. For example, a juvenile arrested for consuming alcohol and subsequently detained in an adult jail or lockup for 24 hours would result in three violations, one of each provision. Even when an instance of secure confinement does not result in a jail removal or deinstitutionalization violation, if the confinement takes place in an adult facility that does not adequately separate juveniles, a separation violation is recorded. The interrelationship among types of violations also compounds difficulties in achieving compliance with the act.

While a 70% decrease in jail removal violations is impressive, it has been suggested that Alaska may never achieve 100% compliance with this goal. Unpredictable weather and vast distances combine to make it difficult to remove juveniles to acceptable facilities from communities where there is no alternative to the jail or lockup for their detention.

Most small Alaska communities previously had no alternative to the jail or lockup for detaining minors taken into custody. Department of Public Safety and municipal buildings are unlikely to have places other than cells where juvenile inebriates can stay until they are sober or where youths accused of crimes can await air transport to juvenile detention centers.

Even those that do have such facilities cannot ensure sight-and-sound separation from adult offenders. In villages, where nonsecure shelters for juveniles do not exist, Village Public Safety Officers are now routinely finding community members to look after juveniles needing supervision or hiring guards to stay with juveniles in reception areas or living rooms until they have become sober or until air transportation is available. This alternative is often workable for the remote locations. Nonetheless, achieving full compliance with the goals of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act will remain extremely difficult in Alaska.

Prior instate studies: 1976 baseline study

Timeframe of the study: 1987 to the present

Agencies involved: Alaska Division of Family and Youth Services; Justice Center, University of Alaska at Anchorage

Prison Visiting: Is It Time To Review the Rules?

N.E. Schafer
Justice Center
University of Alaska at Anchorage
3211 Providence Drive
Anchorage, AK 99508
(907) 786-1810

Objectives of the research: To assess visiting in American prisons through an analysis of visiting rules.

Research methodology: Several sets of prison visiting rules were collected in conjunction with a 1987 survey of visiting policies and practices in State-operated, long-term adult facilities. The letter that accompanied the survey requested copies of the prison's visiting rules. Seventy-one of the 252 responding prisons complied with this request. The collection includes rules from 31 of the 46 States represented in the survey. Rules for private family visits (conjugal visits) were received from one State, but they are not included in the following discussion.

Findings of the research: Most of the rules assembled reflect concerns about security and order, and many of them are specifically related to contraband. In addition to visiting hours, days, and so forth, there are five main areas covered in the sample collection of rules:

1. Becoming a visitor—Who may visit and how that person gains prior approval for visiting.
2. Visitor processing—What constitutes proper identification, how one gains admittance to the visiting room, rules on searches, and what goods and materials may be left for the inmate.
3. Contraband—Special rules often include the specification of items permitted in the visiting room.
4. Conduct—Grounds for denial of the visit and grounds for visit termination.
5. Dress codes—Appropriate attire in the visiting area.

Not all of these areas are covered in every set of rules. Some prisons permit families to bring lunches for "picnics," while others prohibit any food not purchased from visiting-room vending machines. The differences sometimes appear to be related to the custody level of the institution and sometimes to State guidelines.

Becoming a visitor

Most institutions defined family members for purposes of visitation. Although some institutions do not require an application from defined family members, most of them do.

Every institution in the sample specified that visiting children must be accompanied by an adult. Some placed the age limit at 18 for an unaccompanied visitor; others had a limit of 16 years. Friends must usually complete an application to be placed on the prisoner's approved visitor list. In 80% of the institutions, family members must also complete the application.

Visitors who are on parole or who are former prisoners usually need special permission to visit unless they are members of the immediate family. While the directions for applications to visit implied that the information provided would be checked, the survey conducted at the same time these rules were collected found that 45% of the 252 responding institutions did not conduct background checks of visitors. Once a visitor is placed on the prisoner's visiting list, a visit is permitted.

Visitor processing

Identification was required of visitors at all of the prisons in the sample. Although acceptable identification was needed for admittance to the visiting area, many of the institutions suggested that purses or other forbidden items be locked in the visitor's car; others provided lockers. Nearly one-third of the institutions (32.3%) had a written rule stating that persons who are "conspicuously inebriated" will be refused admission to the visiting area.

Some prisons permitted items left at the processing desk to be delivered to the inmate after the visit. A list of acceptable items was often included in the rules.

All of the rules specified that visitors and their belongings would be searched. In most, a metal detector was used on the visitors, but a few indicated that a body search may be required. All suggested that refusal to be searched would result in denial of the visit. This processing clearly reflected a concern for institutional security and a need to detect any effort at bringing contraband into the institution.

Contraband

Every set of rules dealt with contraband. More than 80% defined contraband and referred to legal penalties. Some reprinted the relevant statutes from their State's penal code. State statutes specifically address felony charges associated with attempts to bring drugs and weapons into State penal facilities. Although the responding institutions specified weapons and drugs, they were also concerned with other contraband items. The most frequently mentioned was money, but cameras and tape recorders were also on many lists.

To control contraband, prisons in 23 of the 31 States either listed items that are allowed in the visiting room or listed items that are forbidden. The lists often suggested previous institutional experience with efforts to smuggle forbidden items; for example, infant items. While a few indicated that diaper bags are permitted (although subject to search), many expressly forbid them. Of those that forbid them, three allow "infant items" of an unspecified nature, and the remainder make it very

clear exactly what infant items are permitted; some specify the type of item. Four institutions expressly prohibited quilted baby blankets. Clearly, money or drugs could be concealed in the stuffing of such blankets. Infant seats are specifically permitted in some institutions and specifically prohibited in others.

The differences in the number of items permitted are directly related to the permitted length of the visit. Requiring plastic rather than glass baby bottles is related to security and perhaps to prior institutional experience.

Money is contraband in most facilities in the country, yet most visiting rooms have vending machines from which visitors can purchase sodas, food, and so forth. Several of the rules state that prisoners may not handle money. Most indicate that change for vending machines is allowed. Several indicate an amount that ranges from \$2 to \$25.

It would seem that those prisons that actually specify the items that can be carried into the visiting room would have fewer problems with visitors bringing in items that visiting room supervisors would prefer to ban. Such specifications reduce the need for arbitrary decisions, which lead to negative feelings on the part of both prisoner and visitor.

Conduct

There are two categories of conduct covered in the visiting rules: one category deals with general behavior, the other with physical contact or decorum. Improper conduct can lead, in most of the facilities, to termination of the visit. In some, repeated failure to abide by the rules can lead to termination of the visiting privilege.

The rules of behavior are similar across institutions. The most frequently mentioned rule regards control or management of children (46.4% of the sample). Another common rule regards moving around in the visiting room, changing seats, moving chairs, or "cross-visiting" (chatting with other prisoners or visitors).

One-fourth of the sample rules mentioned this activity as potential grounds for termination of the visit. Loud voices, abusive behavior, and profanity were mentioned in several rule books, as were keeping the visiting area clean and exchanging objects between visitor and inmate. Conduct "detrimental to security" was mentioned by seven facilities. One simply said that visitors must "obey the rules." The most interesting rule was a directive not to "leave animals or children unattended."

The rules of decorum in the sample were even more similar. Almost 40% of the responding institutions stipulated that a kiss or an embrace were permitted at the beginning and end of the visit. Nearly all of the 28 institutions with this rule permitted hand-holding during the visit. Some facilities did not specify when embraces or kisses could be exchanged and used such terms as "orderly conduct," "respectable conduct," "good moral conduct," "good judgment," or "avoiding embarrassment."

Several, probably reflecting prior experience, specified forbidden behaviors. These included: no petting; no sitting on laps; no prolonged kissing; no sexually stimulating activity; no necking; no hands under clothing; no touching or stroking of breasts, buttocks, genitalia, or thighs; keeping

both feet on the floor; and no intertwining legs. One institution warns visitors about being "overly emotional," but it is not clear whether this relates to what has here been called "decorum" or to the general rules of behavior.

Physical contact during visits appears to be of great concern to prison officials. Although the standards for contact visits suggested by the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals mention visiting facilities that provide "ease and informality of communication" and "a natural environment," the visiting rooms of some of the sample institutions are arranged in such a way that physical contact during the visit is minimal. Many direct that prisoners and visitors sit across a table from one another. Such a seating arrangement makes specific rules about touching, petting, lap-sitting, and so forth unnecessary. These rules are more likely to be required when the visiting room is arranged to permit prisoner and visitor to sit side by side. The furnishings, therefore, have an impact on the rules of decorum.

Dress codes

The responding institutions in only three States did not mention attire in their rules for visitors; 90.3% made at least some reference to visitor dress. Five of the thirty-one States included general references to good judgment, appropriate dress, reasonable attire, or discretion. One mentioned only that male visitors could not wear blue jeans, obviously reflecting a concern about visitors dressing like prisoners. The 22 that remained dealt very specifically with dress, and nearly all prohibited "provocative," "indecent," or "suggestive" attire.

All references to dress were collated by State rather than by institution. Thus, even if only one of several responding institutions in the State specified forbidden or required items of apparel, the State was included among the 22 with specific dress codes.

Outer garments, other than hats, tended to be forbidden in other sections of the rules than those dealing with "appropriate dress." Most institutions mentioned them in conjunction with instructions for lockers or in those portions of the rules that specified what items were or were not permitted in the visiting area.

The central issue in dress codes, other than the footwear requirement, was attire that might result in sexual stimulation or invite behavior banned in the rules of conduct; for example, fondling, hands under clothing, and so forth. Included in the "see-through" category was a ban on net/mesh shirts for visitors to a women's institution. Another article banned in one institution—wrap skirts—can be specifically related to conduct rules.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: In most prisons, the rules will fall into the categories already described. The discussion that follows deals with those categories and is intended to assist prison officials in examining rules at their institutions.

Because most prisons request completion of a visitor form for persons named by prisoners as potential visitors, it seems elementary to include the visiting rules in any packet mailed to prospective visitors, but many institutions do not do so; they rely on the prisoner to inform his family of the rules and regulations. At a minimum, the institution should specify the kinds of identification required for admission, any items that are not permitted in the visiting room, and

any activities or apparel for which the visit can be denied. A visitor who is turned away is unlikely to return.

Most prisons are not located in easily accessible areas, and most prisoners' families are from the lower socioeconomic levels. After arranging transportation and spending hours traveling, they should not be turned away because they did not have prior notice of the rules. They should also not be expected to stand in long lines awaiting processing. This is especially difficult for visitors with small children. On days with particularly heavy visitor volume, a take-a-number system might be utilized. Visitors leaving packages might be processed in a different line from those who are only visiting because the paperwork involved in processing packages may slow down the processing of visitors.

Penalties for bringing illegal items to the visit should be included in the rules sent to prospective visitors, and they should also be notified in advance of any items considered institutional contraband.

Proscriptions against cameras and tape recorders are based on both the ease with which contraband can be concealed in them and a concern about maintaining control over information about the institution. Prior permission or special arrangements might be built into the rules so that pictures could be taken on special occasions.

Searches of items carried to the visiting area should be conducted with care. Contraband is a special concern of correctional institutions and must be controlled, but people's belongings can be handled with consideration and explanation even while a very thorough search of them is conducted.

Visiting room rules should be prominently posted in the visiting area, and a conscientious effort to enforce them should be made. One person's unruly or disruptive behavior can spoil the visiting experience for everyone. The extent to which quiet displays of affection are disruptive might, however, be reassessed. The visiting room supervisor obviously cannot permit openly sexual activity; some institutions, however, are able to permit exchanges of kisses during the visit (without resulting problems), while others permit kisses only at the beginning and end of the visit. While such differences may be based on the size of the visiting area, on its furnishings, or on the custody level of the institution, it does seem that more facilities might be able to relax such rules.

Dress codes might also be reassessed. Except for a concern with attire that is too like that of the prison population (a security hazard), most of the dress codes in the sample are concerned with provocative or sexually stimulating apparel. "Provocative" is, after all, in the eye of the beholder and is a subjective judgment. Shorts, sleeveless blouses, and dresses with spaghetti straps are acceptable streetwear in most American cities and are not usually considered sexually stimulating.

An additional question that might require research is the effect of provocative dress on the operation of the institution. Is there evidence that exposure to women wearing shorts is detrimental to security? Do prisoners "act out" after seeing women with bare shoulders? Is sexual frustration in a prison population a measurable phenomenon brought about by visual stimuli?

A ban on dress that invites sexually explicit conduct or that makes it difficult to enforce rules about hands under clothing is justified. Those facilities that limit physical contact during the visit to hand-holding (and they are the majority) do not need to be as concerned with sexual behavior as those that

permit side-by-side contact. Dress codes in these facilities seem to be addressed at limiting visual pleasure. These prisons might reconsider their dress codes.

Rule changes should not be made without thought, but consideration should be given to changing some regulations. Prisons should consider the effect of the rules on encouraging or discouraging visitors and assess the reasons for each rule as well as the need to retain it or the consequences of changing it. Unless there is a substantial risk to security, rules governing visits and visitors should be designed to encourage visitors to return frequently.

Agencies involved: Justice Center, University of Alaska at Anchorage

Prison Visiting Policies and Practices

N.E. Schafer
Justice Center
University of Alaska at Anchorage
3211 Providence Drive
Anchorage, AK 99508
(907) 786-1810

Objectives of the research: To assess the degree to which prisons have increased efforts to make visiting a priority.

Research methodology: While the importance of family relationships to rehabilitation efforts has been widely recognized, there have been no recent attempts to examine, on a national basis, the extent to which prisons encourage visits through visiting policies and practices. Maximizing of opportunities to maintain family ties bears a direct relationship to the institution's understanding of, and commitment to, the rehabilitative effect of maintaining a "natural support system" on which the prisoner can rely upon release. This research reports the results of a new national survey of visiting policies and practices designed to determine to what extent prison officials have implemented their new view of visiting as rehabilitative.

The most recent prior national survey of prison visiting was conducted by the author in 1976. That survey found that visiting opportunities as indicated by visiting schedules had expanded considerably since earlier research had reported that the dominant visiting pattern was twice a month for no more than 4 hours. The 1976 survey, which was broader in scope, found the dominant visiting pattern nationally was once a week for more than 4 hours.

A decade ago there was wide variation in the number of hours per week available for visiting: the range was from a low of 3½ hours to a high of 89 hours. A number of factors were associated with this variation, including overcrowding, location, type of facility, and visiting room capacity. The study found a high correlation between visiting room capacity and the age of the facility, with older facilities tending to have visiting rooms that were quite small relative to the prison's total population.

Because the last decade has seen a major increase in prison construction, it was thought that visiting room capacities and visiting rules and regulations might also have undergone a change.

In the summer of 1987, a survey was mailed to 370 institutions from the American Correctional Association's list of State-operated, long-term adult facilities. Federal facilities were not included for geographic reasons; each of these may draw its population from any State in the Union, making comparisons difficult. Local and county facilities were excluded from the survey because they are so numerous and varied. Surveys were mailed to individual institutions rather than to "headquarters" because schedules tend to vary within States. By September, 237 responses had been received from 46 States, a response rate of 64%. Two States, Illinois and New York, required the researcher to get clearance from the State Department of Corrections before surveys could be completed, but prisons in other States either completed the surveys or settled the permission issue internally without correspondence from the researcher.

Of the 237 surveys returned, 24 were not processed either because they had been mistakenly included on the mailing list (that is, were not long-term adult facilities) or because they did not include the most important information. The sample, therefore, consisted of 213 institutions located in 45 States.

The survey asked for standard information related to visiting: visiting schedule, institutional population, and visit length. It also included a request for information, probably available only where records are computerized. Such information was rarely known by the 1976 respondents but was reported by a substantial number of 1987 respondents.

Findings of the research: The results suggest that there is a trend toward maximization of opportunities for prisoners to maintain family relationships. Comparisons cannot be precisely made with the 1976 survey because different institutions responded, but gross measures document this trend. There are proportionally more facilities with 40 or more visiting hours per week and proportionally more with 7-day visiting schedules.

The survey data show a definite increase in the kind and number of opportunities available for the maintenance of prisoner-family relationships. Contact visits are the norm among 95% of the responding institutions. Only 2 out of the 213 facilities did not offer any contact visits, exceptions so rare as to require a remark. Opportunities for private/extended family visits are more widely available today than they were a decade ago, and both the permitted length of visit and the number of visits permitted per resident per month have increased since 1976.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: The new survey reflects increased interest in visiting as well as a movement toward increased visiting opportunities. The response rate to the survey was high and a substantial number of respondents requested information on survey results. This reflects an interest in comparing policies elsewhere with policies at one's own institution and curiosity about what other prisons are doing to encourage visits.

One way to encourage visitors and to assure their best possible treatment is to designate a specific staff member to be in charge of visiting at the institution. A substantial portion of respondents (72.6%) reported that their institutions have a single staff member in charge of visiting. No information was requested about the duties and responsibilities of the visiting "director." In the best of all possible worlds, this person would review rules and procedures, initiate suggestions for change,

monitor visitor volume, and collect suggestions from staff, visitors, and inmates on ways to improve visits. While he or she need not monitor the visiting room during all visiting hours, he or she should be there frequently to assist visiting room staff and might have input into the selection of personnel for visiting room duty or for visitor processing. The director should be in charge of visitor lists and background checks of visitors and be responsible for maintaining visiting records. He or she would arrange special visits and work with volunteer groups interested in visiting prisoners.

While visiting policies and practices are always bound by schedule, State statute, centralized policies, personnel considerations, geography, and space, there should be room for change in nearly all of these limiting factors. Facilities should be encouraged to experiment with expanded schedules where location and visitor volume appear to warrant it. In States where hours are set for all institutions, authorities might consider making these minimum schedules and encouraging prisons to find ways to go beyond the minimum. Evening hours, for example, would require minimal changes in personnel assignments that need not be costly. Evening visiting hours would not, however, be practical at geographically isolated facilities. At the same time, isolated institutions should be able to offer longer visits to make up for what is lost in frequency.

By and large, State prisons in this country have acted to take advantage of the relationship between visits and postrelease success and have implemented policies that encourage visits. Although the new survey reflects a substantial increase in the number and kinds of visiting opportunities available to prisoners and their families nationally, there is room for improvement. Visiting should be considered a priority, and policies and practices should be continuously reviewed to maximize the maintenance of prisoner-family relationships.

Agencies involved: Justice Center, University of Alaska at Anchorage

Arizona

Arizona Mandatory Sentencing Study

Daryl R. Fischer, M.S., Ph.D., and
Andy Thaker, M.Com., M.B.A., LL.B.
Arizona Department of Corrections
1601 West Jefferson
Phoenix, AZ 85007
(602) 542-3691

Objectives of the research: (1) To establish the extent to which mandatory sentencing as enacted under the 1978 code revision has contributed to the higher growth rate of the prison population and (2) to develop a numerical estimate of the long-term impact of the State's mandatory sentencing statutes on the prison population in Arizona. The principal audience for this research was the Arizona Legislature.

Research methodology: Multivariate Statistical Simulation Model

Findings of the research: Between June 1972 and December 1980, the adult prison population in Arizona grew by an average of 23 per month. Between December 1980 and June 1991, following the enactment of a new criminal code in October 1978, the prison population grew by an average of 88 per month.

As of June 30, 1991, there were 29 separate statutes in the Arizona criminal code establishing mandatory penalties of one type or another. Mandatory sentencing statutes (1) mandate the imposition of a prison term, (2) set a higher range of available penalties than would apply to the typical offender, (3) require that a mandatory minimum sentence be served prior to release, or (4) require that the sentence imposed be consecutive to any other sentence imposed.

Mandatory sentencing in Arizona targets selected types of offenders in the following categories: violent offenders, sex offenders, repeat offenders, drug traffickers, drunken drivers, and escapees.

As of June 30, 1991, there were 7,914 inmates in the Arizona prison system serving mandatory sentences, constituting 52.2% of the active population as of that date. Of this number, 637 were felony drunken drivers sentenced to a minimum of 6 months in prison. The report systematically excludes this group from closer scrutiny as well as from shock incarceration participants and old code inmates. For the mainstream population (excluding the above categories), the average (mean) maximum term was 11.3 years, the average minimum term 7.4 years, and the expected (projected) term to release 8.6 years.

Comparable figures for mainstream inmates admitted from the court during the preceding 3 years are as follows: average maximum term, 6.9 years; average minimum term, 4.3 years; and average expected term, 5.1 years. Excluding life and death sentences, the average maximum term in Arizona (6.4 years) is comparable to the national average of 6.3 years, as established by the Bureau of Justice Statistics study *Felony Sentences in State Courts, 1988*. However, the composite percentage of

sentence served prior to release is much higher for Arizona (74.6%) than for the Nation as a whole (31.6%).

The report establishes that the high average expected term for Arizona inmates is due primarily to the severity of existing mandatory sentence statutes, which impose much longer penalties than would apply to comparable offenders not subjected to them. Previous studies have demonstrated that only about 15% of inmates eligible for mandatory sentences actually receive them, primarily because of changing discretion and plea bargaining practices. Coupled with the much longer term lengths associated with mandatory sentencing, this pattern results in a vast inequity in time served for comparable offenders.

The present study demonstrates that, on average, an inmate sentenced pursuant to mandatory sentencing can expect to do 2.7 times as much prison time to release as a comparable inmate who avoids such sentencing. A sophisticated multivariate simulation model was developed and applied to sentencing data to establish this result. Specifically, offenders sentenced under one or more mandatory sentencing statutes (excluding the highest class of felony) can expect to do an average of 3.7 years, which would have applied to this group absent mandatory sentencing.

In all, the differential in expected terms associated with mandatory sentencing accounts for 32.6% of the total bedspace investment of sentences imposed during the 3-year period studied. This result implies, in turn, that in the long run mandatory sentencing statutes inflate prison population in Arizona by approximately 48%.

An analysis of historical trends in average time served to release for selected categories of offenses demonstrates conclusively that term lengths have increased dramatically since the enactment of the new criminal code in 1978. For example, inmates sentenced for burglary or robbery are now (the early nineties) serving roughly twice as much time under the new code (and mandatory sentencing) as under the old code, while those sentenced for homicide, sexual assault, or aggravated assault are serving roughly 50% more time under the new code. Because of the extreme lengths of mandatory sentences, insufficient time has passed since enactment of the new code and of mandatory sentencing statutes for mandatory sentencing to have had anywhere near its eventual impact on the prison population. In the future, the differential in term lengths will begin impacting time served more noticeably for the more serious offenses, including homicide, sexual assault, and child sex crimes.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: As of January 1, 1992, there were 14,999 beds available to house 15,464 inmates in Arizona. Of the total population, 3,866 inmates, or 25% of the population, were estimated to be in prison solely because of the longer terms associated with mandatory sentencing. Unless countermeasures are taken, the Department projects that the prison population will grow by approximately 6,000 inmates, to 21,464, by January 1, 1997. At that time, an estimated 6,911 inmates, or 32.2% of the population, will be in prison for no other reason than mandatory sentencing. Accordingly, of the 6,470 additional beds required by that date to house the projected population, 3,045 must be provided solely to accommodate the State's current policy on mandatory sentencing.

Prior instate studies:

- Block, Michael K. *Felony Sentencing Study*. Arizona Prosecuting Attorneys' Advisory Council, September 1991.
- Knapp, Kay A. *Arizona Criminal Code and Corrections Study, Final Report to the Legislature Council*. Institute for Rational Public Policy, Inc., June 1991.

Timeframe of the study: July 1988 to June 1991

Agencies involved: Planning Bureau, Arizona Department of Corrections

California

Blue Ribbon Commission on Inmate Population Management: Final Report

Blue Ribbon Commission on Inmate Population Management
California Department of Justice
Statistical Analysis Center
Post Office Box 903427
Sacramento, CA 94203-4270

Objectives of the research: To determine viable strategies to deal with problems of prison overcrowding without reducing public safety.

Research methodology: The California Legislature convened a group of subject matter experts and criminal justice officials (known as the Blue Ribbon Commission on Inmate Population Management) to interpret and perhaps implement a new direction for criminal justice policymaking in light of the recent and unprecedented growth of correctional populations. Additional information was solicited through a series of hearings, each of which highlighted a specific segment of the problem.

Findings of the research: The predominant conclusion was that California's criminal justice system is "out of balance and will remain so unless the entire State and local criminal justice system is addressed from prevention through discharge of jurisdiction. Judges and parole authorities lack sufficient intermediate sanctions to make balanced public safety decisions."

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: Major recommendations made to the legislature included the expansion of intermediate sanctions at the State and local levels, the creation of a sentencing review commission, and the development of a "substance abuse strategy" in all correctional facilities.

Timeframe of the study: 1980's

Agencies involved: Blue Ribbon Commission on Inmate Population Management, California Department of Corrections

Colorado

Classification for Custody and the Assessment of Risk in the Colorado Department of Corrections

Ellen F. Chayet, Ph.D., Todd R. Clear, Ph.D.,
Matthew Clune, and A. Rajendran
School of Criminal Justice
Program Resources Center
Rutgers University
15 Washington Street
Newark, NJ 07102

Objectives of the research: (1) To establish the context of Colorado's prior experience with, and present expectations for, prison classification; (2) to present the results of simulation and other analyses performed on a sample of Colorado's inmates, including the application of current, prospective, and National Institute of Corrections (NIC) models, policy analyses, analysis of risk, and examination of overrides under the current system; (3) to make recommendations about custody level and classification needs in the State of Colorado; and (4) to describe the experience of Illinois and Wisconsin with "objective" classification systems.

Research methodology: The research design for this study involved manual collection of data for the purpose of developing a profile of selected characteristics of inmates and for performing risk and custody level simulation analyses. The study sample consisted of a random selection of 880 inmates in Colorado's prison population as of December 4, 1987. Data sources included Department of Corrections (DOC) offender fields and, to a limited extent, DOC computer-generated variable selection.

A major caveat pertaining to the combined data base is that the data collected by DOC were compiled approximately 2 months after DOC completed its data collection. This had implications for the consistency of variables from the two data sources and the applicability of selected variables for analysis since two different snapshots were represented. Research therefore relied almost exclusively on the data collected by DOC that contained nearly all the information necessary to perform risk and custody level simulation analyses.

Approximately 350 variables were produced, excluding those calculated by Rutgers researchers to complete the analysis. Data included information on the current offense, prior criminal history, institutional experience and adjustment, social and personal background of the inmates, and details of classification and reclassification.

Colorado's inmate population is described along a number of dimensions, starting with a profile of selected characteristics of these inmates. In addition, overrides at the initial and reclassification stage are examined by their frequency, by scored custody level, and by the reason cited for each override. Current classification custody levels are compared with other options: the current scored custody level of Colorado inmates, as determined from the classification model in use, is contrasted with custody levels resulting from simulating two other models, the NIC classification scale(s) and the

new, soon-to-be-implemented Colorado classification model. Also examined is the impact of making two policy assumptions: (1) that many more minimum-security beds are necessary and (2) that fewer minimum-security beds are desirable. Finally, risk is simulated using three scales: the Iowa Risk Assessment Scale, the Michigan Assault Risk Scale, and the Colorado Risk Scale.

Findings of the research: The findings on overrides show an overreliance on this subjective component of classification decisions. The override rate is nearly 30% over initial scored custody levels and is 46% over reclassification scores.

An analysis of the DOC population against the NIC and DOC classification model illustrates the direction DOC is taking with respect to its allocation of custody levels. The DOC model is more cautious in nature. Where NIC classifies 41.2% to the community and 37.6% to minimum security, the respective figures for DOC are 18% and 13.9%. Although NIC would place only 13.7% in a medium-custody level, the DOC model classifies nearly half the cases into this category. Most dramatic, DOC classifies about 20% for the most restrictive custody levels, compared to 7.5% assigned close custody by the NIC model.

From the application of three risk scales to Colorado's inmate population, two profiles of low-risk inmates were developed: those who are low risk on both Michigan and Iowa scales and those assessed as low risk using the Colorado scale. Characteristics evaluated include criminal history, current offense, and institutional behavior. Profiles using both the Michigan and Iowa risk scales indicate that the 285 inmates scored as low or very low risk seem appropriate for community assignments. Profiles using Colorado's validated risk scale also suggest that community placements are appropriate for low-risk inmates.

Findings also show that the impact of new "objective" classification models in both Illinois and Wisconsin appears positive. In Illinois, more inmates were placed in lower security levels, the percentage of inmates placed in maximum security dropped from 35% to 23%, and there was greater consistency in decisionmaking. Although each individual scale item proved weak as a predictor of institutional behavior (age was the strongest predictor), the model demonstrated some capacity to assign inmates according to risk. The informal perception of corrections system staff is that classification is meeting its stated goals, despite the problem of overcrowding that has resulted in high numbers of overrides.

In Wisconsin, implementation of the new model resulted in a significant reduction in the percentage of inmates requiring maximum security and, as in Illinois, age was the strongest predictor of institutional misconduct. The model as a whole was not a very good predictor of future misconduct, and a 50% override rate prevailed. Reasons given for this highest override rate of any State evaluated include the inability of the State to fund sufficient numbers of low-security beds, retainment of a high level of subjectivity in decisionmaking, and deficiencies in the instrument itself.

New Colorado classification policies can be grounded in the following areas of agreement found among the various parties that Rutgers researchers talked with during the course of this study:

- The current classification system is not useful.

- A new classification system should result in a higher number of persons placed in minimum-custody levels; produce a more coherent, though smaller, number of maximum-custody offenders; and reduce or eliminate the situation in which an inmate is assigned to a custody level and has nowhere to move for a long period of time, regardless of good conduct.
- Classification policies should result in consequences for serious infractions (although there is disagreement on how frequently revision in custody level should be the main consequence).
- The classification process should result in a larger number of persons being assigned to community placement.
- Incentives should be created for community corrections boards to take a larger number of offenders, including noncounty clients, out-of-State parole requests, and some serious personal offenders such as sex offenders.
- The number of community corrections beds should be increased.
- Consequences of failure in the community corrections setting need not always be lengthy reassignment to secure custody.
- Perhaps most important, the recent legislative enhancement of demand for corrections resources has seriously restricted the ability of the corrections system to rationally manage either its own resources or the offenders assigned to its authority and has resulted in numerous dilemmas of classification and custody assignment. Without addressing this problem, the degree to which effective classification is possible in Colorado is questioned.

Recognizing the above areas of agreement about classification in Colorado, the findings suggest the following recommendations concerning the system and resource needs:

- More lower security beds should be provided, serving inmates assessed as requiring lower levels of custody.
- An interagency policy group should continue to meet and be charged with rethinking the recent demand for an artificial increase in institutional beds.
- The policy group may also want to devise incentives for increasing the likelihood that community providers will accept inmates from DOC.
- If the number of overrides remains excessive once the new classification model is implemented, a DOC agencywide program of training in scoring and interpretation of classification is recommended.

- DOC may want to consider developing and incorporating a "treatment program" component to a decision process that also decides custody level so these needs are not inconsistently addressed through overrides.
- To significantly enhance the usefulness of the current classification system in Colorado, validation of DOC's new classification instrument on its population is recommended.

Prior instate studies: The project was conducted by the Colorado Division of Criminal Justice in 1986.

Agencies involved: Rutgers University (funded by the Colorado Legislature)

Cost of the study: \$30,000

Colorado Parole Guidelines Commission Report to the Legislature

Kim K. English and Mary J. Mande, Ph.D.
 Office of Research and Statistics
 Colorado Division of Criminal Justice
 700 Kipling Street, Suite 1000
 Denver, CO 80215
 (303) 239-4442

Objectives of the research: To study the parole release decision, how it affects public safety, and what can be done to improve the decisionmaking process and to reduce the chances that an inmate will reoffend when released from prison, thereby evaluating House Bill 1311.

Research methodology: The construction sample for the development of the actuarial risk assessment scale was a group of 672 male parolees released from the Department of Corrections in 1982. Data on dozens of characteristics were collected manually by Division of Criminal Justice researchers from the offenders' case files at the Department of Corrections. Criminal history records of this group were then closely reviewed for the 2 years following their release to the community, and the number of felony rearrests or revocations to prison were recorded in the construction sample data base.

The sample includes offenders released that year who were originally sentenced from Denver, El Paso, Jefferson, and Mesa Counties. Parolees were divided into two groups: "successful" (not rearrested for a new felony) and "failure" (rearrested for a new felony). Next, the information from each offender's case file was examined to identify individual characteristics and to determine whether a statistical relationship exists between the characteristics and the "failure" group. Also, because prison files do not always contain all the information necessary to assess the case, the data were analyzed to determine the weight that most accurately describes the probability of rearrest for those with missing information.

This analysis identified seven variables with weights that are added to produce a risk score for parole eligible inmates, excluding women and sex offenders. The seven variables are as follows:

1. Ever convicted for a burglary, robbery, or theft
2. Number of prior felony convictions
3. Number of prior incarcerations
4. Employed for more than 50% of the past 2 years on the street
5. Convicted for a felony before age 18
6. Serious offender classification
7. Ever married

Another step is required to complete the scientific process. The accuracy of the scale needs to be tested on a new group of parolees who were not included in the original group. For that purpose, at the time this report was published, analysis of the characteristics of a group of offenders released from prison in 1986 and 1987 was under way, as was an assessment of the accuracy of the scale in predicting their success or failure.

Findings of the research: Analysis of the findings of this validation study supported the inclusion of four additional predictors: disciplinary infractions, number of current conviction charges, age at release, and escape or parole violation. Adding new predictors creates a new scale that needs to be revalidated as soon as is feasible. Given the policy value of the items added to Colorado's validation scale, combined with the improvement in predictive accuracy, the Colorado Parole Guidelines Commission decided to include the additional predictors in the Colorado risk scale prior to a second validation study.

The validation study also indicated that the scale was quite successful in differentiating between the group that reoffended and the group that did not. The 11-item scale also did well predicting violent behavior, which is extremely difficult to predict simply because violence is a statistically rare event. The actuarial scale does not assess individual risk. Rather, it identifies the risk level of the group to which an individual belongs.

Agencies involved: Office of Research and Statistics, Colorado Division of Criminal Justice

Cost of the study: Grant partially supported in the amount of \$24,994

Community Corrections in Colorado: Why Do Some Clients Succeed and Others Fail?

Kim K. English and Mary J. Mande, Ph.D.
Office of Research and Statistics
Colorado Division of Criminal Justice
700 Kipling Street, Suite 1000
Denver, CO 80215
(303) 239-4442

Objectives of the research: To explore reasons for the increase in the number of unsuccessful community corrections clients.

Research methodology: Data were gathered from three sources: an existing data base comprising client information; on-site data collection from client case files; and interviews, conducted by Division of Criminal Justice researchers, with program directors, staff, clients, and Department of Corrections Field Services staff. Recommendations for improving the success rate of community corrections clients are included in the report's chapter on policy implications.

Findings of the research:

- Clients with recorded employment problems were three times as likely to fail as those who had no job problems.
- Over 70% of community corrections clients entered the program with a recorded alcohol or drug problem.
- Slightly over half had documented mental health needs.
- When clients with these problems were working, their chances of success improved.
- The proportion of clients who were regressed or revoked to prison varied for each of the 19 programs studied. Failure rates ranged from 30% to 63%.

Study findings suggest that successful program completions might be increased if the following recommendations were pursued:

1. Where they are not now available, job development and assistance in job placement should be given high priority by programs.
2. Once employed, clients with systematically assessed substance abuse or mental health problems should receive professional treatment for those problems.
3. Programs with unexpected success rates or unexpected failure rates should be examined closely to identify model or problem policies and practices.

4. Given (a) the relationship between drug problems and escape and (b) the impact on incarceration costs of overlapping punishments for these drug-related cases, it might be useful to examine prison policies (security classification, Code of Penal Discipline, and parole guidelines) relating to escape from community corrections to ensure systematic coordination of corrections policies.

Who fails?

- Clients who are younger or who have extensive criminal histories had the highest probability of failure.
- When groups with similar criminal histories and demographic characteristics were examined, clients with employment problems were more likely to fail than those who worked without incident. Transition clients were much more likely to have employment, earnings, and subsistence problems than were diversion clients.
- High school graduates were considerably more likely to successfully complete community corrections programs, but there was no statistical link between client outcome and having attained a GED.

Why do they fail?

- Less than 3% of the study group were charged with a new crime while living in a community corrections program.
- 27% of failures were charged with house or technical violations; 20% failed because of escape and accountability problems; and 61% of the escapees had tested positive for drugs while in the program.
- About 5% of the study cases neither succeeded nor failed: termination was a result of a lateral transfer to another halfway house, a detainer, or death.

Prior instate studies: *Community Corrections in Colorado, 1986*

Timeframe of the study: September 1989 to August 1990

Agencies involved: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice/Community Corrections staff provided access to client files. Staff of the Department of Corrections Field Services and of community corrections programs supported the study by participating in the interview component of the research.

Cost of the study: \$15,000 grant

Custody Needs and Public Risk of Colorado's Prisoners: An Assessment

Mary J. Mande, Ph.D.
Office of Research and Statistics
Colorado Division of Criminal Justice
700 Kipling Street, Suite 1000
Denver, CO 80215
(303) 239-4442

Objectives of the research: To assess policies and practices related to custody classification and public risk of inmates.

Research methodology: The random sample for this study was computer generated by the Department of Corrections (DOC) from its prison population as of January 21, 1986. A sample of 674 inmates was produced. Data were manually collected from DOC case files by trained Division of Criminal Justice collectors.

Information was collected on current custody class; current institution; sociodemographic, criminal history, and prison behavior items as well as items needed to classify inmates on the Michigan Assault Risk Scale, the Iowa Violence Risk Scale, the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) initial and reclassification custody scales, and the NIC scales as modified for implementation by DOC.

Study findings describe DOC's inmate population and custody classification results and a risk analysis using the Michigan Assault Risk and Iowa Violence Risk scales.

Findings of the research: The inmate profile findings are summarized below.

Sociodemographic data

- 38% of the inmates were less than 25 years old; 10% were 40 or older.
- 95% were male.
- 21% were black; 26% were Hispanic.
- 43% had neither a high school diploma nor a GED at admission to prison.
- 63% had been employed less than 50% of the 2 years preceding incarceration.

Current offense

- 54% of the inmates were serving time for a Class 4 or 5 felony.
- 55% were committed for nonviolent offenses.

Criminal history

- 31% of the inmates had no prior adult felony convictions; 28% had three or more.
- 43% had no convictions in the 5 years prior to admission; 12% had three or more.
- 29% of the inmates were convicted for offenses in the most severe category of seriousness; 39% were convicted for offenses in the least severe category.

Institutional behavior

- 70% of the inmates had no disciplinary infractions reported in the last 6 months.
- In the last 18 months, 58% had no infractions; 10% were charged with a class 1 infraction, the most severe felony.

Furthermore, the survey of inmates showed that the Department of Corrections' classification policies and practices had changed dramatically in the year prior to the study, resulting in a smaller proportion of offenders classified at the maximum/close level and a larger proportion of those classified at the medium level. About 34% of the scored classification levels were changed by overrides.

The application of the basic NIC model and the risk assessment scales found that overclassification was still occurring. The results suggest that in 1986 almost half of the current population could have been housed at the minimum-security level, assuming that facility security requirements were met. The data also indicated that about 250 inmates met the criteria for placement in community corrections and represented little risk to the public. It should be noted that the Department of Corrections was moving in this direction.

Prior instate studies: *A Profile of Colorado's Prisoners: Custody Needs and Public Risk* (Prison Overcrowding Project, 1983)

Agencies involved: Office of Research and Statistics, Colorado Division of Criminal Justice

Cost of the study: \$30,000

The Effect of Public Opinion on Correctional Policy: A Comparison of Opinions and Practices

Mary J. Mande, Ph.D., and Kim K. English
Office of Research and Statistics
Colorado Division of Criminal Justice
700 Kipling Street, Suite 1000
Denver, CO 80215
(303) 239-4442

Objectives of the research: To investigate who "the public" is, what "public opinion" is, and to what extent does—or should—public opinion influence corrections policy.

Research methodology: A mail survey was sent to State legislators, criminal justice officials, and 800 randomly selected registered voters in each of four Colorado counties. Telephone interviews were also conducted with officials to obtain more indepth information about contacts with the public. In addition to the surveys and interviews, sentencing data were analyzed to compare consistency of attitudes with actual sentencing practices.

Fifty-one percent (1,328) of the mail surveys were completed and returned. The survey included questions about public perception of the crime problem, the criminal justice system, correctional philosophy, opinions on sentencing, and contacts with system officials. Data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences for personal computers (SPSS/PC). Frequencies were run to obtain distributions on all variables. Bivariate and multivariate analyses were used to examine relationships between variables within a data set. To examine relationships between data sets, distributions were compared.

Findings of the research: The issues on which the public is consistent or inconsistent with criminal justice officials are listed below.

Consistent opinions

- Crime is one of our Nation's most pressing social problems.
- Incapacitation is the most important purpose of sentencing decisions; rehabilitation is the second most important purpose.
- Sentences to structured community placement are appropriate for some first-time offenders.
- Community placement is appropriate for first- and second-time property offenders.

Inconsistent opinions

- A higher proportion of citizens than officials believe crime will increase in the future.
- A higher proportion of citizens than officials fear crime.

- 70% of the citizen respondents continue to indicate that Colorado judges impose sentences that are "too soft," compared to 28% of criminal justice respondents. Thus, citizens are unaware of the tougher sentencing enacted in House Bill 1320 (1985), which doubled sentence lengths, or they believe that too many offenders are sentenced to straight probation.
- The public does not recommend straight probation placements.
- When prison was recommended, the median sentence length recommended by criminal justice officials exceeded that recommended by the public in 10 out of 14 scenarios.
- Criminal justice officials, compared to citizens, recommended longer prison terms when the victim was vulnerable.
- A much larger majority of citizens are in favor of capital punishment.

Contacts

- 8%-13% of the citizen respondents reported contacts with a criminal justice official.
- The group reporting contacts was more likely to have reported a household victimization in the last 12 months and to recommend harsher sentences than the overall public.
- 54% of the criminal justice officials reported being contacted by a citizen not directly involved in an active case.
- 67% of the officials say that public contacts never affect their decisions; however, they indicate that victim contacts have the most impact. Of those contacted, 62% say contacts by victims have a "strong" or "somewhat strong" effect.

Comparison with actual sentencing practices

- Public opinion and actual sentencing practice are consistent in three areas: prison for those with two prior convictions, community corrections for property offenders with one prior conviction, and community corrections for property offenders with no prior convictions.
- Public opinion and actual sentencing practice are inconsistent as follows: in many cases, felons are sentenced to straight probation, but the public recommends structured community placement; most first-time robbers are sentenced to prison, but the public recommends structured community placement.
- Actual sentences imposed were about 2.5% longer (overall) than those recommended by citizens.

In answer to the question "What is public opinion?" the study found indications of public opinion, as represented by registered voters, that is contrary to that reported by the media and to what is heard most frequently by legislators, district attorneys, and other criminal justice officials. Also

found, however, was that a small portion of the public holds the opinions reported by the media and officials. This is the salient public that is most likely to be actively involved in the political process regarding criminal justice policy.

In the political process, the more important the issue to the interest group member, the stronger the effect on policy. A district attorney or legislator, for example, may be defeated by the negative votes of one-issue voters if the candidate is perceived to be "soft on crime." More moderate voters, however, do not tend to vote against a candidate who assumes a "tough on crime" position even though it may not reflect their attitudes.

In Colorado, millions of dollars are being invested in prison facilities based on the belief that the public demands greater use of prison for convicted offenders. The data, however, imply that a publicly acceptable and less costly option is to increase surveillance and treatment of most offenders in the community.

The data further suggest that official misperception of public opinion is created by public responses to abstract questions as well as by contacts with a criminal justice interest group advocating for more severe sentences. Crimes are often described by the news media in blood-chilling detail, and the prosecution and sentencing of offenders are reported day by day. Thus, when asked an abstract question about "soft" or "severe" sentencing decisions, for example, respondents are likely to recall the stories about heinous crimes and to respond with these cases in mind.

The data show, however, that when case details are provided for less sensational cases, the public supports structured community options. Nothing in this research indicates a predominant "lock 'em up and throw away the key" mentality. Unfortunately, no change is likely unless (1) the media stop sensationalizing crime cases and present a more balanced picture of crime and the system's ability to deal with it and (2) political candidates educate themselves on the issues and also educate their constituents to accept reasonable positions.

Prior instate studies: *Attitudes Toward Crime: A Survey of Colorado Citizens and Criminal Justice Officials* (1989); *Crime in Colorado: 1984 Citizen Survey* (1986); and *Crime in Colorado: A Survey of Citizens* (1982)

Agencies involved: Office of Research and Statistics, Colorado Division of Criminal Justice

Cost of the study: Supported by a grant for \$30,000

Evaluation of Multijurisdictional Task Forces in Colorado

Suzanne Kraus Pullen and Mary J. Mande, Ph.D.
Office of Research and Statistics
Colorado Division of Criminal Justice
700 Kipling Street, Suite 1000
Denver, CO 80215
(303) 239-4442

Objectives of the research: (1) To evaluate how five task forces are working and (2) to determine what elements and strategies are proving to be effective in meeting stated goals and objectives.

Research methodology: Evaluation strategy focuses on task force design and performance. The research design encompasses both process and outcome components: process evaluation is based on performance data such as agency-report arrests and drug seizures as well as data from interviews; outcome evaluation focuses on incentives for task force development, program design, enforcement strategies, and task force strengths and weaknesses. To assess impact on the drug problem, the evaluation uses both quantitative data (drug arrests) and qualitative data from interviews with community members to assess the seriousness of the drug problem in the community before and after the introduction of the task force.

Findings of the research: Findings related to task force design show that all five task forces had the same goals: (1) to reduce the availability of drugs in their community; (2) to arrest, prosecute, and convict drug users and dealers; and (3) to target and seize the property of drug users and dealers.

Other findings on task force design include the following:

- Each task force has taken a similar approach in designing the force. All use undercover agents and rely heavily on information from informants and intelligence gathered in the field.
- Three of the task forces have a board of directors that meets on a regular basis to discuss ongoing task force activities, problems, and new developments and to make personnel decisions. The two task forces that do not have a board of directors involve fewer agencies.
- Drug arrests as measured by Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) reports are increasing in the task force jurisdictions. (Note: Other activities or factors that may have contributed to this increase were not measured as part of the evaluation.)
- Most of the citizens interviewed reported that the drug problem in their community is either the same as or worse today than it was 5 years ago. They reported that the primary drug of abuse is alcohol, followed by marijuana and cocaine. They perceive major drug abusers to be young adults of high school age and in their twenties. Therefore, the public perception of task force effectiveness is unclear.

Performance findings are described in relation to the three goals set by all three multijurisdictional task forces:

1. Reduce the availability of drugs—Drug seizure amounts fluctuated over the grant periods compared in this evaluation. It is difficult to assess the degree to which the availability of drugs has been reduced by the activities of the task force. Interview data from task force members and other research conducted in Denver during this grant period (Drug Use Forecasting) indicated that it was difficult to get certain types of drugs in the Denver metropolitan area.
2. Arrest, prosecute, and convict drug dealers—UCR reports indicate that drug arrests in the task force jurisdictions have increased by 30%-60% between 1986 and 1990. A separate study that compared jurisdictions in Colorado indicated that 65% more drug-related arrests were made in task force jurisdictions than in non-task-force jurisdictions.
3. Target and seize the property of drug offenders—While dollar amounts of asset seizures vary, each of the task forces for which data were available had at least maintained the same level of seizures or increased the number from the comparison grant period. Overall, asset seizure income increased by more than 20% from FY 1988-89 to FY 1989-90.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: There are four critical elements that should be considered when future funding decisions for task forces are made:

1. Perceived benefit—If there is no expected gain from task force membership, overall commitment on the part of critical "players" may not be as strong. There must be, therefore, a perceived benefit to all agencies involved in the task force; for example, resource and information sharing and income from asset seizures and increased drug arrests.
2. Commitment and participation by critical decisionmakers—If each jurisdiction's power-holding authorities do not support multijurisdictional efforts, task forces will be less likely to meet their goals. Critical decisionmakers include chiefs of police, sheriffs, district attorneys, judges, and city council members.
3. Organizational entity—A board of directors or other organizational entity must be an integral part of the task force structure. This facilitates meeting goals and objectives, reduces duplication of law enforcement efforts, resolves turf issues, and fosters cohesiveness among participating agencies.
4. Region-appropriate strategy—Task forces must design a strategy for law enforcement that is appropriate to their demographic and geographic region. Relevant regional characteristics must be identified at the onset and incorporated into the design and structure of the task force. For example, the use of undercover agents is likely to be ineffective in rural districts where strangers are noticed.

Timeframe of the study: October 1, 1989, to September 30, 1990

Agencies involved: Office of Research and Statistics, Colorado Division of Criminal Justice

Cost of the study: \$75,309

Getting Tough on Crime in Colorado

Mary J. Mande, Ph.D.
Office of Research and Statistics
Colorado Division of Criminal Justice
700 Kipling Street, Suite 1000
Denver, CO 80215
(303) 239-4442

Objectives of the research: To study the "toughness" of a 1985 amendment [House Bill (H.B.) 1320] to Colorado's sentencing law by examining (1) the effects of this legislation on sentencing practices and on the prison system and (2) the validity of some of the assumptions used in forecasting policy impacts.

Research methodology: Three sources provided data for this research. First, quantitative data were collected from seven Colorado judicial districts selected to be representative of the State. Second, in those same districts, personal interviews were conducted with judges, district attorneys, defense lawyers, and probation officers. Third, a statewide mail survey of judges was replicated, in which they were asked how they would sentence in hypothetical cases.

The source for quantitative data was the Colorado court data base. The Colorado Division of Criminal Justice annually collects data from district court felony case files. For the sample period, July 1, 1984, through December 31, 1986, a 10% systematic sample of case filings produced 1,997 cases for analysis. Of the 1,997 filings in the sample, 1,548 had resulted in convictions at the time of the data collection.

Qualitative information, collected for the purpose of a better understanding of the dynamics of law implementation, was derived from 47 interviews (10 district court judges, 12 district attorneys, 12 defense attorneys, and 13 probation officers). The judicial survey, the third data source, was mailed to the entire population of Colorado district court judges. Of the 105 judges surveyed, 79 judges who hear criminal cases responded. At least one judge in each of the 22 judicial districts responded, and in 11 of the districts, 100% of the judges returned completed surveys.

Findings of the research: Because many factors other than H.B. 1320 may have affected sentencing patterns during the observation period, as many as possible of these factors were compared, pre- and post-H.B. 1320, to identify possible confounding effects. The following changes were observed:

Offender profile

- Slight increase in the proportion of male offenders
- Slight increase in the 18- to 20-year-old group
- Slight increase in never-married offenders

Offender needs

- Increase in unemployment at sentence—related to increase in pretrial confinement
- Increase in reported substance abuse

Criminal history

- Increase in the proportion of offenders with prior juvenile history
- Decrease (not statistically significant) in adult offenders with no criminal history

Offense characteristics

- A smaller proportion of offenders charged with Class 4 felonies and a larger proportion charged with Class 5 felonies

Plea bargaining

- No change

Placement decisions for convicted offenders

- No change

Changes in sentence length

- A survey of judges found that recommended sentence lengths have increased 35% since 1980.
- The increase in recommended sentence lengths was found in all cases, but it was greater for repeat and violent offenders.

- Analysis of data from court case files shows that sentences were increasing dramatically under the old sentencing law. Analysis of sentences in relation to the midpoint of the ranges shows that 61% of the total sample were at or above the top of the range. Sixty-eight percent of sentences imposed prior to the effective date of H.B. 1320 were at or above the top range, compared to 52% of new-law sentences. However, the percentage of sentences that fall between the middle and top of the range increased from 1% under the old law to 10% under the new law.

Sentence length

- Under H.B. 1320, the average sentence length has increased 30 months, from 63.6 months to 93.6 months. A sentence of 93.6 months requires a minimum length of stay in prison of 46.8 months.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: Prison population projections using old-law sentence lengths as of June 30, 1985 (the new law was effective on July 1, 1985), and new-law sentence lengths show that the new-law projected prison population for 1995 would be more than 4,000 over old-law sentence lengths, thus creating a need for that many additional prison cells.

Agencies involved: Office of Research and Statistics, Colorado Division of Criminal Justice

Cost of the study: Partially funded by a \$30,000 award granted by the Bureau of Justice Statistics

Individual Crime Rates of Colorado Prisoners

Mary J. Mande, Ph.D., and Kim English
Office of Research and Statistics
Colorado Division of Criminal Justice
700 Kipling Street, Suite 1000
Denver, CO 80215
(303) 239-4442

Objectives of the research: To replicate RAND's Second Survey of Inmates in California, Texas, and Michigan on a sample of Colorado offenders.

Research methodology: In 1986 the National Institute of Justice funded the Colorado Division of Criminal Justice to replicate the RAND survey on an incoming cohort of 313 male prisoners. The 45-page RAND questionnaire was administered under similar conditions to a random sample of inmates housed in the prison's diagnostic unit. Participation in the study was voluntary and confidential. Official record data were collected from prison files for each of the survey participants.

Participation and frequency of crimes committed in 10 crime types were studied by the Colorado Division of Criminal Justice (DCJ) to attempt to validate the Greenwood 7-Point Scale (Greenwood and Lavin, 1982) to identify high-rate offenders, but researchers found the scale to incorrectly predict

54%-58% of the burglars and robbers in the Colorado sample. Also, replicating the method used by RAND researchers, the quality of the self-report data was assessed by comparing within-questionnaire items for consistency. Certain self-report items were compared with official records to obtain estimates of consistency.

Annualized crime rates were calculated for each respondent, and the distribution across the cohort was observed. Indeed, the same skewed distribution reported by inmates in the three States previously studied was found. Participation and frequency rates in Colorado were similar to those found in Texas prisons and were considerably lower than those found in Michigan and California.

Findings of the research: Half of the offenders in the Colorado sample committed fewer than five or six crimes per year; violent crimes were much less frequent, with an annual median rate of fewer than two. Colorado respondents reported a median annual drug crime rate at least twice that of the other three States, suggesting that there have been changes in drug crime patterns and criminal justice policies related to drug crimes across different jurisdictions and/or across time (the RAND data were collected in 1978).

Using discriminant analysis, DCJ researchers tried to describe high-rate offenders (those committing crimes at rates above the mean) with both self-report and official record data. Using both data sources, a combination of items was obtained that described this type of offender in ways important to both social policy and criminal justice program development: began criminal activity early in life; began to do crime "for the reputation" and "for excitement"; recently used illegal drugs; recently convicted of a felony; not married; currently young; previous arrest for a crime similar to current crime; and so on.

Timeframe of the study: Data were collected from January to April 1986. The final report was produced in 1988.

Agencies involved: This study involved the Colorado Department of Public Safety, Division of Public Safety, and the Division of Criminal Justice (lead). The Department of Corrections allowed DCJ access to inmates.

Cost of the study: One component of the prisoner classification study was funded by the National Institute of Justice for approximately \$158,000.

Sentencing Trends in Colorado 1983-1989

Mary J. Mande, Ph.D., Adele Platter, Ph.D.,
Chris Webster, and Joan Crouch
Office of Research and Statistics
Colorado Division of Criminal Justice
700 Kipling Street, Suite 1000
Denver, CO 80215
(303) 239-4442

Objectives of the research: To identify trends that would explain the rapid increase in prison populations.

Research methodology: The study includes independent qualitative and quantitative components. Quantitative data were extracted from a computer file data base of 12,448 court case records of felons who were sentenced between 1983 and 1989. Qualitative data were collected in a telephone survey of 214 system decisionmakers. Respondents were asked to identify their perceptions of change in sentencing patterns and placement decisions during the 1980's. Each research component represents a sample of nine counties that were selected on the basis of diversity in geographic characteristics, population density, and type of economic activity. After analyzing each component separately, findings were compared to determine the extent to which court data and interviewee perceptions concur.

Findings of the research: Study findings indicate that sentencing patterns and placement decisions were fairly stable during the 1980's. Variation was present from year to year, but very few trends were found. The most striking trend was the increase in crimes involving substance abuse and in convicted felons with substance abuse problems. The sentencing law passed in 1986 appears to have had an impact on placement decisions; while the percentage of offenders placed on probation dropped after 1985, placements to community corrections and prison increased after the sentencing law was implemented.

Many inconsistencies were found between changes perceived by key system decisionmakers and data collected from court records. Several explanations are possible: (1) people generally place greater emphasis on recent events, and respondents may therefore have focused on recent information when responding to interview questions; (2) respondents may not have been in decisionmaking positions within the criminal justice system throughout the observation period; (3) respondents may have been influenced by media reporting; and (4) some respondents answered in terms of absolute numbers, while others replied in terms of relative change. We do not know the extent to which the ambiguity in responses affected the findings but, on the bases of prior work, we can report that it is unlikely that rewording the interview form would have made significant differences in overall responses.

Many factors influencing change in sentencing or placement decisions could not be separated out or measured: for example, Colorado's declining economy in the 1980's may have affected offender profiles, and a tougher public attitude toward crime may have altered perceptions of actual sentencing and placement patterns.

Extensive examination of changes in sentencing and placement in Colorado during the 1980's did reveal a remarkable amount of system stability and, if the timeframe were expanded, it is likely that even greater stability would be found.

To summarize, data collected from 7 years of court case records show some shifts but very few strong trends during that period of time. In addition, although 7 years is considered a reasonable observation period for a trend study, it is not long enough to reveal long-term trends. Persistent changes during a 7-year period may appear as random variation when embedded in a longer timeframe.

Timeframe of the study: 1983-89

Agencies involved: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice

Cost of the study: \$40,000

Validation of the Iowa Risk Assessment Scale on a 1982 Release Cohort of Colorado Inmates

Mary J. Mande, Ph.D., and Kim K. English
Office of Research and Statistics
Colorado Division of Criminal Justice
700 Kipling Street, Suite 1000
Denver, CO 80215
(303) 239-4442

Objectives of the research: To investigate whether two recently developed risk assessment scales, the RAND Selective Incapacitation Scale and the Iowa Risk Assessment Scale, could be generalized to the population of convicted felony offenders in Colorado.

Research methodology: The research design for this study included manual collection of data from Department of Corrections files on all the variables needed to classify offenders on the Iowa Risk Assessment Scale as well as other items found to be related to recidivism. The research called for collection of three outcome variables: seriousness (none, technical, felony nonviolent, or felony violent); the number of recidivism events; and the date of the first recidivism event. Termination data were also collected on each case, including successful completion of the 2-year at-risk period, death, and out-of-State move. For both recidivism and termination, available data were collected from the offender case files and the DOC management information system during the classification data collection. However, the primary data source for recidivism data was the automated criminal history file maintained by the Colorado Bureau of Investigation.

Research was based on a sample of 1982 releases from the Colorado Department of Corrections. Four jurisdictions were included in the sample (Denver, El Paso, Jefferson, and Mesa Counties) selected for the number of releases, the quality of the criminal justice records, and accessibility. In 1982, about 700 prisoners were released in these districts (44% of prison releases). Reasons for selecting 1982 as the sample year were as follows: (1) offense class data needed for sentencing decisions under a presumptive sentencing law effective July 1, 1979, led to more complete descriptions of the instant offense (thus, 1982 data would be more reliable than those in records prior to 1982) and (2) selection of a 1982 cohort provided a uniform time at risk of 2 years for the entire sample.

SPSSX was used to program and analyze the data. Frequencies for the major indicators (prior violence, criminal history, conviction offense, substance abuse, current offense, street time, escape, and serious offender) were compared for the Colorado and Iowa samples. Next, the bivariate relationship between predictors and outcome variables was examined. Missing data were weighted to improve somewhat the face validity of the relationship between predicted and observed outcomes.

Findings of the research: Study findings show that the Iowa Risk Assessment Scale has no empirical or practical value as a tool for estimating the risk of Colorado prisoners. Furthermore, it adds another case to the growing body of evidence that the Iowa model specifically, and perhaps all region-specific models, does not generalize well to other regions or States. Although the core of predictors is the same, predictive utility of the operationalized versions appears to be dependent on the policies and practices of recordkeeping specific to each region or State.

Agencies involved: Office of Research and Statistics, Colorado Division of Criminal Justice

Cost of the study: This study was one phase of a project supported by a \$158,454 grant.

Connecticut

Offender Profiles: Those in Prison and in the Community Compared

Eleanor Lyon, Ph.D., and Dianna Aprea
Office of Policy and Management
80 Washington Street
Hartford, CT 06106
(203) 566-6295

Objectives of the research: To identify incarcerated men and women who could be considered for carefully designed and supervised community sanctions.

Research methodology: To collect comparative data on sentenced populations, random samples of men and women in the custody of the Department of Correction (DOC) were first drawn by DOC research staff. They provided lists of 10% of the men and 30% of the women who were sentenced and in custody on October 1, 1990. Two samples of men and women were drawn: one was of those who were incarcerated, and one was of those who were in DOC custody in the community (either in halfway houses or on "supervised home release"). Because of the relatively small number of women in the system, a higher proportion was needed to obtain a sample large enough for confidence and for statistical analysis.

Additional samples were obtained of men and women sentenced to the Alternatives to Incarceration Program (AIP). This new program was designed for convicted offenders who would otherwise be "jail bound"; they are supervised by probation officers. Table 1 displays the samples obtained for each of these sentenced groups.

Table 1. Samples of Sentenced Men and Women

	Men	Women	Total
DOC (incarcerated)	401	116	517
DOC (community)	305	197	502
AIP	207	30	237
Total	913	343	1,256

Data on each offender in the samples were obtained from the DOC, from risk assessment information recorded by bail commissioners in their interviews, and from criminal history data (charges at arrest and at disposition and the sentence for each arrest incident) available through the bail commission office. Data were collected for the following variables: age, sex, race/ethnicity, education, marital status, relationship to coresidents, number of dependents, presence of family in the State, source of support, drug and alcohol problems identified in bail interviews, charge(s) at arrest (the three most

serious were recorded), type of charge (each), seriousness of charge, charge at disposition, sentence, the total number of arrest incidents on record, and the total number of charges on record. The data on charges and dispositions were recorded for the present incident and for the five most serious incidents on record (as well as the point in the sequence of arrest incidents at which they occurred). Data were also recorded on whether each offender was banned from home release, was serving a mandatory minimum prison sentence, or was formally detained in confinement (for example, because the offender was awaiting trial on other charges or being held for extradition to another State).

Although multivariate analyses were used, the interest in comparative profiles meant that simple frequencies, cross-tabular analyses, and correlations were the primary techniques employed and reported in the study. Additional analyses will be performed with these samples as new questions are suggested by policymakers.

Findings of the research: The statistical profiles drawn from the samples of sentenced men and women compare those who were sentenced to the DOC and were confined at the time the data were collected with those who were sentenced to the DOC and supervised in the community and with those who were sentenced to the AIP and supervised by the Office of Adult Probation (OAP). The profiles, then, compare one "in" group with two groups of people who are "out."

Sentenced men

The men sentenced to the DOC were demographically similar to those sentenced to the AIP, with one exception: those in the AIP were significantly younger than the DOC groups. Thirty-one percent were under age 21, compared to 7% of the DOC community and 18% of the DOC incarcerated men. While Latinos were underrepresented in the AIP program (16% of the total, compared to 26% and 24%, respectively), the difference did not reach the .05 level of significance. Data on education, marital status, relationship to coresidents, number of dependents, presence of family in the State, employment, and indications of drug or alcohol problems were similar for the three groups. Over half of the men in all three groups, for example, did not have a high school diploma, and over four-fifths reported that they had never married.

The men in the three groups did, however, have significantly different experiences with crime and the criminal justice system. The incarcerated men were significantly more likely than the men in the community groups to have been sentenced for violent or property crimes and less likely to have been sentenced for substance-related offenses. However, 31% of the confined men were convicted of drug or alcohol crimes, and 73% were sentenced for nonviolent offenses.

The men in the AIP were significantly more likely than the others to have been convicted of unclassified felonies (primarily drug offenses) or unclassified offenses (largely violation of probation). Sixty percent of the AIP men fell into one of these two offense categories, compared to 46% of the DOC community and 38% of the incarcerated men. However, men in the AIP had been convicted of other "serious" offenses as well: 11% were sentenced for Class B or C felonies, of which nearly half (46%) were crimes against persons.

The men in the AIP averaged fewer known arrests than the men sentenced to the DOC: 4.7, compared to 6.6 for the DOC community and 9.0 for the incarcerated men. However, 45% of the incarcerated men had five or fewer recorded arrests (compared to 70% of those in the AIP), while over a quarter of the Class B or C felons in the AIP convicted of a violent crime had six or more known arrests.

When criminal justice personnel were asked in questionnaires and focus group meetings which offenders should most certainly be incarcerated and which could be considered for community-based sanctions, there was consensus that those who commit violent crimes should be confined, while many substance abusers and property offenders could be considered for alternatives. Accordingly, a pool of men was identified as a starting point for discussion of candidates for community punishments. The criteria were that they not be convicted of a "crime against persons" (FBI definition), have *no* such charges in their five most serious arrest incidents, and have no ban from home release, detainer, or mandatory minimum sentence associated with their confinement. When these criteria were met, 21% of the incarcerated sample remained. Over half (53%) were serving sentences of 3 years or less, and over half (54%) were convicted of substance offenses (36% were property offenders). The men in this group averaged nearly seven known arrests; the average was inflated by the extensive records of some, since 42% had three or fewer total arrests on record. This pool consisted predominantly of African-American and Latino men sentenced for drug offenses and white men convicted of property crimes; Latinos, in particular, were overrepresented in this pool. At the time the sample was drawn, there would have been 1,600 men in this pool.

Sentenced women

The women in the three groups were demographically similar. Although observed differences did not reach statistical significance, primarily because of small sample size, Latinos were underrepresented in the AIP, and AIP women were more likely than the others to be employed when arrested and to have dependents.

The women in the three groups, however, had significantly different experiences with crime and the criminal justice system. For example, 87% of the women in the AIP were sentenced for either a substance-related crime or a crime against persons (primarily "risk of injury to a minor"). In contrast, 58% of the incarcerated women and 45% of the women supervised by the DOC in the community were sentenced for property or public-order crimes (for example, prostitution, violation of probation, or failure to appear). In addition, the women in the AIP had shorter arrest records (two-thirds had five or fewer arrests, compared to 51% of the DOC community women and 44% of those confined) and shorter average criminal histories (3 years, compared to over 5 years).

When the same criteria used to generate the pool of men were applied to the sample of incarcerated women, 35% remained. Two-thirds of these women were serving sentences of 3 years or less. Nearly half (45%) were convicted of substance-related crimes, while 29% were sentenced for property offenses and 26% for public-order crimes. The Latinos in the group had overwhelmingly (83%) been convicted of substance-related offenses, while the white and African-American women were about evenly divided among substance, property, and public-order crimes. The primary characteristic of the women in this pool was their extensive arrest history: they averaged over 12 arrests; only 29% had official records of 3 or fewer arrests. At the time the data were collected, the pool of women who met the criteria would have reached 162.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: The research provided comparative data on offender populations that had not previously been available. It demonstrated that while there are significant aggregate criminal history differences among three groups considered "jail bound" at the time of sentencing and while those who were incarcerated were generally more "serious" offenders, there was also notable overlap between those who were confined and those who were receiving community sanctions. Using criteria that eliminated those with any record of crime against persons and those with statutory or administrative release restrictions, nearly 1,800 incarcerated men and women could be considered for carefully designed and supervised community sanctions. These projections were based on confined populations at the time the samples were drawn; because facilities that were subsequently opened have expanded the numbers of incarcerated men and women, the numbers in the potential pools would now be larger.

Characteristics of men and women in these potential pools indicate that community programs for these populations would need careful monitoring and strong drug treatment components. Well-monitored community service and restitution programs would also be consistent with the substantial segments convicted of property offenses. The large portion of Latino men and women would suggest the importance of bilingual programming sensitive to cultural differences. Educational and job training elements are suggested by the offenders' limited experiences in these areas. The presence of a substantial proportion of single mothers among the women would argue for a child care component in community programming for female offenders, possibly accompanied by education in parenting skills.

The pools described in this study served as a starting point for policy discussion. Other pools, which excluded people charged with drug sales and burglaries involving weapons or night entry into residences, were also explored. The proportion of incarcerated offenders identified through these approaches ranged from 14% of the men to 38% or more of the women. With the development of a graduated system of carefully designed and monitored sanctions, many of these offenders could be sentenced to community programs, and prison beds could be utilized for the most serious and violent, who could actually serve the more lengthy sentences they were given.

Agencies involved: Research and Evaluation Services, Child & Family Services, Inc.

Delaware

Delaware Incarceration Factbook

Jack O'Connell and Lyle Milton Baltrusch, Ph.D.
Delaware Criminal Justice Council
Statistical Analysis Center
60 The Plaza
Dover, DE 19901
(302) 739-4626

Objectives of the research: To provide descriptive explanations of how and why Delaware's correctional population has increased over the past decade.

Research methodology: The research design used for the *Delaware Incarceration Factbook* is a 120-month time series analysis focusing on DOC's detention, jail, and prison populations. These populations are examined from the perspectives of changing admission and length-of-stay patterns. Each data point in the time series is presented by 15 types of crime and 7 sentencing categories. Furthermore, separate time series are provided by month for admissions: detention; jail and prison; time detained or served in jail or prison; and a detailed annual demographic overview of the detention, jail, and prison populations by sex, race, and age.

Findings of the research: Findings show the changes in each of the correctional populations. Most of the increase is caused by the increase in admissions for drug offenses, probation violations, arrest warrants, and misdemeanor crimes. The detention population went from 237 in 1981 to 711 in 1990, an increase of 200%. The prison population was stabilized by the implementation of SENTAC (the Sentencing Accountability Law) in 1987, which deinstitutionalized many of the nonviolent felons by placing them in highly structured prison alternative programs. Furthermore, Truth in Sentencing has stabilized time-served patterns so that similar offenders serve similar sentences. Under Truth in Sentencing, nonviolent offenders are serving short sentences and violent offenders are serving longer sentences. In short, the tradeoff between violent and nonviolent offenders has helped limit the jail and prison population growth. Longer sentences for violent crimes will contribute to a higher corrections population in the future.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: The policy impact of the *Factbook* has been significant. It has provided the baseline information needed by State decisionmakers to carry on an informed discussion relating to structured sentencing, correctional crowding, the revision of detention standards, and the impact of mandatory laws on the correctional populations.

Timeframe of the study: 1981-90

Agencies involved: Statistical Analysis Center; Department of Corrections

Delaware Inmate and Detention Population Forecast 1991 to 1996

Jack O'Connell, Lyle Milton Baltrusch, Ph.D.,
and Jorge Rodríguez
Delaware Criminal Justice Council
Statistical Analysis Center
60 The Plaza
Dover, DE 19901
(302) 739-4626

Objectives of the research: To provide a methodologically sound forecast that includes consensus assumptions for the Delaware Department of Corrections' (DOC's) populations.

Research methodology: The Delaware Inmate and Detention Population Forecast 1991 to 1996 uses a components-of-change forecasting methodology. This type of forecast model incorporates both the numerical historical data relating to specific "key components of change" and future estimates of criminal justice system "policy" changes and degree of societal "criminality." The underlying demographic changes, through the use of demographically determined rates, are explicitly included in the forecast model.

The components-of-change population forecast model used in this report uses 86 variables of age, sex, incarceration status, and crime type. The cross-tabulation of these 86 variables—each serving as a subforecast of the total forecast—is summarized on a quarterly basis beginning in 1983 and forecast by quarter from 1991 through 1996.

Over 200 criminal statutes in the Delaware Code are summarized into 15 crime types: assault, burglary, warrants and contempt violations, illicit drugs, driving under the influence of alcohol, fraud, homicide, life sentences (including three subgroups—homicide, sex offenses, and other), miscellaneous offenses (which include all other offenses not placed in a category), probation violations, parole violations, robbery, sex offenses, theft, traffic offenses, and weapons violations.

The starting point of the forecast is admission rates to the Delaware DOC. Using admission rates, rather than the number of persons admitted, allows the forecast to control for the changing composition of the State's population and the propensity of offenders to be admitted in 1 of the 15 crime types. Time served, or length of stay (LOS), is estimated using average time served when known (for example, for detention and jail sentences, less than a year; for prison sentences, greater than a year). Projections for admission rates and LOS patterns are based on an individual study of each crime and sex subcategory. This level of detail provides for the examination of 30 subcategories covering both admission rates and LOS for a 32-quarter period.

Likewise, each of the 30 subcategories for admission rates and LOS estimates are individually estimated for each future quarter until the fourth quarter of 1996. Assumptions are set for a longer range, but unpublished, forecast. The actual assumptions for the forecast are established by a group that sets the policy assumptions and that includes representatives of the major police departments, the Attorney General, the Governor's Office, the Public Defender, and the Department of Corrections.

Establishing LOS assumptions receives special attention because Delaware has recently established two major structured-sentencing laws. The first law requires that Level V punishment (jail or prison incarceration) be emphasized for convicted violent offenders and that a hierarchy of nonincarceration offenses be emphasized for nonviolent offenders. This law, called SENTAC, was passed in late 1987. In 1990, a determinate sentencing law, entitled Truth in Sentencing, was passed, abolishing parole for offenders sentenced after July 1990 and providing a new sentencing structure and good-time pattern for all criminal statutes.

Findings of the research: On June 30, 1990, the total inmate and detention population was 3,635. Of this population, 2,334 were inmates in prison, 590 were inmates in jail, and 711 were detainees.

The growth of the total incarcerated population is expected to be slower in the future than the rapid DOC population increase experienced between 1985 and 1990. The greatest single-year increase—315—occurred between June 1985 and June 1986. In comparison, the June 1990 to June 1991 increase is expected to be only 62. During this period, the prison and detention populations are expected to decrease by 38 and 11, respectively. The jail population is expected to increase by 111 inmates. This offset for prison and jail populations is due to the 1990 implementation of the Truth in Sentencing law, which shortens the time served by property offenders in return for longer time served by violent offenders.

By fiscal year 1996, the total population is expected to increase to 4,364, of whom 2,769 are expected to be inmates in prison, 813 are expected to be inmates in jail, and 782 are expected to be detainees.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: DOC's facility crowding is a difficult problem in Delaware. This study's findings are used for facility planning, program planning, legal questions related to crowding, the impact of both SENTAC and Truth in Sentencing, the impact analysis of criminal law changes, and the establishment of budgets.

Timeframe of the study: 1991-96

Agencies involved: Statistical Analysis Center; Department of Corrections

DOC Forecast Monitoring Report: 4th Quarter 1991

Jack O'Connell and Lyle Milton Baltrusch, Ph.D.
Delaware Criminal Justice Council
Statistical Analysis Center
60 The Plaza
Dover, DE 19901
(302) 739-4626

Objectives of the research: (1) To compare the Department of Corrections' (DOC's) population forecasts with the actual trends; (2) to explain the variance between the forecast and the actual populations for detention, jail, and prison populations; and (3) to show the variance in each of these populations for 15 types of crime.

Research methodology: This study used a comparison of forecast versus actual population values.

Findings of the research: The actual population is 2% higher than the forecast population. Significant detail on the Department of Corrections' populations is provided for 15 types of crime.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: The report informs the DOC and the Budget Office on how and why the DOC's population is changing. The results are used to inform policymakers on the effectiveness of their forecast assumptions. Significant variances are studied and the information is used to help set revised assumptions.

Timeframe of the study: First quarter 1989 through first quarter 1993

Agencies involved: Statistical Analysis Center; Department of Corrections

Impact of the Drug Trafficking Law on the Delaware Criminal Justice System

Jack O'Connell and Jorge Rodríguez
Delaware Criminal Justice Council
Statistical Analysis Center
60 The Plaza
Dover, DE 19901
(302) 739-4626

Objectives of the research: To identify the effects of Delaware's new drug trafficking law.

Research methodology: The study employed a quasi-experimental pre-post design, using an interrupted time series to indicate the initiation of the new drug trafficking law. Two crime data series, a drug weight data series (from the Medical Examiner's Office), a jail detention series, and sentenced admissions to jail and prison are used to compare the periods before and after the implementation of the law.

Findings of the research: The law was effectively implemented and has led to a significant increase in drug trafficking cases that result in arrest, detention, and sentencing. There has been a significant impact on the detention and prison populations—increasing about 10%-15%. There appeared to be a short-term effect on the illicit drug market in the fall and winter of 1990. By 1991, the weight of drugs being seized on the streets had returned to its record-high levels.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: This study has proved to be a key source of information for the debate on how best to use scarce resources to combat the illicit drug problem.

Prior instate studies: An impact study prior to the implementation of the law was done in 1989, and an impact study was published in 1991.

Timeframe of the study: Quarterly, 1989–91

Agencies involved: Statistical Analysis Center; State Bureau of Identification; Medical Examiner's Office; Department of Corrections

Level IV Sentencing Options—Part II: Statistical Evaluation

Emily A. Reed, Ph.D.
Criminal Justice Council
State Office Building
820 North French Street, 4th Floor
Wilmington, DE 19801

Objectives of the research: To indicate whether halfway houses and electronic monitoring present viable alternatives to incarceration.

Research methodology:

Offender description: Information on offenders' characteristics included sex, race, age, location by county, criminal history, lead crimes, sentence length, percentage with violent lead charges, percentage in halfway houses and under electronic monitoring, program activities, program completion rates, and the offender's next sentencing level after Level IV. A profile of the typical Level IV offender was developed from these characteristics.

Rehabilitation and recidivism: The rearrest rates of the sample of Level IV offenders during the 1 year after they left Level IV were used as a rehabilitation measure. To provide comparable "at risk" periods for those offenders who violated Level IV conditions and went to Level V, the followup period was calculated as 1 year from the Level V release date following their Level IV failure. The rates of rearrest were used as the measure of recidivism in the various comparisons because of the difficulty of finding accurate reconviction and reincarceration data.

The rearrest rates of the Level IV sample cases were examined in several different ways to portray the effectiveness of the Level IV programs:

- **Crime seriousness**—The severity of rearrest crime was analyzed to show the seriousness of the reoffending that does occur.

- Internal recidivism comparisons—Differences in electronic monitoring and halfway house reoffense rates and those of program completions and dropouts were used to illustrate internal variations in Level IV.
- Other State comparisons—Level IV recidivism for serious crimes was compared to similar information from other States to illustrate how well Level IV performed on a broader spectrum.
- Delaware prison recidivism comparison—Level IV reoffending was compared to that of similar Delaware prison releasees to illustrate similar program effectiveness.
- Pre-post arrest comparison—Level IV offense rates prior to and after program participation were analyzed to show the program's effect.

Violent/nonviolent offenders: One of the general goals of SENTAC is to incapacitate the violence-prone offender while reserving sentencing alternatives for nonviolent offenders. This goal was examined by comparing the characteristics of Level IV violent and nonviolent offenders, especially the differences in their rehabilitation rates.

First offender/repeat offender comparison: Comparison of the recidivism of Level IV first and repeat offenders was used to delineate the types of offenders who are good Level IV risks.

The diversion question: The achievement of diversion from incarceration was analyzed by two methods:

1. The information about the offenders in the programs was summarized according to the type and length of their sentences (that is, incarceration and for how long or probation and for how long), which were grouped by the type of crime. This information was then compared to what similar offenders would have been sentenced to before SENTAC.
2. The criminal histories of the sample were compared to those of a sample of persons sentenced to Levels III and V for the same crimes during the time period (April to November 1989). The appropriateness of the sentences for Level IV offenders was determined by examining their criminal histories to see if they are more serious than those of Level III offenders and less serious than those of Level V offenders for the same crimes.

Presumptive sentencing and conformity to sentencing standards: The average sentences of the seven frequent 1988 Level IV lead crimes were compared to the presumptive sentences in effect under the original 1987 SENTAC sentencing standards to see whether conformity existed in actual sentencing and standards adopted for it.

Profile of suitable offenders: Five characteristics were identified as being statistically linked to low levels of recidivism. These are used to develop the Salient Factor Scorecard, which is based on a point system and can be used to make more informed sentencing decisions.

Data sources used for this study included the Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS), especially the Computerized Criminal History (CCH) file and the Judicial Information Center (JIC) docket information. The Statistical Analysis System (SAS) was used to perform the data analysis.

Findings of the research: Level IV options are less expensive than imprisonment, and taxpayer dollars can be saved with no reduction in public safety if Level IV is used more extensively.

Level IV first offenders, whether or not convicted of a violent lead offense, have almost no history of rearrest in the year following program participation. Their level of rehabilitation, as measured by recidivism, is the best of any subgroup.

More offenders with no prior violent convictions and a current violent conviction stay in the Level IV programs to their end than do nonviolent offenders. They also do no worse than nonviolent offenders in rearrests in the year following program participation.

Not all violent offenders are an unreasonable risk for Level IV. In the early days of the SENTAC level system of sentencing (1988), the judiciary's sentencing of lead-charge violent offenders to Level IV was validated by the significantly better program completion rates of lead-charge violent offenders and their similar recidivism rates after program completion. Their one violent conviction was aberrant behavior, because lead-charge violent offenders' recidivism is no greater than that of other program participants.

Two-conviction violent sample cases completed Level IV at virtually the same rate as nonviolent offenders, and they had more serious criminal records and greater recidivism than the nonviolent sample cases. Nonetheless, not quite half of them were rearrested in the 1-year followup period, indicating that sentencing of two-conviction violent offenders to Level IV should be more carefully weighed than sentencing of offenders with less risk.

The diversion analysis showed that for selected crimes for which offenders are most frequently sentenced to Level IV, SENTAC has achieved its goal of diverting nonviolent offenders into alternative sentencing options and reserving scarce prison cells for those convicted of violent crimes.

A comparison of the lengths of both prison and probation sentences before SENTAC to those under SENTAC (1986 and 1989, respectively) for offender samples illustrates an amazing decline in the lengths of all sentences for all crimes.

Both these changes—diversion to alternatives and shorter sentences—make comprehensive improvements in the sentencing system. They save scarce resources and taxpayer dollars by less frequent and shorter use of the expensive prison option with an accompanying reliance on less expensive alternatives. There is no concurrent loss of public safety with greater incapacitation of offenders convicted of violent offenses.

That virtually all sentences, both in/out decisions and lengths, were within recommended ranges shows remarkable compliance to the sentencing standards by the courts.

Five characteristics of the Level IV sample—the number of prior convictions, the number of prior violent convictions, the number of prior nonviolent felony convictions, the seriousness of the current lead charge, and age—are linked to recidivism.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: Based on the Level IV experience, the SENTAC system of sentencing has been extraordinarily effective. Seven in ten of the sample cases successfully completed their Level IV sentences. More than 6 in 10 were not rearrested in the year after program completion. Of those who were rearrested, most had only minor charges.

The Delaware Level IV sample fared well in recidivism in comparison to samples of young parolees and prison releasees from other States. The sample's rate of offending in the year following program participation was substantially reduced from its rate in the year prior to program participation. However, there was no difference in the rearrest rates of samples of 1988 Delaware Level V and Level IV offenders.

Because the Level IV sample did just as well as the prison releasees and did better after Level IV than before it, Level IV is an intelligent use of a criminal sanction. It keeps offenders employed, thereby supporting themselves and paying taxes; rehabilitates as much as, if not more than, prison; and creates no greater public risk when offenders leave its supervision—all at reduced cost.

SENTAC also has a very positive diversionary effect, resulting in a 19% reduction in the use of Level V for six selected Level IV lead crimes and an increase of incarceration for two of three selected violent crimes. Average sentence lengths, both for incarceration and for probation, were greatly reduced following SENTAC's implementation.

Comparison of seven selected lead crimes from the Level IV sample showed a remarkable level of compliance by sentencing authorities with the presumptive sentencing standards. This validates both the reasonableness of the presumptive sentences and the readiness of the judiciary to implement sentencing reform.

Based on an assessment of Level IV sentencing, SENTAC is a resounding success, calling for implementation of the following seven recommendations:

1. The presumptive sentence for the eight sample charges examined should exclude Level V, except for unusual circumstances, because placement in the community offers no greater public risk than incarceration, at reduced cost.
2. All felony first offenders should be given careful, case-specific consideration for Level IV sentences (whether their lead charge is violent or nonviolent), unless precluded by statute (Class A and B felonies).
3. Based on the sample's rehabilitation and good performance in remaining arrest free after completion of their Level IV sentence, an option should be adopted, when mandatory incarceration is required, to allow all first offenders to be sentenced to Level IV (or even lesser sanctions when feasible).

4. No changes need to be made in the current practice of sentencing lead-charge violent offenders to Level IV because most of them complete the programs and because they are rehabilitated at the same rate as nonviolent offenders.
5. Two-conviction violent offenders can be sentenced to Level IV; however, their sentencing should be more carefully scrutinized because of their greater risk (one chance out of two) of serious rearrest. Whether two-conviction violent offenders go to Level IV should be determined on a case-by-case basis, with the realization that they pose greater danger to the community, on average, than lead-charge violent offenders.
6. Because Truth in Sentencing (TIS) statutorily replaced the sentencing standards used in 1988 and has been in effect for almost a year, a similar assessment should be done on sentencing under TIS to check for similar degrees of compliance.
7. The five characteristics associated with successful and suitable Level IV offenders should be used to make more informed Level IV sentencing decisions. The prototype, the Salient Factor Scorecard, and other possibilities should be explored for adoption by the appropriate decisionmaking authorities.

Prior instate studies: *Violation of Probation Sentencing, Short-Term Evaluation of Level II Substance Abuse Outpatient Treatment, and Videophone Evaluation*

Timeframe of the study: Sample from 1988, with a followup period to December 31, 1989

Agencies involved: Criminal Justice Council (lead); Department of Corrections (support)

Cost of the study: The study was performed by regularly employed personnel.

Lifers in Delaware

Jack O'Connell and Lyle Milton Baltrusch, Ph.D.
Delaware Criminal Justice Council
Statistical Analysis Center
60 The Plaza
Dover, DE 19901
(302) 739-4626

Objectives of the research: (1) To determine the size, rate of change, and type of offenders who are serving life sentences and (2) to estimate the future population of lifers.

Research methodology: Time series analysis and rate of change calculations are the two methods used to analyze the change in the lifer population.

Findings of the research: Because the laws affecting life sentences changed in 1974, the lifer population has been growing steadily, at about 22 per year. In June 1981, the lifer population was 177. In 10 years it had grown to 383, an increase of 116%. If the rate of growth continues, the lifer population will be 568 in the year 2000. Sex offenders—that is, repeat felony sex offenders—are beginning to make up a larger portion of the lifer admissions.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: Sentencing, deterrence, and correctional costs and operations are the issues affected by this study.

Timeframe of the study: Quarterly, 1981-91

Agencies involved: Statistical Analysis Center; Department of Corrections

Florida

Boot Camp: A Twenty-five Month Review

Research Staff
Bureau of Planning, Research and Statistics
2601 Blairstone Road
Tallahassee, FL 32399-2500

Objectives of the research: To evaluate the Boot Camp program.

Research methodology: The data drawn from the Department of Corrections (DC) computerized data base were supplemented by written questionnaires and Boot Camp's own records.

Findings of the research: Findings pertain to the first 25 months of the program's operation (October 1987 through October 1989) and represent data drawn from the DC computerized data base supplemented by written questionnaires and Boot Camp's own inmate records. Among the findings are the following:

- The typical inmate admitted to Boot Camp was a 19-year-old unmarried male who acknowledged using illegal drugs and was convicted on a primary offense of burglary or robbery and sentenced to 3.6 years in prison.
- Compared with inmates who failed at Boot Camp for disciplinary or motivational reasons, inmates who graduated were slightly older, more likely to have completed high school, somewhat less likely to acknowledge using illegal drugs, and more likely to have been convicted of armed robbery or violent crimes on a first-degree felony.
- Of the 281 Boot Camp graduates, 90% consistently met or exceeded the basic requirements of the program in the areas of military drill, obstacle course, work assignment, dress code, substance abuse training, and counseling (rational-emotive therapy training). The vigorous physical training that inmates received generally improved their fitness.
- The reincarceration rate of Boot Camp graduates was 25.3%, which compares favorably with 27.8% for a matched inmate group. Accounting for the superior performance of the Boot Camp graduates was a lower reincarceration rate for technical violations of probation. The graduates have shown no uniform superiority in recommitments to prison for new crimes, although some evidence suggests that the program may have a deterrent impact for some types of offenders but not for others.
- New felonies committed by Boot Camp graduates were highly time clustered, with 57.5% occurring within the first 4 months after release from prison and 83% occurring within the first 8 months. On average, graduates with new felony commitments maintained "good" postrelease behavior for 4.5 months, a figure virtually identical to that of the comparison group.

- Reincarcerated Boot Camp graduates acknowledged problems with job skills, employment, and substance abuse.
- In total incarceration time, graduates of Boot Camp served 19% of their sentences, compared to 32% for a matched inmate group. State prison time alone constituted 13% of the graduates' sentences and 22% of the comparison group's. If graduates of Boot Camp had served 22% of their sentences in State prison, over 39,759 inmate days would have been added to the correctional system's load, at a cost of more than \$1.25 million.

Prior instate studies: March 1989

Timeframe of the study: October 1987 to October 1989

Agencies involved: Florida Department of Corrections

Cost of the study: Agency expenses

Control Release Authority Decisions for Habitual Offenders: A Pilot Simulation

William D. Bales
Bureau of Planning, Research and Statistics
2601 Blairstone Road
Tallahassee, FL 32399-2500

Objectives of the research: To inform the legislature of the effects of changing statutory early release eligibility for habitual offenders.

Research methodology: This report documents a pilot test of early-prison-release decisions the Control Release Authority (CRA) would make if certain types of habitual offenders were statutorily eligible for early release. The significant increase in the number of offenders in Florida statutorily declared as habitual offenders under FS 775.084(1)(a) and (b) is well documented. The number of scarce prison beds required to house habitual offenders is increasing dramatically for several reasons: (1) the number of new habitual offenders entering prison continues to increase; (2) habitual offenders receive significantly longer sentences than nonhabituals; (3) early release through the CRA is statutorily denied; and (4) only incentive gaintime reduces a habitual's sentence, resulting in an average percentage of sentence served of 75%. The current forecast indicates that the habitual offender population will increase to 24,000 inmates by FY 1996-97 if existing policy and practices continue.

The study presented here was conducted to determine the number of habitual offenders the CRA would release early from prison if statutory authority to do so existed. The analysis will indicate the number of habituals selected for early release and the offense and prior criminal record of these cases.

Findings of the research: Of the 201 habitual offenders reviewed by the CRA, 100 (49.8%) would have been released early through the CRA:

- The objective scoring results using the eight salient factors recommended early release for 89 of the 201 (44.3%) habituals.
- For 15, or 7.5%, of the habituals, the scoring instrument recommended early release, but the CRA denied early release.
- Early release would have been granted over the recommendation of the scoring results in 26 cases (12.9%).
- Drug offenders accounted for 43% of the 100 habitual offenders who would have been released early; property offenders accounted for 53%; and third-degree felons accounted for 41%.
- One in four (27%) habituals determined to be appropriate for early release were third-degree property offenders.
- 75 of the would-be early-release habituals had no prior violent convictions.
- 120 (59.7%) of the entire sample had four or more prior convictions, and 104 (51.7%) had no prior convictions for a violent crime.
- Most habituals in the sample were 18 to 25 years of age when they committed the first offense resulting in incarceration.

This analysis of the early-release decisions the CRA would have made on 201 habitual offenders if given the statutory authority to do so suggests that one-half would have been released early. Those offenders determined to be suitable risks for early release were likely to be third-degree offenders without extensive prior criminal records and to have a low probability of having violence in their past.

Based on the sample, 19% of the habitual offenders currently entering prison would be designated for early release by the CRA. The Department of Corrections projects that 3,770 habituals will be sentenced to prison in FY 1992-93. If CRA review were possible, 716 of these habituals would have advanceable release dates.

Timeframe of the study: January to June 1991

Agencies involved: Florida Department of Corrections; Florida Parole Commission

Cost of the study: Agency expenses

Control Release Populations: Changes in Advanceable and Non-Advanceable Pools

William D. Bales and Dena Stephens
Bureau of Planning, Research and Statistics
2601 Blairstone Road
Tallahassee, FL 32399-2500

Objectives of the research: To inform policymakers of changes in the makeup of the prison populations eligible and ineligible for early release.

Research methodology: Using the Department of Corrections data base, a monthly trend analysis was conducted on pools of inmates who are eligible and inmates who are ineligible for early release.

Findings of the research: The percentage of the status prison population *statutorily ineligible* for release through the Control Release Authority (CRA) has increased from 60% in June 1991 to 65.3% in January 1992.

The number of inmates in the nonadvanceable pool has increased from a level of 5,091 in February 1991 to 7,278 in February 1992.

The size of the advanceable pool has declined to a level that makes the CRA's ability to maintain the lawful capacity more and more problematic (from 8,881 in February 1991 to 4,653 on February 11, 1992). The only time the advanceable pool did not decline was in July and August 1991, when the CRA reevaluated inmates in the nonadvanceable pool and moved the less serious offenders into the advanceable pool.

This information clearly demonstrates that without changes in policy or significant increases in prison beds in the near future, the ability of the CRA to maintain the prison population within lawful limits will be in jeopardy.

Timeframe of the study: February 1991 to February 1992

Agencies involved: Florida Department of Corrections

Cost of the study: Agency expenses

Growth Orientation Inc. Personal Development (GODEV) at New River Correctional Institution: A Psychological Measure of the GODEV Effectiveness

G. Abbas Darabi, Ph.D.
Bureau of Planning, Research and Statistics
2601 Blairstone Road
Tallahassee, FL 32399-2500

Objectives of the research: (1) To measure inmates' psychological symptoms before and after treatment that prepares them for the return to society, (2) to determine the difference between the two measures, and (3) to describe any improvements.

Research methodology:

- Design—The study's design was pretest-posttest, but nonexperimental.
- Sample—All inmates entering the GODEV treatment program at New River Correctional Institution were administered the test, and 127 of them were included in the study.
- Instrument—The instrument used in the study was the 53-item Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI), developed by Leonard R. Derogatis and Philip M. Spencer of Clinical Psychometric Research. The test is a self-reporting inventory that requires a sixth grade reading level and 20-25 minutes of administration time. It measures nine primary symptom dimensions on a five-point scale and provides three global indices for overall assessment of an individual's psychological status. The BSI was validated by its authors and is marketed with standardized norms for normal, outpatient, and inpatient cases.
- Variables—The test measured the following variables: somatization, obsessive-compulsive, interpersonal sensitivity, depression, anxiety, hostility, phobic anxiety, paranoid ideation, and psychoticism.
- Analytical method—The BSI is individually scored on the computer and presents psychological profiles of the clients. It also provides aggregate data and collective scores on the nine primary dimensions as well as the overall indices. In this study, the pretest and posttest scores were calculated for the whole sample on all the variables. The results were then compared, and a t-test analysis was conducted to determine the significance of any differences.

Findings of the research: The results of this analysis indicated a significant reduction in inmates' psychological symptoms after their treatment. Improvement occurred in depression, psychoticism, obsessive-compulsive, and anxiety symptoms. Except for interpersonal sensitivity, the reductions in inmates' psychological symptoms were all found to be statistically significant.

Prior instate studies: A similar study was done for another institution in 1990.

Timeframe of the study: The psychological measures for the study were administered to inmates for a period of 6 months through December 1991. The analysis was done in February 1992, and the report was published at the same time.

Agencies involved: The Bureau of Planning, Research and Statistics of the Florida Department of Corrections conducted the study for the Office of Adult Services. The New River Correctional Institution and staff of the GODEV program participated by administering the tests and collecting information.

Cost of the study: The researcher used the internal resources of the Department to conduct the study, and no outside services were used.

Mandatory Minimum Sentencing in Florida: Past Trends and Future Implications

William D. Bales and Linda G. Dees
Bureau of Planning, Research and Statistics
2601 Blairstone Road
Tallahassee, FL 32399-2500

Objectives of the research: To inform policymakers of the long-range impact of increased use of mandatory minimum sentencing.

Research methodology: All offenders sentenced to prison under mandatory minimum statutes from 1980 to 1990 were studied. All mandatory minimum statutes were researched relative to gaintime and early-release eligibility. The expected prison terms for each type of mandatory sentencing were calculated, along with the projected costs associated with each. The stacking of mandatory minimum offenders in Florida prisons from March 1988 to June 1990 was captured.

Findings of the research: The combination of court-ordered capacity limits, dramatic increases in prison admissions, and moderate rises in prison construction has resulted in the early release of thousands of Florida prison inmates. The legislature, the judiciary, and the public at large have become dismayed by the decreasing percentage of sentences served in prison and the rapid return of prisoners back to their communities. This situation has fueled legislation that makes mandatory minimum sentencing a more viable option for the courts to employ to keep felons in prison longer. In addition, pressure by the public to keep offenders in prison longer has moved prosecutors and judges to use mandatory sentences at an ever-increasing rate.

While the mandatory sentencing practices serve the agendas of local officials, they have the effect of creating a significant subpopulation of long-term prison inmates. The data presented in this paper suggest that the mandatory minimum population will continue to grow at a potentially significant rate during the 1990's. Expenditure data indicate that incarcerating mandatory minimum inmates will cost substantially more than their nonmandatory counterparts.

The negative aspect of this ever-increasing mandatory minimum population is that the number of new inmates eligible for early release will decline, resulting in fewer of the incoming inmates being released early. However, the term of incarceration for those eligible inmates will be reduced further as their numbers decline. Such a situation can lead to increasing public disapproval, which has been a causal factor in the influx of mandatory minimum sentences over the past several years.

Timeframe of the study: Historical data (1980-90)

Agencies involved: Florida Department of Corrections

Cost of the study: Agency expenses

Psychological Impact of Tier Programs: An Outcome Evaluation

G. Abbas Darabi, Ph.D.
Bureau of Planning, Research and Statistics
2601 Blairstone Road
Tallahassee, FL 32399-2500

Objectives of the research: (1) To measure inmates' psychological symptoms before and after treatment, (2) to determine the differences between the two measures, and (3) to describe any improvements.

Research methodology:

- Design—The study's design was pretest-posttest, but nonexperimental.
- Sample—All inmates entering the two therapeutic treatment programs (Tier II and Tier III) at 11 institutions were administered the test, and 433 of them were included in the study.
- Instrument—The instrument used in the study was the 53-item Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI), developed by Leonard R. Derogatis and Philip M. Spencer of Clinical Psychometric Research. The test is a self-reporting inventory that requires a sixth grade reading level and 20-25 minutes of administration time. It measures nine primary symptom dimensions on a five-point scale and provides three global indices for overall assessment of an individual's psychological status. The BSI was validated by its authors and is marketed with standardized norms for normal, outpatient, and inpatient cases.
- Variables—The test measured the following variables: somatization, obsessive-compulsive, interpersonal sensitivity, depression, anxiety, hostility, phobic anxiety, paranoid ideation, and psychoticism.

- Analytical method—BSI is individually scored on the computer and presents psychological profiles of the clients. It also provides aggregate data and collective scores on the nine primary dimensions as well as the overall indices. In this study, the pretest and posttest scores were calculated for the whole sample on all the variables. The results were then compared, and a t-test analysis was conducted to determine the significance of any difference.

Findings of the research: The results of this analysis indicated a significant reduction in inmates' psychological symptoms after their treatment. Mean differences of 14 points for the Tier II program and 13 points for the Tier III program were found in the overall scale. Similar significant improvements for all the primary indices were also demonstrated. In both programs, the most noticeable changes occurred in depression, psychoticism, obsessive-compulsive, interpersonal sensitivity, and anxiety symptoms.

Timeframe of the study: It took more than 9 months to collect sufficient amounts of data for this study. The psychological measures for the study were administered to inmates up to December 1990. The analysis was done over a period of 3 months, January through March 1991, and the report was published in March 1991.

Agencies involved: The Bureau of Planning, Research and Statistics of the Florida Department of Corrections conducted the study for the Office of Substance Abuse Programs. Substance abuse treatment programs in 11 major institutions participated in the study by administering the tests and collecting information.

Cost of the study: The researcher used the internal resources of the Department to conduct the study; no outside services were used. Other than the procurement of the psychological test from a vendor for a minimal amount, no expenses were incurred.

Tier Programs Outcome Evaluation: A Recommitment Study

G. Abbas Darabi, Ph.D.
Bureau of Planning, Research and Statistics
2601 Blairstone Road
Tallahassee, FL 32399-2500

Objectives of the research: (1) To measure the accuracy of the substance abuse screening instruments, (2) to determine the differences between the instruments, and (3) to identify an appropriate screening instrument.

Research methodology:

- Design—Two screening instruments were administered by two different methods: personal interviews with inmates and paper-and-pencil testing. The results were then compared with a well-established screening instrument.

- **Sample**—Four samples of 50 inmates each were randomly selected in the first phase; a sample of 200 inmates was randomly selected for the second phase.
- **Instrument**—The following instruments were used in the study: the Addiction Severity Index (ASI), the Modified Michigan Alcohol & Drug Screening Test (MADST), and the Modified Addiction Severity Index (MASI).
- **Variables**—The test measured the following variables: identification of inmates' addiction problem and the severity of addiction.
- **Analytical method**—Data were collected in two phases. In the first phase, one of the two versions (interview and self-reporting) of MADST and MASI instruments was given to inmates on a given day during a 4-day period. Fifty inmates were randomly selected each day. This resulted in four samples of 50 inmates each. In the second phase, 200 inmates were randomly selected, 180 of whom were administered the drug and alcohol portion of the ASI. Inmates' scores on all the instruments were compared.

Findings of the research: The results of this study indicate that the interview form of MADST and self-reported version of MASI were the most consistent with respect to outcome measures of assessment. Each of these instruments, which differ in item content and in method of administration, yields statistically significant correlation coefficients between scores and interviewers' ratings and between scores and issues related to drug or alcohol areas. These findings were supported by subsequent regression analysis in which scores from the MADST interview sample and scores from the MASI self-reported sample were predictive of severity ratings.

Timeframe of the study: The screening measures for the study were administered to inmates for a period of 3 weeks in January and February 1989. The analysis was done in April 1989, and the report was published at the same time.

Agencies involved: The Bureau of Planning, Research and Statistics of the Florida Department of Corrections conducted the study for the office of Substance Abuse Programs. The New River-West, New River-East, Reception and Medical Center, and Lancaster Correctional Institutions participated in and supported the study.

Cost of the study: Researchers used the internal resources of the Department to conduct the study, and no outside services were used.

Illinois

Crowding at Cook County Jail

Mark Myrent
Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (ICJIA)
120 South Riverside Plaza
Chicago, IL 60606-3997
(312) 793-8550

Objectives of the research: To examine the factors that contribute to overcrowding as well as the different approaches county officials have used to deal with the current problem.

Research methodology: This report was the outcome of an investigation of a variety of historical and current sources about crowding at Cook County Jail. Jail data were obtained from Richard Glotz and Dwayne Peterson of the Cook County Department of Corrections. Michael Mahoney, Kim Garrett, and Charles Fusano of the John Howard Association also contributed to the report. This research documents the problems with crowding in the Cook County correctional system since its inception more than 100 years ago. In addition, the report describes how a Federal consent decree issued in 1982 effectively established a population limit so that no inmate would be forced to sleep on the floor or in any other area not designated for sleeping.

Findings of the research: Officials focused their efforts in two directions: (1) a significant expansion of jail facilities and (2) several measures directed toward the population of pretrial inmates, who make up the vast majority of the jail's population. As part of the consent decree, jail officials were given greater flexibility to release nonconvicted inmates through a release program called Administrative Mandatory Furlough (AMF). An analysis of the number of inmates who received I-bonds between November 1986 and August 1989 indicates that the release program had a substantial impact on the jail population. In the most recent month, August 1989, for example, the estimated end-of-month population without AMF would have been 8,440 rather, than the actual population level of 6,969.

The overall trends in Cook County Jail crowding can be traced to several factors. In recent years there has been a significant increase in the average length of stay for non-I-bond inmates in Cook County—from 38.13 days in 1986 to 59.9 days in 1988. Therefore, the AMF program, which targets defendants with bonds of up to \$50,000, is not effective in removing those pretrial inmates who have the longest court delays. Other factors that may have had an effect on the jail population include a "get tough" attitude by government officials toward crime control, the emphasis on the problem of drug-related crime, and trial delays resulting from the backlog of felony cases.

This research also describes the attempted and proposed strategies to combat crowding, including jail construction, a long-range study to determine jail needs, and the use of electronic monitoring. The report also discusses possible solutions to jail crowding based on a 5-year study sponsored by the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, which outlined a full range of alternatives to jail crowding.

Prior instate studies:

- The Criminal Justice Project of Cook County. *Crime and Criminal Justice in Cook County: An Overview*. Evanston, Illinois: Center for Urban Affairs and Policy Research, 1989.
- Jake Katz, Howard Messing, and Robert Harris. *An Assessment of Jail Crowding—Cook County, Illinois* (TA Project #89-J1056). Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Corrections Jail Center, 1989.

Timeframe of the study: From the inception of the Cook County correctional system in 1870 to mid-1989

Agencies involved: ICJIA, in collaboration with the Cook County Department of Corrections

Education and Criminal Justice in Illinois

Alice Jones and Mark Myrent
Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (ICJIA)
120 South Riverside Plaza
Chicago, IL 60606-3997
(312) 793-8550

Objectives of the research: To investigate the linkages between the educational system and the criminal justice system in Illinois, such as whether a lack of education is associated with criminal behavior and whether crime interferes with children's ability to get an education.

Research methodology: This research includes two surveys conducted by the Authority. The first, the Illinois High School Survey, was administered to almost 2,700 students and more than 1,300 teachers in 31 urban, suburban, small-town, and rural high schools across the State. The primary aim of this survey was to provide a wide variety of information about the extent to which students and teachers are victims of crime in and around schools and about their perceptions of safety and discipline in their schools and neighborhoods. The findings of this survey provide important insights into the nature and extent of the problem.

Findings of the research: Some of the findings of this study are as follows:

- When asked to compare the safety of their school to that in their neighborhoods, 44% of the students and one-fourth of the teachers in the Illinois High School Survey indicated that school was less safe or as unsafe as the neighborhood it was in.
- Although school crime problems are often associated with inner-city schools, suburban schools were found to have similar or higher levels of certain crimes.

- Theft was the crime most commonly reported in the Illinois High School Survey.
- One in twelve students reported being the victim of a physical attack, and almost twice that many had escaped an attempted assault during the school year.
- Weapons that were reportedly used in the attacks on students included clubs, knives, pipes, and, in almost 8% of the attacks, guns.

The Authority also surveyed 700 male and female inmates as they were being admitted to the Illinois Department of Corrections. This survey, conducted by means of in-person interviews, covered questions about inmates' experiences in school, their attitudes toward education, and their future educational plans.

- Seventy-two percent of inmates said they had not graduated from high school, compared to a 4-year cumulative dropout rate of 22% for Illinois high school students in 1989.
- The average last grade completed by Illinois inmates was 10th grade, 7th month, but the average score on a test of basic skills (TABE) was only 7th grade, 9th month.
- Inmates were much less likely to have graduated than their fathers.
- Repeat offenders were only 6.6% more likely to have dropped out than first offenders, but they dropped out significantly earlier than first offenders.
- The most common reasons for dropout among male inmates were related to criminal justice factors.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: Representatives of the Illinois educational system have actively participated in this research project and worked with the Authority to draw up recommendations for specific programs that can be conducted in schools, adult education programs, jails, prisons, juvenile detention centers, probation programs, the courts, and other areas where crime and education meet or come into conflict.

Timeframe of the study: June 1990

Agencies involved: ICJIA, Educational Advisory Panel

Electronically Monitored Home Confinement in Illinois

Roger Przybylski
Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (ICJIA)
120 South Riverside Plaza
Chicago, IL 60606-3997
(312) 793-8550

Objectives of the research: (1) To provide an indepth look at electronically monitored home confinement, both in Illinois and the rest of the Nation, and (2) to describe the basic types of monitoring systems used in criminal justice programs today.

Findings of the research:

- As of July 1, 1988, 362 individuals had been placed on electronically monitored home confinement in Illinois; all were monitored with continuous signaling devices.
- About 65% of the individuals placed in monitoring programs were pretrial releasees; the remainder were probationers or work releasees.
- The length of time individuals spent in monitoring programs was 1-4 months.
- Of the 334 individuals who had been discharged from monitoring programs as of July 1, 1988, 281 (84%) completed the program successfully.

Timeframe of the study: February 1988

Agencies involved: ICJIA

The Jail I-Bond Program

Carolyn Rebecca Block, Mary J. Matos, and Dwayne Peterson
Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (ICJIA)
120 South Riverside Plaza
Chicago, IL 60606-3997
(312) 793-8550

Objectives of the research: In early 1990 the Authority's Statistical Analysis Center and the program staff of the Cook County Department of Corrections (CCDOC) undertook a joint research effort to examine the Cook County Jail's I-bond release program. This collaborative research effort had one major goal. CCDOC staff wanted to assess the effect that the jail I-bond program, instituted as a result of a Federal court decree on overcrowding, had on reducing the jail's population from November 1986, when the program began, until August 1990. To begin to plan for the future, it was important to understand how past policy decisions had affected the jail population. To accomplish

this goal, the research team had to develop a method of analysis that would take into account not only the number of people released through this program, but also the effect that those people would have had on the jail population over a period of time if they had remained in jail.

Research methodology: To calculate the number of additional people who would have been housed in Cook County Jail if there had been no I-bond program, two types of information were necessary: the number of people released under the jail I-bond program each month and the length of stay of these people had they not been released. Once this information was calculated, the additional people were added to the actual end-of-month population in every month to yield the adjusted jail population assuming no jail I-bond release program. These data were provided by Dwayne Peterson of the Correctional Information Management System at the Cook County Department of Corrections. To estimate length of stay, historical data were used—the actual length of stay of similar detainees before the jail I-bond program began.

In estimating length of stay, it is important to calculate the proportion of jail I-bond releasees who would have remained in the jail during each succeeding month. This distribution method of analysis measures the chance of an inmate's "survival" in the jail population from one month to the next and was used to analyze the impact of the jail I-bond program on the population of Cook County Jail. Authority and CCDOC staff adapted Interactive Models for Projecting Arrest and Correction Trends (IMPACT) to perform this analysis because other available jail population projection software packages were not designed to handle this particular question.

Findings of the research: The findings of this analysis illustrate that the jail I-bond release program had a considerable effect on the population of the Cook County Jail. For example, in August 1990, the estimated jail population without I-bonds would have been 8,170, compared to the actual population of 6,831—a difference of 1,339, or 20% higher than the actual population. Without the I-bond program, the jail population in August 1990 would have been 1,953 inmates above capacity.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: Policy decisions such as the establishment of the jail I-bond program at the Cook County Jail can have a major impact on jail populations. In addition, there are software programs that can help local jail staff measure what is happening and what is likely to happen when policies such as this are put into effect. Although this particular application was developed to measure the impact of policies already in place, this same method can also be used proactively by local jail administrators to estimate the future consequences of policies under consideration.

This report illustrates the need for long-range jail planning, particularly the analysis of proposed policies prior to their implementation. Most jails in Illinois must respond, often with scarce resources, to a variety of jail program and capacity issues. Proactive planning may indicate that current plans are on target, that adjustments need to be made in proposed policies before they are implemented, or that new policies need to be developed. A strong planning approach, using available software tools, can help jail administrators anticipate problems before they reach emergency proportions.

Prior instate studies:

- Block, Carolyn Rebecca, and James V. Spring. *Impact of the Mandatory Furlough Program on the Cook County Jail Population*. Chicago: Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, 1988.
- Bongovanni, James P. *Population Analysis Through 1984*. Chicago: Cook County Department of Corrections, 1984.
- Devitt, Christine, and James R. Coldren. *The Pretrial Process in Cook County: An Analysis of Bond Decisions Made in Felony Cases During 1982-1983*. Chicago: Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, 1987.
- Hickey, Maureen. "Illinois Jails Under Pressure." *The Compiler* 9, no. 4 (Summer): 4-6. Chicago: Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, 1989.
- Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority. *Crowding at the Cook County Jail: Historical Perspective and Current Strategies*. Chicago: Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, 1989.
- Myrent, Mark. *Administrative Mandatory Furlough at Cook County Jail: March 30-June 15, 1988*. Chicago: Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, 1988.

Timeframe of the study: November 1986 to August 1990

Agencies involved: ICJIA, in collaboration with the Cook County Department of Corrections

Repeat Offenders in Illinois

Roger Przybylski
Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (ICJIA)
120 South Riverside Plaza
Chicago, IL 60606-3997
(312) 793-8550

Objectives of the research: To establish useful data on repeat offenders in Illinois.

Findings of the research:

- Most offenders had a long history of arrest, and many started their criminal careers at an early age.
- Roughly 60% of the releasees were arrested at least once during the 27- to 29-month followup; roughly 40% were incarcerated at least once.

- Most releasees recidivating by arrest did so within the first 8-9 months following release from prison; risk of incarceration was greatest 6-18 months following release from prison.
- Prior criminal history was the most important factor for distinguishing recidivists from nonrecidivists; property offenders and those with extensive criminal histories were most likely to be arrested and incarcerated following release from prison.

Timeframe of the study: Releasees were followed for a 27- to 29-month period upon their release from prison in 1983.

Agencies involved: ICJIA, with partial funding from a grant from the Bureau of Justice Statistics

Indiana

Indiana Boys' School Tracking Study: Recidivism Among Boys Released From 1984-85 Through 1988-89

Michael J. Sabath, Ph.D., John W. Ransburg,
and Steven E. Sidebottom
Indiana Criminal Justice Institute
Center for Criminal Justice Research and Information
302 West Washington Street
Room E209
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Objectives of the research: Conducted at the request of the Task Force on Juvenile Institutions, this tracking study was designed (1) to provide statistical information on boys released from the Indiana Boys' School (IBS) and (2) to assess the extent of recidivism among these boys, particularly as measured by subsequent incarceration in the adult institutions of the Indiana Department of Correction (DOC).

Research methodology: The study is based on a 10% sample of the 3,814 boys released from IBS over 5 fiscal years (1984-85 through 1988-89).

Statistical analysis methods including survival analysis, bivariate analysis, and nonparametric measures of association were used to examine the relationships between recidivism and numerous demographic, social history, offense, and other variables to identify characteristics of boys that may have an important bearing on recidivism. Recidivism was measured as subsequent incarceration in one of three correctional settings: IBS, one of the three largest Indiana jails, or the adult institutions of the Indiana DOC.

Findings of the research:

- Forty-one percent of the 382 boys in the study were reincarcerated in 1 of the 3 correctional settings following release from IBS. Twenty-five percent of all of the boys in the study were eventually incarcerated in an adult facility of the Indiana DOC.
- Recidivism was greatest for the earliest release cohort (1984-85 releasees). Sixty-one percent of this cohort was incarcerated again in one of the three correctional settings after release.
- Slightly more than 60% of the 155 recidivists were incarcerated in an adult correctional institution in Indiana after release from IBS; 70% of the 45 recidivists in the earliest release cohort were incarcerated in an adult correctional institution of the Indiana DOC.
- Survival analysis showed that after about 18 months it is unlikely a boy released from IBS will return to IBS. This was partly because many boys "age out" of the opportunity to return to IBS within this time period.

- Survival analysis showed that few boys were incarcerated in any correctional setting after 36 months following their release from IBS.
- Factors exhibiting the strongest link to recidivism included age, delinquency, Quay behavioral classification, and race. Recidivists tended to be boys who were younger, who committed more delinquent acts, and who were classified as psychopathic/aggressive types (BC-3's in the Quay classification). Race by itself did not demonstrate a strong direct relationship to recidivism; along with age, it was found to be an important defining characteristic of high-risk recidivists.
- Psychopathic/aggressive types were found to differ greatly from other classification types on such characteristics as age when first admitted to IBS, type of offense, and level of education.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: The following recommendations were made regarding the monitoring of recidivism, development of information systems, postrelease treatment and supervision, and future research:

- The Department of Correction should monitor recidivism of juveniles so that policymakers and correctional administrators can track changes in this problem area over time.
- The Department of Correction should continue efforts to develop an automated juvenile information system. Emphasis should be placed on identifying and including data elements that provide useful information about programs and treatment at IBS and their influence on boys' performance following release.
- The Department of Correction should consider intensifying programming, treatment, and supervision in the postrelease period.
- Research should be conducted to learn more about why disproportionate numbers of black boys appear to be committed to IBS and appear to be disproportionately classified in some categories of the classification system.
- Additional research should be conducted on drug abuse among juveniles committed to the DOC, with emphasis on assessing the adequacy of drug abuse treatment resources and services provided to juveniles and on evaluating drug abuse programming offered at DOC juvenile facilities.
- Research, particularly qualitative research, should be conducted to explore the reasons underlying recidivism among youth released from DOC's juvenile institutions. Systematic study is needed to elaborate on the reasons and circumstances that lead youth to continue on a path of delinquency.

Timeframe of the study: Five fiscal years (1984-85 through 1988-89)

Agencies involved: Center for Criminal Justice Research and Information, Indiana Criminal Justice Institute; Indiana Department of Correction; Indiana Boys' School; Task Force on Juvenile Institutions

Massachusetts

Impact of Drug Offenders on County Houses of Correction

William M. Holmes, Ph.D., and Michael Reibel
Statistical Analysis Center
Massachusetts Committee on Criminal Justice
100 Cambridge Street, Room 2100
Boston, MA 02202
(617) 727-0237

Objectives of the research: (1) To describe drug and alcohol offenders in county Houses of Correction (HOC's), (2) to assess the impact of drug offenders on the county system, and (3) to examine the flow of such offenders through the system. The description of drug and alcohol offenders includes comparisons with other inmates who are not drug or alcohol offenders. The examination of impacts discusses implications for HOC overcrowding, treatment of substance abusers, and alternative sentencing.

Research methodology: The study was a survey of county inmates, examining the offenders' prior history and their current offenses, sentences, and other corrections information. The study included a sample of inmates in county Houses of Correction who were sentenced for drug or alcohol offenses during calendar 1987, plus a sample of all other inmates sentenced during the same period. Data were collected from computerized records in the Department of Correction and from the inmate files in the Houses of Correction. Access to the data followed legal confidentiality requirements of Criminal Offender Record Information (CORI) procedures for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. The report on which this summary is based (Holmes and Reibel, 1989) discusses in detail the measures used, the pretesting of the data collection instrument and procedures, the sample selection, and data collection and processing.

Findings of the research: The offenders are described according to their sociodemographic characteristics, their history of substance abuse and treatment, and their criminal history. Comparisons are made between substance abusers and non-substance abusers.

- Sociodemographic profile—Offenders in the HOC's tended to be younger, white, citizens, and never married. Inmates also tended to have poor education and manual occupations. A few more substance abusers than non-substance abusers had graduated from high school or college.
- Substance abuse history—Alcohol was the most commonly reported abused substance. A number also reported abuse of heroin, cocaine, or marijuana. Some reported use of "speedballs" (simultaneous use of cocaine and heroin), especially women.

- **Criminal history**—Drunk driving was one of the most common offenses for which inmates were incarcerated. Larceny, burglary, and drug offenses were also common offenses for which persons were sentenced. Most inmates had prior incarcerations. Substance abusers were more likely to be incarcerated for alcohol or drunk driving offenses; non-substance abusers, for larceny.

The large numbers of drug and alcohol abusers in Houses of Correction pose a major challenge to the criminal justice system. On the one hand, there is a great need for treatment programs to reach the many abusers who have had no help in dealing with their abuse problems. On the other hand, there are not enough resources available to fully fund traditional programs—even though these programs are known to be effective for many of those they serve. In such a situation, it is especially important that existing resources be coordinated and directed toward the most pressing problems, which revolve around issues of short-term inmates, the diversity of substance abuse, and the coordination of services.

Short-term inmates

The identification of substance abuse is inhibited by the fact that prisoners in many HOC's are not classified or reviewed for substance abuse treatment needs if they have short sentences. While it may seem wasteful to expend resources on someone who will leave the system not long after intervention begins, there are short-term interventions that can help some inmates who have limited sentences. Waiting until these persons reenter the system with a more serious offense not only gives up on them as individuals; it also increases recidivism, contributes to overcrowding, and imposes a burden on society.

Short-term programs can accomplish useful ends. They can provide a better assessment of an inmate's medical and mental health needs, leading to outside referrals after the inmate is released. They can educate and motivate prisoners on the nature of their problems, the benefits of addressing them, and the options for dealing with them after they are released. Such programs may also allow diversion of some inmates into residential facilities, relieving overcrowding.

Diversity of substance abuse

Even though alcohol abuse is the most prevalent form of substance abuse among the inmates, a significant percentage abused a variety of controlled substances. Many of the inmates were also polysubstance abusers, adding greatly to the diversity of patterns of substance abuse. Several patterns of polysubstance abuse stood out: use of alcohol/marijuana, heroin/alcohol, heroin/cocaine, and cocaine/marijuana. Efforts to address substance abuse especially need to ensure the availability of programs to address these combinations of drugs.

Coordination of services

The combination of educational, occupational, and substance abuse problems exacerbates prisoners' problems. Progress in one area may be defeated in another unless interventions are coordinated to meet the prisoners' multiple needs. Written case plans for prisoners will help accomplish this end. With so many short-term prisoners in the system, however, many have no case plan and no coordination of services. Information developed as part of the presentencing probation assessment,

if passed along with the prisoner's record, could be used to speed up classification and the development of case plans and to make them more available to shorter term prisoners.

Jail overcrowding

Because substance abusers (two-thirds of whom are alcoholics) constitute one-third of HOC prisoners, reducing the presence of alcohol abusers and drug offenders in the HOC's will have an impact on overcrowding. Because these offenders on average have shorter sentences, many of them are neither classified nor offered treatment interventions. Classification may also identify drug offenders who would benefit from diversion and treatment.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: Relieving the overcrowding due to drug offenders is complicated by the fact that more serious offenders serve longer sentences. Diversion of less serious drug offenders, who might be better candidates for alternative sentences, frees up fewer months of bedspace than diversion of more serious offenders. This does not mean that the more serious offenders should be released just to relieve overcrowding; it means that diversion of a spectrum of offenders would be needed to make a significant impact on overcrowding.

Timeframe of the study: June 1988 to October 1989

Agencies involved: Massachusetts Statistical Analysis Center; Massachusetts Department of Corrections; Sheriff's Office

Cost of the study: \$27,000

Minnesota

Corrections Crowding in Minnesota

Sandy Pappas, Luz Frias, and Kathy Guthrie
Minnesota Criminal Justice Statistical Analysis Center
300 Centennial Office Building
658 Cedar Street
St. Paul, MN 55155
(612) 297-7518

Objectives of the research: (1) To determine the extent of corrections crowding at present, (2) to project the future corrections population, and (3) to discuss alternatives to the crowding problem.

Research methodology: The data in this report come from several sources. Data for most facilities were obtained from the Minnesota Department of Corrections (DOC) Detention Information System. Data for facilities that do not use this system were obtained directly from them, including the facilities in Hennepin and Ramsey and the Northeast Regional Corrections Center. As a check on the accuracy of the data in the DOC system, the usage information by type of offender was sent to each county jail administrator in July with a request to respond if there were any inaccuracies. The handful of responses received indicated very small discrepancies in the overall counts, which were well within acceptable limits.

In addition, a telephone survey of court service directors was conducted in January 1989 to gauge the use of jail alternatives in counties experiencing jail crowding. The survey also sought to determine whether counties could reduce jail crowding through the expansion of sentencing alternatives such as community service, restitution, or house arrest.

Findings of the research:

- All of the State's sentencing options—prisons, jails, probation, restitution, and community service—are becoming crowded.
- One factor contributing to jail crowding is the number of inmates who are incarcerated for pretrial detention and the length of their pretrial stays. Members of the Facilities Assessment Subcommittee actively pursued legislation that expedited the judicial process in general and that set goals for the speedy resolution of criminal cases.
- Counties that have a jail crowding problem appear to have a probation crowding problem as well.
- In 1988, one-third of the jail space used statewide was for presentence detention. The remaining two-thirds was used by sentenced offenders who were either serving a sentence or in a work release program. Of the space used by sentenced offenders, one-third was used by DWI offenders.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: Upon discovering that no uniform data collection existed across the State on jail usage, sentencing practices, and sentencing alternatives to incarceration, the Subcommittee was successful in proposing legislation that now requires the Sentencing Guidelines Commission to work with other correction entities to determine how more detailed information can be gathered on a routine basis. This would permit the legislature to make reasoned judgments regarding State and local sentencing policy in the future.

Timeframe of the study: 1988-89

Agencies involved: Minnesota State Legislature (lead); Minnesota House Majority Research (support); Minnesota House Research (support); Minnesota Sentencing Guidelines Commission (support); Minnesota State Planning Agency (support)

Sentencing and Correctional Policies

Elliot Long, Marlys McPherson, and Jim Ahrens
Minnesota Criminal Justice Statistical Analysis Center
300 Centennial Office Building
658 Cedar Street
St. Paul, MN 55155
(612) 297-7518

Objectives of the research: To better understand sentencing and correctional policies in Minnesota. This report was prepared for the Legislative Audit Commission.

Research methodology: The researchers interviewed correctional administrators and practitioners, representatives of professional organizations, State and local officials, and people who have studied correctional policy in Minnesota and elsewhere. The researchers also (1) visited jails and accompanied Department of Corrections (DOC) jail inspectors to observe the inspection process firsthand and (2) attended meetings of the Sentencing Guidelines Commission and the Jail Standards Task Force, which was established by the Commissioner of Corrections to recommend changes to the current standards. A survey of administrators and probation officers was conducted to determine what programs and services are available at the local level. Information on costs and the numbers of people under correctional control was collected and analyzed. The researchers also conducted an extensive literature search as well as made contact with national organizations involved in corrections policy and research. Legislation, agency documents, and evaluations pertinent to Minnesota's sentencing and correctional policies were reviewed.

Findings of the research: Minnesota's overcrowding problems are not as severe as those in most other States. But, paralleling national trends, Minnesota has experienced a substantial increase in the number of offenders in prisons and jails and on probation. Minnesota has managed to avoid serious problems, until recently, largely because there was excess capacity in prisons and jails when the period of increased incarceration began. But now, State and local correctional facilities are at or over capacity, and probation caseloads have grown to critical levels.

The growth in the offender population has accelerated since 1986 and is projected to continue. The main reason for this growth is that more people are being punished in more serious ways than in the past. The State faces a choice: build more jails and prisons or make changes in sentencing and correctional policies that would manage the expected increase in offenders more efficiently.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: The report recommended improvements in the sentencing guidelines structure and renewed emphasis on community corrections programs, including alternatives to incarceration. Such steps will provide greater flexibility in the criminal justice system and, in the long run, may reduce costs. Finally, State jail standards need to be updated so that they do not block local jail expansion or add unnecessarily to local costs.

Prior instate studies: *Corrections Crowding in Minnesota*

Timeframe of the study: 1980-89

Agencies involved: Minnesota State Auditor (lead); Minnesota Sentencing Guidelines Commissions (support); Minnesota State Planning Agency (support); Minnesota Department of Corrections (support); Minnesota Bureau of Criminal Apprehension (support); Minnesota House Research (support)

Missouri

Assaults and Other Major Violations: Perpetrators and Victims

Timothy A. Pierson, Ph.D., and Diane D. Spieker
Planning, Research & Evaluation Unit
Missouri Department of Corrections
Post Office Box 236
Jefferson City, MO 65102
(314) 751-2389

Objectives of the research: (1) To accurately measure the scope and nature of inmate violence on other inmates and on staff, (2) to identify traits or characteristics of assaultive/violent inmates, and (3) to provide basic information on inmate victims.

Research methodology: This study provides a detailed analysis of inmate rule violations for assault, sexual assault, and escape.

- **Sampling technique**—This study examined the institutional violation records of 11,922 inmates confined in the system on July 1, 1988. A total of 5,041 violation incidents were included in the study (from 2,439 inmates, not including escapees still at large). Characteristics of 421 assault victims were also examined.
- **Data sources**—Data from the Offender Management Information System (OMIS) and related case file material were used in the study. Seven rule violations involving violence were initially examined, with a more detailed review of assaults, sexual assaults, and escapes.
- **Variables and measurements**—Inmate demographic variables were examined, along with offense characteristics; institutional location, classification, and custody rating; the number and type of rule violations; the month of violation; and assault victim information.

Findings of the research: Only 20.4% of the inmate population was responsible for all 5,401 major rule violations. The rate of major rule violations has fallen from 205 per 1,000 inmates in 1983 to 110 per 1,000 inmates in 1987. The seasonal pattern of assaultive violations was clearly demonstrated during the study. Definitions of "major" assault were not consistent throughout the Department of Corrections. Inmate assaults on other inmates are generally more severe than inmate assaults on staff, although both may be classified as major assaults. The rate of inmate perimeter escape per 1,000 inmates fell from 6.7 in 1981 to 1.4 in 1987. Furlough failures, a form of escape, are very rare, with only 203 failures out of 16,492 furloughs since the program started in 1972—a 98.8% success rate. Travel furloughs, used to transport inmates to community-based halfway houses, have a success rate of 99.6%.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: The study recommended changes in the inmate rule structure and definitions. The study also served as the foundation for an evaluation of the Adult Internal Management System (AIMS), which is now in place in the State's correctional facilities.

Timeframe of the study: 1987-88

Agencies involved: Missouri Department of Corrections/Planning, Research & Evaluation Unit

A Comparative Analysis of Inmates Released Under Director's Release and Parole During the Years 1986 Through 1988

Kenneth Hartke
Planning, Research & Evaluation Unit
Missouri Department of Corrections
Post Office Box 236
Jefferson City, MO 65102
(314) 751-2389

Objectives of the research: (1) To identify common traits or characteristics of director's release inmates and (2) to compare this group with inmates released under parole or conditional release.

Research methodology: This was a fairly informal study that examined the traits associated with director's release inmates and provided a comparison between this group and inmates released under parole and conditional release. A director's release is a final discharge without subsequent community-based supervision.

- Sampling technique—All prison inmates released under Director's Release from 1986 through 1988 were compared to inmates released under parole and conditional release during the same timeframe.
- Data sources—Data for this study were extracted from the Offender Management Information System (OMIS).
- Variables and measurements—The study included an examination and comparison on age, race, sex, marital status, offense type, offense behavior, institutional violations, violation behavior, vocational and work skills, educational background, escape history, parole performance, sentence length, and custody rating.

Findings of the research: The study provided a close look at a group of offenders who are, perhaps, the most troublesome inside a prison setting; who do not fare well under parole supervision; and who tend to be less prepared for life in a free society. On average, the group was younger, less educated, and less skilled and had fewer family or marital relationships than those released on parole or conditional release. The group was also more assaultive while in prison, but less likely to be

involved in a prior violent crime or to have a drug conviction than the parole or conditional release group. The director's release group, largely property offenders, generally had shorter sentences than the other inmates and, when paroled, usually were revoked and returned to prison to complete the remainder of their prison term.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: The study findings resulted in a changed view of this group of offenders. The previous perception of director's release inmates was that they were older, long-term inmates rather than young, short-term, troubled offenders.

Timeframe of the study: 1986-87

Agencies involved: Missouri Department of Corrections/Planning, Research & Evaluation Unit

Criminal Justice Attitudes—Missouri

Michael Fischter, Ph.D., and Carol Veneziano, Ph.D.
Post Office Box 236
Jefferson City, MO 65102
(314) 751-2389

Objectives of the research: (1) To measure public attitudes toward criminal justice and correctional issues and (2) to compare public attitudes with attitudes of policymakers and practitioners or administrators.

Research methodology: This was a public opinion survey patterned after the 1988 Colorado survey published as *Attitudes Toward Crime: A Survey of Colorado Citizens and Criminal Justice Officials*.

- Sampling technique—The researchers mailed survey forms to a sample of 2,000 licensed drivers, a sample of probation officers, a sample of prison inmates, a sample of police officers, all circuit court judges, all county prosecutors, and members of the State's general assembly.
- Data sources—The survey responses served as the data source in this study.
- Variables and measurements—Survey responses were tabulated and compared according to the type of respondent. Nineteen hypothetical offense scenarios were included in the survey.

Findings of the research: Missouri citizens were more open to community-based punishments than were criminal justice officials. When the citizens favored a prison term for an offender, based on the case scenario, they favored shorter terms than were recommended by the responding judges and prosecutors.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: This research has been condensed and released as an executive summary for local judges, prosecutors, and other interested individuals to introduce the idea of reducing the State's reliance on prison as the punishment of choice for certain crimes. The study will also be available for the newly installed State Sentencing Commission.

Timeframe of the study: 1989

Agencies involved: Missouri Department of Corrections; Southeastern Missouri State University

Felony Probation: A Comparative Analysis of Public Risks in Two States

Michael Fichter, Ph.D., Peter Hirshberg, Ph.D.,
and Johnny McGaha, Ph.D.
Post Office Box 236
Jefferson City, MO 65102
(314) 751-2389

Objectives of the research: (1) To identify and examine probation success rates for Missouri and (2) to compare them with published rates from a study of California probation.

Research methodology: This study replicated RAND's California probation study using Missouri's Board of Probation and Parole probationers. The researchers wanted to know if the RAND study's 65% rearrest rate was unique to California. (See the National Institute of Justice's *Research in Brief*, March 1985, for a report on the RAND study.)

- Sampling technique—A sample of 2,083 Missouri urban felons were tracked for a 40-month followup period.
- Data sources—Information was taken from case file material in the Probation and Parole Information System (PAPIS).
- Variables and measurements—The study primarily looked at 40-month rearrest rates for felony probationers from Missouri's major urban counties.

Findings of the research: Missouri's study group had a 23% rearrest rate over the same 40-month followup period used in the RAND study.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: This study countered some of the widely accepted notions of probation being an ineffective alternative to prison.

Timeframe of the study: 1986

Agencies involved: Southeastern Missouri State University

Handling Long-Term Offenders: The Missouri Project

Ernest L. Cowles, Ph.D.
Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency, and Corrections
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, IL 62901

Michael J. Sabath, Ph.D.
Center for Criminal Justice Research and Information
Indiana Criminal Justice Institute
302 West Washington Street
Room E209
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Objectives of the research: (1) To identify the most pressing problems of long-term incarceration that might be amenable to programmatic intervention and (2) to develop two or three exploratory interventions to address these problem areas.

Research methodology and findings: The project was divided into two parts. The first part was designed to collect information about the nature, scope, and perceived seriousness of problems associated with long-term imprisonment in Missouri. The second part attempted to use this information for the development of exploratory program initiatives.

In the problem identification phase of the project, survey research was used to solicit the perspectives of "key actor" groups; that is, those who affect or are affected by the problems of long-term incarceration. This process was initiated by holding roundtable discussions with line and administrative staff, followed by similar discussions with long-term inmates to identify concerns associated with long-term imprisonment. Prison environmental assessment instruments used by Toch (1977) and the Federal Bureau of Prisons were also reviewed. This effort produced a lengthy listing that was consolidated into 32 problem areas. Generally, these 32 problems fell into 1 of 6 categories:

- Institutional services
- Institutional careers
- Inmate-staff relationship/communication
- Physical environment

- Programs and activities
- Family and community relationships

The 32 problems were structured into Likert-type questions that asked the respondents to review each problem and to rate its severity from "not a problem at all" to "a severe problem." The questions were, along with additional background questions, then assembled into a questionnaire that was administered to samples of the different key actor groups, including long-term offenders (LTO's), short-term offenders (STO's), correctional officers, and treatment staff.

These samples each contained approximately 10% of the individuals in the larger populations they represented and were drawn from the Missouri Department of Corrections and Human Resources Offender Management Information System, and personnel record data bases, using a random selection technique. A separate administration of the survey was completed for all female inmates because it was believed that this group might have special concerns that would be "buried" within the responses of the larger male inmate groups and because of the relatively small number of females in the total prison population. Of the total sample surveyed in the five key actor groups (N = 1,556) and the separate female inmate survey (N = 356), approximately 60% of those surveyed returned usable questionnaires.

The primary purposes of these surveys were to determine how the stakeholder groups viewed the severity of problems associated with long-term incarceration and to assess the consistency in their perceptions. Consistency in the views of the different groups on the existence of a problem and its severity was seen as a target of opportunity for developing long-term management strategies. Management strategies targeted in these areas would be easier to develop and implement and would likely be more effective in dealing with LTO's.

The surveys were analyzed in three ways. First, the problem severity ratings and rankings were examined to identify the most severe problems associated with long-term incarceration from the perspective of each stakeholder group. Second, the ratings and rankings were analyzed across groups to assess consistency in perceptions among the five groups. Additional analysis determined the level of congruence (reflected in bivariate correlations) in perceptions of problem severity between long-termers and correctional staff. Third, qualitative information contained in the open comment section of the questionnaire was used to clarify and describe aspects of long-term problems identified as potential areas for program development.

The results of the problem identification phase of the project revealed LTO's to be very concerned with factors affecting the quality of day-to-day prison life, including the prison environment (for example, noise, crowding, and privacy), institutional services (for example, the availability and quality of medical care and food quality), and their relationships with the staff (such as the staff ignoring inmates' complaints and suggestions and the attitudes of the staff toward inmates). These perceptions were not noticeably different from those of the other inmates, except that LTO's perceived both relationships with the staff and medical care as more serious problems. Female inmates identified the quality-of-life issues related to crowding, noise, and privacy as less serious problems than did their male counterparts. This difference may result from actual differences between the conditions found at the women's prison and those at the men's institutions.

An examination of the perceptions of staff in relation to those of the LTO's revealed three broad problem groupings. First, there were areas in which there was distinct disagreement in perceptions regarding problem severity. For example, staff did not view their relationships with long-termers as particularly serious problems (for example, problem areas such as the staff ignoring inmate complaints and suggestions and the attitudes of the staff toward inmates), while the LTO's ranked these among their more serious concerns. Conversely, LTO's ranked their concerns for several traditional treatment areas (for example, reading and writing skills, availability of needed treatment programs, and understanding information presented in class) below most other identified problems, while the staff saw these areas as priority concerns. Second, there were problems about which LTO's and staff shared fairly similar views, seeing the problems as relatively minor. Third, there were problems about which there was reasonably good agreement between the groups, seeing the problems as moderate to severe in nature. These problems tended to center on environmental and service concerns (for example, noise, crowding, privacy, health care, and visitation), but also included relevant long-term programming issues (for example, vocational programming that provided useful skills, unproductive time, planning education to fit needs, and academic programming that provided useful knowledge or skills). This grouping became the primary area for the development of the exploratory programs attempted in the remainder of the project.

Based on the information collected in the problem-identification phase of the project, an attempt was made to explore possible long-term management strategies. The thrust of these efforts focused not on producing programs capable of being directly exportable to other systems, but to concentrate on the methodology for program design that might be utilized by other systems. Three key elements—security, control, and quality of life—need to be considered in developing long-term programs. Because the key actor groups are likely to attach different importance to each of these elements, the strategy was directed toward getting involvement from each group both in identifying problems and in shaping solutions.

Two of the exploratory programs were designed to provide viable institutional careers for LTO's and, in so doing, to provide useful vocational skills training, to reduce unproductive time, and to provide meaningful activity that benefited both the LTO's and the corrections system. In the first of these, a computer software development enterprise was established. The Software Development Program sought to replicate eight real-world work atmospheres in terms of the work environment, professional expectations, and worker involvement in decisionmaking. In return for rigorous demands regarding professional productivity and personal conduct, LTO workers selected for the program were compensated at a rate much above the standard prison wage scale, were provided a pleasant work setting, and were accorded professional treatment and responsibility. From rather humble beginnings (six personal computers and six LTO workers), the Software Development Program doubled in size and was able to justify a midsize, stand-alone mainframe within a year of its inception. The Software Development Program was also incorporated as a regular unit of the Department's computer services section, and in addition to greatly helping the Department meet its own computer programming needs, the program was able to begin contracting with other State agencies for programming services.

A second exploratory effort used an approach similar to the Software Development Program, centering on the idea of using LTO's to operate a video production studio that became known as Jefftown Productions. This nontraditional area for inmate work also had the potential to provide a valuable resource for the Department while serving as an incentive for positive long-term behavior. Again, the concept appeared successful. The Jefftown Productions program produced four major

training videos for the Department by the end of the project as well as another video production for a nonprofit organization outside the agency.

The third exploratory program focused on a different area, that of inmate-staff relations. This effort, called the Inmate Forum, was originally conceived only as a mechanism to provide communication between the project staff and the long-term inmates. By establishing a relationship with a group of influential long-termers, the LTO project stood a better chance of gaining acceptance by the inmate population, and Inmate Forum members could represent the larger population and provide feedback on various aspects of the LTO project. The operation consisted of regular, informal meetings with a small group of LTO's selected to articulate the views of the larger population and to present information about the project to the population. The Inmate Forum proved to be invaluable in helping to collect data and in gaining acceptance of project initiatives. It was, in fact, so well received that the administration decided to maintain the program to help in planning a new long-term prison facility, which was under construction during most of the project, and in facilitating improved communication between staff and LTO's.

The final program effort of the project consisted of an attempt to develop and integrate LTO management strategies for the Department's new maximum-security prison. This effort, termed the Potosi Plan after the facility's name, attempted to combine the notions of long-term institutional careers, meaningful incentives capable of motivating LTO's to engage in positive behaviors, and specifically designed environment and activities for those who would likely be spending a majority, if not all, of their adult lives in a correctional facility. Because of delays in the facility's construction, these concepts were only beginning to be transformed into actual programs as the LTO project drew to a close.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings:

1. Traditional programs offered in correctional institutions are geared toward the offender who will be reentering the community within a few years at most. These programs often do not meet the needs of the inmate who may be incarcerated for decades.
2. Long-term inmates are concerned with the institutional environment, with programs that are relevant to extended imprisonment, and with having meaningful work. To properly address the areas of security, control, and quality of life and meet the needs of both inmates and staff, a policy of concentrating the long-term population in one institution is recommended. Resources targeted toward management of this population can thus be maximized.
3. Programs, environments, and services for long-term offenders should be designed for an extended institutional life and for individuals at various stages of life, that is, the 20-year-old and the 60-year-old.
4. Problem identification strategies, such as the one used in the LTO project, can be useful tools in developing management strategies. Finding areas of consensus on the nature and severity of problems associated with long-term sentences among those who affect or are affected by these problems can lead to workable strategies for long-term confinement.

Similarly, finding areas of major disagreement may point to areas where such strategies are sorely needed but are difficult to implement.

Timeframe of the study: 30 months

Agencies involved: This study was sponsored by the National Institute of Justice (grant #84-IJ-CX-0043) and conducted with the Missouri Department of Corrections and Human Resources.

Cost of the study: \$289,000

**Missouri Sexual Offender Program (MOSOP):
Inmate Characteristics and Recidivism**

Timothy A. Pierson, Ph.D.
Planning, Research & Evaluation Unit
Missouri Department of Corrections
Post Office Box 236
Jefferson City, MO 65102
(314) 751-2389

Objectives of the research: (1) To provide an overview of the Missouri Sexual Offender Program (MOSOP), (2) to provide an overview of sex offender characteristics, and (3) to examine the success or failure rates of program graduates.

Research methodology: This major study provided a review of the current MOSOP and explores release outcomes for early program graduates.

- Sampling technique—The study examined characteristics of 1,421 sex offenders confined in the Missouri Department of Corrections on May 1, 1988, and compared them with the remaining 10,160 inmates serving time on nonsex charges.
- Data sources—Information was obtained from the Department's Offender Management Information System (OMIS) and from the Missouri State Highway Patrol's criminal history files.
- Variables and measurements—Variables included age, commitment age, sentence length, race, sex, rural/urban county, offense type, family ties, work skills, public risk level, marital status, institutional risk level, medical status, mental health status, formal education and education level, vocational level, and custody level. As a measure of outcome success, the study examined Highway Patrol criminal history records (rap sheets) and parole performance records for the 1984 and 1985 program completions.

Findings of the research: MOSOP participants tended to be older and to serve longer sentences than other inmates. They also tended to have higher levels of need for medical and mental health services and a lower family visitation need. The MOSOP group had a higher level of vocational and work skills than other inmates—partly because they were older. The study showed a positive association between MOSOP (Phase II) completion and successful performance after prison release. Those who completed the program had lower general recidivism and lower sex-offense recidivism than inmates who failed to complete the program.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: The study serves as a foundation for continuing research on sex offenders and the MOSOP. A followup recidivism analysis conducted in 1989 provided additional support for the initial recidivism findings of the 1988 study. Currently, a study funded by the National Institute of Corrections is examining and automating detailed MOSOP file material to be used in an artificial intelligence application. This project will establish a neutral net simulation model based on sex offender data.

Timeframe of the study: 1984-85 (focusing on program graduates)

Agencies involved: Missouri Department of Corrections/Planning, Research & Evaluation Unit

Parole and Probation Violators as a Component in Missouri's Escalating Prison Population

Timothy A. Pierson, Ph.D.
Planning, Research & Evaluation Unit
Missouri Department of Corrections
Post Office Box 236
Jefferson City, MO 65102
(314) 751-2389

Objectives of the research: To identify the role that parole/probation revocation plays in the growth of prison populations.

Research methodology: This study examined trends over the last decade in parole and probation violators revoked to Missouri prisons. An updated version of this study was completed in 1989 and showed more recent information on the impact of revocations on the increased prison population.

- Sampling technique—No sampling was involved. This study examined the source of prison admissions for a 13-year period (1976-88) and focused on parole revocations as a significant subgroup of all admissions.
- Data sources—The Department of Corrections' Offender Management Information System (OMIS) and the Probation and Parole Information System (PAPIS) served as the sources of the data.

- Variables and measurements—The analysis centered on the type of prison admission and, if a parole revocation, the type of revocation. Yearly admissions were compared for the entire period, showing the significant growth in parole revocations.

Findings of the research: Parole revocations have increased from 10.2% of prison admissions in 1976 to 22.6% of admissions in 1988. While admissions increased by 153.9% over the period, parole revocations increased by 463.2%. Probation revocations have also increased significantly. Technical (non-offense-related) violations are responsible for most revocations. Over the period from 1979 to 1988, technical revocations increased by 414.5%, while all revocations increased by only 219.7%.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: The study provided a number of recommendations as well as a basis for policy changes in the Department that now provide a rational alternative to technical parole revocation.

Timeframe of the study: 1980-88

Agencies involved: Missouri Department of Corrections/Planning, Research & Evaluation Unit

Probation Cases Opened FY 1985 to FY 1988: Driving-While-Intoxicated (DWI) and Non-DWI Probationers Compared

Timothy A. Pierson, Ph.D.
Planning, Research & Evaluation Unit
Missouri Department of Corrections
Post Office Box 236
Jefferson City, MO 65102
(314) 751-2389

Objectives of the research: (1) To examine and compare group characteristics of driving-while-intoxicated (DWI) and non-DWI probationers, (2) to identify success rates for DWI offenders on probation, and (3) to briefly compare DWI probationers with institutional DWI offenders.

Research methodology: This nonexperimental study examined and compared the performance and characteristics of DWI offenders with those of non-DWI offenders.

- Sampling technique—The study examined records for all cases opened (46,878) to probation during fiscal years 1985 through 1988. A supplemental component of the study examined prison inmates admitted for DWI convictions.
- Data sources—The study used data from the Probation and Parole Information System (PAPIS) and, to a lesser extent, the Offender Management Information System (OMIS).

- Variables and measurements—Variables included age, sex, race, county of conviction, sentence length, military discharge, educational attainment, occupation, marital status, case closing type, case type, and final outcome (for 1985 cases).

Findings of the research: Probationers convicted of DWI differ significantly from probationers convicted of other crimes. They are an older group, by 6 years on average, and are better educated and more likely to have a skilled job. The DWI group consists overwhelmingly of misdemeanor offenders with a 2-year sentence to probation. Non-DWI probationers averaged a 4-year term, and 64% were felony offenders. Inner cities tended to have far fewer DWI probationers than the rest of the State, while suburban areas and smaller urban areas had relatively high numbers of DWI probationers. The DWI probationer profile resembles a "white male middle-class" profile, while the non-DWI group more closely resembles the classic street offender, somewhat similar to the prison inmate group. The study shows an 84% success rate for DWI probation cases, compared to approximately a 60% success rate for non-DWI probationers.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: At the time of the study, misdemeanor DWI probationers were a major part of the probation caseload and were increasing at an alarming rate. These cases were also consuming a large share of available supervision hours and departmental resources. Since the completion of the study, most misdemeanor DWI cases have been removed from the Department's jurisdiction and are handled through community-based and private- or public-contracted resources.

Timeframe of the study: FY 1985 to FY 1988

Agencies involved: Missouri Department of Corrections/Planning, Research & Evaluation Unit

Protective Custody: The Missouri Experience With Comparative State Analysis

Timothy A. Pierson, Ph.D.
Planning, Research & Evaluation Unit
Missouri Department of Corrections
Post Office Box 236
Jefferson City, MO 65102
(314) 751-2389

Objectives of the research: (1) To examine Missouri's protective custody (PC) practices, (2) to survey other States to identify their PC practices and establish accurate numbers, (3) to examine the reasons behind Missouri's high PC rate, and (4) to recommend areas of change or improvement.

Research methodology: This study examined the practices and problems related to the use of protective custody in U.S. and Canadian correctional agencies. Missouri's recent history of large-scale use of PC was examined. A description of PC facilities at the institutions is presented,

including historical origins and capacities. The study also offers a review and examination of 16 articles and books—including two unpublished works—on protective custody.

- Sampling technique—Data for all 915 Missouri protective custody inmates were compared with data on the remaining 9,593 non-PC inmates, using a number of variables.
- Data sources—Records extracted from the Offender Management Information System (OMIS) were used in this study, along with survey responses from the majority (64) of States and Canadian provinces.
- Survey questionnaire—The study included the results of a comprehensive survey on protective custody and related issues sent to the other 49 States, the District of Columbia, U.S. territories, the Federal Bureau of Prisons, 10 Canadian provinces, and the (Federal) Correctional Service Canada in early December 1986.
- Variables and measurements—The study examined a full range of demographic variables and offense-related data as well as classification and custody-level variables. A great deal of information from the survey responses of the other correctional jurisdictions was reported and analyzed.

Findings of the research: Missouri's PC inmates have lower education levels, are less likely to be married, and have greater medical, mental health, and vocational training needs than other inmates. They are more likely to be serving a prison term for a violent crime than non-PC inmates. The survey information provides a detailed examination of practices surrounding protective custody in the responding States and provinces.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: Recommendations included the adoption of an internal classification system to reduce the need for protective custody. The Adult Internal Management System (AIMS), developed by Levinson and Quay, was eventually implemented systemwide.

Timeframe of the study: 1986

Agencies involved: Missouri Department of Corrections/Planning, Research & Evaluation Unit

Recent Changes in Sentencing Practices as Evidenced by Inmate Commitment Characteristics

Kenneth Hartke
Planning, Research & Evaluation Unit
Missouri Department of Corrections
Post Office Box 236
Jefferson City, MO 65102
(314) 751-2389

Objectives of the research: (1) To identify and trace the notable changes in the characteristics of Missouri's prison inmates and (2) to identify changes in sentencing practices.

Research methodology: This study examined and analyzed various changes in the offense and sentence characteristics of newly admitted inmates during the mid- to late 1980's and identified a basic change in the State's sentencing practices.

- Sampling technique—Offender and offense characteristics for new court commitment prison admissions for the fiscal years 1983-89 were examined.
- Data sources—Information for this report was drawn from the Offender Management Information System (OMIS).
- Variables and measurements—The published study focuses on offense type and sentence length for inmates received from the courts during the 7-year period.

Findings of the research: The study shows that the State's courts are sending increasing numbers of nonviolent property offenders to prison. Many of these offenders were formerly assigned to probation supervision. In addition to being an unwise and unwarranted change in sentencing, this practice has had an exacerbating effect on the prison overcrowding problem in Missouri and has driven up the cost of punishment for nonviolent property offenders.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: This short study has been useful in explaining and publicizing the growing reliance on prison confinement as the primary criminal sanction in Missouri.

Prior instate studies: This is a revised version of a 1989 study.

Timeframe of the study: 1983-89

Agencies involved: Missouri Department of Corrections/Planning, Research & Evaluation Unit

A Study of Employee Turnover in the Missouri Department of Corrections

S. Denise Taylor, John Beard, and Kenneth Hartke
Planning, Research & Evaluation Unit
Missouri Department of Corrections
Post Office Box 236
Jefferson City, MO 65102
(314) 751-2389

Objectives of the research: (1) To establish a departmental turnover rate, (2) to identify reasons for staff turnover, (3) to identify problems or concerns among recently hired staff, (4) to measure the impact of turnover, and (5) to recommend steps to counteract high turnover.

Research methodology: This study was a detailed examination of the employee turnover problem in the Missouri Department of Corrections based on responses from two employee/former employee surveys and departmental personnel records.

- Sampling technique—All departmental employees who were terminated from employment during fiscal year 1989 were included in the study as well as a random sample of new employees hired during the same fiscal year.
- Data sources—Employee personnel records, automated personnel system files, and two surveys were used for the study.
- Variables and measurements—The study examined a variety of employee demographic variables, job tenure, job class, job location, marital status, education level, job-related survey items, and several open-ended survey responses.

Findings of the research: The Department's turnover rate of 13.9% is somewhat lower than was generally believed; however, there are certain job classes that have much higher turnover. A number of problem areas contributed to the problem of staff retention. Twenty-five percent of the FY 1989 new hires selected for the study had left the Department before we could send them a survey. Most of the survey respondents indicated that they had chosen corrections as a career rather than as a temporary job. Problems with inadequate advancement opportunities, workload, job or family stress, and the quality of supervision were frequently cited as reasons for leaving the Department. A comparison of survey responses from former employees and newly hired employees revealed that the new hires had similar concerns on many issues.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: A number of recommendations were included in the final report to improve opportunities for advancement, to improve basic orientation and training, and to explore the use of alternative work schedules.

Prior instate studies: Institution Staffing Study 1 & 2 (April 1988)

Timeframe of the study: 1989

Agencies involved: Missouri Department of Corrections/Planning, Research & Evaluation Unit

Success or Failure in Halfway House and Honor Center Placement: A Study of Rollbacks During Calendar Years 1985 to 1989

Timothy A. Pierson, Ph.D.
Planning, Research & Evaluation Unit
Missouri Department of Corrections
Post Office Box 236
Jefferson City, MO 65102
(314) 751-2389

Objectives of the research: (1) To develop a profile of those inmates who are being "rolled back" to secure institutions from halfway houses or honor centers and (2) to identify any common traits or predictors among this group.

Research methodology: This was a nonexperimental study involving inmates assigned to community-based facilities in preparation for eventual release on parole.

- Sampling technique—No sampling was required. All 11,390 placements for calendar years 1985 through 1989 were considered in the study.
- Data sources—Offender Management Information System (OMIS).
- Variables and measurements—Basic offender characteristics, institutional performance, and criminal convictions were examined, along with an outcome measure for performance in the community placement facility.

Findings of the research: A total of 1,532 placements (13.5%) were sent back ("rolled back") to higher custody institutional confinement during the study period. Rollback rates ranged from 8.7% in 1989 to 17.9% in 1988. On the surface, the 13.5% rollback rate over the study period is quite low in comparison with published reports or prior studies; however, a direct comparison is not possible because of the wide range of placement methods and treatment approaches in the studies from other States.

Development of a profile of inmates who are likely to be rolled back was affected by a strict prescreening process that limits community placements to inmates of certain custody ratings who are also approaching parole dates. Age at commitment, the number of institutional violations, the needs score for work skills, the nature of the current offense, marital status, and formal education were all associated with positive community placement outcome. Many of the variables that normally serve as salient features of the inmate population did not appear in this study because of the prescreening process that introduced an abnormal homogeneity into the study group.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: A series of recommendations were offered at the conclusion of the study concerning future halfway-house contracts and enhancements to the OMIS data base.

Prior instate studies: Previous informal studies of halfway-house placements

Timeframe of the study: Calendar years 1985-89

Agencies involved: Missouri Department of Corrections/Planning, Research & Evaluation Unit

New Jersey

Contingent Intermediate Sentences: New Jersey's Intensive Supervision Program (ISP)

Frank S. Pearson and Alice Glasel Harper
Administrative Office of the Courts
State of New Jersey, CN-987
Trenton, NJ 08625
(609) 984-0076

Objectives of the research: To update the findings of the Rutgers Institute for Criminal Research external program evaluation.

Research methodology:

- Design—Comparison group.
- Data sources—New Jersey Computerized Criminal History System and Intensive Supervision Program (ISP) internally collected data.
- Variables measured—Recidivism, offenses, and costs.
- Analytical methods—Survival analysis and benefit-cost analysis.

Findings of the research: ISP is able to hold down recidivism. Differences in recidivism rates were statistically significant and lower for the ISP sample than for the study comparison group. Successful ISP completers had survival rates of .97. Among ISP violators, the survival rate was .78. ISP is cost effective. In 1986, the program saved 62,000 offender days of prison time. ISP saves roughly \$7,000-\$8,000 per offender compared with ordinary terms of incarceration and parole.

Timeframe of the study: 1987-88

Agencies involved: Institute for Criminal Research/Intensive Supervision Program

Cost of the study: In-house expenses

Progress Report: New Jersey's Intensive Supervision Program

Intensive Supervision Program Research Unit Staff
Administrative Office of the Courts
State of New Jersey, CN-987
Trenton, NJ 08625
(609) 984-0076

Objectives of the research: To summarize the Intensive Supervision Program's (ISP's) compliance with goals and objective achievement.

Research methodology:

- Data sources—Internal programmatic data.
- Variables measured and measurements used—Contacts, employment rates, participant status, recidivism, payments, earnings, community service, and demographics.
- Unit of analysis—Participant.
- Analytical methods—Descriptive statistics and survival analysis.

Findings of the research: ISP demonstrates extremely low recidivism. Only 4.3% of the graduates have been convicted of serious new offenses. ISP has collected more than \$3.6 million in court-ordered fees and penalties since 1985.

Timeframe of the study: Quarterly series

Agencies involved: Intensive Supervision Program

Cost of the study: In-house expenses

New Mexico

Analysis of Adult Felony Sentencing in New Mexico

Gary LaFree, Ron Huskin, and Ann Gruys
New Mexico Statistical Analysis Center
University of New Mexico
Room 140, Onate Hall
Albuquerque, NM 87131
(505) 277-6247

Objectives of the research: First, to examine sentencing disparity by race, ethnicity, age, sex, prior criminal record, offense seriousness, and other characteristics of victims, offenders, and offenses. Second, to provide a demographic overview of the characteristics of New Mexico's felony offenders. Third, to prepare estimates for policymakers of how the variables mandated by the legislation creating the Sentencing Guidelines Commission (severity of the instant offense and offender's prior criminal record) currently relate to sentencing patterns in New Mexico. Fourth, to determine the variables that predict length and type of sentence in New Mexico and whether these variables differ by judicial district and county. Fifth, insofar as the data allow, to assess the effect on sentencing outcomes of a range of key variables, including pretrial release status, habitual offender statutes, aggravating and mitigating factors, concurrent and consecutive sentencing, and mandatory enhancements. Sixth, to examine differences in offender characteristics for different sentencing outcomes (for example, prison, probation, parole, or suspended sentence).

Research methodology: A statistical profile of New Mexico offenders was prepared, including descriptive information on the characteristics of offenders, characteristics of the offenses they have committed, offenders' prior criminal activities, victim attributes for crimes against persons, and the range of punishments these offenders received. The relationships among these types of variables were then examined for incarcerated offenders, offenders on probation, offenders participating in preprosecution diversion programs, and all three groups combined.

The universe of felons whose incarceration began during New Mexico FY 76 was 962, according to data obtained from the New Mexico Department of Corrections (DOC). A short-form questionnaire was completed for each of these individuals based on information provided by the DOC. The short-form questionnaire facilitated examination of the universe according to, for example, county of conviction, place of incarceration, and conviction offense.

A narrower sample of 400 of the 962 incarcerated felons had to be selected because of funding difficulties. The sample was stratified according to county of conviction, and the number of felons from each county was as proportional to the total sample (400) as the total number of felons incarcerated from that county was to the universe (962) of felons incarcerated during FY 76. The appropriate number of cases was randomly selected for inclusion in the sample. Data collectors then traveled to the various correctional institutions across the State and compiled long-form questionnaires based on their review of the files for each member of the sample. The information on incarcerated felons is based on data collected in the short-form and long-form questionnaires for approximately 40% of the felons sentenced to incarceration during FY 76.

The sample of probationers and those receiving deferred and suspended sentences was also narrowed to 400 from the universe of 2,343, compiled by data collectors from records of the district courts of New Mexico. One-page short-form questionnaires were prepared for the universe of 2,343, detailing information concerning the county of conviction, offenses committed, offenses sentenced for, and actual sentence imposed. The cases for which long-form questionnaires were to be completed were randomly selected. Data collectors then traveled to the probation offices and district courts across the State to complete long-form questionnaires based on their review of the files. Information was collected for approximately 17% of the felons receiving sentences during FY 76.

The strategy for analyzing preprosecution diversion (PPD) data was different from the procedures used for the analysis of incarcerated felons and probationers. The universe of cases was defined formally as all cases in which the district attorney signed a PPD contract with the offender in FY 76. Data collection by the Sentencing Guidelines Commission determined that of the 469 cases in the PPD sample, 108 (23.1%) were from Bernalillo County, and the remaining 361 cases were from all other New Mexico counties.

Findings of the research:

Offender characteristics

New Mexico males are more likely to receive incarceration or probation than are New Mexico females. The most striking difference is between preprosecution cases, in which women make up 33.1% of the total, and incarcerated cases, in which women are only 7.8% of the total.

Black offenders are more likely to be incarcerated than to receive probation or preprosecution diversion. By contrast, whites are more likely to receive preprosecution diversion.

Young offenders are more likely to be in preprosecution diversion, as expected. The average age of preprosecution diversion participants is 27 years, the average age of probationers is 29.7 years, and the average age of incarcerated offenders is 31.3 years.

Incarcerated offenders tend to be relative newcomers to New Mexico: 43% of the incarcerated offenders have lived in New Mexico for 10 years or less, compared to 31% of all individuals on probation and 26% of those in preprosecution diversion. More than 40% of offenders who received incarceration, probation, or preprosecution diversion were born outside of New Mexico.

Preprosecution diversion participants tend to be better educated than incarcerated offenders. While 75.5% of the PPD cases have at least a high school education, only 53.1% of the incarcerated offenders reached that educational level.

Incarcerated offenders are much more likely to be unemployed at the time of arrest than either probationers or preprosecution diversion participants. More than 60% of the incarcerated felons were unemployed at the time of arrest. Although employment differences between the probation and preprosecution diversion sample were not statistically significant, information on this variable was missing in a substantial number of cases.

In the sample of incarcerated offenders, the percent with a history of alcohol abuse was 72.9, compared to 55.6 of the sample of offenders on probation. Similarly, the percent of incarcerated offenders with a history of drug abuse was 71.4, compared to 46.2 of offenders placed on probation. Incarcerated offenders were more likely to have been involved with more serious drugs, especially cocaine/crack and heroin.

System characteristics

In summary, the security ratings for incarcerated felons are minimum, medium, and maximum; nearly 90% of New Mexico felons were sent to either maximum or medium facilities.

Rates of incarceration by district were estimated by weighting the number of incarcerations by the sample proportions and dividing that figure by the total population of the judicial district and then multiplying by 100,000. The most striking pattern to emerge was a geographic one: the three districts with the highest rates of incarceration are all within the southeast region of the State. By contrast, there is a tendency for districts with low incarceration rates to be in the northern regions of the State.

As with the incarcerated felon sample, probation rates vary greatly by district. However, rates of probation do not appear to be uniformly linked to one region of the State as do rates for incarceration. Preprosecution diversion rates vary widely by judicial district, with the higher rates dominating in the northern districts and the lower rates dominating in the southern districts.

Offense characteristics

The general pattern that emerged is that incarcerated and probation cases resemble each other in terms of whether they involve crimes against persons or property and that preprosecution cases are strikingly different from the other two samples. Only 7.8% of preprosecution cases were classified as crimes against persons, compared to 52% for incarcerated felons and 51% for probationers. More than 93% of all those in the preprosecution program were classified as having committed a crime against property compared to 57% of the probationers. Only 4% of the preprosecution cases involved both crimes against persons and property crimes, compared to 22% of the incarcerated felon sample and 30% of the probation sample.

The total number of offenses for the incarcerated sample showed that incarcerated felons had committed a larger number of offenses. While 33% had committed three or more offenses, only 9% of those on probation had committed three or more offenses. Because those in the preprosecution diversion program were not technically convicted, their total number of arrest charges were examined instead to get a number comparable for the incarcerated and probation samples. More than half of the offenders in the preprosecution diversion program had only one charge against them at the time of arrest. As expected, offenders in the incarcerated and probation samples have generally committed much more serious offenses than those in the preprosecution diversion sample. More than 57% of all offenses involved theft. The next most common category was violent offenses, which constituted 10.2% of the entire sample. Other common categories were controlled substance violations, which constituted 8.11%, and habitual offender violations, 6.28%. The sample included no racketeering or loan-sharking offenses and a relatively small number of public corruption, gambling, familial offenses, DWI's, probation violations, and firearm enhancement cases.

Approximately 32% of incarcerated offenders used some kind of weapon. This rate is considerably higher than the weapon-use rate for probationers or PPD cases. However, probation cases are significantly more likely to involve weapons than are PPD cases. Incarcerated offenders are more likely to use knives and handguns than are probationers or PPD offenders, and probation cases are more likely to include knives and handguns than are PPD cases.

Offender's criminal history

The most striking feature in this data is that a large proportion of offenders are arrested at an early age. Forty-one percent of the sample of incarcerated offenders had been arrested at the age of 21 or younger.

Of the PPD sample, 77% had no prior felony convictions, probationers were three times more likely than incarcerated offenders to have no prior convictions in their records, and 11% of the incarcerated offenders had eight or more prior convictions.

Punishment

An extremely large number of offenders are committed to prison for a relatively short period of time. More than 64% of offenders are committed to prison for less than 3 years. Moreover, statutory good time within the correctional system allows these offenders to serve substantially less than 3 years. In terms of correctional policy, this means a large proportion of offenders circulate through the prison system very rapidly. Parole is virtually automatic for incarcerated offenders; more than 96% of the sample received parole. The vast majority of cases involve either 1- or 2-year parole terms; only 5% of the cases received parole lengths of 3 years or longer.

Using multiple regression analysis and controlling for the severity of the offenses and the offender's prior criminal record, punishment alternatives were analyzed. Hispanic offenders received more severe punishment than non-Hispanic offenders; blacks, on average, received more severe punishment than nonblacks; men received more severe punishment than women; and unemployed offenders received more severe punishment than employed offenders. Older offenders were more likely to be severely punished than younger offenders, and the longer the time of residence in New Mexico, the less severe the punishment.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: Apart from the availability of data in official records, a major problem facing New Mexico Criminal Justice planners is the lack of automated data systems. All data on probation and suspended and deferred sentences had to be collected by hand from original records. The major statewide machine-readable source of data is maintained by the Department of Corrections and includes only individuals who have been convicted. Many variables that are important for policy purposes are either not recorded at all or are not coded reliably. Strategies for improving data quality can be divided into administrative, data entry, and maintenance categories that could be aided by the creation of a statewide data quality task force. The mandate for this task force would be to review the State's criminal justice data collection and perform regular audits to ensure that high-quality data standards are maintained.

Perhaps the most important unofficial function of such a task force on data quality would be to publicize the State's commitment to improved data collection among principal agencies.

Automation of criminal justice recordkeeping systems is critical. Development of uniform documents and forms for reporting and recording criminal history data and use of a tracking system to ensure that arrests and disposition data are properly linked and that individual charges and counts are included are extremely important.

Timeframe of the study: State FY 76

Agencies involved: New Mexico Statistical Analysis Center, University of New Mexico

Cost of the study: \$40,000

North Carolina

The Seroprevalence of Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) Infection in All Incoming Inmates Admitted to the North Carolina Department of Correction

H. Parker Eales, R.N.
Chief of Health Services
North Carolina Department of Correction
831 West Morgan Street
Raleigh, NC 27603
(919) 733-5711

Objectives of the research: (1) To determine the seroprevalence of human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) infection in incoming inmates and (2) to provide the data necessary to formulate a plan for the detection, prevention, and treatment of AIDS in the prison population.

Research methodology:

- Sampling technique—The entire universe for the period from November 1, 1989, through April 30, 1990, was used.
- Reliability/validity of the data—Within limits of current medical technology.
- Variables measured and measurements used—Blood samples were tested for presence of the HIV antibody. Repeatedly reactive tests were confirmed by the Western Blot method.
- Unit of analysis—Presence/absence of the HIV antibody.
- Analytical methods—Standard medical screening testing.

Findings of the research: There was a seroprevalence rate of 3.1% (274 positive test results out of 8,726 inmates tested).

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: Using the data gathered, long-range plans for the detection, prevention, and treatment of HIV infection and AIDS within North Carolina's prison system are being made.

Timeframe of the study: November 1989 to April 1990

Agencies involved: Senate Bill No. 44 authorized this study.

Cost of the study: This study was done as part of overall operating expenses.

Oklahoma

Analysis of the Oklahoma Department of Corrections Substance Abuse Offender Population

Steve Davis, Ph.D.
Oklahoma Criminal Justice Resource Center
Statistical Analysis Center
621 North Robinson, Suite 445
Oklahoma City, OK 73102
(405) 232-3328

Objectives of the research: To estimate the portion of the prison population that could benefit from substance abuse treatment and the rate at which new offenders with these needs are entering the system.

Research methodology: Several sources were used to gather data, including the substance abuse needs of the offenders, from the automated classification data system; offenders whose crimes were drug or alcohol related, from automated inmate sentence and movement files; the needs of the current inmate population, from field files collected by case managers at minimum and community security; evidence of the offender committing his or her crime under the influence of drugs or alcohol as collected by probation and parole officers; and the waiting list for the minimum security (current medium-security offenders) (this list was reviewed by case managers and the substance abuse treatment needs were assessed). These data were entered into the IBM 4361 computer using the Statistical Analysis System Full Screen Product (SAS/FSP). Frequencies and cross-tabulations of all the data were calculated using SAS.

Findings of the research: Over 2,600 inmates' needs assessments indicated moderate or severe substance needs. Nearly 900 currently incarcerated offenders who have identified substance abuse needs are at or below the minimum-security level. Only a small number of those with identified needs are being treated in existing programs.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: Increased funding for substance abuse treatment programs aimed at offenders was requested through the State legislature. Following this analysis, in 1989, the Department of Corrections developed an initial plan for a statewide substance abuse treatment program. The plan includes a request for intermediate-sanction programs such as work centers and drug offender work camps. This plan was submitted to the State legislature in 1990 and 1991.

Prior instate studies: Routine data collection of felons with substance abuse felonies

Timeframe of the study: October 1985 to September 1986

Agencies involved: Statistical Analysis Center; Oklahoma Department of Corrections

Oklahoma Criminal Justice Computerization Study

Cliff Sandel and Russ Buchner
Oklahoma Criminal Justice Resource Center
Statistical Analysis Center
621 North Robinson, Suite 445
Oklahoma City, OK 73102
(405) 232-3328

Objectives of the research: (1) To determine the number of computers in municipal, county, and State agencies; (2) to assess the use of the computers by agency (that is, software applications); and (3) to develop recommendations to increase computerization statewide based on the data needs of local and State criminal justice agencies.

Research methodology: Survey questionnaire

Findings of the research:

- There is no systematic survey of computer and software use. Municipal and county agencies purchase computers based on staff knowledge of computer use. There is no direction to automation given from the State level.
- There is no systematic training in the use of computers offered to law enforcement agencies in Oklahoma. The central peace officer training program does not provide such training.
- The State is moving from the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) system to the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS). There is no plan to increase the number of automated agencies to allow the NIBRS software that is being developed to be used. The State Offender-Based Tracking System (OBTS)/Arrest Disposition Reporting System (ADRS) program receives data from the 27 district attorney districts. There is no plan to automate the system.
- There is no statewide law enforcement users group.
- There is no publication that allowed agencies to determine who in law enforcement had computer knowledge.
- Since 1987, \$924,022.59 of Bureau of Justice Assistance formula grant funding has been spent on computer equipment to support law enforcement agencies. The funding was not part of a State plan.
- The State of Oklahoma could benefit from a statewide criminal justice information strategy. Limited municipal, county, and State funding for automation should be used to purchase equipment and software that is conducive to information collection and sharing on a statewide basis.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: The survey data revealed the need for a statewide meeting to assess the information needs of the law enforcement community. The meeting was held in August 1990. A criminal justice information committee was formed in the spring of 1991 and continues to meet twice a month. The resource center conducted a followup survey in December 1990 to determine the number of agencies interested in computers. Following this survey, a grant was prepared to provide personal computers to agencies that could afford the 25% match. A grant was awarded in 1991 that will allow placement of 296 computers in municipal, county, and State law enforcement agencies. Each computer will hold 10 years of felon information from the corrections data base. In addition, the NIBRS software being developed can be installed in each police department and sheriff's office that has a grant computer. Finally, data for the State OBTS can be gathered using the computers provided to district attorneys. This project will also cause a major change in the type of training being provided to State law enforcement agencies by the Council on Law Enforcement Education and Training.

Prior instate studies: No systematic survey of hardware and software use had been conducted. Each year, State agencies submit computer equipment requests to the Office of State Finance. This data becomes part of the State automation plan. However, the plan does not address specific issues related to the development of a statewide criminal justice data system.

Timeframe of the study: November 1989 to November 1991

Agencies involved: State Statistical Analysis Center, Oklahoma Criminal Justice Resource Center

Cost of the study: Bureau of Justice Assistance formula grant funds (#D89060) totaled \$4,500. These funds were awarded to the Resource Center through the State Drug and Violent Crime Policy Board.

Oklahoma Department of Corrections: Recidivism of Selected Groups of Offenders Survival Analysis Tables

Bill Chown
Research and Evaluation Unit
Oklahoma Department of Corrections
3400 Martin Luther King Avenue
Oklahoma City, OK 73113

Objectives of the research: To determine the usefulness of survival analysis in analyzing the rate of return (recidivism) of selected groups of felony offenders.

Research methodology: Felony conviction data from the Department of Corrections (DOC) were collected by offense group from January 1982 through December 1986. The data base included all felony convictions for the 5-year period. The data were then analyzed by survival analysis to determine the percentage of felons surviving over a 5-year period.

Findings of the research: Survival rates of offenders differ significantly over time. Over a 5-year period, felons with alcohol-related offenses and motor vehicle theft had the lowest survival rates (48.9% and 45.7%, respectively), while those with manslaughter and drug distribution offenses had the highest failure rates (88.3% and 74.5%, respectively). Failure rates based on security level at the time of release showed no significant differences. Survival rates were positively related to age—the older offenders survived in the community the longest.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: Data support the need to develop more alcohol- and drug-related treatment programs for offenders.

Timeframe of the study: January 1982 through December 1986

Agencies involved: Statistical Analysis Center; Oklahoma Department of Corrections

Cost of the study: DOC budget

Oregon

First-Year Report on Felony Sentencing Guidelines

Kathryn Ashford and Craig Mosbaek
Oregon Criminal Justice Council
School of Urban and Public Affairs
Post Office Box 751
Portland State University
Portland, OR 97207
(503) 725-4130

Objectives of the research: The study was designed to assess the extent to which the guidelines during the first year of operation are achieving underlying objectives: proportional punishment, truth in sentencing, uniformity, and consistency with correctional capacity. The Oregon Criminal Justice Council's study of 1986 sentencing practices was used as a baseline to assess changes in sentencing patterns under the guidelines.

Research methodology:

- **Sample**—The sample included 6,206 felons sentenced under the guidelines between November 1, 1989, and January 18, 1991. The sample was estimated to represent 74% of all felons sentenced under the guidelines and approximately 50% of all felony cases sentenced during that period. Several counties have not submitted the required disposition reports on their guidelines cases.
- **Data sources**—By law, sentencing courts are required to submit to the Council a disposition report form on each case sentenced under the guidelines.
- **Variables**—The variables included over 50 elements in the following categories: offender demographics (sex and race); current crime(s) of conviction; guidelines grid coordinates; presumptive sentence; actual sentence imposed (disposition; amount of prison, probation, jail, or treatment time; and financial conditions); reasons cited for departure sentence (if imposed); case processing (dates and custody status); and defendant's prior criminal record (prior juvenile adjudications and adult Class A misdemeanors and felonies).
- **Unit of analysis**—The unit of analysis was the sentenced felon, not the court case or conviction. Although sentencing report forms are case based, cases are aggregated to the defendant level prior to analysis.
- **Analytical methods**—Largely descriptive, cross-tabular analysis.

Findings of the research: Although the overall imprisonment rate has been reduced to 16% from 18% under the previous indeterminate system, the rate of imprisonment for those convicted of person-to-person crimes has increased significantly over the preguidelines system. Lengths

of stay have also increased, particularly for person-to-person crimes. Notwithstanding the concerns of some, the study indicates that the trial rate remains stable at 10% and the time from plea to sentence has been reduced.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: The findings were presented to the legislature as a means of assessing the impact of the guidelines. During the first year of implementation, the guidelines appear to be achieving the underlying goals. Judges complied with the guidelines in 94% of the cases examined. Sentence disparity by race and sex, while greatly reduced by the guidelines, remains in those areas where the court retains the greatest discretion—departures and optional probationary sentences.

Prior instate studies: *1986 Felony Sentencing Practices* (1988)

Timeframe of the study: November 1989 to March 1991

Agencies involved: Oregon Criminal Justice Council (lead); Department of Corrections (support); State courts (support)

Cost of the study: \$80,000

1986 Felony Sentencing Practices

Kathryn Ashford
Oregon Criminal Justice Council
School of Urban and Public Affairs
Post Office Box 751
Portland State University
Portland, OR 97207
(503) 725-4130

Objectives of the research: The study was designed to document sources of variability in sentencing practices under an indeterminate system for use in the development of sentencing guidelines. The study also provided a cross-sectional profile of sentenced felons for use in simulation studies on the impact of the sentencing guidelines as well as comparative baseline data on sentencing and case processing prior to the guidelines.

Research methodology:

- Design—Nonexperimental.
- Sample—The sample included 3,842 felons sentenced in 1986. Sample cases were selected from a sampling frame developed by merging Department of Corrections data on prison admissions and probation receptions with conviction records from the State Police Computerized Criminal History (CCH) files. Cases were stratified by county, race, and sex

for sample selection. Female and minority defendants were oversampled. Cases were weighted for analysis to reflect the population (N = 8,487) from which they were drawn.

- **Data sources**—Data were collected manually from official court records. The primary records consulted were charging instruments, security and release forms, judgment orders, and presentence reports. For those cases involving prison sentences, data on release dates, when available, were obtained from the Department of Corrections computer system.
- **Variables**—The variables included over 200 elements in the following areas: offender demographics (sex, race, education, substance abuse, employment, marital status, and living arrangements); current felony offenses (each charge at indictment and conviction); sentence outcomes (disposition and amount); elements of crime (weapon use, drug/alcohol use, victim characteristics, injury, and property loss); case processing (dates, PSI's, and custody status); and the defendant's prior criminal record (prior juvenile adjudications and adult misdemeanors, felonies, and prior incarcerations).
- **Unit of analysis**—The unit of analysis is the sentenced felon, and not the court case or conviction. During on-site data collection, information on all criminal cases culminating in a single sentence or proximate sentence orders was consolidated as a single case.
- **Analytical methods**—Largely descriptive, cross-tabular analysis. Multivariate regression was used to assess the impact of the defendant's race and sex on the decision to imprison and the length of the sentence.

Findings of the research: Both the probability of imprisonment and the duration of a prison sentence were significantly related to the severity of the conviction offense and to the offender's prior record. The defendant's race and sex were also related to sentence outcomes, even after controlling for these first two variables. Research confirmed that there is a large degree of jurisdictional variability in sentencing practices. The average offender sentenced to prison is projected to serve only 24% of the sentence imposed by the court.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: The offense and prior record data were used to classify the distribution of these cases according to various guidelines policies (both dispositional and durational) as they were being developed, to simulate the future demand for correctional resources.

Timeframe of the study: November 1988 to November 1989

Agencies involved: Oregon Criminal Justice Council (lead); Department of Corrections (support); State courts (support); Oregon State Police (support)

Cost of the study: \$150,000

Validation of Oregon's Risk Classification System Used in the Parole Matrix

Christopher Baird, Audrey J. Bakke, Douglas Holien,
Terry Zirk, and Kathryn Ashford
Oregon Criminal Justice Council
School of Urban and Public Affairs
Post Office Box 751
Portland State University
Portland, OR 97207
(503) 725-4130

Objectives of the research: (1) To analyze the current use of risk assessment in parole decisionmaking in Oregon and recommend improvements; (2) to assess the predictive validity of Oregon's History/Risk Scale; (3) to improve, if possible, the ability to identify offenders by risk through revision or replacement of the current risk classification scale; (4) to estimate the potential impact on prison populations and crime of any recommended revisions; (5) to recommend other uses of risk assessment in criminal justice decisionmaking in Oregon; and (6) to analyze State data needs related to the project and assess current information system capabilities.

Research methodology:

- **Sample**—The study tracked a sample of 1,398 inmates for 24 months following release from Oregon prisons. Sample included all 1,218 male inmates released between January and August 1984 and all 180 female inmates released between January 1982 and August 1984. Sample cases were selected from the Department of Correction's (DOC's) automated Client Tracking System.
- **Data sources**—Data extracted from the DOC automated system were augmented with data collected manually from Parole Board paper files and institutional misconduct reports. Outcome data on arrests and convictions following release were obtained from the State Police Computerized Criminal History (CCH) files.
- **Variables**—The variables include over 200 elements in the following areas: offender demographics (sex, race, education, substance abuse, employment, marital status, and living arrangements); commitment offenses; prior criminal record (number and type of adult and juvenile arrests, convictions, commitments, and revocations); institutional adjustment (number and type of formal disciplinary reports); risk classification scores; release performance (number and type of arrests and convictions).
- **Unit of analysis**—The unit of analysis is the releasee.
- **Analytical methods**—Largely descriptive, cross-tabular analysis. There was an assessment of the History/Risk Scale based on correlations between scale items and primary outcome measure, the number of reported arrests. An alternative scale was developed on a randomly selected construction subsample using multivariate regression. The predictive validity was assessed on a validation sample.

Findings of the research: The study provided a profile of the average inmate released from Oregon prisons in terms of social and criminal history. During the 6-month parole period, 33% were revoked. The majority were revoked for technical violations or alleged new criminal activity, but there were no new convictions. During the full 24-month followup, 59% were arrested for a new crime. Researchers concluded that the Oregon History/Risk Scale is a valid classification tool and reasonably predictive of future rearrest. The study also developed an alternative scale with comparable predictive accuracy that would be easier to administer.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: The researchers recommend using risk classification to set supervision levels for parolees and probationers. If the parole risk scale is retained, Item D (age weighted by criminal history) should be eliminated because it is not statistically related to offender risk. The results indicated that risk classification is playing a minimal role in determining the length of prison term. Low-risk cases are serving more time than the matrix prescribes. Researchers outlined the ways in which risk assessment could be used to save prison beds without jeopardizing public safety and recommended improvements in information systems.

Timeframe of the study: November 1986 to January 1988

Agencies involved: Oregon Criminal Justice Council (lead); National Council on Crime and Delinquency (under contract); Department of Corrections (support); Oregon State Police (support)

Cost of the study: \$58,000

Texas

Analysis of Criminal History and Offense Characteristics of Aggravated Offenders Admitted to Prison

Lisa M. Riechers, Scott Carruth,
and Tony Fabelo, Ph.D.
Criminal Justice Policy Council
Post Office Box 13332
Capitol Station
Austin, TX 78711
(512) 463-1810

Objectives of the research: (1) To show policymakers the effects of legislation and various sentencing options on prison system capacity and (2) to show how sentencing practices such as "life without parole" will affect the prison population/capacity.

Research methodology:

- **Subjects**—The sample consisted of 313 offenders randomly selected from a pool of approximately 1,800 aggravated offenders admitted into the Texas prison system during a 6-month period between April and September 1990. This represents approximately 10% of the aggravated offenders admitted yearly to the Texas Department of Criminal Justice, Institutional Division (TDCJ-ID). An aggravated offense (or "3G" offense) is any offense coded under Article 42.12, Section 3G, of the Texas Code of Criminal Procedure. These offenses are capital murder, aggravated assault, aggravated sexual assault, aggravated kidnapping, and aggravated robbery. In addition, an offense that is not listed under 3G can be enhanced by the courts if it is found that a weapon was used during the commission of the crime. Aggravated offenders are required to serve at least one-fourth of their sentence as calendar time.

Of the 313 offenders in the sample, 301 were males and 12 were females, all either incarcerated in the Texas prison system or under parole supervision. All were coded into the system through their individual correctional identification number (TDC#) and State identification number (DPS#).

- **Apparatus and procedure**—A three-page survey questionnaire was used to collect the offender information. This questionnaire consisted of a general demographic information section, offense information section, and an adult criminal/social history section. Each section asked detailed questions about the offender's background, admission type, sentencing status, number of charges, criminal history, and prior incarcerations.

The source of offender information was the Texas Department of Criminal Justice, Pardons and Paroles Division (PPD), Inmate Records. An offender's file shows all known criminal, social, medical, mental, and educational information. This information is compiled during the inmate's entrance into the prison system and subsequently transferred to parole upon the inmate's release.

Staff from the Criminal Justice Policy Council and the Texas Department of Criminal Justice, Pardons and Paroles Division, coded the information from the inmate files.

Findings of the research:

- Aggravated (3G) offenders comprise 8% of the total prison admissions per year. Because aggravated offenders must serve at least one-fourth of their sentence as calendar time, aggravated offenders incarcerated in the Texas prison system constitute 30% of the prison population overall.
- Of the 313 offenders surveyed, 42% were incarcerated for aggravated robbery; 21% for aggravated sexual assault (12% for aggravated sexual assault of a child and 9% for aggravated sexual assault); 18% for homicide; 14% for aggravated assault with a deadly weapon; and 5% for "other" offenses such as kidnaping, arson, and weapons findings for property and drug offenses.
- Twenty-seven percent of the offenders surveyed showed a pattern of violence in their criminal history records. A pattern of violence is defined as previous use of a weapon during the commission of a crime, use of force, prior aggravated offenses, and multiple aggravated offenses (such as two or more counts of aggravated robbery resulting from either two separate events or robbery of two individuals). The criminal history of the sample offenders was examined to determine whether any pattern of violence existed. It should be noted that even if no record of violence has been found, offenders could still have committed some form of violence during the commission of a crime. Of the 27% that showed some pattern of violence, 16% were incarcerated for multiple aggravated offenses, 9% had a prior aggravated offense, and 3% overall had a prior aggravated *and* multiple aggravated offenses. Five percent were reported as having prior violent offenses.
- Of the 16% of offenders serving sentences for multiple 3G instant offenses, 61% were for two multiple 3G instant offenses, and 39% showed three or more multiple aggravated instant offenses.
- Predictably, aggravated offenders who have prior aggravated and multiple aggravated offenses (3%) receive longer sentences (mean of 32 years), followed by multiple aggravated offenders (23 years) and offenders with prior aggravated offenses (21 years). Prior violent offenders and nonviolent offenders tend to receive the shortest sentences of all aggravated offenders, 17.5 years and 16 years, respectively.
- According to police records, weapons were used by 80% of the aggravated offenders sampled. Based on a positive finding by the court, 55% of the offenders used a weapon. The remainder was broken out by 25% who used a weapon but had no finding and 20%

who did not use a weapon in the commission of a crime. In the cases where no weapon was used (20%), the offense was most often aggravated sexual assault. Of the 55% that were found to have used a weapon, 51% used a handgun, 26% used a knife, 11% used a shotgun or rifle, and 13% used some other form of weapon.

- Over 60% of the 3G offenders sampled had no prior prison incarceration on record. Thirty-eight percent had one or more prior prison sentences. If divided by patterns of violence, 53.6% of those with a violence pattern versus 31.9% of those with no record of previous violence had served at least one prior prison term.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: Statutorily aggravated offenders must serve one-fourth of their sentence as calendar time, and therefore they accumulate in prisons (30% of the total prison population). This results in a "hardening" of the prison population, which presents prison administrators with a management problem. In addition, as the aggravated offender, incarcerated for 30 years or more, approaches geriatric status, the need for health care and convalescent services increases.

This research shows a need to target the "worst of the worst." Twenty-seven percent of the aggravated offenders sampled were classified as prior aggravated offenders (6%), prior violent offenders (5%), multiple aggravated offenders (13%), or prior aggravated *and* prior multiple aggravated offenders (3%). These offenders show significant patterns of violence and therefore are a severe threat to public safety. In targeting these offenders, policymakers can increase calendar time or legislate "life without parole," thereby meeting public safety needs.

Timeframe of study: April to September 1990

Agencies involved: Criminal Justice Policy Council (CJPC) (lead); Texas Department of Criminal Justice, Pardons and Paroles Division (support)

Cost of the study: The study cost approximately \$6,000 for printing and staff expenses—two full-time staff members (CJPC), one part-time staff member (CJPC), and one part-time staff member (TDCJ-PPD).

Female Offenders in Prison: Trends and Issues

Nancy Arrigona
Criminal Justice Policy Council
Post Office Box 13332
Capitol Station
Austin, TX 78711
(512) 463-1810

Objectives of the research: To examine the increase in female offenders sentenced to prison and inform policymakers of the unique problems associated with the management of this population.

Research methodology: Data were collected from the Texas Department of Corrections (TDC) *Annual Statistical Reports* and from computerized data on all prison admissions, on-hand population, and releases collected by TDC and analyzed by the Criminal Justice Policy Council (CJPC). The TDC computerized data used in identifying offenders with no prior record of TDC confinement or prior probations was adjusted by a 9% reporting error. (Prior analysis by the CJPC of a sample of TDC cases matched with DPS rap sheets had shown that 9% of the cases that TDC reported as having no prior record of TDC confinement or prior probations in fact had a prior record in their rap sheet.)

Findings of the research: The number of females sentenced to prison continues to increase. Female offenders in 1987 were more violent, were serving longer sentences, and had more extensive criminal histories than their counterparts in 1984. The number of females released in 1987 represented 150% of the female prison population and 99.9% of female admissions. A group of females with no previous prison incarcerations was identified as a possible diversion population.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: As the trend of increasing female admissions continues, the implications of this growth and hardening of the female population must be faced separately from that of the prison population as a whole because of the unique operational requirements of this population. The growth of the female population must be weighed against the capacity limits of the women's units. The identification of possible diversions in the female population indicates that increased use of intermediate sanctions for female offenders could slow the increase of female admissions.

Timeframe of the study: Fiscal years 1984-87 (fiscal year begins in September)

Agencies involved: Criminal Justice Policy Council (lead); Texas Department of Corrections (support)

1988 Texas Prison Admissions Survey

Tony Fabelo, Ph.D., and Lisa M. Riechers
Criminal Justice Policy Council
Post Office Box 13332
Capitol Station
Austin, TX 78711
(512) 463-1810

Objectives of the research: To provide a profile of offenders currently admitted to Texas prisons and to examine the changes in the makeup of offenders admitted to prison in terms of offense, criminal history, previous commitments, and drug use.

Research methodology:

- Subjects—A random sample of 972 offenders admitted to prison in the first 3 weeks of November 1988 (males, N = 893) and the first week of December 1988 (females, N = 79) was selected. This represents approximately 30% of the monthly prison admissions and corresponds to the overall percentage of male and female prison admissions.
- Instruments and procedures—Offenders were interviewed during the diagnostic process, prior to being transferred to an assigned unit. Interviews took approximately 20-30 minutes per offender. A questionnaire developed by the Criminal Justice Policy Council (CJPC) staff covered criminal history, drug use history, and general demographic information as well as offense-specific information. Researchers from the CJPC and Adult Probation Officers conducted the interviews. Data were collected from each offender's record prior to the interviewing. Each offender was asked to participate in the self-report component of the study, and those who refused (fewer than 10) were excused without repercussions.
- Comparison samples—Two additional samples were used in this study to provide an indication of trends in prison admissions. A sample of offenders admitted to prison in 1986 was compared to the 1988 sample, and a sample of offenders admitted to prison in August 1989 was used for comparative purposes where possible. The 1986 sample was collected in a similar manner to that for the 1988 sample. The 1989 sample of drug offenders admitted to prison consisted of a random selection of 400 drug offenders who were admitted to prison in August 1989. The information collected on these offenders was obtained from the records only and involved no actual interviewing of offenders. Total admission and population data from the Texas Department of Criminal Justice (TDCJ) was used to document trends as well.

Findings of the research:

Characteristics of drug offenders admitted to prison

The proportion of drug offenders admitted to prison is increasing. For instance, in FY 1988 (September 1987 to August 1988), drug offenders represented 19.1% of all prison admissions. In FY 1989, this percentage rose to 22%, and in FY 1990 this percentage reached 26%. Drug offenders now represent the second largest admissions group, after property offenders.

Drug offenders represented 28% of all admissions to prison in the 1988 sample data (consistent with that month's admissions percentages). The majority of drug offenders in the sample were admitted for a possession violation (54.8%), followed by distribution (42.3%) and manufacturing or other violations.

Aggravated drug offenders represented 11.4% of all drug admissions and 3.2% of all admissions to prison in the 1988 sample. This percentage held true in the 1989 sample as well, with 12% of the drug offenders classified as aggravated. A drug offense is classified as "aggravated" based on the

amount and type of drug (for example, more than 28 grams of cocaine or 50 pounds of marijuana). These offenders had longer sentences than other drug offenders (statutory minimum sentences). Twenty-five percent of aggravated drug offenders had a prior prison incarceration.

Overall, more of the admissions to prison are for revocations of probation or parole. Revocation admissions represented over three-fourths of all admissions in 1988 (75.8%), as opposed to only one-half (52.3%) in 1980. This trend was supported by the admissions samples as well. For instance, drug offenders who had their supervision status revoked represented 46.8% of all drug admissions in the 1986 sample, compared to 57.3% in the 1988 sample and 57.9% in the 1989 sample. Not only were a higher proportion of drug offenders who were recidivists admitted to prison, but a higher percentage of these recidivists were admitted for a supervision violation that involved a new offense. Of those drug offenders admitted for a probation revocation, 25.6% were admitted for a new offense in the 1986 sample, compared to 62.8% in the 1988 sample and 64.7% in the 1989 sample. Of those drug offenders admitted for a parole or mandatory supervision revocation, 75.9% were admitted for a new offense in the 1986 sample, compared to 87% in the 1988 sample and 95% in the 1989 sample.

Drug use of prison admissions

The following information is based on the self-report information collected from the offenders interviewed in the 1988 admissions survey. Drug use is more prevalent in the prison population than in the general population; 47.7% of the offenders admitted to prison reported current drug use (within the month prior to arrest) of one or more drugs, compared to 5.8% of the general population (as reported in a statewide survey conducted by the Texas Commission on Alcohol and Drug Abuse in 1989).

Offenders admitted to prison for a drug violation use more drugs than do offenders admitted for other types of violations. Approximately 62% of the offenders admitted to prison for a drug violation reported current use of drugs, compared to 44.5% of property offenders. In addition, a higher percentage of drug offenders reported having sold drugs at some point, compared to both offenders reported having sold drugs at some point and offenders admitted to prison for other crimes.

Current drug use may affect the potential success of drug offenders under probation, parole, or mandatory supervision. A majority of drug offenders who claimed current use of drugs (61.3%) were admitted for a revocation of probation, parole, or mandatory supervision. Drug use, therefore, seems to be a factor leading to a revocation. This is further corroborated by the fact that 35.7% of drug offenders admitted to prison for a technical probation or parole revocation tested positive for drugs in urine tests conducted while they were under supervision.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: The proportion of drug offenders admitted to prison is increasing. The rise in the number of drug offenders in prison calls for intervention strategies directed specifically at this population, such as drug rehabilitation and treatment, increased drug testing, and policies directed at removing the profitability from trafficking in drugs.

The increasing numbers of drug offenders admitted to prison can be attributed in part to increased law enforcement efforts toward interdiction. However, the high prevalence of drug use among offenders and high recidivism rates of drug offenders suggest the following: (1) the characteristics

and risk potential of some drug offenders placed on community-based sanctions are not conducive to their success in this setting; (2) community-based sanctions have failed to provide the necessary supervision and intervention strategies for these offenders; or (3) community-based sanctions have not yet reached their full potential in this area. All these possibilities are issues for further research.

Prior instate studies: *1986 Study of Offenders Sentenced to Prison* (Texas Board of Pardons and Paroles and the Texas Adult Probation Commission)

Timeframe of the study: Admissions to prison for the first 3 weeks of November 1988 and the first week of December 1988

Agencies involved: Texas Criminal Justice Policy Council (lead); Texas Adult Probation Commission; probation departments throughout the State

Cost of the study: The study cost approximately \$28,000, including two research staff members from the CJPC working approximately 1.5 and 2.5 months and travel per diem (to Huntsville and Gatesville, Texas) of the CJPC staff and probation officers from throughout the State.

Special Alternative Incarceration Program (SAIP) Enhanced Substance Abuse Treatment Evaluation

Nancy Arrigona
Criminal Justice Policy Council
Post Office Box 13332
Capitol Station
Austin, TX 78711
(512) 463-1810

Objectives of the research: The Criminal Justice Policy Council is currently conducting an evaluation of the Special Alternative Incarceration Program (SAIP) boot camp and its enhanced substance abuse component. This evaluation will include a 2-year followup of SAIP inmates released to the community on probation. A group of offenders who completed the boot camp prior to the beginning of the enhanced substance abuse component (preenhanced) is being compared to a group of offenders who received enhanced treatment. Information is also being gathered on a group of similar offenders who served their sentence in the general population under shock probation.

The success of the boot camp and the enhanced substance abuse component will be measured through the recidivism rates of the SAIP offenders in each of the sample groups as will their adjustment to community supervision and drug use after release. These measures will be based on probation and institutional division data collected at specific intervals during the tracking period.

Research methodology: The evaluation of the SAIP enhanced substance abuse component uses a nonexperimental design. The following groups were selected as samples for the evaluation:

- Pre-SAIP sample—Those who completed the SAIP program before initiation of the enhanced substance abuse treatment component.
- Enhanced SAIP sample—Those who received enhanced substance abuse treatment in the boot camp; offenders returning to target counties receive enhanced treatment in the community upon release.
- Shock probation sample—Those who served sentences in the general population; released to probation.

The samples were selected in the following manner:

- Pre-SAIP sample—All inmates admitted to the Goree SAIP between October 12, 1989, and March 15, 1990, were included in the sample. Inmates deemed ineligible for SAIP during the diagnostic process were not included in the sample. However, inmates who became ineligible after admission into SAIP remained part of the sample and were followed up during community supervision whenever possible. There are 330 offenders in the pre-SAIP sample.
- Enhanced SAIP—Inmates admitted to the Goree SAIP between June 18, 1990, and February 28, 1991, were eligible for selection. All shock inmates sentenced from target counties (Dallas, Brazos, and Hidalgo) were included in the sample. These inmates make up approximately one-third of the enhanced sample. The remaining two-thirds of the sample were selected at random from the remaining pool of inmates admitted to the Goree boot camp during this time. There are 220 offenders in the enhanced SAIP sample.
- Two methods of selection were utilized. First, male inmates admitted to prison on shock probation between June 18, 1990, and March 1, 1991, were selected for the sample. (With the exception of age and health requirements, shock probationers are sentenced under the same provisions as are inmates sentenced to the boot camp program. Only those shock probationers age 27 and under were included in the sample.) Second, male inmates admitted to prison between November 1, 1989, and May 31, 1990, were selected based on their departure code ("depart to probation"). As with the other group, only those age 27 and under were included. Approximately 125 offenders will be in the shock probation sample.

Participation in the study was voluntary for the pre-SAIP and enhanced samples. Inmates selected for the samples were notified at time 1 (prior to the start of the interviews) of the intent of the study and given the opportunity to refuse. No inmates refused to participate in the study. Inmates selected for the shock probation sample were not interviewed for the study; information was gathered from inmate record files, which include information collected during interviews conducted as part of the Institutional Division's diagnostic process. Self-reported criminal history and drug use patterns were gathered from these files. There was no face-to-face contact with the inmates included in this sample and, therefore, no consent to participate in the study.

Data collection in the boot camp was conducted in the following manner:

- Pre-SAIP sample—Inmates completed self-report questionnaires twice—once during the first week at the boot camp (time 1) and again in the ninth week of the program (time 2). The questionnaires were administered orally by an evaluation staff person who provided assistance by answering inmate questions as needed. Inmates were informed about the nature of the research by the staff person. Demographic, criminal history, and offense data and baseline drug involvement information were collected on each subject as well as attitudinal changes and impressions of the boot camp. Record data collected from the inmates' files also contained demographic and criminal history information. [Record data, inmate self-report history, self-report attitude (times 1 and 2), boot camp exit (likes and dislikes of boot camp), evaluation of performance in the boot camp, and boot camp discharge information.]
- Enhanced SAIP sample—Identical to the pre-SAIP sample, with the exception that treatment staff administered the questionnaires at time 1 and time 2. Information on participation in and completion of phases I and II was gathered from the Institutional Division. [Record data, inmate self-report history, self-report attitude (times 1 and 2), boot camp exit (likes and dislikes of boot camp), evaluation of performance in the boot camp, boot camp discharge information, and information on completion of the enhanced substance abuse program (phases I and II).]
- Shock probation sample—Record data were collected from the inmates' ID files. These files include information gathered during interviews conducted as part of the Institutional Division's diagnostic process. Demographic, criminal history (self-report and actual), offense, and drug use patterns (self-report) data were gathered from these files. There was no face-to-face contact with the inmates included in this sample. [Record data; community followup began during the first month after release from the boot camp.]

The community information received on pre- and enhanced SAIP inmates is dependent on reporting from the Community Supervision and Corrections Departments. Case classification and community adjustment information will be gathered at the following time periods:

- Intake—Completed within 1 month after release from boot camp. (SAIP inmates are placed in jail until they come before the judge. Once placed on probation, they must report within 24 hours. Intake is completed within 2 weeks. This whole process takes approximately 1 month.)
- Assessment—Must be completed within 30 days of intake.
- Reassessment—Completed 3, 6, 9, 12, 18, and 24 months after assessment.
- Community adjustment—Completed 3, 6, 9, 12, 18, and 24 months after assessment.

- Discharge—Completed when probationer transfers to a different jurisdiction or a different probation caseload/program.
- Termination—Completed when probationer terminates from probation (completes sentence, dies, transfers out of State, or is revoked).

All data collected for the SAIP evaluation will be analyzed using SPSS/PC+.

Findings of the research: Findings to date include the general demographic characteristics of offenders sentenced to the SAIP boot camp; participation in the different phases of enhanced substance treatment; change in asocial attitudes after 90 days in the program; release of offenders to the community (evaluation rating compared to release to conversion of offender); 1-year adjustment to community supervision scores for the pre-SAIP group; and one recidivism rate (return to prison) for the pre-SAIP group. Upcoming analysis will provide comparative information on the pre-SAIP and enhanced substance abuse treatment groups. A process evaluation and a cost-benefit analysis will also be conducted.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: The results of the evaluation will provide information on the effectiveness of the boot camp program and on substance abuse treatment in a boot camp setting.

Timeframe of the study: October 1989 to December 1993

Agencies involved: Criminal Justice Policy Council (lead-evaluation); Institutional Division, Texas Department of Criminal Justice (lead-enhanced substance abuse treatment); Community Supervision and Corrections Division, Texas Department of Criminal Justice (lead-community supervision)

Cost of the study: The enhanced substance abuse program was implemented as a result of a Federal grant in the amount of \$250,000. The evaluation component was awarded \$25,000 from this grant.

Uniform Recidivism and Revocation Calculation

Nancy Arrigona
 Criminal Justice Policy Council
 Post Office Box 13332
 Capitol Station
 Austin, TX 78711
 (512) 463-1810

Objectives of the research: To determine a standard methodology for calculating recidivism and revocation rates in all criminal justice agencies in the State. Included in the report are the recidivism and revocation rates for parole and probation and for juvenile justice programs.

Research methodology: A literature review was conducted to determine the recommended methodologies for calculating recidivism rates for criminal justice programs. A working group made up of personnel from each criminal justice agency was created to assist the Policy Council in determining the methodology to be used. Once a standard formula for recidivism and revocation rates was determined, the methodology was applied to existing data, and comparable recidivism and revocation rates were calculated.

Findings of the research:

- The Texas Department of Criminal Justice, the Texas Youth Commission, the Texas Juvenile Probation Commission, and all other State agencies conducting criminal justice recidivism studies should use the following formula when calculating recidivism rates. Recidivism rate is equal to the following:

The number of offenders placed under community supervision or released from custody during time period (x) with unfavorable outcome (y) within (z) number of months
Number of offenders placed under community supervision or released from custody during time period (x)

- Unfavorable outcomes, or "recidivism events," in the adult criminal justice system should include arrest and incarceration. Unfavorable outcomes in the juvenile justice system should include placement in a Texas Youth Commission (TYC) facility, juvenile arrests reported to TYC, and counts of adult arrests and incarceration of juveniles who become adults during the followup period.
- A 3-year followup period should be used in recidivism studies, with recidivism rates reported after the first, second, and third years.
- The Texas Department of Criminal Justice, Institutional Division, should adopt the methodology and figures used by the Pardons and Paroles Division when reporting recidivism rates for inmates that have been released from prison.
- The Texas Department of Criminal Justice, the Texas Youth Commission, and the Texas Juvenile Probation Commission should use the following formula when calculating revocation rates. Revocation rate is equal to the following:

Number of revocations to a State institutional setting
(State prison or TYC facility) during period (x)
Average daily population during period (x)

- The Community Justice Assistance Division of the Department of Criminal Justice and the Texas Juvenile Probation Commission should develop appropriate research designs and data collection mechanisms for programs in which present data collection does not allow for the calculation of recidivism rates.

- The Criminal Justice Policy Council should continue to coordinate the collection and analyses of data for calculating recidivism and revocation rates. The Policy Council will compile all available recidivism and revocation information in a biennial report.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: A standard definition and calculation should now be used by all criminal justice agencies when reporting recidivism and revocation rates. For programs in which the tracking of offenders is currently not possible, appropriate research designs and data collection mechanisms should be developed to ensure that cohorts of offenders placed under supervision may be tracked for a period of at least 3 years.

Timeframe of the study: Fiscal years 1988-90 (fiscal year begins in September)

Agencies involved: Criminal Justice Policy Council (lead); Texas Department of Criminal Justice (support); Texas Juvenile Probation Commission (support); Texas Youth Commission (support); Legislative Budget Office (support)

Uniform System Cost Project, FY 1989-90

Nancy Arrigona
Criminal Justice Policy Council
Post Office Box 13332
Capitol Station
Austin, TX 78711
(512) 463-1810

Objectives of the research: To provide comparative cost-per-day figures for criminal justice services and supervision. Cost-per-day figures are computed using uniform calculation guidelines.

Research methodology: The guidelines for the calculation of average cost per day were determined by the cost-per-day oversight group. The cost calculation guidelines for the Uniform System Cost Project, FY 1989-90, included the following:

- Calculate operational costs for residential facilities (excluding the cost of construction) for minimum security, medium security, and maximum security. For facilities operated by the Texas Department of Criminal Justice, Institutional Division (TDCJ-ID), calculate the systemwide average operational cost as well as the average cost for the general population, administrative segregation, and solitary confinement.
- Calculate supervision costs by level of supervision and by specialized program.
- Include the costs for special services (presentence investigations, alcohol/drug screening, court liaison, and so forth) whenever possible.

- Include the costs for newly funded services, programs, and facilities whenever possible. Estimates may be used for those programs or facilities that are funded but not fully operational.
- Do not depreciate equipment costs (capital outlay). All capital expenditures (excluding construction and renovation outlays) will be considered as part of operating costs in the year of expenditure.
- Exclude TDCJ-ID's industrial costs and revenues when calculating cost figures.
- Exclude all construction and renovation costs. The costs associated with construction and renovation will be addressed separately in conjunction with various financing options.
- Break out lease payments from the general cost information. Lease payments include payments made for residential facilities, office space, and rental property.
- Include the fringe benefits paid by the State at a rate of 24.5% of salaries for FY 1989 and 27.1% for FY 1990. Fringe benefits include the State-paid portion of insurance, retirement, and Social Security payments. (Rate calculated by the Legislative Budget Office.)
- Exclude unemployment compensation, worker's compensation, and other general costs of State government.
- Calculate total central administration costs and allocate to specific program areas as determined by the agency or division.
- Provide electronic monitoring cost information as a separate program.

The average cost was calculated by dividing the average population of offenders served in a program by the yearly expenditure for that specific program. Each criminal justice operational agency provided actual cost data from which the average cost per day was calculated.

Findings of the research: The project resulted in the calculation of average cost-per-day figures for all major adult and juvenile criminal justice supervision programs. A description of each program was included.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: The calculation of the average operational cost per day provides a reference point for use in determining criminal justice policy options. Cost-per-day figures are used for comparative purposes and general policy direction, not for the development of specific budgetary elements.

Prior instate studies: Previous Uniform System Cost Reports were completed in February 1987 and October 1988.

Timeframe of the study: Fiscal years 1989 and 1990 (September 1988 to September 1990)

Agencies involved: Criminal Justice Policy Council (lead); Legislative Budget Office (support); Governor's Office of Budget and Planning (support); State Auditor's Office (support); Sunset Advisory Commission (support); Comptroller of Public Accounts (support); Texas Department of Criminal Justice (support); Texas Juvenile Probation Commission (support); Texas Youth Commission (support)

Virginia

The Awaiting-Trial Population in Virginia

Anne A. Jones, Helen S. Hinshaw, and Larry Guenther
Virginia Department of Corrections
6900 Atmore Drive
Richmond, VA 23225
(804) 674-3268

Objectives of the research: To identify divertible subgroups.

Research methodology: The research questions posed by the Committee on Legal/Legislative Issues were answerable only through a special survey designed to capture needed data elements. Among these were the types and numbers of releases at all levels of pretrial activity; the role of professional bondsmen in effecting release, together with the amounts and types of bond required; the length of stay in jail for persons released by various means and for various offenses; and the risk to public safety of pretrial release, as measured by failure to appear for trial, and rearrest for criminal conduct while awaiting trial.

Survey design

Limitations of time and restrictions on staff availability dictated a sample that would assure representativeness of the Virginia awaiting-trial population, yet would be feasible in the time allotted. Five jurisdictions were selected according to the following criteria: (1) they should reflect both high-volume urban localities and moderate-volume smaller jails; (2) their filings of cases should be, in the best of all worlds, automated and, in any event, complete; and (3) they should represent geographically diverse, but seriously overcrowded, jails. The sample finally chosen included Fairfax County, Norfolk City, Henrico County, Suffolk City, and Petersburg City.

An admissions cohort from these jurisdictions was selected from 2 consecutive days in October 1988. The dates chosen were Tuesday and Wednesday, October 3 and 4, recommended by the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) to reflect the most stable jail intake of the 7 weekdays. The choice of October, by the same reasoning, avoided seasonal and monthly variations and had three other advantages:

1. It was the most recent month in which edited J7 data were available.
2. Enough time had elapsed since October for most case dispositions to have been made.
3. It was recent enough for courts to have their records (though often "dead files") readily accessible.

A letter was prepared and sent to the clerks of the court and sheriffs about the objectives of the study, its authorization, and the imminent arrival of research staff.

Findings of the research:

Starting with the 185 cases comprising the sample for this survey, 66.5% reached a finding of guilty during the tracking period, ranging from 36.4% in Suffolk to 85% in Henrico. For the sample as a whole, the rest of the defendants were found not guilty in 2 cases (1%), 16 cases (9%) were dismissed, and 24 cases (13%) were *nolle prossed*.

The data indicate that 14.5% were for violent crimes (for example, homicide, rape, assault, or drugs), with the remainder (85.5%) for nonviolent offenses (for example, burglary, drunkenness, obstructing justice, or traffic offenses).

With this profile of the five-jurisdiction sample in mind, it will be useful to envision the flow of cases through three levels of jail release activity.

Magistrate level

All 185 cases were presented to a magistrate, who ultimately released 93 (50%) by secure or unsecure means. The 57 individuals given unsecure release made bail [or personal recognizance (PR)] ranging from \$250 to \$3,000, with a modal value of \$500, while 5 promised to appear (PTA) and another 15 required no bond but were released when sober. Of the defendants qualifying for secure release, 27 did so through a professional bondsman, at bail ranging from \$250 to \$15,000, with typical bails of \$500, \$1,000, and \$2,500. Another five persons posted cash bond ranging from \$200 to \$1,000, two posted real/personal property bond in the amounts of \$1,000 and \$2,500, and two provided corporate surety in amounts of \$250 and \$500. The remaining 92 (50%) defendants were detained, of whom 65 were eligible for release but unable to arrange it.

Arraignment level

Three types of outcome are possible at arraignment. First, defendants may be released while awaiting trial by either secured or unsecured means. Thirty-four persons (18%) were admitted to bail, with six given PR release and one each released by PTA and released when sober. Those awaiting trial as a consequence of secure release did so in most cases (15) by posting bond through a bondsman (ranging from \$500 to \$20,000), but 5 provided cash bond in amounts varying from \$500 to \$10,000 and 6 supplied corporate surety ranging from \$500 to \$2,500.

Second, cases may reach final disposition at arraignment. When this happened, 16 of the 22 cases were found guilty, and 6 were dismissed. All six not-guilty cases were in fact dismissed. Of the 16 found guilty, 1 was sentenced to prison, 11 were sentenced to jail, and 4 were fined. Three of this latter category, found guilty, had not been eligible for release.

Third, defendants may be bound over for a bond-reduction hearing. Of the 36 in this category, 16 were denied release, and 20 were not able to meet release conditions established by the court. In sum, 34 cases (18% of the original 185) were released at this level to await trial.

Bond-reduction level

Hearings to consider bond reduction were conducted for 13 defendants (7% of the arrestees), with detention being the final outcome before trial for 29 others (16%). They will be the focus of additional analysis later. Bond reductions resulted in release for four out of nine persons, with five still unable to meet bond requirements. All four posted secure bond, one through a bondsman, and three through corporate surety, cash, or personal property. Three out of four defendants unsuccessful in bond reductions managed release nonetheless, making bonds of \$2,000 through \$35,000 by corporate surety, cash, or personal property. Other than the findings that the median amount for those released was \$2,000, while the amount for those not released was \$35,000, no pattern was evident in the offenses for which those released had been charged, nor for those detained.

This level of release produced a relatively small number (seven, or 4%) of additional cases to await trial in the community.

Final detained cases are of special interest because they incur long-term bedspace investment by jail administrators. The data from this survey show that of 29 (1 out of every 6 cases in the original arrestee cohort) detained after bond-reduction hearings, 14 were denied bond, and 15 were unable to secure release although eligible to do so. Most of the detainees were felony cases (73%), while 24% were misdemeanants and 3% were ordinance violators. Violent offenses accounted for 24% and nonviolent offenses for 76% of the charges. For those unable, although eligible, to make bond, the median amount was \$20,000.

Drunkenness/DUI offenders numbered 55, of whom 45 (82%) were released at the magistrate level, with 42 unsecured and 3 secured. Another 10 (18%) were released at arraignment. Their stay in jail ranged from 2 hours to 2 days, with an average period of 7 hours. At this rate, almost 10,000 arrestees could be expected at these five jails in 1 year, consuming over 2,800 bed-days. This finding is consistent with previous studies that diversion of public drunkenness and DUI cases would have a dramatic impact on the awaiting-trial population.

Of the 61 commitments for felonies, 42 were approved for release at the magistrate level, and 19 were held for arraignment. Those obtaining release approval did not all return to the community; 26 did not, or could not, post bond, and 1 was released through an unsecured bond. Twenty-one felons were held through both arraignment and bond-reduction levels. For felons released pretrial, jail stays ranged from less than 24 hours to 40 days, with an average of 8.3 days. In the localities studied, this group utilized 332 bed-days; if extrapolated to a year, they could expect 7,300 felons requiring over 60,000 bed-days.

There were 69 misdemeanants or ordinance violators in the sample. Almost half (46%) were released at the first level, about evenly distributed by secured and unsecured means. Eight were held through the remaining two levels. For those individuals released pretrial, the average length of stay was 43 hours. This amounts to 108 bed-days for the five localities taken together and would by extension consume 19,600 bed-days for 10,900 arrestees in a year.

Length of stay can be calculated for the awaiting-trial population, referring back to the earlier trichotomy of felons, misdemeanants, and ordinance violators. Regardless of the type of "average" selected, mean or median, the data showed that felony cases spent about three to four times as many hours in jail as misdemeanor cases and that misdemeanor arrestees stay in jail twice as long as persons charged with ordinance violations.

Special attention was given to the release/bonding process by race and type of offense. As expected, release is most likely at the earliest level (magistrate) for less serious offenses, but an examination of the data by race shows no clear pattern. Bond amounts tend to be higher, generally speaking, at arraignment than at the first level (because lower bond cases have been released to the community), and they show, not unexpectedly, some decrease at the reduction hearings. By levels, the median and range for magistrate hearings are \$500 and \$150-\$100,000, respectively; for arraignments, they are \$750 and \$250-\$125,000, respectively; and for bond-reduction hearings, they are \$2,500 and \$250-\$100,000. No pattern was clearly observable in these amounts among the five localities. A last comparison showed that final bond amounts were greatest, as anticipated, for those not released (in contrast to those who were), but that no differences by race were apparent.

Summary and conclusions

The design phase of this project was informed by a series of richly detailed Virginia studies:

- Fairfax County, by National Institute of Corrections technical assistance consultants.
- Clarke-Frederick-Winchester, by the Department of Criminal Justice Services for their Jail Advisory Group.
- Albemarle/Charlottesville Joint Security Complex's practices and procedures, by the Department of Criminal Justice Services.
- The population jail management study of Richmond, conducted by Offender Aid and Restoration of Richmond, Inc., under contract with the Richmond Community Diversion Incentive Program.

The narrative developed earlier was organized in terms of case flow through three logically ordered stages of disposition: magistrate level, arraignment level, and bond-reduction level. Findings have been presented with respect to divertible subgroups of defendants, bed savings achievable through their diversion, and estimated time in jail experienced by offenders released or detained at each stage. The data gathered from the five representative Virginia jurisdictions during a typical "slice" of time were, for the most part, consistent with findings of other studies done of specific localities in the Commonwealth.

Among the findings of greatest interest were the following:

- Bond amounts showed considerable variation, but was generally not unaffordably excessive.

- Bond amounts did not show disproportionality among defendants, with the exception of slightly greater amounts required of drug offenders.
- As expected, felony cases had less mortality and incurred greater bond amounts than did lesser offenses.
- Bond amounts varied in predictable fashion from magistrate to bond-reduction levels.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: The study was undertaken specifically to address questions raised by the Governor's Commission on Prison and Jail Overcrowding. Findings from the study were incorporated in the Commission's report to the Governor.

Timeframe of the study: Spring 1989

Agencies involved: Virginia Department of Corrections

**Department of Criminal Justice Services Evaluation
of New River Community Sentencing, Inc.**

John G. Schuiteman, Ph.D., and Daniel E. Catley
Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services
805 East Broad Street
Richmond, VA 23219
(804) 674-3268

Objectives of the research: (1) To produce an accurate description of the New River Community Sentencing, Inc. (NRCS), goals, objectives, and operational procedures; (2) to assess the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of the NRCS program; and (3) to assess the program's impact on its participants and the local criminal justice community.

Research methodology: The process evaluation entailed four monitoring visits to NRCS offices, face-to-face or telephone interviews with NRCS staff and criminal justice professionals in the program area, analysis of caseload and client information, and a content analysis of NRCS records, reports, and operations manuals.

- Data sources—Program quarterly progress reports; interviews with 21 persons, including program staff, board members, judges, prosecutors, probation officers, defense attorneys, worksite supervisors; special requests to the NRCS Executive Director or other persons; and various NRCS manuals, reports, and records.

- Variables measured—Various caseload data; hours of community service performed and the estimated value thereof; value of fines and costs paid off via community sentencing; value of jail costs saved by the program's existence; number of clients removed from probation officer caseloads and the attendant savings incurred thereby; number of clients placed in jobs and the wages generated by these clients; number of client worksites utilized, added, or cancelled by type; and so forth.

The only statistics utilized were those required to summarize and describe program performance and to conduct the cost-benefit analysis.

Findings of the research: NRCS provides a sentencing alternative of proven benefit to the courts, law enforcement community, and clientele. NRCS staff supervised 1,192 community-sentence orders in FY 1986-87 (836 of which were newly issued during this period), and NRCS clients performed 30,670 hours of community service. Community sentencing orders were issued by 12 different courts to persons found guilty of 97 types of crime. Seventy-six percent of the clients were male, 90% were white, and 56% were below the age of 21.

Using four relatively hard measures of program benefit (estimated value of community service hours, savings in the cost of probation supervision, savings in jail costs, and allowed wages of NRCS clients placed in jobs by NRCS counselors), NRCS produced a cost-benefit ratio of \$1 in cost to \$1.04 in program benefit. Other, less quantifiable measures of program benefit clearly exist.

NRCS needs to reduce the size of counselor caseloads and increase worksite monitoring. Several areas of the NRCS *Policy and Procedures Manual* need improvement. A systematic method for training new staff and board members is needed. A mechanism for clarifying the relationship between NRCS and local probation and parole offices is needed.

NRCS enjoys an excellent reputation among criminal justice professionals in the New River area. NRCS has been successful in educating and informing area residents and media of the appropriate and beneficial aspects of community sentencing.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: The program has been refunded in all subsequent years and has expanded both its services and its area of jurisdiction.

Timeframe of the study: The evaluation was conducted from May 1987 to May 1988. Program caseload and performance data from FY 1986-87 were the primary data base used in the analysis.

Agencies involved: Department of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS)

Cost of the Study: No additional costs were incurred other than those necessary to pay the two DCJS staff persons assigned to conduct the study.

**Department of Criminal Justice Services Evaluation
of the Offender Aid and Restoration (OAR) Jail Services Program**

John G. Schuiteman, Ph.D., Richard G. Napoli,
and Daniel E. Catley
Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services
805 East Broad Street
Richmond, VA 23219
(804) 674-3268

Objectives of the research: (1) To produce an accurate description of the program's history, organization, operational procedures, recordkeeping and reporting, clientele, and day-to-day provision of services within five jail facilities; (2) to compare actual program services with those stated in the funding Request for Proposal (RFP) and Department of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS)/Offender Aid and Restoration (OAR) contract; (3) to describe all contributions and benefits of the program; and (4) to make all necessary recommendations to correct discrepancies and improve program performance.

Research methodology: Field visits to five jail sites were made, and extensive interviews with OAR staff and local jail administrators were conducted. Site-specific program descriptions were produced by exchanging written drafts with OAR Jail Services Program counselors.

- Data sources—Research data were generated from field visits to the jails and OAR headquarters, program quarterly progress reports, the OAR annual report and demographic survey of program clientele that are prepared at the request of United Way Services, and a questionnaire administered to OAR staff and jail administrators.
- Variables measured—Caseload data; client demographics; counts of services provided, including informational services; client referrals; enrollment data of program-sponsored groups (Prerelease, Family Life, AA, and SA); advocacy services involving communication between program counselors and family members; lawyers; vendors of food, shelter, and transportation; and educational, employment, and housing services.

The only statistics utilized were those required to summarize and describe program performance and to conduct the cost-benefit analysis.

Findings of the research: Although the program is in basic compliance with the requirements set forth in the OAR/DCJS contract, there are disparities between the program descriptions of the funding RFP and OAR/DCJS contract and the Jail Services Program as it exists in reality. Changes in the language of the authorizing documents and reassessment of the extent and type of postincarceration services offered by this program are recommended.

Program recordkeeping and reporting practices do not provide managers with the kind of information needed to describe their clientele, compare counselor caseloads, or make definitive statements about the impact of the program on client employability, recidivism, and social adjustment. Recommendations are made to rectify this situation.

Jail Services Program staff are competent and resourceful in the conduct of their work. Each counselor operates under a unique set of operational conditions within the jail facilities where they provide services. Given the constraints that exist in overcrowded jails that have limited programming resources, the contribution of the counselors in preparing the inmates for reentry into the community is commendable. The administrators of the jails are quick to applaud the program for its role in easing tensions in the facilities.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: The program continues to be funded and has been restructured by a new director who is working to implement the evaluation recommendations.

Prior instate studies: This program was evaluated in 1986 by the Agency Evaluation Committee of the United Way of Greater Richmond, Inc. (now United Way Services), the program's other major funding source. A nine-page report is available. This program was also examined in a 1975 nationwide evaluation of OAR programs conducted by MetaMetrics, Inc., of Washington, D.C.

Timeframe of the study: The evaluation was conducted from February 1990 to October 1990. Program caseload and performance data from FY 1989-90 were the primary data base used in the evaluation.

Agencies involved: DCJS

Cost of the study: No additional costs were incurred other than those necessary to pay the two DCJS staff persons assigned to conduct the study.

**Department of Criminal Justice Services Evaluation
of the Peninsula Marine Institute, Inc.**

John G. Schuiteman, Ph.D., and Daniel E. Catley
Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services
805 East Broad Street
Richmond, VA 23219
(804) 674-3268

Objectives of the research: (1) To produce an accurate description of the Peninsula Marine Institute's (PMI's) operational procedures, recordkeeping, reporting, clientele, and day-to-day provision of services; (2) to determine whether PMI fulfilled its contractual obligations with the Virginia Department of Corrections; (3) to determine whether PMI served a unique and productive role in the local criminal justice system; and (4) to determine whether PMI operated in a cost-effective manner.

Research methodology: Fourteen trips were made to PMI to observe their classes and graduation ceremonies, review PMI administrative and recordkeeping practices, examine student records, and interview local probation counselors, juvenile judges, PMI staff members, and the directors or staff of nine other treatment programs in the Peninsula/Tidewater area of Virginia.

- Data sources—PMI student records, including criminal history, family history, drug abuse or mental health treatment history, and educational history; the PMI *Policy and Procedures Manual*; class materials; questionnaires used in the survey of area judges, juvenile justice professionals, and PMI staff members; and numerous conversations with PMI students and staff.
- Variables measured—Student enrollment, attendance, academic achievement, graduation or termination; criminal history (including a measure of the seriousness of this history based on the number and type of offenses committed); demographic characteristics, job placement; recidivism; and cost factors that allow comparison to other treatment or sentencing alternatives.

The only statistics utilized were those required to summarize and describe program performance and conduct the cost-benefit analysis.

Findings of the research: In its first year of operation, PMI was cost effective. The estimated monthly cost per student was between \$908 and \$1,294. The comparable cost for a juvenile committed to a learning center is \$2,702; for juveniles placed in "286" residential programs, \$3,210.

There is confusion among probation counselors and judges about the criteria used to admit or discharge a juvenile from the program.

PMI needs to improve its performance with regard to vocational skills training, aftercare services, individualized counseling, staff compensation, interface with local school systems, student recordkeeping, and student screening and referral (recruitment).

PMI has garnered widespread support among the probation counselors, judges, and other juvenile justice professionals in the area.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: The program continues to be funded and has been restructured by a new director who is working to implement the evaluation recommendations. (Note: PMI now contracts with the Virginia Department of Youth and Family Services.)

Timeframe of the study: The evaluation was conducted from February 1989 to December 1989. Program caseload and performance data from FY 1988-89 were the primary data base used in the evaluation.

Agencies involved: Department of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS)

Cost of the study: No additional costs were incurred other than those necessary to pay the two DCJS staff persons assigned to conduct the study.

Electronic Offender Monitoring in Virginia: Evaluation Report

John R. Kuplinski
Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services
805 East Broad Street
Richmond, VA 23219
(804) 225-4567

Objectives of the research: (1) To provide a brief history of electronic monitoring (EM) throughout the Nation and Virginia, (2) to analyze client data to generate caseload statistics and describe program operation and the type of participants, and (3) to perform a cost analysis.

Research methodology: The purpose of this report is to provide a more detailed assessment of Virginia's experience with electronic offender monitoring. To provide a degree of perspective, a brief history of the national experience is contained in the report. The report also contains a historical overview of program implementation in the Commonwealth. The largest portion of the report contains an analysis of client data to generate caseload statistics and identify the types of offenders participating in Virginia's local programs. A financial section is included that analyzes the costs of the various programs. Conclusions and recommendations are offered at the end of the report.

The primary data source for the report was a statistical information packet that the four programs funded through the Department of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS) in FY 1989-90 were required to complete for each offender placed in the respective programs. Client data were collected on the following broad topic areas: offender demographic information, type of offense and referral method, violations, length of placement and reason for termination, and supervision fees collected.

Findings of the research:

Virginia within the national perspective

Although Virginia established its first programs shortly after electronic monitoring began to be used by the criminal justice system, the Commonwealth lags behind many States in terms of the number of programs operating, total number of offenders participating, and the range of agencies supervising offenders by means of electronic technology. However, beginning in 1989, the Commonwealth has experienced dramatic growth in the number of programs operating, with a concomitant rise in the number of offenders served. Unlike in other States, EM in Virginia is a local program, primarily serving jail inmates. Except for the recent appropriation to the Parole Board and isolated cases within several local programs, the use of EM as a supervision tool for probationers is nonexistent.

Virginia programs

The report demonstrates that the six programs currently operating have many commonalities. The two most prominent of these common characteristics are that most participants have been sentenced to jail and that most programs are run by the sheriff's office, utilizing the release authority granted to nonjudicial personnel under Section 53.1-131.2. The report also demonstrates that the programs vary widely in terms of the monitoring systems used, methods of equipment acquisition, types of offenders placed, time spent on home arrest, and general program operation.

The variations between the programs are appropriate to address local needs and are acceptable within State guidelines. It is recognized that electronic monitoring should be designed and operated in a manner that best meets the needs of the local jail, the local criminal justice system, and the community. From all indications, the programs appear to be designed and operated according to the needs of the localities that are presently funding these programs or will be funding them after the initial grant period expires. The variations also provide a knowledge base on what works in particular environments. This base will serve DCJS well in any future evaluation endeavors and in its present responsibility to provide technical assistance to current and future users of the technology.

Caseloads and utilization rates

The data indicate that the newly established EM programs in Chesterfield and Frederick have a higher average daily caseload than the programs that have been operating since 1986. Several reasons were offered that could help explain this finding. The major reasons cited were the fact that the newly established programs were implemented with full-time staff in place and began operation after Section 53.1-131.2 was created. The report also indicates that the Fairfax and Norfolk programs have experienced a significant increase in their average daily caseloads since July 1, 1989.

Each of the programs, however, appears to be underutilizing its service potential, if the primary focus is placed on a comparison of the average daily caseload in relation to the number of monitoring units available. This is, however, a rather simplistic measure of whether the programs are operating to their fullest potential. First, it must be recognized that the daily caseload statistic is a calculated average that incorporates both high and low periods of program activity. These periods of program activity can be affected by the availability of staff to adequately monitor a particular number of offenders or, since jail populations are dynamic, it is also possible that a pool of eligible offenders may not always be present in the jail. Second, it is often unreasonable to expect that all the monitoring units a program possesses are available for use. Although the percentage will vary among different types of equipment and vendors, a rule of thumb often employed is that on a given day, 20% of a program's monitoring units will be undergoing routine maintenance and repair.

In light of the above discussion, the following questions are more appropriate measures of program functioning and effectiveness: Are offenders placed in such programs truly "jail bound"? Are the programs protecting public safety? Do the programs offer a less expensive method for sanctioning offenders than incarceration? Do the programs meet the needs of the local criminal justice system and its larger community?

Net-widening

The data indicate that approximately one-quarter of the placements to electronic monitoring occurred as a result of direct court orders made at the time of sentencing. When individual programs were examined, it was found that over three-quarters of the direct court orders in Fairfax were made at the time of sentencing. Although it could not be documented whether these offenders were truly "jail bound," the literature indicates that this decision point is where the net is most likely to be widened.

Success rates and protecting public safety

Virginia's EM programs have been extremely successful in operating in a manner that minimizes the risks to public safety. Approximately 90% of the participants examined completed their electronic monitoring terms successfully. Of the 37 offenders termed program failures, only 2 were terminated due to the commission of a new offense, and only 1 was terminated due to an attempt to escape. The remaining unsuccessful offenders were terminated due to technical violations of program rules and regulations. The 10% failure rate of the Virginia programs was found to be significantly less than the 25% national rate discussed in the Renzema and Skelton national survey.

The failure rates between individual programs ranged from a low of approximately 4% to a high of approximately 16%. The data lend credence to the argument that the disparate violation rates are probably more a function of selection and revocation policy decisions made by the various program staff than a case of technology success or failure. Compared to the programs with low violation rates, the program with the highest violation rate had the highest level of staff scrutiny, greatest extent of substance abuse testing, lowest use of warnings in response to technical violations, and highest placements via direct court order as opposed to staff selection after observation in work release.

Impact on jail populations and the cost of incarceration

The assessment of the impact and cost of EM programs in the Commonwealth indicates that computer technology, coupled with sound selection criteria and proper staffing, can affect a locality's jail population and the cost of incarceration without affecting public safety. However, several misconceptions have arisen: The first misconception is that EM programs can significantly reduce a locality's jail population. This view is false both conceptually and in terms of the actual performance of the EM programs examined. Despite the best efforts of all concerned, the various programs are only diverting approximately 9-11 offenders on a daily basis. This represents a small percentage of the jail population in each of the localities operating such programs.

The second misconception is that EM programs are self-sustaining. This report demonstrates that the true cost of operating these programs entails much more than the leasing or purchasing of equipment. Depending on a particular program's complexity, the actual cost of operating such programs can be significant. Although the programs cost less per offender day than incarceration, supervision fees alone do not appear to be sufficient to cover total EM program costs.

The final misconception is that these EM programs are largely defined by the acquisition of equipment. Despite their relatively low caseloads, these programs are very complex in terms of operation. Placements of offenders on the technology do not simply consist of hooking an individual up to a machine and sending him or her home. Each placement involves a time-consuming process requiring screening, interviewing, home inspections to determine suitability, data entry, and training. Once EM is placed, ongoing personal contact is required to supplement the monitoring system and intervene when the computer detects a violation. In short, EM should be viewed as a program that requires sufficient staff to divert as many offenders as possible in a manner that does not compromise public safety.

Recommendations

- Support for a new program—At a minimum, the Commonwealth should continue to provide grants to localities to encourage expanded use of the technology. The \$300,000 that was made available for each of the past 2 fiscal years and is budgeted for fiscal year 1991-92 allows for the implementation of four to six new programs each year. Given that these programs can still be termed "experimental," the Commonwealth may wish to continue the current funding levels to allow for moderate expansion guided by research and evaluation findings, as they become available.
- Support for ongoing programs—The Commonwealth may also wish to consider a mechanism for funding ongoing programs after the grant period expires. If such an option is chosen, initial funds provided by the Commonwealth could be for the purpose of acquiring monitoring equipment, with subsequent funding to be generated by a combination of local tax dollars and supervision fees paid by participants. Supplementary funding by the Commonwealth appears to be most needed in the area of program staffing.
- The need for continued evaluation—Despite the quantity of information contained in this report, the assessment should not be looked upon as definitive. Time and resources did not allow for detailed analysis of potential net-widening. In addition, examination of certain topics (for example, characteristics of offenders who violate rules and regulations) was not possible because of the low number of cases available for analysis. Therefore, it is recommended that current and future electronic programs be continually under examination.

Timeframe of the study: 1986-90

Agencies involved: DCJS

Cost of the study: \$15,000

Final Report of Virginia's Commission on Prison and Jail Overcrowding

John G. Schuiteman, Ph.D., Richard G. Napoli,
and Daniel E. Catley
Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services
805 East Broad Street
Richmond, VA 23219
(804) 674-3268

Objectives of the research: To develop recommendations to address prison and jail overcrowding.

Research methodology: Compared to the Nation, Virginia is a relatively low-crime State. However, its courts incarcerate higher proportions of criminals, give longer sentences to them, and are inclined to use alternatives such as probation less often than in the Nation as a whole. Virginia's parole rate is low, and the availability of intensive probation or parole supervision is extremely limited. In addition, although the number of offenders diverted through the Community Diversion Incentive Program has increased over time, this incarceration alternative has not stemmed the growth in the incarcerated population and has sometimes "widened the net."

While the crime rate in Virginia, particularly for violent crime, has remained relatively stable over this decade, Virginia's inmate population has grown steadily. In July 1983 there were 14,833 inmates in Virginia's prisons and jails; in July 1989 there were 24,851. Since 1983, Virginia's incarcerated population has grown on the average by more than 8.9% annually. State facilities are approximately 22% over capacity statewide. Still, in October 1989, there were over 3,000 State felons with more than 6 months to serve in local jails, awaiting transfer to State prisons and further straining local jail capacities. Local jails are at 23% of their capacity, while others, in less populated areas, are operating at or below capacity.

In response, the Governor and the General Assembly authorized a 45% increase, over a 3-year period, in the capacity of the State system, at a capital cost of \$232,000,736. Localities have been slower to increase the capacity of jails, but recent jail expansion projects will achieve a 31% increase in jail capacity statewide by 1992. Considerable expansion, particularly the construction of regional jails, is planned for the near future.

The crowding problem, however, will continue. The population for which the State is responsible is expected to grow dramatically over the next decade. By the year 2000, the State will be responsible for more than twice as many felons as are projected for fiscal year 1990. A large increase—163%—in the local jail population is expected over the next decade.

Recognizing the need to address both the short- and long-term pressures on the criminal justice system, Governor Gerald L. Baliles proposed to the 1989 session of the General Assembly the establishment of the Commission on Prison and Jail Overcrowding (COPJO). House Joint Resolution 402, approved by the General Assembly, established the Commission's charge: "The Commission shall examine the relationship, interdependence, financing, and functions of the State and local penal systems. It shall review the procedure and methodology for projecting demand. The Commission shall assess Virginia's and other States' approaches to pretrial detention, alternative sentencing,

housing of various categories of nonviolent offenders, inmate work and educational activity, substance abuse and other rehabilitative programs, prerelease counseling, and postrelease supervision."

The Commission was composed of 4 members of the State Senate and 6 members of the House of Delegates, appointed by the heads of those bodies, and 15 citizen members, appointed by the Governor. There were also 24 advisory members appointed by the Governor to assist the Commission in its work. The work of the Commission was organized into four committees: Inmate Management, Space Requirements, Legal/Legislative Issues, and State/Local Responsibility. The Commission met six times, and each committee met nine times, between April and mid-November. The Commission reported its conclusions and recommendations to the Governor and the General Assembly in December 1989.

The Commission was supported in its work by the Bureau of Justice Assistance's Prison Capacity Program, which provided administrative staff, expertise, and consultant and other funding (\$125,000 total).

In January 1990 the Governor released the final report of the Commission. The 55 recommendations covered a broad range of approaches, including the following:

- Methods for improving the efficiency of pretrial processes
- Changes in the rates for earning "good time" in jails and in the frequency of reviews for adjustments in prisons
- Improvements to the process of forecasting prison and jail populations, including a 10-year horizon
- Improvements in criminal justice information systems and statewide research
- Completion of research on the development of parole guidelines and risk assessment instruments
- Initiation of probation services for misdemeanants and local felons
- Expanded electronic monitoring programs
- Improvements in prison and jail construction processes and practices
- Provision of resources for education, vocational training, and treatment for inmates in jails and prisons

Findings of the research: The findings illustrate two key points: (1) that the current problem of overcrowding is affecting all major phases of the criminal justice system and (2) that the current approaches taken by Virginia's criminal justice system may not adequately meet the future challenges of continued growth in incarceration.

- While Virginia's violent crime rate has remained relatively constant over the past 16 years, the number of total arrests made annually has increased almost every year since 1975.
- The total number of sworn officers in Virginia increased from 10,085 in 1981 to 12,061 in 1988. Improvements in law enforcement approaches and technology have also contributed to more arrests.
- Felony arrests for the sale and/or manufacture of opium, cocaine, and cocaine derivatives in 1988 was over 300% greater than the number of similar arrests in 1985. The number of felony drug convictions has been growing at a 21.6% average annual rate since 1985.
- The number of persons held awaiting trial in local jails has doubled in the past 6 years, and currently half of the statewide jail population is awaiting trial or awaiting sentencing. The number of defendants held pretrial without any release has increased by 21% over the past 3 years.
- While the rate of violent crime in Virginia is lower than that of most States, sentence lengths for violent crimes in Virginia tend to be longer than the national average. The proportion of inmates in Virginia serving 20 years or longer now stands at 42.7% and is among the highest in the Nation.
- Over the past decade, the average sentence length for confined felons in Virginia increased more than 24%.
- While probation is the State's most frequently used alternative to incarceration, in 1987 only five States had an adult probation rate that was lower than Virginia's.
- In 1987, Virginia had 141.5 adults per 100,000 adult population on parole, which is lower than the national average of 196.4.
- While statewide jail capacity increased 24% over the past 6 years, total jail population increased by 104%.
- While capacity at State institutions will increase by 46% over a 4-year period and an additional 5,402 prison beds will be added, prison overcrowding will remain a serious problem in Virginia. (Source: Commission staff analysis.)

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: In its 1990 session, the Virginia Legislature revised the Code of Virginia to effect a number of the Commission's recommendations. The 1990 Appropriations Act mandated that those Commission recommendations not acted upon during the session be made a priority for action and be tracked by the Secretaries of Public Safety and Administration. Activity continues to affect the priority recommendations of the Commission, and the final report continues to serve as a policy guidance document for the legislature and for public safety agencies.

Timeframe of the study: 1980-2000

Agencies involved: Department of Planning and Budget; Department of Corrections; Department of Criminal Justice Services

Health Locus of Control of Female Inmates From the Virginia Correctional Center for Women (VCCW) Measured by the MHLC Scale

Jan E. Zehner Moore and Diane McDermott, Ph.D.
University of Kansas
Department of Counseling Psychology
(913) 864-3931

Janine Cox
Kansas Court of Appeals
Lawrence, KS 66045
(913) 864-3931

Objectives of the research: To provide investigative and descriptive research to determine inmates' perceptions of the personal control they may have of their health.

Research methodology: One hundred and sixty-one female inmates from the Virginia Correctional Center for Women participated in the study. The Multidimensional Health Locus of Control (MHLC) Scale was used to collect data for this project. A simple correlation between forms A (N = 158) and B (N = 154) showed the similarity of the forms to be consistent with what has been reported in the literature. The Z-score statistic was used to compare results between female inmates and normal healthy adults.

Findings of the research: "Internal" control was significantly lower for female inmates on all three tests, and "chance" control was significantly higher on two of the tests. "Powerful others" control did not differ. These results may be explainable from characteristics of a prison environment, such as encouraged dependence, low control over surroundings, and lack of an adequate prison health staff and facilities. No relationship was found between health locus of control and reported frequency and degree of health problems.

Timeframe of the study: Data were gathered in 1987, and the article was completed in 1988.

Agencies involved: Virginia Correctional Center for Women

Cost of the study: The cost was absorbed by the researchers (less than \$100,000).

Jail Population Management Study for Winchester, Frederick, and Clarke

John R. Kuplinski
Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services
805 East Broad Street
Richmond, VA 23219
(804) 225-4567

Objectives of the research: (1) To identify the factors that influence a local jail's population and the impact of case processing on the jail population and (2) to provide recommendations to facilitate efficient and effective use of jail bedspace.

Research methodology: The report was designed to provide information regarding the processing of offenders through the criminal justice systems operating in the communities of Winchester, Frederick, and Clarke. The primary focus of the study is the identification of factors that appear to determine the size and composition of the jail populations in the three localities. Most of the data concerning general population levels, crime rates, and arrest activity were gathered from annual *Crime in Virginia* reports compiled by the Virginia State Police. Supplementary data were provided by the State Police and the arresting agencies operating in the three jurisdictions. Data on average daily population and length of stay was provided by staff of the Joint Confinement and Corrections Operations Project. Finally, court statistics were gathered from the annual *State of the Judiciary* report compiled by the Supreme Court of Virginia.

Findings of the research:

Trends in the jail population

The regional jail population has undergone two periods of growth during the 1980's. The period from 1981 through 1984 was characterized as a period of declining average daily population. During this period, the region's average daily population declined approximately 28%. The second stage encompassed the period from 1985 through October 1988 and was characterized as a period of growth in the jail population. During this period, the region's average daily population increased approximately 45%.

Analysis indicated that changes in the jail population since 1983 have been almost equally influenced by changes in the average length of stay and the volume of admissions to jail. The degree of impact of these causal factors, however, differed by jurisdiction. An attempt was made to examine some of the causes behind the growth in admissions to jail and average length of stay. Regional admissions to jail were strongly influenced by general population growth and, to a lesser extent, the number of arrests.

Detailed historical data were not available to enable study of the factors behind the changes in average length of stay. Although impact could not be measured, the demise of some of the alternative programs operating prior to June 1985 helps to explain the rising average daily populations experienced in recent years. The loss of the Community Alternatives Program, the Sentence Alternative Program, and the Fine Option Program has significantly decreased the range of sentencing options available to the general district court.

Arrest trends since 1985

An examination of arrest data since 1985 indicates that arrests for drug offenses are the primary reason for both the pattern of increasing arrests and the dramatic rise in the jail population. Regional arrests for drug offenses went from 88 in 1985 to 216 in 1988, a 145% increase. This increase is substantially higher than the 34% increase in drug arrests experienced statewide during the same timespan. The average pretrial length of stay for all traffic detainees was 6.2 days, while detained misdemeanants had an average length of stay of 3.9 days.

Felons were more likely to be detained by the magistrate and more likely to be detained throughout case processing. Fifty-nine percent of the felons were detained by the magistrate. Unlike traffic and misdemeanor detainees, only 20% of the detained felons were able to secure pretrial release prior to their first court appearance. The average pretrial length of stay for all felony detainees was 63.4 days.

The number of defendants released on unsecured bonds and the number of defendants whose bonds were adjusted upon further review indicate that magistrates and judges are able to prevent a large number of defendants from being detained upon arrest; if they are detained, efforts are made to reduce their length of stay. For example, 69% of all defendants released by the magistrate, at the bond hearing or shortly after detention, were released on an unsecured bond (traffic = 89%, misdemeanor = 59%, and felony = 66%). The data also indicate that 84% of the felons whose initial bond hearing was held by a circuit court judge on the day of direct indictment by the grand jury were released pretrial. Of these releases, 90% of the felons were released on an unsecured bond.

A second measure of accelerated release practices was the rate at which detained defendants had their initial bonds adjusted by either the magistrate or the judiciary. Over one-third (38%) of the detained misdemeanants and traffic offenders able to obtain pretrial release before their first court appearance were released on an unsecured bond. In other words, a fairly large portion of the misdemeanor and traffic offenders were initially committed to jail by the magistrate with a subsequent bond review performed shortly after the defendant's detention. According to the chief magistrate, it is not uncommon for defendants to be detained to await for sobriety, further information, or arrival of a third party. Release on an unsecured bond may occur once the magistrate's concerns are answered satisfactorily.

The data available to us indicate that factors such as type of offense, sex of the defendant, residence, demeanor, legal status at arrest, and prior arrest history appear to play a role in pretrial decisionmaking.

Impact of judicial processing on the jail population

The general district courts operating within the region were able to expedite the case processing of nonfelony traffic and misdemeanor cases. Detained defendants were brought to arraignment within a median of 3 days, compared to 24 days for those released pretrial. The median interval from arrest to final disposition of detained traffic and misdemeanor offenders was 5 days, compared to 39 days for those defendants able to secure pretrial release. Approximately 67% of the released defendants had case processing times longer than 30 days, compared to 5% of the detained defendants.

One of the reasons nonfelony traffic and misdemeanor detainees had shorter case processing times was that very few of these cases experienced a continuance. Approximately 67% of the detained defendants pled to the original primary offense at arrest, compared to 48% of the released defendants. Only 3% of the detained defendants went to trial, compared to 20% of the released defendants.

It appeared that all three general district courts expedited the processing of nondirect indictment felony detention cases.

The Circuit Court also appeared to expedite the processing of nondirect indictment felony detention cases. However, unlike the general district courts, significant differences were found between the localities in terms of their intervals from preliminary hearing to final disposition.

Impact of sentencing practices on the jail population

Defendants arrested for nonfelony traffic offenses had a conviction rate of 92%. Approximately 81% of the nonfelony traffic convictions result in the imposition of fines and/or court costs as the primary sanction. Nineteen percent of the nonfelony traffic convictions resulted in the imposition of a jail sentence. The average jail sentence imposed was 39 days. However, the average actual postsentence length of stay was 19.5 days.

Defendants arrested for misdemeanor charges had the lowest conviction rates found within the region (57%). Approximately 74% of the misdemeanor convictions resulted in the imposition of fines and/or court costs as the primary sanction. Three percent of the convicted misdemeanants received a probationary term as the primary sanction. Approximately 23% of the misdemeanor convictions resulted in the imposition of a jail sentence. As for type of offense at arrest, 13% of the defendants originally arrested for misdemeanors were given a jail sentence, compared to 43% of the defendants originally arrested for felony offenses. The average jail term imposed was 76 days. However, the average actual postsentence length of stay was approximately 42 days.

Defendants arrested for felony offenses had an 80% conviction rate. Approximately 16% of the convictions were pleas to misdemeanor offenses. Of the defendants convicted of felony offenses, only 2% had fines or court costs imposed as the primary sanction. Approximately 17% of the defendants convicted of felony offenses were given some form of community supervision as the primary sanction (probation = 9% and MAGNET = 8%). When defendants given split sentences are included, 78% of all defendants convicted of felonies had community supervision imposed.

Timeframe of the study: 1986 and 1987

Agencies involved: Department of Criminal Justice Services

Cost of the study: \$50,000

A Methodology for Forecasting Local Jail Populations in Virginia

Tammy Meredith Poulos, John P. Jarvis,
Kim S. Hunt, and Tony Casale
Criminal Justice Research Center
Department of Criminal Justice Services
805 East Broad Street
Richmond, VA 23219
(804) 225-4395

Objectives of the research: (1) To review jail population projection methods and (2) to propose new techniques for future projections, including statistical and simulation approaches.

Research methodology: The first step in developing a local jail inmate projection is to define the population to be projected. The "local-responsible population" includes all offenders housed in jail, with the exception of those available for transfer to the State correctional system. The local jail population projection methodology proposed by the Criminal Justice Research Center is designed to project the total number of inmates under local correctional responsibility. The methodology is designed to address three objectives:

1. Development of an annual projection of the number of persons confined in local jails at the end of each fiscal year through the year 2000.
2. Production of an annual projection of the number of beds required to accommodate the local jail population at the end of each fiscal year.
3. Development of a methodology to assist localities in their determination of jail construction and management needs through technical assistance with local population forecasting.

Phase I of the current methodology addresses the first objective—production of an annual projection of the number of persons confined in local jails at the end of each fiscal year. Factors influencing the yearend confined jail population fall into two conceptual groups: demographic variables and criminal justice variables. Demographic indicators might include a measure of the "at risk" population in Virginia, groups with statistically high rates of criminal activity, and the percentage of the population unemployed. Such measures represent indicators of the potential criminal population. Criminal justice variables include several indicators of the volume of criminal activity likely to affect jail populations: the number of offenses reported to the police, the number of arrests, the number of criminal court filings, and the type of sentences received by criminal defendants. The exact model, however, may vary depending on the availability and reliability of the data sources.

A number of statistical procedures will be examined in the production of an initial forecast. These include techniques relied upon in past jail projections, such as ratio methods, univariate and multivariate time series (ARIMA) procedures, multiple regression, and exponential smoothing. The initial projection methodology is intended to improve upon current statistical practices in two ways. First, the projection will examine several indicators of both demographic and criminal justice variables, creating more reliable measurements of these factors and their effects on local jail populations. Second, more sophisticated principles of statistical modeling will be considered. These enhanced statistical methods may specify more precisely the relationships among the factors that are likely to influence local jail populations.

Although the statistical methodology proposed in phase I represents an improvement over current jail population projection methodologies, it has a number of limitations. First, this methodology is unable to account for the movement or processing of cases through the criminal justice system. The criminal justice system is dynamic. A static, aggregate statistical model is unable to account for a constantly changing jail population. Second, the phase I methodology is unable to directly account for legislative, policy, and procedural changes that affect statewide jail populations.

Fortunately, new technologies in forecasting make sophisticated simulation models of the criminal justice system possible, permitting a forecast of jail populations that will model the progress of each jail inmate through the criminal justice system. Simulation technology applied to jail population forecasting will also provide localities and the Commonwealth with a means of proactively assessing criminal justice policy and practice.

If funding is granted, this phase will meet the second and third objectives of the current methodology through use of a policy simulation forecasting model. The proposed simulation model will estimate at least three large subpopulations affecting total jail populations: admissions, confinements, and releases. The first step in constructing such a model is to examine the criminal justice and correctional systems in Virginia to determine each decision stage affecting each subpopulation. Offenders enter local jails in Virginia in three ways: they enter as a result of an arrest, enter as a result of a court activity decision, or reenter with a violation of probation or parole release. Offenders can exit jails in four ways: they can be released as a result of a judicial decision, they can be transferred to prison, or they can exit with or without parole. The second step in constructing a simulation model is to collect data on the flow of offenders through the criminal justice system. The Prison and Jail Forecasting Policy Committee will select a number of local jails as study sites. Finally, the third step in this proposed methodology is to develop a method to assist localities in determining their jail construction needs through technical assistance.

These data will be used by the simulation model to re-create the movement of inmates through jail and to project future movements. Once refined, the simulation model will produce an annual projection of the number of beds required to accommodate Virginia's local jail population. The simulation model will also allow for the assessment of legislative, policy, or procedural changes that may affect the jail population. For example, if parole grant rates increase by 20%, the simulation model may provide information concerning the impact of this change on jail populations.

Issues and objectives

Forecasts of correctional population dynamics provide State and local governments with information for budgeting and planning various criminal justice capital and operating expenditures. Clearly, the accuracy of these forecasts affects the success of such planning and resource allocation efforts. Overprojection generally results in needless appropriation of resources to criminal justice institutions, while underprojection can compromise the correctional system's ability to adequately ensure the public's safety.

The Virginia Department of Corrections has extensively examined factors that affect prison populations, but relatively little research has been conducted concerning the factors that affect local jail populations. Therefore, the Criminal Justice Research Center of the Department of Criminal Justice Services has been directed to identify and assess these factors and to develop a methodology for forecasting local jail populations. This report describes the history of jail population forecasting in Virginia, the factors likely to affect jail population forecasts, and the Research Center's proposed methodology and schedule for improving the Commonwealth's jail population forecasts.

This workplan outlines the development of the methodology in the following areas. First, the history of local jail forecasting efforts is presented. This historical profile clearly demonstrates the need for systematic annual projections of these populations. The accuracy of all of the methods employed over the years has varied. The most recent forecasts of local jail populations overproject annual population levels by approximately 20% at midyear. Speculation regarding the sources of this recent overprediction has ranged from the increased backlog of State inmates in local facilities to unexpected declines in drug-related arrests. However, there is little empirical evidence to indicate the basis of this overprediction. The development of future jail population projection methods may improve forecast accuracy and local jail planning efforts.

Second, this workplan details the annual consensus process employed to produce an official correctional inmate population forecast. The forecasts of State and local inmate populations in Virginia are currently developed through a series of consensus meetings held each year. The population forecast for State-responsible inmates is used to plan for prison construction needs and daily operating costs. The population forecast of local-responsible inmates currently is used to estimate per diem payments to local jails for the maintenance of State and local prisoners.

Third, this workplan outlines the methodological issues involved in improving Virginia's local jail population forecasting. In considering these issues, the Criminal Justice Research Center has consulted with a wide variety of Federal, State, and local criminal justice professionals with expertise in research and development of correctional population forecasting models.

During the first phase of this proposed methodology, the Research Center will develop a statistical model reflecting the demographic and criminal justice system impacts upon the dynamics of local jail populations. This methodology will produce an initial projection that will be examined by the Prison and Jail Forecasting Policy Committee, which will consider adjusting the projection to account for policies, procedures, or practices likely to affect future inmate populations. The second phase of this research methodology features a policy simulation forecasting model designed not only to produce projections, but also to assess policies, practices, and programs affecting local jail populations.

Agencies involved: Criminal Justice Research Center

Parole Risk Factor Scale for Estimating Parole Risks in Virginia

Virginia Parole Board
6900 Atmore Drive
Richmond, VA 23225
(804) 674-3081

Objectives of the research: (1) To identify the factors most highly associated with parole success or failure and (2) to use these factors to build a scoring system for assessing risk.

Research methodology: Cross-tabulation analysis was used to identify variables that were associated with parolees committing another felony after being paroled. From this analysis, 58 different factors were determined to be at least moderately related to whether the inmate committed another felony.

Correlation analysis, which measures the strength and direction of a relationship between two variables, was performed to identify and eliminate all predictors of recidivism that were correlated with race and sex.

To prevent redundancies in the data that inappropriately lower or raise an inmate's risk score, correlation analysis was again used to group certain factors. For example, if two factors demonstrated equally strong relationships with recidivism but were highly correlated, only one of these factors was used to calculate the inmate's risk score. If these same factors did not have a statistical correlation that was greater than 0.20, each was treated as a separate predictor of risk. This analysis resulted in the selection of 11 groups of factors to predict an inmate's new felony risk.

Weights were assigned to each of those factors in the 11 groups that exhibited either a very strong, strong, or moderate relationship to committing a new felony. The following weighting scheme was used for these categories: very strong indicators were assigned a maximum weight of 40 points, strong indicators were assigned a maximum of 30 points, and moderate indicators were assigned a maximum of 25 points. Other possible responses were assigned points according to the researcher's interpretation of their relative strength as predictors of recidivism. If the value for a particular variable was missing for some inmates, a default score based on the average value for the response in the entire data set was used.

Because the number of independent variables being screened for possible association with each dependent variable was quite large (82), sample bifurcation was employed to reduce the likelihood of chance correlation. The sample was split into two on the basis of the record number; the 2,059 odd numbers made up one subsample, and the 2,058 even numbers made up the other. Then, all analyses were performed on each subsample separately, and the results were compared. The strengths of the conclusions were determined on the basis of both the general association with the dependent variables and on the agreement between the two subsamples.

Findings of the research: The indicators for a new felony conviction within 2 years are listed below:

Very strong indicators

- The current total sentence the inmate must satisfy for parole release is more than 10 years.
- The most serious offense ever was burglary, robbery, assault and battery, or sexual assault.

Strong indicators

- Parole type discretionary (Department of Corrections data base)
- Consecutive sentence
- Age at first commitment less than 21 years (age at first commitment 21 years or older is associated with a lower likelihood of new felonies)
- One or more Disciplinary Action Reports prior to current release
- At least one Disciplinary Action Report for aggressive offense prior to current release
- More than two prior adult felony convictions (prior to current offense); at least one juvenile probation
- At least 1 year on juvenile probation in prior history
- At least one discharge from juvenile probation in prior history
- At least one revocation of juvenile probation in prior history
- At least one revocation of adult probation in prior history
- At least one prior adult parole
- At least one revocation of adult parole in prior history
- At least one escape while incarcerated
- At least one absconding while on probation or parole

Moderate indicators

- Age at time of parole release 25 years or less
- Drug use (heroin or marijuana) (no drug use is strongly associated with a lower likelihood of new felonies)

- Totally concurrent sentence to satisfy current commitment
- Longest time on current commitment spent in medium security (inmates who spend the longest time in maximum security have the lowest likelihood of a new felony on parole)
- Most serious offense on current sentence is burglary or robbery
- At least one prior parole revocation
- Juvenile record and State ward training school
- At least 35 months served prior to release (inmates serving 11 months or less have the lowest likelihood of new felonies)
- One or more Disciplinary Action Reports prior to current release
- One major Disciplinary Action Report prior to current release
- Known aliases
- One or more prior adult misdemeanor convictions
- Age at first arrest less than 18 years
- Age at first conviction less than 18 years
- Unemployed or only sporadically employed during 5 prior years (employment is strongly associated with lower rates of new felonies)
- At least three adult probations in prior history
- At least 24 months of adult probation in prior history
- At least one adult probation discharge in prior history
- Verbal IQ less than 90
- Parole type discretionary (hard-copy data file); one or two interviews

Weak indicators

- Sex—male
- Marital status—single
- Last academic grade completed—10th

- Unemployed
- One or more times in isolation
- One or more times in segregation
- Regressive custody assignments—minimum to medium or medium to maximum (if victim died, inmate has low likelihood of new felony on parole)
- Attempt to escape
- Substance abuse
- Marital/relationship problems noted on parole supervision report for this release

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: Following testing of the proposed risk scale, the Virginia Parole Board adopted a Parole Risk Scale for New Felonies for incorporation into its Parole Guidelines Model, to be implemented January 1, 1992.

Timeframe of the study: The study group consisted of all Virginia inmates serving time for felony convictions who were released on parole between July 1, 1984, and June 30, 1985. The total sample consisted of 4,117 parolees. Each parolee was tracked for incidents of arrests within 2 years after parole for offenses committed after parole.

Agencies involved: The Virginia Parole Board contracted with Ronald Christensen of Entropy Limited, South Great Road, Lincoln, MA 01773, (617) 259-8901, to assist its staff with development of the data collection specifications and instruments, to analyze the data collected from State Police computer systems and from Department of Corrections computer systems and hard-copy inmate files, and to develop a parole risk scale for incorporation into Virginia's parole guidelines model.

Cost of the study: \$23,726 for the private consultant

Canada

Cognitive Skills Training

David Robinson, Ph.D., Frank Porporino, Ph.D.,
and Marcy Grossman, M.A.
Correctional Service Canada
Research and Statistics Branch
Ottawa, Canada K1A 0P9
(613) 995-3340

Objectives of the research: To determine the effectiveness of Cognitive Skills Training in reducing recidivism and to identify the conditions under which the program is most beneficial. The results will influence decisions about which groups of offenders will be targeted for Cognitive Skills Training and will provide information on other questions related to monitoring the success of the program and refining the cognitive-behavioral treatment procedures.

Research methodology: The research uses an experimental design with treatment and control groups established through random assignment. Control group members are placed on a waiting list and are permitted to enter the next available treatment group if they remain interested in the program.

Experimental and control group members submit to a large battery of pretest-posttest measures aimed at assessing cognitive skills deficits and procriminal attitudes. Most of the measures are self-administered, paper-and-pencil tests. However, the Cognitive Skills Training coaches, who deliver the program, also rate each member of the experimental and control groups on a variety of cognitive skills before and after the program. A detailed file review performed on each offender measures various characteristics, including criminal history, institutional adjustment, preincarceration community adjustment, programming needs, and risk of recidivism. The research also includes the collection of "client satisfaction" data from program participants.

The experimental and control groups have been compared, using standard statistical tests of differences, on the various pretest-posttest measures that the program targets for change. In addition, the recidivistic behavior of the experimental and control groups is compared using postrelease followup data.

Findings of the research: The data examined to date show that the program has been successful in terms of the changes observed in the various cognitive skills and attitudes of program participants. These include reduced impulsivity, more positive attitudes toward the criminal justice system, and less tolerance for law violations.

The followup data indicate that program participation, especially for higher risk offenders, is associated with reduced chances of reconviction after release from the institution. Furthermore, participants respond in highly positive terms when asked to evaluate the program.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: Research results obtained to date support the national implementation of Cognitive Skills Training as a major program alternative in Correctional Service Canada. Ongoing results of the research confirm the implementation and are pointing to areas to which the program may be more effectively targeted for the offender population. The research program is also being used to explore a variety of more general questions about change in offenders and their ability to apply new skills in their attempts to reintegrate after release.

Prior studies: The current research builds on previous research on rehabilitation programming conducted in other correctional jurisdictions and in Correctional Service Canada. This project is the first large-scale experimental research on reintegration programming initiated by Correctional Service Canada.

Timeframe of the study: The study dates back to 1988 when data were first collected for a pilot version of the program. A first research report was released in 1990 and was followed by the national implementation of Cognitive Skills Training in all regions of Correctional Service Canada. A second report on a larger sample of participants and controls was released in 1991. Data collection for the project continues, and the research will now focus on specific questions related to program effectiveness.

Agencies involved: The Cognitive Skills Training Program was implemented by the Education and Personal Development Division of Correctional Service Canada. The Division continues to collaborate with the Research and Statistics Branch on data collection for the project.

Cost of the study: The estimated research costs are \$100,000.

Computerized Lifestyle Assessment Instrument

Robinson, Ph.D., Frank Porporino, Ph.D.,
and Bart Millson, B.A.
Correctional Service Canada
Research and Statistics Branch
Ottawa, Canada K1A 0P9
(613) 995-3340

Objectives of the research: (1) To develop a computerized approach for measuring (at reception) inmates' use of alcohol and drugs and (2) to assess the level of severity of substance abuse problems in the offender population.

Research methodology: This was the first major study undertaken by Correctional Service Canada to assess the level of substance abuse in the offender population. The Computerized Lifestyle Assessment Instrument was administered to all incoming inmates in three pilot institutions during 1989 and 1990. By the end of 1990, a total of 500 cases had been processed using the

assessment system. Although all reception inmates were asked to complete the assessment, about 10% did not, for numerous reasons.

The Computerized Lifestyle Assessment Instrument takes a comprehensive approach to assessment, examining a variety of lifestyle factors associated with substance abuse. These factors include physical health, nutrition, mental health, quality of functioning in family and social relationships, criminal behavior patterns, and readiness for substance abuse treatment programming. The computerized assessment package provides a rich source of data on the drug and alcohol abuse patterns of offenders and on how substance use affects criminal activity.

The principal measures in the assessment system are based on the work of Dr. Harvey Skinner, formerly of the Addiction Research Foundation of Ontario, who developed a computer-assisted approach for assessing lifestyle factors related to substance abuse. The assessment approach had been developed for use in family medical practices to provide a method for family practitioners to quickly and reliably screen large numbers of patients for substance abuse problems. With the initial collaboration of another agency in the Ministry (the Solicitor General Secretariat, Corrections Branch), the Research and Statistics Branch of Correctional Service Canada adapted and modified Skinner's computerized assessment procedure for use with Federal offenders.

The adaptation involved the revision of survey items so that they would be appropriate for use with offenders. In addition, a lengthy section was designed to measure substance abuse as it relates specifically to criminal behavior patterns. Motivation to receive treatment while incarcerated is also included in the assessment battery.

Two key assessment components of the instrument are the Drug Abuse Screening Test (DAST) and the Alcohol Dependence Scale (ADS). Both tests have been widely used in research for determining severity of drug and alcohol abuse.

A unique feature of the research design is the use of a microcomputer to administer the full battery of questionnaire items. Questions are presented to the offender on a computer screen, and responses are displayed in a multiple choice format. The offender responds by making the appropriate selection on a keyboard. A staff member introduces the procedure to inmates at the beginning of the session and remains available to answer any questions or concerns that arise for the offender.

Findings of the research: The analyses conducted to date have involved the investigation of the psychometric qualities of the assessment instruments. The data have indicated that many of the instruments possessed adequate reliability, and the estimates of substance abuse problems are consistent with other analyses conducted in Canada and other jurisdictions. The use of file reviews, an alternative method of collecting data on the substance use of offenders, has demonstrated that the computerized approach provides similar estimates of substance abuse problems for this population.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: The validation research conducted on the Computerized Lifestyle Assessment Instrument has resulted in the implementation of the assessment procedure in all reception sites operated by Correctional Service Canada. Ongoing research will help refine the assessment and treatment assignment process.

Timeframe of the study: The project began in 1988 with the development of a prototype of a computerized assessment method. Several versions of the system were tested, leading to a final pilot study in 1990. A report on the pilot, released in February 1991, led to the introduction of the Computerized Lifestyle Assessment Instrument in all Federal reception sites. Research activities now focus on the development of treatment typologies and explorations of the link between substance use and criminal behavior.

Agencies involved: The project was conducted in collaboration with the Education and Personal Development Division of Correctional Service Canada. The project builds on previous work by the Addiction Research Foundation of Ontario on assessment in various lifestyle areas.

Cost of the study: The estimated cost of the project is \$300,000.

**Field Test of the Community Risk/Needs Management Scale:
A Study of Offenders on Caseload**

Laurence L. Motiuk, Ph.D., and Frank J. Porporino, Ph.D.
Correctional Service Canada
Research and Statistics Branch
Ottawa, Canada K1A 0P9
(613) 995-3340

Objectives of the research: To present an overview of the first wave of data collected during the field test, provide a descriptive profile of the needs of offenders under supervision, and examine some of the validation data gathered on the instrument.

Research methodology: Application of the Community Risk/Needs Management Scale was initiated in October 1988 on a pilot basis at 12 separate community field-test sites across Canada. A total of 453 federally sentenced male offenders were assessed by their supervising case managers. The sample of cases studied were on day parole (25.2%), full parole (55%), or mandatory supervision (19.8%). This distribution compared well with the proportion of cases nationally under each category of conditional release. The behavior of the assessed offenders was subsequently monitored for a 6-month followup period.

Findings of the research: The results of the Community Risk/Needs Management Scale field test validated previous findings regarding the predictive value of offender risk/needs assessment. Offenders were easily differentiated by case managers by the nature and level of needs presented. Furthermore, these assessments of case needs were consistently related to conditional release outcomes at the 6-month followup.

Only two of the 12 need factors studied did not significantly relate to outcome (that is, suspension or revocation of conditional release). These two factors were mental ability and health.

The 10 need factors that related significantly to the likelihood of failure or success on conditional release were academic/vocational skills, employment pattern, financial management, marital/family relationships, companions/significant others, accommodation, behavioral/emotional stability, alcohol use, drug use, and attitude.

While the presence of particular needs was clearly related to release outcomes, the field test also sought to determine whether offenders could be accurately and meaningfully grouped by level of needs.

Of special interest was the finding that by simply combining case manager assessments of "criminal history risk" with global ratings of "case needs," as many as 47.5% of offenders assessed as high risk and high need were suspended within 6 months of their initial assessment. Similarly, those cases who were both high risk and high need had the highest rates of revocation (27.1%) during an extended 9-month followup.

In marked contrast, substantially fewer offenders assessed as both low risk and low need were suspended (5.1%) or revoked (1.9%) while on conditional release. This low-risk and low-need group was the largest category among the groupings that were identified (representing 35% of the total sample of cases that were assessed). Reducing the frequency of supervision for these cases could therefore have important implications for the allocation and refocusing of community resources.

An important feature of the research was to examine various scoring mechanisms for the case needs component of the Community Risk/Needs Management Scale. Four different scoring methods were examined: global ratings of need level as provided by case managers, simple tallies of the number of identified needs, scaled ratings of the need areas, and weighted ratings of each need area (that is, as indicated by a statistical analysis of the strength of relationship between each need area and likelihood of reoffending).

Although considerable predictive value was found for each scoring method, it was found that better levels of precision and more apparent differentiation could be achieved by using the most sophisticated "weighted ratings" method for classifying offenders. The disadvantage, however, is that this method requires some summation and calculation that may be perceived by case managers as too mechanistic and clerical in nature.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: Overall, the field test of the Community Risk/Needs Management Scale strongly supports the potential usefulness of an objective risk/needs assessment process in establishing guidelines or standards for varying levels of supervision on conditional release. Apparently, the Community Risk/Needs Management Scale can be used effectively to focus supervision resources by capitalizing on the professional judgment of case management staff. Moreover, the scale can also provide a useful means of monitoring changes in offenders' behavior, attitudes, and circumstances, all of which are clearly related to release outcome.

Prior studies: Previous studies have confirmed that the systematic and structured assessment of the risk and needs levels of offenders can provide useful information about the likelihood of reoffending while on conditional release. This prior research has been conducted by Correctional Service Canada, the Corrections Branch of the Solicitor General Secretariat (part of the Ministry), and various academic researchers in Canada and the United States.

Timeframe of the study: All offenders on caseload in the community on October 1, 1988, were to be assessed using the scale. Exceptions to this were offenders on parole reduced (where the required level of supervision/contact is very low), those who had less than 6 months left before the end of their sentence, and those who had their release suspended awaiting disposition. In addition, all new releases were to be assessed for the next 3-month period and followed up after 6 and 12 months. Moreover, all offenders who were initially assessed (that is, on caseload) were also to be systematically reassessed 6 and 12 months after their initial assessment. This study focused on only the first wave of cases that were assessed using the scale; that is, all cases on caseload on October 1, 1988.

The study findings were reported to Correctional Service Canada's Executive Committee in 1989, and reports for public consumption were produced later that year and in 1990.

Agencies involved: As part of the overall field testing of new standards for conditional release supervision, the Community Risk/Needs Management Scale was administered in collaboration with the Division of Community Release Programs and Support Services and parole offices of Correctional Service Canada, private sector agencies, and the central parole office of the Alberta Solicitor General.

Cost of the study: The estimated cost of the study is \$150,000.

The Prevalence, Nature and Severity of Mental Health Problems Among Federal Male Inmates in Canadian Penitentiaries

Laurence L. Motiuk, Ph.D., and Frank J. Porporino, Ph.D.
Correctional Service Canada
Research and Statistics Branch
Ottawa, Canada K1A 0P9
(613) 995-3340

Objectives of the research: To determine the prevalence, nature, and severity of mental health problems among the adult male offender population in Canadian penitentiaries.

Research methodology: Although 3,224 inmates were selected for the survey, a number of these offenders were no longer in institutions at the time of recruitment (that is, they had been released). In total, 2,812 offenders (87.2%) were available for systematic random sampling in the five separate regions of Correctional Service Canada. The overall response rate for the nation was 68.5% (N = 1,925), but there was considerable variation in the response rate across the regions.

To estimate the prevalence of mental disorder in Correctional Service Canada's specialized institutions (that is, regional psychiatric centers), an effort was made to interview all inmates in these facilities. In total, 412 offenders (12.8%) were available for interviewing. However, 260 offenders were actually interviewed, for a response rate of 63.1% for all specialized institutions combined.

Findings of the research: The results of the Mental Health Survey are presented in the form of prevalence rates. "Lifetime" prevalence is defined as the percentage of the population that showed evidence of a particular disorder at least once in their lifetime.

At this point, lifetime prevalence rates of mental disorder are provided using the widest possible criteria for meeting a DSM-III diagnosis. The survey showed that the risk of having had at least one episode of a psychotic disorder (for example, schizophrenia, schizophreniform, or mania) was 10.4%. The wide lifetime prevalence rate for depressive disorders (for example, major depression, dysthymia, or bipolar) was 29.8%. For anxiety disorders (for example, panic, generalized anxiety, phobia, agoraphobia, or somatization), the rate was 55.6%. For psychosexual disorders (for example, dysfunction, transsexualism, or ego-dystonic homosexuality), the rate was 24.5%. For antisocial personality, the rate was 74.9%. For substance abuse/dependence, the rate was 52.9%; for alcohol abuse/dependence, the rate was 69.8%.

To provide lower bound estimates of mental health problems in the Canadian Federal inmate population, the survey employed the most stringent criteria for meeting a particular DSM-III diagnosis and then examined stringent lifetime prevalence. The survey found that the risk of having had at least one episode of a psychotic disorder was 7.7%. The stringent lifetime prevalence rates for depressive disorders was 21.5%. For anxiety disorders, the rate was 44.1%. For psychosexual disorders, the rate was 21.1%. For antisocial personality, the rate was 56.9%. For substance abuse/dependence, the rate was 40.9%; for alcohol abuse/dependence, the rate was 47.2%.

For a more focused approach to examining offenders' mental health, the lifetime prevalence of antisocial personality or alcohol and drug abuse/dependence was assessed. The survey sought to determine the extent to which these three disorders were found, independently or in combination, among the offender population. The results showed that 37.8% of the total inmate population met the criteria for antisocial personality and at the same time experienced alcohol and drug abuse/dependence. Interestingly, nearly one out of five offenders met the criteria for a dual diagnosis of antisocial personality and alcohol abuse/dependence.

To construct a "criminal profile" of mental health, the wide lifetime prevalence of antisocial personality or alcohol abuse/dependence or drug abuse/dependence was used as a criterion. Notably, 89% of the total inmate population met the criteria for this criminal profile. Moreover, individuals who met the criteria for a criminal profile also had considerably more mental health problems than those offenders who met the criteria for a noncriminal profile. For example, offenders in the criminal-profile group were five times as likely to have had a psychotic episode at some point in their lives.

The analyses conducted to date have involved national, regional, general-population, treatment-center, and security-unit DIS lifetime prevalence and recency rates. In addition, DIS lifetime prevalence rates have been established using wide and stringent criteria and offender characteristics (that is, age, marital status, type of offense, sentence length, and time served). Finally, the lifetime incidence of comorbidity in the Federal inmate population is also available.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: Although it is possible that other factors, such as differences between inmates who remain in custody and those who are released, the ability of inmates to remember episodes that happened long ago, and their willingness to report

symptoms, may have affected the survey results, it seems likely that inmates in Canadian Federal institutions have experienced much more mental disorder than was previously understood.

Prior studies: The Mental Health Survey builds on previous work conducted by Correctional Service Canada on the mental health problems of incarcerated offenders.

Timeframe of the study: All Federal male inmates in Correctional Service Canada institutions on August 10, 1988, were defined as eligible for study. This date allowed sample selection to be completed immediately before the start of DIS interviewing. Because one region was prepared to proceed with its portion of the survey sooner than the rest of the country, one regional sample was drawn from inmates in institutions on April 15, 1988.

Correctional Service Canada's Task Force on Mental Health first reported on the results of this survey in 1989.

Agencies involved: This survey was conducted in collaboration with the Health Care Services Branch of Correctional Service Canada and with regional headquarters and institutions.

Cost of the study: The estimated cost of the study is \$350,000.

Sex Offender Population Study

Laurence L. Motiuk, Ph.D., and Frank J. Porporino, Ph.D.
Correctional Service Canada
Research and Statistics Branch
Ottawa, Canada K1A 0P9
(613) 995-3340

Objectives of the research: To accurately identify the number, types, and characteristics of federally sentenced sex offenders under the jurisdiction of Correctional Service Canada—both in institutions and under community supervision.

Research methodology: There were two components to this study: a census identification of all sex offenders under Federal jurisdiction and an extensive case-file review of a large sample of sex offenders from across the country.

The census checklist was administered by case management officers who assessed sex offenders on their current caseloads. The census checklist gathered case-specific information, such as status (that is, current offenses or previous history), details of the current sex offense (that is, nature of the offense, number of victims, age and sex of victims, degree of injury, degree of force, or presence of alcohol or drugs), past history of sexual offenses (that is, patterns or seriousness), and treatment history (that is, dates, type or nature, location, or sponsors).

The case-file review instrument was administered by researchers under contract. This instrument yielded detailed information on the background of offenders, their sex offense and general criminal history, and their current case management documentation.

Findings of the research: At the present time, the data analysis phase of the project is still under way. The census portion of the study has yielded information on 3,066 sex offenders. Preliminary results of the national sex offender census showed that sex offenders made up 14.9% of Correctional Service Canada's total offender population. In addition, it was found that 18.9% of the incarcerated population and 9.9% of the conditional release population were sex offenders.

While 70.5% of sex offenders identified by the census were incarcerated, 29.5% were under community supervision. Nearly half of the incarcerated sex offenders were in medium-security institutions, and 6.4% were located in regional psychiatric or treatment centers.

The census revealed that 6.2% of the cases identified were incest offenders. For pedophilia, the proportion was 21%; for sexual assault, 40.4%; for "mixed" offenses (such as incest and sexual assault), 27.9%; and for "other" offenses (such as exhibitionism), 3.1%.

Analysis of census information pertaining to the victims showed that adults (18 years or older) and females were more frequently the victims of federally sentenced sex offenders. Children (under 12 years) and adolescents were victims in more than one in four cases. While 57.5% of the sex offenders had victims with slight or no physical injuries, 6.4% of the sex offenders had victims whose injuries were severe enough to cause death.

The file-review portion of the study has gathered information on nearly 1,000 sex offenders. It is expected that some preliminary data from this portion of the study will soon be available.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: Most of the research results obtained to date are being used to help answer a variety of questions relating to the sex offender population in Canada and to current and planned programming for sex offenders.

Prior studies: This research developed from a series of reviews of Correctional Service Canada programs and services for sex offenders. Those reviews underscored the fact that a more coordinated programming and service strategy was needed. Further research on sex offenders was, therefore, strongly recommended.

Timeframe of the study: The research began in 1990 with the development of a sex offender census checklist and a comprehensive file-review instrument. All sex offenders under Federal supervision, both in institutions and in the community, were assessed by case management staff during March 1990 using a structured survey checklist. An extensive case-file review of nearly 1,000 randomly selected sex offenders was completed over a 2-month period. Data analysis for the study continues, and the research will now focus on the development of typologies for differential treatment regimes.

Agencies involved: The study was conducted with the assistance of the Correctional Programs and Operations Sector of Correctional Service Canada, regional headquarters, and operational units (that is, penitentiaries and parole offices) across Canada.

Cost of the study: The estimated cost of the study is \$250,000.

Staff Commitment and Aspirations Study

David Robinson, Ph.D., Frank Porporino, Ph.D.,
and Linda Simourd, M.A.
Correctional Service Canada
Research and Statistics Branch
Ottawa, Canada K1A 0P9
(613) 995-3340

Objectives of the research: To provide important information about the factors that can be targeted to enhance the level of commitment among staff in Correctional Service Canada. The results of the research will inform the design of staff development programming and provide relevant data for an examination of recruitment policies for various occupational groups.

Research methodology: The project involved a survey design consisting of a self-administered questionnaire and a semistructured interview. The sample consisted of a random selection that was stratified by region and occupational groups. The regional sampling consisted of five regions and national headquarters. The 10 occupational groupings included administrators, correctional policy administrators, scientists and professionals, institutional case management officers, community case management officers, support staff, correctional officers, other line staff, correctional supervisory staff, and middle managers. A stratified random sample of 7.6% (800) of the population of 10,500 staff was drawn. Although the final sample of 684 staff fell short of the target of 800, the refusal rate was only 9.6%. A number of selected staff were not able to participate because of vacation or other scheduling problems.

The questionnaire was administered in groups of approximately eight staff members at one time. The 45-page questionnaire required approximately 1 hour to complete and was composed of a variety of measures, including demographic variables, organizational and job attitudinal scales (such as organizational commitment, job satisfaction, or attitudes toward corrections), items on job perception (such as perceptions of job roles or self-ratings of performance), and scales measuring personality dispositions (such as trait anxiety, empathy, or depression). Most of the scales have been used in previous studies conducted by organizational or industrial psychologists.

The semistructured interview concentrated on measuring work history, job stress, exposure to critical incidents, leisure and health issues, career aspirations, expectations of the organization, and attitudes toward the values of the organization. The interview was conducted by trained interviewers and typically lasted 2 hours.

Additional sources of data included performance ratings of staff participants, which were provided by immediate supervisors. These were completed for staff who consented to the procedure. In addition, annual performance appraisal measures, stored in computer files, were linked with the other data for consenting participants.

Findings of the research: The initial analyses consisted of descriptive statistics that provide measures of the level of commitment exhibited by Correctional Service Canada staff and the types of aspirations held by these staff. A series of cross-tabulations examine the relationship between staff commitment and a variety of variables measured in the study. These analyses will provide information on the correlates of commitment (for example, demographic, attitudinal, and personality). Multiple regression analyses are also being performed to investigate the relative importance of the various factors.

Policy impact or implications based on the research findings: Knowledge provided by this project will be used to maintain and enhance the level of commitment of Correctional Service Canada staff. Information on the correlates of commitment will be used to identify priorities for staff development programming. For example, the project will provide knowledge about the types of staff members who are in need of special programming to increase their levels of commitment and satisfaction. The project will also provide data that will assist personnel policymakers in the development of recruitment procedures.

Prior studies: A number of studies of staff have been conducted in the past using smaller samples or focusing on particular occupational groups (for example, correctional officers).

Timeframe of the study: Planning for the project began in April 1990, and a pilot study was conducted in October 1990. Data collection for the national phase of the project was conducted during July and August 1991. A final report on the study will be delivered in December 1991. A variety of research questions will be addressed in analyses subsequent to the final report.

Agencies involved: The project was designed by the Research and Statistics Branch of Correctional Service Canada. Consultations were conducted with the Personnel Development and Training Sector (Correctional Service Canada), and a number of senior managers provided input into the project.

Cost of the study: The estimated cost of the project is \$200,000.