

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

Collection: Reagan, Ronald: Gubernatorial Papers,
1966-74: Press Unit

Folder Title: [Corrections, Board of] –
Coordinated California Corrections:
Institutions, July 1971 (2 of 6)

Box: P33

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digital-library>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/document-collection>

Contact a reference archivist at: reagan.library@nara.gov

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/citing>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

A novel use of the idea of sentence modification is being used in 1 of the study counties by a Superior Court Judge. In approximately 75% of the sentences, the judge imposes a sentence and then suspends 1 day in order to retain jurisdiction. The sentenced person is then committed to the correctional facility.

This facility sponsors a number of programs including work furlough, educational furlough, Alcoholics Anonymous, academic instruction, and additional inspirational types of activities which consist of recorded talks by successful businessmen, successful ex-prisoners, etc. Participation by an inmate in any one of these programs results in a certain number of days being credited to his sentence. Participation in a number of such programs can result in a considerable reduction in the amount of time served. The quality of an inmate's participation is monitored by the judge, who devotes a portion of his own time to visiting the facility weekly. When an inmate arrives at this facility, a calendar is prepared with him, representing every day of his sentence. He begins to mark off the days he has served from 1, 2, 3, and so on and the staff mark off the days he has earned through program participation beginning at the maximum of his sentence, e.g. 365, 364, 363, etc. As these two extremes converge, the inmate can see very graphically that what he accomplishes has a very definite influence on how long he remains incarcerated.

As yet, the actual effect of this particular program upon the rate of recidivism or any other measure is not known. But it is clear that the judge and the staff both feel that it is of benefit and that it does prevent some of their charges from returning. What is even more important is that 1 judge and a facility staff are willing to try something that appears promising.

In summary, there is no established organizational pattern for the administration of sentence modification. The Jail Task Force believes that the Institutional Services Units, discussed in Chapter V, would be the most appropriate unit to perform this function.

County Parole

Penal Code Sections 3075 through 3084 authorize the establishment of county parole boards composed of the sheriff, the probation officer, and a citizen representative. Each of the 15 counties studied had established parole boards. However, the use of county parole in 1969 varied greatly among them. For example, according to the Bureau of Criminal Statistics, one of the large counties in the study group granted 300 paroles. Others did not grant any. In 1969 the 15 counties paroled a total of 488 jail prisoners. Because it is not possible to determine the number of inmates eligible for county parole who were released in 1969, it is not possible to calculate the percentage of paroles granted to those eligible. Some members of county parole boards estimated that less than 1% of the sentenced prisoners were eligible for parole.

In interviews with the sheriffs in the 15 counties, it was determined that there were almost as many interpretations of the reasons for parole as there were counties. In 3 counties, the administrators indicated that they were not there to "second guess the courts" who sentenced the inmate. In a number of other counties, paroles were granted primarily to relieve population pressures in the jail and secondarily to grant "hardship" leaves to inmates. In a few counties, the purpose was restricted solely to considering hardship cases.

A rather unique use of parole was being made in 1 county, based upon the need for hospitalized medical attention. With the advent of Medic-Aid, hospitals in this county began charging the sheriff for the services rendered to inmates, sometimes resulting in an astronomical fee when surgery and hospitalization were necessary. The sheriff soon recognized that the county would thus be liable for 100% of the medical costs whereas, if the inmate was not a prisoner and unable to pay, medical costs would be subsidized by Medi-Cal and Medicare. From then on, any inmate requiring such costly medical attention was granted a parole, had his medical needs served, and returned to the jail to finish serving his sentence. Although carried out under the rubric of parole, the automatic return of the person to jail nullifies this program as a parole program per se.

In most counties, the probation department provided the post-institutional supervision for county parolees; in others, there was no post-institutional supervision. None of the 15 study counties maintained a county parole officer, though it came to the Task Force's attention that at least one Bay Area county has a county parole officer who reviews and recommends cases for county parole and provides for their supervision upon release.

Overall, inmates released on county parole represent a minute portion of the sentenced population. At the present time, if an inmate is serving a jail sentence as a condition of probation, or if any part of his sentence has been suspended, he is not eligible for county parole. However, in the 11 study counties reporting jail statistics to the Bureau of Criminal Statistics, fully 56% of the sentenced jail population is released as a result of the expiration of sentence. All of these persons theoretically were eligible for parole; yet only a small fraction were released prior to the expiration of their sentence. Conditional release, or parole, is a correctional fact of life in both juvenile and adult institutions. Approximately 98% of adults sentenced to prisons are released prior to the expiration of their maximum term. The concept of parole and early release is consistent with the goal of reintegration, and no useful purpose is served by keeping persons incarcerated in county jails until the entire sentence has been served. It is costly, and it results in overcrowding. More important, however, it promotes feelings of injustice and bitterness among those serving time in jails, and seriously undermines reintegration efforts.

County parole would provide an effective follow-through for those releasees requiring after-care services. Because of the similarity and the fact that every county already has a probation department, the Jail Task

Force urges that county parole be integrated with probation services. It also believes that a group should be established, consisting of representatives from the sheriff's office and the probation department, to determine when a jail prisoner should be paroled and whether he is in need of after-care services. This evaluative process and the provision of after-care services would be appropriate functions to be carried out by the Institutional Services Unit discussed in Chapter V.

Weekenders

In each of the 15 study counties, the number of prisoners sentenced to serve weekends has been increasing at a rapid pace and causing considerable consternation for the jail administrator. The logistic problems of bed space, clothing, receipt and release of large numbers of prisoners have not, as yet, been solved in any of the counties visited.

Some administrators have considered a number of alternatives to weekend confinement in jails, including the rental of a hotel wherein work furloughees would also be housed, to special facilities which would be operated only on weekends. Some have considered the possibility of weekenders paying the cost of their incarceration as do work furloughees, and still others have asked judges to use other alternatives, such as work furlough or regular jail sentences. The weekend sentence is preferable to a total lockup because such sentences reduce the deleterious effect of total confinement while maintaining family, social, and economic ties. However, in general, weekend sentences appear to be an unnecessary and undesirable compromise.

The Jail Task Force believes that, if at all possible, the offender should either be placed on probation, without having to serve time on weekends, or he should be placed in a work furlough program.

Conclusion

This section has dealt with developments on the county level that are aimed at either diverting persons from the county jail or minimizing their contact with them. In Chapter II of this Report, it was seen that the jail population has been increasing during the past decade, and that the increase has been due entirely to the growth of the unsentenced jail population. O.R. projects and misdemeanor citation programs have demonstrated their value beyond any reasonable doubt. Yet, these programs are not being used extensively enough either to divert persons, or to minimize their contact with the jail. In light of the tremendous success of such programs, their greatly expanded use throughout the State would logically follow.

Although the sentenced jail population has remained relatively constant over the past 10 years, it should now be clear that a significant portion of that population is made up of persons incarcerated for drunkenness. Removal of these persons from the criminal process would greatly alleviate the overcrowded conditions currently found in many county jails, and would reduce

costs as well. At the same time, more effective non-criminalized methods of handling drunkenness could be utilized.

As stated at the beginning of this section, one of the major concerns of the Jail Task Force is to divert persons from jail to other agencies and alternatives so that those who must be incarcerated by the courts will have the benefit of the limited resources available in these facilities.

Finally, the Jail Task Force believes that research needs to be greatly expanded in the areas of sentence modification and county parole, in order to demonstrate the feasibility of early release for greater numbers of persons. As was shown in the Juvenile Institution Task Force Report, it is possible to greatly curtail the length of sentence without significantly affecting recidivism rates or jeopardizing the community's safety. It is quite likely that similar results would be observed if greater numbers of jail inmates were released after serving only a brief sentence.

V. HIGHLIGHTS OF EXISTING PROGRAMS

This section deals with the programs the Jail Task Force found to be available to the sentenced inmates in the facilities of the 15 study counties. It is not intended to be a county by county list of programs available, but rather, it is a brief summary of all the programs which were available in the 15 counties. It is intended to provide ideas for adoption by other counties in the State. Unique applications or programs which might have application elsewhere are summarized below.

Work Furlough

Twenty-one of the State's 58 counties have established work furlough programs.¹⁷ Eight of the 15 study counties had work furlough in various stages of sophistication, ranging from a specialized work furlough facility in 1 county to 3 counties in which the program was operating out of a maximum security facility, and 4 counties in which the program was operating out of minimum security facilities. Administrators in the 7 counties which did not have work furlough programs voiced concerns over starting such programs within existing facilities, fearing this would make them vulnerable to the introduction of narcotics and other contraband. One sheriff indicated that the board of supervisors was opposed, but he personally felt it would be a valuable asset. The introduction of narcotics via work furlough inmates is a realistic concern. However, in many counties the prisoner with a narcotics record is excluded from participation in work furlough programs. Still, it must be pointed out that inmates with narcotics records can pressure work furloughees to smuggle narcotics into the jail. In those counties which cannot afford separate facilities for work furlough inmates or complete segregation from the general population, the administrator has to decide if the advantages are worth the risks.

Generally speaking, drugs seemed to be available to inmates who wanted them. This does not mean that administrators should not be concerned about the prevalence of narcotics. They should, however, also weigh the benefits of new programs against the possibility of an increase in the contraband already there. On the basis of discussions with inmates and on the basis of experience in correctional facilities, it appears that drugs will always be available to inmates who want them, especially in minimum security facilities.

In one county which operated the work furlough program out of the minimum security facility, the work furloughees returned from employment and proceeded directly to their barracks after checking in. Infrequent spot searches were conducted whenever sufficient staff were available.

In almost every other county, work furloughees returning from employment underwent thorough "skin" searches and were issued laundered clothing upon return to the housing unit. In a third minimum security facility, there are no work furlough inmates, yet there are work crews dispatched daily to outside work details. Despite the difference in search and security procedures, it was fairly evident that narcotics, in varying amounts, were available in all 3 facilities.

The literature about work furlough, and the experience of those counties who have tried it, strongly suggest that the benefits of such a program outweigh the risks.¹⁸ For most inmates, work furlough retains the control of the sentence yet eliminates or reduces some of the negative by-products of incarceration, such as loss of employment, and loss of self-esteem by having a family supported by welfare. Work furlough maintains the economic ties to the community, thus in part assuring that an ex-inmate will not become a burden upon the community. For those who are pragmatists and concerned with value for the dollar, it may be noted that work furlough pays for itself and partially offsets the costs of incarceration.¹⁹ In fact in one of the 15 counties in 1967, the inmates on work furlough contributed \$45,979.60 to family support. Otherwise, much of this would probably have been paid by the welfare department.

An interesting variation of work furlough was discovered when the study staff asked the jail administrator of a small county if a work furlough program existed. He responded, "Yes, we consider our weekenders as being in work furlough." He did not have a work furlough program per se because there was only 1 jail and no capacity to segregate the work furloughee. The sheriff, however, entered into an agreement with the local court that, if the court wanted an inmate on work furlough, the inmate would be sentenced to weekends.

Education

At the time of data collection, 6 counties were operating some kind of educational program, 1 was in the process of instituting such a program, and 8 did not have any kind of education program. Of the 6 counties making

education available to inmates, 2 had programs in both maximum and minimum security, 1 county had it available only in the maximum unit, and 3 had education available only to inmates in minimum security facilities.

The sophistication of such programs ranged from a single volunteer instructor who came into the facility once a week to facilities where subjects were taught in classrooms by certified elementary school, high school, and college instructors. In 1 relatively small facility of approximately 50 minimum security inmates, a volunteer instructor tutors inmates to pass the GED test which, in turn, entitles inmates to a high school equivalency diploma. In the remaining 5 facilities, the instructor is full or part-time and is paid by the local school district at no cost to the correctional facilities. Courses are offered in the large counties on a daily basis and in smaller counties on a weekly or semi-weekly basis, usually in high school equivalency training, but frequently including grammar school mathematics, literacy training, and special subjects in which there is a demonstrated interest by a sufficient number of inmates.

The only requirements on the part of the correctional facility are classroom space and participation by a minimum number of inmates. Because the turn-over of inmates involved is quite high, the instructor must be flexible enough to teach illiterates simultaneously with other students who are studying for high school equivalency.

Many instructors in these counties are relying on programmed textbooks which require only a minimum of monitoring, while supplying a maximum of course content. One of the requirements for completion of the GED examination is that it be given at locations specified by the State, and these are usually high schools in the area, thus requiring that the inmate appear personally to complete the examination. Except for those students who are in maximum security facilities, the counties make arrangements for a staff member or the instructor to escort inmates to and from the examination.

With the increasing number of college level courses open to "challenge" (completing an examination on the subject matter and being granted the units for the course upon passage) and the expansion of curricula available in programmed texts, it is possible for a county jail inmate to complete at least a part of a college education without leaving the grounds.

Educational Leaves

Educational furlough programs are operated on the same basis as is work furlough, except that since the student does not have an income from his education he is not expected to pay his share of the costs of administration, as are work furloughees. Three of the 15 study counties had such programs operating in conjunction with work furlough. All such leaves are limited to college level endeavors, since high school and grammar school courses are available in the jails of these 3 counties. According to the staff involved, grade point averages improve considerably over the student's

averages before incarceration. In 2 of the counties, educational furloughees are expected to perform a specified number of hours of institutional labor each week.

Vocational Training

According to a recent study, there are 23 vocational programs being offered in the jails and correctional facilities through the State.²⁰ In theory, these vocational programs differ from inmate work assignments in that they are intended to teach a skill which will result in the inmate becoming more readily employable. In actuality, vocational programs offered in local correctional facilities differ only in title. In order to qualify as a true vocational training program, the trainee must learn the theory as well as the practice. Only one vocational program in the 15 counties included both of these elements (in this particular county, the vocational program was a part of a Federal grant which terminated within a week of the study staff's visit). All other vocational training programs offered would more appropriately fall under the category of on-the-job training because they did not include classroom instruction on theory and none were certified programs. As indicated in the study cited above:

"This means that in reality, despite the classification of these programs as vocational rehabilitation, their primary effect is to obtain labor from inmates. Coincidentally, inmates in these programs are also being taught a skill in the correctional sense."²¹

In discussing educational and vocational training programs with the administrators in the 15 study counties, it was apparent that they had been giving a great deal of thought to establishing new programs in this area or extending existing ones. However, it was clear to them that the traditional, in-house vocational program was not appropriate because of the great turnover as a result of short sentences given to county jail inmates. The jail administrator in one county reported that the average sentence was 22 days and that he had recently surveyed his inmate population to determine the feasibility of establishing a vocational training program in key punch operation. After eliminating those inmates whose sentences were too short to complete the program, and those whose educational level was insufficient, and those who were not interested, only 9 out of a population of almost 1,000 were qualified. Therefore, the plans were dropped. One large Southern California county reported that 75% of all sentenced prisoners served less than 30 days.

New Directions in Vocational Training

The fact that county jail sentences are quite short did not deter one county from establishing a vocational program of high quality, encompassing both the requirements of theory and practice. Using Federal Manpower Development Training Act funds and cooperating with the local school district,

this county contracted with a large local industry to train inmates for eventual employment in the industry.

According to the facility administrator, the trainer is subsidized on a sliding scale according to the trainee's value in terms of production. During the first phases of training, the employer may be subsidized entirely for training the employee. Midway through the training, as the employee is producing at half capacity, the employer is subsidized one-half of the salary. At the final stages, the employer pays 100% of the employee's salary. The inmate on this training program is considered a work furlough and, though he begins this training program while incarcerated, he continues employment on expiration of his sentence without a break in service.

Although this is a relatively new program and its actual effects are unknown as yet, the concept holds great promise since it is relatively unaffected by length of sentence. At the same time it overcomes the problem of jail programs being isolated from the "real world". There is little question that the trainee is being trained for jobs which exist, since employers are not likely to accept a student for training in skills which are not in demand.

Variations of this basic idea of sending inmates out to obtain skills are in operation in 2 other counties. There, inmates attend vocational training courses at the local community college on an educational leave basis. The difference is that these students are not paid a wage while learning.

Counseling Services

Throughout the State, those counseling services which are available are normally performed by paid staff members, titled Rehabilitation Officers or Correctional Counselors, and community volunteers. Although an undetermined amount of counseling is carried on by custodial staff in their day-to-day relationships with inmates, for the sake of discussion in this section, these services will not be considered.

Statewide, there are 58 full-time rehabilitation personnel assigned to the detention and correctional facilities throughout the State.²² There were approximately 25,471 prisoners in county jails and camps at the time that the inventory of rehabilitation personnel was taken.²³ There was, therefore, a ratio of 1 rehabilitation staff to 439 inmates. In the 15 study counties, there were 46 rehabilitation personnel providing services to 6,116 prisoners. Most of these staff members, however, were devoted totally to the administration of the county's work furlough program. Only 7 of the 15 counties had any staff in the counseling category.

In 6 of the 7 counties reporting counseling services, the staff are a part of the sheriff's office budget and, in one county, the rehabilitation officers are supplied by the county welfare department, but devote 100% of their time to prisoner counseling at the jail complex. Lack of funds has

been one of the major obstacles to the establishment of counseling services in jails. Counseling services in the seventh county referred to above were supplied by a county department which was subsidized in large part by State and Federal sources.

There are some unique counseling programs that exist in county jails. As indicated in the section dealing with sentence modification, one of the 15 counties had assigned two social workers to counsel inmates in order to determine the types of services that might be provided them. One of the most important tasks of the social workers has been, as already stated, to recommend inmates for early release. Thus far, the program has had an exceptional degree of success. Of the 532 inmates released over a two and one-half year period, only 17% have been returned to jail on new charges. This counseling program has resulted in substantial savings of funds that would otherwise have been spent by keeping these inmates locked up.

Another county has also been conducting a unique counseling program, and is an example of how dedicated people can make a significant impact on correctional facilities as a by-product of their efforts. In this county, a probation officer has been assigned to the jail for the purpose of interviewing inmates for possible release on their own recognizance while awaiting trial. Through his visits to the jail, the probation officer became aware of the needs on the part of many prisoners for counseling services. With the support of the sheriff and the jail staff, he began group counseling sessions with both sentenced and non-sentenced prisoners. As the word got around to inmates, there was an increase in the demand for the probation officer's counseling services. To meet this demand, the probation officer contacted the state college in his vicinity. Students in criminology, social work and psychology were assigned to him for inmate counseling services as a part of their field-work training, for which they received college credits. The probation officer, at the time of the Task Force survey, had a number of external family counseling groups which had begun in the jail. The probation department recently assigned a second probation officer to the jail in recognition of the need for such services. The jail staff indicated that there had been a noticeable reduction in the tension levels of prisoners and was supportive to the idea of expanding these services.

Volunteers in Corrections

When asked if there was a place in the rehabilitation program for volunteers from the community, one of the county sheriffs responded "No" and 2 others questioned their value. The remaining 12 counties indicated that there was a place in the rehabilitation program for volunteers and most of them were already making some use of such services. In 2 of these counties, the volunteers were organized into groups subsidized by community funds, with some paid staff. In a few counties, the volunteers consisted of church people, usually ministers, who offered church services weekly and some personal counseling. One county's use of volunteers is so unique that it will be briefly described below.

The volunteers in this particular county are not organized, and, in fact, many do not know each other. Instead, the county has established a board of review consisting of the facility administration and the probation officer who screen applications from citizens who want to volunteer their services. Screening consists of a background check through CII, an interview to determine the volunteer's motivation, and the services he offers. Once the volunteer has been accepted, he is given a brief orientation including a review of the rules of the facility, some cautionary notes, and introduction to the staff. This process is quite similar to that being used in the Royal Oaks, Michigan, probation volunteer program.²⁴

Once selected and oriented, the volunteer and the staff jointly determine a schedule for the former's services. This might range from teaching a course in first aid to escorting inmates back and forth to community functions (for inmates sentenced to this facility, the committing judge issues an order providing that the inmate may be removed from custody for specified periods of time under citizen escort). On the evening of the on-site study at this facility, 3 volunteers had returned approximately 12 inmates. In one case, the volunteer was a member of Alcoholics Anonymous and had taken 4 inmates to attend the weekly AA meeting. The second volunteer had escorted 5 inmates to the high school where they had completed the General Educational Development test (GED), and the third volunteer was returning 3 inmates who had been on work furlough and were being supplied transportation by the volunteer. It was indicated that some inmates attend Toastmasters, Junior Chamber of Commerce, and meetings of various other organizations.

The staff at this facility stated that the volunteer program had worked out quite satisfactorily and there had been only a few instances where volunteers had kept inmates beyond the agreed upon time. In only one case had this happened twice with the same volunteer. There have been no escapes as a result of this program. Except for the personal opinions of the people involved in this program, there is no accurate measure of its effectiveness. Certainly, the effectiveness cannot be measured in recidivism rates alone because, as stated in the President's Crime Commission Task Force Report on Corrections:

"One major reason why voluntary efforts should be expanded is that corrections has too long been isolated from the mainstream of community activity. The direct contact of the volunteer with the correctional system provides a means of countering this situation. It is not enough simply to increase public understanding of corrections through programs of public education, rather, intimate personal experience with the offender has the capacity to make the volunteer an important participant in correctional work and a supporter of correctional effort."²⁵

Another interesting type of volunteer program is the volunteer service organization. Over the years, these community organizations have carried

out some research and demonstration projects on jail inmates and programs, but, unfortunately, they have been handicapped by insufficient funding and a lack of research skills. Consequently, the products of this research have not gained wide acceptance in professional correctional circles, even though some excellent results have been uncovered.

An example of such excellent volunteer group research is a demonstration project sponsored by the Northern California Service League, in which casework services were provided to county jail inmates.²⁶ Although the results were quite encouraging (of those "treated", 57% were re-arrested as opposed to 73% re-arrests for the "un-treated" group), the most significant results were the recommendations growing out of the project experience, which parallel the recommendations of the President's Commission Task Force on Corrections. The Service League's project began in 1958, 10 years before the President's Commission findings.

For counties which are considering adoption of a volunteer program or expanding present programs, the Manual of Correctional Standards by the American Correctional Association²⁷ has a chapter devoted to organizing such efforts and the Board of Corrections, Jail Services Division,²⁸ can direct interested parties to counties which are presently involving volunteers.

Comments

This section of the Jail Task Force Report is misleading if the reader gains the impression that a major attempt at rehabilitation or treatment is being made in the county jails of the State. Such is not the case, since the programs described above exist in only 5 of the 15 study counties and not all in the same county. The remaining 10 counties offer little or nothing in the way of rehabilitation and other treatment services. As indicated in a recent jail study:

"At this point, the role of the sheriff's department as correctional agents comes into question. Certainly by looking at the personnel counts, (comparing personnel involved in security - 6,043 with rehabilitation personnel 17), one cannot escape the impression that the sheriff's departments are geared much more toward the custodial and management functions of detention and corrections. This appears to be the result of conscious decision-making and deliberate policy which is oriented primarily toward efficient operations and management of detention facilities (as opposed to correctional facilities)."²⁹

The intention of this brief discussion of programs has been to suggest to counties that there are alternatives to the traditional trusty job assignments, and that alternatives do not necessarily require additional expenditure of funds. In fact, none of the programs discussed involved expenditures of funds from the sheriffs' budgets.

VI. THE NEED FOR FINANCIAL SUPPORT

There are two key influences affecting the quality of institutional corrections in any county. One major influence is the administrator who determines policy, assigns priorities, and reflects to his staff the importance of the correction function through his interest and support for the division. The second major influence is the Board of Supervisors, who allocate the funds with which to operate, construct, and staff correctional facilities.

Local Funding

Boards of Supervisors have traditionally been most unresponsive in approving new construction to relieve overcrowding of existing facilities. Overcrowded conditions and inadequate facilities have been known to exist for decades before Boards of Supervisors would authorize new construction; even then, authorization was often secured only after serious incidents had occurred in the jail and public attention brought to the problem. It is typically the combination of bizarre incidents occurring in the jail, a Board of Corrections investigation, support by the County Grand Jury, and factual reports by the sheriff, that result in augmentation of services or new construction.

A number of sheriffs pointed out that in competing for the local tax dollar, the jails have to compete with other departments which are subsidized by the State and Federal government, whereas the tax dollars supporting jails come exclusively from local tax sources.

Internal Budget Allocations

Correctional services tend to receive low priority in the budgets of most sheriffs' offices. In one of the most affluent counties of the State, in fiscal 1965-66, the operating budget for corrections was only 12% of the sheriff's total operating budget. In the next fiscal year, because of the construction of a new minimum security facility, the operating budget for corrections in the same county rose to 34%. In fiscal 1969-70, the operating budget had increased to 40%, a high figure when compared with almost all of the other counties in the State. It should also be noted that the salaries for sheriff's personnel in the corrections division of this county were proportionately lower than the operations budget. Thus, in fiscal 1969-70, while 40% of the sheriff's operating budget went to corrections, only 33% of his budget for salaries went to corrections staff. The picture on the statewide level indicates that only a small portion of sheriffs' budgets throughout California is channeled into corrections.

State Subsidy

When sheriffs were asked if the State should subsidize local corrections, 28 out of 32 responded affirmatively. Several expressed the fear that State subsidy would bring State controls. They also pointed out that many counties had negative experiences with other State subsidies in which the State had failed to adjust its funding rates to meet increases in cost of living, thus leaving the counties to pay a disproportionate share of new programs or projects. Examples of such occurrences were cited in the juvenile camp subsidy program, the probation subsidy program, and, most recently, mental health and welfare programs. For a more extended discussion of these concerns among local officials, the reader is referred to the Juvenile Institution Task Force Report. However, it should be made clear that, while it is subsidizing other correctional facilities and services, the State does not provide any subsidies to the county jails.

Other Possible Sources For Jail Funds

Administrators were asked to suggest sources of revenue for jail operation, other than property taxes. Of 26 replies, 15 suggested that a percentage of court assessed fines be allocated to jails. Eight suggested a bar tax or an increase in the alcohol tax to be used for subsidizing detoxification centers or jail programs for alcoholics. Two respondents would like to see work furlough funds returned to the jail rather than to the general fund. One sheriff suggested that the State could subsidize jail operations through the allocation of products from Correctional Industries. Since the cost of the products (furnishings, food, clothing) consumed in jail operations is primarily wages, and only a fraction is raw material, the State would be passing on a whole dollar value while expending only a fraction. Generally, however, the sheriffs were not optimistic about receiving significantly increased funding to bolster their jail operations.

VII. EVALUATION OF CORRECTIONAL FACILITY PROGRAMS

Knowledge of the Corrections System

The unfortunate part of many community-based correctional programs and facilities is that unsubstantiated claims and counterclaims are made about what jails are doing, with no systematic effort being made to determine what is effective, what is not, what costs too much, what does not cost, what the county has to support entirely, what the Federal government and the State will subsidize, and what really makes the difference in reducing crime. In a recent article titled "Opportunities for Action Research",³⁰ Montilla reviewed his experience in a 3 year project which took place in one of the 15 counties studied by this Task Force. Referring to the many successful demonstration projects across the nation which have proven successes in reducing crime and delinquency, he asks:

"Why haven't they caught on in jurisdictions other than where they were developed? Why were innovations so often developed by groups not part of the formal (criminal justice) system? Why were so many promising correctional ideas of recent years, despite supportive evidence, allowed to die?"³¹

In regard to the lack of information and Montilla's question about the death of so many promising correctional ideas, he cites an observation by Bernard Diamond, M. D.:

"One of the biggest differences between science and mysticism is that science utilizes the instrument of feedback....Mystical systems, including the law, do not do this. They, like Plato, deduce what ought to be and now things ought to be done. They proceed, as an act of faith, and then, in order not to shatter their faith and create doubts and uncertainty, they carefully avoid feeding back their results into the process by empirical observation of output. The advantages of such a mystical system are clear. The system is not subject to challenge or dispute....Such a system has a high capacity to survive unchanged irrespective of the value of its output. But ... the output is not entirely illusory....The output becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy to a certain degree.

"For example ... the law has always been quite clear as to the single purpose of punishment; it is to deter crime.. ..As an article of faith, the law has accepted for thousands of years that punishment is an effective deterrent of crime. Most people in and out of the law firmly believe this to be true. And because they believe it, to some extent it is true. ...Sociology and psychology can easily demonstrate that the functions of punishment are manifold (that certain types of punishment have certain positive and negative effects on certain people under certain conditions). ...The mystical nature of (the legal application of punishment)...is apparent when it is realized how carefully the law has avoided subjecting its punishment output to empirical test. When faced with the empirical observation that punishment may not deter crime, the law simply refuses to feed back that observation into the legal process, thereby refusing to modify the basic belief that punishment does deter and obstructing the possibility of the development of new methods of influencing criminal behavior. ...But the law, when it does acknowledge that its punishment output does not deter crime, has only one remedy: increase the severity of punishment."³²

Clarity of Goals and Costs

Although the goals of corrections have been the subject of much discussion, few would argue with the fact that corrections has something to do with reducing criminal behavior. It also exists to apply some sort of punishment to satisfy society's demand for vengeance. Punishment today is thought of as incarceration and incarceration frequently results in: (1) the learning by non-delinquents from delinquents, (2) a handicap to becoming re-employed, (3) loss of a job, (4) pressures upon an already strained family relationship, (5) loss of self-respect.

Before society can attain the lofty goals described in the establishment of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, society will need to temper its need for punishing people. Punishing offenders by incarcerating them has not substantially reduced the probability of their committing further crimes.

Montilla offers an example where the costs of society's need to punish obviously outweigh whatever the advantages. And, this example speaks only to the tangible dollar costs, not to the costs in terms of human life and dignity.

"A middle-aged divorcee with three minor children was convicted of issuing a \$20 NSF check (against an account that had a \$17 balance). She was jailed pending trial, was given a six-month jail sentence (which was suspended) and was ordered to pay restitution. She paid the restitution, probably out of her welfare check of \$258 per month. The judge, in an unusual action, however, also ordered her to pay the county \$75 for public defender services. When she later told the court that she could not pay the charge, she was jailed. This action set in motion referral of the children to juvenile court and their detention in the county childrens shelter at a county cost of \$1,050 per month for the three children plus the jail costs for the mother.

"Newspaper accounts of this case and a vigorous protest by the public defender finally brought about the release of the woman."³³

How much is society willing to pay to punish people? As it is now, costs are hidden because so many different county departments are involved. If the "corrections system" were truly a system, not only would the results be plain, but the costs to the taxpayer would also be apparent.

Present Research Efforts

Probably the most sophisticated and comprehensive research now being conducted on a jail program in California is a work furlough study taking place in Santa Clara County. Under a research grant by the Federal Department

of Health, Education and Welfare, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, the Center for Interdisciplinary Studies at San Jose State College, in cooperation with the County Sheriff, is trying to answer, via empirical data, the question: Just how effective is work furlough?³⁴ Data gathering concluded in early 1971 and a final report should be published shortly. Although the major foci of the study are the economic and rehabilitative values of jail and an assessment of behavior change, a preliminary report³⁵ indicates that many factors in jail programming will be spoken to, including some interesting observations about the major role sheriffs will be playing in corrections.

A requirement of all demonstration projects funded by L.E.A.A. is that the project must build in a research and feedback element. As of this writing, very few projects have been funded which have jail programs as their focus, and of those which have been so funded, results are not yet available.

Although there are some isolated research projects being conducted in county correctional facilities, as yet there is no systematic evaluation and feedback system operating in any of the State's 58 counties. The Jail Task Force urges that such research systems be established at the State and local levels.

FOOTNOTES

¹Board of Corrections, A Study of California County Jails, State of California (Sacramento, April 1970), pp. 102-105.

²Further discussion of volunteers in corrections is contained in the Juvenile Institution and System Task Force Reports, Correctional System Study (Sacramento 1971).

³Charles E. Ares, Anne Rankin and Herbert Sturz, "The Manhattan Bail Project: An Interim Report on the Use of Pre-Trial Parole", New York University Law Review, 38 (January, 1963), pp. 67-95.

⁴The San Francisco Committee on Crime, A Report on the Criminal Court of San Francisco, Part II: Bail and O.R. Release, San Francisco, February, 1971.

⁵Ibid., p. 21.

⁶Ibid., p. 22.

⁷Ibid., pp. 23-25.

⁸President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967), p. 233.

⁹The San Francisco Committee on Crime, A Report on Non-Victim Crime in San Francisco, Part I: Basic Principles, Public Drunkenness, San Francisco, April 25, 1971, p. 17.

¹⁰President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, op. cit., p. 236.

¹¹The San Francisco Committee on Crime, A Report on Non-Victim Crime in San Francisco, Part I: Basic Principles, Public Drunkenness, op. cit., p. 15.

¹²Ibid., p. 23.

¹³Jacqueline P. Wiseman, Stations of the Lost, (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970), p. 113.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 113.

¹⁵Bay Area Social Planning Council, The Chronic Drunkenness Offender in Alameda County, (Oakland, December, 1969).

Footnotes

¹⁶Bureau of Criminal Statistics, Adult Criminal Detention Reference Tables: 1969, State of California (Sacramento, 1970).

¹⁷Board of Corrections, op. cit., p. 53.

¹⁸Fred T. Hoover, Work Furlough Practices in California 1968, San Mateo County Sheriff's Department, August, 1968, Redwood City, California.; California Taxpayers Association, June, 1968, Work Furlough Programs in California Counties 1967-68: A Workload Study, State of California (Sacramento).; California Citizens Council, National Council on Crime and Delinquency, Work Furlough, A Time-Tested and Tax-Saving Program For Your Community, (Oakland, California, April, 1966).

¹⁹California Taxpayers Association, op. cit.

²⁰Board of Corrections, op. cit., pp. 51-60.

²¹Ibid., p. 51.

²²California Council on Criminal Justice, The California Criminal Justice System, State of California (Sacramento, 1970), p. 110.

²³Bureau of Criminal Statistics, Crime and Delinquency in California 1969, State of California (Sacramento, 1970), p. 137.

²⁴Royal Oak Municipal Court, Concerned Citizens and a City Criminal Court, Project Misdemeanor Foundation, (Royal Oak, 1969).

²⁵President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Criminal Justice, Task Force Report: Corrections, (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967), p. 104.

²⁶Northern California Service League, The County Jail Inmate As a Subject for Rehabilitation, (San Francisco, August, 1964).

²⁷American Correctional Association, Manual of Correctional Standards, (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967).

²⁸Board of Corrections, Jail Services Division, State of California (Sacramento).

²⁹Ibid., p. 73.

³⁰M. Robert Montilla, "Opportunities for Action Research in Community Correction", Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, Vol. VI (2), July, 1969.

Footnotes

³¹Ibid., p. 134.

³²Ibid., p. 128.

³³Ibid., p. 133.

³⁴Alvin Rudoff, et al., "Jail Inmates On Work Furlough", (paper presented at the American Society of Criminology Annual Meeting,) (Dallas, December 28, 1968).

³⁵Alvin Rudoff, et al., "Evaluating Work Furlough" (paper submitted for publication to Federal Probation in 1971). (Mimeographed.).

CHAPTER IV

THE MODEL COMMUNITY CORRECTIONAL FACILITY

This chapter presents a summary of the major elements of a model community correctional facility, including the county jail, as gleaned from the staff and inmates of correctional facilities in the study counties. It offers a statement of the goal of the model jail system and suggests specific methods to achieve the goal. Finally, this chapter presents the basic principles upon which progressive correctional facilities should be founded.

I. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE MODEL FACILITY FROM ADMINISTRATORS AND STAFF

Administrators and staff agreed on most of the elements proposed for inclusion in the model facility. Where there was significant disagreement, it is noted.

Adequate Funding

In order to accomplish a reasonably effective corrections task, there must be adequate facilities, sufficient staff, and programs which are effective. Adequate funds are mandatory to support all three of these ingredients. Because counties are already overburdened with increasing needs for funds, the State and Federal governments will need to subsidize local corrections facilities.

Effective Programs

Given adequate staff and facilities, efforts must be made to determine what programs will be most effective in reducing the recidivism for given types of inmates. As yet, however, there is little in the way of systematic empirical evidence demonstrating the effectiveness of alternative programs that exist in the county jail systems throughout the State. Most program decisions are made on the basis of untested rules of thumb, or on the basis of tradition. Both staff and inmates of county jails strongly recommended the development of on-going, systematic research aimed at determining the relative effectiveness of different programs that were being implemented in the county jails throughout the State.

Unified Efforts

Law enforcement, the courts, the county jails, and probation departments sometimes appear to be at odds with each other. The courts seem to be asking the jail to rehabilitate the offender, but with sentences of less than 30 days "rehabilitation" is difficult, if not impossible. There is

a need to unify the efforts of these various agencies so that each knows what is expected and what it can expect from others.

Training for Corrections

Adequate provisions should be made to provide staff with appropriate and relevant training in jail procedures, human behavior, and techniques of rehabilitation. If administrators expect law enforcement personnel to undertake the job of rehabilitation, then they must make clear how corrections relates to law enforcement.

Law Enforcement and Corrections

Although there were notable exceptions, the majority of first line deputies manning the jails and some of the jail administrators suggested that corrections was not an appropriate function for a law enforcement agency. Sheriffs, however, were generally opposed to relinquishing the corrections responsibility.

Inmates Inappropriate for Jail

With some consistency throughout the 15 study counties, the Task Force heard both staff and administrators saying that jails were inappropriate places of confinement for the increasing number of younger, more troublesome inmates who, a few years ago, were sent to state prison. Many also observed that jails were inappropriate settings for the "revolving door" alcoholic. With highly aggressive offenders and alcoholics (and possibly other inappropriate persons) diverted from the jail, community facilities could begin to concentrate their efforts on the more responsive inmate.

Observations by the Jail Task Force

The recommendations of the Jail Task Force are based in large part upon the comments and concerns expressed by staff and administrators in Chapter III. However, the Task Force questions the appropriateness of a recommendation to divert the "younger, troublesome inmate" to state prison. Commitment to state prison should be a last resort for all but those who pose a serious threat to the safety of the community. Thus far, state prison programs have not proven to be more effective than local efforts and there are indications that the reverse is true.¹ Probably a more satisfactory resolution to the question of commitment to state prison for troublesome youth is to provide greater State support to enable local officials to develop more effective programs for this type of inmate.

II. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE MODEL FACILITY FROM INMATES

The reader will note that many of the inmates' concerns and recommendations correspond to those made by jail administrators and staff. This is not surprising, since both groups are intimately involved in jail processes. Their points of view differ, however. Inmates, for example, complained of staff being unwilling to listen to their troubles. On the other hand, the staff complained that there was insufficient personnel to provide the time necessary to give inmates adequate attention.

Humane Physical Conditions

The most frequently expressed concern or recommendation by inmates had to do with their physical surroundings. They stated that, in order to reduce the brutalizing effect of jails on people, jails should not be crowded and should be hygienically clean and sanitary. Inmates should be removed from cells when they become sick, and they should not be placed in tanks when they come into jail while obviously ill (inmates were apparently referring to drunks and addicts who were suffering from DT's and withdrawal pains). To expedite such changes, a number of inmates suggested that the general public should be allowed to tour jails unannounced.

Selection at Intake

With reference to the negative effects of locking people up in jail, inmates recommended that only the people who need to be in jail should be placed there. They would eliminate jail sentences for all first-termers unless they were "dangerous". They would further eliminate jail for users of marijuana and alcohol unless they requested some time in jail (contrary to what one might expect, there were a number of inmates who felt that jail had been their salvation because they had been caught up in a "madness" as they described it, which necessitated drastic measures).

Individual Attention

A universal complaint by inmates was that there was no one in the facility who had time to listen to them. Many stated that deputies or correctional officers were not there to listen to them, but rather to maintain security. Even if they would listen to them, there were not enough to go around. They would like to see deputies and correctional officers trained in human relations so that inmates would be treated more as individuals.

Secondly, they would like to see counselors or probation officers included on the staff, to help them unravel their complicated lives before release and to help them define some goals towards which to work.

Given case workers and custodial staff trained in human relations, they would add group counseling, or, as they termed it, "rap sessions" which would be designed to change the attitude of staff.

Segregation

Although there were some objections to the next recommendation, it appeared that there was some agreement to the need for segregation of inmates according to age and crime. Prisoners generally made distinctions between (a) inmates under 30 years of age, (b) inmates over 30 years old, (c) those who commit violent crimes and "hurt other people", (d) thieves, and (e) mentally disturbed offenders. According to the inmate model, the marijuana user, the alcoholic, and the heroin user would not be in jails.

The Opportunity to Earn Funds

Reasoning that most inmates are poor, do not have ready employment upon release, and do not have families to support them, one consistent recommendation throughout the Task Force survey was that they be allowed to work at jobs which pay them so that they could save for the day of their release.

Motivation

Many observed that jail inmates, by and large, are a very pessimistic group and have failed so many times that they leave jail knowing they will fail again. This seemed to apply particularly to the alcoholic. Inmates asked for programs which would change negative orientations to life. Examples they gave were Dale Carnegie courses, Alcoholics Anonymous, and Toastmasters.

Community Resource Information

A recurring request was for knowledge about resources in the community and how to apply for them. Many inmates had heard that they could qualify for vocational training but had no idea how to obtain such assistance. Inmates requested that representatives of various community agencies be allowed to come into the jail so they could obtain answers to their questions.

All Programs Voluntary

They recommended that no one should be forced to participate in any kind of program because (1) it ruins the program for those who do want to participate, (2) inmates do not gain anything unless they want to, and (3) it will eliminate programs which no one needs (presumably because no one will be attending them). In some cases, programs were available only to "honor dormitories" and inmates felt that these "honor inmates" were those least in need of programs.

Individual Responsibility

If this were a listing of recommendations according to priority, the need to have more responsibility would be one of the top priority items. This recommendation was made very frequently by the inmates. Generally, inmates believed that their lives were managed to such an extent that they were forced to respond in a child-like fashion. They perceived staff attitudes as suspecting the worst rather than expecting the best. In their opinion, expecting the "best" would be a greater inducement to responsible behavior. The problem is that no one is responsible (inmates have no role in the decisions effecting them) and everyone is responsible (if one inmate in a dormitory breaks a serious rule, the whole dormitory is sometimes punished).

Training in Use of Leisure Time

Inmates recommended the establishment of programs which would train them to use their leisure time constructively.

Academic and Vocational Training

They identified three areas in which the inmate population needed academic instruction. For those who could not read or write, there is need for some very basic instruction; for those who had been to school but had not graduated, they identified a need for instruction in order to obtain a high school diploma. A great number also requested various vocational training courses.

Increased Family Contact

Contact with family members was considered to be far more important to inmates than were any new programs that might be established in the jail. Inmates recommended a revision of visiting privileges to allow for more frequent visits and personal contact. This is consistent with the goal of reintegration. For the females, restrictions against visiting with their minor sons and daughters would be eliminated. There would be no limitation on the number of letters to and from families.

Release Based on Readiness

There was a high degree of consensus among inmates that lengthy jail terms embitter people, and that there is a time in most inmates' sentences when they are better prepared for release than at any other time. Because of this, they recommended that prisoners be released "when they are ready" rather than wait until the expiration of their maximum term. However, there was disagreement among the inmates on just how such a decision might be reached.

Mark Debt "Paid"

An overwhelming number of inmates spoke to the problem of the stigma of a person who has been in jail. Many employment opportunities are closed to them. When a crime occurs, they are the first suspects to be questioned. Furthermore, society never again fully trusts them. They wanted some process by which their crime could be erased from the records so they could compete in the labor market on the basis of ability rather than past history. As one inmate put it:

"Once you've committed a crime you're never finished paying for it. After you've paid your debt to society you should be judged on your ability."

Summary

Generally, the recommendations made by the inmates interviewed are those which have been recommended by experts in the field, and virtually every recommendation made can be found in the President's Commission Report The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society.² Perhaps the only serious objection to implementing them is based on economics. If the State were to assure humane conditions in all county jails, the costs could be astronomical if examined in terms of large, steel and concrete maximum and minimum security jails. If, however, inmates' recommendations for selecting those who would go to jail were implemented (only those who need "control"), the present number of jails might very well be able to handle the inmates remaining. The funds presently allocated for new construction could be diverted to improved conditions and support for people-changing programs.

III. THE GOAL OF THE COMMUNITY CORRECTIONAL FACILITY

In further development of the discussion of functions, goals, and philosophies begun in Chapter II, the Jail Task Force proposes that the primary goal of corrections and particularly correctional facilities, is:

The protection of society through reduction of the probability that an offender will commit another crime.

Secondary goals include rehabilitation, reintegration, deterrence, and incapacitation by confinement. Some would argue that retribution is a fifth goal. However, retribution bears no relationship to the primary goal of corrections, i.e. the protection of society. Retribution may motivate those who sentence offenders to a period of incarceration, so this function may be subsumed under the heading of "deterrence".

IV. PRINCIPLES OF THE MODEL COMMUNITY CORRECTIONAL FACILITY

The basic principles of the entire correctional system are summarized in the System Task Force Report. The statements which follow attempt to apply these principles to community correctional facilities.

The Appropriateness of Incarceration

Jails and correctional facilities should be based upon the goals described above and should always be primarily geared at protecting society by reducing the probability that the offender will commit another crime. It is the position of the Jail Task Force that this primary goal is almost always compatible with and best achieved by rehabilitation and reintegration of the offender into society. This means that the jail must not be used as a "dumping ground" for society's misfits, such as the alcoholic and the mentally handicapped offender. The community has the responsibility for providing alternatives to confinement in jail for people who come to the attention of law enforcement for reasons other than the commission of a crime.

Coordination

The community correctional facility is only one component of the criminal justice system that is affected by and in turn affects all other components. This principle leads to the need for coordination among the criminal justice system components in order to achieve the overall goal as efficiently and economically as possible. This principle also speaks to the need for coordination between the local corrections component sub-units, correctional facilities, probation, and law enforcement.

Safe and Humane Conditions

The facilities which serve the criminal justice system (corrections and detention) must be able to provide safe and humane living conditions through appropriate housing and sufficient staff. If the community decides that a person must be locked up for his or the community's safety, the community has a moral and legal obligation to guarantee the individual's safety, and to provide him with living conditions which allow him to maintain mental and physical well-being.

Responsibility for Community Corrections

As the mobility of California's population increases, both the counties and the State must share in the responsibility for the reintegration of offenders. The State has the overall enabling responsibility for the corrections system. It must assume the responsibility for equalizing the financial burden

among the counties through a subsidy and must substantially assist the counties in achieving their goals through consultation, standard setting and enforcement, training, and research. The counties have a responsibility to establish the facilities and provide the services that will meet the offender's needs. Community correctional services must meet or exceed the standards that have been set by the State.

Accountability

Jails (as well as all components of the correctional and criminal justice systems) must be accountable to the community in which they operate. This principle requires that a comprehensive fund of knowledge be developed in the following areas: (a) follow-up research to assess the outcome of decisions made by the principals in the criminal justice and correction systems; (b) the costs of the decisions made in terms of both immediate and long range costs based upon follow-up; (c) the existing and possible alternatives available to each decision maker at critical points in the correction system; (d) the inter-faces between the components of the correctional and criminal justice systems and other services in the community.

Range of Services

Treatment of offenders should be individualized to the greatest extent possible. This principle has implications for both the nature of correctional facilities and the variety of correctional programming available. The extent of external control upon an inmate should bear a direct relationship to the actual danger he poses to himself and the community.

Jails typically tend to over-control, probably because the maximum security facility can be used to house all offenders, whereas minimum security facilities can house only those who have a higher degree of self-control. In maximum security, the inmate has little opportunity to develop internal controls when they are lacking. He may find whatever ability for self-reliance he had diminishes as time in custody continues.

The range of services, therefore, must include maximum security facilities for those who pose an inordinate danger to the community, and minimum security facilities to house the work and educational furlougher and the "week-ender". A range of correctional programs must be available in each of these facilities, so that correctional efforts are directed toward the reintegration of the offender into the community. The range of programs should include the traditional work experience, vocational training, education, and community-based activities which can be carried on when the inmate leaves the facility. Ideally, offenders should be released back to the community out of a program such as work furlough, where there is a minimum of external control and a maximum of self-controlled, community-based activities.

Reintegration

In line with the principle stated immediately above, but of sufficient importance to re-state and develop, is the need to direct correctional efforts towards returning the offender to the community. Institutions have only a temporary role in dealing with the offender and therefore must make every effort, consistent with public protection, to assist the offender in making a successful return to the community. Staff of the correctional facility should be committed to the reality that the offenders whom they are supervising, in the next hour or in the next day, will be free in the community.

Visibility and Public Involvement

The facilities, processes, and programs in correctional facilities belong to the community and the community has a right to be informed on all aspects of corrections, particularly the goals of corrections and the extent to which corrections is meeting these goals. This principle means not only that the public should be made aware of research results, but also that it should be involved in correctional programming. The efforts of corrections in public education and community involvement will result in greater public support and greater ease in attaining the goal of corrections.

The model community correctional facility is based upon the foregoing principles and the recommended modifications which follow.

FOOTNOTES

¹President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Task Force Report: Corrections (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967), p. 162.

²President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967).

CHAPTER V

PREVAILING ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Undoubtedly, the present correctional system and the system of criminal justice are in need of fundamental change. Clearly, changing the jail operation without also changing the entire system is at best a stop-gap measure. However, the present corrections "non-system" may not be capable of withstanding the immediate future pressures without being inundated. This section of the Jail Task Force Report proposes some modifications to the existing "non-system" which are in keeping with a more fundamental reorganization and which are immediately applicable.

I. THE DILEMMA OF JAILS: CHANGE, TRANSFER, OR CLOSE?

A basic issue which increasingly confronts California's system of criminal justice is whether or not sheriff's departments, or any other law enforcement agency, should continue to operate jails, particularly jails for sentenced offenders. Data collected in this study revealed strong feelings on both sides of the issue.

A number of nationally respected authorities in criminal justice have urged that jails no longer be administered by law enforcement agencies. For example, the International City Managers Association stated:

"The responsibility of jail management is separate from law enforcement and ideally should be administered by professional corrections personnel rather than by police officers."¹

The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice has also argued:

"As long as jails are operated by law enforcement officials, no matter how enlightened, it will be more difficult to transform them into correctional centers. As a major step toward reform, jails should be placed under the control of correctional authorities who are able to develop the needed program services."²

Following this thought, an increasing number of municipalities have deleted the operation of jails from the responsibilities of their police departments. Also in accord with this philosophy, the California Penal Code allows for the creation of a separate county department of corrections to operate facilities for sentenced offenders.

In general, arguments advanced in favor of removing the jails from law enforcement administration are as follows:

1. The basic philosophy and approach of law enforcement and corrections are often in sharp contrast, in respect to offenders, viz. many see the role of law enforcement as "locking them up" and that of corrections as "getting them out" and reintegrating them into the community.
2. Effective correctional activities require a substantially different type of training than that normally provided for law enforcement personnel.
3. Freeing deputies from jail duty would make them available to perform critically needed police duties for which they are uniquely trained.
4. Placing of the jails under correctional personnel, such as the probation officer or a county department of corrections, would provide for more effective integration of correctional efforts, i.e. a "continuum of treatment" between pre-institutional, institutional, and post-institutional efforts.
5. Philosophically, rehabilitation ranks near the bottom of law enforcement's primary concerns while correctional personnel clearly see it as the primary and most effective means of protecting society. Rehabilitation tends to receive the lowest priority of law enforcement administration in terms of staffing and other resources.
6. County jails remain the only segment of the entire correctional system that is not administered and staffed by trained correctional personnel.

Those persons who favor retention of jails by law enforcement agencies offer the following observations:

1. Under the auspice of law enforcement, some jurisdictions have demonstrated an interest in corrections, and have developed sophisticated corrections programs.
2. There is a basic similarity in function, viz. providing a service to people.
3. Assignment to correctional facilities provides good initial training for the newly-hired deputy.
4. Some counties which had previously removed the jail function from law enforcement have since reassigned that responsibility to the sheriff.

Data collected in this study reinforce the dichotomy of opinion. As indicated in Chapter III, persons who staff California's jails feel that law enforcement, the courts, and corrections are working toward opposing

goals, and that jail staff gets "caught in the middle". The data also reflect a sense of futility on the part of these persons in respect to the correctional goals of jails. Also apparent is the feeling expressed by jail staff that they trained to be law enforcement officers, joined a sheriff's department in order to perform police duties, and that they "want to get out" of their custodial assignments.

Data reveal that one-third of 36 sheriffs who responded to the question, "Do you believe that the operation of facilities for sentenced prisoners is an appropriate task for a law enforcement agency?", answered negatively, while two-thirds of the respondents felt that the task was appropriate. As indicated in Chapter IV, the majority view of the sheriffs is not supported by most of the first-line deputies who staff the jails, but it is supported by a majority of jail administrators. Sixteen of the sheriffs also thought that the staff assigned to corrections should be specialists in the field and 11 were opposed to specialization, preferring that their deputies be as capable in patrol, investigation and other duties as they were in corrections.

When the issue was discussed with presiding judges of Superior Courts, Chairmen of Boards of Supervisors, and Chief Administrative Officers in the 15 counties included in this study, 76% of the 38 interviewees favored removal of responsibility for sentenced prisoners from the sheriff. Sixty-three percent of the respondents urged creation of a local or regional department of corrections, and 16% favored transferring the jail function to the probation officer. They noted that the probation officer is a correctional specialist, and that, in many cases, he already operates correctional institutions.

It is the strong view of the Jail Task Force that California's jail system must decide upon one of two courses of action. The first such course is to remove responsibility for sentenced inmates from the sheriff or from any other department which is basically law-enforcement in nature. In this instance, it becomes necessary for the system to develop alternative programs, either under a local or regional department of corrections, or under the probation officer.

The second alternative is to retain the jailing responsibility within sheriff's departments, and to develop within those departments sophisticated correctional programs, staffed by persons trained in correctional philosophy and procedures, and making effective use of community-based resources. In short, if the latter alternative is to be chosen, the sheriffs of California must recognize the importance of corrections (as has been done in some California counties) and, in effect, develop a corrections-oriented "mind-set".

In either event, it is imperative that both local jurisdictions and the State (aided, as possible, by LEAA funds) make a substantially greater financial commitment to provide the necessary staff and other resources in order to develop genuine "correctional" facilities. If they do not, the results are clear: (1) jails will continue to represent the nadir of corrections and (2) the courts will continue to order them changed or closed.

II. INADEQUATE INFORMATION SYSTEMS

In a recent study of California county jails published by the California Board of Corrections, the inadequacies of information in the corrections component of the county criminal justice system were highlighted:

"The findings in this area (program evaluation through data analysis) were quite discouraging. The ability of most counties to evaluate their own correctional efforts in any sense beyond intuition is non-existent... There cannot be effective programs, much less the evaluation of them, without sound, reliable records."³

Scarcity of information is not a recent development in local corrections. Adams and Burdman, in their study of California county jails 14 years ago, observed:

"The jail administrator is operating, and he will continue to operate, under a severe handicap until he develops a broadly useful inmate record system. This will permit them -- or cooperating research agencies -- to make certain kinds of evaluations of his operation. He will become able to plan his program with much more confidence than formerly. But more important, he will be able to make evaluations of a fundamental kind. He will be able to determine the contributions of specific administrative policies of programs for all inmates or for particular classes of inmates. ...At the present time, the major deficiency in county jail data is the lack of a system for maintaining accurate and meaningful statistics on population breakdowns. In order to obtain basic information as to size, composition, and movement of jail population at the particular time, jail officials were obliged to resort to estimates or to make laborious counts on the bound register. The absence of elementary statistical information is a serious obstruction to planning research."⁴

The 1970 study was encouraged to find that the Bureau of Criminal Statistics had slowly been increasing the coverage of its ongoing adult criminal detention study which began on a pilot basis in 1964 with five counties, and in 1968 had expanded to include 43 counties.⁵ Unfortunately, because of economic considerations, the Bureau of Criminal Statistics is reducing its adult detention study to 15 counties and reducing its efforts to control the quality of the data input from the counties.⁶ Development of the local agencies' ability to provide the Bureau with accurate data on the movement of offenders through the jails and camps was a slow and laborious process, as indicated by the four years required to expand the initial three county study to 43 jurisdictions. To return to the level of sophistication existing in 1965 appears to be an unfortunate step back-

ward for the criminal justice information so badly needed.

In the 1959-70 fiscal year, the Department of Justice launched a five year plan to computerize the Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS). The extent of information CJIS will be able to provide correctional decision-makers, through the compilation of statistical reports reflecting the population movement through jail and probation, is not yet clear; the target date for the availability of such information is sometime in the 1973-74 fiscal year.⁷

In addition to its publication Crime and Delinquency in California, each year the Bureau of Criminal Statistics has provided the counties with adult criminal detention data which include statistics on the sentencing court, type of conviction, offense for which convicted, sentence, length of sentence imposed, actual time served, and individual inmate characteristics such as age, race, sex, and the type of release.⁸ It would appear that these types of data would be indispensable to local administrators for purposes of budgeting, facility planning, and staffing. However, while all studied agencies were familiar with the yearly publication, Crime and Delinquency in California, few were familiar with the extent of data available in the companion volume, Adult Criminal Detention, and with the implications of these data. As one administrator said, "All they do is tell me that I have a problem, and I already know that."

The problem, therefore, is not solely one of insufficient data, but it is also one of interpreting the data and applying it to decisions. Montilla suggests that decision-makers in corrections do not want statistics and prefer to continue making decisions on the basis of faith and other considerations. He quotes a judge as having said, "I don't believe in statistics".⁹ This attitude, which is probably held by many decision-makers in the criminal justice system, is perhaps the reason why administrators have been unaware of such data, and why administrators have been reluctant to cooperate in keeping systematic records on their respective agency operations.

Another, and extremely important, kind of information necessary to the development of an efficient corrections system are data which indicate what programs are most effective with what types of offenders. These types of data are developed through follow-up studies, which cover a period of time and which involve comparing offenders who remain arrest-free with those who are rearrested, in an effort to determine what factors distinguish the two groups. A pre-requisite to such follow-up studies is the development of base-expectancy tables, so that factors other than those being studied (programs, sentences, etc.) can be consistent.

The picture is quite different at the level of State correctional efforts. The Department of Corrections and the Department of the Youth Authority have a combined budget exceeding one million dollars per year for research and administrative statistics. Both departments know the characteristics of their wards/inmates, and are able to plot their populations on the basis of a multitude of variables. They can, with some accuracy, project

their anticipated needs for facilities and programs, or the elimination of such facilities and programs for years into the future. The Department of Corrections has developed predictive base expectancy tables and has applied them to research program effectiveness. In view of the fact that State level corrections has only a minority of California's offenders under its control, while the majority of offenders are under local control and supervision, the expenditure of funds and efforts in research appears to be disproportionate. However, this situation can be gradually remedied by the State assisting local communities in research.

The problem of insufficient information can be divided into three sub-problems:

1. Insufficient data are fed back to the correctional decision-makers at the level of the community.
2. Correctional decision-makers at the community level are suspicious of criminal statistics so that the simple increase in the availability of such data alone would not suffice.
3. Sophistication in the use of correctional data is at an undeveloped level because skills in this area have not been called upon. Therefore, if data were available, and an attempt were to be made encouraging decision-makers to use these data, then it would be necessary to inaugurate an educational program regarding data use and create a system of demands for decisions which reflect understanding of probable outcomes.

Recommendations

1. *The State of California should expand its major responsibility for the accumulation, dissemination, and the interpretation of data reflecting the movement of the offender through each sub-unit of the criminal justice system and should provide follow-up data which would describe the outcome of critical decisions made by each component of the criminal justice system.*
2. *The State should provide interpretative services and training for the correctional decision-makers in the use of the data collected. This effort should be directed at generating greater confidence in the use of data on crime and developing the skills necessary to apply data to decisions.*

III. THE ISOLATION OF SUB-UNITS IN THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

In the State of California there are 58 separate criminal justice systems, corresponding to its 58 counties. Within the system in each county, there are three relatively distinct sub-units composed of law enforcement, the courts (including the district attorney and public defender), and correc-

tions (including detention and correctional facilities and probation). In the 15 counties studied by the Jail Task Force, 60 such sub-units were functioning. Though focus was on the detention and correctional facilities in these counties, staff gathered impressions from the remaining three sub-units in each county from the Correctional System Study staff.

Although ostensibly working toward the same ultimate goal, i.e., the reduction of crime, each sub-unit in these systems performed its function in relative isolation from the other sub-units. Further, sub-units in one county were also relatively isolated from corresponding components in the other counties. Within the county justice system, the relative isolation of one sub-unit from another expressed itself in a number of ways. Administrators of detention and correctional facilities felt that they were expected to be passive respondents to court decisions and sentencing which had a significant impact upon their operations. As the time between arraignment and sentence grows, so does the pre-sentenced population in the jail, thus overburdening the staff and resources available. With regard to the results of sentencing upon correctional facilities, the sheriffs indicated that they were expected to handle an increased number of sentenced prisoners for a shorter time, thus precluding the possibility of continuing or developing rehabilitation programs.

As an indicator of the isolation of correctional facilities from probation, the study results indicate that more than 61% of the inmates serving jail sentences as a condition of probation stated that they had not seen their probation officers, even though over 41% were within four weeks of release. According to one sheriff, his most important supporter was the probation department. However, in the remaining 14 counties, no mention was made of the contributions of probation to institution and correctional programs.

Though any single decision by a sub-unit of the criminal justice system may not have a significant impact upon the remaining sub-units, when a decision is considered in the context of the hundreds of thousands of persons processed through the jail each year, it is easy to see how decisions made in one unit cause reverberations throughout the entire criminal justice system.

With regard specifically to jail operations, there appears to be some duplication of effort as a result of the lack of coordination. The most apparent duplication existed in booking and records-keeping in those few counties which had both city jails and county jails. When an offender is apprehended by the city police department and booked into the city jail, he is fingerprinted, photographed, and his criminal record is researched through the Bureau of Criminal Identification and Investigation. When he is turned over to the sheriff, the procedure is often repeated. The staff time involved in the duplication of the process and the costs of duplicate records-keeping is incalculable but significant when one looks at the other sub-units in the justice system. Expensive criminal laboratories and technical staff sometimes exist within blocks of each other, one in the police department and one in the sheriff's department. Amalgamation of such services

is taking place throughout the State but at a slow pace. If there is to be a substantial reduction of crime, and the costs of controlling it, there must be unification of effort.

Recommendation

3. *Counties (or, if several counties wish to group themselves, regions) should establish Criminal Justice Commissions composed of representatives from the sub-units of the criminal justice system in the area, members of the community, and members of local governing bodies.*

The local Criminal Justice Commission, as envisioned in this recommendation, is composed of an executive officer and members who represent local law enforcement, the courts, corrections, local governing bodies, and the community. The prime functions would be the "monitoring" and co-ordination of the criminal justice system, possible allocation of Federal funds to the sub-units of the justice system, and interpretation of the activities of the criminal justice system to the community. The Commission would have no functional authority over the sub-units.

IV. MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR LOCAL DETENTION FACILITIES

Revision of Standards Recommended

In December 1969, the State Board of Corrections published a report based on 18 months of extensive research by the Committee to Study the Inspection of Local Detention Facilities.¹⁰ In regard to the adequacy of the present minimum jail standards, the Committee observed that only 9 out of the 108 pages included in the Minimum Jail Standards¹¹, published by the Board of Corrections, are mandatory. All other provisions are recommended. In regard to inspection, 14 separate bodies are charged with partial or overall responsibility of inspection, yet many of these bodies may not know what they are inspecting. In summary, the Committee stated: "The present system of inspection and its efficiency can be seen as one long series of 'even if's'.

1. Even if many inspections are legally authorized, some are not made for a number of reasons: The present provision for the inspection is permissive; the provision for formation of the inspecting agency is permissive; the inspecting agency lacks the manpower or time.
2. Even if the inspection is made, the subsequent report is generally advisory in nature and lacks any legal enforcement powers.
3. Even if the report contains advice, its value may vary with whether the inspector is a lay group or a professional.

CALIFORNIA CORRECTIONAL SYSTEM STUDY

Final Report

Human Relations Agency
Board of Corrections

James M. Hall, Chairman
Secretary, Human Relations Agency

Karl Holton, Vice-Chairman
Probation Officer
Los Angeles County (Ret.)
(Citizen Member)

Michael N. Canlis
Sheriff, San Joaquin County

Mrs. Eleanor W. Hiller
Chairman, Women's Board of
Terms and Parole

R. K. Procunier
Director of Corrections

Allen Breed
Director of the Youth Authority

Julio Gonzales
Vice Chairman
Youth Authority Board

Henry Kerr
Chairman, Adult Authority

Edward Walker
Chairman, Narcotic Addict
Evaluation Authority

State of California

Ronald Reagan, Governor

Sacramento

JULY, 1971

STUDY STAFF

Robert E. Keldgord, Program Director

Robert O. Norris, D. Crim., Associate Program Director

Miss Patricia A. Hagen, Secretary-Office Manager

Probation Task Force

Richard P. Gist, Director

Jack Allbright, Consultant
Mrs. Joyce M. DeVore, Consultant
Harry A. Dudley, Consultant
Sam Glane, Consultant
David R. Mutsler, Consultant
Miss Gwen M. Monroe, Consultant
Arthur D. Nettles, Jr., Consultant
Leo M. Owen, Consultant
Rito Rosa, Jr., Consultant
Mrs. Gloria Steen, Consultant
Joseph J. Tavares, Consultant
William A. Underwood, Consultant

Ernest S. Bachelor, Consultant
Wes DeWeert, Consultant
Jack Gifford, Consultant
Russell D. Kokx, Consultant
Francis E. Miller, Consultant
Gilbert J. Negrette, Consultant
Miss Sylvia Newberry, Consultant
Joseph W. Phelan, Consultant
Harley L. Ross, Consultant
Miss Marilyn Stewart, Consultant
Miss Lucille Toscano, Consultant
Joel A. Ungar, Consultant

Juvenile Institutions Task Force

Eugene O. Sahs, Director

Mrs. Edith Elkins, Consultant
William Pagle, Consultant
Lawrence Stump, Consultant

Leonard Moncure, Consultant
Willie Richardson, Consultant

County Jails and Camps Task Force

Edward A. Veit, Director

Mrs. Willa J. Dawson, Consultant

Edgar A. Smith, Consultant

Prisons Task Force

Gus Harrison, Director

William L. Kime, Consultant

Perry M. Johnson, Consultant

Parole Task Force *

Tully, McCrea,	Co-Director
Mrs. Helen Sumner,	Co-Director

R. Barry Follensen, Consultant	Edward F. Tripp, Consultant
Jeffrey Glen, Consultant	Lee F. Cumpston, Consultant
Frederick Howlett, Consultant	Don Gottfredson, Ph.D., Consultant
Walter Lusser, Consultant	Dean R. Lantz, Consultant
Arnold Pontesso, Consultant	K. W. Ostrom, Consultant

Systems Task Force

Robert M. Brown, Jr.,	Co-Director
Donald L. Garrity, Ph.D.,	Co-Director

Special Consultants

Neeley Gardner
Daniel Glaser, Ph.D.
Richard A. McGee
Spencer Williams

Editor

Peter G. Garabedian, Ph.D.

Artist

Mrs. Lily Wong

Clerical Staff

Mrs. Lorraine Cook
Mrs. Shirley Houser
Miss Kathy Mackey
Miss Beverly Campbell

*The Parole Task Force Report was prepared, under contract, by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency.

CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Honorable W. Craig Biddle, Co-chairman
California State Assembly

Honorable James M. Hall, Co-chairman
Secretary, Human Relations Agency
Chairman, Board of Corrections

Honorable Arthur Alarcon
Judge of the Superior Court
Los Angeles County

Wesley Barrett
Chief of Police
City of Oroville

Herbert L. Ashby
Chief Asst. Attorney General--Criminal
Department of Justice
Sacramento

Honorable Bernard J. Clark
Sheriff
Riverside County

Honorable Marie Bertillion Collins
Judge of the Municipal Court
Oakland

Honorable Gordon Cologne
California State Senator

Honorable John T. Conlan, Chairman
Board of Supervisors
Ventura County

Robert Eckhoff
Public Defender
Santa Barbara County

Herbert E. Elingwood
Legal Affairs Secretary
Governor's Office

Tony Garcia
Secretary-Business Agent-ILWU
Port Hueneme

Allen Grant, President
California Farm Bureau Federation
Berkeley

Honorable Bertram Janes
Justice of the Third District
Court of Appeal
Sacramento

Kenneth Kirkpatrick
Chief Probation Officer
Los Angeles County

Elmer Kim Nelson, Jr., D.P.A.
School of Public Administration
University of Southern California

Charles J. Patterson, Ph.D.
Vice President
World Airways, Inc.
Oakland

Mrs. Dorothy L. Schechter
Assistant County Counsel
Ventura County

Honorable Ray Reynolds
Judge of the Municipal Court
San Francisco

Ted L. Smith
Chief Probation Officer
Placer County

Honorable Keith Sorenson
District Attorney
San Mateo County

INTRODUCTION: INSTITUTIONS TASK FORCE REPORTS

It is the view of this study that the most effective service which can be rendered to an offender, consequently resulting in the best protection of society, and probably also offering society the greatest economy, is community-based service provided by the local level of government.

Further, it is held that, when institutionalization is considered for an individual, the burden for placement of an individual in an appropriate facility, and demonstrating the need for such placement, rests with the system. Concurrently, there exists a burden upon the system to return the offender to the community at the earliest time possible, consistent with public safety. In order to accomplish this mission, it is deemed imperative that institutional programs be community-oriented, and that they be equipped to effect smooth transition into the community-at-large.

Despite this commitment to the value of community-based programs, the study recognizes that, for some offenders such programs are not adequate, and that, accordingly, there remains a need for institutional care of some persons.

Data provided by the California State Bureau of Criminal Statistics reveal that for every 100 Superior Court convictions, approximately 9 defendants are committed to prison, that approximately 4 persons are committed to the California Youth Authority for institutionalization, that approximately 4 persons are, by means of a civil commitment procedure, sent to the California Rehabilitation Center (for narcotics rehabilitation), and that some 41 persons are sent to local jails, either as a condition of probation or as the result of a straight jail sentence.¹

Additional data reveal that, for every 100 referrals to a probation department by California's Municipal Courts, some 23 defendants are sentenced to local jail, and approximately one person is committed to the California Youth Authority for institutionalization.²

In respect to juveniles, data reveal that for every 100 youth who appear before California's Juvenile Courts, approximately 12 youth are committed to locally-operated camps, ranches, and schools, and approximately one youth is committed to the California Youth Authority.³

While it is true, as will be reflected later in this Task Force Report, that commitments to State-operated youth and adult institutions have decreased dramatically in the past few years, the operation of these institutions remains a costly burden to the taxpayer. For example, the yearly cost of maintaining a ward in a CYA facility is \$6,754, and, should it become necessary for the State to build additional youth institutions, the construction costs, at present levels, will be \$20,000 per bed.⁴ In State-operated adult institutions, the yearly cost of maintaining a prisoner in custody is \$3,012;⁵ should it become necessary for the State to build additional adult penal facilities, the construction costs, at present levels, are estimated to range between \$20,000 and \$25,000 per bed.⁶ In contrast, field supervision can be provided at a fraction of institutional cost; for example, CYA can supervise a juvenile parolee for \$648 per year.⁷

When viewed nationally, correctional institutions are seen as large, antiquated, ill-equipped and poorly-staffed facilities, which are deprived of interaction with the community, and the effectiveness of which is more likely to be hindered than helped.⁸ The institutions exist in an information vacuum, and are handicapped by a lack of public support. The horizon is dotted by large multi-purpose custodial facilities which are wasteful of both offenders and staff.

Although California's correctional facilities have had a national reputation for providing superior services to inmates, it is still true that many of its institutions are large, fortress-like concrete structures, generally isolated from the community, and frequently operated within an information vacuum. California's correctional institutions receive public support only sporadically. At times the public is willing to support institutions that are antiquated as demonstrated in its willingness to tolerate a jail that is a century old.

It must also be noted that, more often than not, correctional institutions have been built without much prior consideration of the programs they were to house, and in some instances, institutions have been built but never opened.

Authorities have developed a series of purposes for correctional institutions, as follows:⁹

- "1 To seek to limit confinement to persons actually requiring it, for only as long as they require it, and under conditions that are lawful and humane.
2. To afford both the community and the offender temporary and partial respite from each other in order to facilitate resolution of the crisis which led to commitment.
3. To make the confinement experience constructive and relevant to the ultimate goal of reintegrating the offender into the community and of preventing recidivism.
4. To educate the community and its agencies about the problems of reintegrating offenders in order to elicit their collaboration in carrying out specific rehabilitative efforts and in improving conditions which militate against such efforts.
5. To seek continual improvement in the system's capacity to achieve these ends."

It is the view of this study that neither the State of California, nor any of its political subdivisions, should erect correctional facilities without adhering to these purposes. Further, it is suggested that consider-

ation be given to the closure of some existing institutions which, for one reason or another, cannot operate within the confines of these purposes; it is submitted that savings resulting from such closures could best be applied to local, community-oriented programs, subsidized by the State and operated by local jurisdictions under conditions and standards determined by the State.

FOOTNOTES

¹Bureau of Criminal Statistics, Crime and Delinquency in California: 1969, State of California (Sacramento, 1969), p. 121; Bureau of Criminal Statistics, Adult Probation: 1969, State of California (Sacramento, 1969), p. 27.

²Bureau of Criminal Statistics, Adult Probation: 1969, op. cit., p. 30.

³Bureau of Criminal Statistics, Juvenile Probation and Detention: 1969, State of California (Sacramento, 1969), p. 1; Bureau of Criminal Statistics, Crime and Delinquency in California: 1969, op. cit., p. 179.

⁴1970-71 cost data, provided by the Department of Youth Authority, State of California.

⁵Department of Finance, California State Budget: 1971, State of California (Sacramento 1971).

⁶Data provided by Department of Corrections, based on construction of medium security facility.

⁷1970-71 cost data, provided by the Department of Youth Authority, State of California.

⁸Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, Manpower and Training in Correctional Institutions: 1969 (Washington, 1969). (Should be ordered from the American Correctional Association.)

⁹Ibid., p. 36.

CALIFORNIA CORRECTIONAL SYSTEM STUDY

JUVENILE INSTITUTION TASK FORCE REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS	ix
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Study Objectives	1
Scope of the Study	2
The county level	2
The State level	2
Limitations	2
Study population	3
Methodology	3
Phase I. Review of the literature	3
Phase II. Institutional survey	3
Staff questionnaires	4
Client questionnaires	4
Phase III. Model-building interviews and panels	5
Phase IV. Data assessment	5
Summary	5
II. AN OVERVIEW OF JUVENILE INSTITUTIONS IN CALIFORNIA	7
The County System	7
Historically	7
Today	8
The State System	10
Historically	10
Today	13
Summary	14

CHAPTER	PAGE
III. JUVENILE INSTITUTIONS MODEL	18
Goals	18
Realistic expectations	18
Principles	19
Responsibility	19
Reintegration	19
Coordination	19
Community-based	20
Visibility and accountability	20
Burden of proof	20
Public involvement	20
Change-orientation	20
Differentiation and range of services	21
Financial support	21
Standards	21
Facilities	21
Type	21
Size	21
Planning	22
General	22
Staff	22
Ratios	22
Qualifications	22
Training	23
Working conditions	23

CHAPTER	PAGE
IV. THE CURRENT SYSTEM: SURVEY FINDINGS	25
Goals and Expectations	25
Staff views	25
Client views	26
Functions	26
Intake	26
County process	26
State process	26
Clientele	27
Reception, classification, assignment	31
Time delays	31
Quality of information	32
Use of classification materials	33
Summary	33
Care, custody, and control	35
Program	38
Treatment	41
Education	41
Work and vocational training	41
Summary	42
Release and aftercare	43
Length of stay and readiness for release	43
Links between institution and aftercare	47
Resources	48
Geographic location	48

CHAPTER	PAGE
Institutional design	51
Institutional size	51
Living unit size	52
Staffing Ratios	54
Staff characteristics and qualifications	55
Para-professionals	56
Volunteers	58
Training	59
Working conditions and morale	59
Public relations	63
Fiscal support	63
Research and Evaluation	64
Role of research and evaluation	64
Impact of correctional programs	66
At the county level	66
At the State level	67
Promising directions	69
Minimizing penetration into the institutional system	69
Differential programming	71
Creating normal social settings in institutions	72
Continuity between institution and community	72
Summary	72
V. PREVAILING ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS	79
Credibility Gap Between State and Counties	80
Recommendation 1	80

CHAPTER	PAGE
Subsidy	80
Recommendations 2 - 4	82
Classification and Diagnosis	82
Recommendations 5 - 8	83
Program Gaps	83
Emotionally disturbed youth and drug users	83
Young adults	84
Girls	84
Educational and vocational programs	84
Recommendations 9 - 14	85
Release and Aftercare	86
Recommendations 15 - 20	87
Facilities	88
Recommendations 21 - 22	89
Staff	89
Recommendations 23 - 26	90
Public Involvement	90
Recommendation 27	90
Research and Evaluation	91
Recommendations 28 - 31	91
APPENDIX A	94

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Growth of County Camps	9
II. Comparison of Juveniles Committed to CYA and County Camps, Ranches, Homes, and Schools, 1969	11
III. Characteristics of Youth Authority Boys in Institutions June 30 Each Year, 1961 - 1970	29
IV. Characteristics of Youth Authority Girls in Institutions June 30 Each Year, 1961 - 1970	30
V. Use of Classification Materials (Staff Responses)	34
VI. Evaluation of Care, Custody, and Control (Staff Responses)	36
VII. Mean Length of Stay of Wards in CYA and CDC Institutions Prior to Release on Parole, 1961 - 1970	44
VIII. Readiness for Release (Staff Views)	46
IX. Percentage of Wards in Youth Authority Institutions by Area of Commitment	50
X. Staff Characteristics	57
XI. Training Needed and Received: Administrators	60
XII. Training Needed and Received: Supervisors	61
XIII. Training Needed and Received: Line Workers	62
XIV. Time on Parole Prior to Violation for Wards Released to CYA Parole in 1964 & 1965	68
XV. Expected and Actual Violation Rates of Youth Authority 1968 Parolees, by Institution	70

LIST OF CHARTS

CHART	PAGE
I. Attempted Suicides	39
II. Attacks on Staff or Wards	39
III. Self Inflicted Injuries	39
IV. Restraints Needed	40
V. Fights - Involving Injuries	40
VI. Escapes	40
VII. Institution Size - Youth Authority Facilities	53

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The State of California should enact legislation clearly spelling out its role and binding commitment to acceptance of the primary overall and enabling responsibility for corrections throughout the State, with the counties having the primary responsibility for the delivery of correctional services.
 2. The State of California should subsidize county camps, ranches, schools, and homes in accord with the overall subsidy program specified in the System Task Force Report. Essentially, that Report recommends subsidization for actual costs of maintenance and operation according to the following ratios:
 - a. 75/25--Probation field services, including day care programs. This means that the State would pay 75% of the costs and the counties 25%.
 - b. 60/40--"Open" institutions (facilities where youths reside but from which they have regular access to the community, e.g. group homes or facilities which send youths to school in the community).
 - c. 40/60--"Closed", but community-based and short-term institutions (i.e. youths normally reside in them 24 hours a day, but they are located in the community, have a high degree of interaction with the community, and limit length of stay to 6 months or less).
 - d. 25/75--Other "closed" institutions (i.e. those which commit youths for more than 6 months, or which are not located reasonably close to the communities from which the youths are drawn).
- This subvention presumes an obligation on the part of the counties of adherence to State standards.
3. On the other hand, assuming that the above recommendation is implemented, the counties should pay 75% of the actual cost for any youths committed to the State.
 4. The California Council on Criminal Justice should provide whatever funds are available to help the counties develop those juvenile institutional programs that are most critically needed and which are consistent with the principles and standards set forth in Chapter III.
 5. No youths should be sent to the Youth Authority reception centers unless it is absolutely necessary to resolve a specific problem of classification or diagnosis that can not be handled in any other way. All normal classification and diagnostic responsibilities should be delegated to the individual State institutions or should be performed at the county level via contracts before delivery of a youth to the CYA.

Summary of Recommendations

6. *The Youth Authority Board should be relieved of the responsibility for making institutional assignments or transfers. These duties should be assigned to the CYA Intake Unit or other Youth Authority staff.*
7. *The Youth Authority should consider modifying its reception centers to provide one or more of the following:*
 - a. *"back-up" facilities of a medical-psychiatric nature for short-term treatment of emotionally disturbed youths,*
 - b. *model Youth Correctional Centers,*
 - c. *small specialized units for the diagnosis and study of those youths for whom these services cannot be adequately performed elsewhere,*
 - d. *travelling clinical teams to provide classification and diagnostic services for the other Youth Authority institutions and, on a contractual basis, for the counties.*
8. *The Youth Authority should more aggressively reject cases, or at least notify the committing court, when commitment does not seem necessary or where the CYA does not have appropriate programs (e.g. youths who belong in a mental health facility or program).*
9. *Each county should make available (either directly or by contract):*
 - a. *A range of alternatives to institutionalization for every type of youth that can be satisfactorily supervised outside of institutions.*
 - b. *A range of community-based, short-term facilities for those youth who need some type of confinement, with particular emphasis on proper facilities and programs for:*
 - i. *emotionally disturbed youth*
 - ii. *drug users*
 - iii. *girls*
 - iv. *young adults*
10. *The Youth Authority should place greater emphasis on developing, within their present institutions, small specialized units for different types of youths, particularly those mentioned in the preceding recommendation.*
11. *Whenever possible, State and county facilities should be co-educational.*

Summary of Recommendations

12. Both the State and counties should develop more educational and vocational programs in which youths are sent into the community for training in existing programs.
13. No new facility should be constructed without a State-approved plan for a specific, detailed program based on clearly stated objectives. The State should play a more active role in assisting the counties to develop such plans.
14. Permissive legislation should be enacted allowing both the State and counties to contract with one another or with non-correctional agencies or individuals to provide any type of assistance in operating institutional programs.
15. All youth should be released from any non-voluntary institutional program within six months, unless the institutional staff can demonstrate that society will receive substantially better protection in the long-run by retaining the youth. Any extension beyond six months must be carefully reviewed at least every two months by the paroling authority or the court.
16. At both the State and county levels, greater use should be made of short-term (1 to 3 months) intensive institutional programs, followed by intensive aftercare supervision as required.
17. Unless the protection of society is substantially threatened, every institution (including the program for each youth) should be "open". Appropriate family members and other persons from the community should be encouraged to come into the institution and the youths should be allowed to go into the community for appropriate activities. Youths should never completely leave the community except when it is absolutely necessary.
18. Parole or probation officers should be assigned when a youth is committed, rather than when he is released. From the time of commitment, these officers should work with the youth and his family with the aim of preparing them for the youth's release.
19. Aftercare officers (probation and parole) should be assigned to a community-based unit rather than to an institution and should carry "in-and-out" caseloads of no more than 25 youths.
20. If CYA and CDC are consolidated into a new State Department of Correctional Services, all State institutional and parole services, juvenile and adult, should be in one division, so as to provide for a continuity of services (see System Task Force Report for more details).

Summary of Recommendations

21. No new facility (or modifications of existing ones) should be built, at either the State or county level, unless:

- a. The total capacity does not exceed 100 and the living unit capacities do not exceed 20.
- b. The facility is close enough to a major community (whenever possible, the community from which the youth are committed) to allow reasonably convenient two-way access.

There should be no construction of new State institutions for at least the next decade, although modification of existing State facilities might be in order.

22. Legislation should be enacted authorizing the State to establish mandatory minimum standards for all juvenile institutions. Failure to adhere to these standards, at either the State or county level, should result in the closure of such institutions.
23. The numbers, qualifications, and training of staff should be brought up to the standards outlined in Chapter II.
24. Correctional staff should actively recruit, train, and supervise volunteers and para-professionals, including ex-offenders, for institutional programs.
25. The State should develop a training network of State and county trainers, similar to the CO-ACT model, to provide or coordinate necessary training for all institutional staff. This should be done without cost to the counties. Any extensive training provided by the State could be made available on a contractual basis.
26. Correctional personnel should be allowed to transfer between field and institutional assignments, and between various State and county correctional agencies, without loss of rank and other benefits, provided they meet the appropriate requirements. A statewide certification procedure, that would assure minimum staff standards, should be explored.
27. Active efforts should be made by institutional staff to involve the public on at least three levels:
- a. General public education and public relations.
 - b. As a source of direct aid, e.g. financially and as volunteers.
 - c. In an advisory capacity.

Summary of Recommendations

28. Every institutional program should be evaluated continuously in order to determine whether or not each is achieving its stated objectives. Failure to accomplish these objectives, provided reasonably adequate resources are available, should result in modification or elimination of the program.
29. County agencies, as well as the State, should substantially increase their commitment to evaluation and research both philosophically and by allocating significantly greater resources for this function.
30. Research activities should be team efforts (involving administrators, line workers, and research staff) and should concentrate on determining and disseminating information about what does and does not assist in accomplishing the goals of corrections.
31. The State and counties should enter into a collaborative effort of program research and evaluation. The State should play the primary role in planning, carrying out, and disseminating the results of correctional research, with active participation and cooperation from the counties. Research assistance and information should be provided for the counties without charge, but counties should be able to contract with the State or outside sources for extensive, individual projects.