

134620

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Corrections

Survey of Residential Community
Corrections Facilities
in the United States

Prepared by:
Aspen Systems Corporation
Mary Foote
June Sivilli

NCJRS

FEB 25 1992

ACQUISITIONS

December 1989

This report was supported under Grant Number 88C06GGZ0 from the National Institute of Corrections, U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

HC
810

PROPERTY OF
NIC Information Center

RECEIVED SEP 8 5 1991

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	ii
Chapter 1, Background Study and Objectives	1
Chapter 2, Project Methodology	3
Chapter 3, Survey Results	8
Chapter 4, Private and Public RCCF's	41

Appendices

Appendix A

Table 1: Distribution of RCCF Referrals, By Type and Source
Table 2: Types of Discharge From RCCF Programs
Table 3: RCCF Population Size by Age

Appendix B

Questionnaire and Cover Letters

Appendix C

State Composition of Data Base/Respondents

134620

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

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

Permission to reproduce this ~~copyrighted~~ material has been granted by

Public Domain/NIC
U.S. Department of Justice
to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

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

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The following material summarizes the Survey of Residential Community Corrections Facilities, conducted in 1989 by the Aspen Systems Corporation for the Community Corrections Division of the National Institute of Corrections, an agency within the U.S. Department of Justice.

The NIC conducts training, technical assistance, research and evaluation, information dissemination, and policy and standards formulation activities to assist state and local corrections systems. The Community Corrections Division was established in 1981 to enhance NIC's ability to address the needs of the rapidly increasing and changing residential community corrections universe.

Background and Purpose of the Study

As conceived in the 1960's, residential community corrections programs were aimed at rehabilitating their clients by treating specific problems that contribute to criminal behavior. Since the mid-1970's, however, the pressure to reduce prison and jail crowding while preserving public safety has led many states and local jurisdictions to expand greatly their residential community corrections programming.

As a consequence, a variety of residential community corrections facilities (RCCF's) are now operating in the United States. Because their parent agencies, development, funding, and support have been so diverse, however, up to now no national inventory existed of RCCF's and their principal characteristics. The purpose of this survey was to identify RCCF's nationwide and to compile descriptive data on their operations and roles in comprehensive corrections systems.

In addition to a directory of RCCF's, the products of this survey include the aggregate data summarized here and presented in tabular form later in this document. These data will be used by NIC staff to identify programs and foster research likely to be useful to residential community corrections practitioners and policymakers.

Methodology

For the purpose of the survey, an RCCF was defined as a program which 1) houses adult offenders, 2) receives at least 70% of its clients through criminal justice referrals, 3) operates independently from a jail or prison, and 4) permits clients to leave the premises during the day. Aspen project staff identified programs which appear to meet these criteria through current directories, organizational mailing lists, State Departments of Corrections, and sheriff's offices in municipalities with populations of more than 100,000.

Questionnaires jointly developed by Aspen and NIC staff were sent to each of the approximate 1100 RCCF's thus identified. The questionnaires covered topics relating to a program's community, facility, management, operations, clients, and fiscal matters. At the completion of the survey

initiatives (two mailings and a follow-up telephone call), 77% of the 839 eligible contacted RCCF's had returned completed questionnaires.

Survey Results

The following sections list and summarize noteworthy findings in the six major areas of inquiry: organizational characteristics, program characteristics, client population characteristics, community relationship characteristics, fiscal operations characteristics, and physical facility characteristics.

Organizational Characteristics

Operating/Management Agencies

- The RCCF's are almost equally divided between the public and private sectors. Fifty-two percent are government-run, with the majority of facilities operating at the State level; 46% are privately run, consisting mainly of private, nonprofit facilities; and 2% are classified as "other."
- Almost one-half of RCCF's report having a parent agency operating their program.

Staff Structure

- The national RCCF full-time staff ratio of males to females is 2 to 1. A similar proportion of both sexes, 13%, serve in administrative positions. Females are more predominant in clerical positions, at 20% compared to 1% of males. Males perform security services more often than females, however, at 56% compared to 30% for females. "Service" positions are found to a greater extent among females than among males (24% versus 18%).
- Volunteers are an integral part of RCCF programs. Almost two-thirds of RCCF's use volunteer staff, and almost one-half of those facilities place volunteers in the role of providing services to facility residents.

Program Characteristics

- Approximately three-fourths of the RCCF's have either an advisory board or policymaking board.
- More than one-half of the RCCF's accept referrals from state prisons. About one-fourth of RCCF's report State parole resident placements. State probation agencies are referral sources for less than one-fifth of the RCCF's.
- A majority of RCCF's make available a broad range of services. Individual counseling is available at 92% of the RCCF's, employment counseling/placement is provided by 92%, and medical

services are offered by 89% of RCCF's. GED/ABE preparation is available at 88% of the RCCF's.

- Offender types most often excluded from treatment are sex offenders, rejected by 54% of RCCF's; violent offenders are excluded by 49%; and offenders with psychiatric disorders, by 47%. The least excluded offender types are drug abusers and alcohol abusers, by 3% and 2% respectively.
- The total number of residents admitted to RCCF's during the last fiscal year was 100 or less for 34% of facilities, 101 to 200 for 28%, and 201 to 300 for 13%. The remaining one-fourth of RCCF's report annual admissions exceeding 300, up to more than 10,000, with only 4% reporting admissions over 1,000.
- The average "success rate" for the completion of RCCF programs was 73%. The average proportion of disciplinary transfers was 16% and the average rate of administrative transfers was 7%. The average rates of escape and client withdrawal were 8% and 9.3%, respectively.

Client Population Characteristics

- Over half, or 52%, of the RCCF's exclusively admit male residents, while 8% admit only women. The remaining facilities, approximately 40%, provide both male and female accommodations.
- The total number of female residents in over half of the RCCF's, or 59%, is less than 10. More than 40% of the RCCF's report having from 10 to 39 male residents. Over one-third of facilities have male populations in the range of 50 to 150.
- The racial composition of the national RCCF resident population is 50% white, 38% black, 10% Hispanic, 1% Native American/Aleutian/Eskimo, and 0.4% Asian/Pacific Islanders.
- The age distribution of the RCCF residents is most concentrated in the 26- to 39-year-old range, which makes up 47% of the national total. An additional 27% are in the younger range of 22 to 25 years old. Overall, 87% are under age 40.

Community Relationship Characteristics

- The majority of RCCF's are located in cities or counties with a population over 10,000. One-half are located in urban areas with a population of 250,000 or more. About one-fifth are in areas with a population between 100,000 and 249,000. One-third are in locations having less than a 100,000 population.
- About one-half of RCCF's are located in communities that are characterized as mixed residential-business neighborhoods, one-fourth are in areas described as primarily business-commercial,

and approximately one-fifth are in residential areas of the community.

- When the RCCF directors were asked to describe the type of relationship the facility had with the surrounding community, 74% reported either "very friendly" (3%) or "somewhat positive" (36%). Approximately 23% said the atmosphere was "neutral," and 3% said "somewhat negative." Only 1 RCCF, or 0.2% of the respondents, reported a "very hostile" environment.
- A minority of RCCF's (13%) experienced delays in opening or was prevented from operating due to neighborhood opposition. Even fewer (8%) were delayed in opening or operating because of zoning restrictions.

Fiscal Operations Characteristics

- State Departments of Corrections (DOC) provide funding to 71% of the RCCF's. Funding from other sources was reported by significantly fewer facilities: client fees by 39%, Federal Bureau of Prisons by 28%, and local correction agencies by 22%.
- State DOC funds make a relatively large contribution to the total operating RCCF budgets, comprising over 75% of the budgets for 67% of the facilities. Federal Bureau of Prisons and local corrections agencies make smaller contributions, with Federal Bureau of Prisons comprising over 75% of budget funds in 24% of facilities, and local agencies in 39%.
- Most RCCF's, or 84%, charge client fees. A formula based on clients' earnings was the most frequent means of fee assessment.

Physical Facility Characteristics

- While RCCF's are found in a variety of buildings, more are found in institutional buildings, around 40%, than in other types; another 13% are using hotels/motels; 12% are in multi-family duplexes; 10% are in single family houses; and 10% are in apartment buildings.
- The age of the buildings vary, with no distinct pattern. Relatively equal percentages of RCCF's were occupying buildings less than 10 years old as were occupying those over 75 years old around 16% in each.
- The vast proportion of RCCF's, or 95%, started operating in their current building after 1970; 41% began operation in the 1970's; and 50% began since 1980.
- One-half of the RCCF programs operated prior to locating in their current building. Slightly more than 80% of these began operating in the prior location after 1970.

- Facility size, measured by total bed capacity, is relatively small. Cumulatively, 12.7% have fewer than 20 beds, 27% have fewer than 30, and 50% have fewer than 50 beds.

Potential of the Data: A Comparison of Public and Private RCCF's

The data highlighted above generally reflects the state of the survey data as it is now available, consisting of useful breakdowns of aggregate figures on discrete characteristics. To test the utility of the data for focused analysis, however, the survey team ran data comparing private and public facilities on a few key variables. The results of this work include:

- The most common public RCCF's are those operated by State governments; they comprise nearly 64% of public RCCF's and 33% of all RCCF's. The most common private RCCF's are those operated by nonprofit organizations; they constitute 80% of private RCCF's and 36% of all RCCF's.
- Approximately half of both private and public RCCF's operate under the aegis of a citizens' advisory board. However, while over 75% of private RCCF's are accountable to a board of directors, only 17% of public RCCF's are.
- Similar proportions of public and private RCCF's--42% and 38%, respectively--are accredited.
- Although the study focused exclusively on facilities which receive no more than 30% of their clients from other than criminal justice referrals, only 5.8% of the responding RCCF's accepted any such referrals at all. Of these, 80% are private facilities.
- Public RCCF's generally have larger programs than private RCCF's. Over two-thirds of public facilities but less than one-third of private facilities have 50 or more beds.
- Clients' length of residency tends to be longer in public RCCF's than in private RCCF's.
- Not surprisingly, given their larger capacity, public RCCF's have larger budgets than do private facilities. Over a third of public RCCF's have annual budgets of \$750,000 or more, compared with 17% of private programs.

CHAPTER 1 STUDY BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

Background of Study

The National Institute of Corrections (NIC) works to assist state and local corrections systems by conducting five legislatively mandated activities: training, technical assistance, research and evaluation, operation of an information clearinghouse, and policy and standards formulation and implementation.

NIC established the Community Corrections Division in 1981 to focus the Institute's services better on the rapidly changing probation, parole, residential, and other community-based corrections programs. While corrections populations have increased in recent years, probation and parole caseloads have expanded even more dramatically. In response, other community sanctions and supervision strategies have been developed. Electronic monitoring, intensive supervision, and residential community corrections programs are being used extensively by jurisdictions to meet such diverse purposes as reducing prison or jail crowding, providing greater protection to the community, serving victim interests better, and changing offender behavior. As new programs and public policies develop, patterns of community sanctions use have changed.

Residential community programs are an integral part of the corrections process. Utilized at various stages in the criminal justice process, their role is now widely accepted. They are used for a number of reasons in a multitude of settings, but their three primary functions are to alleviate crowding in prisons and jails, to serve as an alternative sentence that is community-based, and to offer therapeutic and support services to offenders with special needs (such as treatment for mental illness or substance abuse).

The more common residential facilities are provided for in the postadjudication phase of the system, usually as condition of probation, a prerelease mechanism, or as parole aftercare. Categories for inclusion and examination in this study include pretrial release/diversion facilities, halfway houses, restitution and community service centers, driving while intoxicated (DWI) facilities, prerelease facilities, work release facilities, parole facilities, and halfway back houses.

RCCF's have become an integral part of the criminal justice system. Yet, as various sources with differing priorities have generated programs, RCCF's now offer an assortment of program models and structures. Because the development, funding, and support for programs have been so diverse, there has not been a mechanism to record and evaluate the growth and use of programs systematically.

Purpose of Project

The NIC has recognized the need for a reliable, comprehensive, national inventory to identify types of residential community corrections providers, services, programs, and operational structures. The purpose of this study was to collect and compile descriptive data on RCCF operations and their role within the correctional process. The study identifies adult offender residential programs nationwide and synthesizes information about their clients, services and programs, organizational structures, and fiscal operations.

The final products of this project will offer many benefits to the field of corrections. The final results should assist the NIC by serving as a basis for the training agenda and future research. Community corrections officials will learn about the program elements available in community-based corrections, enabling them to make the most of resources available. Community corrections practitioners may further develop their program's identity, and network with other practitioners to assist them in future needs. Additionally, the results should spur independent researchers through the use of IBM compatible computer disks on which the data will be stored.

Objectives of the Study

The goal of the study is to generate statistical data regarding RCCF's that describe and permit analysis of the variety of programs operating nationwide. Six categories of data were sought:

- The organizational characteristics portray the managerial levels, and the positions and size of program staff and volunteers.
- The RCCF program characteristics indicate the kinds of services and the modalities of treatment available to clients. This information, along with the data about sources of referrals, admissions, and exclusions, effectively depicts the RCCF programs.
- To understand the nature and size of the clientele served by the RCCF's, the survey collected data about demographic characteristics such as age, sex and race of residents.
- Another objective was learning the degree to which neighborhood opposition and zoning laws restrict or prevent facilities from establishing or operating their programs.
- Fiscal data were requested regarding funding sources, operating costs, and annual budgets, to understand how multiple sources of funding and assessed fees affect operating budgets.
- The final objective of the survey was to describe the location and structure of the RCCF facilities to understand the types of buildings being utilized for residential corrections placements.

CHAPTER 2 PROJECT METHODOLOGY

Overview of Project Design

This chapter describes the research design developed for the national survey of RCCF's. Due to the relative lack of existing data from which to advance a more refined analysis, NIC sought a broadly detailed study to obtain descriptive information. Because a clearly defined universe base was not available, the first step of the three-part design process was the identification and compilation of an RCCF universe data base. The second step was the design and development of the survey questionnaire. The third phase included data collection and analysis. Each of these three design components are discussed below in more detail.

Definition of the RCCF Universe

One of the objectives of the project was the identification of programs across the nation that could be defined as residential community correction facilities. For the purpose of this study, a residential community corrections facility (RCCF) is defined as a residential corrections program that meets the following criteria:

1. Houses adult offenders. (Examples of offenders are pretrial, sentenced, prerelease, work release, study release, or referred under conditions of probation or parole.)
2. Has admissions in which at least 70% are placed by federal, state, or local criminal justice authorities. ("Placed" refers to offenders ordered by criminal justice authorities to participate in the residential community corrections program as a formal part of a sanction or supervision strategy.)
3. Operates independently from the detention operation of a jail, prison or other correctional institution. (If the RCCF is physically part of a jail, prison or other correctional institution, inmates are housed separately from the general inmate population.)
4. Allows residents to leave the facility during the day for work, education, or community programs.

Universe Data Base Compilation

In order to create this comprehensive data base, a two-faceted approach was taken. First, all residential community corrections programs in available directories were included. Second, a more systematic networking of state and local level agencies was conducted to identify residential programs. This also served as a "reliability check" for many programs listed in the directories.

A review of all existing directories revealed that many were outdated, more than 5 years old, or gave a minimum amount of descriptive information about the facilities. For the purpose of this survey, two directories were appropriate for use because they were regularly updated and provided sufficient information to allow a discriminating selection of facilities meeting the definition of an RCCF. The directories were:

1. American Correctional Association (ACA) Juvenile and Adult Correctional Departments, Institutions, Agencies and Paroling Authorities Directory, published in 1988.
2. Association of Halfway House Alcoholism Program Directory, published in 1986.

Two additional lists were received and added to the data base. The Bureau of Prisons provided a list of active contracts with community programs. The International Halfway House Association (currently the International Association of Residential and Community Alternatives) also provided a list of residential correction programs in the 50 states.

The second stage of developing the data base was to supplement existing sources with more current information from State Departments of Corrections. Due to the considerable variation among states, a networking approach to the appropriate contact(s) in each state was developed. This was conducted by a telephone inventory that provided two advantages: (1) it allowed the project staff flexibility in explaining the definition in relation to each state's unique correctional system structure; and (2) it introduced the study to the Departments of Corrections (DOC) staffs and enlisted their participation in the process. The following information was requested from each Department: names of RCCF's within the DOC's jurisdiction or, as appropriate, under the Department of Probation and Parole's jurisdiction, as well as additional county or local-level contacts and names of private or religious organizations known to operate RCCF's.

A final aspect of data universe development was contacting all sheriff's offices nationwide in jurisdictions with populations of more than 100,000. A total of 396 letters were mailed with enclosed, stamped, self-addressed return postcards. The purpose of the mailing was to request names and mailing addresses of facilities meeting the study definition of RCCF's. Responses were received from 203 sheriffs's offices, reporting 132 RCCF's. After removing the 26 that were duplicates, 106 new facilities were added to the data base.

Questionnaire Design

In order to compile information in a standardized format, a data collection instrument was designed. The wide range of objectives discussed in Chapter 1, Study Background and Objectives, required a detailed series of questions eliciting information in six major areas: facility descriptions and identifying information; types of services; organizational structure; demographics; community environment; and fiscal information. (See Appendix B for a reproduction of the questionnaire.)

The instrument comprised two sections: the first collected information for the national directory, and the second collected information for the final report. The first section sought facility names and addresses, and collected basic descriptive information to provide a profile of services available, population demographics, and referral sources. The second section was the more extensive portion of the instrument and asked for a wide range of data variables that provided results for the final descriptive summaries. Section 2 included a statement of confidentiality to encourage frank responses. Both sections were used in providing data for the final analysis.

After the design phase, the instrument was developed and revised by the pretesting of nine respondents, with reviews by directors of both government and private facilities, and administrative reviews from practitioners, researchers, and other corrections professionals knowledgeable in the RCCF field.

Data Collection

Two mail followups and one telephone followup were conducted to obtain the final 77% response rate. The first mailing distributed 1,077 surveys. Three weeks later, a second mailing of 847 surveys was conducted. (Prior to the second mailing, the response rate was 21.3%). Three weeks after the second mailing, a reminder postcard was mailed to the 550 facilities from which no response had yet been received. (Prior to the postcard mailing, the response rate reached 49%). Three weeks after the postcard reminder, a final telephone followup was undertaken in which the survey team attempted to contact 393 facilities. (The response rate previous to the telephone followup was 65%). A final mailing of 103 surveys took place following the telephone followup. (Prior to the last mailing, the response rate was 69%). The final response rate was 77%, representing 647 completed and eligible questionnaires out of 839 RCCF's meeting our definition.

The questionnaires were mailed to the directors of the facilities, whose names were known in most cases. When not known, the generic position title of administrator was included in the addresses. The package included:

1. An introductory cover letter. A personalized and introductory letter, produced on NIC stationery, was sent to each RCCF director.
2. The questionnaire. The questionnaire accompanied the cover letter with a stamped, self-addressed return envelope. The questionnaire was made visually appealing by a contrast color for the cover and a typeset format.

Data Processing

Data collected from the questionnaire include information on facility description, organizational structure, client demographics, referral sources and types, admission for client types, services provided, geographic and neighborhood descriptions, building descriptions, advisory boards, staffing,

accreditation, control procedures, and operating budget. These items made up a data base of 360 items of information on 647 facilities. Each facility record is 973 columns wide in the data base.

A coding scheme and code book were designed for transferring data into the ASCII file format. The coding scheme consisted of a format with 1=yes and 2=no. For multiple choice questions with one column allocated per variable, the 1, 2 format was not necessary, and a designated unique number was used as the code for each category; i.e., 3=residential.

Where responses to an item included "don't know," or "not available/refuse to answer," these items were collapsed into one category and regarded as "missing data" for purposes of statistical analysis.

The data base was created in the form of an ASCII file, because ASCII is easily converted for use in other software. The data were then formatted, using SAS PC, version 6.03, into a SAS data set, which allows for statistical procedures to be performed. The ASCII file is on diskette and can be used for further studies by NIC.

Standard statistical descriptive procedures were run on the data: frequencies, sums, means, standard deviations, and minimum and maximum values. The use of these procedures to analyze the data provides both a range and confidence check of the data. Variables were broken into categories after examining the range of each variable in order to provide a logical representation of the data distribution. Cross-tabulations of select variables for bivariate analysis were also performed.

Study Constraints

A number of potential constraints existed due to the number and distribution of RCCF's. In each instance, these possible difficulties were foreseen and approaches planned accordingly.

Sampling

From preliminary literature reviews the universe of RCCF's was estimated at 3,000; the actual number identified for purposes of this study was approximately 1,100. Because of the relatively small number of RCCF's (1,074), and the unknown distribution of key data elements, no attempt was made to draw a nationwide random sample. Several sources were employed to compile the master universe list. Each of the two directories gave different descriptions, and lists obtained from State Departments of Corrections and local level sheriffs' offices were collected by different methods of solicitation (phone calls and written requests). The disparate sources and methods used in compiling the master universe of RCCF's suggested a conservative sampling approach. Another consideration was the need to draw a sufficient number of facilities to permit comparisons across all the variables that were to be examined. Therefore, all RCCF's identified were included in the final sample.

Response Rate

One concern of this study was whether it would be possible to obtain an adequate response rate. The mail survey methodology was not conducive to a high response rate, particularly when using a questionnaire requiring 30 to 60 minutes for completion, as determined during the pretest. Extensive followup efforts were therefore planned. Establishing a high response rate through successive contacts with nonrespondents was a study priority. A total of three followup measures was undertaken. Related to this was the problem of diminishing return with each subsequent followup and therefore increased cost incurred per nonrespondent. The 77% response rate is adequate to represent the universe population of 1,074 facilities and provides valid perspectives about the RCCF's that participated in the study.

Quality of Responses

One issue in this study was the degree of accuracy and consistency of data from the respondents. Because the questionnaires were self-administered by respondents, there was increased potential for misunderstanding such critical issues as the definition criteria or for circling the wrong codes. Also, the number of questions requesting numerical data placed a burden of accuracy on the respondents.

The inconsistencies and errors in numerical data were rectified when other questions provided sufficient data. When data inconsistencies could not be resolved by recalculations, phone calls were made to respondents to clarify the information. Because resolving minor discrepancies was cost prohibitive, the data base contains some small variations in totals as is common in mail surveys of this scope. However, the overall good quality of data supports a valid and comprehensive description of the study participants.

CHAPTER 3 SURVEY RESULTS

Organizational Characteristics

One of the important tasks of this project was to collect information about the administration and management practices of residential community corrections programs. The first section describes the organizational management and includes policymaking boards of directors and citizens' advisory boards, the composition of the boards, the type of managerial agency, and other kinds of facilities operated by the agency. The second section deals with staffing patterns, because they are core to the operations of residential community programs. The variables include information describing positions of full-time and part-time staff. Also included are the variables pertaining to volunteers and how they are used in the programs.

Organizational Management

Respondents were asked if their facility worked with an advisory board or a policymaking board. Approximately 75% responded affirmatively. Table 3-1 shows that just over half of the facilities work with a citizens' advisory board and that 44% work with a policymaking board of directors.

TABLE 3-1
RCCF'S WITH ADVISORY AND GOVERNING BOARDS

Facility has Board?	Citizens' Advisory Board		Policymaking Board of Directors	
	N	%	N	%
Yes	333	51.8	283	44.1
No	310	48.2	360	55.9
Total	643	100.0	643	100.0

Note: 157 facilities, or 24%, reported that they did not work with either a citizen advisory board or a policymaking board of directors.

Table 3-2 shows the occupational status or types of people comprising advisory and policymaking boards. A wide variety of professionals, businesspersons, and community citizens are frequently represented on the RCCF boards. However, a relatively small number, less than a fifth, have former offenders serving on their boards.

TABLE 3-2
RCCF'S BOARD COMPOSITION

Background of Board Members	Citizens' Advisory Boards (100%-333)		Policymaking Board of Directors (100%-283)	
	N	%	N	%
Criminal Justice Professionals	256	76.9	169	59.7
Social Service Professionals	240	72.1	161	56.9
Other Professionals	237	71.2	200	70.7
Businesspersons	260	78.1	208	73.5
Government Officials	146	43.8	98	34.6
Community Citizens	278	83.5	176	62.2
Former Offenders	56	16.8	42	14.8
Other*	7	2.1	24	8.5

* "Other" includes such nonspecific responses as department directors, minority groups, and appointees by governors. Multiple response were allowed, so percents are not additive.

Just over one-half of responding facilities are operated by a parent organization or agency, as table 3-3 depicts.

TABLE 3-3
RCCF MANAGEMENT BY PARENT ORGANIZATION

Type of Organization	Number of Facilities	Percent of Facilities
Parent Organization	333	51.9
Independent	309	48.1
Total	642	100.0

The RCCF's in the study were found in the public and private sectors to a similar extent; private RCCF's, classified as nonprofit or profit, comprised 45% of the total; and public RCCF's, federal, state, county and city, comprised 50% of the facilities. Table 3-4 presents a more detailed description of the respondent composition.

TABLE 3-4
SECTOR AND TYPE OF RCCF OPERATING ORGANIZATION

Organization-- Agency	Number of Facilities	Percent of Facilities
Private Not-For-Profit	236	36.6
State	214	33.2
County	107	16.6
Private For-Profit	58	9.0
Other*	15	2.3
City	11	1.7
Federal	3	0.5

* "Other" includes a combination of city/state, city/county, judicial district, probation department, board of directors, and county facility funded by state.

Another issue of interest concerning the management agencies is the total number of RCCF's that they operate. Table 3-5 shows that 61.6% of the agencies operate more than one community corrections facility, and one-fifth of those operate more than 10 facilities.

TABLE 3-5
NUMBER OF RCCF'S OPERATED BY SINGLE AGENCY

Number of RCCF's Oper- ated by Managing Agency	Number of Facilities	Percent of Facilities
One Facility Only	248	38.6
2 Facilities	92	14.3
3-5 Facilities	95	14.8
6-10 Facilities	75	11.7
More than 10 Facilities	133	20.7
Total	643	100.0

In addition to asking respondents about multi-RCCF agencies, the survey asked about other kinds of programs that are operated by their managing agencies. These programs are listed in Table 3-6, which shows that almost 50% of the study's RCCF's managing their agencies operate other institutional corrections programs.

TABLE 3-6
OTHER PROGRAMS OPERATED BY RCCF MANAGING AGENCIES

Type of Programs	Number of Agencies	Percent of Agencies*
Institutional Corrections	310	48.4
Institutional, Not Corrections-Oriented	50	7.8
Other Residential, Not Corrections	131	20.4
Nonresidential Community Corrections	192	30.0
Nonresidential, Not Corrections	119	18.6
Other**	55	8.6

* 100%=641

**"Other" includes such responses as juvenile facility, juvenile youth development centers, corrections-oriented rehabilitation, consultants for residential facilities, and homeless-chronic mentally ill veterans's programs.

Note: 122 facilities reported that their agencies do not operate any facilities listed above.

RCCF Staffing

For the study questionnaire, staff positions were categorized as follows:

- Administrative (e.g., executive director, assistant director, program director, and business manager).
- Services (e.g., counselor, case manager, teacher, and social worker).
- Clerical (e.g., secretary, clerk, and receptionist).
- Support staff (e.g., maintenance, kitchen staff, and bus driver).
- Security (e.g., desk staff, monitor, and guard).

Table 3-7 provides the information collected on staff size and positions. The total number of males employed in full-time positions is approximately 8,000, or twice the number of females, who have nearly 4,000 positions. The largest number of staff positions is "Security," with almost 50% of all employees. Positions included in the category of "Services" make up the second largest group with one-fifth of employees. The figures for males and females show a larger percent of females are employed in service positions, while a larger percent of males are employed in security positions. Interestingly, the percent of administrators is the same for males and females, at approximately 13%.

TABLE 3-7
AGGREGATE RCCF STAFF, BY POSITION AND GENDER

RCCF Staff Position	Full-Time						Part-Time					
	Males		Females		Total		Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Administrative	1037	12.9	525	13.1	1562	13.0	47	5.8	22	3.1	69	4.5
Services	1413	17.6	948	23.6	2361	19.7	189	23.3	140	19.6	329	21.4
Clerical	108	1.3	813	20.3	921	7.7	14	1.7	121	16.9	135	8.8
Support	726	9.1	384	9.6	1110	9.2	87	10.7	105	14.7	192	12.5
Security	4526	56.4	1204	30.0	5730	47.7	456	56.2	296	41.4	75	49.0
Other*	212	2.6	114	2.8	326	2.7	25	3.1	34	4.8	59	3.8
Total	8022	99.9	3988	99.4	12010	100.0	818	100.8	718	100.5	1536	100.0

* "Other" includes professional services provided by medical staff-e.g., nurse or doctor; situations where one person holds two positions-e.g., services and clerical or cook and driver; and some nonspecific responses-e.g., jail staff and state inmates.

Table 3-8 shows the pattern of RCCF'S reporting a relatively small number of female employees at their facilities; over one-half of the RCCF'S employ 5 or fewer females full-time, compared to one-fourth of the RCCF'S employing 5 or fewer males full-time. Conversely, 42% of the RCCF'S report more than 10 male full-time employees, compared to 17% reporting more than 10 female full-time employees.

TABLE 3-8
RCCF FULL AND PART-TIME WORKFORCE, BY GENDER

Type of Program Staff	Number of RCCF's Reporting Staff Size Range							
	1 - 5		6 - 10		More than 10		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Total Full-Time								
Male	152	25.2	197	32.7	25	42.1	603	100.0
Female	313	53.7	173	29.7	97	16.6	583	100.0
Total Part-Time								
Male	255	91.1	22	7.9	3	1.1	280	100.0
Female	253	92.0	18	6.5	4	1.5	275	100.0

Volunteers are an integral part of many RCCF staffs. In answer to whether programs use volunteer staff, just under two-thirds, or 64%, of facilities responded affirmatively.

Table 3-9 describes the basic categories of volunteer functions. It indicates that 63% of the RCCF's use volunteers in special events (e.g., parties and social groups). Almost one-half (49%) also report volunteers performing professional services (e.g., counseling, case management, and social work). Clerical services and support functions are also performed by volunteers in 23% and 18% of facilities, respectively.

TABLE 3-9
RCCF'S USE OF VOLUNTEERS

Volunteer Position	Number of Facilities	Percent of Facilities
Special Events	260	63.3
Services	200	48.7
Other*	88	21.4
Clerical	93	22.6
Support Staff	73	17.8
Security	60	14.6
Administrative	14	3.4

* "Other" consists primarily of responses as religious services, Alcoholics Anonymous, Narcotics Anonymous, support groups, student interns, and research.

Program Characteristics

To provide data to describe the characteristics of RCCF programming, the facilities in the survey were asked about referral sources, facility capacity, available services, and length of residency.

Referral Sources

The study examined the extent to which RCCF's are utilized by the various corrections agencies. Data were collected for two variables as summarized in table 3-10. "Referral type" refers to the relative location of the offender/arrestee in the criminal justice system, including pretrial, probation, postconviction, parole, prison/jail, and non-criminal justice. "Referral source" describes the level of government as Federal, State, local, or nongovernment.

TABLE 3-10
RCCF REFERRALS BY TYPE AND SOURCE

Referral Type	Referral Sources (Percent)			
	Federal	State	Local	Nongovernment
Pretrial	9.9 (N=64)	2.8 (N=18)	5.9 (N=38)	0.1 (N=157)
Probation	16.1 (N=104)	18.4 (N=119)	12.5 (N=81)	0.2 (N=1)
Postconviction Court Order	17.8 (N=104)	10.5 (N=68)	12.5 (N=81)	0.2 (N=1)
Parole	12.1 (N=78)	24.3 (N=157)	1.2 (N=8)	0.2 (N=1)
Prison/Jail	23.8 (N=154)	53.8 (N=348)	15.6 (N=101)	0.2 (N=1)
Non-Criminal Justice	0.2 (N=1)	0.3 (N=2)	1.4 (N=9)	1.9 (N=12)
Other	1.2 (N=8)	2.2 (N=14)	1.7 (N=11)	0.3 (N=2)

The most common type of referrals are from a jail or prison setting. The largest proportion of RCCF's (54%) reported some admissions from state prison referrals. Federal prison referrals are reported by 24% of the RCCF's. From all levels of parole referrals, state parole referrals are the most common, as reported by 24% of facilities. See Appendix A, Table 1, for a more detailed breakdown of referral sources.

RCCF Population and Capacity

The gender of the RCCF's resident populations is shown in table 3-11. More than one-half of facilities reported only male residents, while less than one-tenth reported only female residents. However, almost 40 percent reported admitting both male and female residents.

TABLE 3-11
RCCF PROGRAM ELIGIBILITY BY GENDER

Gender	Number of Facilities	Percent of Facilities
Male Only	337	52.2
Female Only	54	8.4
Co-Correctional	254	39.4
Total	645	100.0

Table 3-12 provides the breakdown for the RCCF's bed capacity and shows a total of 14% reporting less than a 20-bed capacity, and 50% reporting less than a 50-bed capacity. Facilities with male clients have larger bed capacities; 53% have 50-bed capacity or greater, while only 12% of facilities with female clients report capacities of 50 or more.

TABLE 3-12
RCCF CLIENT CAPACITY BY GENDER

Number of Beds	Facilities Reporting Male Clients		Facilities Reporting Female Clients		Facilities Reporting Both		Total Facilities	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Less Than 10	2	0.6	4	7.8	0	--	6	1.0
10-19	36	11.2	19	37.2	18	17.1	73	11.7
20-29	41	12.8	18	35.3	30	11.9	89	14.3
30-39	36	11.2	3	5.9	34	13.5	73	11.7
40-49	35	10.9	1	2.0	35	13.8	71	11.4
50-99	90	28.0	4	7.8	87	34.5	181	29.0
100-149	46	14.3	1	2.0	24	9.5	71	11.4
150-199	18	5.6	1	2.0	13	5.2	32	5.1
200 or More	17	5.3	2	--	11	4.4	28	4.5
Total	321	100	51	100	252	100	624	100

Services Available to Residents

One of the most important tasks of this project was to identify the range of services available and the treatment modalities used in providing these services. A major area of inquiry was the types of services currently offered by the RCCF's and the means by which the services are made available. Table 3-13 presents in the first column the percentage of facilities making each service available. The additional columns display the percentage of facilities by the mode of delivery.

TABLE 3-13
SERVICES AVAILABLE BY SOURCE/SERVICE

Services	Facilities Providing Service		Source of Service				Service Contract		
			Facility Staff		Another Agency				
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Mental Health									
Individual Counseling	595	92.5	456	77.3	276	46.8	63	10.7	
Group Counseling	532	82.7	374	71.1	256	48.7	67	12.8	
Psychological									
Screening/Testing	462	72.0	111	24.3	312	68.3	90	19.7	
Family Counseling	423	65.8	211	50.4	275	65.6	25	6.0	
Employment Services									
Employment Counseling									
Placement	592	92.2	489	84.2	276	47.5	38	6.5	
Vocational/Skill									
Training	482	75.1	103	21.6	406	84.9	32	6.7	
Sheltered Employment	211	33.0	43	20.4	171	81.0	6	2.8	
Educational Services									
GED/ABE Preparation	569	88.5	189	33.6	405	71.9	58	10.8	
College Courses	403	63.1	13	3.2	388	96.6	9	2.2	
High School Courses	393	61.4	55	14.0	338	86.0	14	3.6	
English as a Second									
Language	252	39.4	25	10.0	228	90.8	7	2.8	
Life Management									
Budgeting	519	81.0	481	93.6	83	16.1	8	1.6	
Life Skills Training	489	76.3	397	81.9	156	32.2	18	3.7	
Housing Referrals	451	70.4	334	76.8	187	41.7	7	1.6	
Parenting Skills	354	55.3	176	49.9	220	62.3	16	4.5	
Health Care									
Medical Services	574	89.4	129	22.7	370	65.1	156	27.5	
Dental Service	553	86.1	81	14.8	375	68.6	135	24.7	
Physical Rehabilitation	358	55.9	38	10.7	292	82.0	62	17.4	
Substance Abuse Services									
Urinalysis	599	93.3	465	77.9	111	18.6	137	22.9	
Alcohol Rehabilitation,									
Outpatient	454	70.7	148	32.6	352	77.5	61	13.5	
Drug Rehabilitation,									
Outpatient	449	69.9	128	28.5	355	79.1	62	13.8	
Drug Rehabilitation,									
Residential	392	61.1	202	51.9	211	54.2	61	15.7	
Alcohol Rehabilitation,									
Residential	390	60.8	196	50.0	218	55.8	56	14.3	
Drug Detoxification	225	35.0	39	17.2	181	79.7	27	11.9	
Alcohol Detoxification	214	33.4	36	16.5	175	80.3	22	10.1	
Methadone Maintenance	136	21.3	17	11.1	128	84.2	13	8.6	
Miscellaneous Services									
Recreational Services	551	86.0	476	86.9	168	30.7	13	2.7	
Community Service									
Activities	504	78.6	360	71.9	243	48.5	11	2.2	
Legal Services	412	64.4	47	11.4	372	90.3	13	3.2	
Welfare Services	386	60.3	52	13.4	355	91.5	7	1.8	
Sex Offender Treatment	255	39.8	64	25.1	203	79.6	40	15.7	

Note: Of a total of 647 facilities, 92.5% make individual counseling available. Of those facilities, 77.3% provide this service onsite, 46.7% provide it through referrals to other agencies, and 10.7% provide it by service contracts. (Facilities may provide a service from more than one source, so the percentages do not total 100.)

The majority of RCCF's provide a broad spectrum of services to their residents. The most frequently provided services are: individual counseling, provided by 92.5% of facilities; employment counseling placement, provided by 92.2%; medical services, provided by 89.4%; and, urinalysis, provided by 93.3% of facilities.

Services provided by fewer than one-half of the facilities are sheltered employment (33%); English as a second language (39.4%); and sex offender treatment (39.8%). Even these less available services are still offered in almost 40% of the RCCF's.

The association between substance abuse and crime has made correctional substance abuse treatment an area of current interest. Substance abuse services, for both alcohol and drug abusers, are frequently available in the area of rehabilitation (at a rate of 70% for outpatient treatment, and 60% of RCCF's for residential treatment). Detoxification is available to a lesser extent, by approximately one-third of the facilities. Methadone maintenance is available from even fewer facilities, approximately one-fifth. Regarding the provision of substance abuse services, at least half of RCCF's make the services available by referral to another agency, rather than from facility staff, and less frequently (in 8% to 23% of the RCCF's) by service contract. The exception is urinalysis, provided most often by facility staff in 77.9% of facilities.

Modalities of providing the services were examined across each major service category.

- Mental Health Services

Group and individual counseling are provided at the facility or onsite by a majority of facilities (more than 70%). By contrast, family counseling is provided more often by referral, by a modest margin of 65.6%, compared to the 50.4% available onsite. A greater difference is found for psychological testing, provided more frequently by referral to another agency (68.3% compared to onsite provision by 24.3%).

- Employment Services

Sheltered employment and vocational skill training are most often available by referral to other agencies, while employment counseling or placement services are most often provided by facility staff.

- Education Services

All education services are made available most frequently by referral to other agencies, representing from 71.9% to 96.8% of the respondent total.

- Life Management Services

With the exception of parenting skills, services are most often provided by facility staff. The extent of this onsite provision ranges from 76.8% for housing referrals to 93% for budgeting.

- Health Care Services

The most apparent trend for health care is by referral to other agencies; for dental, 68.7%; medical, 65.1%; and physical rehabilitation, 82%.

The survey instrument also collected information on the classification of offender assessment systems being used by residential programs to determine eligibility status and program needs. The facility directors were asked, "Does your facility rely upon standardized classification/risk assessment instruments to select clients or develop programs?" More than half (56.7%) of RCCF's reported using a standardized instrument.

Facilities' use of security control procedures are presented in Table 3-14. Almost all facilities practice the more routine controls such as room searches (97.4%), resident counts (95%), and floor checks (92.6%). Urinalysis and breathalyzer tests are also widely administered, by 94.6% and 70.4% respectively. Control procedures that are more technologically advanced, such as closed-circuit TV and electronic monitoring, are conducted by a minority of facilities (17.3% and 9.9%, respectively). Also found in a minority of facilities are higher security measures, such as physical restraints reported by 24.1% of the facilities, and holding cells mentioned by 13.6%.

TABLE 3-14
RCCF's USE OF CONTROL PROCEDURES BY TYPE

Control Procedure	Number of Facilities	Percent of Facilities*
Room Searches	629	97.4
Sign In/Out Sheets	624	96.6
Routine Resident Counts	614	95.0
Urinalysis	611	94.6
Regular Floor Checks	600	92.6
Site Visits	584	90.4
Phone Checks	540	83.6
Visitor Monitoring/Searches	467	72.3
Breathalyzer	455	70.4
Fine/Restitution Collection	340	52.6
Physical Restraints	156	24.1
Closed-Circuit TV/Cameras	112	17.3
Holding Cells/Quiet Rooms	88	13.6
Electronic Monitoring	64	9.9
Other	67	10.4

* 100% = 647

Another indication of the scope of services is the type of offender/client excluded from admission. Table 3-15 indicates the individuals most often excluded are sex offenders, followed by violent offenders, and psychiatric disorders.

TABLE 3-15
RCCF'S EXCLUDED OFFENDERS, BY OFFENDERS/DISORDERS

Offenders/Disorders Excluded	Number of Facilities	Percent of Facilities*
Sex Offenders	346	53.7
Violent Offenders	319	49.5
Psychiatric Disorders	306	47.5
Arsonists	235	36.5
Mentally Retarded	232	36.0
Physically Disabled	166	25.8
Medical Disorders	149	23.6
HIV Positives	79	12.3
Habitual Offenders	68	10.6
Drug Abusers	19	3.0
Alcohol Abusers	12	1.9
Other	53	8.2

* 100% = 647

Length of Residency

The survey found that the average number of days a client spends in an RCCF is 131.5. The distribution of the facilities (table 3-16) shows that almost one-half of the facilities reported from 61-120 days, while one-fifth reported the average stay as being between 121-180 days. Of the remaining RCCF's, 6.5% report average length of residence as between 181-240 days and 8.0% report as 241 days or more. Thus, while RCCF's generally tend to be relatively short-term in length of residency, some (14.5%) have an average residency of a half year or more.

TABLE 3-16
LENGTH OF AVERAGE CLIENT RESIDENCY LAST FISCAL YEAR

Average Days of Residency	Number of Facilities	Percent of Facilities
60 or Less	99	16.2
6-120	29	48.4
121-180	128	20.9
181-240	40	6.5
241 or More	49	8.0
Total	612	100.0

Table 3-17 shows that RCCF admissions for the last fiscal year were distributed in the following way: approximately one-third of facilities admitted 100 or less clients, and 28.2% of facilities admitted between 101 and 200 clients per year. Thirty-eight percent exceeded 200 admissions.

TABLE 3-17
RCCF ADMISSIONS, LAST FISCAL YEAR

Number of Residents Admitted	Number of Facilities	Percent of Facilities
100 or Less	192	34.1
101-200	159	28.2
201-300	76	13.5
301-400	46	8.2
401-500	20	3.6
501-1,000	48	8.5
More than 1,000	22	3.9
Total	563	100.0

Successful completion rates as well as administrative transfer rates of clients in RCCF's were calculated from the data. Table 3-18 shows an average of 73% of discharges represent successful completion of RCCF programs, while the average rate of disciplinary transfers is 15.8%, and the average for administrative transfers is 7.2%. (Table 2 in Appendix A shows a more detailed breakdown of the percentages of residents discharged for each type of discharge.)

TABLE 3-18
DISTRIBUTION OF RCCF DISCHARGES, BY TYPE

Type of Discharge	Number of Facilities	Average % Discharges
Successful Completion	582	73.4
Disciplinary Transfer	544	15.8
Client Withdrawal	143	9.3
Escape	455	8.1
Administrative Transfer	284	7.2

Another variable examined in the survey was the extent of accreditation. Forty-one percent of RCCF's reported having program accreditation. Table 3-19 shows that of the 266 facilities reporting accreditation, almost one-half have been accredited by the Commission on Accreditation for Corrections, and just over one-fourth have been accredited by a state corrections agency.

TABLE 3-19
AGENCIES ACCREDITING RCCF PROGRAMS

Accrediting Agency	Number of Facilities	Percent of Facilities Accredited by Agency
Commission on Accreditation for Corrections	130	48.8
State Corrections Agency	72	27.2
Other State Agency	18	6.8
Other*	46	17.3
Total	266	99.9

* "Other" includes such responses as Commission on Accreditation for Rehabilitation Facilities, Standards for Adult Community Residential Services, and Commission on Correctional Standards. (Some responses were not related to accreditation.)

Client Population Characteristics

To provide data that describe the characteristics of RCCF residents, the facilities in the survey were asked to identify the number of residents in relation to the demographic variables of sex, race, and age.

As discussed in the previous section, more than half of the facilities, 52%, reported all-male populations, while only 8% reported all-female populations. However, 39% reported the facilities provide accommodations for both males and females. Table 3-20 presents the statistics for male and female residents for all the RCCF's in the study.

TABLE 3-20
AGGREGATE RCCF RESIDENT POPULATIONS, BY GENDER

Sex of Residents	Number of Residents	Percent of Residents
Male	36,723	90.2
Female	3,975	9.8
Total	40,698	100.0

Table 3-21 presents data on the facilities with male, female, and co-correctional facilities. The pattern for resident populations is one of significantly larger male populations, in that one-half of "male only" facilities have more than 50 males, while only 13% of "female only" facilities have more than 50 females.

TABLE 3-21
RCCF CLIENT POPULATION SIZE, BY GENDER

Number of Residents	Male-Only Facilities		Female-Only Facilities		Co-correctional Facilities*			
					Male		Female	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
< 10	8	2.4	7	1.9	17	6.8	90	38.6
10-19	46	13.7	26	11.5	44	17.5	70	30.0
20-29	48	14.3	11	50.0	33	13.1	41	17.6
30-39	36	10.7	3	21.2	44	17.5	15	6.4
40-49	33	9.8	3	1.9	21	8.3	5	2.1
50-99	92	27.5	2	4.8	58	23.1	3	1.3
100-149	41	12.2	1	1.9	23	9.2	7	3.0
150-199	16	4.8	0	-	5	2.0	2	0.9
≥ 200	15	4.5	0	-	6	2.4	0	-
Total	335	100.0	52	100.0	251	100.0	233	100.0

* Distributions for coed facilities are presented for each sex to show the difference in populations.

Table 3-22 shows the distribution of the aggregate resident population by race. Overall, approximately one-half of the study's total RCCF population was white, more than one-third was black, and most of the remaining residents were Hispanic.

TABLE 3-22
AGGREGATE RCCF RESIDENT POPULATION, BY RACE

Race of Resident	Number of Residents	Percent of Residents
White	20,033	50.5
Black	14,979	37.8
Hispanic	4,059	10.2
Native American, Aleutian and Eskimo	381	1.0
North Asian and Pacific Islander	144	0.4
Other*	53	0.1
Total	39,644	100.0

* "Other" includes Middle Easterners (Lebanese, Arabs, Egyptians, and Iranians) and nonracial descriptions such as South Africans.

Table 3-23 displays the proportion of facilities with varying levels of residents for each racial group. Consistent with the national totals, Blacks and Hispanics comprise a small portion of the resident populations; 42.9% of the facilities with black residents have a black population of 10 or fewer, 77% of facilities with Hispanic residents report a Hispanic population of 10 or fewer. In contrast, only one-fourth of the facilities with white residents have 10 or fewer residents.

TABLE 3-23
RCCF CLIENT POPULATION SIZE, BY RACE

Number of Clients	% of Facilities with # of Whites (N=619)	% of Facilities with # of Blacks (N=569)	% of Facilities with # of Hispanics (N=368)
10 or Less	25.7	42.7	77.2
11-25	28.4	24.6	13.0
26-50	26.5	17.0	5.7
51-100	14.7	11.8	2.2
More than 100	4.7	3.7	1.9
Total	100.0	99.8	100.0

Only 17.3% of the RCCF's report having Eskimo, Native American, and Aleutian residents. Similarly, only 9.3% of the facilities report Asian/Pacific Islander residents. Table 3-24 makes apparent the relatively isolated condition of the minorities. Most facilities report less than 10 residents in the Eskimo, Native American, or Aleutian category, as well as in the Asian/Pacific Islander group, and approximately one-half of the facilities have only one minority resident.

TABLE 3-24
RCCF CLIENT POPULATION SIZE, BY RACE

Number of Clients	% of Facilities with Eskimo, Native American and Aleutian (N=111)	% of Facilities with Asian/Pacific Islanders (N=60)
1	45.9	56.7
2-10	51.4	41.6
More than 10	2.7	1.7
Total	100.0	100.0

The national population of RCCF residents is relatively young. Eighty five percent are under age 40; nearly one-half (45.9) are in the age range of 26 to 39, and more than one quarter (25.9%) are between 22 and 25 years of age. Not surprisingly, because of the study's RCCF definitional requirement

of "primarily adult facilities," very few residents are under 18 years old (about 1% of the population). Similarly, few residents are 50 years of age or older--also 1% (see table 3-25). (Refer to table 3, Appendix A, for a more detailed breakdown of the RCCF population size by age groups.)

TABLE 3-25
AGGREGATE RCCF POPULATION, BY AGE

Age Category	Number of Residents	Percent of Residents*
Less Than 18 Years Old	395	1.1
18-21 Years Old	4,378	11.9
22-25 Years Old	9,494	25.9
26-39 Years Old	16,827	45.9
40-59 Years Old	4,923	13.4
60 Years Old or Older	508	1.4
Total	36,625	99.6

* Percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding.

Community Relationship Characteristics

Community action and reaction to both the proposal and operation of RCCF's has emerged as an important issue in community corrections. Most successful community corrections operators stress the importance of introducing the community to the RCCF through such activities as public hearings, and integrating community members through citizen/advisory groups.

This section presents the data describing the variables that depict community interaction with RCCF's, including neighborhood opposition and zoning restrictions encountered and solutions to the opposition. Table 3-26 provides a breakdown of facilities by type of neighborhood. Almost one-half of the respondents are located in mixed residential and business neighborhoods, and almost one-fourth are located in mostly commercial, business, or industrial neighborhoods.

TABLE 3-26
RCCF NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTERISTICS

Type of Neighborhood	Number of Facilities	Percent of Facilities*
Mixed Residential and Business	297	46.0
Mostly Commercial, Business, or Industrial	154	23.9
Mostly Residential	137	21.2
Mostly Rural	46	7.1
Other	11	1.7
Total	645	99.9

* Percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding.

When respondents were asked to describe their current relationship with the neighborhood, the general atmosphere was positive, as can be seen in Table 3-27. A clear majority of 74% reported a "somewhat positive" or "mostly friendly" relationship with the neighborhood.

TABLE 3-27
RCCF RELATIONSHIP WITH NEIGHBORHOOD

Type of Relationship	Number of Facilities	Percent of Facilities
Mostly Friendly	243	37.6
Somewhat Positive	236	36.5
Neutral	147	22.8
Somewhat Negative	19	2.9
Very Hostile	1	0.2
Total	646	100.0

Respondents were asked if their facility had ever been delayed in opening or been prevented from operating because of neighborhood opposition or zoning. If they had, they were asked to describe the nature of the opposition and resolution. Fifty-eight of the 634 responses, or 9.1%, were "yes." The majority of RCCF's that encountered opposition (45 facilities) said it arose

from community residents, rather than from businesses or government agencies (see table 3-28).

TABLE 3-28
SOURCE OF OPPOSITION TO RCCF'S

Source of Opposition	Number of Facilities	Percent of Facilities
Residents	5	78.0
Business	3	5.0
Local Government	4	7.0
Town, County, City Government	1	2.0
State Government	1	2.0
Residents and Government	2	3.0
Residents and Business	2	3.0
Total	58	100.0

Table 3-29 provides descriptions for those 54 respondents describing the nature of the neighborhood opposition. Over three-fourths described a general negative attitude in the community.

TABLE 3-29
NATURE OF LOCAL OPPOSITION TO RCCF'S

Problem	Number of Facilities	Percent of Facilities
General Negative Attitude	43	79.6
Location Dispute	5	9.2
Violent Offenders		
Viewed as Threat	3	5.6
"Too Many Self-Help/ Corrections Groups in Area"	3	5.6
Total	54	100.0

Eighteen respondents provided descriptions for any action taken during the delay or opposition. Summaries of their actions are shown table 3-30.

TABLE 3-30
RCCF RESPONSE TO LOCAL OPPOSITION

Action or Measure Taken	Number of Facilities
Public Hearing	9
Litigation	6
Government Intervention	1
Citizen Advisory Group	2
Total	18

Of 52 respondents describing a resolution or outcome to their conflict with the neighborhood (presented in table 3-31), over half either experienced an unfavorable outcome or were forced to relocate.

TABLE 3-31
RESOLUTION OF RCCF NEIGHBORHOOD CONFLICT

Status	Number of Facilities
Pending/Unresolved	4
General, Favorable to RCCF	18
General, Unfavorable to RCCF	16
Relocate	14
Total	52

A minority of 9% or fifty-five of 636 RCCF's answered "Yes" to the question, "Has your facility ever delayed opening or been prevented from operating a residential community corrections program because of zoning?" Of the RCCF's describing the zoning opposition (table 3-32), 13 of 43 facilities reported a general zoning opposition to the location of their facility. Ten of the 43 respondents explained that the zoning permits they had applied for had been rejected, and 9 of the respondents described an unclear or ambiguous zoning criteria that delayed or prevented their opening.

TABLE 3-32
NATURE OF RCCF ZONING PROBLEMS

Description of Problem	Number of Facilities
General/Not Specific	13
Permit Rejected	10
Unclear or Ambiguous Zoning Criteria	9
City Temporarily Not Issuing Permits	4
Expansion Attempt Blocked	4
Denied Location in Residential Zone	3
Total	43

Descriptions of any type of action taken for resolving the zoning conflict are shown in Table 3-33. Nineteen of the 20 facilities reported various hearings: planning commission, superior court, local court, and public hearings.

TABLE 3-33
RCCF RESPONSE TO ZONING PROBLEMS

Action or Measure Taken	Number of Facilities
Superior Court Hearing	7
Planning Commission Hearing	5
City, Local Court Hearing	5
Public Hearing	2
Mayor's Task Force Created	1
Total	20

Fiscal Information

Financial information was examined by collecting data from three distinct fiscal measures or indicators: funding sources, assessment of client fees, and total annual operating budgets. All data were compiled by the RCCF's from the last fiscal year for which records were available.

Table 3-34 summarizes the data describing the various funding sources of RCCF budgets. The most apparent finding is the prevalence of State Department of Corrections (DOC) funds, reported by 71.5% of facilities. Also of sizeable

proportions were funds from the Federal Bureau of Prisons (28.0%) and local corrections agencies (22.5%).

TABLE 3-34
RCCF FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Number of Facilities	Percent of Facilities*
Federal Bureau of Prisons	170	28.0
State Department of Corrections	435	71.5
Local Corrections Agencies (e.g., Community Corrections Board, Sheriff's Department)	137	22.5
United Way	45	7.4
Client Fees	240	39.5
Private Donations	62	10.3
Grants/Foundations	41	6.8
Other Agencies		
Federal	41	6.8
State	76	12.6
County	47	7.8
City	17	2.8

* 100% = 607. Multiple responses were allowed, so percentages do not equal 100.

In addition to the prevalence of funding sources in the RCCF population, an issue to consider is the relative contribution to the total operating budgets made by the various funding sources. Table 3-35 presents the proportions of total budgets received from the most prominent sources. It makes apparent the heavy reliance of many RCCF's on State DOC funds. Sixty percent of RCCF's receive State DOC funds, and more than 75% of their budgets come from the DOC. RCCF's receiving Federal Bureau of Prisons and local corrections agencies funds are more varied in the extent to which they rely on these funding sources. Other funding sources comprise one-quarter or less of the budget for the majority of facilities.

TABLE 3-35
DISTRIBUTION OF RCCF FUNDING SOURCES

Percent of Total Budget	Federal Bureau of Prisons (N=162)	State Dept of Correc- tions (N=417)	Local Correc- tions Agencies (N=132)	United Way (N=43)	Client Fees (N=228)	Private Dona- tions (N=62)	Grants Founda- ions (N=41)
≤ 25%	45.1	12.0	30.3	95.3	91.2	82.3	82.9
26-50%	14.8	11.3	20.5	4.7	5.7	11.3	4.9
51-75%	16.0	9.8	9.8	-	2.6	6.5	4.9
76-100%	24.1	66.9	39.4	-	0.4	-	7.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 3-36 indicates the averages for the most common funding sources of total operating budgets. For the RCCF's receiving State DOC funds (71.5%), DOC revenues comprise an average of 77% for the budgets. Local corrections agencies contribute an average of 55.1% to the budgets for facilities receiving this revenue, and Federal Bureau of Prisons funding comprises an average 42.7% of RCCF budgets receiving Bureau of Prison funds.

TABLE 3-36
RCCF FUNDING SOURCES BY AVERAGE PERCENTAGE OF OPERATING BUDGETS

Funding Source	Number of Facilities	Percent of Budgets*
State Department of Correction Local Corrections Agencies (e.g. Community Corrections Board, Sheriff's Department)	417	77.0
Federal Bureau of Prisons	132	55.1
Client Fees	162	42.7
	228	13.1

* Based on the average of financial data from all facilities receiving funding from each source.

The RCCF directors in the study were also asked if they charge client fees, with no reference to budgetary allocation. When asked from this broader perspective, 535 facilities, or 83.9%, answered affirmatively. This disparity from the 39.5% reporting it as part of their operating budgets suggests that

almost 300 facilities, or 55%, use client fees for alternative budget options. Possible options for fees disbursement would be "general or miscellaneous funds" not directly managed by higher level administration, or other department funds independent of administrative oversight.¹

Table 3-37 displays the formulas used by RCCF's when charging client fees. A formula based on the percent of client earnings was the most frequent means of fee assessment. Over one-half of RCCF's collecting fees (56.4%) report this practice. Also relatively common was an established daily rate formula by almost one-half (45.1%) of the facilities. The other two fee formulas, a sliding scale based on ability to pay and fee-for-service, were practiced by much smaller proportions of the RCCF's, 17.2% and 4.9% respectively.

TABLE 3-37
RCCF'S USE OF CLIENT FEE FORMULAS BY TYPE

Fee Formula	Number of Facilities	Percent of Facilities*
Percent of Client's Earnings	301	56.4
Established Daily Rate	241	45.1
Sliding Fee Scale/Ability to Pay	92	17.2
Fee-for-Service	26	4.9

* 100% = 534. Respondents were allowed multiple responses, so percentages do not equal 100.

Table 3-38 summarizes the distribution of the total annual operating budgets for the RCCF's. The single greatest proportion of facilities report budgets in the range of \$250,001 to \$500,000. Almost 31% operate within this range. An additional 21.2% reported budgets between 500,001 and \$750,000. Collapsing these categories illustrates that just over one-half, or 51.9% of the RCCF's in the study, operate in the range of one-quarter to three quarters of a million dollars. An additional 9.9% of facilities exceed this range with budgets between \$751,001 and \$1,000,000, and 16.3% have budgets greater than \$1,000,000.

¹ This information was obtained from telephone discussion with RCCF directors. Directors also mentioned jurisdictions controlled by legislation that specifies how fee revenues can be used.

TABLE 3-38
RCCF'S OPERATING BUDGET (LAST FISCAL YEAR)

Budget Amount	Number	Percent
\$100,000 or Less	25	5.0
\$100,001 to 250,000	83	16.7
\$250,001 to 500,000	153	30.8
\$501,001 to 750,000	105	21.2
\$751,001 to 1,000,000	49	9.9
\$1,000,001 to 2,500,000	67	13.5
\$2,500,001 to 5,000,000	7	1.4
Over \$5,000,000		
Total	496	100.0

Note: Total excludes 151 facilities, or 23%, not providing data for the question.

Physical Facility Characteristics

This section presents the key physical facility characteristics of the RCCF's in our study. The varieties of buildings and the types of occupancy are described by the following characteristics:

- Beginning year of operation
 - In current location
 - Prior to current location
- Building structure
- Age of building
- Type of adaptation of RCCF program
- RCCF occupancy status.

Respondents were asked to specify the year in which their RCCF first occupied its current building. Table 3-39 displays responses indicating that 95% of the facilities had been in their current building since 1970: 54% started during the 1980's, and 41% started during the 1970's.

TABLE 3-39
YEAR RCCF OCCUPIED CURRENT BUILDING

Year	Number of Facilities	Percent of Facilities
Before 1960*	6	0.9
1960-1969	25	3.9
1970-1979	259	40.9
1980-1989	344	54.3
1980-1984	211	33.3
1985-1989	133	21.0
Total	634	100.0

* Category range was 1930 - 1959.

However, 323 or one-half of RCCF's had operated prior to their current location. Of these facilities, the majority (60.6%) started in the 1970's (see table 3-40). An equal proportion of about one-fifth started earlier in the 1960's, as well as later in the 1980's. The data on the year of current location and on prior operation, highlight the relative young age of RCCF's.

TABLE 3-40
YEAR RCCF'S ESTABLISHED, PRIOR LOCATION

Year	Number of Facilities*	Percent of Facilities
Before 1960**	2	0.6
1960-1969	58	18.7
1970-1979	188	60.6
1980-1989	62	20.0
1980-1984	45	14.5
1985-1989	17	5.5
Total	310	99.9

* Thirteen respondents did not answer questions.

**Category included years 1953 and 1959.

Table 3-41 illustrates the variety of building types that are occupied by RCCF's. Almost 40% of respondents described the facility building type as

institutional (e.g., hospital, school, jail, or prison). The remaining RCCF's are found among a variety of building types; approximately one-tenth each are in apartment buildings, duplexes, and single family houses. A slightly higher proportion of 13% is found in hotel or motel structures.

TABLE 3-41
RCCF BUILDING TYPES

Type of Building	Number of Facilities	Percent of Facilities
Institution	257	39.8
Hotel/Motel	86	13.3
Multifamily Duplex	76	11.8
Single Family House	65	10.1
Apartment Building	64	9.9
Farm/Ranch	3	0.5
Other*	94	14.6
Total	645	100.0

* "Other" includes descriptions that do not fit into any of the categories provided. Examples include archive buildings, convents, and churches.

In view of the variety of buildings utilized for RCCF's, it is interesting that the age ranges are also diverse. Table 3-42 presents the age ranges for the RCCF buildings, indicating no predominance of buildings in a particular range.

TABLE 3-42
AGE OF RCCF BUILDINGS

Age of Building	Number of Facilities	Percent of Facilities*
Less than 10 Years Old	103	16.7
10-24 Years Old	126	20.4
25-49 Years Old	147	23.8
50-74 Years Old	139	22.5
75-99 Years Old	74	12.0
100 Years Old or More	28	4.5
Total	617	99.9

* Percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding.

Only one-fifth of the facilities reported that their buildings were designed for the program. Almost 60% of the building were remodeled. This suggests that 80% of the RCCF's made capital expenditures when starting to operate (see table 3-43).

TABLE 3-43
BUILDING DESIGNED/ADAPTED FOR RCCF PROGRAMS

Building Was:	Number of Facilities	Percent of Facilities
Remodeled for Program	387	59.9
Designed for Program	130	20.1
Occupied Without Renovations	120	18.6
Other	9	1.4
Total	646	100.0

Table 3-44 shows the occupancy status of the RCCF's as being marginally higher for ownership than for rental or rent-free arrangements, at 55% versus 45% respectively.

TABLE 3-44
RCCF OCCUPANCY STATUS

Occupancy Status	Number of Facilities	Percent of Facilities
Own	354	55.1
Rent	269	41.8
Other*	20	3.1
Total	643	100.0

* "Other" includes various types of no-cost occupancy.

CHAPTER 4 PRIVATE AND PUBLIC RCCF'S

As mentioned in the previous chapter, just over half the RCCF's participating in the survey are public and just under half are private. This chapter compares public and private facilities in terms of several key variables likely to be of interest: affiliated boards, accreditation, acceptance of noncriminal referrals, client capacity, average client residency, and operating budgets.

Table 4-1 summarizes the public and private composition of the survey respondents. State RCCF's make up 63% of public facilities and 33% of the total.

TABLE 4-1
PUBLIC AND PRIVATE RCCF'S, BY TYPE OF OPERATING AGENCY

Type of RCCF	Number of RCCF's	Percent of RCCF's	Percent of Total RCCF's
Public:			
Federal	3	0.9	0.5
State	214	63.9	33.2
County	107	31.9	16.6
Municipal	11	3.3	1.7
Total	335	100.0	52.0
Private:			
Profit	58	19.7	9.0
Nonprofit	236	80.3	36.6
Total	294	100.0	45.6
Total	629		97.6

Note: Approximately 2.3%, or 15 respondents, did not classify their RCCF's in the above categories. The "Other" responses were: judicial districts, combinations of county and state, or city and state, and other nonspecific responses such as sheriff's offices.

As can be seen in table 4-2, citizens' advisory boards are found to a similar extent in public and private facilities, in around one-half each. Boards of directors, as would be expected, are more prevalent among private RCCF's than public RCCF's (75.5% compared to 16.5%).

TABLE 4-2
PUBLIC AND PRIVATE RCCF'S, BY AFFILIATED BOARDS

Type of RCCF	Citizens' Advisory Board (%)	Board of Directors (%)
Public:		
State (N=212)	65.6	14.6
County (N=107)	32.7	19.6
Total (N=333)	53.4	16.5
Private:		
Profit (N=212)	66.1	14.6
Nonprofit (N=230)	44.1	79.7
Total (N=292)	48.3	75.5

Note: Percentages are not shown for public, federal, and city RCCF's due to small number bases, but are included in public total figures.

The magnitude of accreditation is similar for public and private facilities, reflected in table 4-3 by 42% for the total public and 37% for the total private programs reporting accreditation.

TABLE 4-3
ACCREDITED PUBLIC AND PRIVATE RCCF'S

Type of RCCF	Number	Percent Accredited
Public:		
Federal	3	100.0
State	210	47.1
County	107	31.1
Municipal	11	45.4
Total Public	330	42.4
Private:		
Profit	58	36.2
Nonprofit	235	38.3
Total Private	293	37.9
Total RCCF's	638	40.9

The RCCF definition outlined in chapter 1 excluded facilities with more than 30% noncriminal admissions. Thus facilities included in this study had between 0 and 30% noncriminal referrals. Only 5.8%, or 37 facilities,

reported any noncriminal referrals. While the number is small and percentages should therefore be interpreted cautiously, table 4-4 shows the distribution of RCCF's with these noncriminal referrals.

TABLE 4-4
PUBLIC AND PRIVATE RCCF'S WITH NONCRIMINAL REFERRALS

Type of RCCF	Number of RCCF's	Percent of RCCF's
Public	7	18.9
Private*	30	81.1
Total	37	100.0

* Twenty-six of the 30 private facilities were nonprofit.

Almost half of this study's RCCF's, or 46%, have bed capacities for female residents. Table 4-5 displays the breakdown for the 301 facilities. The largest category of facilities admitting females are the private, nonprofit RCCF's. Just over 40% are found in the nonprofit category. Also notable is the extent of "female bed" facilities among the county RCCF's. In view of their comprising only 16.6% of all RCCF's, the percentage allowing females is substantial at 22.6%.

TABLE 4-5
RCCF'S ADMITTING FEMALES

Type of RCCF	Number of RCCF's	Percent of RCCF Type*	Percent of Total RCCF's
Federal (N=3)	2	66.7	0.7
State (N=214)	54	25.2	17.9
County (N=107)	68	63.5	22.6
City (N=11)	5	45.4	1.7
Profit (N=58)	40	69.0	13.3
Nonprofit (N=236)	125	53.0	41.5
Other (N=15)	7	46.7	2.3
Total	301		100.0

* Percentages do not equal 100 because they are calculated from the number of RCCF's within each category.

Public RCCF's tend to have greater bed capacities than private RCCF's. with 68.6% of facilities having more than 50 beds. Private RCCF's with more than 50 beds are in the relative minority, at 29.7%. See table 4-6 for all categories of public and private RCCF's.

TABLE 4-6
PUBLIC AND PRIVATE RCCF'S CLIENT CAPACITY, BY TYPE

Type of RCCF	Less than 50 Beds	50-99 Beds	100-149 Beds	150+Over Beds
Public:				
Federal (N=3)	100.0	-	-	-
State (N=202)	29.2	36.1	22.8	11.9
County (N=106)	34.0	36.8	12.3	17.0
City (N=11)	27.3	18.2	-	54.5
Total (N=322)	31.4	35.4	18.3	14.9
Private:				
Profit (N=57)	56.1	31.6	5.3	7.0
Nonprofit (N=229)	73.4	20.1	3.9	2.6
Total (N=286)	69.9	22.4	4.2	3.5
Total (N=608)	49.5	29.3	11.7	9.5

Note: Total excludes "Others" category, or 15 RCCF's.

Table 4-7 charts the results when respondents were asked the average length of residency for clients during the last complete fiscal year. The general pattern is for public RCCF's to keep clients for longer terms than private RCCF's. This is evidenced by 22.8% of public facilities reporting an average length exceeding 180 days, compared to only 5.3% of private facilities. Over three-fourths of private facilities, by contrast, reported resident programs under 120 days.

TABLE 4-7
AVERAGE LENGTH OF CLIENT RESIDENCY IN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE RCCF'S

Type of RCCF	60 Days or Less (%)	61-120 Days (%)	121-180 Days (%)	Over 180 Days (%)
Public (N=311)	18.0	32.5	26.7	22.8
Private (N=284)	14.4	66.5	13.7	5.3

Note: The table excludes 15 facilities categorized as "others" and 38 facilities not providing data.

Comparisons of public and private annual operating budgets were also drawn. From table 4-8 below, it can be seen that public RCCF's have a pattern of somewhat larger operating budgets. This is consistent with their larger bed capacity and longer lengths of stay for residents. Twice as many public as private RCCF's have budgets exceeding \$750,000. Over one-third, or 35%, of public facilities operate with budgets over \$750,000. By comparison, 17% of private facilities have budgets exceeding \$750,000.

TABLE 4-8
PUBLIC AND PRIVATE RCCF'S BY ANNUAL OPERATING BUDGET

Annual Budget	Public RCCF's		Private RCCF's	
	N	%	N	%
\$100,000 or Less	15	6.3	10	4.1
\$100,000-250,000	31	13.0	49	20.3
\$250,001-500,000	56	23.5	91	37.8
\$500,000-750,000	51	21.4	50	20.8
\$750,001-1,000,000	30	12.6	18	7.5
\$1,000,001-2,500,000	46	19.3	18	7.5
\$2,500,001-5,000,000	4	1.7	3	1.2
Over \$5,000,000	5	2.1	2	0.8
Total	238	100.0	241	100.0

Note: The table excludes 168 RCCF's not providing data for this variable.
The 479 RCCF's included in the table represent 74% of the respondents.

APPENDIX A

Table 1: Distribution of RCCF Referrals, By Type and Source

Table 2: Types of Discharge From RCCF Programs

Table 3: RCCF Population Size By Age

TABLE 1
DISTRIBUTION OF RCCF REFERRALS, BY TYPE AND SOURCE

Referral Source	Facilities Reporting Percent of Total Population									
	1 - 25%		26 - 50%		51 - 75%		76 - 100%		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N		N	%	N	%
Pretrial										
Federal	60	93.7	3	4.7	-	-	1	1.6	64	100.0
State	16	88.9	2	11.1	-	-	-	-	18	100.0
Local	29	76.3	5	13.2	2	5.3	2	5.3	38	100.0
Nongovernment	1	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100.0
Probation										
Federal	101	97.2	2	1.9	-	-	1	1.0	104	100.0
State	53	44.5	19	16.0	13	10.9	34	28.6	119	100.0
Local	38	46.9	18	22.2	14	17.3	11	13.6	81	100.0
Nongovernment	1	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100.0
Postconviction, Court Order										
Federal	103	89.6	11	9.6	1	0.9	-	-	115	100.0
State	32	47.1	17	25.0	3	4.4	16	23.5	68	100.0
Local	38	46.9	15	18.5	5	6.2	23	28.4	81	100.0
Nongovernment	2	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	100.0
Parole										
Federal	66	84.6	7	9.0	3	3.8	2	2.6	78	100.0
State	103	65.6	30	19.1	8	5.1	16	10.2	157	100.0
Local	8	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	100.0
Nongovernment	1	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100.0
Prison/Jail										
Federal	73	47.4	29	18.8	27	17.5	25	16.2	154	100.0
State	55	15.8	48	13.8	31	8.9	214	61.5	348	100.0
Local	33	32.7	18	17.8	7	6.9	43	42.6	101	100.0
Nongovernment	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100.0	1	100.0
Self-Referral										
Federal	2	50.0	-	-	1	25.0	1	25.0	4	100.0
State	12	92.3	-	-	-	-	1	7.7	13	100.0
Local	19	90.5	2	9.5	-	-	-	-	21	100.0
Nongovernment	3	75.0	1	25.0	-	-	-	-	4	100.0
Non-Criminal-Justice										
Federal	1	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100.0
State	2	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	100.0
Local	9	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	100.0
Nongovernment	12	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	100.0
Other*										
Federal	6	75.0	0	-	-	-	2	25.0	8	100.0
State	6	42.9	1	7.1	2	14.3	5	35.7	14	100.0
Local	11	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	11	100.0
Nongovernment	1	50.0	1	50.0	-	-	-	-	2	100.0

*Note: "Other" includes homeless, immigration, U.S. Marshalls-federal, federal inmates status unknown, house arrest, and other descriptions that did not fit into the categories.

TABLE 2
TYPES OF DISCHARGE FROM RCCF PROGRAMS

Type of Discharge	Percent of Residents Discharged									
	25% or less		26-50		51-75		76-100		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Successful Completion	11	1.9	67	11.5	218	37.5	286	49.1	582	100.0
Clients Withdrawal	127	88.8	15	10.5	1	0.7	0	0.0	143	100.0
Escape	434	95.4	19	4.2	2	0.4	0	0.0	455	100.0
Disciplinary Transfer	459	84.4	77	14.4	7	1.3	1	0.2	544	100.0
Administrative Transfer	268	94.4	15	5.3	0	0.0	1	0.4	284	100.0

TABLE 3
RCCF's POPULATION SIZE AND BY AGE

Number of Clients	17 Years or Less	18-21	22-25	26-39	40-59	60+
10 or Less	92.0	72.4	52.3	30.7	74.5	97.8
11-25	5.3	21.9	30.1	31.4	17.0	1.1
26-50	1.3	4.4	11.6	21.3	6.7	0.5
51-100	1.3	0.8	4.5	12.4	0.4	0.5
101+	0.0	0.4	1.4	4.2	0.4	0.0
TOTAL	100.0	99.9	99.9	100.0	100.0	99.9*
	(N=75)	(N=479)	(N=558)	(N=573)	(N=506)	(N=183)

* Percents do not equal 100 due to rounding.

APPENDIX B

Questionnaire and Cover Letters

APPENDIX B: QUESTIONNAIRE AND COVER LETTERS

- Cover Letter for First Mailing
- Cover Letter for Second Mailing
- Instruction Sheet Accompanying First and Second Mailings
- 12-Page Questionnaire
- Postcard Reminder

(All of these items are accurate reproductions.)



U.S. Department of Justice

National Institute of Corrections

Washington, D.C. 20534

DATE

ADMINISTRATOR'S NAME
FACILITY OR PROGRAM NAME
STREET ADDRESS
CITY, STATE, ZIP

Dear ADMINISTRATOR:

Residential community corrections programs have become an important part of the criminal justice system. However, no one has developed a complete list of the public and private facilities in operation, or described their capacities, services, or types of offenders. Therefore, program operators and policymakers are unable to find information that they need. The National Institute of Corrections (NIC), with Aspen Systems Corporation, is conducting a study to document the number and types of residential community corrections facilities (RCCF's) operating today. We will use the data collected in this study to develop both a national directory and a descriptive narrative report.

The questionnaire has two sections. We will develop a national directory from information provided in the first section. The second section of the questionnaire seeks additional material for the descriptive report. All information you provide in the second section will be treated as confidential and will be used only to prepare statistical summaries. The identification number on the front of the questionnaire is for recordkeeping purposes only. We obtained the names and addresses of those in our sample by reviewing existing directories of residential corrections programs and by contacting several federal, state, and local criminal justice agencies.

We have included instructions to assist you in providing the information needed. If you have any questions, please call the Project Director at Aspen Systems Corporation, Mary Foote, at 301-251-5179, or the NIC Project Monitor Laura Schmitt, at 202-724-7995. When the results of the study are made available in the fall, we will provide a copy of both reports to all facilities that return a completed questionnaire.

Your cooperation and support are essential if the corrections field is to better understand the residential community corrections industry. We greatly appreciate your time and help in providing this important information.

Sincerely,

George M. Keiser, Chief
Community Corrections Division

Enclosures



Washington, D.C. 20534

March 21, 1989

Administrator
Facility Name
Address
City, State, ZIP

Dear Administrator:

Within the last 3 weeks we asked you to participate in a nationwide study of residential community corrections facilities. Aspen Systems Corporation, in conjunction with NIC, is conducting this study. Its purpose is to provide NIC and criminal justice practitioners with an understanding of the number of residential community corrections facilities and their capacities, the different populations being served, and the kinds of services being offered.

Your cooperation is essential and greatly appreciated. This is one of the first major studies attempting to gather national data about residential community corrections facilities. We want to obtain the most complete and accurate descriptions of these facilities, both public and private.

If you have already completed and returned the questionnaire to us please accept our sincere thanks. If not, please do so today. For your convenience we are enclosing another copy of the questionnaire and instructions, as well as a self-addressed, postage-paid envelope. Information from the first section of the questionnaire will be used to compile a national directory. The second section of the questionnaire seeks material for a descriptive report. Confidentiality is assured here as only statistical summaries will be used.

We are contacting facilities that we believe fit our definition of residential community corrections facilities as described on page 1 of the questionnaire. Please take a moment to look at the definition, and continue to fill it out as is appropriate for your facility.

We look forward to receiving your completed questionnaire.

Thank you for your time and interest.

Sincerely,

George M. Keiser, Chief
Community Corrections Division

Enclosures

**INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING
NIC QUESTIONNAIRE**

- o **PLEASE COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE FOR YOUR RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS FACILITY ONLY.** If your agency operates other residential community corrections facilities, **PLEASE SUBMIT A SEPARATE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR EACH FACILITY.** If you need additional questionnaires, please call us at 301-251-5179.
- o If you don't have the information to answer a question, and cannot estimate it, please write "DK" for "don't know" in the right margin.
- o If a question does not apply to your facility or agency, write "NA" for "not applicable" in the right margin.
- o Where questions call for numbers, please record "0" (zero) if the answer is none.
- o If you have any questions, or if you are aware of a residential community corrections facility that has not received a questionnaire, call Mary Foote, Project Director, Aspen Systems Corporation, at 301-251-5179.
- o Return the completed questionnaire in the addressed, enclosed envelope to:

Aspen Systems Corporation
NIC Survey, 2B
1600 Research Boulevard
Rockville, MD 20850

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

**NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
CORRECTIONS QUESTIONNAIRE**

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to vary from 30 to 60 minutes per facility response, with an average of 45 minutes per facility response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to: National Institute of Corrections, 320 First Street NW, Washington, DC 20534; and to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20530.

I.D. #

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CORRECTIONS QUESTIONNAIRE**

DIRECTORY SECTION

The National Institute of Corrections (NIC), an agency within the United States Department of Justice, supports State and local corrections programs. NIC has awarded a grant to Aspen Systems Corporation to conduct a study of residential community corrections facilities (RCCF). If your facility meets the definition of an RCCF, as outlined below, please complete this entire section and your facility will be listed in a directory. If your facility does not meet the definition, please complete questions 1 and 2 and return the Questionnaire to us so that we may correct our records. Your voluntary participation and support is greatly appreciated.

DEFINITION OF A RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS FACILITY

For the purposes of this study, a residential community corrections facility is defined as a residential corrections program that meets the following criteria:

- (a) Houses adult offenders. (Examples of offenders are pretrial, sentenced, prerelease, work release, study release, or referred under conditions of probation or parole.)
- (b) Has admissions in which at least 70 percent are placed by Federal, State, or local criminal justice authorities. (*Placed* refers to offenders ordered by criminal justice authorities to participate in the residential community corrections program as a formal part of a sanction or supervision strategy.)
- (c) Operates independently from the detention operation of a jail, prison, or other correctional institution. (If the RCCF is physically part of a jail, prison, or other correctional institution, inmates are housed separately from the general inmate population.)
- (d) Allows residents to leave the facility during the day for work, education, or community programs.

1 What is your facility's name and address?

Facility name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ ZIP _____

Director's name _____ Phone number (____) _____

Contact's name _____ Phone number (____) _____

Your name _____ Phone number (____) _____

2. Does your facility meet the above definition of an RCCF? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

Yes (SKIP TO QUESTION 3)

No (RETURN DIRECTORY QUESTIONNAIRE)

1
2

If No, please indicate the letter(s) corresponding to the criterion you don't meet, and return this form in the enclosed envelope. Thank you for your assistance.

Criterion not met (list letter(s) from box above):

3. Is your facility operated by an organization or agency other than that stated as the facility name in question 1? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

Yes

No (SKIP TO QUESTION 4)

1

2

If Yes, what is the name of the organization or agency that operates your facility?

Organization/Agency name

Address

City

State

ZIP

4. What type of organization or agency operates your facility? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

Federal Government

State government

County government

City government

Private, for profit

Private, nonprofit

Other (SPECIFY BELOW)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

5. Please indicate the sex of residents in your facility. (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

Males

Females

Males and females

1

2

3

6. What is the facility's current bed capacity per day for men and women? (GIVE ACTUAL NUMBER)

_____ beds for men

_____ beds for women

_____ total beds

7. What is the total number of men and women currently residing in your facility? (GIVE ACTUAL NUMBER—INCLUDE RESIDENTS WHO MAY BE AWAY ON PASS OR FURLOUGH)

_____ men

_____ women

8. What percentage of your total residents are non-criminal justice referrals? (GIVE PERCENTAGE)

_____ %

9. For the last fiscal year, please estimate the percentage of the total residential population placed by the following REFERRAL SOURCES. (GIVE PERCENTAGE FOR EACH CATEGORY)

REFERRAL TYPE	Referral Source			
	% Federal	% State	% Local	% Non-Government
Pretrial/Preconviction program				
Probation				
Post-conviction direct court order				
Parole				
Prison or jail (includes prerelease, work-release, furlough, etc.)				
Offender self-referrals				
Sources not involved in criminal justice system				
Other (SPECIFY BELOW) _____				

10. Are there certain offender/client types or disorders that your facility generally excludes from admissions? (CIRCLE ALL NUMBERS THAT APPLY)

Violent offenders
Sex offenders
Arsonists
Drug abusers
Alcohol abusers
Habitual offenders
Psychiatric disorders
Medical disorders
Mentally retarded
Physically disabled
HIV positives
Other (SPECIFY BELOW)

11. Listed below are a variety of services. Please indicate whether or not your facility makes the service available regularly to residents. Specify the source of each service. (CIRCLE APPROPRIATE NUMBERS)

SERVICE DESCRIPTION	Is this service regularly available to residents?		If Yes, indicate the source of the service		
	Yes	No	By facility staff or volunteers	By referral to another agency	By service contract
MENTAL HEALTH					
Group counseling	1	2	1	2	3
Individual counseling	1	2	1	2	3
Family counseling	1	2	1	2	3
Psychological screening/testing	1	2	1	2	3
EMPLOYMENT SERVICES					
Employment counseling/placement	1	2	1	2	3
Sheltered employment	1	2	1	2	3
Vocational/skill training	1	2	1	2	3
EDUCATIONAL SERVICES					
GED/ASE preparation	1	2	1	2	3
High school courses	1	2	1	2	3
College courses	1	2	1	2	3
English as a second language	1	2	1	2	3
LIFE MANAGEMENT					
Budgeting	1	2	1	2	3
Housing referrals	1	2	1	2	3
Life skills training	1	2	1	2	3
Parenting skills	1	2	1	2	3
HEALTH CARE					
Dental services	1	2	1	2	3
Medical services	1	2	1	2	3
Physical rehabilitation	1	2	1	2	3
SUBSTANCE ABUSE SERVICES					
Drug detoxification	1	2	1	2	3
Drug rehabilitation, residential	1	2	1	2	3
Drug rehabilitation, outpatient	1	2	1	2	3
Alcohol detoxification	1	2	1	2	3
Alcohol rehabilitation, residential	1	2	1	2	3
Alcohol rehabilitation, outpatient	1	2	1	2	3
Motivational enhancement	1	2	1	2	3
Urinalysis	1	2	1	2	3
MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES					
Legal services	1	2	1	2	3
Welfare services	1	2	1	2	3
Recreational services	1	2	1	2	3
Community service activities	1	2	1	2	3
Sex offender treatment	1	2	1	2	3

(PLEASE GO TO NEXT SECTION)

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CORRECTIONS QUESTIONNAIRE**

CONFIDENTIAL SECTION

Thank you for helping the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) and Aspen Systems in our study of residential community corrections facilities (RCCF). All the information that you give us in this section will be kept confidential and will be used to prepare statistical totals. While your cooperation is strictly voluntary, your participation is indispensable for developing an accurate picture of RCCF's in the criminal justice system.

1. What is the population of the city/county in which your facility is located? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

City of 250,000 and more 1
City of 100,000 to 249,999 2
City of 50,000 to 99,999 3
City of 10,000 to 49,999 4
City of less than 10,000 5
Suburban county 6
Rural county 7

2. How would you describe the neighborhood in which your facility is located? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

Mostly residential 1
Mostly business/commercial/industrial 2
Mixed residential and business 3
Mostly rural 4
Other (SPECIFY BELOW) 5

3. How would you describe the building that houses your facility? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

Single-family house 1
Multifamily house/Duplex 2
Apartment building 3
Farm or ranch 4
Hotel/Motel 5
Institution (e.g., current or former hospital, training school, jail, prison) 6
Other (SPECIFY BELOW) 7

4. Was the building designed for your program, remodeled from an existing structure, or occupied without renovations? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

Designed for program 1
Remodeled for program 2
Occupied without renovations 3
Other (SPECIFY BELOW) 4

5. Does your agency or organization own or rent/lease the building in which your program is operated? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

Own building 1
Rent/lease building 2
Other (SPECIFY BELOW) 3

6. What is the approximate age of the building? (GIVE THE NUMBER OF YEARS)

_____ years

7. When did your residential community corrections program start operating in this building? (GIVE ACTUAL YEAR)

19 _____

8. Did your program operate prior to being located in this building? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

Yes 1
No (SKIP TO QUESTION 10) 2

9. When did your agency or organization establish or start operating your residential community corrections program? (GIVE THE YEAR ESTABLISHED)

19 _____

10. How many residential community corrections facilities does your agency or organization operate? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

This facility only 1
2 facilities 2
3-5 facilities 3
6-10 facilities 4
More than 10 facilities 5

11. What other types of programs does your agency or organization operate? (CIRCLE ALL NUMBERS THAT APPLY)

Institutional corrections programs (e.g., prisons or jails) 1
Institutional programs, not corrections oriented (e.g., training schools, mental health hospitals) 2
Other residential programs, not corrections oriented 3
Nonresidential community corrections programs 4
Nonresidential community programs, not corrections oriented 5
Other (SPECIFY BELOW) 6
None of the above.....

12. Does your facility work with a: (CIRCLE ALL NUMBERS THAT APPLY)

Citizen/Advisory board 1
Policymaking board of directors 2
Neither (SKIP TO QUESTION 14) 3

13. Who serves on the board(s) at your facility? (CIRCLE ALL NUMBERS THAT APPLY)

	Citizen/Advisory board	Policymaking board
Criminal justice professionals (e.g., law enforcement officers, probation officers, prosecutors, judges, defense attorneys)	1	1
Social service professionals (e.g., social workers, psychologists, educators)	2	2
Other professionals (e.g., doctors, clergy, lawyers)	3	3
Business people	4	4
Government officials	5	5
Community citizens	6	6
Former offenders	7	7
Other (SPECIFY BELOW)	8	8

Total number serving on board
(GIVE NUMBER OF BOARD MEMBERS) _____

14. How many men and women work at your facility in the following positions? (GIVE THE NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES FOR EACH CATEGORY)

	Full-time (40 hours)		Part-time (less than 40 hours)	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
Administrative (e.g., executive director, assistant director, program director, business manager)	_____	_____	_____	_____
Services (e.g., counselor, case manager, teacher, social worker)	_____	_____	_____	_____
Clerical (e.g., secretary, clerk, receptionist)	_____	_____	_____	_____
Support staff (e.g., maintenance, kitchen staff, bus driver)	_____	_____	_____	_____
Security (e.g., desk staff, monitor, guard)	_____	_____	_____	_____
Other (SPECIFY BELOW)	_____	_____	_____	_____
Total employees	_____	_____	_____	_____

15. Do you use volunteer staff at your facility? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

Yes 1
No (SKIP TO QUESTION 17) 2

16. In what capacity do you use volunteer staff in your facility? (CIRCLE ALL NUMBERS THAT APPLY)

- | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| Special events (e.g., parties, study groups.) | 1 |
| Administrative (e.g., executive director, assistant director, program director, business manager) | 2 |
| Services (e.g., counselor, case manager, social worker) | 3 |
| Clerical (e.g., secretary, clerk, receptionist) | 4 |
| Support staff (e.g., maintenance, kitchen staff, bus driver) | 5 |
| Security (e.g., desk staff, monitor, guard) | 6 |
| Other (SPECIFY BELOW) | 7 |

17. Is your program or any part of your program accredited? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

- | | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Yes | 1 |
| No (SKIP TO QUESTION 18) | 2 |

If Yes, who accredited the program? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| Commission on Accreditation for Corrections | 1 |
| Commission on Accreditation for Residential Facilities | 2 |
| State corrections agency (SPECIFY BELOW) | 3 |
| Other State agency (SPECIFY BELOW) | 4 |
| Other (SPECIFY BELOW) | 5 |

18. Does your facility rely upon standardized classification/risk assessment instrument(s) to select clients or develop your program? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| Yes | 1 |
| No | 2 |

19. Which of the following control procedures are used for your residents? (CIRCLE ALL NUMBERS THAT APPLY)

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------|----|
| Unanalysis | 1 |
| Breathalyzer | 2 |
| Room searches | 3 |
| Sign in/out sheets | 4 |
| Phone checks | 5 |
| Site visits | 6 |
| Electronic monitoring (i.e., bracelets) | 7 |
| Closed-circuit TV/cameras | 8 |
| Physical restraints | 9 |
| Holding cells/quiet rooms | 10 |
| Fine/restitution collection | 11 |
| Visitor monitoring/searches | 12 |
| Regular floor checks | 13 |
| Routine resident counts | 14 |
| Other (SPECIFY BELOW) | 15 |

20. For your current population, describe the racial composition (GIVE NUMBER OF EACH RACE AND TOTAL)

White	_____
Black	_____
Hispanic	_____
Native American	_____
Aleutian, Eskimo	_____
Asian or Pacific Islander	_____
Other (SPECIFY BELOW)	_____

Total	_____

21. For your current population, what is the age distribution? (GIVE NUMBER OF EACH AND TOTAL)

Under 18 years old	_____
18-21 years old	_____
22-25 years old	_____
26-39 years old	_____
40-59 years old	_____
60 or over	_____
Total	_____

22. What was the total number of residents admitted during the last fiscal year? (GIVE NUMBER BELOW)

_____ clients

23. Estimate the average length of stay in number of days for residents in your facility during the last fiscal year. (GIVE NUMBER BELOW)

_____ days

24. Estimate the percentage of residents discharged from your program for the following reasons during the last fiscal year: (GIVE PERCENTAGE)

Successful completion of program	_____ %
Client's withdrawal from program	_____ %
Escape	_____ %
Disciplinary transfer/discharge	_____ %
Administrative transfer	_____ %

25. Which of the following best describes the current relationship between your facility and your neighborhood? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

Very friendly	1
Somewhat positive	2
Neutral	3
Somewhat negative	4
Very hostile	5

26. Has your facility ever delayed opening or been prevented from operating a residential community corrections program because of neighborhood opposition or zoning? (CIRCLE APPROPRIATE NUMBERS)

Neighborhood
opposition

Zoning

Yes 1
No (SKIP TO QUESTION 27) 2 2

If Yes, briefly note the nature of the opposition and resolution, including the year the problem occurred, the length of time involved in resolving disputes, and whether litigation was necessary. If more space is needed, please use the back of this form.

NEIGHBORHOOD: _____

ZONING: _____

27. What was your total facility operating budget for the last fiscal year? EXCLUDE CAPITAL COSTS (GIVE DOLLAR AMOUNT)

\$ _____

28. For the last fiscal year, please indicate the funding sources for your operating budget. Estimate the approximate percentage of the total budget provided by each. (CIRCLE NUMBER AND INDICATE PERCENTAGE OF EACH BELOW)

	Funding source		If Yes, percent of total		Funding source		If Yes, percent of total
	Yes	No			Yes	No	
Federal Bureau of Prisons	1	2	_____ %	Other Federal Agencies	1	2	_____ %
State Department of Corrections	1	2	_____ %	Other State agencies	1	2	_____ %
Local corrections agencies (e.g., community corrections board, sheriff's department)	1	2	_____ %	Other county agencies	1	2	_____ %
United Way	1	2	_____ %	Other city agencies	1	2	_____ %
Client fees	1	2	_____ %	Private donations	1	2	_____ %
Other (SPECIFY BELOW): _____			_____ %	Grants/Foundations	1	2	_____ %

29. Does your facility charge client fees? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

Yes 1
No 2

30. If client fees are charged, what formula(s) does your facility use to calculate them? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

Percent of client's earnings 1
Established daily rate 2
Sliding fee scale based on ability to pay 3
Fee for service 4
Other (SPECIFY BELOW) 5

**Thank you very much for your help.
If you have any questions, please call: 301-251-5179**

**Please return the
questionnaire in the enclosed envelope to:**

**Aspen Systems Corporation
NIC Survey, 2B
1600 Research Boulevard
Rockville, MD 20850**

Comments

12

April 7, 1989

NIC and Aspen Systems are conducting a national study of residential community corrections programs. Last month we sent you a questionnaire and asked you to describe your facility. If you have already returned the questionnaire, please accept our thanks. If not, I ask that you please take some time today to fill it out.

With your cooperation, it will be possible to develop a full and accurate description of residential community corrections facilities. Upon completion of the study, we will send a copy of the Directory and final report to every facility that returns a completed questionnaire.

If you did not receive the questionnaire, or if it has been misplaced, please call Mary Foote at Aspen Systems (301-251-5179) and she will send one immediately.

With Many Thanks for Your Cooperation.

George M. Keiser, Chief
Community Corrections Division
National Institute of Corrections

APPENDIX C

State Composition of Data Base/Respondents

APPENDIX C: STATE COMPOSITION OF DATA BASE/RESPONDENTS

Table Appendix C-1 provides a state-by-state breakdown of survey response during data collection. The breakdown is categorized in the following way: the number of eligible questionnaires received; the number of ineligible facilities; the number of duplicates; the number that never responded; and a few that consented to having facility name and address included in the directory that will accompany this report.

TABLE APPENDIX C-1
STATE COMPOSITION OF DATA BASE/RESPONDENTS

State Name	Eligible Questionnaires Received	Number Ineligible	Dupli- cates	No Response	Directory Only	Total
Alaska	4	5	0	2	0	11
Alabama	12	7	0	1	0	20
Arizona	4	8	2	0	1	15
Arkansas	3	1	0	0	1	5
California	65	31	15	13	0	124
Colorado	24	3	0	0	1	28
Connecticut	9	17	0	8	0	34
District of Columbia	8	0	0	2	0	10
Delaware	1	0	0	0	0	1
Florida	57	12	4	15	4	92
Georgia	19	0	0	4	1	24
Guam	0	0	0	1	0	1
Hawaii	3	0	0	0	0	3
Idaho	2	2	0	0	0	4
Illinois	14	9	0	5	0	28
Indiana	15	4	2	1	0	22
Iowa	14	2	0	4	0	20
Kansas	6	5	0	1	0	12
Kentucky	7	3	0	3	1	14
Louisiana	10	2	0	3	0	15
Massachusetts	19	2	1	4	0	26

(Table continued)

State Name	Eligible Questionnaires Received	Number Ineligible	Dupli- cates	No Response	Directory Only	Total
Maryland	15	4	0	3	0	22
Maine	2	1	0	0	0	3
Michigan	27	6	1	6	0	40
Minnesota	13	6	0	2	0	21
Missouri	11	3	0	3	0	17
Mississippi	16	4	1	5	2	28
Montana	4	0	1	1	0	6
North Carolina	22	26	1	4	2	55
North Dakota	2	2	0	1	0	5
New Hampshire	1	3	0	2	0	6
New Jersey	9	2	0	3	0	14
Nebraska	4	1	0	1	0	6
New Mexico	1	4	0	2	1	8
Nevada	3	0	0	2	0	5
New York	16	4	1	9	0	30
Ohio	28	12	0	8	1	49
Oklahoma	12	3	0	1	0	16
Oregon	12	4	0	4	0	20
Pennsylvania	27	7	2	8	1	45
Puerto Rico	0	0	0	4	0	4
Rhode Island	1	0	0	0	0	1
South Carolina	8	3	3	6	0	20
South Dakota	2	6	0	0	0	8
Tennessee	9	3	0	1	0	13
Texas	44	14	1	20	2	81
Utah	9	2	0	1	0	12
Virginia	16	7	1	4	0	28
Vermont	2	4	0	0	0	6
Washington	15	4	0	13	0	32
Wisconsin	15	9	1	4	0	29
West Virginia	2	0	0	1	1	4
Wyoming	3	0	0	1	0	4
Total	647	257	37	187	9	147

NIC Survey of Residential Community
Correctional Facilities

Codebook

Prepared by:

Aspen Systems Cororation
Rockville, Maryland

NIC Survey of Residential Community
Correctional Facilities

NOTE: Skip patterns from the questionnaire are represented in different places in the database with periods. Different software packages view periods in different ways. SAS for example, reads a period as missing data. Simply be aware that the periods exist and are not errors in the database.

Column
Number

1-7	Interview ID Number (7 digits: this is the number in the lower right hand corner of the cover page.) It represents the four digit sequential number, the two digit state code, and the one digit source code.
8-67	<u>Q1. Facility name</u>
68-127	<u>Street address</u>
128-142	<u>City</u>
143-144	<u>State</u>
145-153	<u>Zip</u>
154-183	<u>Director's name</u>
184-193	<u>Phone number for director</u>
194-223	<u>Contact's name</u>
224-233	<u>Phone number for contact</u>

234-263

Name of respondent

264-273

Phone number for respondent

274

Q2 Does facility meet definition
Q2 has 7 columns

If Q2=NO, then Columns 281-970
are blank

1 = Yes
2 = No

275-280

Criteria not met

Blank = Inapplicable: all criteria are met (coded 1 in
Q2, Column 274)

Possible Responses:
a b c d m x

281

Q3. Operated by organization or agency
Q3 has 147 columns

If 281=NO, then Columns 282-427
are blank

1 = Yes
2 = No
8 = DK
9 = NA/Refused

282-341

Organization name

Blank = Inapplicable: facility is not managed by
organization (coded 2 in Q3, Column 281)

342-401

Address

Blank = Inapplicable (coded 2 in Q3, Column 281)

402-416

City

Blank = Inapplicable (coded 2 in Q3, Column 281)

417-418

State

Blank = Inapplicable (coded 2 in Q3, Column 281)

419-427

Zip

Blank = Inapplicable (coded 2 in Q3, Column 281)

428

Q 4 Type of organization or agency

Q.4 has 1 column

- 1 = Federal
- 2 = State
- 3 = County
- 4 = City
- 5 = Private, for profit
- 6 = Private, not for profit
- 7 = Other (specify)
- 8 = DK
- 9 = NA/Refused

429

Q 5 Sex of residents

Q.5 has 1 column

- 1 = Males
- 2 = Females
- 3 = Males and females
- 8 = DK
- 9 = NA/Refused

430-438

Coder: Q.6, Q.7 and Q.8 must be coded in 3 DIGIT Fields. For each field with a response, add leading zeros to the remaining fields on the left.

Q 6 Bed capacity for men and women

Q 6 has 9 columns

430-432

Coder: 8x(3) means code 888

xxx = Number of men

8x(3) = DK

9x(3) = NA/Refused

Coder: If 430-432 or 433-435 or 436-438 = DK or NA, then all of Q.6, = 9, 8's or 9, 9's

433-435

xxx = Number of women

8x(3) = DK

9x(3) = NA/Refused

436-438

xxx = Total beds

8x(3) = DK

9x(3) = NA/Refused

439-444

Q 7 Number of men and women

Q.7 has 6 columns.

439-441

xxx = Number of men

8x(3) = DK

9x(3) = NA/Refused

442-444

xxx = Number of women

8x(3) = DK

9x(3) = NA/Refused

445-447

Q 8 Percentage of noncriminal justice referred

Q.8 has 3 columns

xxx = Percentage

8x(3) = DK

9x(3) = NA/Refused

448-543

Coder: In Q9, responses must be coded in 3-digit fields. For each field with a response, add 0's to the remaining column(s) to the left to fill the field.

Q 9 Referral Sources:
Q.9 has 96 columns.

448-450

Pretrial/Federal

xxx = Percentage
8x(3) = DK
9x(3) = NA/Refused

451-453

/State

xxx = Percentage
8x(3) = DK
9x(3) = NA/Refused

454-456

/Local

xxx = Percentage
8x(3) = DK
9x(3) = NA/Refused

457-459

/Non-gov't

xxx = Percentage
8x(3) = DK
9x(3) = NA/Refused

460-462

Probation/Federal

xxx = Percentage
8x(3) = DK
9x(3) = NA/Refused

Q.9 continued

463-465

/State

xxx = Percentage
8x(3) = DK
9x(3) = NA/Refused

466-468

/Local

xxx = Percentage
8x(3) = DK
9x(3) = NA/Refused

469-471

/Non-gov't

xxx = Percentage
8x(3) = DK
9x(3) = NA/Refused

472-474

Post-conviction/direct court order
Federal

xxx = Percentage
8x(3) = DK
9x(3) = NA/Refused

475-477

/State

xxx = Percentage
8x(3) = DK
9x(3) = NA/Refused

478-480

/Local

xxx = Percentage
8x(3) = DK
9x(3) = NA/Refused

481-483

/Non-gov't

xxx = Percentage
8x(3) = DK
9x(3) = NA/Refused

484-486

Parole/Federal

xxx = Percentage
8x(3) = DK
9x(3) = NA/Refused

487-489

Q.9 continued

/State

xxx = Percentage
8x(3) = DK
9x(3) = NA/Refused

490-492

/Local

xxx = Percentage
8x(3) = DK
9x(3) = NA/Refused

493-495

/Non-gov't

xxx = Percentage
8x(3) = DK
9x(3) = NA/Refused

496-498

Prison or jail/Federal

xxx = Percentage
8x(3) = DK
9x(3) = NA/Refused

499-501

/State

xxx = Percentage
8x(3) = DK
9x(3) = NA/Refused

502-504

/Local

xxx = Percentage
8x(3) = DK
9x(3) = NA/Refused

505-507

/Non-gov't

xxx = Percentage
8x(3) = DK
9x(3) = NA/Refused

508-510

Offenders self-referrals/Federal

xxx = Percentage
8x(3) = DK
9x(3) = NA/Refused

Q.9 continued

511-513

/State

xx = Percentage
8x(3) = DK
9x(3) = NA/Refused

514-516

/Local

xxx = Percentage
8x(3) = DK
9x(3) = NA/Refused

517-519

/Non-gov't

xxx = Percentage
8x(3) = DK
9x(3) = NA/Refused

520-522

Sources not involved in criminal justice system/Federal

xxx = Percentage
8x(3) = DK
9x(3) = NA/Refused

523-525

/State

xxx = Percentage
8x(3) = DK
9x(3) = NA/Refused

526-528

/Local

xxx = Percentage
8x(3) = DK
9x(3) = NA/Refused

529-531

/Non-gov't

xxx = Percentage
8x(3) = DK
9x(3) = NA/Refused

532-534

Other/Federal

xxx = Percentage
8x(3) = DK
9x(3) = NA/Refused

Q.9 continued

535-537

/State

xxx = Percentage
8x(3) = DK
9x(3) = NA/Refused

538-540

/Local

xxx = Percentage
8x(3) = DK
9x(3) = NA/Refused

541-543

/Non-gov't

xxx = Percentage
8x(3) = DK
9x(3) = NA/Refused

544-555

Coder: if item is circled in Q.10, code it = 1. Any item not circled, code = 2.

Q.10 Offender/client types excluded from admissions Q.10
has 12 columns

544

DK and NA are only to be used if described as such.

1 = Violent offenders

545

2 = Sex offenders

546

3 = Arsonists

547

4 = Drug abusers

548

5 = Alcohol abusers

549

6 = Habitual offenders

550

7 = Psychiatric disorders

551

8 = Medical disorders

552

9 = Mentally retarded

553

10 = Physically disabled

554

11 = HIV positive

555

12 = Other

8x(12) = DK

9x(12) = NA/Refused

556-679

Q 11 Variety of Services

Q 11 has 124 columns, broken into 4 column fields

556

Coder: if item is circled
in Q.11, code it = 1. Any
item not circled, code = 2.

Mental health/group counseling

1 = Yes
2 = No

If NO, (2) then 557-559 are
blank

557-559

Source of Service

Blank = Inapplicable (coded 2 in Column 556)

1 = By facility

2 = By referral

3 = By service contract

8x(3) = DK

9x(3) = NA/Refused

560

/Individual counseling

1 = Yes

2 = No

If NO, (2) then 561-563 are
blank

561-563

Source of Service

Blank = Inapplicable (coded 2 in column 560)

1 = By facility

2 = By referral

3 = By service contract

8x(3) = DK

9x(3) = NA/Refused

564

/Family counseling

1 = Yes

2 = No

If NO, (2) then 565-567 are
blank

565-567

Source of Service

Blank = Inapplicable (coded 2 in column 564)

1 = By facility

2 = By referral

3 = By service contract

8x(3) = DK

9x(3) = NA/Refused

568

If NO, (2) then 569-571 are blank

/Psychological screening/testing

1 = Yes

2 = No

Source of Service

Blank = Inapplicable (coded 2 in column 568)

1 = By facility

2 = By referral

3 = By service contract

8x(3) = DK

9x(3) = NA/Refused

569-571

572

If NO, (2) then 573-575 are blank

Employment services/empl. counseling/placement

1 = Yes

2 = No

Source of Service

Blank = Inapplicable (coded 2 in column 572)

1 = By facility

2 = By referral

3 = By service contract

8x(3) = DK

9x(3) = NA/Refused

573-575

576

If NO, (2) then 577-579 are blank

/Sheltered employment

1 = Yes

2 = No

Source of Service

Blank = Inapplicable (coded 2 in column 576)

1 = By facility

2 = By referral

3 = By service contract

8x(3) = DK

9x(3) = NA/Refused

577-579

580

If NO, (2) then 581-583 are blank

/Vocational/skill training

1 = Yes

2 = No

Source of Service

Blank = Inapplicable (coded 2 in column 580)

1 = By facility

2 = By referral

3 = By service contract

8x(3) = DK

9x(3) = NA/Refused

581-583

Q.11 continued

584

If NO, (2) then 585-587 are blank --

Educational services/GED/ABE preparation

- 1 = Yes
- 2 = No

585-587

Source of Service

Blank = Inapplicable (coded 2 in column 584)

- 1 = By facility
- 2 = By referral
- 3 = By service contract
- 8x(3) = DK
- 9x(3) = NA/Refused

588

If NO, (2) then 589-591 are blank

/High school courses

- 1 = Yes
- 2 = No

589-591

Source of Service

Blank = Inapplicable (coded 2 in column 588)

- 1 = By facility
- 2 = By referral
- 3 = By service contract
- 8x(3) = DK
- 9x(3) = NA/Refused

592

If NO, (2) then 593-595 are blank

/College courses

- 1 = Yes
- 2 = No

593-595

Source of Service

Blank = Inapplicable (coded 2 in column 592)

- 1 = By facility
- 2 = By referral
- 3 = By service contract
- 8x(3) = DK
- 9x(3) = NA/Refused

596

If NO, (2) then 597-599 are blank

/English as a second language

- 1 = Yes
- 2 = No

597-599

Source of Service

Blank = Inapplicable (coded 2 in column 596)

- 1 = By facility
- 2 = By referral
- 3 = By service contract
- 8x(3) = DK
- 9x(3) = NA/Refused

Q.11 continued

600

If NO, (2) then 601-603 are blank

Life management/budgeting

- 1 = Yes
- 2 = No

601-603

Source of Service

Blank = Inapplicable (coded 2 in column 600)

- 1 = By facility
- 2 = By referral
- 3 = By service contract
- 8x(3) = DK
- 9x(3) = NA/Refused

604

If NO, (2) then 605-607 are blank

/Housing referrals

- 1 = Yes
- 2 = No

605-607

Source of Service

Blank = Inapplicable (coded 2 in column 604)

- 1 = By facility
- 2 = By referral
- 3 = By service contract
- 8x(3) = DK
- 9x(3) = NA/Refused

608

If NO, (2) then 609-611 are blank

/Life skills training

- 1 = Yes
- 2 = No

609-611

Source of Service

Blank = Inapplicable (coded 2 in column 608)

- 1 = By facility
- 2 = By referral
- 3 = By service contract
- 8x(3) = DK
- 9x(3) = NA/Refused

612

If NO, (2) then 613-615 are blank

/Parenting skills

- 1 = Yes
- 2 = No

613-615

Source of Service

Blank = Inapplicable (coded 2 in column 612)

- 1 = By facility
- 2 = By referral
- 3 = By service contract
- 8x(3) = DK
- 9x(3) = NA/Refused

Q.11 continued

616

If NO, (2) then 617-619 are blank

Health care/dental service

- 1 = Yes
- 2 = No

617-619

Source of Service

Blank = Inapplicable (coded 2 in column 616)

- 1 = By facility
- 2 = By referral
- 3 = By service contract
- 8x(3) = DK
- 9x(3) = NA/Refused

620

/Medical services

- 1 = Yes

If NO, (2) then 621-623 are blank

621-623

2 = No

Source of Service

Blank = Inapplicable (coded 2 in column 620)

1 = By facility

2 = By referral

3 = By service contract

8x(3) = DK

9x(3) = NA/Refused

624

/Physical rehabilitation

1 = Yes

2 = No

If NO, (2) then 625-627 are blank

625-627

Source of Service

Blank = Inapplicable (coded 2 in column 624)

1 = By facility

2 = By referral

3 = By service contract

8x(3) = DK

9x(3) = NA/Refused

628

Substance abuse services/drug detox

1 = Yes

2 = No

If NO, (2) then 629-631 are blank

629-631

Source of Service

Blank = Inapplicable (coded 2 in column 628)

1 = By facility

2 = By referral

3 = By service contract

8x(3) = DK

9x(3) = NA/Refused

0.11 continued

632

/Drug rehab. residential

1 = Yes

2 = No

If NO, (2) then 633-635 are blank

633-635

Source of Service

Blank = Inapplicable (coded 2 in column 632)

1 = By facility

2 = By referral

3 = By service contract

8x(3) = DK

9x(3) = NA/Refused

636

/Drug rehab., outpatient

1 = Yes

2 = No

If NO, (2) then 637-639 are blank

637-639

Source of Service

Blank = Inapplicable (coded 2 in column 636)

1 = By facility

2 = By referral

3 = By service contract

8x(3) = DK

9x(3) = NA/Refused

640

/Alcohol detoxification

1 = Yes

2 = No

If NO, (2) then 641-643 are

blank

641-643

Source of Service

Blank = Inapplicable (coded 2 in column 640)

1 = By facility

2 = By referral

3 = By service contract

8x(3) = DK

9x(3) = NA/Refused

644

/Alcohol rehabilitation, residential

1 = Yes

2 = No

645-647

If NO, (2) then 645-647 are
blank

Source of Service

Blank = Inapplicable (coded 2 in column 644)

1 = By facility

2 = By referral

3 = By service contract

8x(3) = DK

9x(3) = NA/Refused

Q.11 continued

648

If NO, (2) then 649-651 are blank

/Alcohol rehab., outpatient

1 = Yes
2 = No

649-651

Source of Service

Blank = Inapplicable (coded 2 in column 648)
1 = By facility
2 = By referral
3 = By service contract
8x(3) = DK
9x(3) = NA/Refused

652

If NO, (2) then 653-655 are blank

/Methadone maintenance

1 = Yes
2 = No

653-655

Source of Service

Blank = Inapplicable (coded 2 in column 652)
1 = By facility
2 = By referral
3 = By service contract
8x(3) = DK
9x(3) = NA/Refused

656

If NO, (2) then 657-659 are blank

/Urinalysis

1 = Yes
2 = No

657-659

Source of Service

Blank = Inapplicable (coded 2 in column 656)
1 = By facility
2 = By referral
3 = By service contract
8x(3) = DK
9x(3) = NA/Refused

660

If NO, (2) then 661-663 are blank

Miscellaneous services/legal services

1 = Yes
2 = No

661-663

Source of Service

Blank = Inapplicable (coded 2 in column 660)
1 = By facility
2 = By referral
3 = By service contract
8x(3) = DK
9x(3) = NA/Refused

Q.11 continued

664

/Welfare services

665-667 If NO, (2) then 665-667 are blank

1 = Yes
2 = No

Source of Service

Blank = Inapplicable (coded 2 in column 664)

1 = By facility
2 = By referral
3 = By service contract
8x(3) = DK
9x(3) = NA/Refused

668

/Recreational services

1 = Yes
2 = No

669-671 If NO, (2) then 669-671 are blank

Source of Service

Blank = Inapplicable (coded 2 in column 668)

1 = By facility
2 = By referral
3 = By service contract
8x(3) = DK
9x(3) = NA/Refused

672 If NO, (2) then 673-675 are blank

/Community service activities

1 = Yes
2 = No

673-675

Source of Service

Blank = Inapplicable (coded 2 in column 672)

1 = By facility
2 = By referral
3 = By service contract
8x(3) = DK
9x(3) = NA/Refused

676

/Sex offender treatment

1 = Yes
2 = No

677-679 If NO, (2) then 677-679 are blank

Source of Service

Blank = Inapplicable (coded 2 in column 676)

1 = By facility
2 = By referral
3 = By service contract
8x(3) DK
9x(3) NA/Refused

U.S. Department of Justice
NIC Questionnaire
-- Confidential Section --

680

Q 1 What is the pop. of the city/county where your facility is?

Q.1 has 1 column

- 1 = 250,000 + more
- 2 = 100,000 - 249,999
- 3 = 50,000 - 99,999
- 4 = 10,000 - 49,999
- 5 = Less than 10,000
- 6 = Suburban county
- 7 = Rural county
- 8 = DK
- 9 = NA/Refused

681

Q 2 Describe your neighborhood

Q.2 has 1 column

- 1 = Mostly residential
- 2 = Mostly business/commercial/industrial
- 3 = Mixed residential business
- 4 = Mostly rural
- 5 = Other
- 8 = DK
- 9 = NA/Refused

682

Q 3 Describe your building

Q.3 has 1 column

- 1 = Single family house
- 2 = Multi-family house/duplex
- 3 = Apartment bldg.
- 4 = Farm or ranch
- 5 = Hotel/motel
- 6 = Institution (hosp., school, etc.)
- 7 = Other
- 8 = DK
- 9 = NA/Refused

683

Q 4 Was the building designed for your program, remodeled?

Q.4 has 1 column

- 1 = Designed for program
- 2 = Remodeled for program
- 3 = Occupied w/o renovations
- 4 = Other
- 8 = DK
- 9 = NA/Refused

684

Q 5 Do you own or rent/lease?

Q.5 has 1 column

- 1 = Own bldg.
- 2 = Rent/lease bldg.
- 3 = Other
- 8 = DK
- 9 = NA/Refused

685-687

If Q.6 or Q7 have a response,
fill in remaining columns to the
left with leading zeros.

Q 6 What is the approximate age of the building?

Q.6 has 3 columns

- xxx = age of bldg.
- 8x(3) = DK
- 9x(3) = NA/Refused

688-689

Q 7 When did RCCP start operating in the building?

Q.7 has 2 columns

xx = actual year

98 = DK

9x(2) = NA/Refused

690

Q 8 Did program operate prior to being located in this building?

Q.8 has 1 column

1 = Yes

2 = No

If NO, then columns 691-692 are blank

691-692

Q 9 When did your agency/org. est. or start operating your RCCP?

Q.9 has 2 columns

Blank = Inapplicable (coded 2 in column 690)

xx = year

98 = DK

9x(2) = NA/Refused

693

Q 10 How many RCCP's does your agency/org. operate?

Q.10 has 1 column

1 = This facility

2 = 2 facilities

3 = 3-5 facilities

4 = 6-10 facilities

5 = More than 10 facilities

8 = DK

9 = NA/Refused

694-700

Coder: Items circled in
Q.11 = 1, items not circled
in Q.11 = 2.

Q 11 What other types of programs does your agency/organization operate?

Q.11 has 7 columns

694

1 = Institutional corrections program

695

2 = Institutional, not corrections oriented

696

3 = Other residential, not corrections oriented

697

4 = Non-residential, community corrections

698

5 = Non-residential, non-corrections

699

6 = Other

700

7 = None of the above

8x(7) = DK

9x(7) = NA/Refused

701-703	<u>Coder:</u> Items circled in Q.12 = 1, items not circled in Q.12 = 2.	Q 12 <u>Does your facility work with:</u> Q.12 has 3 columns
701		1 = Citizen/advisory board
702	If 701-703=3, 888, or 999, then 704-723 are blank (inapplicable)	2 = Policy making board of directors
703		3 = Neither 8x(3) = DK 9x(3) = NA/Refused
704-723	If ALL columns are blank	Q 13 <u>Who serves on the board?</u> Q.13 has 20 columns Blank = Inapplicable (If coded 3 C. 701-703, Q 12)
		<u>Q.13 continued</u>
704	<u>Coder:</u> Items circled in Q.13 = 1, items not circled in Q.13 = 2	1 = C.J. pros. on citizen/advisory board
705		1 = C.J. pros on policymaking board
706	Q13., C. 704-723 cannot have 8's or 9's. If a category is DK or NA, code it = 2.	2 = Soc. serv. pros. on citizen/...board
707		2 = Soc. serv. pros on policymaking board
708		3 = Other prof. on citizen/advisory board
709	NOTE: Cols. 704 thru 719 are presented item by item here for clarity, as the question is two level and may appear confusing.	3 = Other prof. on policymaking board
710		4 = Businessperson on citizen/advisory board
711		4 = Businessperson on policymaking board
712	If any of Q.13, C. 704 thru 719 is circled and 720-721 or 722-723 = NA/Refused or DK, then code 720-721 or 722-723 (the one that is DK/NA) 00.	5 = Government ofc. on citizen/advisory board
713		5 = Gov't officials on policymaking board
714		6 = Community Citizens on citizen/advisory board
715		6 = Comm. citizens on policymaking board
716		7 = Former offenders on citizen/advisory board
717		7 = Former offenders on policymaking board
718		8 = Other on citizen/advisory board
719		8 = Other on policymaking board
720-721	<u>Coder:</u> in C.720-721, and 722-723, Responses are coded in two digit fields.	xx = # people serving on citizen/advisory board
722-723	For each field with a response, fill in remaining columns to the left with zero's.	xx = # people serving on policymaking board

724-807

Q.14 # men and women at facility by position
Q.14 has 84 columns

724-726
727-729
730-732
733-735

Coder: in Q.14, responses
must be coded in 3 digit
fields. For each field with
a response add leading zero's
to the remaining column to the
left to fill the field.

736-738
739-741
742-744
745-747

748-750
751-753
754-756
757-759

760-762
763-765
766-768
769-771

772-774
775-777
778-780
781-783

784-786
787-789
790-792
793-795

796-798
799-801
802-804
805-807

xxx = # full-time, administrative men
xxx = # full-time, administrative women
xxx = # part-time, administrative men
xxx = # part-time, administrative women

xxx = # full-time, services men
xxx = # full-time, services women
xxx = # part-time, services men
xxx = # part-time, services women

xxx = # full-time, clerical men
xxx = # full-time, clerical women
xxx = # part-time, clerical men
xxx = # part-time, clerical women

xxx = # full-time, support staff men
xxx = # full-time, support staff women
xxx = # part-time, support staff men
xxx = # part-time, support staff women

xxx = # full-time security, men
xxx = # full-time security, women
xxx = # part-time security, men
xxx = # part-time security, women

xxx = # full-time other, men
xxx = # full-time other, women
xxx = # part-time other, men
xxx = # part-time other, women

xxx = Total # full-time employees, men
xxx = Total # full-time employees, women
xxx = Total # part-time employees, men
xxx = Total # part-time employees, women

8x(84) = DK

9x(84) = NA/Refused

808

If NO, (2) columns 809-815 are
blank

Q 15 Do you use volunteer staff?

Q.15 has 1 column

1 = Yes

2 = No

809-815

Q 16 In what capacity do you use volunteers?

Q.16 has 7 columns

Blank = (Inapplicable, coded 2, Q 15, column 808)

1 = Special event

809

810

2 = Administrative

811

3 = Services

812

4 = Clerical

813

5 = Support staff

814

6 = Security

815

7 = Other

8x(7) = DK

9x(7) = NA/Refused

816-817

Q 17 Is your program or any part of your program
accredited?

Q.17 has 2 columns

816

If NO, (2) then column 817 is
blank

1 = Yes

2 = No

817

Who accredited the program?

1 = Commission on Accreditation for Corrections

2 = Commission on Accreditation for Res. Fac.

3 = State Corrections Agency

4 = Other State Agency

5 = Other

8 = DK

9 = NA/Refused

818

Q 18 Does your facility rely on standardized
classification/risk assessment instrument(s)?

Q.18 has 1 column

1 = Yes

2 = No

8 = DK

9 = NA/Refused

819-833

Coder: if item is circled in Q.19, code it =1. If not circled, code it =2.

819

820

821

822

823

824

825

826

827

828

829

830

831

832

833

Coder: If Q.19, cols. 819 - 833=OK, or NA, then cols. 819 - 833 are all coded either 8's or 9's

Q 19 Which of the following control procedures are used for your residents?

Q.19 has 15 columns

1 = Urinalysis

2 = Breathalyzer

3 = Room searches

4 = Sign in/out sheets

5 = Phone checks

6 = Site visits

7 = Electronic monitoring

8 = Closed circuit TV

9 = Physical restraints

10 = Holding cells/quiet rooms

11 = Fine/Restitution collection

12 = Visitor monitoring/searches

13 = Regular floor checks

14 = Routine resident counts

15 = Other

8x(15) = DK

9x(15) = NA/Refused

834-854

Coder: in Q.20 responses must be coded in 3 digit fields. For each field with a response add leading zero's to the remaining columns to the left to fill the field.

834-836

837-839

840-842

843-845

846-848

849-851

852-854

Coder: If Q.20, cols. 834-854 =OK or NA, C.834-854 are coded either 21,8's if DK or 21,9's if NA/refused.

855-875

855-857

Q 20 Racial composition of current population

Q.20 has 21 columns

xxx = # White

xxx = # Black

xxx = # Hispanic

xxx = # Native american, Aleutian, eskimo

xxx = # Asian or pacific islander

xxx = other

Q.20 continued

xxx = Total # current pop.

8x(21) = DK

9x(21) = NA/Refused

Q 21 Age distribution for current pop.

Q.21 has 21 columns

xxx = # resident under 18 years of age

858-860

861-863

864-866

867-869

870-872

873-875

Coder: If Q.21, cols. 855-875 =DK or NA, then C.855-875 are coded either 21, 8's if DK or 21,9's if NA/refused.

876-879

Coder: In Q.22, 23 and 24, for each field with a response add leading zero's to the remaining columns to the left to fill the field.

880-882

883-897

883-885

886-888

889-891

892-894

895-897

898

xxx = # 18 to 21 year olds

xxx = # 22 to 25 year olds

xxx = # 26 to 39 year olds

xxx = # 40 to 59 year olds

xxx = # 60 or over year olds

xxx = Total # current pop.

8x(21) = DK

9x(21) = NA/Refused

Q 22 What was the total number of residents admitted during the last fiscal year?

Q.22 has 4 columns

xxxx = total # residents

8x(4) = DK

9x(4) = NA/Refused

Q 23 Estimate the average length of stay in # days for residents during last fiscal year

Q.23 has 3 columns

xxx = # of days

8x(3) = DK

9x(3) = NA/Refused

Q 24 Estimate the percentage of residents discharged for the following reason during last fiscal year:

Q.24 has 15 columns

xxx = % Successful completion

xxx = % Clients withdrawal

xxx = % Escape

xxx = % disciplinary transfer/discharge

xxx = % administrative transfer

8x(15) = DK

9x(15) = NA/Refused

Q 25 Description of facility-neighborhood relationship

Q.25 has 1 column only.

1 = Very friendly

2 = Somewhat positive

3 = Neutral

4 = Somewhat negative

5 = Very hostile

8 = DK

9 = NA/Refused

899-900

Coder: if item in Q.26 is circled code it = 1, items not circled = 2.

If NO (2), then columns 900-912 are blank

901-906

Coder: The code categories for Q.26, columns 901-912, can be found in the "Open Ended Codes" attachment. Code the appropriate codes in the right hand margin.

907-912

913-919

Coder: For a response to Q.27, fill in remaining columns to the left with the leading zeros.

920-967

Q 26 Has facility ever delayed opening or been prevented from operating a RCCP because of neighborhood opposition/zoning?
Q.26 has 14 columns

1 = Yes
2 = No

Neighborhood
Blank = Inapplicable (coded 2 column 899)
xxxxxx = Description of incident re: neighborhood opposition

Zoning
Blank = Inapplicable (coded 2 column 900)
xxxxxx = Description of incident re: Zoning

Q 27 Total operating budget/capital costs
Q.27 has 7 columns
xxxxxxx = \$ amount
8x(7) = DK
9x(7) = NA/Refused

Q 28 For last fiscal year, indicate funding sources and approximate percent of total budget for each
Q.28 has 48 columns

Q.28 continued

920

Federal Bureau of Prisons

1 = Yes
2 = No

921-923

If NO, (2) columns 921-923 are blank ..

Coder: For a response to 921-923, fill in remaining columns to the left with leading zeros.

If yes, percent of total
Blank = Inapplicable, (coded 2, column 920)
xxx = % of total budget (for every response)
3x(8)=DK
3x(9)=NA/Refused

924

Other Federal Agencies

1 = Yes
2 = No

925-927

If NO, (2) columns 925-927 are blank

Coder: If a response to 925-927, fill in remaining columns to the left with leading zeros.

If yes, percent of total
Blank = Inapplicable, (coded 2, column 924)
xxx = % total budget
3x(8)=DK
3x(9)=NA/Refused

928

State Department of Corrections

1 = Yes
2 = No

929-931

If NO, (2) columns 929-931 are blank

Coder: If a response to 929-931, fill in remaining columns to the left with leading zeros.

If yes, percent of total
Blank = Inapplicable, (coded 2, column 928)
xxx = % total budget
3x(8)=DK
3x(9)=NA/Refused

932

Other State Agencies

1 = Yes
2 = No

933-935

If NO, (2) columns 933-935 are blank

Coder: If a response to 933-935, fill in remaining columns to the left with leading zeros.

If yes, percent of total
Blank = Inapplicable (coded 2, column 932)
xxx = % total budget
3x(8)=DK
3x(9)=NA/Refused

936

Local Corrections Agencies

If NO, (2) columns 937-939 are blank

1 = Yes
2 = No

937-939

Coder: If a response to 937-939, fill in remaining columns to the left with leading zeros.

If yes, percent of total
Blank = Inapplicable, (coded 2, column 936)
xxx = % total budget
3x(8)=DK
3x(9)=NA/Refused

940

Other County Agencies

If NO, (2) columns 941-943 are blank

1 = Yes
2 = No

941-943

Coder: If a response to 941-943, fill in remaining columns to the left with leading zeros.

If yes, percent of total
Blank = Inapplicable, (coded 2, column 940)
xxx = % total budget
3x(8)=DK
3x(9)=NA/Refused

944

United Way

If NO, (2) columns 945-947 are blank

1 = Yes
2 = No

945-947

Coder: If a response to 945-947, fill in remaining columns to the left with leading zeros.

If yes, percent of total
Blank = Inapplicable, (coded 2, column 944)
xxx = % total budget
3x(8)=DK
3x(9)=NA/Refused

948

Other City Agencies

If NO, (2) columns 949-951 are blank

1 = Yes
2 = No

949-951

Coder: If a response to 949-951, fill in remaining columns to the left with leading zeros.

If yes, percent of total
Blank = Inapplicable (coded 2, column 948)
xxx = % of total budget
3x(8)=DK
3x(9)=NA

952

Client Fees

If NO, (2) columns 953-955 are blank

1 = Yes
2 = No

953-955

Coder: If a response to 953-955, fill in remaining columns to the left with leading zeros.

If yes, percent of total
Blank = Inapplicable, (coded 2, column 952)
xxx = % total budget
3x(8)=DK
3x(9)=NA

956

Private Donations

If NO, (2) columns 957-959 are blank

1 = Yes
2 = No

957-959

Coder: If a response to 957-959, fill in remaining columns to the left with leading zeros.

If yes, percent of total
Blank = Inapplicable, (coded 2, column 956)
xxx = % total budget
3x(8)=DK
3x(9)=NA

960

Other

If NO, (2) columns 961-963 are blank

1 = Yes
2 = No

961-963

Coder: If a response to 961-963, fill in remaining columns to the left with leading zeros.

If yes, percent of total
Blank = Inapplicable, (coded 2, column 960)
xxx = % total budget
3x(8)=DK
3x(9)=NA/Refused

964

Grants/Foundations

If NO, (2) columns 965-967 are blank

1 = Yes
2 = No

965-967

Coder: If Q.28, C.920-967 = DK or NA, then all columns in Q.28 are coded 48(8)'s or 48(9)'s.

If yes, percent of total
Blank = Inapplicable, (coded 2, column 964)
xxx = % total budget (for every response fill in remaining fields to the left with leading zero's.)
8x(48) = DK
9x(48) = NA/Refused

968

Q 29 Does your facility charge client fees?
Q.29 has 1 column

If NO, columns 969-973 are blank and questionnaire coding is complete

1 = Yes
2 = No

969-973

Coder: If item is circled in
Q.30, code it = 1, item not
circled code = 2.

969

970

971

972

973

Q 30 If client fees are charged, what formula(s) does
your facility use to calculate them?
Q.30 has 5 columns

Blank = Inapplicable, (coded 2, column 968)

1 = % client's earnings

2 = Established daily rate

3 = Sliding fee scale based on ability to pay

4 = Fee for service

5 = Other

8x(5) = DK

9x(5) = NA/Refused

ATTACHMENT

OPEN ENDED CODES

899-912

Neighborhood/Zoning Opposition

Q 26 Neighborhood Zoning

899

1 = Yes

900

2 = No

901-906

Neighborhood

901

Source of opposition

- 0 = Not mentioned
- 1 = Residential
- 2 = Business
- 3 = Local Government
- 4 = Town/County/City Government
- 5 = State Government
- 6 = Residential and Government
- 7 = Residential and Business

902

Description of opposition

- 0 = Not mentioned
- 1 = General, negative attitude, opposition
- 2 = Location dispute, specific to school, etc.
- 3 = Negative media campaign
- 4 = Violent offenders viewed as threat to community
- 5 = Too many self-help/corrections groups in area

903

Measure/Action

- 0 = Not mentioned
- 1 = Public hearing
- 2 = Litigation/Court hearing
- 3 = Government Intervention
- 4 = Neighborhood Advisory Panel Created

904

Resolution/Outcome

- 0 = Not mentioned
- 1 = Pending or unresolved
- 2 = General, Won dispute/Desired outcome
- 3 = General, Lost dispute/Undesired outcome
- 4 = Relocated/Alternative site

905-906

Year Occured

- 00 = Not mentioned
- nn = Last two digits of year

Q 26 continued

907-911 ZONING

907

Description of problem

- 0 = Not mentioned
- 1 = General, non-specific
- 2 = Permit rejected
- 3 = Denied location in residential zone
- 4 = Unclear or ambiguous zoning criteria
- 5 = City temporarily not issuing permits
- 6 = Expansion attempt blocked

908

Action taken

- 0 = Not mentioned
- 1 = Planning Commission or Zoning Board hearing
- 2 = Superior Court hearing (state/local)
- 3 = City or local court hearing
- 4 = Public hearing
- 5 = Mayors Task Force established

909

Result

- 0 = Not mentioned
- 1 = Application/Permit granted
- 2 = Application/Permit denied

910-911

Length of dispute

- 00 = Not mentioned
- nn = Number of years, (enter actual)

912

Blank - code zero (0)