

PLAN FOR A COST ANALYSIS OF THE CORRECTIONS REPORT

27722



STANDARDS AND GOALS PROJECT
CORRECTIONAL ECONOMICS CENTER
OF THE
AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION



COMMISSION ON CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES & SERVICES

January, 1975

PLAN FOR A COST ANALYSIS OF THE

CORRECTIONS REPORT

Prepared for
the National Institute
of Law Enforcement
and Criminal Justice

Standards and Goals Project
Correctional Economics Center
American Bar Association
1703 DeSales Street, N.W., Suite 501
Washington, D.C. 20036
January, 1975

The fact that the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice furnished financial support to the activities described in this publication does not necessarily indicate the concurrence of the Institute in the statements or conclusions contained therein.

CORRECTIONAL ECONOMICS CENTER

STAFF

Billy L. Wayson
Director

Gail S. Monkman
Assistant Director

Dr. Virginia Wright
Research Director

Ann. M. Watkins
Research Associate

Yvonne Mitchell
Administrative Assistant

Barbara Bland
Administrative Assistant

ADVISORY BOARD

Henry Aaron, Washington, D.C.
Sylvia Bacon, Washington, D.C.
Alfred J. Blumstein, Pa.
Norman Carlson, Washington, D.C.
Ronald E. W. Crisman, Vt.
John R. Dunne, N.Y.
Thomas Gilmore, Pa.
Robert Gruensfelder, Mo.
George Hall, Washington, D.C.
Donald J. Horowitz, Wa.
Richard A. McGee, Ca.
Peter Preiser, N.Y.
Louis Randall, Ill.
Donna Shalala, N.Y.
Allyn R. Sielaff, Ill.
Neil M. Singer, Md.

The Correctional Economics Center is a project of the ABA Commission on Correctional Facilities and Services which has been joined by the Association of State Correctional Administrators, Council of State Governments and National Conference of State Criminal Justice Planning Agency Administrators as cooperating organizations. Initiated in December, 1973, the Center is supported by a discretionary grant from the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation of New York City. The overall goal of the Center is to demonstrate how economic concepts and analysis can be applied to the corrections sector of the criminal justice system.

Implementation of innovations and system reform will require sound economic and cost analysis to help correctional systems and administrators employ limited budget resources to translate proposed innovations into fiscal reality. The Center offers assistance to correctional administrators analyzing the economic and budgetary implications of major policy decisions and seeks to promote economic analysis within corrections by stimulating evaluation by economists, correctional researchers and others. This is achieved through personal contacts, public appearances and publications.

Center staff have participated in workshops and presented papers on correctional economics at the annual meeting of the American Correctional Association, the Second National Workshop on Corrections and Parole Administration, and the California Probation, Parole and Correctional Association's annual meeting. The Center responds to numerous requests for data, information and recommendations from federal, state and local agencies, legislative committees, special commissions, private organizations and independent research projects.

STANDARDS AND GOALS PROJECT

ADVISORY BOARD

Sylvia Bacon, Washington, D.C.
Alfred J. Blumstein, Pa.
Lee S. Friedman, Ca.
George Hall, Washington, D.C.
Robert J. Kutak, Neb.
Richard A. McGee, Ca.
Donna Shalala, N.Y.
Allyn R. Sielaff, Ill.

The Correctional Economics Center has been granted funds from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration to undertake a Standards and Goals Project. The purpose of this project is to perform a cost analysis of the Corrections Report of the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, and present it in a form which will aid state and local decision-makers as they set and implement their own standards and goals for corrections. Included in the Report are priorities and standards for upgrading corrections and other criminal justice functions impacting on that process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY..... | 1 |
| INTRODUCTION..... | 3 |
| PURPOSE OF THE PROJECT..... | 5 |
| ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK FOR THE PROJECT..... | 8 |
| Correctional Guidelines: The <u>Corrections Report</u> | 9 |
| Economic Concepts: Government Activities as Producers..... | 12 |
| Typology for Changes Suggested by the <u>Report</u> | 15 |
| Cost and Resource Analysis of Corrections and Implementing the <u>Corrections Report</u> | 28 |
| PROJECT ACTIVITIES AND SCHEDULE..... | 29 |
| Part One: Organization and Planning..... | 30 |
| Part Two: Program Analysis..... | 34 |
| Part Three: System Analysis..... | 37 |
| Part Four: Preparation of Final Report..... | 38 |
| GLOSSARY..... | 39 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| Figure | Page |
|---|------|
| 1. Standard 5.2 - Sentencing the Nondangerous Offender..... | 10 |
| 2. Standard 11.6 - Women in Major Institutions..... | 11 |
| 3A. Programmatic Changes Suggested by the <u>Corrections Report</u> Which are Program-Specific..... | 18 |
| 3B. Programmatic Changes Suggested by the <u>Corrections Report</u> Which Apply to More Than One Program..... | 22 |
| 4. Systemic Changes Suggested by the <u>Corrections Report</u> | 25 |
| 5. Activity Schedule for the Standards and Goals Project..... | 31 |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 600-page Corrections Report of the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, formally issued in October, 1973, presents a comprehensive set of standards and goals for corrections and other criminal justice functions impacting on that process. In operational terms, the Report envisions changes which can be classified into two types: programmatic and systemic. Programmatic changes affect one of five specific program areas: pretrial programs, institutional-based corrections, parole, probation, and other community-based corrections. They include such changes as the development of a complete range of community-based activities or the provision of legal services for institutionalized offenders. Systemic changes are not uniquely concerned with any one of the five areas identified above. They include such changes as the increased use of pretrial diversion programs which affects the number and types of people in post-conviction programs, system-wide planning and management, and the use of sentencing institutes.

Analysis presented in the Report deals primarily with how these changes will contribute to a more equitable, just, and humane criminal justice system. From an economic perspective, such changes may also affect the costs of corrections and associated activities in three ways: (1) they may involve an increase in the level of public expenditure required to support a particular activity, such as an educational program in a prison; (2) they may change the opportunity costs associated with a given program, such as the wages incarcerated persons could earn if they had not been imprisoned; and (3) they may impact on the external costs of a particular activity, such as welfare payments to families of incarcerated persons. It is therefore the purpose of the eighteen-month Standards and Goals Project of the Correctional Economics Center to supplement the Report with a study of the Report's cost implications. More detailed information on the Project's purpose, analytical framework, and activity schedule is provided in the accompanying plan.

Following initial organization and planning, which will be completed when this plan is submitted to the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice in January, 1975, the first set of Project activities are directed at the preparation of cost and resource analysis in the form of separate program analyses for each of the following activity groupings:

- Pretrial Programs
- Institutional-Based Corrections and Parole
- Probation and Other Community-Based Corrections.

These program analyses are to be published at the end of August, 1975. Subsequent activities will be directed at cost analysis of systemic changes. Project products presenting the results of this analysis are to be published at the end of the Project in February, 1976.

All of the Project's analysis and reports are to be written to serve as guides to state and local officials setting and implementing their own standards and goals for corrections. The following officials are viewed as the primary audience for the Project's analysis:

- State criminal justice planning agencies
- State correctional administrators and staffs
- State budget office staffs
- State legislatures and staffs
- Similar planners, administrators, and staffs at the local level.

INTRODUCTION

This plan describes the purpose, analytical framework, and activity schedule for an eighteen-month cost and resource analysis of the Corrections Report to be performed by the Correctional Economics Center of the American Bar Association's Commission on Correctional Facilities and Services. All of the Project's analysis and reports are to be written to serve as guides to state and local officials setting and implementing their own standards and goals for corrections. The first part of this plan therefore delineates in more detail which state and local officials the Project is addressing and how they might be expected to use the Project's products. The following officials are viewed as the primary audience for the Project's analysis:

- State criminal justice planning agencies
- State correctional administrators and staffs
- State budget office staffs
- State legislatures and staffs
- Similar planners, administrators, and staffs at the local level.

The second part of this plan defines a framework for the Project's cost analysis in four sections:

- Correctional Guidelines: The Corrections Report
- Economic Concepts: Government Activities as Producers
- Typology for Changes Suggested by the Report
- Cost and Resource Analysis of Corrections and Implementing the Corrections Report.

The first two sections focus on guidelines for the Project's analysis from corrections and economics, respectively. In the last two sections, economic concepts and correctional reform are joined in an approach which provides for cost analysis of programmatic and systemic changes envisioned in the Corrections Report.

In the third and final part of this plan a schedule and description of Project activities is presented. After organization and planning, the first set of activities is directed at the preparation of cost and resource analysis in the form of separate program analyses for each of the following activity groupings:

- Pretrial Programs
- Institutional-Based Corrections and Parole
- Probation and Other Community-Based Corrections.

These program analyses are to be published at the end of August, 1975. Subsequent activities will be directed at the cost and resource implications of features of the Report which involve system-wide changes in the flow of persons through the criminal justice process, as well as changes in such activities as research and planning and management for corrections. Project products presenting the results of this analysis are to be published at the end of the Project in February, 1976.

A Glossary of the most important terms used in developing the Project's analytical framework and activity schedule is included as an appendix.

PURPOSE OF THE PROJECT

The purpose of the Standards and Goals Project is to perform a cost and resource analysis of the Corrections Report, and to present it in a form which will aid state and local decision-makers as they set and implement their own standards and goals for corrections. The Project's written products are to supplement analysis in the Corrections Report of the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, prepared by a task force of representatives from law enforcement, prosecution, judiciary and corrections agencies and formally issued in October, 1973. The Report recommends priorities and standards for upgrading corrections and other criminal justice functions impacting on that process.^{1/}

The Corrections Report is the most extensive compendium of potential reform of the American correctional system. Because of its complexity, scope, and frequent ambiguity, most have viewed this document as a starting point. The U.S. Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), which sponsored the preparation of the Report, is also sponsoring standards and goals processes in each of the fifty states to consider adopting the essence of the Corrections Report at the state level.

The Standards and Goals Project concurrently supported by LEAA is directed at filling a gap in the supporting analysis presented in the Report. Examination of the Corrections Report reveals a document that builds policy guidelines primarily on the basis of the need to reform. For example, a policy of applying the concept of "least drastic means" is assumed to be valid essentially because in a humane, ethical society, reliance on incarceration as a "treatment" is not consistent with "reform-oriented" thought. As the Report points out, this is especially true when current research indicates that at least treatment modalities make little or no difference in a rehabilitative sense. Little attention is paid, however, to differences in the cost

^{1/}Because the Corrections Report does make recommendations for upgrading corrections and other criminal justice functions impacting on that process, the term "corrections" is generally used very broadly in this plan to refer to a system of activities including pretrial detention and release, sentencing, post-conviction detention, probation, parole and other community-based programs. When the term is used to refer to a narrower set of post-conviction activities, it is so specified.

of alternatives to institutional-based corrections. Important implications of the Report for state and local decision-makers, over and above accepting the Report's Standards as the "right" thing to do, are the "price-tag" effects.

In keeping with its purpose of aiding state and local officials, one of the Project's first tasks has been to specify potential state and local users of its products and, given these users, to identify types of products suitable to their needs. A great variety of state and local officials, each with different needs and functions relative to correctional decision-making, will be involved in setting and implementing correctional standards and goals. Consider, for example, the interests and needs of the director of a state criminal justice planning agency as compared with those of the administrator of a local jail.

Given the contents of the Corrections Report, the following groups seem to be those to which the work of the Standards and Goals Project should be addressed:

- State criminal justice planning agencies
- State correctional administrators and staffs
- State budget office staffs
- State legislatures and staffs
- Similar planners, administrators and staffs at the local level.

The Project's products are intended to encourage state and local decision-makers to make correctional decisions after giving appropriate attention to economic issues. Work of this Project should provide a frame of reference that illustrates how economics can be applied to viewing the changes proposed by the Corrections Report. Since the audience the Project hopes to reach has been, and will probably continue to be, primarily concerned with differences in public expenditure costs, the products of this Project will be illustrating how the Standards may lead to differences in these costs. Additionally, the work of this Project will stress other important economic concepts that are very significant in viewing costs.

These include economies of scale, opportunity costs and external costs which are extremely important in conceptualizing changes in an established system of corrections. The aim of the Project in this respect is to suggest, by description and illustration, how these concepts should be utilized in considering and implementing the Standards.

The Project's first aim is to provide a general frame of reference, particularly for state and local officials considering establishing standards which will guide their own future activities. At the same time, the cost analysis provided by the Project should also be of use to administrators seeking to implement standards set at the state level. For example, consider a state correctional administrator who is seeking to justify to the state legislature the establishment of a new or substantially revised work-release program, in the spirit of the Report. He would have available in the Project's reports information concerning the costs of such a move. This information would be based principally on data associated with similar experiences elsewhere in the nation.

The Project's reports would also provide guidance to that administrator's staff in analyzing the costs of their own state's program changes, by suggesting types of data to be collected and by illustrating procedures for cost estimation designed to yield more comprehensive cost estimates. Such estimates would include other social costs in addition to the direct public expenditures for work release programs.

The ultimate goal of this Project is thus to provide those responsible for setting standards and implementing the changes suggested by the Corrections Report with supplementary cost analysis. At the same time, the Project should expand this audience's notion of "cost" so that future decisions will be based on sounder economic theory. It is evident upon close examination of the Corrections Report that a complete cost and resource analysis of all 129 Standards will not be possible given time and resources. Nevertheless, the results of this Project can significantly improve the chances for successful and thoughtful implementation of correctional standards by providing an appreciation for the issues and a proper perspective for more specific analysis at the implementation level.

ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK FOR THE PROJECT

The analytical framework for the Standards and Goals Project is essentially an integration of correctional guidelines and economic concepts. This framework is described below in four sections:

- Correctional Guidelines: The Corrections Report. This section describes the source and nature of correctional guidelines in the Report that the Project is using to identify activities and changes for cost and resource analysis.
- Economic Concepts: Government Activities as Producers. This section describes the economic view of corrections and other governmental activities as producers using scarce resources (and therefore generating costs) to produce specified outputs (benefits). Social costs, which include opportunity and external costs as well as direct public expenditures, are also explained.
- Typology for Changes Suggested by the Report. This section presents a method for classifying correctional guidelines with potential cost impacts into programmatic and systemic changes. Such a classification provides a framework for cost analysis of individual corrections programs at different stages in the criminal justice process and system-wide effects of correctional guidelines.
- Cost and Resource Analysis of Corrections and Implementing the Corrections Report. This section describes differences between program and system analysis of corrections costs, as well as Project procedures for determining priorities for analysis, given limited Project resources and the very broad scope of the Corrections Report.

Standard 5.2

Sentencing the Nondangerous Offender

State penal code revisions should include a provision that the maximum sentence for any offender not specifically found to represent a substantial danger to others should not exceed 5 years for felonies other than murder. No minimum sentence should be authorized by the legislature.

The sentencing court should be authorized to impose a maximum sentence less than that provided by statute.

Criteria should be established for sentencing offenders. Such criteria should include:

1. A requirement that the least drastic sentencing alternative be imposed that is consistent with public safety. The court should impose the first of the following alternatives that will reasonably protect the public safety:

- a. Unconditional release.
- b. Conditional release.
- c. A fine.
- d. Release under supervision in the community.
- e. Sentence to a halfway house or other residential facility located in the community.
- f. Sentence to partial confinement with liberty to work or participate in training or education during all but leisure time.
- g. Total confinement in a correctional facility.

2. A provision against the use of confinement as an appropriate disposition unless affirmative justification is shown on the record. Factors that would justify confinement may include:

- a. There is undue risk that the offender will commit another crime if not confined.
- b. The offender is in need of correctional services that can be provided effectively only in an institutional setting, and such services are reasonably available.
- c. Any other alternative will depreciate the seriousness of the offense.

3. Weighting of the following in favor of withholding a disposition of incarceration:

- a. The offender's criminal conduct neither caused nor actually threatened serious harm.

b. The offender did not contemplate or intend that his criminal conduct would cause or threaten serious harm.

c. The offender acted under strong provocation.

d. There were substantial grounds tending to excuse or justify the offender's criminal conduct, though falling to establish defense.

e. The offender had led a law-abiding life for a substantial period of time before commission of the present crime.

f. The offender is likely to respond affirmatively to probationary or other community supervision.

g. The victim of the crime induced or facilitated its commission.

h. The offender has made or will make restitution or reparation to the victim of his crime for the damage or injury which was sustained.

i. The offender's conduct was the result of circumstances unlikely to recur.

j. The character, history, and attitudes of the offender indicate that he is unlikely to commit another crime.

k. Imprisonment of the offender would entail undue hardship to dependents.

l. The offender is elderly or in poor health.

m. The correctional programs within the institutions to which the offender would be sent are inappropriate to his particular needs or would not likely be of benefit to him.

Related Standards

The following standards may be applicable in implementing Standard 5.2.

- 5.3 Sentencing to Extended Terms.
- 5.4 Probation.
- 5.5 Fines.
- 6.3 Community Classification Teams.
- 16.7 Sentencing Legislation.
- 16.8 Sentencing Alternatives.
- 16.10 Presentence Reports.
- 16.11 Probation Legislation.
- 16.12 Commitment Legislation.
- 16.14 Community-Based Treatment Programs.

Standard 11.6

Women in Major Institutions

Each State correctional agency operating institutions to which women offenders are committed should reexamine immediately its policies, procedures, and programs for women offenders, and make such adjustments as may be indicated to make these policies, procedures, and programs more relevant to the problems and needs of women.

1. Facilities for women offenders should be considered an integral part of the overall corrections system, rather than an isolated activity or the responsibility of an unrelated agency.

2. Comprehensive evaluation of the woman offender should be developed through research. Each State should determine differences in the needs between male and female offenders and implement differential programming.

3. Appropriate vocational training programs should be implemented. Vocational programs that promote dependency and exist solely for administrative ease should be abolished. A comprehensive research effort should be initiated to determine the aptitudes and abilities of the female institutional population. This information should be coordinated with labor statistics predicting job availability. From data so obtained, creative vocational training should be developed which will provide a woman with skills necessary to allow independence.

4. Classification systems should be investigated to determine their applicability to the female offender. If necessary, systems should be modified or completely restructured to provide information necessary for an adequate program.

5. Adequate diversionary methods for female offenders should be implemented. Community programs should be available to women. Special attempts should be made to create alternative programs in community centers and halfway houses or other arrangements, allowing the woman to keep her family with her.

6. State correctional agencies with such small numbers of women inmates as to make adequate facilities and programming uneconomical should make every effort to find alternatives to imprisonment for them, including parole and local residential facilities. For those women inmates for whom such alternatives cannot be employed, contractual arrangements should be made with nearby States with more adequate facilities and programs.

7. As a 5-year objective, male and female institutions of adaptable design and comparable populations should be converted to coeducational facilities.

a. In coeducational facilities, classification and diagnostic procedures also should give consideration to offenders' problems with relation to the opposite sex, and coeducational programs should be provided to meet those needs.

b. Programs within the facility should be open to both sexes.

c. Staff of both sexes should be hired who have interest, ability, and training in coping with the problems of both male and female offenders. Assignments of staff and offenders to programs and activities should not be based on the sex of either.

Related Standards

The following standards may be applicable in implementing Standard 11.6.

2.1-2.18 Rights of Offenders.

6.1 Comprehensive Classification Systems.

14.3 Employment of Women.

16.4 Unifying Correctional Programs.

A theme running throughout the Report is that a person's penetration into the criminal justice system should be as limited as possible, with imprisonment used only in cases where it is justified by society's need for protection. In any decision affecting an offender's placement or length of stay in a corrections program, the "least drastic means" is to be the rule. For example, Standard 5.2 on "Sentencing the Nondangerous Offender" states that courts "should impose the first of the following alternatives that will reasonably protect the public safety:

- Unconditional release.
- Conditional release.
- A fine.
- Release under supervision in the community.
- Sentence to a halfway house or other residential facility located in the community.
- Sentence to partial confinement with liberty to work or participate in training or education during all but leisure time.
- Total confinement in a correctional facility."

The Standards vary significantly in specifying what types of activities or what changes in practices would be required to bring state or local governments into compliance. The generality of key phrases, such as using the "least drastic means" in sentencing and subsequent decisions regarding offenders, make the Standards subject to a wide range of interpretation by judicial and administrative officials.

Economic Concepts: Government Activities as Producers

From an economic perspective, all governmental activities, including corrections, can be viewed as productive activities which use scarce resources and therefore incur costs to produce a set of outputs, frequently termed "social benefits" in the case of governmental social programs. Corrections is distinct from other governmental activities because it produces different outputs such as protection to society, crime reduction, and rehabilitation of offenders.

In general, the Corrections Report is more concerned with outputs of corrections, such as the unquantifiable benefits of justice, equity and humanity, than it is with their costs. Section 5 of Standard 4.8 on "Rights of Pretrial Detainees" states that cost is not to be a factor:

Administrative cost or convenience should not be considered a justification for failure to comply with any of the above enumerated rights of persons detained awaiting trial.

On the other hand, cost considerations are explicitly recognized as factors to be considered in Standard 4.1 on "Comprehensive Pretrial Process Planning" which states that:

Each criminal justice jurisdiction immediately should begin to develop a comprehensive plan for improving the pretrial process. In the planning process, the following information should be collected: . . . 2. The cost of pretrial release programs and detention.

Nevertheless, the Report envisions changes in corrections, such as improved services and the upgrading of personnel, which are likely to have significant impacts on the costs of correctional activities. Likewise, because of many interrelationships which exist between corrections and activities in different stages of the criminal justice process, such as pretrial detention and sentencing, the Corrections Report also suggests standards for those activities which are likely to have significant cost impacts. From an economic perspective, these cost impacts may be of three types:

- Public expenditures--Direct public outlays for personnel, facilities, equipment, supplies, or purchase of goods and services, associated with providing services to persons in a particular activity, such as wages for guards and social workers and expenditures for construction.
- Opportunity costs--Costs associated with alternatives foregone because a particular public activity is undertaken. For example, the opportunity cost of a correctional activity which incarcerates a person and makes it impossible for him to earn wages is the income (opportunity) foregone from working. On the other hand, the opportunity cost for a community-based activity includes the costs (such as government processing and harm to other persons) associated with any increase in crime attributable to acts by a person who alternatively might have been incarcerated.

- External costs--Costs involved in providing or utilizing a service provided by a particular activity, which must be incurred for the activity's outputs to be produced. Examples of such costs would be the costs incurred by volunteers (such as transportation and leisure time foregone) in community-related correctional activities, and welfare payments to families of incarcerated persons.

Changes in costs resulting from implementation of recommendations in the Corrections Report must be considered within the context of outputs correctional activities are expected to produce. For example, it is important to consider separately the costs of activities designed to protect society from dangerous persons (institutional-based corrections) from those designed primarily to "rehabilitate" and "reintegrate" convicted offenders into society (community-based corrections). One way in which this can be accomplished is by analyzing the costs of individual "programs," where each program is defined as a set of activities serving the same or similar functions and therefore having similar objectives.

Correctional activities can be grouped into functional programs by their stage in the criminal justice process. The result is the program structure shown below:

- Pretrial Programs
- Institutional-Based Corrections
- Probation
- Parole
- Other Community-Based Corrections.^{1/}

^{1/} This five-part program structure is used in the Standards and Goals Project to distinguish between programmatic and systemic changes, defined in the next section. In subsequent analysis and cost estimation, the Project will also be using a subclassification of activities within these five program areas as a framework for providing separate cost estimates for activities with significantly different unit costs.

In addition to more traditional correctional activities, such as parole and pretrial detention, this program structure can be defined to include decriminalization and diversion within the pretrial grouping. The Corrections Report recommends that certain behavior now considered to be criminal in most states be decriminalized. This recommendation includes both victimless "crimes" (such as drunkenness, drug addiction, mental illness, and vagrancy) and juvenile status offenses (such as truancy). Decriminalization would involve changing laws so that such behavior is no longer considered criminal and therefore is outside the scope of corrections. Until that recommendation is implemented, however, the Report recommends that diversion programs be available for the addict, the alcoholic, or the truant. "Diversion" is the process of halting or suspending formal criminal proceedings prior to adjudication for someone charged with violating a statute. The Report also recommends that diversion programs should be available for certain criminal offenses, such as misdemeanors committed by first offenders. From an economic perspective, decriminalization and diversion will mean transferring some of the costs of correctional programs to other governmental agencies, such as drug treatment centers. Such transfers need to be included in an economic analysis of the Corrections Report.

Typology for Changes Suggested by the Report

Because of the characteristics of the Corrections Report and its individual Standards described in the introductory section on "Correctional Guidelines," the individual Standards, by themselves, cannot be used as the components of a design for systematic cost and resource analysis. However, it is possible to identify types of changes envisioned in the Report, associate one or more Standards or parts of Standards with these changes, develop guidelines for estimating the impacts of the identified changes (and associated Standards) on the costs of corrections, and calculate cost estimates using these guidelines.

Two general types of changes are suggested by the Corrections Report, programmatic changes and systemic changes. Programmatic changes affect the activities within one stage of the criminal justice process. For the purpose of this study the stages are defined as the following:

- Pretrial programs
- Institutional-based corrections
- Parole
- Probation
- Other community-based corrections.

Several kinds of programmatic changes advocated by the Standards are:

- Development of a full range of alternative activities within a program area (for example, educational, vocational, and counseling services in institutional-based programs);
- Flexibility in assigning persons within any one program to the various available activities;
- Administrative improvements within each program, including the recognition of offenders' rights;
- Improved services for persons served by or working in the program (for example, manpower training for prison guards).

Systemic changes are of two types. The first type affect the flow of people through the criminal justice system, either by changing the pattern or the speed of that flow. For example, to the extent that the Standard advocating pretrial diversion programs is implemented, the number of people who are candidates for community corrections will be affected. Similarly, if Standards on community corrections are implemented, the number and types of offenders assigned to institutional-based programs may be altered.

The second type of systemic changes are those which are not uniquely concerned with any one program area, and typically affect two or more program areas simultaneously. Examples of such changes are centralized management, planning, and research and judicial visits.

This typology of programmatic and systemic changes provides a framework for the Project's cost and resource analysis and is used to classify the changes recommended by the Standards in the Corrections Report. While the classification has necessarily involved some interpretation of the Standards by the Project staff, every effort has been made to be objective and to maintain the spirit of the Report.

Because of the purpose and the scope of this Project, only the changes suggested by the Standards which are likely to have significant cost implications have been selected for analysis and classified as programmatic or systemic.

Those changes initially selected for further study are listed in Figures 3A, 3B, and 4. Figures 3A and 3B present the programmatic changes. Figure 3A is limited to program-specific changes, classified by stages in the criminal justice process and by program area. Figure 3B lists changes which are applicable to more than one program area and indicates to which program(s) they apply.

Figure 4 lists systemic changes divided into two groups. The first group of systemic changes are those which affect the flow of people through the criminal justice process. Typically, these changes result from the interrelationships of programs and include sentencing. The second group are the systemic changes such as research and centralized planning that could affect several program areas simultaneously.

There are some Standards which incorporate both programmatic and systemic changes, as they have been defined above. Some programmatic changes are also very closely linked with systemic changes. For example, implementation of formal diversion programs (a programmatic change) is a prerequisite to changes in the number entering the criminal justice system due to diversion programs (a systemic change). Therefore, some Standards are listed more than once in Figures 3A, 3B, and 4. The Standards and Goals Project has planned its activities (program and system analysis discussed in detail in the third part of this plan) so as to provide for separate analysis of both types of changes while also developing guides for state and local officials which recognize both types of changes and their interrelationships.

The Corrections Report defines corrections as "the community's official reactions to the convicted offender, whether adult or juvenile." The use of "convicted offender" in this definition would seem to exclude juveniles who pass through noncriminal court processes from which no conviction can be received. However, recognizing the fact that "corrections has accepted the role of 'treating' and 'helping' juveniles," the Report also discusses "the diversion of juveniles from the criminal justice system, juvenile intake and detention, juvenile institutions, and community programs for youth," as well as the long range objective of removing juveniles not tried as adults from the purview of corrections. Cost analysis for the Standards and Goals Project will focus on programs for adults (including youths and juveniles tried and sentenced as adults). However, in some cases juvenile programs may be used as "models" for estimating the costs of

Figure 3A

Programmatic Changes Suggested by the Corrections Report
Which are Program-Specific

| Programmatic Change Groupings, by Stage in the Criminal Justice Process | | Associated Standards in the <u>Corrections Report</u> |
|---|--|---|
| Program Area | Change | |
| <u>Pretrial</u> | Implementation of Formal Diversion Programs | 3.1 |
| | Use of Alternatives to Arrest: | 4.3 |
| | - Citation Instead of Arrest | |
| | - Summons Instead of Warrant | |
| | Use of Alternatives to Pretrial Detention, e.g., Release on Recognizance (ROR), Assuring Appearance at Trial with Fewest Possible Restrictions | 4.4 |
| | Recognition of Pretrial Detainees' Rights To Appear Before a Judicial Officer and To Challenge His Detention | 4.5 |
| | Least Restrictive Confinement of Pretrial Detainees While Assuring Appearance at Trial | 4.8 |
| | Education, Recreation, Counselling and Treatment of Special Problems for Detainees | 4.9 |
| | Speedier Trials | 4.10 |

Figure 3A (cont'd)

| Programmatic Change Groupings, by Stage in the Criminal Justice Process | | Associated Standards in the Corrections Report |
|---|--|--|
| Program Area | Change | |
| <u>Pretrial</u> (cont'd) | Swift, Humane Intake Processing of Detainees | 9.5 |
| | Decriminalization of Mental Illness, Drug Addiction, Alcoholism; Provision of Treatment Outside Criminal Justice System | 9.7 |
| | Development of ROR Pro- grams by Probation Officers in Large Cities | 10.5 |
| <u>Institutional- Based Corrections</u> | | |
| • Local In- stitutions | Central Coordination of Adult Intake Services | 9.4 |
| | Improvement in Staffing Patterns | 9.6 |
| | Changes in Visitation, Medical Services, Meals, etc. | 9.7 |
| | Improvement of Facilities and Services | 9.8 |
| | Use of Furloughs, Work and Study Release | 9.9 |
| • Major In- stitutions | Improvement of Facilities to: | |
| | - If New Institutions Are Justified, Plan Them To Provide Services and Privacy | 11.1 |
| | - Modify Existing Insti- tutions To Provide Ser- vices and Privacy | 11.2 |
| | - Improve Social Environ- ment To Stimulate Behavioral Change | 11.3 |

Figure 3A (cont'd)

| Programmatic Change Groupings, by Stage in the Criminal Justice Process | | Associated Standards in the Corrections Report |
|---|---|--|
| Program Area | Change | |
| • <u>Major Insti- tutions</u> (cont'd) | Improvement of Services in: | |
| | - Education and Voca- tional Training | 11.4 |
| | - Religious Programs | 11.7 |
| | - Recreation Programs | 11.8 |
| | - Counselling | 11.9 |
| <u>Probation</u> | - Prison Labor and Industries | 11.10 |
| | Use of Work and Study Furloughs | 11.4 11.10 |
| | Implementation of Re- vised Probation Policies with Written Conditions and Revocation Procedures | 5.4 |
| | Statewide Organization of Probation | 10.1 |
| | Provision of Wide Range of Probation Services; Purchases of Other Services from Outside Agencies | 10.2 |
| <u>Parole</u> | Use of Probation for Misdemeanor Convictions in All Appropriate Cases | 10.3 |
| | Development of Manpower for Probation Programs | 10.4 |
| | Establishment of Parole Boards Independent of Correctional Institutions | 12.1 |
| | Improvement in Qualifica- tions of Parole Board Members | 12.2 |
| | Implementation of Parole Hearing Procedures With Offender Participation, Prompt Decisions and Written Records | 12.3 |

Figure 3A (cont'd)

| Programmatic Change Groupings, by Stage in the Criminal Justice Process | | Associated Standards in the Corrections Report |
|---|---|--|
| Program Area | Change | |
| <u>Parole (cont'd)</u> | Implementation of Revocation Hearing Procedures Providing Offender Rights to Counsel and to Challenge Allegations | 12.4 |
| | Improvement of Community Services for Parolees | 12.6 |
| | Reduction of Limitations on Parolees | 12.7 |
| | Improvement of Staffing in Parole Programs | 12.8 |
| <u>Other Community- Based Corrections</u> | Use of Community Corrections for: | 7.1 |
| | - Nonresidential Supervision | |
| | - Residential Alternatives to Parole, Probation, and Incarceration | |
| | - Prerelease | |
| | - Reentry | |
| | Establishment of Working Relationship for Corrections with Community Services in: | 7.2 |
| | - Employment | |
| | - Education | |
| | - Social Welfare | |
| | - Law Enforcement | |
| | Citizen Involvement in Community-Based Corrections | 7.3 |
| | Inmate Involvement in Community Programs | 7.4 |
| | Redistribution of Correctional Manpower From Institutional to Community-Based Programs | 14.8 |

Figure 3B

Programmatic Changes Suggested by the Corrections Report
Which Apply to More Than One Program

| Change | Associated Standards in the Corrections Report | • Indicates Programs to Which Changes Are Applicable | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---------------------------------|-------|-----------|--------|-----------------------------------|
| | | Pretrial ^{1/} | Institutional-Based Corrections | | Probation | Parole | Other Community-Based Corrections |
| | | | Local | Major | | | |
| Recognition of Offenders Rights to: | | | | | | | |
| • Courts | 2.1 | | • | • | | | • |
| • Legal Services | 2.2 | | • | • | • | • | • |
| • Legal Materials | 2.3 | | • | • | • | • | • |
| • Protection from Physical Abuse | 2.4 | | • | • | | | |
| • Healthful Surroundings | 2.5 | | • | • | | | |
| • Medical Services | 2.6 | | • | • | | | |
| • Reasonable Searches | 2.7 | | • | • | | | |
| • Nondiscriminatory Services | 2.8 | | • | • | | | |
| • Rehabilitation If Sentenced | 2.9 | | • | • | • | • | • |
| • Retention or Restoration of Civil Rights, Including Employment | 2.10 | | • | • | • | • | • |
| • Rules of Conduct Employing "Least Drastic Means" | 2.11 | | • | • | | | |
| • Reasonable Disciplinary Procedures | 2.12 | | • | • | | | |

^{1/}Persons in the criminal justice system prior to trial are not "offenders."

(cont'd)

Figure 3B (cont'd)

| Change | Associated Standards in the Corrections Report | • Indicates Programs to Which Changes Are Applicable | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---------------------------------|-------|-----------|--------|-----------------------------------|
| | | Pretrial ^{1/} | Institutional-Based Corrections | | Probation | Parole | Other Community-Based Corrections |
| | | | Local | Major | | | |
| • Written Procedures for Non-Disciplinary Changes in Offender Status | 2.11 | | • | • | | | |
| • Grievance Procedures | 2.14 | | • | • | | | |
| • Free Expression and Association | 2.15 | | • | • | | | |
| • Religious Freedom | 2.16 | | • | • | | | |
| • Access to Public Through Mail, Visits and Media | 2.17 | | • | • | | | |
| • Remedies for Violation of the Above Rights | 2.18 | | • | • | | | |
| Train Professional Correctional Managers | 13.1 | • | • | • | • | • | • |
| Short-, Intermediate-, and Long-Range Agency Planning | 13.2 | • | • | • | • | • | • |
| Development of Labor-Offender-Management Negotiations | 13.3 | • | • | • | • | • | • |
| Plan for Agency Employee Strikes | 13.4 | • | • | • | • | • | • |
| Improvement in Staff Recruitment | 14.1 | • | • | • | • | • | • |
| Recruitment and Use of Volunteers | 14.5 | • | • | • | • | • | • |
| Revision of Personnel Practices To Retain Staff | 14.6 | • | • | • | • | • | • |

Figure 3B (cont'd)

| Change | Associated Standards in the Corrections Report | • Indicates Programs to Which Changes Are Applicable | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---------------------------------|-------|-----------|--------|-----------------------------------|
| | | Pretrial ^{1/} | Institutional-Based Corrections | | Probation | Parole | Other Community-Based Corrections |
| | | | Local | Major | | | |
| Participation of Managers, Staff and Offenders in Agency Management | 14.7 | • | • | • | • | • | • |
| Implementation of Work-Study Programs as Attraction to Careers in Corrections | 14.10 | • | • | • | • | • | • |
| Implementation of Staff Development Plans | 14.11 | o | o | o | o | o | o |

Figure 4

Systemic Changes Suggested by the Corrections Report

| Change | Associated Standards in the <u>Corrections Report</u> |
|---|--|
| <u>I. Systemic Changes Affecting Flows Through the Criminal Justice System</u> | |
| Change in Number Entering Criminal Justice System Due to: | |
| • Diversion Programs | 3.1 |
| • Decriminalization | 3.1 |
| • Use of Citations and Summons Instead of Arrests | 4.3 |
| • Alternatives to Pre-trial Detention | 4.4, 10.5 |
| • Increased Use of Fines When Appropriate | 5.5 |
| Change in Time Served Due to: | |
| • Use of Least Drastic Sentencing Alternatives for Nondangerous Offenders. Maximum Term, 5 Years. | 5.2 |
| • Maximum Term 25 Years for Persistent, Professional or Dangerous Offenders (excluding Murderers) | 5.3 |
| • Revision of Probation Policies with Written Statement of Conditions | 5.4 |
| • Maximums on Consecutive Sentences; Increased Use of Concurrent Sentences | 5.6 |

Figure 4 (cont'd)

| Change | Associated Standards in the <u>Corrections Report</u> |
|--|--|
| Keeping Official Records of Sentencing, Including Judges' Reasons for Particular Sentence | 5.19 |
| Comprehensive Needs Evaluation for Local Facility Planning | 9.10 |
| Gathering Information for and Developing Comprehensive Plan of the Pretrial Process | 4.1 |
| Consolidation of Institutional and Parole Field Service in State Department of Corrections | 12.5 |
| Development of State Correctional Information System and Data Base | 15.1, 15.3, 15.4 |
| Provision of Staff to Analyze Correctional Information | 15.2 |
| Success of Criminal Justice System Measured by Recidivism | 15.5 |
| Incorporation of Local Detention and Correctional Function Within State System | 9.2 |
| State and Local Cooperation in Planning Community Corrections | 9.1 |
| Reorganization of Correctional Personnel Among Jurisdictions | 9.6 |
| State Planning to Assure Academic Training of Correctional Personnel | 14.9 |

adult programs which would provide similar kinds of services (for example, diversion programs with a variety of counseling and educational services). In addition, where the analysis also suggests how similar or related programs for juveniles might be affected by changes envisioned in the Report, these will be noted in descriptive material accompanying the Project's cost estimates. For these reasons, Standards in the Corrections Report relating specifically to juveniles (chapter 8) are not included in Figures 3A, 3B, or 4.

Cost and Resource Analysis of Corrections and Implementing the Corrections Report

Building on the typology of programmatic and systemic changes presented in the previous section, two complementary approaches--program and system analysis--can be used to analyze the cost and resource implications of implementing the Corrections Report. More detailed information on how the Standards and Goals Project plans to undertake such analysis is presented later in this plan under "PROJECT ACTIVITIES AND SCHEDULE" and so will not be repeated here. In all of this analysis it will be necessary to "operationalize" the Standards, that is to associate them with changes in the operations of a system of correctional and related activities that will occur if the Standards are implemented. For the purposes of such an analysis, implementation is assumed to go beyond the process of passing legislation or issuing administrative guidelines to the development and carrying out of a series of changes in the amounts and types of services provided to persons in correctional and related programs, as specified by the Report and its Standards.

The Project anticipates that it will not be possible to analyze the cost implications of all of the changes envisioned in the Corrections Report within the time and resources available. It also recognizes that some changes are more easily analyzed for cost implications (for example, the increased use of judicial visits) and others are more important to correctional reform (for example, the redistribution of corrections personnel to community-based programs). To aid the Project in determining priorities for analysis, in its early activities (literature search, identification of prototypical projects, and so forth) and in later stages in which more detailed cost estimates will be made, the Project is conducting an informal survey of state and local officials and corrections analysts. In this survey, respondents are being asked to rate changes suggested in the Report as to feasibility of cost analysis and importance for correctional reform. The list of changes used in this survey includes the lists shown in Figures 3A, 3B, and 4.

PROJECT ACTIVITIES AND SCHEDULE

The Standards and Goals Project plans to prepare:

- Three program analyses of the cost and resource implications of the Corrections Report for (1) pretrial programs, (2) institutional-based corrections and parole, and (3) probation and other community-based corrections;
- A cost analysis of systemic changes suggested in the Report, to include analysis of costs associated with changes in the flow of persons through the criminal justice process and other changes, such as research and management innovations, not covered in the three program analyses listed above;
- A final report.

All of the Project's analyses and reports are to be written to serve as guides to state and local officials on factors to be considered and techniques for estimating costs associated with developing new corrections programs or revising old ones so as to be in accordance with the implementation priorities and specific Standards of the Corrections Report. It is assumed that these guides will be at a level of clarity and sophistication which will make them most useful to:

- State criminal justice planning agencies
- State correctional administrators and staffs
- State budget office staffs
- State legislatures and staffs
- Similar planners, administrators and staffs at the local level.

Although the Project's analyses will be guided by specific Standards and goals presented in the NAC Report, the wording of these Standards and goals is general enough that the Project's analysis should be useful to states or localities considering other correctional standards and goals.

More detail on how the Project has selected an analytical framework and developed plans for future activities, as well as how it plans to proceed in the next fourteen months, are presented in Figure 5 and described below. The Project's activities can be divided into four parts:

- I. Organization and Planning (September, 1974 - January, 1975)
- II. Program Analysis (November, 1974 - August, 1975)
- III. System Analysis (November, 1974 - February, 1976)
- IV. Preparation of Final Report (November, 1975 - February, 1976).

Part One: Organization and Planning

The Standards and Goals Project began on September 1, 1974, under the general direction of Billy L. Wayson, Director of the Correctional Economics Center (CEC). Four fulltime staff members have been hired and are now working on the Project:

- Dr. Virginia Wright, Research Director
- Michael Fischel, Research Associate
- Ann Watkins, Research Associate
- Barbara Bland, Administrative Assistant

Dr. Neil Singer, Associate Professor of Economics at the University of Maryland, has also been hired as a consultant and is participating in Project planning and analysis.

Figure 5
Activity Schedule for the Standards and Goals Project
(September 1, 1974 - February 29, 1976)

| Activity | Project Month | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|------|-----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| | Sept | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |

Part One: Organization and Planning

- Recruitment and Hiring
- Office Rental and Equipment Purchases
- Advisory Board Selection
- Initiation of Literature and Data Search
- Construction of Standards Cross-Reference Matrix
- Development of Preliminary Program Structure
- Development of Standards Classification System
- Preliminary Selection of Standards for Analysis
- Preparation of Detailed Project Plan
- Advisory Board Review of Detailed Project Plan

Part Two: Program Analysis

- Literature and Statistical Survey
- Field Research
- Writing of First Drafts
- Review of First Drafts
- Completion of Program Analyses
- Final Review of Program Analyses

- Guides for State and Local Officials
- ▼ Administrative Reports (Progress and Financial)
- Advisory Board Meetings

Activity Schedule for the Standards and Goals Project
(continued)

| Activity | Project Month | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|------|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 |
| | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug | Sept | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb |
| <u>Part Three: System Analysis</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Literature Survey | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Field Research | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Preparation of Interim Staff Report | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Review and Planning | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Completion of System Analysis | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Writing and Review | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <u>Part Four: Preparation of Final Report</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Review and Planning | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Preparation of Topic Outline | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Writing and Review | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

■ Guides for State and Local Officials

▼ Administrative Reports (Progress and Financial)

● Advisory Board Meetings

An eight-member Advisory Board which will review and make recommendations regarding the Project's analysis and activities has been selected. They are:

Judge Sylvia Bacon, Superior Court for the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C.

Dr. Alfred J. Blumstein, Professor and Director of the Urban Systems Institute, Carnegie-Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Mr. George Hall, Statistical Policy Division, Office of the President, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, D.C.

Mr. Richard McGee, President, American Justice Institute, Sacramento, California

Dr. Donna Shalala, Associate Professor of Politics Teacher's College, Columbia University, New York, New York

Mr. Allyn R. Sielaff, Director, Illinois Department of Corrections, Springfield, Illinois

Mr. Robert J. Kutak of Kutak, Rock, Cohen, Campbell, Garfinkle and Woodward, Omaha, Nebraska

Dr. Lee S. Friedman, Assistant Professor, University of California at Berkeley, Berkeley, California

The first six members listed are also on the Correctional Economics Center's Advisory Board; the two other members were selected specifically for the Standards and Goals Project.

Activities during the first four months have been directed at the development of an analytical framework and a detailed work plan to guide the Project's activities. The product of these efforts is this plan for a cost and resource analysis of the Corrections Report and its standards.

The first major event in the development of this plan was a two-day planning meeting attended by all members of the staff; Dr. Neil Singer, consultant economist; Ms. Kay Harris, now Assistant Project Director of the ABA Corrections Commission's Law Resource Center and formerly Assistant Director of the National Advisory Commission's Corrections Task Force Staff; Dr. Richard Sullivan, Director of Research and Evaluation for the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission; and Ms. Marlene Beckman, LEAA grant monitor for the Standards and Goals Project. At this meeting several alternative approaches to classifying Standards and performing an economic analysis of the Corrections Report were presented and discussed. An approach embodying separate analysis of distributional and procedural changes was agreed upon as the one most consonant with the spirit and content of the Report.

Following the planning meeting, the staff developed the approach chosen into a more detailed framework for a systematic analysis of the cost and resource implications of the Report for a typical state system of correctional and related activities. A draft plan incorporating this systematic approach was reviewed by members of the Project and CEC Advisory Boards in Williamsburg, Virginia, on December 9 and 10.

In accordance with discussion and recommendations made by several Advisory Board members at this meeting, major changes in the plan's style and some revisions in the way the staff will conduct and present its cost analysis were made. The purpose of these changes has been to clarify and represent the dual concerns of the Project to (1) analyze the complexity of the effects of system-wide changes encompassed in the Report, and (2) develop products which state and local officials are likely to find useful in setting and implementing their own correctional standards and goals. The final Project plan, entitled Plan for a Cost Analysis of the Corrections Report will be published in January, 1975.

Organization and planning for the Project will be completed when this plan is submitted to the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice in January, 1975.

Part Two: Program Analysis

Work on three program analyses to be prepared by the Standards and Goals Project began in November, 1974. These three analyses will focus on the cost and resource implications of the Corrections Report for activities in the following broad program groupings:

- Pretrial Programs (Ann Watkins)
- Institutional-Based Corrections and Parole (Neil Singer)
- Probation and Other Community-Based Corrections (Michael Fischel).

The name shown with each grouping is the person who has primary responsibility for preparing that program analysis. General coordination and analytical direction will be the task of Dr. Virginia Wright, Research Director of the Project.

Each program analysis is to include the following:

- A system (program structure) for subclassifying activities within the broad activity groupings being studied, by types of services provided, degree of supervision, and so forth;
- An examination and analysis of the costs of existing prototypes of different types of activities (including public expenditures, opportunity costs and external costs);
- An analysis of the extent to which existing prototypes are likely to be replicable and their costs, therefore, representative;
- An analysis of how procedural changes associated with activities in the program areas being studied may have significant cost implications ^{1/};
- A discussion of the relationships of activities in one program area (for example, diversion) to other programs in the criminal justice system (for example, community corrections), and the effects these interrelationships have on opportunity costs and externalities;
- Suggestions to states and localities as to what types of statistical information they need to collect for their own programs, in order to be able to make useful and accurate cost estimates;
- Other illustrations to guide decision-makers in assessing the cost of implementing a new program or revising an old one in a particular locality, such as marginal versus average cost considerations.

^{1/} For some changes, such as unified probation, it may be impossible or impractical to find cost data which can be associated with changes called for in the Standards. In such cases, it may be possible only to provide a prescription for how a particular locality might go about estimating the cost impacts for a change being considered.

To secure information for these analyses, the Project will rely primarily on a survey of correctional and related research and project and government reports (local, state and federal) and supplementary field work (to be performed by telephone as much as possible), to study projects and places with "typical" and "advanced" programs. Examples of more specific types of information sources currently being studied are the following:

- LEAA comprehensive state plans;
- Project and program evaluations for activities supported by LEAA and other government agencies (such as ABT Associates' studies of diversion programs and Levitan's work on manpower training programs);
- Cost and cost-benefit studies of corrections and other government programs (for example, Holahan's analysis of "Project Crossroads" and Block's work on scale economies for correctional institutions);
- General program analysis of specific types of criminal justice activities (such as Coates' study of community-based corrections and Nimmer's analysis of diversion programs);
- Descriptive information prepared by associations of persons or groups involved in particular types of criminal justice activities (such as the International Halfway House Association and the National Association of Counties).

Given the wide scope of the Report and the limited time and resources of the Standards and Goals Project, it will not be possible for the Project to collect primary data, such as offender statistics. It is expected, however, that it will be necessary for the Project to supplement published or aggregated statistics, such as budget data for inappropriate activity or resource groupings, with additional analysis and field work. Both actual and hypothetical data may be used to illustrate how a particular locality might go about estimating the cost and resource implications of setting and implementing a particular correctional standard or goal.

A draft of each of these three analyses is to be completed by April 1, 1975. At that time, some parts of the analysis should be completed while other parts may only be in outline form. Each draft will be reviewed for content and style by selected members of the Advisory Board and other state and local officials with interest or expertise in the program area. The three program analyses are to be ready for publication by the end of August, 1975.

Part Three: System Analysis

Analysis of the ways in which activities and changes in activities in any one stage in the criminal justice process are likely to affect activities (and thus public expenditures and other social costs) in a subsequent stage of the criminal justice process (or another activity in the same stage) is one component of the program analyses whose preparation has been described in the previous section. Thus the program analyses will be concerned with system analysis, from the perspective of a particular type of program (such as community-based corrections), and therefore will be considering, to a limited extent, systemic changes envisioned in the Corrections Report. (These changes are listed in Figure 4.)

In addition to what is presented in its program analyses, the Project plans to develop supplementary analysis of the cost and resource implications of systemic changes proposed in the Report from a broader "total system" perspective. As in its program analyses, however, the Project does not have the time nor the resources to develop a complete system model, and so will be building on models prepared by other research. What is envisioned is the possibility of introducing the Project's analysis of programmatic and systemic changes (and associated cost estimates) into a system model, such as JUSSIM developed at Carnegie-Mellon University, to derive estimates of total system effects of systemic changes which can result from implementing changes proposed in the Corrections Report. Preliminary study of how the Project might make use of such a model (and statistical data on the criminal justice process prepared for a jurisdiction already utilizing the model) is the responsibility of Dr. Virginia Wright, Research Director. While the program analyses are being prepared (under her direction and coordination), Dr. Wright will be reviewing system models (such as JUSSIM) for possible use at a later stage in the Project.

In addition to exploring the possibilities of more detailed analysis of systemic changes of the "flow" type described above, Dr. Wright will also be doing research for the Project's cost analysis of other systemic changes in Figure 4, such as research and development of information systems. As in other parts of the Project, this cost analysis will consist primarily of relating and applying concepts and statistics from research and prototypical projects on topics relevant to the Standards and changes suggested by the Corrections Report.

It is not possible to specify at this early stage in the Project how far the Project will be able to go with its analysis of systemic changes envisioned in the Report, nor to specify exactly how the results of the Project's cost analysis of systemic changes will be published. After completion of the program analyses in August, 1975, detailed plans for the remainder of the Project, including how the Project plans to proceed with and publish its cost analysis of systemic changes, will be developed, with assistance from the Advisory Board at its second meeting in the fall of 1975. As for all Project products, any guides developed will be reviewed by state and local officials and analysts before publication for content and style. Some type of publication incorporating the Project's system analysis is to be completed at the end of the Project in February, 1976.

Part Four: Preparation of Final Report

As with Project activities associated with system analysis described in the previous section, it is not possible to specify exactly what the contents of the Project's final report will be until after the three program analyses have been completed in August, 1975. Depending on their length, the full text of the program analyses may be included in the final report, or their contents may be synthesized and supplemented with additional system analysis. Plans for a final report will be developed concurrently with plans for additional system analysis, with the assistance of the Project's Advisory Board at its second meeting in the fall of 1975. Four months have been allocated to preparation and review of the final report, to be completed at the end of the Project in February, 1976.

The initial grant application for this Project mentioned the preparation of a planning guide for state and local officials, in addition to a series of analytical reports. As plans for this Project have developed, all of the Project's reports are now to be written as guides for state and local officials, and so there is no longer any one document specifically viewed as the planning guide from the Project.

GLOSSARY

community-based corrections - post-conviction correctional activities that are based primarily in a "non-secure" community setting, which either constitute alternative sentencing dispositions to secure institutional incarceration or alternative programs for offenders upon release from a secure institution (while both probation and parole activities are the major existing components of community-based corrections as it is defined here, these two activities will be analyzed independently in the Standards and Goals Project).

community-related activities - pre-conviction and post-conviction activities, residential or non-residential, which provide persons in the criminal justice system with opportunities for contact with a community during work or leisure.

corrections - because the Corrections Report does make recommendations for upgrading corrections and other criminal justice functions impacting on that process, corrections is generally used very broadly in this study to refer to a similar system of activities, including pretrial detention and release, sentencing, post-conviction detention, probation, parole and other community-based programs; when the term is used to refer to a narrower set of post-conviction activities, it is so specified.

decriminalization programs - activities for persons who would have been accused or convicted of criminal behavior for acts no longer considered criminal after implementation of the Standards, such as drunkenness, drug addiction, mental illness, vagrancy and truancy.

diversion programs - activities persons, such as alleged misdemeanants accused of a first criminal act, for whom formal criminal proceedings have been halted or suspended prior to adjudication following being charged with violating a statute.

external costs - costs involved in providing or utilizing a service provided by a particular activity, which must be incurred for the activity's outputs to be produced. Examples of such costs would be the costs incurred by volunteers (such as transportation and leisure time foregone) in community-related correctional activities, and welfare payments to families of incarcerated persons.

institutional-based corrections - post-conviction correctional activities that are based primarily in "secure" facilities concerned essentially with isolating offenders from the community, but also include programs which allow for limited community contact for offenders with a regular return to a "secure" institution (such as work release and furlough programs).

opportunity costs - costs associated with alternatives foregone because a particular public activity is undertaken. For example, the opportunity cost of a correctional activity which incarcerates a person and makes it impossible for him to earn wages is the income (opportunity) foregone from working. On the other hand, the opportunity cost for a community-based activity includes the costs (such as government processing and harm to other persons) associated with any increase in crime attributable to acts by a person who alternatively might have been incarcerated.

program - a set of activities serving the same or similar function.

programmatic changes - changes which affect the activities within one stage of the criminal justice process, such as manpower training for prison guards or counseling services for inmates (for the purpose of this study, stages in the criminal justice process are defined as the following: pretrial programs, institutional-based corrections, parole, probation, other community-based corrections).

program structure - a classification of correctional and related activities into functional groupings for the purpose of comparing costs and outputs of alternative sets of activities.

public expenditures - direct public outlays for personnel, facilities, equipment, supplies or purchase of goods and services, associated with providing services to persons in a particular activity, such as wages for guards and social workers and expenditures for construction.

social costs - public expenditures, opportunity costs and external costs of correctional activities.

Standard - one of the 129 standards for correctional and related activities presented in the 1973 Corrections Report of the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals.

systemic changes - changes not uniquely concerned with any one of five program areas (pretrial programs, institutional-based corrections, parole, probation, and other community-based corrections), such as the increased use of pretrial diversion programs which affects the numbers and types of people in post-conviction programs of any type, system-wide planning and management, and the use of sentencing institutes.

PUBLICATIONS LISTING

The Value of Adult Inmate Manpower, Dr. Neil M. Singer,
Correctional Economics Center, November, 1973, 19 pages.

Correctional Economics Center: Descriptive Brochure,
6 pages.

Cost-Benefit Analysis --- Three Applications to Corrections,
Correctional Economics Center, May, 1974, 35 pages.

The Economics of Crime and Corrections: A Bibliography,
Correctional Economics Center, September, 1974, 45
pages.

Resource Needs of Correctional Administrators: A Survey
Report, Correctional Economics Center, November, 1974,
21 pages.

Cost Analysis of Community Correctional Centers -- A Case
Study: Indiana, January, 1975, 42 pages.

Note: Limited copies (upon request) can be obtained with-
out cost.