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PHILADELPHIA, April 25, 1974

Mr. John Snavely
Executive Director
Governor's Justice Commission
Box 1167, Federal Square Station
Harrisburg, Pa.

Dear Mr. Snavely:

In 1972 the Governor's Justice Commission awarded subgrant DG-197-73A to evaluate the visitation program of the Pennsylvania Conference of State Trial Judges which was already in progress.

The purpose of the evaluation study was multifaceted. To report on the observations and conclusions of the judges with regard to improving the correctional institutions; to recommend a plan of action for future justice training in corrections; and to recommend ways and means to bring about a closer working relationship between the Trial Judges and the agencies administering criminal justice in the Commonwealth.

The visits to five of the six state correctional institutions were monitored for purposes of the study. Faculty from the Pennsylvania State University were responsible for the Camp Hill SCI visit; University of Pittsburgh for the Pittsburgh SCI visit; and Marywood College School of Social Work for the balance of the monitored visits. In addition, the Criminal Justice Resource Center of Marywood was responsible for other data collection and assembly of the final report.

Each recommendation was given thoughtful consideration and is the direct result of the Judges' input. Extensive tape recordings were made at each institution and the Judges participated in exchange with administrators, residents, staff, and various authorities in the field. In addition, residents and staff were surveyed with instruments similar to those used by the Judges.

This is the first time for a judicial visitation program in Pennsylvania. As such, it represents a unique effort on behalf of the State Trial Judges to become more intimately aware of the operations and progress of the state correctional institutions and to directly assist in the up-grading of our entire correctional system. The monitoring and coordinating of these visits by several educational institutions added a new dimension to this effort.

Hopefully the completion and publication of this report will provide a blueprint for further action by the courts in the continuing effort to up-grade and humanize efforts in the field of criminal justice.

Sincerely,

JUDGE RICHARD P. COMAR
Chairman, Corrections Committee
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PROLOGUE

It has often been said that the most difficult task a judge must perform is to send a fellow human being to prison. There is no doubt of the wrenching effect of pronouncing a sentence. What is much more thought provoking and in many instances extremely disturbing is for a judge to go to see those same people in the prisons where they are serving their terms. Is this the "punishment" he had in mind, or the law had in mind, — is this the "treatment" — is this the "education" — is this the "rehabilitation." These are the questions that came to the minds of the Pennsylvania Judges as they carried out their visitation program to the State's Correctional Institutions. Suddenly sentences were not simple Court Orders. Dramatically they each became an imposed severely handicapping lifestyle on a specific man or woman.

The lack of adequate facilities, the lack of adequate staff, the uselessness of meaningless programs, the devotion of many dedicated officers and administrators, the lack of sufficient funding and the overriding question of the value of the "prison system" itself were matters forcefully demonstrated by this program.

What impact the Judges of Pennsylvania can or will have on the future of our Corrections System remains to be seen and will result only from continual concern and dedication of time and energy. But those making the visits were unanimous in two items — one, that the program should be continued, and two, that the visits made a remarkable impact on their concept of sentencing.

Richard P. Conaboy
BACKGROUND OF THE VISITATION PROGRAM

In the past decade we have seen much dramatic statutory and decisional change in the criminal law field. There has been a new awareness among criminal defendants and trial lawyers alike about the rights of individuals accused. Likewise this awareness has carried over when defendants are convicted and sentenced.

These new programs and decisions brought new demands upon the judiciary and particularly evident is the need on the part of the sentencing judge for knowledge about the correctional alternatives available to him at the time of sentencing and later when his input is required for certain of the after-institution programs.

One of the most difficult jobs that a Judge has to perform is to sentence another human being to prison. In doing so every judge should be concerned with the nature and quality of the facility and programs to which a convicted person is being sentenced. He should be aware of what conditions of his sentence are set and how the facilities are available to meet the needs of the inmate; what educational and treatment opportunities exist; how well programs are administered; how well trained the staff is and what inmates think of the programs. These are but a few of the concerns of any judge who sentences a defendant when sentencing alternatives are available.

In early 1971, with these and like concerns uppermost in the minds of the conference membership, the Corrections Committee recommended that an educational program be provided in each prison. The purpose of this program was to provide a written or verbal perception of a few. The technique also contributed to preventing any attrition of participants in the latter part of the program.

One of the many rapid changes and new demands on the judiciary that the Conference of State Trial Judges in Pennsylvania was established. The Conference selected, as one of its major objectives, the continuing education of the judiciary on the operation of the Court system and the administration of Justice.

The Conference of State Trial Judges was established to present judicial workshops, training and educational programs to assist with this task. The Conference worked with the Pennsylvania State Bar Association, the American Judicature Society, and other interested persons and organizations to bring these educational programs to the judiciary.

The Conference of State Trial Judges is an annual meeting of the presidents of the state bar associations held in cooperation with the Pennsylvania State Bar Association and the American Judicature Society. It is a forum for the exchange of ideas on judicial education and administration of justice.

One of the most important functions of the Conference is to provide an opportunity for Judges to communicate with and sound out residents on issues and problems. Judges were encouraged to bring with them their probation officers since they often make sentencing recommendations in their pre-sentence investigations, Eighty-four such individuals attended the visits. Included in this number are several District Attorneys, Public Defenders and others concerned with learning more about what the Pennsylvania correction system has to offer.

Included in a later section of this report is an analysis of participants and non-participants who responded to a state-wide questionnaire. Reasons for non-participation are examined and recommendations following that section direct participants and non-participants in such surveys in participating in such surveys. An analysis of recommendations, other than those in this program made by Judges is also included in that Section.

THE CAMP HILL S.C.I. VISIT

On October 25, 1971, more than 60 individuals including 42 Judges, visited the Camp Hill facility. Compilation of data for the report on Camp Hill was completed by Pennsylvania State University and was derived from 27 Judges who...
The cumulative results of the questionnaires and tape recordings indicated that those responding felt that the State Correctional Institution at Camp Hill tried to give a false impression of the existing situation. In the opinion of Dr. Henry Burns from Penn State, the population of the institution, vocational training, for example, indicated various programs were a stunning success. In discussing the program with residents at the institution, they seriously questioned how beneficial these programs were to them.

The overall impression of jurists visiting Camp Hill has been termed “guardedly” pleasing. This seems to indicate that structurally and programatically, Camp Hill is better than most prisons in this country.

This material is an abstract of a 175-page research report which was submitted by Dr. Henry Burns as part of the Pennsylvania State University evaluation of the Camp Hill visit.

### Questionnaire

**Question Number One**

The question:

Previous visits to correctional institutions: Circle applicable items.

- a. county b. state c. before becoming judge d. after becoming judge

The results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Before becoming judge</th>
<th>After becoming judge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Before becoming judge</th>
<th>After becoming judge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>State &amp; State</th>
<th>Before becoming judge</th>
<th>After becoming judge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>State &amp; State</th>
<th>Before becoming judge</th>
<th>After becoming judge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Number Two**

**SPECIFIC RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE**

1. All 27 judges who returned questionnaires responded that they had previously visited a prison.
2. On a 1 to 10 scale regarding the Physical Plant itself, 22 judges gave it an 8 rating which indicates they feel the structure is adequate. Some compared it to a military compound and a few were totally discouraged with the entire structure.

**Dining Facilities** - Twenty judges rated this item at 8 or above which indicates they feel this isn’t a problem area. Living Quarters - Eleven judges felt the quarters were sufficient, some felt they were below standards, and the remainder saw the living cell block arrangement as a definite hindrance to rehabilitation.

**Classification** - Ten judges rated this item at 8 or above; however, most felt uncertain since in the short span of time allotted for the visit, observation of recreation was absent.

**Mail Privileges** - Fourteen judges rated this item at 8 or better. Eight left it blank. In review, most felt this category was sufficiently being handled.

**Admission Procedures**

- Physical Plant: None
- Dining Facilities: None
- Living Quarters: 1
- Recreation: None
- Classification: None
- Visiting: None
- Civil Rights: None
- Staff-Inmate Relations: 3
- Work Program: 2
- Basic Education: 2
- Vocational Training: 1
- Medical Care: 2
- Admission Procedures: None
- Pre-Release: 1
- Human Rights: 2

**Alternatives to Incarceration**

- Note: Highest rating = 3
- Nine gave the “small unit regional correctional institution” a rating of 3 or above (1 = high). Three left it blank.
- Seventeen falls in the 4-7 range. Seven rated it in the 8-10 range.
- Eighteen gave “increased use of parole to halfway house” a rating of 3 or above. Five left it blank. Eight fell in the 4-7 range. Only one was in the 8-10 range.
- Twelve rated “increased use of parole to halfway house” at 3 or above. Five left it blank. Eight fell in the 4-7 range. Only one was in the 8-10 range.
- Twelve rated “increased use of parole to halfway house” at 3 or above. Five left it blank. Eight fell in the 4-7 range. Only one was in the 8-10 range.
- Twelve rated “increased use of parole to halfway house” at 3 or above. Five left it blank. Eight fell in the 4-7 range. Only one was in the 8-10 range.
- Twelve rated “increased use of parole to halfway house” at 3 or above. Five left it blank. Eight fell in the 4-7 range. Only one was in the 8-10 range.
Role of Conference

Sixteen rated "education" and eighteen "laboring." Only three chose "lobbying," seven "issuing position statements," and four "other." (These "other" choices are explanatory and will be included in the final report.)

Question #4: (Priority of Alternatives to Incarceration)

| 1. | Highest priority |
| 2. |  |
| 3. |  |
| 4. |  |
| 5. |  |
| 6. |  |
| 7. |  |
| 8. |  |
| 9. |  |
| 10. | Blank |

- small unit regional
- correctional institution
- increased use of probation to halfway house
- increased use of parole to halfway house
- normal parole
- work furlough
- educational furlough
- vocational

The Pittsburgh S.C.I. Visit

The second visit of the Conference was in November 1971 to Pittsburgh State Correctional Institution. The visit was monitored by the University of Pittsburgh who submitted an extensive report. Dr. Monroe Miller of the Department of Psychology was the principle investigator with regard to the Pittsburgh visit.

Questionnaire Results - Judges Data

Table 1 shows the coded responses of the judges with respect to the evaluative summary (section 1) of the questionnaire. The data presented reflect the mean response for all judges such that the greater the magnitude of the response the more favorable the evaluation it reflects. As Table 1 shows, the general results show impressions across a variety of issue areas which are judged less than adequate or neutral. It should be noted that the maximum score possible on these coded scales was the value 5, thus any mean values under 3.0, the neutral point indicate evaluation in an unfavorable area.

Further evaluation of the data suggests very strongly that a negative impression was gained by the judges with respect to most areas of opportunity, morale, etc., of the prison population. In addition, when a comparison is made of the ratings of judges with respect to the counseling and vocational and educational programs, equally negative evaluations occur. In both instances, as indicated in Table 1, the evaluations were significantly below adequate or neutral and inadequate for nearly all items and, in addition, the variability in responses on the part of the judges was extremely low according to nearly all items and, in addition, the variability in responses on the part of the judges was extremely low.

Further evaluation of the data provided by the judges questionnaire can be seen in examination of their responses to the prison problem check list. It should be kept in mind that in this area of the questionnaire, judges were required to check those items which they thought the problem at Western Penitentiary would be, and to respond, again to those individuals that they felt were particular problems. The items felt to be problems in the prison by the judges are presented in Table 2. This reflects the frequency with which the items checked were felt to be existing problems in the prison. As can be seen in Table 2, virtually all items on the check list were included with only a few exceptions, specifically, the use of force in dealing with inmates, excess emphasis on control, lack of understanding of the inmate, and visits being prohibited. A significant proportion of the other items were viewed by a significant number of judges as existing problems in the prison. Most significant were the inadequacy of staff wages, the poor job opportunities for prisoners, understaffing, separation of prisoners from the outside world, low prestige of guards, recidivism, and homogeneity. The items for which the judges felt most serious were those items which were judged as most serious by the judges and it particularly instructive. While a number of items were checked as severe or a few as being most serious problems in the prison, the most frequently checked items have to do with unequal provision of black and white staff and the prison staff not dealing with the cause of crime. These were also suggested as the first part of the questionnaire. Each of these items was significantly judged as a serious problem in the ratings of the judges.

The responses to the judges to other sections of the questionnaire were largely anecdotal in nature and suggest that the data reflected in the above two sections were consistent with other observations of the two characteristics of the prison population.
9. Lack of understanding between guards and prisoners
10. Being a guard has low prestige in the society leading to limited opportunities for hiring
11. Low morale for inmates and lack of trust among prison and staff
12. Low morale for inmates and lack of trust between prison and staff
13. Visits from wife or furlough home prohibited
14. Lack of privacy and no freedom from supervision for inmates
15. Overcrowding
16. Prison doesn’t deal with the cause of crime
17. Prisoners learn criminal behaviors from inmates
18. Prisoners lose opportunities for hiring
19. Recidivism
20. Differences in sentences for similar crimes
21. Loss of dignity, humanity, masculinity and individuality for Inmates
22. Homosexuality

D. Data Problems

The above findings indicate some specific consequences of the visit of the judges. However, a few problems attached to the data should be acknowledged in the conclusions. The first problem is that some constraints were not collected in the questionnaire portion. For example, the time spent in the facility was not noted in the questionnaire. The second problem is the lack of a uniform impression. Some of the judges felt that the visit was extremely useful as an educational effort which might have important consequences for sentencing and case disposition. However, some judges also reported that the information obtained was not attributed directly to the visit even though it appeared to be important.

C. Observational and Interview Data

Detailed presentation of these data are not included since their major thrust is to accentuate the general findings obtained in the questionnaire portion. Most significant among these is the support given by verbal expression to the problems suggested in the prison problem check list and the negative evaluation suggested in the evaluative summary. A variety of worries were expressed about the general dissatisfaction of the prisoners and judges. However, most of the worries were not expressed in the judges and expressed some hope that the visit would be significant in concerning the system of corrections within Pennsylvania.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judges</th>
<th>Staff &amp; Prisoner rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>Vocational Train. Education &amp; Work Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prison check list. Comparison of the judges' responses to the prison problem check list with those of the staff and inmates is presented in Table 5. This suggests certain similarities but more differences, some of which are in highly predictable directions. Generally, recidivism is considered to be a problem in the area of loss of society. For the staff, the problems identified focused upon issues surrounding wages, understaffed, etc. Also included were the areas of understanding between staff and prisoners, low prestige for being a guard, lack of trust in staff, and learning criminal behavior within the institution. These clearly differed in important respects from the prisons. For example, the examination of the inmate questionnaires indicate that the primary problem here was not related to opportunities, prison separation from the outside world, lack of understanding between prisoners and guards, low morale for inmates, difficulty in visits of the inmate and staff, and lack of dealing with the cause of crime.

While the discrepancies noted above cause a less optimistic interpretation of the findings, it is important to note that most of the prisoners were anxious and interested in talking with the judges and expressed some hope that the visit would be significant in concerning the system of corrections within Pennsylvania.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judges</th>
<th>Staff &amp; Inmates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prison wages too low</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much force in dealing with inmates</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low prestige</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of trust between guards and prisoners</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison doesn't deal with the cause of crime</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisoners learn criminal behaviors from inmates</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisoners lose opportunities for hiring</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of dignity, humanity, masculinity and individuality for Inmates</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcrowding</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recidivism</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisoners lose opportunities for hiring</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisoners learn criminal behaviors from inmates</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of dignity, humanity, masculinity and individuality for Inmates</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcrowding</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recidivism</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisoners lose opportunities for hiring</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above findings indicate some specific consequences of the visit of the judges. However, a few problems attached to the data should be acknowledged in the conclusions. The first problem is that some constraints were not collected in the questionnaire portion. The second problem is the lack of a uniform impression. Some of the judges felt that the visit was extremely useful as an educational effort which might have important consequences for sentencing and case disposition. However, some judges also reported that the information obtained was not attributed directly to the visit even though it appeared to be important.
of privileges and up-grading of facilities, such as libraries and living conditions were noted by nearly 30% of the Judges.

Regarding the Judges' opinion on recently emerging offender rights, 46% of the Judges felt that their intentions in sentencing were not being carried out by the facilities of the Bureau of Corrections; 27% felt that services were inadequate and needed expansion and improvement; however, 42% felt that the Bureau of Corrections largely ignored. 

When asked to describe the general philosophy of sentencing with regard to rehabilitation, training and treatment, a majority (46%) of the Judges felt that sentencing had a triple purpose, including the goals of punishment, rehabilitation and prevention of or protection against future criminal activity. However, only 8% felt that the existent legal rights at Dallas were on a too liberal basis. Several Judges noted that while legal services for State inmates were adequate that services for Federal prisoners or those on parole were inadequate. 8% felt that their intentions in sentencing were not being carried out by the facilities of the Bureau of Corrections due to primarily their opinion that rehabilitation program as existing, were inadequate. 23% felt that the evaluation toward release and would be most conducive to carrying out a flexible rehabilitation program. 23% felt that rehabilitation programs are an effective means of reducing recidivism, particularly those offenders who repeat sexual offenses. 23% felt that evaluation toward release would be most conducive to carrying out a flexible rehabilitation program. 

The judges, from their discussions with matrons, assessed the following areas as problematic: a) communication in their role in delivering services; b) Community Treatment Centers; c) Regional prisons, the following responses were indicated: 26% completely agreed with institutional furlough; 45% agreed with the program; 23% were certain that the minimum wage should not be lowered; 90% felt there were no problematic areas or had no opinion on this question. The communication problems identified by the Judges were: a) standardization of furlough procedures and necessity for court approval (19%); and b) suggestion for increase in the number of judges assigned to hear furlough cases. 22% felt that the Judges felt their intentions in sentencing were not being carried out by the facilities of the Bureau of Corrections due to primarily their opinion that rehabilitation program as existing, were inadequate. 8% felt that their intentions were generally being carried out, but their specific recommendations regarding rehabilitation were largely ignored. 31% felt that their intentions were being carried out completely or fairly completely. 23% had no comment on this issue.
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and more opportunity for speaking with staff and inmates (30%). Several felt that visits should be mandatory, that Commonwealth and federal prisons and County prisons should be included in the program and that defined objectives should be built into the visits, including more definitive statements regarding the roles of the Court, prison administration and Bureau of Parole with regard to pre-release and furlough.

THE HUNTINGDON S.C.I. VISIT

On October 13, 1972 Pennsylvania County Judges visited and reviewed the personnel, physical and program components of Huntingdon State Correctional Institution. Based on the statistical data of the questionnaire as well as the tape recorded information collected during the entire visit day the following information and interpretation of the material is available:

The Judges consensus of opinion of the adequacy of the physical living conditions: 46% of the fifteen (15) participants felt the overall living conditions related to sleeping, dining, recreation, were excellent. An 8% indicated in reporting their responses that the physical conditions offered in behalf of the inmates were adequate with minimal improvements.

The remaining portion of the Judges (8%) saw the living conditions as being good while none indicated the standards as being poor. In general it appears the large majority of the individuals who responded felt the physical standards established by the facility were rated as less than adequate.

Another area of examination was the question of cottage programs for a limited portion of the population who were considered minimal risk male offenders serving five (5) years or less who will be served in the planned regional correctional facilities. Of the fifteen (15) respondents to this question 33% indicated positively that the concept of a cottage concept was applicable and should be implemented. However 33% acknowledged that the concept was workable but one should vary according to prison environments.

A smaller portion of the Judges, 7% who replied indicated negatively the feasibility of the concept while an equal amount 7% responded that they were unfamiliar with the concept of a cottage program in a regional correctional facility.

An inquiry regarding the interest of variations in administrative regulations which govern inmates rights and privileges in Huntingdon compared to other State Correctional Facilities serving only male offenders yielded the following.

There appeared to be an even distribution of responses to this question that 20% of the respondents felt there were variations in administrative regulations at Huntingdon SCI as opposed to other facilities. However 13% also answered yes to the question by building the extent of variations in regulations. Another 20% who replied felt there were no noteworthy variations in regulations of this facility compared to others.

The majority of the Judges answering this question i.e. 28% also felt there were no variations but added reserved comment that 73% of them felt that there was not an adequate amount of time to develop any in-depth understanding of the quality of the inmates and personnel during the visit.

Based on comments and inmates 77% of the respondents replied that the major complaint regarding this program was the long waiting list which existed in being considered for placement.

In regard to the question the response was the 82% of the group and the comments were rather ambiguous in the Judges, Luckily.

The fifth question addressed in this section of the report related to the Judges assessment derived from inmate group discussions was the Judges findings for change at Huntingdon in the Pennsylvania Correctional system.

Money for capital improvements and renovation of the physical plant were considered by 6% as important factors contributing to the resolution of problems verbalized by the inmates. Increased awareness of Judges of uniformity in sentencing and objective sentence review were areas reported by 19% of the respondents as expressed by the inmate withdrawal. An increase in uniformity of the counseling staff, and the establishment of meaningful drug programs were considered by 12% as making a significant change in the current system.

In regard to Community Treatment Centers 40% identified continued training of staff as crucial to successful programming.
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I. Nature and Purpose of the Survey Questionnaire

Between October 1971 and February 1973, the Pennsylvania Conference of Trial Judges sponsored a series of visits by trial judges to various State Correctional Institutions. One hundred ninety-two (192) judges from the Commonwealth, representing 47.7 per cent of the total, participated in the visit program. Of these, one hundred twenty-four (124) judges made a total of two hundred eleven (211) visits. In addition, eighty-four (84) other court related personnel made ninety-four (94) visits during this program. These persons are not included in this study.

The survey was initially conceived as a means of evaluating these visits as perceived by the participating judges. As the project was discussed with various officials of the Pennsylvania Conference of Trial Judges, it was suggested that the scope of the survey be broadened to include other areas of timely concern to the judiciary and/or the Bureau of Corrections. This unit, then, has three major sections, each based entirely on the responses of judges to the survey questionnaire, including some comments by the respondents.

The first section discusses the relationship between demographic characteristics of the respondent judges, both those who did and those who did not participate in the SCI program, and the opinions of the SCI respondents to certain demographic characteristics. The second section of the survey analyses the effectiveness of the SCI visit program and also reports the suggestions of the respondents for similar programs in the future. An important component of this evaluation is the measure of perceived visit effectiveness by respondents with multiple visits as opposed to those with a single SCI visit. The third section is a tabulation and interpretation of the respondent judges' opinions to certain demographic characteristics.

A. Sex

All but one (1) of the one hundred ten (110) respondents were male. The number of female trial judges in Pennsylvania was at that time (1971) a very small proportion of the population. Women, who accounted for 3.6 per cent of the total of judges in the Commonwealth, accounted for only 0.9 per cent of the respondents. Because of the under-representation of female judges (only 10%) and because experience was not determined to be significant for purposes of this study, the remainder of the data is the breakdown by sex.

B. By County

The breakdowns by Class of county indicates that the number of respondents by Class is fairly consistent with the population of the Commonwealth by Class. Approximately one-third (1/3) of the respondents were from 1st, 2nd, and 2nd Class counties, which counties account for about one-third (1/3) of the population. The rest were from 3rd and 4th Class counties and for counties of the 5th through 8th classes. In practical terms, this means that there are no apparent differences between the data collected by the survey and the opinions expressed on it skewed toward either urban or rural population areas.

C. Age

The age distribution of the respondents appears to be representative with 48.2 per cent of all participants reporting age between 45 years and 54 years. The remainder of the age distribution resembled a normal curve with a slight over-representation of judges 65 years of age and older among the respondents who participated in the visit program. Table 1 lists the age distribution of the respondents.

### Table 1: Ages of Respondents by Participation in SCI Visits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ages of Respondents</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>% Total</th>
<th>Non-Participants</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>% Total</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 and under</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 and over</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Total Years on Bench

Table 2 indicates that more than 70 per cent of the respondents have served on the bench less than ten (10) years.

A comparison of the participants with the non-participants indicates that a slightly higher percentage of the participants (74.2%) had served less than ten (10) years than the non-participant respondents (67.5%). This does not appear to be a significant difference and both groups can be considered to be "matched" in this area.

The fact that the percentage of respondents who had served five (5) years or less on the bench and 27.3 per cent had from five (5) to nine (9) years of experience leads to some speculation. It may be inferred that judges with a single term are more able or more willing to participate in the SCI visit program. However, lacking any comparative data in this respect, the only thing which can be said is that judges with less experience on the bench are more likely to answer mailed questionnaires.

Table 2: Total Years on Bench

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years on Bench</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9 years</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14 years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 years and over</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Law Practice Prior to Judicial Service

The respondents were divided between those respondents who have practiced by years of law practice prior to serving on the judiciary. This indicates a good deal more pre-judicial legal experience with 69.3 per cent having ten (10) years of experience and more than 42.7 per cent having twenty (20) years or more of pre-judicial legal experience. In response to survey question 6, less than 20 per cent of the respondents reported that they were primarily engaged in the practice of criminal law prior.
of visitations would benefit both the judiciary and the various correctional facilities. With more and more public concern and interest being focused on community oriented programs, it would appear that a program of visitations to County prisons, community treatment centers, and regional jails would be valuable.

### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Visits to Non-SCI Program Institutions, etc.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Visits (in 100s)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Participants</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Visits</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCI Visits by Institution</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCI</td>
<td>89.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Hill SCI</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munsey SCI</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15Rockview SCI</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntingdon SCI</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graterford SCI</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the forty (40) respondents who did not participate in the SCI visit program, 88 per cent reported that they felt the visit program was worthwhile, while 12 per cent did not. The majority of respondents (67%) felt the visits were of moderate value, four (4) respondents (5.7%) reported they were of little value, and two (2) respondents (2.9%) felt they were of no value. It is noted that this question does not appear to be one of the major criteria upon which participating judges based their response to the question. It does appear that there was some "net gain" in the program and the dealings with the SCI's. Pittsburgh SCI's and the Munsey SCI's. Whether this is because of the unique characteristics of the populations of these institutions or because of other variables (e.g., location, visit date) cannot be determined.

### Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To What Extent Do You Agree with the Statement that Visits to State Correctional Institutions are an Important Part of the Professional Development of the Judiciary?</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Participants</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Agree Completely</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Agree with Reservations</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Disagree completely</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*(Total)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A suggested area of follow-up in this regard is a study to determine in what way the visits had been valuable and what factors the respondent judges used in their determination. It could be of some benefit to include a study on the sentencing procedures of judges as part of a larger survey of sentencing practices throughout the Commonwealth. Another area that would be the most realistic would be studies of the program and the policies and procedures of the Bureau of Correction.

Survey question #27 asked to what extent the SCI visits increase the participating judges' knowledge of SCI procedures. Thirty-four (34), or 48.6%, of the respondents felt there was considerable increase, thirty-two (32), or 45.7%, felt there was little increase. One per cent felt that there was no increase.

In the light of the central importance the judges play in the criminal justice system, and because of their need to make informed decisions in sentencing, this increase in knowledge is important because it is of the judges to the SCI's. It is noted that it is probably not in the judges' agreement with, opposition to, or feelings about SCI procedures; it merely reports the increase of knowledge.

### Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect did your participation in the Total Judges visit have on your impressions of the programs and policies of the Bureau of Correction?</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Visits reinforced positive impressions or changed impression procedure to positive</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Visits reinforced negative impressions or changed impressions from positive to negative</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. No change in either positive or negative impressions</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Both positive and negative impressions were reinforced. 2%  
5. No response

Survey question #28 attempted to measure changes in attitudes of the judges as a result of the SCI visits. Table 7 indicates the effect the judges expected the visits to have on the judges' impressions of the programs and policies of the Bureau of Correction. While it is difficult to determine the specific criteria upon which participating judges based their responses to this question, it does appear that there was some "net gain" in the program and the dealings with the SCI's. As it becomes more evident that some problems in the criminal justice system can most effectively be dealt with through joint action among various agencies, SCI's should appear to have more positive impressions by those in one segment of the system as a desirable prerequisite for well planned joint action.

It might also appear that the respondent judges who participated in the visit program feel that the program has helped their sentencing process, has increased their knowledge of SCI's, and has tended to leave them with better impressions of the policies and programs of the Bureau of Correction than previously held.

Survey questions #21, #22, #23, and #25 explore the respondents' opinions in future judicial visit programs. More than half of the respondents feel that they should be held without any other activity during the visit, with those who made the visits expressing this opinion to a much higher degree than the non-participants. It could be significant that 63 per cent of the participants desired visits without any other activity while only 35 per cent of the non-participant respondents expressed such an opinion. This could be a function of the program of visits already conducted and should be weighed in this way.

Almost 80 per cent of the respondents feel that the visit day should be assumed because of the hurried schedules of many of the judges and based upon the schedule used for this SCI visit program. It is one of the ways in which the SCI program was conducted and possibly with the help of the Pennsylvania Conference on Sentencing and the General Court of Pennsylvania Conference.

Survey question #23 examines the judges' opinions on the type of invitations to be extended in future SCI visit programs. Over half favored the present method, i.e., no geographic limitations. More than one-fourth (1/4) favored visits by judges from the same section of the state.

The responses to question #25 expresses the overwhelming opinion of judges that the visits be kept on a voluntary basis, as is presently the case. Eighty-eight (88) respondents (90%) felt visits should be held voluntarily, twenty (20), or 2%, felt the Supreme Court might mandate them, and one (1), or 1%, felt that legislation should require such visits.

In light of the fact that so many of the non-participant judges reported they were unable to make visits because of voluntary, or 28.4%, they are generally in agreement with the format used during this SCI visit program.
To what extent do you support the current Bureau of Corrections furlough program?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Part.</th>
<th>Non-Part.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Strongly support</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Support with reservations</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Opposed to program</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Strongly opposed to program</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 110 100% 70 40

When queried regarding their opinions on the need for development of additional alternatives, respondent judges indicated a high degree of interest in such alternative programs. Question #33 indicates that almost 70 per cent of the respondents favored a program of direct commitment to the planned State Regional Correctional Facilities (Table 10). Similarly, nearly 70 per cent of the respondents favored the sentencing code to allow the sentencing judge greater flexibility (Table 11). From the responses to Question #32, it is not clear what specific changes in the sentencing code are advocated by the judges. Because such a significant portion of them express the opinion that it should be changed, this appears to be an appropriate area for follow-up investigation.

Restructuring the sentencing code to allow the sentencing judge greater flexibility?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Part.</th>
<th>Non-Part.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Yes</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 110 100% 70 40

Do you favor the abdication of the minimum sentence?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Part.</th>
<th>Non-Part.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Strongly favor abdication</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Favor abdication with reservations</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Oppose abdication</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Strongly oppose abdication</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Other (specify)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. No response</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you favor the use of advocates, ombudsmen or similar positions in the correctional system?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Part.</th>
<th>Non-Part.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Strongly favor</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Favor with reservations</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Opposed to program</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Strongly Opposed</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. No Response</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another area of joint interest based upon the data in Table 14 is the respondents favor for direct commitment to the Bureau of Corrections Community Treatment Centers. 60 per cent favor such commitments, while less than 40 per cent are not in favor.

Questions #36 and #37 relate to the Counties’ handling of detentioners. Table 15 indicates that 46 per cent of the judges feel their counties have not given consideration to such plans, or, at least, have not developed concrete plans. 43 per cent report that their counties have developed plans or initiated programs to deal with the light of your Judicial Combin.,.d

Table 16

Table 17

Table 18

To what extent has your court, the commissions or prison board, developed plans or programs for detentioners?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Part.</th>
<th>Non-Part.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. County should continue present methods of handling detentioners</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. County should focus more attention and effort on detentioners than at present</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. State should take over custody of detentioners</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Jails should become state operated facilities</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Other (specify)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. No response</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As with other questions, Table 18 shows a significant difference in opinion regarding the status of detentioners, again appears to be an area where joint action by the Bureau of Correction, the various counties, and the judiciary would serve to benefit such.

Table 19

Table 20

Table 21

Table 22

Table 23

Table 24

Table 25

Table 26

Table 27
Table 19
The 1968 Task Force on Corrections recommend the creation of a cabinet level Department of Corrections which would place the field service control and coordination of the Board of Probation and Parole under the jurisdiction of the new department.

Do you favor the above recommendations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total %</th>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Non-Part</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Yes</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. No Response</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VISITATION REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

All of the conclusions and recommendations drawn from the previously presented data are also supported by the more specific findings which derive from the visits. Conclusions are made on the basis of combined data from the judges questionnaires in addition to similar data collected from residents and staff of the various institutions. The recommendations are the "final solutions" by any means necessary to bring about the needed improvement and to carry the information toward reform and improvement in the area addressed. Neither are conclusions and recommendations intended to be critical of the present administration of the Board of Corrections or the Judiciary. Both groups were invited to study this report and were fully cooperative in implementing it as a whole. The Board of Corrections welcomed the opportunity to work with the Judges and "sell" their programs. As was noted, there was a progressive support of Bureau programs as the visitation program went along, particularly among those who made more than one visit. Each conclusion and recommendation is valid to the extent that objective data and subjective observation was combined and analyzed from a one day visit. Obviously the recommendations would carry more validity as the proportion of time spent at each location varied. At this beginning points, however, recommendations and conclusions are limited to the primary use of the Criminal Justice field, including institutions.

THE GOVERNOR

1. The Governor is requested to review the visitation report and to communicate it to the agencies or bodies appropriate to the recommendation(s) with a request that the agency draw a feasibility plan and timetable for implementation of the recommendation(s).

2. Priority should be given to establishment and expanded use of the Governor's Council on Corrections as a communication vehicle for resolving procedural and program problems. The composition of the council should be expanded to include offenders and the resolutions of the committee should be widely circulated to the participating institutions.

THE JUDICIARY

1. The Superior Court should designate a specific number of days throughout the year to be utilized for professional development and attendance at the judges visitation observation. The recommendation number eight, one day per year, is the minimum number to be allocated.

2. It is recommended that Standard 7.24 of the Court's Task Force Report "NOT be adopted in Pennsylvania at this time. Professional development must remain voluntary at least until there is opportunity to test the effectiveness of programs and the level of attendance they generate after judges have been trained on the programs. It is possible that some judges and conclusion number one are not satisfactory, then the Standard (7.24) should be fully implemented. The Standard reads:"

3. The existing correctional visitation program of the Pennsylvania Conference of State Trial Judges should be continued and expanded with adequate Governor's Justice Commission and legislative appropriation support for best effectiveness. The visitation programs on specialized subject matter. The visitation program should include visits to Community Treatment Centers, Regional Prisons, Federal Prisons, and a variety of alternative community based programs.

4. Visitations programs from county jails should be encouraged by the Supreme Court of a Judicial District level.

5. It is recommended that Standard 7.25 of the Court's Task Force Report of the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals be adopted. The Standard reads:

6. The existing correctional visitation program of the Pennsylvania Conference of State Trial Judges should be formalized in Pennsylvania and should be attended immediately before or after the judge first takes office. Attendance at National orientation programs should be encouraged upon implementation of recommendation number five.

7. It is recommended that a comprehensive plan of judicial orientation, sabbatical leave, continuing education and professional development be created with planning for adequate funding for appropriate programs and an adventurous and maintenance. The Plan should designate a central authority, such as a State Judicial college to implement this plan and to implement jointly with the Pennsylvania Conference of State Trial Judges and the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania.

8. It is recommended that Standard 7.55 of the Court’s Task Force Report of the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals be implemented fully in Pennsylvania. The Standard reads: "Each State should publish periodically — and not less than quarterly — a newsletter with information from the Chief Justice, the Court Administrator, correctional authorities, and other interested parties. This newsletter should include articles of interest to judges, references to relevant agency reports, "Judicial and correctional fields, and citations of important appellate and trial court decisions." Implementation of this recommendation is of such crucial since it comes so quickly, it is difficult for most trial judges to stay on top of the ever changing situation without an organized vehicle for doing so. The Bureau of Corrections

1. Priority should be given to upgrading the quality and quantity of Bureau Training programs in the areas of human behavior, social environment, sub-cultures and communications skills. There is a need to focus on the quality of communication between staff and administration; residents and staff; and administration and resident.

2. It is recommended that the permanent position of Resident Advocate be created. The position should be filled by persons who have an extensive background in community corrections and who should be directly responsible to the Attorney General. Such an office would contribute significantly in facilitating communication between residents and staff.

3. It is recommended that the research capacity of the Bureau be considerably upgraded and so designed that it is directly useful in program development. The recommendation is to implement this recommendation by the appointment of a full time professional or bodies charged with research.

4. Regularized communication, via a newsletter should be established with all trail judges. This vehicle should be utilized to report research, procedures and regulation changes; program clarification and introduction; and as a means of soliciting expanded input about upgrading the system form the judiciary. It is possible, implementation of this recommendation should be coordinated or joined with judiciaty recommendation 8.

5. Priority should be given to the creation and upgrading of the quantity and quality of institutional recreational and basic educational opportunities. Expanded use should be made of existing recreational facilities.

6. Vocational educational opportunities should be expanded and made realistic in line with existing community standards. The implementation of this recommendation should be coordinated with the establishment of a residential vocational school to serve the Bureau population.

7. The Bureau should make a commitment to the program of training, which is being supported.

8. Furlough and Work/Education release programs should be expanded with the exception of lifers. The refinement of criteria and procedure for these programs should continue to be developed with judicial input and with participation from the Conference on the General Bureau and the Bureau.

9. The Community Treatment Service of the Bureau should be expanded in conjunction with the recommendations of the Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals.

10. The length of time necessary for classification upon arrival at a diagnostic center should be reduced by one half.

11. The Regionalization concept of the Bureau of Corrections should be continued including the development of small regional institutional complexes. This change should allow for better programming of resident placements. The small residential program should be the primary architectural mode of the facilities. Consideration should be given to modular design and new low programmatic flexibility. In preparation for regional facility development, planning consideration should be given to development of a community education plan about the facility and its purpose: closer planning with the counties the facilities will serve to define their needs and refining of the mission of the facility on the programs and services. The recommendation should consider the implementation of a vocational program of the Bureau.
APPENDIX

1. Many of the deficiencies and consequent recommendations made by the visiting judges are directly linked to the unavailability of sufficient appropriations to begin and maintain the range of programs needed in the correctional system to provide a valid rehabilitative process. It is recommended that the full request of the Bureau of Corrections for appropriations be enacted in order to implement the recommendations of this report and to fund the operation of other programs identified and established by the Bureau.

2. It is recommended that the legislation and appropriations required be strengthened and implement other recommendations in this report, particularly those pertaining to the judges' role in rehabilitation efforts.

3. It is recommended that priority consideration be given to legislation recognizing the administration and delivery of correctional services in Pennsylvania including the creation of a cabinet level department and unification of all correctional services.

4. Legislation allowing for direct commitment to Regional Correctional facilities and to alternative community based programs be enacted.

5. It is recommended that local jurisdiction of county jails, multi-county jails, and detention centers be retained. However, consideration should be given to strengthening the State's role in the setting and enforcement of standards and goals for those facilities. Direct financial assistance from State appropriations should be available to counties in meeting standards and goals.

APPENDIX

Pennsylvania State Trial Judges Visitation Camp Hill, Pennsylvania October 25, 1971

It is not necessary to identify yourself, however, if you wish to do so, please feel free to sign your name above.

1. Previous visits to correctional institutions: Circle applicable items.
   - a. county
   - b. state
   - c. before becoming judge
   - d. after becoming judge

2. Rate the following items on a scale of 1-5, with 5 indicating the item to be favorable. In arriving at the number, consider each item in terms of its worth to the overall goals of criminal justice; i.e., protecting the public and correcting the offender. Keep in mind that perhaps more than 99 percent of these offenders will sooner or later be released to the free community. In rating, evaluate each item in terms of the adequacy of that item in contributing to the individual's potential success in the open community after the prison experience.
   - a. Physical Rights
   - b. Doping Facilities
   - c. Living Quarters
   - d. Recreation
   - e. Classification
   - f. Vocational Training
   - g. Mail Privileges
   - h. Medical Care
   - i. Staff-Inmate Relations
   - j. Admission Procedures
   - k. Work Program
   - l. Basic Education
   - m. Human Rights

3. Of the above, do you feel any elements could be identified as being a hindrance (indigities, isolation, "dehumanizing" treatment, etc.) to the individual in his later adjustment to society if released? If so, circle the entire item.

4. If you are in agreement that more alternatives should be developed instead of incarceration, then your opinion is needed as to which direction . . . Indicate your choice from highest to lowest priority with number "1" for highest priority.
   - a. small unit regional correctional Institution
   - b. education, basic, high school, college
   - c. vocational (skills) training institution
   - d. work furlough
   - e. educational furlough
   - f. parole

5. To the best of your knowledge, do the vocational (skills) training offered prepare inmates for job demands in your particular county? Yes No

If you do not agree with the above, please explain that such training is inadequate, how and by whom can it be improved and any other comments you wish.

INMATE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What is your assessment of the physical living conditions (sleeping, dining, recreation) at Dallas? How do they aid or impede goals of your rehabilitation?

2. In your opinion do the judges who participated in your discussion group now have a better understanding of living conditions and the effectiveness (or lack of) of incarceration?

3. What is your assessment of the adequacy of medical services at Dallas? Please comment.

4. What is your assessment of the adequacy, availability, opportunity, staff and/or motivation for programs? Please comment.

5. Counseling:
   - a. Educational
   - b. Vocational Training:

6. What are your priorities for change (if any) in the prison system? e.g., rehabilitation and treatment programs, legal aids; mail and visiting privileges; furlough, community treatment and/or parole release procedures.

7. Do you feel the humane philosophy expressed by officials of this facility is carried out by staff including correctional officers? If not, why not?

8. Do you feel the judge's visit improves the understanding of problems involved in rehabilitation efforts? Should such visits be required by law? If so, how frequently?

9. Did you feel the inmates comprising your discussion group were representative of the variety of viewpoints which are expressed in the general population? Were these viewpoints accurately and/or directly expressed?

10. What is your opinion of the effect (if any) that the judges who participated in your discussion group now have on prison officials?


State Conference of Trial Judges

Pennsylvania S.C.I. Visit - January 14, 1972

INMATE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What is your assessment of the physical living conditions (sleeping, dining, recreation) at Dallas? How do they aid or impede goals of your rehabilitation?

2. In your opinion do the judges who participated in your discussion group now have a better understanding of living conditions and the effectiveness (or lack of) of incarceration?

3. What is your assessment of the adequacy of medical services at Dallas? Please comment.

4. What is your assessment of the adequacy, availability, opportunity, staff and/or motivation for programs? Please comment.

5. Counseling:
   - a. Educational
   - b. Vocational Training:

6. What are your priorities for change (if any) in the prison system? e.g., rehabilitation and treatment programs, legal aids; mail and visiting privileges; furlough, community treatment and/or parole release procedures.

7. Do you feel the humane philosophy expressed by officials of this facility is carried out by staff including correctional officers? If not, why not?

8. Do you feel the judge's visit improves the understanding of problems involved in rehabilitation efforts? Should such visits be required by law? If so, how frequently?

9. Did you feel the inmates comprising your discussion group were representative of the variety of viewpoints which are expressed in the general population? Were these viewpoints accurately and/or directly expressed?

10. What is your opinion of the effect (if any) that the judges' visits to prisons have on prison officials?

1. What is your assessment of the adequacy of physical living conditions (sleeping, dining, recreation) in your tour area?
2. What advantages or disadvantages do you perceive in Muncy’s cottage system (versus cellblocks in the other six S.C.I.s) for treatment and rehabilitation?
3. Do you see the cottage treatment and living concept as applicable for the small population, minimal risk, male offenders serving 5 years or less who will be served by the planned Regional Correctional facilities?
4. Do you recognize any variation in administrative regulations governing the wide variety of inmate rights and privileges at Muncy as compared to other SCI’s you have visited and which serve only male offenders? If you have not visited another S.C.I. in the past 12 months, please note this.
5. Based on your discussions and the presentations by Institutional administrative and treatment staff, matrons and inmates, do you conclude that programs such as counseling, education, furnishing, vocational training, in-service training, community and furnishing, are available in sufficient quantity and quality to be significantly meaningful in the delivery of correctional services? Comment specifically with regard to any program(s).
6. What do you assess, from inmate group discussion to be their priority areas for change at Muncy and in the Pennsylvania Correctional system? List in order of priority.
7. From your discussions with matrons, what areas do you assess as problematic in the role in delivering services? (e.g., level of training, communication to and from inmates and/or administration; working conditions; understanding or implementing the “Treatment Oriented Philosophy” of the Bureau; etc.) Comment specifically with suggested resolution.
8. A) In line with the concept of treating the offender in the community and development of small Regional Correctional facilities, please express your opinion of each of the following listed programs by checking (_) one category in each column.

| Institutional Furlough Community Treatment Centers Regional Prisons |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. Completely agree    | 2. Agree with Reservation |
| 3. Uncertain - Neutral  | 4. Serious Reservations |
| 5. Disagree Compl Eleanor E. May, Corrections Director, (specify) |

B) If any of your checks fall in lines 2 through 6, please note your reason for or area of reservation, disagreement or lack of clarity.

C) Specifically list suggested solutions which the Bureau of Corrections can implement to resolve your concerns listed in your questionnaire.

9. What areas for in-service training do you see as priority ones for Bureau personnel, e.g., 1) dynamics of human behavior; 2) security/self-defense; 3) relationship and communication skills; etc. Be specific.
10. Should more use be made of private sector resources such as consultants, universities, research and private industry or should this capacity be expanded within the Bureau or eliminated?
11. Would you support or oppose the following: (Check (_) the appropriate column)
   A) Residential and day care center at Muncy for children of inmates to include a training component for inmates to be trained in running centers.
   B) Legislation requiring judges to visit S.C.I.’s on a regular basis.
   C) Transfer of all juveniles to the Department of Welfare, (male and female).
   D) “Co-ed” Regional Prisons and Community Treatment Centers
   E) Inclusion of the Parole Board under Corrections to create a continuum of services and prevent duplicity of services.
   F) Make corrections a cabinet level (Secretary) Position as recommended by the Legislative Task force on corrections.

Support: Oppose: Uncertain

12. Please add your comments and suggestions for future visits and programs or topics you would like to observe, discuss or see explored.

Survey of Pennsylvania State Conference of Trial Judges

Frequently members of the judiciary have expressed opinions on various aspects of Criminal Justice. No systematic approach to these various questions has been attempted, however, so that only isolated opinions are available. In an attempt to determine judicial thinking on matters of importance, we are asking that you list below any areas of concern which you feel would be the proper subject of a questionnaire to be distributed to all trial judges. List as many subjects as you wish. When all the responses have been received, those questions which are raised frequently will be incorporated into a questionnaire. Thank you for your cooperation in the completion of this questionnaire and for any suggestions you may offer.

Return within 5 days to:

Judges Project - Center for the Study of Crime Prevention and Treatment
Marywood College School of Social Work
2300 Adams Avenue
Scranton, Pennsylvania 18509

Check all appropriate items.
1. CLASS OF COUNTY
   A. 1. Under 35 years
   B. 30-39
   C. 40-44
   D. 45-49
   E. 50-54
   F. 55-59
   G. 60-64
   H. 65 & over
   I. 3. Male
   J. Female

2. AGES
   A. Total Years Served on Bench:
   B. Prior to becoming Judge
   C. Prior to Elevation to the Bench

3. SEX
   A. 1. Male
   B. 2. Female

4. Total Years Served on Bench:
   A. Less than 5
   B. 5-9
   C. 10-14
   D. 15-19
   E. 20-24
   F. 25 & over

5. Number of Years You Practiced Law

6. Held no opinion

7. Prior to becoming Judge
   A. Less than 5
   B. 5-9
   C. 10-14
   D. 15-19
   E. 20-24
   F. 25 & over

8. Prior to Elevation to the Bench, Were you Primarily Engaged in the Practice of Criminal Law?
   A. Yes
   B. No

9. Which of the Following Public Positions have You Held? Check all applicable positions.
   A. District, Asst. or D.A.
   B. Municipal Office
   C. County Office (other than D.A. or Asst. D.A.)
   D. Appointive, Salaries Public Office
   E. Other (specify)

10. Held no public position

11. Since recognized a Judge How Frequently Have You Visited the Following?
    A. SCI's
    B. Counties
    C. Other Institutions
    D. Regional Prisons
    E. Community Treatment Centers
    F. Other (specify)


13. TOTAL SCI VISITED 1971-73
   A. 1
   B. 2
   C. 3
   D. 4
   E. 5
   F. 6
   G. 7
   H. 8
   I. 9
   J. 10 or more

14. Should be required by the single most important reason for not participating
   A. Not applicable
   B. Conflict of spurt business
   C. Conflict of personal schedule
   D. No conflicts; preferred not to attend
   E. Do not believe visits are of any value

15. If you participated in the 1971-73 program sponsored by Pa. Conference of State Trial Judges
   A. Yes
   B. No

16. What SCi visits SHOULD BE CONDUCTED?
    A. Without any other activity planned during the visit
    B. In conjunction with a sentencing conference
    C. Should not be conducted
    D. Other (specify)

17. WHAT SHOULDBE THE DURATION OF SCI VISITS?
    A. One day
    B. Two day
    C. Three days
    D. Four days
    E. Longer than five days

18. WHAT SHOULD BE THE BASIS ON WHICH THE JUDICIARY ARE INVITED TO SCI VISIT?
    A. Judges presiding in counties of similar class
    B. Judges presiding in the same section of the state
    C. No geographic limitations
    D. Other (specify)

19. DO YOU AGREE WITH THE STATEMENT THAT VISITS TO STATE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS ARE AN IMPORTANT PART OF THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE JUDICIARY?
    A. Agree completely
    B. Agree with reservations
    C. Disagree with reservations
    D. Disagree completely

20. TO WHAT EXTENT DO YOU AGREE WITH THE STATEMENT THAT VISITS TO STATE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS SHOULD BE ARRANGED?
    A. On a completely voluntary basis
    B. Only required by Pa. Supreme Court Rule
    C. Should be mandated by legislation
    D. Other (specify)

21. IF YOU ARE OPPOSED TO VISITS TO SCI's, WHY?
    A. Not applicable

22. WHICH VALUE HAVE THE SCI VISITS HAD FOR YOU IN YOUR SENTENCING PROCEDURE?
    A. Have not participated in SCI visits
    B. Have been of considerable value
    C. Other (specify)
| 3. Have been of moderate value |
| 4. Have been of little value |
| 5. Have been of no value |

27. TO WHAT EXTENT DID THE SCI VISITS INCREASE YOUR KNOWLEDGE OF SCI PROCEDURES?

| 1. Did not participate |
| 2. Considerably |
| 3. Moderately |
| 4. Very little |
| 5. Not at all |

28. WHAT EXTENT DID YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THE TRIAL JUDGES VISITS HAVE ON YOUR IMPRESSIONS OF THE PROGRAMS AND POLICIES OF THE BUREAU OF CORRECTIONS?

| 1. I did not participate in the visits |
| 2. Visits reinforced previous positive impressions |
| 3. Visits reinforced previous negative impressions |
| 4. Visits did not change previous positive impressions |
| 5. Visits changed previous negative impressions |
| 6. Visits changed impression from positive to negative |
| 7. Visits changed impression from negative to positive |

29. TO WHAT EXTENT DO YOU SUPPORT THE CURRENT BUREAU OF CORRECTIONS FURLOUGH PROGRAM?

| 1. Strongly support |
| 2. Support with reservations |
| 3. Opposed to program |
| 4. Strongly opposed to program |
| 5. Other (specify) |

30. TO WHAT EXTENT DO YOU FAVOR EXPANDING THE FURLOUGH AND COMMUNITY TREATMENT PROGRAM TO INCLUDE PERSONS UNDER LIFE SENTENCE?

| 1. Strongly favor |
| 2. Favor with reservations |
| 3. Opposed |
| 4. Strongly opposed |
| 5. Other (specify) |

IN THE LIGHT OF YOUR JUDICIAL EXPERIENCE, DO YOU SEE THE NEED FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF ADDITIONAL ALTERNATIVES SUCH AS:

31. Direct commitment to the planned State Regional Correctional facilities. 1. Yes ___ 2. No ___ 32. Restructuring of the sentencing code to allow the sentencing judge greater flexibility. 1. Yes ___ 2. No ___ 33. Do you favor the abolition of the minimum sentence?

| 1. Strongly favor abolition |
| 2. Favor abolition with reservations |
| 3. Oppose abolition |
| 4. Strongly oppose abolition |
| 5. Other (specify) |

34. Do you favor the use of advocates, ombudsmen or similar positions in the correctional system?

| 1. Strongly favor |
| 2. Favor with reservations |
| 3. Opposed |
| 4. Strongly opposed |
| 5. Other (specify) |

35. Direct commitment to the Bureau of Corrections Community Treatment Center. 1. Yes ___ 2. No ___

36. TO WHAT EXTENT HAS YOUR COURT, THE COMMISSIONS OR PRISON BOARD, DEVELOPED PLANS OR PROGRAMS FOR DETENTION?

| 1. Have not given any consideration to such plans |
| 2. Have considered plans/programs but have not developed anything concrete |
| 3. We have developed plans |
| 4. Have initiated programs |

37. WHAT DO YOU THINK THE ROLE OF THE COURT SHOULD BE WITH REGARD TO DETENTIONERS WHEN REGIONAL PRISONS ARE OPENED?

| 1. County should continue present methods of handling detentioners |
| 2. County should focus more attention and effort on detentioner than at present |
| 3. State should take over custody of detentioners |
| 4. Jails should become state operated |
| 5. Other (specify) |

THE FOLLOWING THREE (3) QUESTIONS ARE RELATED TO YOUR USE OF THE PRE-SENTENCE INVESTIGATION. PLEASE DO NOT LIMIT YOUR RESPONSE TO THE CHECKMARKS. YOUR COMMENTS CONCERNING YOUR REASONS FOR USING OR NOT USING IT WILL LEAD TO A BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF THE VALUE OR LIMITATIONS OF THIS PROCE-DURE.

38. How frequently do you order your County Probation Office to conduct a pre-sentence investigation for felons?

| 1. Order it in all cases of felony |
| 2. Order it on a basis |
| 3. Order it only in unusual situations |
| 4. Rarely order it |
| 5. Never order it |

39. HOW FREQUENTLY DO YOU ORDER YOUR COUNTY PROBATION OFFICE TO CONDUCT A PRE-SENTENCE INVESTIGATION ON MISDEMEANANTS?

| 1. Order it in all cases of misdemeanor |
| 2. Order it on a basis |
| 3. Order it only in unusual situations |
| 4. Rarely order it |
| 5. Never order it |

40. IF YOU DO NOT ORDER PRE-SENTENCE INVESTIGATIONS FOR FELONS, INDICATE THE SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT REASON WHY YOU DO NOT ORDER THE INVESTIGATION. CHECK ONE ONLY.

| 1. Order in all cases of felony |
| 2. Order on a basis |
| 3. Order only in unusual situations |
| 4. Rarely order it |
| 5. Never order it |

State Conference of Trial Judges
State Correctional Institution at Huntingdon
Visit Evaluation

Instructions:
This evaluation form is to be used by association members who visit Huntington S.C.I. on October 13, 1972. DO NOT complete the form until the visit is over. The form is provided now so you may keep these areas in mind during your tour.

The compiled results of this and other visit evaluations will be distributed to association members later this year. Judiciary are not required to identify themselves unless they desire to do so. All non-judiciary personnel completing this should identify themselves, at least by type of work, i.e. parole officer, etc.

Completed evaluation forms should be mailed to:
Judge Richard P. Conaboy
Chairman, Corrections Committee
Pennsylvania Conference of Trial Judges
Lackawanna County Court House
Scranton, Pa. 18503
or
Mr. James F. Melody, Director
Center for the Study of Crime Prevention and Treatment
Marywood College
Scranton, Pa. 18509

1. What is your assessment of the adequacy of physical living conditions (sleeping, dining, recreation) in your tour area?

2. Do you see cottage treatment and living concept as applicable for the small population, minimal risk, male offenders serving 5 years or less who will be served by the planned Regional Correctional facilities?

3. Do you recognize any variation in administrative regulations governing the wide variety of inmate rights and privileges at Huntington as compared to other SCI’s you have visited and which serve only male offenders? If you have not visited another S.C.I. in the past 12 months, please note this.

4. Do you favor your discussions and the presentations by institutional administrative and treatment staff, officers and inmates, do you conclude that programs such as counseling, education, furlough, vocational training, in-service training, community treatment and furlough are available in sufficient quantity and quality to be significantly meaningful in the delivery of correctional services? Comment specifically with regard to any program.

5. What do you assess, from inmate group discussion to be their priority areas for change at Huntington and in the Pennsylvania Correctional system? List in order of priority.

6. From your discussions with officers, what areas do you assess as problematic in their role in delivering services (e.g., level of training, communication to and/or from inmates and/or administration; working conditions; understanding or implementing the “Treaty Oriented Philosophy” of the Bureau; etc.) Comment specifically with suggestions for resolution.

7. A) In line with the concept of treating the offender in the community and development of small Regional Correctional facilities, please express your opinion of each of the following listed programs by checking ( ) one category in each column.

| Institutional Furlohuh Community Regional Location Treatment Centers Prisons |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Completely agree |
| 2. Agree with reservation |
| 3. Uncertain - Neutral |
| 4. Serious reservations |
| 5. Disagree completely |
| 6. Unclear as to meaning and implications |

B) If any of your checks fall in lines 2 through 6, please note your reason for or area of reservation, disagreement or lack of approval in the margin.

C) Specific list suggested solutions which the Bureau of Corrections can implement to resolve your concerns listed in part B above.

8. What areas for in-service training do you see as priority ones for Bureau personnel (e.g., 1) dynamics of human behavior; 2) security self-defense; 3) relationship and communication skills; etc. Be specific.

9. Should more use be made of private sector resources such as consultants, universities, research and private industry or should this capacity be expanded within the Bureau or eliminated?

10. Would you support or oppose the following: (Check ( ) the appropriate column)

- A) Legislation requiring Judges to visit S.C.I.’s on a regular basis.
- B) Transfer of all juveniles to the Department of Welfare, (male and female).
C) "Co-ed" Regional Prisons and Community Treatment Centers.
D) Inclusion of the Parole Board under Corrections to create a continuum of services and prevent duplicity of services.
E) Make corrections a cabinet level (Secretary) position as recommended by the Legislative Task Force on Corrections.

Support  Oppose  Uncertain

11. Please add your comments and suggestions for future visits and programs or topics you would like to observe, discuss or see explored.

State Conference of Trial Judges
Muncy S.C.I. Visit - June 2, 1972

MATRONS QUESTIONNAIRE

1. In your opinion do you feel that you have sufficient communication with M.S.C.I. administration? If no please comment.
2. What is your assessment of the Bureau of Correction's new training program? For example does it offer you the methods and techniques that assist you in your job at the institution.
3. Do you feel educational requirements for Matron positions should be raised? How about salaries? If you see a need for changes in these areas, please comment.
4. What was your impression of the Judges visit to Muncy? If you scheduled the visit, what would you have added or subtracted from the agenda, if anything, to make the visit more worthwhile.
5. Should similar visits continue in the future? If so, how often and who should attend?
6. Do you feel correctional counselors at M.S.C.I. have sufficient educational background for their role as counselors?
7. Do you enjoy working at M.S.C.I. If so, why? If not, why?
8. What is your opinion about the Bureau's Community Treatment Program? How about furlough?
9. Muncy, as you are aware, is unique in structure compared to the Bureau's six other S.C.I.'s, one of the main differences is its small population and its cottage style of living arrangements. In your opinion, should Muncy adopt more security measures like the other institutions or should the other institutions start resembling Muncy's pattern?

State Conference of Trial Judges
Muncy S.C.I. Visit - June 2, 1972

INMATE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What is your assessment of the physical living conditions (sleeping, dining, recreation) at Muncy? How do they aid or hinder the goals of your rehabilitation?
2. In your opinion do the Judges who participated in your discussion group now have a better understanding of living conditions and the effectiveness (or lack of) of incarceration?
3. What is your assessment of the adequacy of medical services at Muncy?
4. What is your opinion of the adequacy and availability of programs such as:
   - Counseling:
   - Education:
   - Vocational Training:
5. What do you feel should be changed within the prison system? For example: living conditions, rehabilitation and treatment programs, legal aid, mail and visiting privileges, furlough, community treatment and/or parole release procedures.
6. Do you feel the human philosophy expressed by officials of this facility is carried out by the staff including correctional officers? If not, why?
7. Do you feel the Judge's visits improve their understanding of problems involved in rehabilitation efforts? Could such visits be required by law? If so, how frequently?
8. Did you feel the inmates comprising your discussion group were representative of the variety of viewpoints which are expressed in the general population?
9. What is your opinion of the effect (if any) that the Judge's visits have on prison officials?
10. What is your main complaint(s) (if any) about the Judge's visit? About Muncy S.C.I.? Be specific.
11. General suggestions about future Judge's visits to prisons. Be specific.