

AN EVALUATION
OF THE
NEW HAMPSHIRE STATE PRISON
"Establishment of Recommended Positions"

GRANT NUMBER

76/77-I-E/A-2105 F03/02; 79-I-A2105 F02

PROJECT PERIOD

February 3, 1978 - June 30, 1979

JAMES CAHILL
Evaluation Specialist

NEW HAMPSHIRE GOVERNOR'S COMMISSION ON CRIME AND DELINQUENCY

February 26, 1979

55286

SUB-GRANTEE New Hampshire State Prison

PROJECT TITLE "Establishment of Recommended Positions"

PROJECT DIRECTOR N. E. Pishon, Deputy Warden

GRANT NUMBER 76/77-I-E/A-2105 F03/02; 79-I-A-2105 F02

GRANT PERIOD February 3, 1978 - June 30, 1979

GRANT BUDGET

<u>Item</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Fed.</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Local</u>
Personnel Services	\$98,134	\$88,319	\$9,815	0
Consultant Services	0	0	0	0
Travel and Subsistence	0	0	0	0
Construction and Renovation	0	0	0	0
Rental	0	0	0	0
All Other	1,000	900	100	0
Indirect Costs	<u>7,118</u>	<u>6,406</u>	<u>712</u>	<u>0</u>
Total Cost	\$106,252	\$95,625	\$10,627	0

PREVIOUS PROJECT HISTORY

<u>Grant Period</u>	<u>Total Funding</u>	<u>Fed.</u>	<u>Percentage State</u>	<u>Local</u>
December 15, 1976 to March 31, 1978	\$84,910	90%	10%	0%

NCJRS

MAR 5 1979

ACQUISITION

EVALUATOR: J. D. Cahill
DATE: February 27, 1979

ADDITIONAL BACKGROUND -- FUNDING HISTORY

1. 76-ED-01-0015 Discretionary

12/15/76 - 3/31/78

LEAA \$76,419
GCCD 8,491
\$84,910

Salaries \$72,892
Benefits 7,289
Equipment 686
Indirect Cost 4,043
\$84,910

2. 76-I-A 2105 F03

2/3/78 - 9/30/78

LEAA \$5,252
GCCD 584
\$5,836

Salaries \$4,736
Benefits 710
Indirect Cost 390
\$5,836

76-I-E 2105 F02

2/3/78 - 8/3/78

LEAA \$42,560
4,729
\$47,289

Salaries \$37,930
Benefits 5,690
Indirect Cost 3,169
Audit; Supplies 500
\$47,289

77-I-E 2105 F02

2/3/78 - 11/30/78

LEAA \$447
GCCD 50
\$497

Salaries \$442
Benefits 42
Indirect Cost 33
\$497

77-I-A 2105 F02

2/3/78 - 11/30/78

LEAA \$4,794
GCCD 533
\$5,327

Salaries \$4,518
Benefits 452
Indirect Cost 357
\$5,327

3. 79-I-A-2105 F02

10/1/78 - 6/30/79

LEAA \$42,573

GCCD 4,730

\$47,303

Salaries \$37,728

Benefits 5,906

Audit; Supplies 599

Indirect Cost 3,169

\$47,303

Summary

	<u>LEAA</u>	<u>GCCD</u>	<u>Combined</u>
Discretionary	\$76,419	\$ 8,491	\$ 84,910
E			
76/77-E & A	53,053	5,896	58,949
79A	<u>42,573</u>	<u>4,730</u>	<u>47,303</u>
	\$172,045	\$19,117	\$191,162

ADDITIONAL BACKGROUND

As the project was originally constituted, the following personnel were scheduled to work under the grant:

1. One correctional research specialist;
2. One correctional counselor to direct the minimum security unit and engage in case management;
3. One prison sergeant; and
4. Six correctional officers.

At the present time, the position of correctional research specialist is vacant, and due to a lack of funds remaining in the grant, the hiring of a person to fill this position has been precluded. The position is not among those provided for in the proposed prison appropriation in the 1980-1981 capital budget. Other personnel adjustments are discussed below.

The project was most recently evaluated by John Clark of this office in January, 1978. A renewal funding application is now pending.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project embraces two closely related components: correctional case management and the staffing of a minimum security unit for the prison (hereinafter 'MSU'). The project was initiated in 1976 directly in response to the publication of two major studies -- the LEAA task force report entitled Survey of New Hampshire State Prison and that conducted by Louis Berger Associates and entitled New Hampshire Prison Facility Study: Phase I Report. These studies discussed in detail the need for development of case management, research, and minimum security capabilities. This evaluation report will discuss only two capabilities, those of case management and minimum security, as the remaining component, correctional research, is no longer operational. The correctional research project under the 1976-1977 discretionary grant failed to meet any of its objectives with any appreciable success. Research

was subsequently conducted from November, 1977 to March, 1978 and temporarily in the early summer of 1978, but the research position is now vacant. It has been determined in the alternative that retention of prison sergeant/counsellors is immediately more appropriate for the major purposes of the grant and the project as presently conducted.

A. Case Management

This component operates on the theory that fragmentation of inmate services and programs within penal institutions reduces the effectiveness and increases the administrative costs of incarceration. It was proposed that New Hampshire State Prison (NHSP) would seek the services of a correctional counsellor/case manager to provide continuity of services throughout the entire correctional process from intake to final release. By following the progress of inmates from the point of entry to the institution, the case manager would be able to assess for each inmate the advisability of participation in any of the several treatment services and programs available at NHSP. Particularly with respect to the MSU, it was proposed that the case manager would be able to early identify inmates who would eventually benefit especially by participation in the MSU program, thereby to divert them from unnecessarily over-secure environments in the institution during the portions of their confinements leading up to MSU eligibility. Various other responsibilities have been assigned to this position, including individual counselling, assistance in diagnostic evaluation, assignment of work programs (via membership on the Work/Classification Board), and staff training. Additionally, this person directs the operations of the MSU.

B. The Minimum Security Unit (MSU)

The prison's 1979 (1976-1978) Biennial Report identifies at page twenty-one the functions of the minimum security unit:

1. The housing of inmates who have been classified as minimum security risks;
2. Reduction of the opportunities for outside work crews and inmates otherwise on 'trusty' status to introduce contraband into the main walled facility; and
3. Provision of an intermediate step to facilitate inmates' eventual transfers to halfway houses or their direct re-entry to society.

The predominant administrative objective to the MSU is the streamlining of institutional management and inmate classification by removing inmates on trusty status from the general prison population. The immediate benefits of this arrangement were seen as a reduction in the need for food and custodial services in the main facility and intensification of education and vocational training opportunities and opportunities for personal counselling. Long range benefits were seen as the diminution or elimination of the harmful effects of institutional peer pressure upon a group of inmates who have substantially different responsibilities and treatment needs.

The MSU is a three-story brick building on the prison grounds which was once used to house prison employees. It has a capacity of thirty-two inmates and dining and laundry facilities separate from those of the main prison. The first floor contains a kitchen, dining area, visiting room, and office area. The second and third floors have interconnecting bedrooms with living space for three inmates per room, the third floor being set aside for the farm crew. The basement contains the laundry equipment and a craft workshop.

Acceptance to MSU is granted or denied according to a regular procedure, the steps of which are substantially as follows. An inmate wishing to be considered for admission to the MSU submits a written request to the correctional counsellor/MSU director for consideration. The counsellor reviews the inmate's

case history, including all records and personal data assembled by the classification officer, and conducts an interview with the inmate applicant. The inmate's work supervisor and cellblock supervisor submit written comments on the inmate's progress and the advisability of acceptance into the MSU. All comments and a formal written request for trusty status are assembled and presented to the Work/Classification Board, which acts upon the application and, if it finds favor with it, sends it to the Warden for a final determination.

Basic institutional due process of law requires that standard criteria for eligibility be used in each case. Accordingly, the prison has developed a series of yardsticks against which to measure acceptability:

1. Criminal history and the nature thereof;
2. Previous escapes or attempts, if any;
3. Disciplinary history;
4. Treatment reports and the data generated in the classification process;
5. Administrative and other risks; and
6. Court orders, where appropriate.

The MSU operates independently of many of the prison routines. Every resident of the MSU is required to work at one of several work assignments available to trusty inmates, such as shipping and receiving, maintenance, farm labor, janitorial crew, and administration. (Inmates within the walled facility are not required to participate in the prison industries or other work assignments.) MSU inmates also assume housekeeping responsibilities in the house, such as routine maintenance, cleaning, and laundry. The MSU cook is an inmate and a resident of the house.

MSU residents are granted comparatively more privileges than inmates in the main facility, but fewer than those enjoyed by residents of Shea Farm, the prison halfway house in Concord. Prison inmates are allowed six

visiting hours per week under normal circumstances; MSU inmates are allowed forty. MSU inmates also have greater indoor and outdoor recreational opportunities and generally live in a more relaxed and less regimented atmosphere than do inmates in the main facility. No weapons are worn by the custodial officers in the house; nor do these officers wear uniforms like those of their counterparts inside the walled facility. MSU officers wear blue blazers bearing the prison insignia, grey trousers, and neckties. Inmates are encouraged to participate in certain matters related to the operation of the house, and are encouraged to maintain contact with their families and friends on the outside.

The length of time that an inmate may spend as a resident of the MSU is not limited artificially by any regulation or procedure. However, an inmate will not be considered for acceptance to the MSU until he has reached a point in the term of his sentence within two years of his minimum release date. Inmates may be transferred out of MSU for violations of the prison disciplinary rules or the MSU house rules.

Mr. Michael Donovan has held the position of correctional counsellor/case manager/MSU director since March, 1977. He holds an A. B. in sociology and prior to his association with the MSU program he worked for four and one-half years at the Shea Farm Halfway House. As of May 12, 1978, all MSU positions not previously within the Treatment Directorate of the prison had been transferred thereto from the Custody Department, five officers had been certified according to the job specifications for 'Prison Sergeant Custody/Treatment', and their positions had been upgraded from LG 9 to LG 15.

The five sergeants work on three shifts, beginning at 9:00 a.m., 5:00 p.m., and 1:00 a.m.; one sergeant is assigned to the 9:00 a.m. and 1:00 a.m. shifts, and two to the 5:00 p.m. shift, during which time the greatest amount of activity takes place in the house.

There have been no changes in the makeup of the MSU staff since May, 1978.

PROJECT OPERATION

The MSU was officially opened on May 4, 1977 under the supervision of correctional counsellor/case manager Mr. Donovan and four uniformed correctional officers. The officers were responsible for security in the house and for the supervision of minimum security inmates assigned to outside maintenance jobs. Mr. Donovan, however, had been hired on March 25, and during the time from the date of his hire to the opening of the house, he supervised an inmate painting crew at the then recently renovated MSU building. He acquisitioned many of the interior furnishings and provided significant direction to the design and layout of the building interior. Once the MSU became operational, he located his office there and undertook general supervisory responsibility in the MSU in addition to his counselling duties. He assures that each MSU inmate is provided needed medical services, participates in the work program and the housekeeping routine, and is provided with all needed and desired counselling and educational services. He is directly responsible for the health, safety, and comfort of all persons living and working in the house.

His case manager responsibilities require him to personally provide counselling to MSU inmates in a variety of matters, ranging presently from personal hygiene to personal budget planning. He monitors the progress of inmates in the walled facility whom he has identified as potentially suited for participation in the MSU, he consults with other counsellors and the members of the prison administration, and as noted above, he serves on the prison Work/Classification Board.

One hundred eighty-seven inmates have been admitted to the MSU since its opening in 1977. Policies adopted by the Board of Trustees of the prison during the summer of 1978 have made admission to the MSU a more selective process than it has been in the past. Thus, although the capacity of the MSU house is thirty-two, there are usually slightly less than that number of inmates in residence.

Of the 187 inmates who have been admitted to the MSU, the following is reported:

187 ADMITTED

65 Paroled

4 Returned to NHSP for parole violation or new conviction

56 Transferred to Shea Farm

1 Escaped from Shea Farm

6 Returned to NHSP for parole violation or new conviction

7 Returned to NHSP for farm rule violation

2 Escaped from MSU

1 Returned to NHSP same day

1 At large

1 Transferred to out-of-state institution

3 Released from NHSP by court order

31 Returned to NHSP main facility from MSU

2 At request of returnee

2 Upon service of detainer by another jurisdiction

3 By order of NHSP Board of Trustees

1 For health reasons

21 For violation of MSU house rules or NHSP regulation

4 Later returned to MSU

26 IN MSU ON DATE OF EVALUATION

The statistical significance of the above figures is discussed among the CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS. The offenses for which MSU inmates have been incarcerated include nearly all of those for which the NHSP general population is serving time, except that sex offenders and inmates convicted of serious violent crimes have not generally been admitted to MSU. Among the offenses for which MSU inmates currently in residence have been incarcerated are second degree murder, robbery, negligent homicide, habitual motor vehicle (DWI) offenses, burglary, "bad checks", and drug offenses.

Since the opening of the MSU, efforts have been made to keep MSU inmates

separate from inmates within the walled facility without closing MSU inmates out of services and programs available to MSU inmates but offered only inside. Since July 1 of last year, educational services have been made available by tutors five afternoons per week in the MSU; this had eliminated the necessity for MSU inmates to attend classes in the main prison school facility. The alcohol and drug treatment service conducted by the Mental Health Unit has established a thereapeutic group inside the MSU. Inmates have had the use of indoor athletic facilities inside the walls one evening per week while the population is locked up. However, it is still necessary for MSU inmates to report inside for sick call, church services, and some work assignments.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The statistics reproduced above are significant to the extent that they indicate that the MSU's ex-residents who have been paroled or released either directly from MSU or through Shea Farm have, in 106 cases out of 161 (66%) not returned to NHSP. Mr. Donovan is not authorized to maintain personal contact with ex-inmates, and it is therefore not possible for him precisely to determine to what degree MSU participation has contributed to their successful reintegration to society. Nonetheless, fewer than 20 (15%) of MSU inmates who have been paroled or finally released from custody have returned to prison, even though 27 inmates to date have been unable to participate successfully in its program.

The measure described above certainly is limited by the fact that only non-failure (not positive success) can be identified, and the statistical sample is small and represents less than two years of operation of the project. However, it is reasonable to state that the MSU program has thus far compared favorably against the success rate of the prison as a whole in preventing the return of its paroled and released inmates. During the research for the 1977 Status and Trends Report of the Statistical Analysis Center, it was found

that nearly 25% of those inmates paroled from NHSP eventually return to prison, and that at least 23% of those incarcerated in the prison have served one or more terms at NHSP. The most recent Biennial Report of the prison indicates that 51% of the inmates confined at NHSP during the biennium July 1, 1976 to June 30, 1978 had served previous sentences in state or federal institutions generally.

Idleness and disciplinary difficulties are rare in the MSU. In addition to their assigned jobs and the housekeeping routine, inmates have immersed themselves in a 'sprucing up' effort in the house. Under Mr. Donovan's direction, inmates have volunteered their free time for repainting and carpentry work. Some inmates have contributed small amounts out of their work program earnings for curtains and small furnishings. Mr. Donovan, the sergeant/counsellors, and the MSU residents have "scrounged around" for some furniture and needed equipment not otherwise provided. Repainting and repair of woodwork on the first floor has been successfully carried out. Similar work is planned for the dormitory areas of the second and third floors. Residents have taken the initiative on occasion to pool some of their inmate wages to hold holiday dinners and gatherings for their families.

A small group of inmates has been providing labor for the remodeling of the former Calumet Club in Manchester into a second halfway house, and one inmate has been performing public service work for a state agency in Concord. Five inmates in the house are pursuing GED (Graduate Equivalency Diploma) certificates.

Mr. Donovan indicated to the writer that one essential skill that the MSU inmates appear to be developing is the ability to live peaceably and cooperatively in a close and often tense environment. Another skill being pervasively taught is the ability to accept responsibility, and the MSU house rules make it

clear that irresponsible and uncooperative behavior cannot be tolerated, as it jeopardizes the success and future direction of the MSU program.

The writer concludes that the MSU program at the state prison is a worthwhile and productive project. In its short history it has shown itself fully able to meet its objectives. It has gained the approval and support of the residents of Concord who live in the neighborhoods near the prison grounds. The program is internally strong enough to have remained in operation without diminution in service or effectiveness despite funding shortages apparent toward the end of the present fiscal biennium. Evidence of its effectiveness are the initiatives that residents in the house have taken to improve its physical plant and the apparent success with which its ex-residents have thus far returned to free society. Mr. Donovan's abilities are beyond doubt and it is clear that he has undertaken his responsibilities in an extraordinary manner. Problems with staffing by correctional officers which appeared at the time of Mr. Clark's evaluation in 1978 have been eliminated.

The project to provide case management and minimum security capabilities at the state prison merits continued support by this agency, in accordance with established commission policy.

END