

2176



ABSTRACT

AN EVALUATION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION  
OF COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS IN  
OREGON, COLORADO AND CONNECTICUT

FINAL REPORT

Prepared for  
Grant 82-15-CV-K015  
National Institute of Justice

56566  
99474

Principal Investigator: Dennis J. Palumbo  
Morrison Institute  
Arizona State University

Co-Principal Investigators: Michael Musheno  
Center for Justice Studies  
Arizona State University

Steven Maynard-Moody  
Center for Public Affairs  
University of Kansas

Research Assistants: Margaret E. Cawley  
Arizona State University

Kathryn Hyer  
Arizona State University

Tempe, Arizona  
June 1985

The purpose of this evaluation of the implementation of community corrections in three states was to identify the more successful programs and the implementation conditions that produce these successes. The programs in Oregon, Colorado, and Connecticut were each studied in detail using a triangulation of quantitative and qualitative methods and data. Oregon's program is a sentencing alternative to incarceration in prison and is administered through the Department of Corrections by those counties deciding to participate in the program. Colorado's program is a sentencing alternative to prisons as well, but it is administered through the state's Judicial Department by judicial districts. Residential treatment facilities in Colorado are run by private, non-profit agencies. Connecticut's program is a transitional one for offenders within a year of being released from prison, and both residential and nonresidential facilities are provided by private, nonprofit agencies, many of which are church affiliated. The program in Connecticut is run by the State Department of Corrections.

All three programs are successful in achieving some of their objectives, which are to reduce the number of commitments of nonviolent felons to state penal institutions, save money, help reintegrate offenders back into their communities, and build political constituencies for the purpose of educating the public and improving the criminal justice system.

There is wide variation within each state in the extent to which these objectives are being achieved by counties, judicial districts and various agencies and cities. The more successful programs have entrepreneurs involved in getting the programs started and in maintaining them, a higher degree of commitment to the program by implementors, a higher degree of implementation, more perceived support by various groups, more training, more access to decisionmaking by implementors, and greater change in programs to adapt them to local conditions. Moreover, being clear about objectives and a higher degree of agreement among implementors about them is an important ingredient of success. The programs administered through the Judicial Department seem to be more successful because they avoid turf battles and have higher support by probation officers, judges, and prosecutors. The most achievable goals are reducing commitments to state prisons and reducing costs; rehabilitation is only slightly more successful in community corrections than in probation or regular incarceration. One weak link is the lack of community support and more work needs to be done in educating the community about the programs.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A research project that takes two and one-half years to complete and moves from one university to another incurs a lot of debts in order to be completed. First of all, the patience, cooperation, and assistance of the community corrections program managers in each state has been essential to this research. All three states have innovative and dedicated individuals involved in running their programs. They are to be commended for the excellent programs they have helped build and for their thorough openness, hospitality, and access. The specific individuals involved have been identified in the individual state reports.

Secondly, the personnel involved in doing the research have changed over the course of the two and a half years. When we began, Dennis Palumbo was principal investigator and Paula Wright, Elaine Sharp, and Cheryl Swanson were co-principal investigators. Egon Guba was visiting researcher at the Center for Public Affairs, University of Kansas, when the research design for Oregon was being developed and he contributed to that effort. Elaine Sharp and Cheryl Swanson stepped out after Oregon was completed. Steven Maynard-Moody became co-principal investigator when we began Colorado and Steven Miller became research assistant. Laura Winterfield worked as consultant for the field work in Colorado.

The project moved from the University of Kansas to Arizona State University after the field research in Colorado was completed. Paula Wright discontinued her affiliation with the project at that point. Michael Musheno became co-principal investigator when we began Connecticut, L.A. Wilson was a consultant on the Connecticut field work, and Kathy Hyer became research assistant. Kathy Hyer left after the Colorado data and report were completed and Marge Cawley became research assistant.

As the project was finished, the principal research staff were Dennis Palumbo, principal investigator, Steven Maynard-Moody and Mike Musheno as co-principal investigators, and Marge Cawley as research assistant.

I'd like to thank all of the various individuals who were involved in one way or another with the project over the course of these two and a half years. Many of them as well as the administrators and managers of the programs in each state contributed a great deal to the research.

A special note of thanks is due Dr. Larry Bennett, our project monitor at the National Institute of Justice. He was most cooperative, patient and helpful when we were seeking access to states for the research, in reacting to and making suggestions about the research design, and in offering perceptive and helpful comments on earlier drafts of this report.

Finally, I would like to express my appreciation for the processing of this report by the support staff in the College of Public Programs' Word Processing Pool.

Dennis Palumbo  
Tempe, Arizona  
June 1985

TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Abstract . . . . .  | iii |
| Acknowledgements . . . . .  | v   |
| List of Tables . . . . .  | ix  |
| An Evaluation of the Implementation of Community Corrections<br>in Oregon, Colorado and Connecticut . . . . . | 1   |
| A. What Exactly is Community Corrections? . . . . .   | 1   |
| B. Scope of the Research . . . . .  | 3   |
| C. Methodology . . . . .  | 3   |
| Definitions and Measurements . . . . .  | 4   |
| D. Major Findings . . . . .   | 6   |
| 1. Individual State Summaries . . . . .   | 6   |
| a. Oregon . . . . .   | 6   |
| b. Colorado . . . . .   | 7   |
| c. Connecticut . . . . .  | 8   |
| 2. Degree of Implementation . . . . .   | 10  |
| 3. Comparing the Implementation of Community<br>Corrections Among the Three States . . . . .                  | 11  |
| a. Level of Commitment to Community Corrections . . . . .   | 12  |
| b. Reasons for Becoming Involved in Community Corrections . . . . .   | 12  |
| c. Agreement About What the Program Should Accomplish . . . . .   | 13  |
| d. Modification of the Program to Fit Local Needs . . . . .   | 14  |
| e. Access to Decisionmaking . . . . .   | 14  |
| f. Perceived Support for the Program . . . . .  | 14  |
| g. Entrepreneurial Activity . . . . .   | 16  |
| h. Availability of Training . . . . .   | 19  |
| 4. Achievement of Objectives in the Three States . . . . .  | 20  |
| a. Differences in the Goals of Each Program . . . . .   | 21  |
| b. Improvements in Services . . . . .   | 23  |
| c. Impact on Public Safety . . . . .  | 24  |
| d. Widening of the Net of Social Control . . . . .  | 26  |
| e. Perceptions of Program Success . . . . .   | 26  |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| E. Keys to Successful Implementation . . . . .    | 27 |
| F. The Impacts of Community Corrections . . . . . | 29 |
| G. The Future of Community Corrections . . . . .  | 30 |
| References . . . . .                              | 32 |

LIST OF TABLES

| <u>Table</u> |  |    |
|--------------|--|----|
| 1            | Degree of Implementation . . . . .   | 10 |
| 2            | Level of Commitment to Community Corrections . . . . .   | 12 |
| 3            | Most Important Reason for<br>Involvement in Community Corrections . . . . .  | 13 |
| 4            | Agreement Among Participants in Community<br>Corrections About What the Program Should Accomplish . . . . .                                  | 13 |
| 5            | Extent to Which Community Corrections<br>Programs Have Changed Since Their Adoption . . . . .  | 14 |
| 6            | Access to Decisionmaking in Community Corrections . . . . .  | 14 |
| 7            | Perceptions of the Extent of<br>Support for Community Corrections . . . . .  | 15 |
| 8            | Correlation Between the Differences in<br>Agreement on Goals of Upper- and Street-Level<br>Implementors and Implementation Success . . . . . | 18 |
| 9            | Availability of Rating of Training . . . . .   | 20 |
| 10           | Importance of Various Goals of Community Corrections . . . . .   | 21 |
| 11           | Degree of Improvement in Various Conditions<br>Since the Adoption of Community Corrections . . . . .   | 23 |
| 12           | How the State's Community Corrections<br>Program has Affected Cooperations . . . . .   | 24 |
| 13           | Amount of Increase or Decrease in Public<br>Safety as a Result of Community Corrections . . . . .  | 25 |
| 14           | Agreement that Felons are<br>Released Too Early from Prison . . . . .  | 25 |
| 15           | Perceptions of Success . . . . .   | 27 |

AN EVALUATION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION  
OF COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS IN  
OREGON, COLORADO, AND CONNECTICUT

A. What Exactly is Community Corrections

Community corrections is a way of mobilizing community resources and restructuring criminal justice agencies in order to make nonviolent felons pay for their crimes while at the same time reintegrating them back into the community. It probably is one of the least understood elements of modern corrections policy because it is a complex program that can be administered in a number of different ways, for different types of offenders, at different stages during the processing of an individual through the criminal justice system. This report is based on primary research in Oregon, Colorado, Connecticut and Kansas, and secondary research for other states, such as Minnesota and cities such as Des Moines, Iowa. In addition to over a hundred face-to-face interviews with respondents in Oregon, Colorado, and Connecticut, we sent out more than a thousand questionnaires and collected extensive reports, court data, and statistics in each of these three states.

Not many corrections officials are fully aware of what precisely is involved in the wide variety of programs that can be identified as community corrections. As a result, there are a number of misunderstandings about community corrections. Three of the main misunderstandings are:

1. Community corrections is a soft approach to crime control and the only "real" punishment for offenders is imprisonment (Selke, 1984). However, many public officials (judges, sheriffs, prosecutors, county commissioners, probation officers, parole officers, counselors) in the three states we studied (Oregon, Colorado, Connecticut) feel that community corrections provides a greater amount of control over offenders than incarceration in prison does (see below for the actual figures). For them, therefore, community corrections is not a soft approach at all.
2. Offenders sentenced to community corrections are simply released back into the community and therefore pose a danger to the communities. However, many programs use their local jails or other secure facilities (a renovated army barracks in Kansas, halfway houses) for at least a portion of the community corrections sentence. While offenders in halfway houses may leave them during the day to go to work, they must return after work and are under rather intensive supervision. Moreover, only a small percent of the hundreds of public officials we interviewed and to whom we sent questionnaires in the three states feel that community corrections increases the amount of crime in their respective communities (see below).

3. A third misconception is that community corrections is a single approach that emphasizes the medical treatment model. But approaches to community corrections vary widely from location to location. There is no one way to implement community corrections. Although treatment and psychological counseling are parts of community corrections, a more accurate characterization is that community corrections recognizes the broader social and economic context of crime and attempts to deal with this by helping offenders rid themselves of their substance abuse problems and find meaningful employment.

Community corrections can occur at a number of different points in the criminal justice process. The three main points are: (1) pre-trial release; (2) as a sentencing alternative for convicted, nonviolent felons; and (3) as a transitional program for individuals within six months to a year of being released from prison.

Community corrections also can vary widely in its administrative arrangement. In several states (Minnesota, Oregon, Kansas) the program is administered through the state Department of Corrections and run by counties under a county-option arrangement. In other states (Colorado) the program is administered by the state Judicial Department through judicial districts and services are provided by private, nonprofit agencies rather than by public agencies. In still other locations (Connecticut), the program is administered by the state department of corrections through private, nonprofit agencies throughout the state.

Whatever the particular administrative arrangement, there are several components that are common to all programs. One is that community corrections is a mechanism for decentralizing the delivery of corrections programs from the state to the county, judicial district, and community levels. A second is that it promotes system changes in the way law enforcement, prosecutorial, judicial, probation, parole, and human service agencies interact. The third is that it sets up a mechanism for educating the public, media, and the legislature about corrections issues. If implemented correctly, these three elements can lead to successful community corrections.

Various community corrections programs have existed for a long time in the U.S. Informal diversion and release on one's own recognizance have existed for at least 20 years; probation as a sentencing alternative has existed for more than a century; and parole as a transitional program goes back to the 19th century. What is different about community corrections includes: (1) a number of new programs have developed around it, and (2) it restructures the administrative arrangements for delivering corrections services.

A number of new programs have been created through community corrections, including restitution, community service, individual and family counseling, general educational development, job finding assistance, and substance abuse treatment. Of course, some of these can exist without a formal community corrections program, and several were created independently of community corrections. The difference that community corrections makes is that it provides an administrative structure through which various mixes of these individual programs can be combined in unique and innovative ways.

### B. Scope of the Research

The goal of this study is to discover what implementation factors lead to successful implementation of community corrections programs. Although implementation is the principal focus, it is necessary to consider impact variables as well because success must be defined in terms of how well the program is meeting its objectives. And the objectives of each program are those each state believes their main objectives should be, not those the investigators impose on them. As we shall see below, the objectives are somewhat different in each state, even though there are some similarities among the three states.

The implementation variables we have studied in this research are:

- (1) the degree of commitment to the programs by those responsible for implementing them as measured by their belief that community corrections is an effective way of handling offenders and by their expressed support for it;
- (2) the degree to which the program has been implemented as measured by the percent of time implementors devote to it and by their level of involvement in it (how these were measured is discussed in the next section of this report);
- (3) the amount and type of changes made in the program since their adoption;
- (4) the efforts of an entrepreneur to get the program going;
- (5) the amount of coordination achieved among agencies of the criminal justice system and between the administering agency and the community;
- (6) the amount of perceived support given to the program by various groups such as elected officials, the community and service providers;
- (7) the amount of access to decisionmaking various groups have;
- (8) the amount of influence over decisions of various groups such as judges, sheriffs, prosecutors and advisory boards;
- (9) the amount and type of training provided; and
- (10) the selection process for determining who will be admitted into the programs.

The impact variables we investigated are: (1) how much reduction there has been in the commitment of nonviolent offenders to state prison; (2) the cost effectiveness of the program; (3) reductions in recidivism; (4) degrees of perceived success of the programs; (6) perceived changes in community safety; (7) perceived improvements in various services such as probation, treatment, and community programs; and (8) the widening of the net of social control.

The principal hypothesis of this research is that the programs experiencing greater success will have greater commitment to the program by those who implement it, more changes in the program during implementation, more activity by entrepreneurs to get the programs started, more cooperation and coordination among agencies involved in implementation, a greater amount of perceived support for the program by various groups, more access to decisionmaking, and more training for implementors.

### C. Methodology

This research uses triangulation of quantitative and qualitative methods and data to test the principal hypotheses. It also is a utilization-focused evaluation in that the relevant officials in the respective states were involved in selecting variables to study and questions to add. They also were involved in analyses and interpretation of the findings.

The research began in each state with unstructured, open-ended interviews by about six researchers who spent two weeks in Oregon and a week each in Colorado and Connecticut. We conducted research in each state in turn, finishing one before moving on to the next. This enabled us to make adjustments as we proceeded. All face-to-face interviews were tape-recorded and transcribed by the interviewers.

The purpose of the field research was to become familiar with the details of each program, identify data sources, find out what factors the agencies wanted us to investigate, collect quantitative data and reports, and collect notes for case studies.

After the field interviews we constructed closed-ended questionnaires and mailed these to a large sample of implementors. We achieved approximately fifty percent response rate in each location. In Oregon, we conducted phone interviews with upper-level implementors such as judges, prosecutors and directors. We didn't do this in Colorado and Connecticut because we found the mailed questionnaire to be adequate.

The field interviews, returned questionnaires, records and other data were then analyzed and a report written for one state before moving on to the next state. Questionnaires and other quantitative data were computer analyzed.

Definitions and Measurements. Community corrections means different things to different people and encompasses a number of different programs. It is not possible to impose a single definition on all programs for there are different versions of community corrections. The programs we investigated include:

- (1) Pre-trial release programs for those awaiting trial but who are unable to afford bail. This usually is but a small part of community corrections.
- (2) Sentencing alternatives to state prison or to probation for nonviolent felons. This is the largest and most common component of community corrections. It also is the newest aspect of community corrections.

There are a variety of programs into which individuals, sentenced to community corrections are placed including residential treatment (halfway house), community service, restitution, job development and education programs.

- (3) Transitional programs for those within a year of release from prison/jail. These individuals usually are placed in a halfway house and given various treatment services, similar to those sentenced to community corrections. This is a more traditional form of community corrections than either of those described above.

Each of these programs can be administered in a different way and, in fact, are in the three states we investigated. Oregon follows the Minnesota model which is a county option program run through the state's

Department of Corrections. Under this plan a county can decide whether or not it wants to become involved in the program. If it does, it receives a grant from the state to run its programs. In Oregon, the program is almost entirely a sentencing alternative run by a county director of community corrections through public agencies such as the jail, probation officers, and treatment service workers.

Colorado's program is run by the State Judicial Department through judicial districts rather than counties. Services in Colorado are provided by private, nonprofit agencies, not by state or county employees. Colorado also has a transitional program run by the State Department of Corrections. We did not investigate this component of community corrections in Colorado.

Connecticut's program is administered by the State Department of Corrections but residential and nonresidential services are provided entirely by private, nonprofit agencies. The Connecticut program has two objectives: One is to develop political constituencies outside the Department for the purpose of improving corrections policy and administration, the other is to provide transitional services for offenders about to be released from prison. Connecticut also has a pre-trial release component in New Haven, Connecticut.

Each state has different goals. Oregon's program is a probation enhancement program that seeks to reduce the number of nonviolent felons being sent to state prisons and also reduce the overall cost of corrections. The purpose of its pre-trial release program is to reduce jail populations and ensure that individuals show up for their court trial. The Colorado program stresses reduction in commitment of nonviolent felons to state prisons as its foremost goal. The transitional program in Connecticut, on the other hand, has two goals: one is to help the successful reintegration of released prisoners back into the community, and the other is to build political constituencies for the purpose of improving the criminal justice system.

The implementors of community corrections programs have been divided into two groups. (1) Upper-level implementors are all those who do not have daily contact with clients and who occupy more powerful positions in the system. They include judges, prosecutors, advisory board members, program directors, and sheriffs. (2) The street-level implementors are those who have day-to-day contact with clients and include probation officers, institutional counselors, volunteers, program staff, parole officers, residential facility counselors, and treatment staff.

The degree of commitment these implementors have to the program is measured by two questions: 1) the extent to which they believe community corrections is an effective way of handling offenders, and 2) how much they support community corrections. The degree of implementation also is measured by two questions: one asks what percent of their total work time is devoted to community corrections, and the other asks them to select one of six descriptions about their level of involvement. For the latter question the descriptions range from indicating a low level of involvement by the statement "I do not have very many responsibilities with regard to community service programs," to the highest level of involvement, "I am now carrying out my responsibilities in a routine fashion." Also, to measure the degree of involvement of an entire

geographical area, such as a county, we used the per capita expenditures for community corrections.

How much change was made in community corrections programs since their inception was measured by a direct question on the mailed questionnaire. This question was followed by one that asked how constructive these changes were.

We measured improvements in cooperation and coordination by asking on the mailed questionnaire how the community corrections programs affected cooperation among agencies within the criminal justice system and between the department and the community.

The activity and importance of an entrepreneur was measured by observations during the field visits and by asking respondents on the mailed questionnaire to name and give the title of three individuals they believed played a key role in developing community corrections programs in their area. We also asked what role was played by these individuals, including being a philosophical proponent, getting the programs started, developing treatment services, expanding community services, building political constituencies, or linking programs with other agencies.

Access to decisionmaking, amount of influence various groups have, and amount of training all were measured by questions on the mailed questionnaire.

To measure reduction in commitments to state prison we collected data on commitments for about a ten-year period; five before and five after adoption of the programs. (This was done in Oregon and Colorado only. Connecticut does not have reduction in commitments as one of its goals.) To determine how much reduction occurred we computed a regression equation of criminal case filings and commitments for the period before the adoption of community corrections and used this equation to predict the expected commitments after adoption. Since case filings have almost a perfect correlation with commitments, the difference between the expected and actual commitments was considered to be the amount of reduction. Data on recidivism and costs for some counties and locations were supplied by the state agencies through various reports and other evaluation studies.

#### D. Major Findings

Because each state is so different in the type of program and the way it is being administered, it is difficult to compare them. There are some variables that are similar across the three states, particularly implementation variables. But there also are a number of variables that are not the same. In this section we first will describe each state individually and then compare the differences as well as the similarities among the three states.

##### 1. Individual State Summaries

a. Oregon. Oregon's program is a sentencing alternative (diversion) program for individuals who might otherwise be sent to state prison or be placed on probation. Run by the Department of Corrections (DOC), it is a county option program in which counties decide whether or

not they will participate. There are three classes of counties in Oregon; Options 1, 2, and 3. Option 1 are fully participating counties; they receive a subsidy from the state for providing a variety of services. Probation officers are county rather than state employees. Option 2 counties are similar except that probation officers are not county but remain state employees. These counties receive the same subsidy from the state as the Option 1 counties. Option 3 counties are mostly the rural counties. They are not fully participating counties and receive up to 42 percent of what Options 1 and 2 counties receive. They can use funds for enhanced probation only. Thirteen of the state's thirty-six counties are Options 1 and 2 counties; they are the larger, more populous urban counties, and contain 62 percent of the state's total population.

The fully participating counties (Options 1 and 2) have reached a higher level of implementation than Option 3 counties. Their upper- and street-level implementors: (1) are more committed to the program; (2) are more likely to have entrepreneurs who helped get them started; (3) have greater perceived support from elected officials and the community; (4) have achieved a higher level of cooperation and coordination among the units within the criminal justice system and between criminal justice agencies and community groups; (5) have higher levels of agreement about goals; and (6) believe the county has been successful. These counties also have done better than Option 3 counties in reducing commitments of nonviolent felons to state prisons. We estimate that Option 1 and 2 counties have reduced their commitments by 466 individuals from 1978 through 1981, while Option 3 counties increased their commitments by 395 individuals.

The program, therefore, has been successful in Oregon, although some problems have surfaced. One is that there is a lack of support by probation officers for the program because it threatens their status, security, and their union. It does this because probation officers are required to become county employees and this not only gives them less security than if they are state employees, but Balkenizes their union. Another problem is that the program was not working very well in Multnomah County, which is the largest county in the state, containing the City of Portland. The program there in 1983 was not doing very much and appeared to be in danger of collapsing. If the program fails in Multnomah, the entire system could be in jeopardy because the main objectives of reducing commitments to state prison and costs could not really be met. A new director for Multnomah was appointed in 1984 and more resources and efforts applied there in an attempt to turn it around.

b. Colorado. Colorado has both a diversion program as a sentencing alternative and a transitional program for individuals about to be released from prison. The former is administered by the State Judicial Department and the latter by the Department of Corrections. This evaluation deals only with the former.

The State Judicial Department administers the diversion program through its 22 judicial districts, most of which are comprised of more than one county. The judicial districts are divided into five types, depending on their level of involvement. At the top end are counties

that have a comprehensive level of services, a contract with the state, a local advisory board, and residential and nonresidential services. At the low end are counties that have no contract with the state, no local advisory board, a small number of clients who receive services in programs outside the county. The principal type of supervision for diversion clients is residential placement in a privately run residential facility. The state pays \$25 a day for each individual, and the facility can also charge room and board. Individuals in these facilities are still under jurisdiction of probation officers.

There is a wide range in the degree to which the judicial districts have implemented community corrections. The judicial districts that have achieved the highest level of implementation are those whose implementors (1) have a higher percent committed to community corrections, (2) perceive that elected officials and others have a high level of support for community corrections, (3) perceive there has been an increase in cooperation among units involved in corrections, (4) have a higher degree of agreement about the goals of the program, (5) have changed and adapted the program to local conditions, (6) have training available for individuals involved in the program, and (7) agree the program has been successful. These districts also have made a much greater reduction in their commitments to state prisons from 1977-78 through 1982-83 than the other districts. We estimate they have reduced their commitments by a total of 2,124 individuals while judicial districts at the lower end of implementation reduced theirs by 330.

There is no doubt that the program in Colorado has been successful in achieving its goals. Although there is a wide range in the degrees of success among the judicial districts, all of them achieved some level of success. The overall level of support for the program in the state is very high, 89 percent of the 302 respondents support the program a great deal or moderately high. The program has been very cost effective while not reducing public safety and without a significant widening of the net of social control.

We encountered only two problems in the Colorado program. One is that the parole officers who are involved in the transitional program administered by the Department of Corrections are not very supportive of the program of the State Judicial Branch. There appears to be some turf battles, and the individuals who administer the state-run residential treatment facilities are not positive about the privately run facilities in the diversion program. In fact, some of these latter have been closed because of inefficiencies in their operations. This is related to the second problem which is that individuals in the transition program are often placed in the same residential facility as those in the diversion program. The mixing of the nonviolent, younger offender with the more seasoned and older offender released from prison is not an ideal treatment situation. And since parole officers must interact somewhat with probation officers in regard to residential facilities, the former's lack of support for the diversion program can be somewhat detrimental to this program.

c. Connecticut. The Connecticut program is run by the State Department of Corrections. It has two goals: to build political

constituencies and to provide services for individuals about to be released from prison. It began in 1972 when the public-private resources expansion project (P/PREP) was started. A group of private, nonprofit agencies provide residential and nonresidential services to help offenders become reintegrated into the community. In addition, these agencies are required to devote time to building political constituencies for the purpose of improving the criminal justice system itself.

The latter is a unique aspect of Connecticut's community corrections program. The program also is unique in its use of volunteers who work primarily in Women In Crisis and the Connecticut Prison Association (CPA). The former is an agency dedicated to helping the spouses (mostly women) of incarcerated individuals. The CPA has a program to help incarcerated offenders with their legal problems and another program for volunteers who correspond with and visit prisoners. The Connecticut program grew rapidly during the early 1970s but slowed in the late 1970s as prisons started to become overcrowded, as more and more offenders opted for pre-release furloughs, and as the number of eligible offenders declined.

The Connecticut program has achieved a great deal of success. Both upper- and street-level implementors support it a great deal (upper-level more so). Probation officers, parole officers, program staff and volunteers are much less likely to support the program than executive or program directors or the Department of Corrections administrators. The former are also less likely to believe there has been increased cooperation, to say their agency became involved in community corrections as a result of commitment to its principles, to feel they have access to decisions and less likely to believe the program has been successful. Halfway houses, P/PREP agencies and nonresidential PREP agencies are more likely than the Judicial Department, corrections institutions, and volunteer service agencies to support the program and believe it has been successfully implemented.

Connecticut has achieved a very high level of support for its program and has been successful in achieving its goal of reintegrating offenders into the community. At the same time, it has been a little less successful in its goal of building a political constituency. In addition, several groups (parole officers, volunteers, and institutional counselors) feel they have no access to decisionmaking in statewide policies. Only 7.1 percent of all groups feel they have a fairly large amount or great deal of access to decisionmaking. The rest feel they have a moderate amount (18.6%), relatively little (33.3%), or none at all (41.1%). Upper-level and central administrators generally have more commitment and believe the program is working than street-level implementors. They have a rosy and somewhat unrealistic picture of what is occurring. For example, upper-level administrators believe that probation officers have much more commitment to the program than they actually do. It should be emphasized however, that probation officers are not a part of the program as it is currently constituted. However, their commitment can become important if and when Connecticut begins a sentencing alternative program.

## 2. Degree of Implementation

There is a wide range among the three states in the degree of implementation as measured by the average percent of time that implementors devote to community corrections; Connecticut has the highest average percent of time that implementors devote to community corrections (38.7%) and Oregon the lowest (19.5%) (see Table 1).

Table 1  
Degree of Implementation

### 1. Average percent of total work time devoted to community corrections:

|           | Oregon | Colorado | Connecticut |
|-----------|--------|----------|-------------|
| $\bar{X}$ | 19.5%  | 26.7%    | 38.73%      |
| N         | 268    | 303      | 309         |

### 2. Level of Involvement:<sup>1</sup>

|         | Oregon |     | Colorado |     | Connecticut |     |
|---------|--------|-----|----------|-----|-------------|-----|
|         | %      | N   | %        | N   | %           | N   |
| Highest | 59.3   | 156 | 53.0     | 163 | 55.0        | 236 |
| Middle  | 22.8   | 60  | 13.0     | 41  | 6.5         | 28  |
| Lowest  | 17.9   | 47  | 34.0     | 105 | 38.5        | 165 |
| Totals  | 100.0  | 263 | 100.0    | 309 | 100.0       | 429 |

<sup>1</sup>Due to rounding of percentages within tables throughout the report the total percentages do not always equal 100.0 percent.

The reason the average percent of time being devoted to community corrections is so low is because there is a wide range of different types of individuals who are involved in community corrections, and community corrections is only a small part of the total work effort of many of them. For example, a county prosecutor, judge, or sheriff usually is involved in community corrections only a small portion of their total work time; the rest of their time is spent on noncommunity corrections cases. Also, nonprofit, community service agencies that are involved in community corrections often (in Connecticut particularly) do other things besides community corrections, so the average percent of their work time being devoted to community corrections is low. For probation officers, the usual arrangement is for a few probation officers to be involved in community corrections full-time, with the rest not being involved at all, so the average percent of time that all probation officers devote to community corrections is low. The only individuals who devote full-time to community corrections are state, county or district program directors, assistants, halfway house wardens,



directors and staff, regional coordinators, and some probation officers. But the overall average is low because many people who devote only a small percent of their total work time to community corrections are an essential part of the network.

Degree of implementation also was measured by asking respondents a series of six questions ranging from "I do not have very many responsibilities with regard to community corrections" at the lower end, to "I am carrying out my responsibilities in community corrections in a regular routine fashion." As Table 1 shows, the three states are roughly the same on this measure.

### 3. Comparing the Implementation of Community Corrections Among the Three States

The principal findings about successful implementation of community corrections can be summarized briefly as follows: States, counties, and or districts that have been most successful in implementing community corrections have

- a. A higher level of commitment to the program by those who must implement it, particularly by the street-level implementors.
- b. An emphasis upon the principles of community corrections and particularly rehabilitation rather than just taking advantage of available funds.
- c. Greater agreement among implementors and between the upper-level and street-level implementors about the goals of community corrections.
- d. More modification of the program to fit local needs and job structures.
- e. Greater access to decisionmaking by those who implement the program.
- f. Greater perceived support by legislators, service providers, and the community.
- g. "Entrepreneurs" or catalysts who are strong philosophical proponents of the program, who help get it established and who promote agreement between upper- and street-level implementors about what the goals of the program should be.
- h. More training for program implementors.

We describe how each of the three states fare on these aspects of successful implementation in the rest of this section.

#### a. Level of Commitment to Community Corrections

There is a fairly wide variation in the degree of commitment to the program. As Table 2 shows, Colorado and Connecticut are considerably higher than Oregon. Both have a far higher percent who believe in the effectiveness of community corrections and who support it; in fact, a high percent, around 90 percent in Colorado and 70 to 80 percent in Connecticut, both believe in and support the programs. Even in Oregon, around 50 percent of the implementors believe in the effectiveness of community corrections and almost 56 percent support it; thus, there is a fairly high level of commitment to community corrections in all three states.

Table 2  
Level of Commitment to Community Corrections

#### 1. Belief in community corrections as an effective way to handle felons:

| Percent who ... | Oregon |     | Colorado |     | Connecticut |     |
|-----------------|--------|-----|----------|-----|-------------|-----|
|                 | %      | N   | %        | N   | %           | N   |
| Agree           | 48.9   | 132 | 88.9     | 279 | 71.3        | 300 |
| Are neutral     | 22.2   | 60  | 7.0      | 22  | 19.2        | 81  |
| Disagree        | 28.9   | 78  | 4.1      | 13  | 9.5         | 40  |
|                 |        | 270 |          | 314 |             | 421 |

#### 2. Support for community corrections:

|                   |      |     |      |     |      |     |
|-------------------|------|-----|------|-----|------|-----|
| Great deal        | 25.6 | 69  | 59.0 | 182 | 48.3 | 205 |
| Moderately high   | 30.0 | 81  | 32.5 | 100 | 35.1 | 149 |
| Moderately little | 24.8 | 67  | 7.5  | 24  | 14.9 | 63  |
| Not at all        | 19.6 | 53  | 1.0  | 2   | 1.7  | 7   |
|                   |      | 270 |      | 308 |      | 424 |

#### b. Reasons for Becoming Involved in Community Corrections

There is wide variation in the reasons for becoming involved in community corrections. In Oregon, the largest percent said that the principal reason their local areas became involved is to take advantage of the available funds, whereas in Colorado and Connecticut it is because of a commitment to the principles of community corrections (see Table 3). Oregon also stresses gaining more local control, far more than the other states.

Table 3  
Most Important Reason for Involvement in Community Corrections  
Percent Selecting Each Choice

|   | Oregon | Colorado | Connecticut |
|---|--------|----------|-------------|
| Reduce overcrowding in jails <sup>1</sup>         | 11.3   | 19.0     |             |
| Reduce overcrowding in state prison <sup>1</sup>  | 12.1   | 22.0     | 28.6        |
| Take advantage of funds <sup>2</sup>              | 37.9   | --       | 12.7        |
| Gain more local control                           | 21.0   | 10.0     | 5.3         |
| Commitment to principles of community corrections | 15.3   | 39.0     | 49.4        |
| Other   | 2.4    | 11.0     | 4.1         |
| N =   | 124    | 293      | 395         |

<sup>1</sup>These two items were combined on the Connecticut questionnaire.

<sup>2</sup>This item was not included on the Colorado questionnaire.

c. Agreement About What the Program Should Accomplish

Colorado's respondents have a significantly higher percent who say there is agreement among participants in community corrections about what the program should accomplish (see Table 4).

Table 4  
Agreement Among Participants in Community Corrections  
About What the Program Should Accomplish

| Percent who ...               | Oregon | Colorado | Connecticut |
|-------------------------------|--------|----------|-------------|
| agree or strongly agree       | 57.2   | 73.0     | 49.5        |
| are neutral                   | 22.9   | 14.0     | 32.5        |
| disagree or strongly disagree | 20.9   | 14.0     | 18.0        |
| N =                           | 271    | 285      | 406         |

d. Modification of Program to Fit Social Needs

Colorado also has a significantly higher percent who believe there have been changes in the program since its inception (Table 5) and more than three-quarters of these respondents believe the changes that have been made have been constructive in adapting the program to local needs.

Table 5  
Extent to Which Community Corrections Programs  
Have Changed Since Their Adoption

| Percent who say it has changed ... | Oregon | Colorado | Connecticut |
|------------------------------------|--------|----------|-------------|
| a great deal or quite a bit (yes)  | 36.0   | 55.0     | 38.0        |
| some                               |        | 31.0     | 43.1        |
| little or none (no)                | 64.0   | 13.0     | 18.8        |
| N =                                | 253    | 287      | 415         |

e. Access to Decisionmaking

Colorado also tends to be the highest in the percent who believe they have a great deal or a fairly large amount of access to decisionmaking in community corrections. However, there is a small percentage in each state who feel they have some access.

Connecticut has the most centralized program of the three and it is evidenced by the fact that only 7.1 percent of the respondents in that state feel they have access to statewide decisionmaking and three-quarters feel they have almost none (see Table 6).

Table 6  
Access to Decisionmaking in Community Corrections

| Percent who have ...                | Oregon | Colorado | Connecticut |           |
|-------------------------------------|--------|----------|-------------|-----------|
|                                     |        |          | In-area     | Statewide |
| a great deal or fairly large amount | 32.5   | 34.0     | 15.6        | 7.1       |
| moderate amount                     | 15.9   | 23.0     | 25.0        | 18.6      |
| relatively little or none           | 51.6   | 43.0     | 59.4        | 74.4      |
| N =                                 | 157    | 295      | 436         |           |

f. Perceived Support for Program

Colorado also has the highest percent who feel there is much or some support for the program by elected officials, service providers, probation officers, and the community (see Table 7). However, all three

states see relatively little support from the community. Community antagonism, particularly about where halfway houses should be located, is a problem for community corrections all over. Surprisingly, this opposition of the community does not get translated into opposition by elected officials because a majority of elected officials in all three states are perceived to support the programs. It appears elected officials can both support community corrections and take a "get tough" approach to criminals at the same time.

Table 7  
Perceptions of the Extent of Support  
For Community Corrections

| Percent who say there is among | Oregon            | Colorado    | Connecticut |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------|
| <u>Elected Officials ...</u>   |                   |             |             |
| much or some support           | 61.1              | 73.0        | 57.5        |
| undecided                      | 20.2              | 18.0        | 24.9        |
| much or some resistance        | <u>18.7</u>       | <u>8.0</u>  | <u>17.6</u> |
| N =                            | 267               | 282         | 409         |
| <u>Service Providers ...</u>   |                   |             |             |
| much or some support           | 67.3              | 92.0        | 83.0        |
| undecided                      | 16.9              | 7.0         | 12.5        |
| much or some resistance        | <u>15.8</u>       | <u>2.0</u>  | <u>4.5</u>  |
| N =                            | 266               | 286         | 400         |
| <u>Community ...</u>           |                   |             |             |
| much or some support           | 37.4              | 38.0        | 37.5        |
| undecided                      | 49.2              | 40.0        | 28.2        |
| much or some resistance        | <u>13.2</u>       | <u>21.0</u> | <u>34.4</u> |
| N =                            | 262               | 287         | 408         |
| <u>Probation Officers ...</u>  |                   |             |             |
| much or some support           | 30.8 <sup>1</sup> | 91.0        | 70.6        |
| undecided                      | 12.3              | 5.0         | 21.5        |
| much or some resistance        | <u>56.9</u>       | <u>5.0</u>  | <u>8.0</u>  |
| N =                            | 130               | 288         | 391         |
| <u>Parole Officers ...</u>     |                   |             |             |
| much or some support           |                   | 76.0        | 71.0        |
| undecided                      |                   | 18.0        | 21.0        |
| much or some resistance        |                   | <u>5.0</u>  | <u>7.9</u>  |
| N =                            |                   | 269         | 390         |

<sup>1</sup> Probation and parole officers were combined in the Oregon questionnaire.

g. Entrepreneurial Activity

There are "movers and shakers" in all three states who are strong philosophical proponents of the program, who help get the program established, and who help make it a regular part of the local criminal justice systems. We call them entrepreneurs although they are not motivated by the possibility of making a profit as is the case with private industry entrepreneurs. But public sector entrepreneurs are risk-takers in that they push for a program that is not exactly popular in the national get tough climate that exists.

The roles played by public sector entrepreneurs are varied. Our field observations revealed that the following is the rank order of importance in roles: (1) being a philosophical proponent of community corrections, (2) getting the program set up, (3) garnering local support, and (4) assuring that community corrections became an established component of the larger criminal justice process. These roles include a mixture of promotional networking and administrative activities, including efforts to convince skeptics of the value of the approach, making sure that viable programs emerge from the policy mandate, and linking community corrections with the larger process of administering justice. For example, one of the most recognized entrepreneurs, the director of community corrections in a county, was able to get sheriffs, prosecutors, judges, probation officers, and counselors to interact and work together when they previously did not. Fortified by an incredible amount of energy, this entrepreneur spent a lot of time visiting and touching bases with all of these people to make sure they understood what was happening in the different parts of the program. As the sheriff put it, "Before Lou [the director] took over, none of us even got together much less talked to each other. Now we have a common denominator."

Many of the programs that comprised community corrections existed before the county became a part of the state's system. Many of them were begun under LEAA funds earlier in the decade. The pre-trial release programs were operated by the circuit court, the misdemeanor program consisted of only one probation officer and was utilized primarily by the district court, a very small work-release program was operated through the sheriff's office, the state corrections division supervised felony probation and parolees in the county, and mental health services were limited to offenders upon request by the county court. There were no volunteer services, drug counseling, or community service programs. However, under the director of community corrections all of these programs were available and well coordinated.

The questionnaire responses confirm our field observations that entrepreneurs play diverse roles in the innovation process. Each respondent was asked to rate a list of roles associated with influential persons from very important to not important at all on a seven-point Likert-scale. For each questionnaire, a role was designated as important when a respondent rated it as important or very important.

In Colorado, the most important role played by entrepreneurs was that of getting the community corrections program established in the judicial district; 85 percent of our respondents stressed the importance of this role. The other roles identified by the respondents are:

getting support for community corrections (83%); serving as a philosophical proponent (81%); and assuring that community corrections became an established component of the criminal justice system (74%). A surprisingly low 36 percent identified lobbying for the Community Corrections Act as an important entrepreneurial activity. Hence, the respondents stressed the internal, as opposed to external, dimensions as being more important.

The roles played by entrepreneurs in Connecticut were similar. Respondents identified getting the community services program started as the most important role (80%). This was followed by being a philosophical proponent of community services (78%), expanding community service programs (78%), linking community services programs with other agencies (69%), developing effective treatment and service programs (68%), and building political constituencies for community corrections (55%).

Rather than uncovering a single individual performing a diversity of roles, our reputational analysis revealed a number of different people were entrepreneurs in each locale where successful implementation was evident. For example, in Colorado, the judicial district that has the most successful program had twelve different people as entrepreneurs, but one person was named ten times, another was mentioned six times, two others were each mentioned four times, and the remaining eight persons were only mentioned once each. This same pattern held for most other successful districts in Colorado. For example, in another district which successfully implemented community corrections, the two top individuals were each named by eleven persons as being the most influential, and the next three persons on the list were each mentioned five times apiece, with six others each being mentioned by only one person. Thus, one conclusion we reached is that entrepreneurship was spread over more than one person in any given locale where innovative outcomes emerged, although a few people often stood out.

Equally significant, we found a wide range of organizational participants named as influential in getting community corrections adopted and implemented. These included probation officers, county commissioners, judges, district attorneys, and state officials such as the regional manager, state director of community corrections, or the state director of corrections. In both states, many different types of individuals were named, but the type varied by program locale. For example, three judges were identified in one district, while in another the two most frequently identified entrepreneurs were probation officers.

Although upper-level administrators, such as judges, county commissioners, and state directors, were named more often than street-level, service providers, a number of the latter participants were also named. For example, of the 74 entrepreneurs named in the 20 Colorado judicial districts, 16 or 22 percent were probation officers. Thus, although the entrepreneurial role is more likely to be occupied by an individual in middle- and upper-level positions, street-level workers play entrepreneurial roles in the implementation process as well.

If, as discussed above, one of the primary roles of public sector entrepreneurs is to act as an internal program advocate, then we

may assume that most of the members of the organization will agree about what the program is supposed to accomplish. Getting public workers crucial to the operation of community correction to believe they are working toward a common goal important to society rather than simply meeting daily work requirements is one of the most important tasks of entrepreneurs. Thus, we should expect the more successful organizations to have a greater amount of agreement between the upper- and street-level implementor about the goals of the organization. We tested this hypothesis in one of our study sites (Colorado).

The difference in agreement between upper- and street-level implementors was measured for the four most important goals of the program. These goals are to rehabilitate offenders, save money, promote community involvement in corrections, and provide humane treatment of offenders. Respondents were asked how important they thought each of these goals were on a seven-point Likert-scale ranging from very important (7) to not at all important (1). The mean score of upper- and street-level implementors for each of these goals was computed. We then subtracted the average score of street-level respondents from the average of upper-level respondents and computed the absolute sum of the differences for the four goals for each of twelve judicial districts. These absolute sums are listed in Column 3 of Table 8.

Table 8  
Correlation Between the Differences in Agreement on Goals of  
Upper- and Street-Level Implementors and Implementation Success

| Number of the<br>Judicial District | Rank on<br>Implementation Success<br>Highest to Lowest | Difference in Agreement<br>Between Upper- and Street-Level<br>Implementors on Four Goals |                   |
|------------------------------------|--|--|-------------------|
|                                    |  | Absolute Difference  | Rank <sup>2</sup> |
| 20 <sup>1</sup>                    | 1  | 0.51   | 1                 |
| 4                                  | 2  | 1.35   | 3                 |
| 8                                  | 3  | 1.57   | 5                 |
| 6                                  | 4  | 2.62   | 10                |
| 12                                 | 5  | 2.00   | 7                 |
| 14                                 | 6  | 2.25   | 8                 |
| 17                                 | 7  | 1.55   | 4                 |
| 1                                  | 8  | 2.73   | 12                |
| 21                                 | 9  | 2.37   | 9                 |
| 2                                  | 10   | 1.33   | 2                 |
| 18                                 | 11   | 1.89   | 6                 |
| 10                                 | 12   | 2.72   | 11                |

$r_s = .43$

<sup>1</sup>The numbers in this column refer to specific judicial districts in Colorado; for example, judicial district number 2 (ranked 10) is Denver.

<sup>2</sup>The numbers in this column are the rank order of the difference in agreement about goals with the smallest difference ranked first.

Twelve judicial districts in Colorado were ranked on nine variables (i.e., average percent of work effort spent on community corrections, belief in effectiveness of community corrections, support for the program, changes in activities to adapt to local circumstances, availability of training, amount of reductions of offenders to state prison, perceptions of how successful the program is, perceptions of how well program is implemented, and perceived increases in cooperation). The district that received the highest sum of ranks in these nine variables was ranked first, and so on down to the twelfth district. We then ranked the same twelve districts on the amount of difference in agreement about goals with the district with the least difference being ranked first (see Table 8).

The Spearman rank-order correlation between the agreement on goals and implementation success is .43; meaning there is a high correlation between the extent to which there is agreement between upper- and street-level implementors on the one hand, and successful implementation on the other hand. In other words, where the two levels agree about which goals are important, the organization does better. We take this to be indirect evidence that the entrepreneurs in the more successful districts were doing a better job of getting the members of their organizations to work toward a common goal.

The goal most often identified in Colorado was rehabilitation. This was the goal that was selected by the largest percent of all respondents as being very important. Of all respondents, 53 percent gave this goal a rating of seven of the 1 to 7 scale, whereas only 25 percent gave "save money," 22 percent gave "promote community involvement," and 37 percent gave "provide humane treatment of offenders" such a rating. This fits in with the idea that entrepreneurs make the members feel they are working for some high order purpose (i.e., rehabilitating offender) rather than simply putting in their time as public employees.

#### h. Availability of Training

The final implementation factor associated with successful implementation is availability of training. However, we did not find this variable to be as important as the others.

Colorado is not the highest in the percentage of respondents who have had some training specifically related to community corrections (see Table 9). This is somewhat surprising because Colorado tends to be the highest on all other dimensions. It should also be noted that, except for Connecticut, less than a majority of respondents have received training and that training in all three states is not given a very high rating. This is a decided deficiency in the way the program is being implemented. If community corrections is something new and different from the standard operating procedures of street-level implementors then training is required to familiarize them with the new procedures to be used. However, to a great extent, community corrections is not really a new approach to the way offenders are treated; it is based fairly heavily on treatment modalities that have been used in the past. Perhaps the newest aspect of community corrections is its administrative arrangement. It is a way to bring together a number of

agencies and services that always have existed in a systematic and concentrated effort to handle nonviolent offenders. In fact, many of the services and treatments (i.e., antiabuse for alcohol offenders) have existed in the past. Community corrections simply increases the number of such services and arranges the organizations that provide them into new interactive patterns.

Table 9  
Availability and Rating of Training

|   | Oregon | Colorado | Connecticut       |
|---|--------|----------|-------------------|
| <b>A. Availability of training:</b>       |        |          |                   |
| Yes                                       | 45.0   | 39.0     | 54.5              |
| No  | 55.0   | 61.0     | 45.5              |
| N =                                       | 86     | 279      | 409               |
| <b>B. Rating of Training for:</b>         |        |          |                   |
| <u>Advisory Board Members:</u>            |        |          |                   |
| Excellent and comprehensive               | 0      | 12.0     | 29.6 <sup>1</sup> |
| Good, adequate                            | 36.0   | 56.0     | 56.1              |
| Inadequate                                | 64.0   | 32.0     | 14.3              |
| N =                                       |        | 82       | 230               |
| <u>Local Community Corrections Staff:</u> |        |          |                   |
| Excellent and comprehensive               | 21.1   | 26.0     |                   |
| Good, adequate                            | 52.6   | 49.0     |                   |
| Inadequate                                | 26.3   | 25.0     |                   |
| N =                                       |        | 96       |                   |
| <u>Direct Service Providers:</u>          |        |          |                   |
| Excellent and comprehensive               | 15.6   | 20.0     |                   |
| Good, adequate                            | 56.3   | 50.0     |                   |
| Inadequate                                | 28.1   | 30.0     |                   |
| N =                                       | 32     | 82       |                   |

<sup>1</sup> The question in Connecticut did not specify particular groups but asked only how the respondent rated the training they had received.

#### 4. Achievement of Objectives in the Three States.

All three states have been successful in achieving at least a part of their objectives (and the objectives are somewhat different in each state). The principal accomplishments of the program in the three states are:

- a. Improvements in and development of a variety of direct services for offenders.

- b. Creation and use of new programs such as community service, restitution, and aid in finding employment.
- c. Greater coordination among the agencies of the criminal justice system and between criminal justice agencies and the community.
- d. No decrease in public safety.
- e. No significant widening of the net of social control.
- f. High level of perceived success in implementing the program and achieving program objectives.
- g. A significant reduction in the number of nonviolent offenders being committed to state prison.

We will describe these achievements in this section as well as how each state has done on each dimension.

a. Differences in the Goals of Each Program

Oregon's program is a probation enhancement one that has promoting community involvement and reducing the number of commitments of nonviolent felony offenders as its two most important goals (see Table 10), whereas Colorado emphasizes rehabilitating offenders and providing humane treatment as its two main goals, and Connecticut has reducing the number of offenders in state institutions and rehabilitating offenders as its top two goals.

Since the three states have different programs and different goals, it is not surprising there is not much agreement among them about which goals are most important in community corrections (see Table 10).

Table 10  
Importance of Various Goals of Community Corrections

| Percent Who Say That the Goal of ...                              | Oregon |      | Colorado |      | Connecticut |      |
|---|--------|------|----------|------|-------------|------|
|   | %      | Rank | %        | Rank | %           | Rank |
| <u>Reducing the number of offenders in state institutions is:</u> |        |      |          |      |             |      |
| very important  | 72.3   | 1    | 70.0     | 5    | 78.0        | 1    |
| neutral   | 9.1    |      | 16.0     |      | 14.0        |      |
| not important   | 18.6   |      | 14.0     |      | 8.0         |      |
| N =   | 264    |      | 312      |      | 423         |      |
| <u>Rehabilitating offenders is:</u>                               |        |      |          |      |             |      |
| very important  | 63.2   | 4    | 91.0     | 1    | 77.0        | 2    |
| neutral   | 16.5   |      | 4.0      |      | 14.0        |      |
| not important   | 20.2   |      | 6.0      |      | 9.0         |      |
| N =   | 261    |      | 312      |      | 429         |      |

Table 10, contd.

| Percent Who Say That the Goal of ...             | Oregon |      | Colorado |      | Connecticut |      |
|--|--------|------|----------|------|-------------|------|
|  | %      | Rank | %        | Rank | %           | Rank |
| <u>Improving Coordination Among Agencies is:</u> |        |      |          |      |             |      |
| very important                                   | 65.1   | 3    | 63.0     | 6    | 69.0        | 5    |
| neutral  | 12.5   |      | 22.0     |      | 20.0        |      |
| not important                                    | 22.4   |      | 14.0     |      | 11.0        |      |
| N =  | 264    |      | 311      |      | 420         |      |
| <u>Saving money is:</u>                          |        |      |          |      |             |      |
| very important                                   | 56.2   | 5    | 73.0     | 3    | 52.0        | 7    |
| neutral  | 18.3   |      | 14.0     |      | 24.0        |      |
| not important                                    | 25.6   |      | 13.0     |      | 24.0        |      |
| N =  | 258    |      | 314      |      | 421         |      |
| <u>Promoting community involvement is:</u>       |        |      |          |      |             |      |
| very important                                   | 72.2   | 2    | 72.0     | 4    | 69.0        | 4    |
| neutral  | 14.8   |      | 17.0     |      | 20.0        |      |
| not important                                    | 13.0   |      | 12.0     |      | 12.0        |      |
| N =  | 263    |      | 310      |      | 421         |      |
| <u>Avoiding building jails and prisons is:</u>   |        |      |          |      |             |      |
| very important                                   | 44.1   | 7    | 45.0     | 7    | 57.0        | 6    |
| neutral  | 16.7   |      | 21.0     |      | 19.0        |      |
| not important                                    | 39.2   |      | 35.0     |      | 25.0        |      |
| N =  | 263    |      | 309      |      | 419         |      |
| <u>Providing humane treatment is:</u>            |        |      |          |      |             |      |
| very important                                   | 55.5   | 6    | 79.0     | 2    | 77.0        | 3    |
| neutral  | 18.1   |      | 12.0     |      | 13.0        |      |
| not important                                    | 26.5   |      | 10.0     |      | 10.0        |      |
| N =  | 260    |      | 313      |      | 430         |      |

Of course, there are some areas of agreement: all three states rate reducing the number of offenders in state institutions high and place avoiding building new jails and prisons low in their rank of importance (see Table 10), but this is the extent to which there is agreement among all three states. There are areas where two of the three states agree; for example, Colorado and Connecticut rank rehabilitating offenders high and also providing humane treatment fairly high. But there is a very low correlation among the three states in their overall rankings. For example, the correlation in the ranking of importance between Oregon and Colorado is  $-.04$ , which is virtually no relationship at all. The correlation between Colorado and Connecticut is  $.36$  which is a very moderate positive relationship. The highest degree of agreement is between Oregon and Connecticut which has a correlation of  $.54$  (a fairly

high positive relationship). Overall, the emphasis seems to be on the traditional goals of rehabilitating offenders and reducing the number of offenders in state penal institutions.

b. Improvements in Services

There is far more agreement among the states about what improvements have been made in various conditions since the adoption of community corrections (see Table 11). Direct services to offenders ranks first among the conditions listed on the questionnaires of all three states--although this item was not on the Connecticut questionnaire, our field interviews indicate Connecticut respondents feel direct services have been greatly improved. All three states agree that coordination among agencies of the criminal justice system has substantially improved. This fits in with the notion that community corrections is not really a new set of programs and goals, but the traditional goals of treatment services organized in a new administrative structure that draws upon and integrates services in a much more effective and efficient manner. Of the various conditions, crowding in jails has improved the least.

Table 11  
Degree of Improvement in Various Conditions  
Since the Adoption of Community Corrections

|   | Oregon |      | Colorado |      | Connecticut |      |
|---|--------|------|----------|------|-------------|------|
|   | %      | Rank | %        | Rank | %           | Rank |
| <u>Crowding in jail:</u>  |        |      |          |      |             |      |
| Slightly or much better   | 24.4   | 5    | 44.0     | 5    | 34.8        | 4    |
| No change   | 27.6   |      | 34.0     |      | 32.3        |      |
| Slightly or much worse  | 48.0   |      | 22.0     |      | 32.8        |      |
| <u>Direct services to offenders:</u>  |        |      |          |      |             |      |
| Slightly or much better   | 65.4   | 1    | 80.0     | 1    | *           |      |
| No change   | 17.7   |      | 15.0     |      |             |      |
| Slightly or much worse  | 17.0   |      | 4.0      |      |             |      |
| <u>Community safety:</u>  |        |      |          |      |             |      |
| Slightly or much better   | 39.5   | 4    | 32.0     | 6    | 38.8        | 3    |
| No change   | 40.3   |      | 55.0     |      | 50.5        |      |
| Slightly or much worse  | 20.2   |      | 14.0     |      | 10.7        |      |
| <u>Coordination among criminal justice agencies:</u>                          |        |      |          |      |             |      |
| Slightly or much better   | 65.4   | 1    | 64.0     | 2    | 54.2        | 2    |
| No change   | 23.4   |      | 33.0     |      | 42.5        |      |
| Slightly or much worse  | 11.2   |      | 4.0      |      | 3.3         |      |
| <u>Coordination among criminal justice agencies<br/>and private agencies:</u> |        |      |          |      |             |      |
| Slightly or much better   | 58.4   | 3    | 62.0     | 3    | 56.4        | 1    |
| No change   | 26.4   |      | 33.0     |      | 39.7        |      |
| Slightly or much worse  | 15.2   |      | 5.0      |      | 3.8         |      |

Table 11, contd.

|                                       | Oregon |      | Colorado |      | Connecticut |      |
|---------------------------------------|--------|------|----------|------|-------------|------|
|                                       | %      | Rank | %        | Rank | %           | Rank |
| <u>Probation and parole services:</u> |        |      |          |      |             |      |
| Slightly or much better               | 60.2   | 2    | 49.0     | 4    | *           |      |
| No change                             | 24.4   |      | 44.0     |      |             |      |
| Slightly or much worse                | 15.4   |      | 8.0      |      |             |      |

\*These items were not included on the Connecticut questionnaire.

When specifically asked about how the state's community corrections program has affected cooperation among various groups, the majority of respondents in all three states said that cooperation had increased; Colorado has the highest percent of the three states who see an increase in cooperation (see Table 12).

Table 12  
How the State's Community Corrections Program  
Has Affected Cooperation

|           | Oregon | Colorado | Connecticut |
|-----------|--------|----------|-------------|
| Increased | 56.2   | 74.0     | 68.3        |
| Neither   | 34.2   | 24.0     | 30.3        |
| Decreased | 9.6    | 2.0      | 1.5         |
| N =       | 260    | 287      | 347         |

c. Impact on Public Safety

It appears that public safety has not been seriously harmed in any of the three states, although a fairly large percent of respondents in Connecticut see some decrease in public safety as a result of community corrections (see Table 13). This may be due to the fact that a sensational murder was committed by an offender who was in the community corrections program in Hartford. The offender murdered the janitor in the Catholic Church near the halfway house in which he resided. This incident gained widespread publicity when a state legislator held a news conference on the steps of the Church and vowed not to allow incidents like it to occur in the future.

Table 13  
Amount of Increase or Decrease in Public Safety  
As a Result of Community Corrections

|           | Oregon | Colorado | Connecticut |
|-----------|--------|----------|-------------|
| Increased | 40.6   | 13.0     | 12.3        |
| No change | 48.4   | 70.0     | 42.2        |
| Decrease  | 11.0   | 17.0     | 45.5        |
| N =       | 217    | 215      | 367         |

Oregon has the highest percent of respondents who see some improvement in public safety as a result of community corrections. This may be due to the fact that many judges and prosecutors say the program gives them greater control over offenders than if they are sentenced to state prisons. This gets us to the issue of widening the net of social control. In Oregon, a large percent of respondents say that offenders are released from prison too early (see Table 14). This is partly due to the probation matrix in the state that specifies the time a convicted offender must serve before being released on parole.

Table 14  
Agreement That Felons are Released  
Too Early From Prison

|                 | Oregon | Colorado | Connecticut |
|-----------------|--------|----------|-------------|
| Percent who ... |        |          |             |
| agree           | 90.7   | 58.0     | 38.9        |
| are neutral     | 5.6    | 27.0     | 36.5        |
| disagree        | 3.7    | 16.0     | 24.6        |
| N =             | 269    | 313      | 414         |

A number of respondents in Oregon said the matrix is too lenient and individuals get out of prison too soon. They like community corrections because they can have control over offenders placed in these programs for a much longer period of time than if they are sent to prison. For example, a person convicted of burglary may be released on parole after six months if sent to state prison but have a commitment for a year or more if s/he is sentenced to community corrections. Thus, there appears to be some widening of the net of social control in Oregon, at least in the sense the program increases the length of control over offenders.

d. Widening of the Net of Social Control

Net widening in Colorado, to the extent to which it occurs, is different than in Oregon or Connecticut. A relatively small percent of offenders (i.e., about 18%) who are placed in community corrections likely would have been placed on regular probation rather than being sent to prison if community corrections did not exist. This conclusion is based on data supplied by the State Judicial Department and an independent study that showed that although the persons placed in community corrections more closely resembled those placed on probation than they resembled those being sent to prison in regard to their current offense, they more closely resembled those sentenced to prison than those being placed on probation in their previous offenses. A discriminant analysis based on a large number of variables of the individuals placed in community correction shows that the overwhelming majority (82%) would have been sent to prison if community corrections did not exist.

Net widening in Connecticut is still different. It does not bring more people into the corrections system since the program is only for those being released from prison. A consequence of the Connecticut program is that it requires from those released into the program a longer time commitment than from those released directly from prison. But since those being placed into the program are much more likely to find employment (twice as likely) and have lower recidivism rates (10%), then whatever net widening has occurred may be better interpreted as a more appropriate application of sanctions.

e. Perceptions of Program Success

The program perceived to be the most successful by those who implement it is the one in Colorado. Table 15 shows that 79 percent of the Colorado implementors believe the program has been moderately or very successful; 67.6 percent of the Connecticut respondents and 61.2 percent of the Oregon respondents believe this.

A smaller percentage of respondents in all three states say the state's existing corrections administration has been successful in its implementation. Both Oregon and Connecticut are rather low in the percent who agree the state has been successful, with Oregon being the lowest of the three.

In all three states there is a division of opinion in how the respondents rate the state administration's success as compared to the county's success in implementing community corrections. For example, in Oregon only 31.1 percent agree the state has been successful in administering the Community Corrections Act but 61.2 percent agree the county has been successful and in Colorado 75 percent agree the judicial district has been successful. Because Connecticut doesn't have counties, judicial districts, or other local units of government involved in implementing its Community Corrections Act we did not include this question on that questionnaire. We, however, asked a series of six questions about how well different aspects of the Connecticut program have done; on the average 60 to 70 percent of the respondents said these programs (i.e., halfway houses, nonresidential service agencies, PREP council) had done moderately or very well. Thus respondents in all



three states give the local governmental jurisdiction or agency a much higher success rating than they give the state administration. It should be emphasized, however, that the programs in all three states have been judged to be successful by two-thirds or more of the individuals who implement them (see Table 15, part A). This is a high rate of perceived success.

Table 15  
Perceptions of Success

|   | Oregon | Colorado | Connecticut       |
|---|--------|----------|-------------------|
| A. <u>Community corrections has been:</u>   |        |          |                   |
| very successful   | 23.6   | 24.0     | 12.2 <sup>1</sup> |
| moderately successful   | 37.6   | 55.0     | 55.4              |
| neutral   | 14.1   | 15.0     | 0                 |
| moderately unsuccessful   | 10.3   | 5.0      | 27.1              |
| very unsuccessful   | 14.4   | 1.0      | .8                |
| N =   | 263    | 296      |                   |
| B. <u>The State's existing corrections administration has been successful in its implementation of community corrections:</u> |        |          |                   |
| Percent who ...   |        |          |                   |
| agree   | 39.1   | 59.0     | 47.6              |
| neutral   | 29.9   | 26.0     | 33.9              |
| disagree  | 31.0   | 15.0     | 18.5              |
| N =   | 261    | 309      | 410               |

<sup>1</sup> These figures are the average percent who rated the Connecticut program on six different dimensions. The total N ranged from 390 to 410. For Oregon and Colorado the percents are the responses to a single question.

E. Keys to Successful Implementation  
Implementation has been defined as the complex process of planning, organizing, coordinating, and promoting in order to achieve policy objectives (Hyder, 1984, p. 1). There can be a very wide gap between what a policy promises and the actual performance that is delivered (Marcus, 1980). But this gap can be closed by taking certain key steps. The first is to get the commitment and support of those who must implement the program. This includes not just those at the top (judges, prosecutors, legislators, commissioners, sheriffs, directors), but also the street-level implementors (probation/parole officers, counselors, volunteers, and staff). We have found that those at the upper-level tend to support the program more than the street-level administrators. This is as it should be since one of the main jobs of the upper-level administrators is to instill a sense of enthusiasm in the program among those they direct and naturally can do this better if they are

enthusiastic about it themselves. But it also is crucial that street-level implementors have access to decisionmaking. When those at the street-level participate in decisions, they develop a sense of ownership in the program and, as a result, have a higher level of support for it. They not only feel that the program is doing good things, but also that it increases their chances of doing their own job more effectively.

In the several states that we researched we found that the state law that established the program was passed several years after local programs have been started in counties and cities in the state. The state law simply ratified and allowed for expansion of programs that began at the local level; most often, these programs were begun with the help of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration in the early 1970s by individuals whom we call public sector entrepreneurs. They served as the catalyst to generate support for the program among elected officials as well as among those who will implement it. They helped advertise their programs and were eager to have people study them.

It is easier for these entrepreneurs to generate support for the program if the goals to be achieved are clear and realistic. The principal goal of community corrections as a sentencing alternative is to reduce the number of nonviolent felons being sentenced to state prisons. As a result--because it is less costly to handle an offender in community corrections than it is to put the same individual in prison--the second major goal is to reduce the overall cost of corrections. The programs can be implemented more successfully if these two goals are the main objectives.

Many street level implementors, however, still are committed to the goal of rehabilitation, and in a number of locations a high percent of respondents say this is the reason their area became involved in community corrections. In addition, for transitional programs, the primary goal is reintegrating offenders back into the community. Reducing prison populations is, at best, a secondary goal in transitional programs. The Connecticut program, a transitional program, is unique in that its main goal since its inception in 1972 has been the building of political constituencies. Organized by a private agency called the Connecticut Justice Education Committee, the purpose is to educate the public, media, and legislators about important corrections issues and to build support for system change that improves the operation of corrections in the state. A network of private, nonprofit agencies has been built in the state for this purpose. The goal of building political constituencies and using existing social service agencies for this purpose is an excellent strategy for getting a state to start community corrections. The Connecticut experience is very valuable in this regard.

The flexibility of community corrections is an immense advantage that facilitates its being adapted to local conditions--which is another key to successful implementation. A program that works in one location cannot be transplanted without modification to another location. Community corrections is different in each state, even when the same overall design has been followed. And within each state there are wide variations in each county, judicial district, or other local areas in which it operates. Programs such as community corrections usually

are not begun de novo but, instead, are added to or grafted onto existing programs and facilities which, of course, is the best strategy for getting such programs started.

Because community corrections requires that existing agencies and practices be changed or modified, it must be accompanied by training for implementors, including the upper-level people such as judges and prosecutors. The purpose of the training should be to familiarize them with the details of the program and their role in the system. For example, sentencing alternative programs cannot succeed if judges will not sentence nonviolent offenders to the program (which is what happened early in the Minnesota program). Training for judges is one way to correct this situation.

Private, nonprofit agencies can be an important component of successful implementation of all types of community corrections programs. In Colorado, private, nonprofit agencies contract with the state to provide minimum and medium security residential facilities (halfway houses) and services for individuals sentenced to community corrections. In Connecticut, many of the private agencies have a religious or social service affiliation. They not only provide halfway house residential facilities and services but also are required by contract to devote a portion of their time to educating the public about corrections and garnering support for specific system changes.

Getting community support--another key to successful implementation--can be facilitated by building on and working with existing community resources. Community opposition to community corrections usually centers around locating a halfway house in the neighborhood. This may be offset somewhat if members of the community serve on an advisory board and community residents are invited to visit the facility and learn about its programs. In Colorado, halfway house directors are required to establish advisory committees in each neighborhood in which a halfway house is located. These committees serve the function of reassuring the community that its safety has not been reduced.

#### F. The Impacts of Community Corrections

Community corrections as a sentencing alternative reduces the number of individuals who are sentenced to state prison. Our research estimates that the State of Colorado was able to reduce its commitments to state prison in the six-year period from 1977 through 1983 by about 2,124 individuals. The reduction in commitments for Oregon in the four-year period from 1978-1981 was 375. These reductions in commitments lowers the costs of corrections unless, of course, the savings realized by not sending individuals to prison are offset by the costs of running community corrections programs. However, we found no evidence that this is the case. To the contrary, we found that there is a significant monetary savings realized through community corrections.

One of the main criticisms of community corrections is that it widens the net of social control. We found that this is true to a certain extent but also that there has not been a great deal of net widening and that, in some cases, this may have actually been beneficial. For example, in Oregon, the impact has been to increase the amount of control over offenders already in the system rather than to

put people in it who otherwise would not be. Judges in Oregon in particular said they liked the program because it ensured that they had control over offenders for a longer period of time than would be the case if they were sent to prison. In Colorado, we found that around 15-20 percent of the offenders being sentenced to community corrections would have been placed on probation if community corrections did not exist. However, the other 80-85 percent would have been sent to prison.

Because two-thirds of those sentenced to community corrections have serious substance abuse/mental health problems, they are better off in a community corrections program than they would be in prison. At least they receive some form of treatment there, whereas in prison their problems would likely get worse. So, the net widening that has occurred may be a more appropriate sanction than straight probation because community corrections is better equipped to deal with substance abuse/mental health problems than prison.

#### G. The Future of Community Corrections

Community corrections is likely to grow in the United States (and perhaps in other countries as well) for a number of reasons. First there is serious prison and jail overcrowding and the cost of prison construction and maintenance to correct this situation is very high. Community corrections can help reduce the price of corrections and this appeals to state legislators. Even a dramatic increase in the use of privately-run prisons is not likely to change this. Second, the fact that community corrections can handle nonviolent offenders more effectively, at a lower cost, and without any additional threat to public safety will be an additional incentive for its expansion.

A third reason it will grow is that prisons in most states are overused. Many of the respondents we interviewed in each state, as well as a specific study made in Colorado, indicate that as many as one third of the residents of prisons could more appropriately be handled in community corrections programs. These tend to be first-time, nonviolent offenders who have committed a crime such as burglary and who often have a substance abuse problem.

Community corrections also helps solve a major problem in corrections created by the fact that prosecution of offenders takes place at the county level while the state is responsible for incarcerating those sent by the counties. Since counties are not charged a user fee for the people they send to state prisons, they tend to look upon prisons as a "free good." Thus, there is an economic incentive to "overincarcerate." Community corrections alleviates this problem somewhat because, under some arrangements, the county directly pays for the incarceration costs. For example, in Minnesota, Oregon and Kansas, the state reduces its subsidy to the county for each offender convicted of certain crimes that is sent to a state prison. Thus, the county cannot look upon state prisons as a free good in these systems.

Still another reason community corrections is likely to expand is because the community becomes involved in corrections through participation on advisory boards and through the use of private, nonprofit organizations to provide services and promote support. Connecticut is the most innovative state in this regard. Its Private-Public Resources

Expansion Program (PREP) has been in existence since 1972. Through it, the state contracts with private agencies which provide halfway houses and other services and also helps educate legislators, the media, and the public about corrections issues. The Criminal Justice Education Committee organizes these agencies and directs their efforts in creating a political constituency to support system change. This agency has been very successful in generating support for various corrections programs.

While there are many factors in favor of growth for community corrections, there also are obstacles. One is that many people still view it as a soft approach and believe that a first-time, nonviolent offender should be sent to prison. But the view that community corrections is a soft approach is incorrect and efforts can be made to change it. For example, in Denver, Colorado, individuals sentenced to community corrections are first put in the city jail for 30 to 90 days in what is called "shock" probation. After this taste of incarceration, offenders are placed in one of the halfway houses. Once public officials and the public at large are made aware that community corrections is not a soft approach but is a more appropriate sanction than prison for certain types of offenders, this kind of opposition should diminish.

A second obstacle is the fact it is difficult to find sites for halfway houses due to neighborhood opposition. For example, in Fort Collins, Colorado, a halfway house was located across the street from the women's dormitory at Colorado State University. This resulted in outcries in the community, but the halfway house operated there for several years without the occurrence of one unfavorable incident.

A third serious obstacle is the need to find productive, non-dead-end jobs for offenders. Many of the respondents in our study said they believed the real key to success is to find a good job for their clients, without which they were likely to get into trouble again. There has been considerable success in the states we studied in finding meaningful jobs for a large percent of offenders (i.e., 60-70%), but there still is a long way to go in the area. This, of course, is the area when the community can be the most helpful.

Finally, another major obstacle is the turf battle that can occur between the corrections and judicial branches. Sentencing alternative programs need the support and commitment of judges and probation officers in order to work, but when they are run by the Department of Corrections, these officials are likely to look upon the programs as competition rather than helpful to them. The probation officers and judges in Colorado are far more supportive of the program than their counterparts in Oregon and Connecticut--partly because the sentencing alternative program in Colorado is housed in the Judicial Department. As a result, the program seems to operate better in that state. This is not to conclude that it always should be located in the judicial branch, only that the professional and agency needs of the judicial branch must be given consideration when sentencing alternative programs are being set up. Ideally, a collaborative arrangement between the corrections and judicial branches would be best.

Some of these obstacles to growth of community corrections are formidable. But the factors in favor of growth and development appear

to outweigh the obstacles and the likelihood is that the program will spread to more states and localities in the United States.

#### REFERENCES

- Masood Hyder, "Implementation: The Evolutionary Model," in David Lewis and Helen Wallace, Policies Into Practice: National and International Case Studies in Implementation. London: Hernemann, 1984.
- Alfred Marcus, Promise and Performance: Choosing and Implementing an Environmental Policy. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1980.
- William Selke, "An Empirical Analyses of the Ideological Barrier in Community Corrections," Journal of Criminal Justice, 12, 1984, pp. 541-549.

**END**