

111316

**SURVEY OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION  
PRIORITIES OF DOC CENTRAL OFFICE ADMINISTRATORS  
AND INSTITUTIONAL ADMINISTRATORS**

**Final Report**

**Prepared by:**

**Michael W. Forcier, Ph.D.  
Research Division**

**Massachusetts Department of Correction**

**Michael V. Fair  
Commissioner**

**NCJRS**

**MAY 18 1988**

**August 1987**

**ACQUISITIONS**

**PUBLICATION: #14,962-48pp.-250cps.-8-11-87  
Approved by State Purchasing Agent**

## **SURVEY OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION PRIORITIES OF DOC CENTRAL OFFICE ADMINISTRATORS AND INSTITUTIONAL ADMINISTRATORS**

### **I. Introduction**

The Department of Correction's (DOC) Strategic Plan outlines DOC goals and corresponding strategic objectives including "results which are capable of being evaluated, measured, and monitored". In recognition of this, the DOC Research Division conducted a **Survey of DOC Central Office Administrators and Institutional Administrators** in order to obtain their **perceptions** of research needs and priorities. The need for this survey stemmed from an increased interest in research and evaluation, and recognition of the potential role of research to inform policy and program development, and institutional operations and management, while also being of benefit to the outside community.

This study was envisioned as a three phase process. Phase 1 consisted of the actual survey and is represented by this report which presents the study results. Phase 2 consisted of discussions with DOC Executive Staff in order to obtain their input and advice concerning directions for future research based upon the survey results. Phase 3 consisted of recommendations made by the Research Division for future research based upon the survey results and discussions with DOC Executive Staff.

## PHASE I

### Survey Results

#### II. Study Objectives

The primary objectives of this survey were to obtain information from DOC Central Office Administrators and Institutional Administrators which could be used to help the Research Division prioritize research projects, incorporate necessary and desired information into the Research Division's data-base, and plan for personnel. A further objective was to identify critical needs and problems which administrators face in operating their divisions or institutions, and how research might be of assistance in addressing those needs or problem areas. Finally, but not least importantly, this study represents a first step toward making research even more relevant to the needs of policy-makers, program planners, and institutional staff by involving them in the research process and providing them the opportunity to help set a research agenda which will be of maximum benefit to them.

#### III. Methods of Data Collection

The survey was administered in person in a semi-structured interview format by the Deputy Director of Research. Two types of respondents were interviewed: 1) DOC Central Office Administrators; and, 2) Institutional Administrators. The DOC Central Office Administrators interviewed were:

- Director - Education
- Director - Programs and Classification
- Director - Psychological Services

- Director - Industries
- Director - Training Academy
- Director - Health Services
- Director - Public Affairs
- Director - Budget
- Director - Contract Pre-Release Programs
- Director - Food and Farm Services
- Chief - Apprehension Unit
- Director - Affirmative Action
- Director - Labor Relations
- Director - Manpower
- Legislative Aide - Legislative

Interviews with Central Office Administrators were conducted at the DOC Central Office except for those Administrators whose offices were located outside of Central Office (i.e., Industries, Education, Food and Farm Services, Manpower, Contract Pre-Release Programs, Health Services).

The Institutional Administrators interviewed were Superintendents. Superintendents were invited to, and in some cases did, have their Deputy Superintendents or other staff participate in the interviews. Some Superintendents requested their staff to prepare memoranda on needed research topics at that institution which they then used as the basis for their responses. In some instances, these memoranda were given to the interviewer during the actual site visit or sent to the Research Division in the form of a follow-up memorandum after the visit. Site visits were made to each institution for the purpose of conducting interviews with Superintendents except for the interview with the Superintendent of the North Central Correctional Center which was held at the DOC Central Office. In some instances, the Director of Research accompanied the Deputy Director of Research

on institutional site visits. A list of survey respondents and the division or institution they were with at the time of the survey is attached as Appendix A.

#### IV. Sources of Data

A seven item interview schedule was developed for the interview process. The questions were designed to tap three areas:

- critical needs or problems administrators face in operating their divisions/institutions;
- research studies administrators would like to see undertaken and inmate programs they would like to see evaluated; and,
- types of information not currently available which they would like to have on the inmate population.

The interview questions were open-ended so as to allow for the broadest possible input from the study respondents. Some of the questions were accompanied, however, by a list of interview probes which were used to facilitate questioning and recording. The seven questions asked were:

1. What are some of the most critical areas of need which you, as an administrator, face relating to correctional policies and programs?
2. What are the most important problems or needs you faced during the last year in operating a correctional division/institution?
3. What types of research would be helpful to you for purposes of policy and program development?
4. What are five research studies you would like to see the DOC Research Division undertake in the next 3 years?
5. What types of information not currently available would you like to have on inmate populations?

6. Are there any inmate programs which you would like to see evaluated? If so, which programs?
7. Is there anything else you would like to say about needed areas of research on correctional issues in the Commonwealth?

A complete copy of the Interview Schedule and protocol is reproduced as Appendix B.

Given the qualitative and open-ended nature of the interview questions, the survey results were not amenable to statistical or quantitative analysis. Therefore, analysis of the responses obtained consisted of identifying, describing, and categorizing common needs/problems and frequently mentioned research needs/priorities. These were then rank-ordered according to the frequency with which they were mentioned by respondents.

#### V. Organization of this Report

The survey results are presented in three sections reflecting the different areas tapped by the interview questions. The first section, **Critical Needs/Problems**, identifies the major needs and problems facing administrators in operating their division or institution. In the context of this question, "needs" and "problems" refer not only to research but also to, more broadly, resources, physical plant, and staffing. The second section, **Suggested Research Projects/Program Evaluations**, describes the major research studies and program evaluations which administrators would like to see conducted in the next two to three years. Respondents were asked to identify needed research both of their own division/institution, as well as across divisions/institutions or, system-wide. The third section, **Data Information Needs**, identifies the types of information which Administrators would like to have on the inmate population which they do not

currently receive. The purpose of this question was to identify information which, if feasible to obtain, could be incorporated into the Research Division's data-base and provided on a regular basis to Division Directors and Institutional Superintendents to assist in policy development and program planning.

Before presenting the survey results, one caveat is in order. The reader is asked to bear in mind that the intent of this survey was to obtain the perceptions of Division Directors and Institutional Superintendents, and the results presented herein reflect those perceptions. No attempt was made in this report to reinterpret, verify, or corroborate the accuracy of those perceptions by reference to statistics, data, or other factual information. This is because we believe it to be important to obtain the perceptions of other DOC Administrators irrespective of the validity of those perceptions.

The section to this report entitled "PHASE 2, Executive Staff Input" summarizes the results of a meeting held with Executive Staff in order to present the results of the survey and to obtain their input and advice concerning future directions for research. The section of this report entitled "PHASE 3, Recommendations for Research," presents recommendations for future research based on the survey results and discussions with Executive Staff.

## VI. Results

### A. Critical Needs/Problems

Critical needs and problems cited by survey respondents clustered into four major areas: Inmate Classification; Programs; Resources; and, Informational Needs. Issues pertaining to each of these areas were mentioned most frequently by respondents and are discussed separately below.

## 1. Inmate Classification

A number of superintendents cited inmate classification and the changing character of the inmate population as presenting major problems for their institutions. Classification was frequently criticized for being inaccurate, incomplete, and misleading. Classification reports were said to contain outdated and inaccurate information, good time which was not updated, and insufficient documentation for making programmatic and custodial decisions about inmates. Some illustrative anomalies of the classification process have resulted in inappropriate placement of inmates at various institutions and programs such as: inmates on psychotropic medication sent to work around farm machinery or inmates with hepatitis sent to work for food services; physically disabled inmates placed at forestry camps where physical labor is required; and, inmates with outstanding warrants or escape histories placed in lower levels of security. At the same time, most of these same Superintendents realized that such problems were not the fault of the Classification Division per se, but rather attributable to other factors such as overcrowding.

Although there was agreement that there was indeed a need for an accurate classification process tied to inmate programmatic needs, there was also some sentiment that the Classification and Program Agreements (CAPA) system, however well intentioned in concept, was not the solution. Given overcrowding, and rapid movements of inmates through the system, inmates were frequently said to not be at an institution long enough to complete a program. Furthermore, if inmates were transferred to another institution lacking a program begun at the prior institution, they would be unable to meet the terms of their CAPA. Even when programs were available at different institutions, inmates were often said to fail to follow through on their programming. Concern was expressed that the

Department was signing CAPAs with inmates but would not be able to live up to their end of the agreement by guaranteeing an inmate would be in a certain institution at a particular point in time.

Many respondents pointed to changes in the nature and characteristics of the inmate population and problems which these changes have created for them. Gone, for the most part, was said to be the older, more seasoned inmate, in many ways the model inmate who concentrated on doing his own time, only to be replaced by a cohort of younger, more violent, management problem inmates. As evidence of these changes respondents pointed to increases in the number of escapes, returns to higher custody, parole violators, failures in lower security, and disciplinary reports. Minimum and pre-release facilities, in particular, pointed to an increase in "hard core" inmates with violent criminal histories who, only eight years ago, would have been behind walls.

Among some other demographic changes perceived by respondents to have occurred in the inmate population has been an increase in the number of Hispanic offenders at certain institutions, many of whom were incarcerated for drug offenses. A concentration of any ethnic or racial group at one institution was seen as dramatically affecting the culture and climate of that institution, as well as presenting special programming problems. Classification was said to have the potential to affect the composition and climate of the institution by its transfer process.

A number of institutions cited an increase in the percent of their population consisting of sex offenders. Across all institutions, sex offenders ranged from 25 to 40 percent of an institution's population with an average population size of approximately one third. The increase in sex offenders was said to pose serious problems of developing or finding programs for this group.

Some institutions spoke of an increase in the number of inmates with medical

problems and a lack of resources to deal with such problems. In institutions lacking medical units, inmates with medical problems were said to tax an institution by tying up staff in transportation of inmates to and from outside hospitals for medical services. Concern was also raised that given incomplete classification reports, little is known about inmates' medical and/or medication histories when they arrive at an institution. Finally, concern was expressed by a number of respondents about the potential of the AIDS problem to grow.

## 2. Programs

A number of respondents pointed to the need for expanded programming, program services, and leisure activities. The two types of programs cited as most needed were psychological services and substance abuse. There was general sentiment that in addition to program expansion, there was a need to "get the word out" to inmates about these programs. One possible mechanism seen for accomplishing this was the CAPA.

It would appear that the current practice is for most programs to be developed at the institutional level. One problem with this is that there is relatively little cross-institution knowledge or awareness of programs. A second problem with institution-generated programs is that they are sometimes developed without full knowledge as to what is effective in terms of treatment or program services. For these reasons, both Division Directors and Institutional Superintendents, cited the need for comprehensive psychological services and substance abuse systems which are based on the findings of research as to what constitutes effective treatment.

Other programs and services which were cited as in need were programs for sex offenders, expanded work, employment and vocational/leisure opportunities,

intermediate care for chronically ill patients, and additional contract pre-release programs. However, it was suggested that before programs are expanded, the DOC should first identify those programs which are needed, the types of program approaches and services which are effective, and then tailor these program approaches to different types of offenders.

The desire for increased programming was counterbalanced by some skepticism concerning the purposes and rehabilitative potential of programming. First, because of the increasingly rapid movement of inmates between institutions, individuals were said to not be in any one institution's programs long enough to work with. This, coupled with the fact that programs at one facility may not necessarily exist at another facility, was seen as detrimental to effective participation in the CAPA system. Second, some respondents felt that the rehabilitative aspects of programs were limited and their primary purpose was to reduce inmate idleness and keep inmates busy. Other, more cynical respondents believed that most inmates were career criminals beyond rehabilitation who only participated in programs because it looked good to the Classification and/or Parole Board, not because they sincerely wanted help. Some suggested we examine the level and intensity of participation in programs as a measure of inmate sincerity and not simply whether inmates attended programs. Finally, the focus of some programs was criticized as misdirected. For example, education programs were felt to aim too high by offering college level computer courses when most inmates were more likely to be manual laborers upon release.

### 3. Resources

While less amenable to research, resource needs and problems were frequently cited by survey respondents and particularly, Superintendents. Resource

needs fell into three areas: Space and Physical Plant; Equipment; and, Human Resources. Each is discussed below.

a. Space and Physical Plant

Through both the interviews and the tours of each institution, it was apparent that improvements in the physical plant was a critical resource need at many institutions. The physical plant and structure of many institutions are in various stages of disrepair and in need of upgrading or expansion. Delays in capital outlay projects, the failure of the physical plant to keep pace with expansion, and lack of space conducive to program activities were said to adversely affect both staff and inmate attitudes. Moreover the lack of resources has led to concern that some institutions would not be able to comply with American Correctional Association (ACA) standards.

b. Equipment

Equipment needs ranged from motor vehicles to updated medical equipment to computer software. A number of Superintendents cited the need for better motor vehicles for transporting inmates to other institutions, outside hospitals, and program activities. Basic medical equipment in some facilities was either non-existent or not operational. Similarly, other types of machinery or recreational equipment which could be used to train inmates in a vocation or provide recreation were frequently found to be broken and inoperable.

Both Division Directors and Superintendents cited a need for further computerization of records. Among the types of information in need of computerization were:

- better personnel management information system software;
- inmate medical needs, prescriptions, and medical encounters;
- systems for monitoring/tracking inmate transfers;
- an inmate movement accountability system for inmates on furlough and work release; and,
- production, sales, and billing records for the correctional industries program.

It should be noted that the Research Division has recently completed a project for the Programs and Classification Division which computerizes all inmate transfers. A project to computerize inmate movements while on work release or furlough is in process.

### C. Human Resources

Human resources were uniformly cited by survey respondents as a major area of need. Virtually all institutions were in need of additional staff and specifically, correctional officers. Rapid turnover and vacancies in these positions was attributed to the loss of correctional officers to law enforcement agencies and to extended sick leave, industrial accidents, and stress. Some raised questions about the legitimacy of extended industrial accidents and attributed this to abusive sick leave.

Concern was expressed that the DOC was investing in the training of correctional officers only to see them leave after the completion of their probationary period. This was especially true of minority and female officers who were said to be difficult to recruit and retain, and attracted to careers in law enforcement.

In addition to correctional officers, staff shortages were mentioned for the

following positions: correctional counselors; nurses and pharmacists; support staff (clerks); correctional educators; and, engineers. Problems of recruitment and retention in these fields were attributed to unequal compensation and less prestige in corrections compared to other career fields.

Problems of staff turnover, shortages, and abusive sick leave were said to have been exacerbated by the failure of staff recruitment and retention to keep pace with program expansion. Moreover, staff shortages have resulted in a substantial amount of staff time consumed by the use of correctional officers for transportation of inmates to and from other institutions as well as outside hospitals. Suggestions for research on staffing issues are discussed in the section, **Suggested Research Projects/Program Evaluations**. Finally, a number of respondents suggested the need for additional training of all staff ranging from senior staff training on the MMARS system to correctional officer training on the routine handling of disciplinary problems.

#### **4. Informational Needs**

Many respondents expressed a need to have access to better information and closer interaction with other Divisions and Institutions. Among the types of information requested was a model for forecasting bed space needs, cost data for making budgetary and resource allocation decisions, and information on legislative bills, and policies and programs promulgated at the institutional or Central Office levels.

Both Division Directors and Institutional Superintendents cited a need for closer interaction between Divisions, with Executive staff, and across Institutions. One suggested forum for accomplishing this was to have Division Directors attend the Superintendents' meetings. Some Division Directors felt that the Institutions

were too autonomous and this made it difficult to keep track of direct services, delivery performance, and accountability. One suggested solution to this problem was a centralized system for various services and programs. Other Division Directors felt that Central Office staff could do a better job of getting information out to the field. This was echoed by those Superintendents who called for better coordination with other DOC Divisions.

## **B. Suggested Research Projects/Program Evaluations**

Respondents were asked to identify the types of research (e.g. surveys, evaluations, etc.) which were most helpful to them in policy and program development, and specific research studies and program evaluations which they would like to see the Research Division undertake in the next 2-3 years. This section presents the types of research, research projects, and program evaluations suggested by study respondents.

### **1. Types of Research**

Respondents were asked to identify the types of research which were most helpful to them for purposes of policy and program development. Three types of research were most frequently mentioned as helpful: Program Impact Evaluation; Comparative Research; and, Population Trend Analyses. Each is discussed below.

#### **a. Program Impact Evaluation**

There was overwhelming sentiment that although there are a substantial number of programs for inmates across institutions, extremely little is known about

program effectiveness or program impact. A number of Superintendents suggested that all major program areas (i.e., Industries, Education, Psychological Services, Substance Abuse, Health Services), be routinely evaluated in order to assess program purpose/goals, staff capability, performance, enrollment, and program effectiveness. Many stated that given a wide variety of program models or approaches to choose from (e.g., group vs. individual counseling), it was important to know what types of treatment worked best for the inmate population, what programs inmates participate in, the degree of participation, and the impact of program participation on recidivism rates, failure in lower security, disciplinary infractions, and other variables.

**b. Comparative Research**

A few respondents expressed an interest in comparative research which could compare the performance of institutions against one another as indicated by outcome measures such as recidivism rates. This view was expressed despite the fact that this type of research is already conducted by the Research Division since virtually all reports include a break down of statistics by institution. Interest in comparative research was especially evident among the pre-release centers which saw themselves as differing in ways which had the potential to affect program outcome. One respondent called for a comparative analysis of the escape and success/failure rates of inmates who go through contract pre-release versus those released directly from an institution.

### **c. Population Trend Analyses**

Superintendents identified population trend analyses as a valuable type of research for purposes of policy and program development. It was frequently mentioned that institutions would experience an increase or decrease in certain types of offenders (e.g., sex) or demographic groups (e.g., Hispanics) that would present special problems in terms of the climate of the institution and developing programs to meet the needs of a certain influx of a particular type of offender and/or demographic group. The Research Division was said to have a major role in assisting institutions quickly and on a continual basis by identifying if their populations were changing in significant ways and how they could respond. Specific population trends said to be of particular value were: the count sheet; chronologies of movements and movement patterns; demographics (age, race, sex, medical); and, special need populations (e.g., substance abusers).

### **2. Research Studies/Program Evaluations**

Suggestions for research ranged from that for system-wide research on broad program areas (e.g., psychological services, industries) or topics (e.g. comparative recidivism rates for pre-release centers) to studies or evaluations of a specific program in one institution (e.g., Pre-Release Preparation Program at MCI-Shirley, Hodder House at MCI-Framingham) to suggestions for further research on particular topics or problem areas (e.g., protective custody, escapes, departmental segregation). Although many respondents had suggestions for future research and evaluation, fewer were actually able to articulate a testable research question or hypothesis. This section is divided into the following subsections reflecting the major research studies/program evaluations suggested by survey respondents:

Staff; Classification; Substance Abuse; Psychological Services; Medical; Education; Industries; and, Miscellaneous studies.

a. Staff

Consistent with its identification as a critical need, studies of staff and staffing issues were frequently cited as a requested research area. A variety of research topics were identified in regard to staff, and most of them focused on line staff. Topics suggested included:

- Surveys of staff recruitment, retention, and turnover among correctional officers and correctional counselors.
- Validation and evaluation studies of the Training Academy program for staff and the relationship of training to job performance.
- Recruitment and retention of minority and female correctional officers and correctional counselors.
- Usage of (extended) sick leave by institution and shift.
- Staffing patterns across institutions and their relationship to disciplinary incidents and programmatic needs.
- Career advancement patterns within the Department of Correction.
- Stress among correctional officer staff and its relationship to job turnover.

It should be noted that although historically staffing issues have been the province of the Division of Personnel, the Research Division has conducted research on staff in conjunction with the DOC Training Academy.

## b. Classification

Second most frequently mentioned as an area in need of research was classification and specifically, Classification and Program Agreements (CAPA). Because the Research Division will begin a study of the CAPA Classification system at MCI-Concord in July of 1987, we will be able to address many of the research questions raised by survey respondents. However, because there were many suggestions for research on classification which could not possibly be addressed in a single study, it may be necessary to conduct further research on classification.

Many of the suggestions for research stemmed from criticism of the classification system. For example, classification was blamed for sending the "wrong" inmates to different security levels, institutions, and/or programs. A prime example of this would be sending inmates with escape histories to lower security levels. Although many respondents could articulate criticism of the classification process, few were actually able to translate their criticism into a research question or hypothesis.

A great deal of interest was centered on CAPA and whether or not it was working as intended. Respondents calling for evaluation of the CAPA system suggested a number of potential research issues which will be considered for possible inclusion in the Research Division's forthcoming classification study. These include:

- Process studies of the internal application of CAPA;
- The effectiveness of CAPA in counteracting overcrowding;
- The links between CAPA and the degree of inmate program participation for CAPA versus non-CAPA inmates;
- CAPA classification guidelines and the number of CAPA contracts which

follow through their actual sequence or are altered;

- Whether CAPA works as well for minority inmates who move through the system more slowly.

Again, some respondents felt that CAPA was destined for failure due to overcrowding and a lack of program uniformity across institutions. Under those conditions, inmates cannot possibly comply with the CAPA contract.

In addition to studies of CAPA at Concord, research was also suggested on CAPA at Framingham. Finally, Bridgewater State Hospital is starting a classification system and it was recommended that their system be evaluated in two years.

### c. Substance Abuse

The third most frequently mentioned area of needed research was on substance abuse and specifically, evaluations of substance abuse programs. Among the types of research suggested were:

- relationship of substance abuse to crime and criminal histories;
- evaluations of the effectiveness of substance abuse treatment programs;
- the prevalence of substance abuse problems among the inmate population; and,
- the different types of treatment available which are most effective in addressing substance abuse.

There appears to be little awareness of the types of treatment available to substance abusers and the effectiveness of different treatments with different groups. Although there is substantial agreement that the percent of inmates with substance abuse problems is very high, little is actually known about the nature and extent of the substance abuse problem. Because much of the inmate data are self-

reported, little is known from a clinical perspective about the quantity and frequency of an inmate's alcohol/drug use, symptomatology, or adverse consequences experienced (such as arrest) due to substance abuse. Moreover, there appears to be an automatic assumption that much crime results from substance abuse when in fact the causal chain between substance abuse and crime has been shown by research to be infinitely more complex than that. One unfortunate result of this way of thinking is that the inmate who admits to a heroin addiction of five years may be classified and treated the same programmatically, as the inmate who reports having consumed twelve beers before he committed an armed robbery. In fact, the nature of their addictions are substantially different.

In addition to the general suggestions for research on substance abuse listed above, the following were specific studies mentioned by survey respondents:

- Research tracking inmate participants in MCI-Shirley's substance abuse unit through parole and aftercare;
- Outcome evaluation of Longwood Treatment Center graduates;
- Research relating characteristics of Longwood inmates identified through the MMPI and Alcohol Use Inventory to post program success/failure;
- Exploratory research on a recovery-based chemical dependency program that could follow inmates through various security levels; and,
- Evaluation of MCI-Norfolk drug treatment programs.

#### **d. Psychological Services**

As with substance abuse services, there were frequent suggestions for research on psychological service programs and psychological service needs of inmates. There was substantial agreement that there was first a need to determine what psychological services are needed for inmates based on the types of

psychological problems exhibited across the inmate population. On the basis of this information, programs should be subsequently evaluated as to treatment effectiveness. Approximately one third of the inmate population was said to be receiving psychological services and there is a stated need to increase the number of inmates receiving these services. Specific projects cited as deserving of study were: research on female inmates at MCI-Framingham with psychiatric problems; the relationship between education, industries employment and psychological services; a study of referrals from education programs to psych services based on classroom behavior; and, evaluations of the effectiveness of the Division of Legal Medicine.

**e. Medical**

Research on the health and medical needs of inmates was identified as a research priority. Little systematic data exists on the health problems, medical encounters, and medical needs of inmates. While epidemiological research is outside the purview of the Research Division, studies to predict the medical needs of inmates, particularly with respect to the use of outside hospitals, was suggested by respondents. Some discontentment was expressed by respondents with the quality of medical care provided by staff of both the Lemuel Shattuck Hospital and Goldberg Associates, leading to a call for research on the quality of care and treatment, and productivity of medical staff.

**f. Education**

Educational programs were suggested as another area for research and evaluation projects. As with other programs areas, concern was expressed by some

survey respondents over the quality and effectiveness of educational programming and its relationship to both institutional and post-incarceration adjustment. As mentioned earlier in this report, there was some sentiment that current educational programs are misdirected and above the level of most inmates, leading some to call for a reassessment of where to begin educationally with inmates, and a reorientation away from academic toward vocational training. The impact of educational programs, research tracking inmate participation in educational programs as they move through the system, and studies of completion/non-completion rates in educational programs were topics all said to be worthy of study.

#### g. Industries

Among the specific research questions of interest to survey respondents regarding industries were: the relationship between participation in industries and successful post-incarceration reintegration and employment; inmate turnover in the industries program; market research on pre-industries products which should be produced; and, a feasibility study of a pre-industries training program for inmates with no work experience and/or the unskilled. An **Evaluation of the Correctional Industries Program** was begun this year and is in progress. Therefore, although this program area was cited by some as in need of research, the Research Division does not see a need for additional research on this program beyond the present study.

#### h. Miscellaneous Research Topics

Listed below are research topics which were mentioned less frequently by survey respondents which did not fall under any of the categories listed above. In

most cases, these projects were mentioned by only one or two survey respondents as deserving of study. Many of the suggested research projects are specific to one institution's programs (e.g. the Pre-Release Preparation Program at Shirley) and the fact that they were mentioned less frequently and listed separately here is not meant to imply that they are less deserving of study. These projects are:

- Evaluation of the Overall Impact of Unit Management Within the Correctional System
- Research Effort Concerning Where to Locate Prisons
- Research Study on Protective Custody Inmates, Enemy Situations and CORI-A Inmates
- Research on the PRA Program
- Evaluation of the Effectiveness of North Central Correctional Center's Minimum Preparation Program
- Research on Inmates with Outstanding Warrants
- Research on Inmates Furloughed in Different Months Across Institutions
- Study of the Impact of Food and Farm Services Employment on Inmate Idleness and Reintegration
- Correlational Study of Food, Cycle Menu, Nutrition and Prison Violence in Walled and Non-Walled Facilities
- Research on the Effectiveness of Training Received in the Culinary Arts Program
- Process Evaluation and Follow-up Study of MCI-Shirley's Pre-Release Preparation Program
- Research on the Characteristics of Inmates in the Departmental Segregation Unit
- Research Reports on Institutional Climates
- Research on Barred Visitors

- Research on Incarcerated Veterans
- Research on Problems Facing Staff Who are Veterans
- Studies of Procurement Practices Across Institutions
- Market and Enterprise Research on the Costs and Benefits of Food and Farm Services
- Research on the Disciplinary Problems Posed by Younger versus Older Offenders
- Studies of Sex Offenders
- Research on Success and Failure Rates in Minimum Security
- Recidivism Research on the Percent That Fail After Pre-Release and their Reasons for Failure
- Research on Multiple Admissions to versus those Stabilized at MCI-Bridgewater
- Research on Escape Profiles, Factors Related to Escape, Escape Rates by Institution
- Research on Racial Disparities in Time Spent in the System
- Follow-up study of Inmates in MCI-Shirley's Hispanic Offender Program
- Evaluation of the Supervised Pre-Release (SUPPLE) Program
- Evaluation of Hodder House at MCI-Framingham compared to other Pre-Release Facilities.

**C. Data Information Needs**

The Operations Unit of the Research Division routinely collects, analyzes, and disseminates the following information on the inmate population by institution, including: total admissions; total releases; race; age; offense; sentence; level of education; recidivism rates; county commitments; furloughs; disciplinary reports;

CORI-A; court commitments; movements; and, criminal history data. Except for criminal history and select social background data which are obtained from the Board of Probation, the sources for the above information are the institutions themselves who provide the Research Division with this information at the individual level where it is statistically analyzed and reported in aggregate form back to the institutions.

In order to determine if there is additional inmate information which should be incorporated into the Research Division's data base, we asked survey respondents what types of information not currently available they would like to have on the inmate population. In many instances, respondents cited a desire for data on inmates which they currently either routinely receive or have access to from Research Division files. We do not repeat here those types of data which we already collect and provide to both Administrators and Superintendents but rather only those types of information which they do not receive but would like to have on inmates. In some instances, respondents called for better quality of data on inmates particularly with respect to substance abuse, educational and psychological needs, and medical histories. It was suggested that an attempt be made to validate self-reported information provided by inmates. Many, however, realized this to be a difficult, if not impossible task in light of CORI regulations. Listed below are the types of information on the inmate population survey respondents would like to receive:

- types of programmatic services inmates receive
- number of inmates under the influence of alcohol or drugs at the time of offense
- list of DSU inmates and other inmates who represent "management" problems
- psychological/psychiatric histories of inmates including medication(s) used

for psychiatric problems

- number of AIDS/ARC cases and source of infection (i.e., sexual, IV drug use)
- health background of awaiting trial populations at MCI-Framingham and other county residents housed in DOC facilities
- list of "sensitive case" inmates (i.e., organized crime, AIDS, protective custody, enemies)
- other English-as-a-Second Language populations besides Hispanic (e.g., Asian)
- inmates who were juveniles in DSS and DMH facilities
- inmates who were abused as children, especially those incarcerated for child abuse
- pre-incarceration substance abuse histories
- family support/structure data
- court data on warrants
- family psychiatric histories
- number of inmates serving mandatory sentences.

This concludes Phase 1 of this study, the actual presentation of results from the **Survey of Research and Evaluation Priorities of DOC Central Office Administrators and Institutional Administrators**. After Executive Staff reviewed this report, the study entered Phase 2 which consisted of discussions between Executive Staff and Research Division Staff in order to obtain the input and advice of Executive Staff concerning future directions for research. On the basis of these discussions, the Research Division presents, in Phase 3 of the study report, recommendations to Executive Staff for future research.

## PHASE 2

### Executive Staff Input

On June 8, 1987, the Director and Deputy Director of Research met with Executive Staff in order to present the results of the survey and to obtain their input and advice concerning future directions for research. This section presents the results of that meeting and is followed by recommendations for future research based upon both the survey results and Executive Staff input.

Executive staff in attendance at the June 8th meeting were: Michael V. Fair Commissioner; George Vose, Deputy Commissioner, Dennis Humphrey, Associate Commissioner, Programs and Treatment; Peter Macchi, Acting Associate Commissioner, Administration; John Bishop, Associate Commissioner, Legal; and, Brian Gendron, Associate Commissioner, Operations.

In terms of types of research which should be conducted, Executive staff placed a strong emphasis on program evaluations. There was said to be a need to obtain a better sense of whether or not particular programs are effective, particularly in light of the high expenditures associated with some programs and the consequent need to tie evaluation results to funding decisions.

A second type of research said to be in need of greater emphasis was population trend analysis. Specifically, there was said to be a greater need to identify changes in the demographic composition of the inmate population and utilize this information in policy and program decisions.

In terms of actual research topics, four potential studies were suggested. First, examine the reasons for high staff turnover among both correctional officers and correctional counselors, and identify personality traits and behavioral characteristics that are associated with successful job performance as correctional

staff, division/program directors and superintendents. Second, conduct research on barred visitors. Third, pursue the use research findings as an aid in the design of new facilities. Finally, it was suggested that the Research Division work with the Budget Office to develop a statistical analysis of how the Department spends its dollars.

In the final section of this report, we present recommendations for future research based on the survey results and discussions with Executive Staff.

### PHASE 3

#### Recommendations for Research

Listed below are the five research projects which the Research Division proposes to undertake beginning in fiscal year 1988. While these projects do not necessarily reflect specific projects suggested by either survey respondents or Executive Staff, they are in line with the survey results and subsequent input from Executive Staff.

#### I. Evaluation of Unit Management Within the Correctional System

The concept of Unit Management was developed as a strategy for enhancing institution operations and environment, better use of staff resources, and more efficient delivery of program services to the inmate population. Although utilized extensively by the Federal Bureau of Prisons since the late 1960's the concept has a shorter history within the Massachusetts Department of Correction having first been implemented at MCI-Cedar Junction, Walpole in 1980. Today, unit management is practiced in a number of DOC institutions.

Despite its relatively short history within the Massachusetts prison system, there is sufficient experience with the concept of unit management to warrant an evaluation of its effectiveness in reaching its stated goals. Moreover, while there is a Federal model of unit management, there has never been a uniform model of unit management within Massachusetts. It would therefore be valuable to examine how the concept of unit management has been implemented in each of the institutions in which it is practiced and the consequences of differently conceptualized and implemented models for institutional operations, environments, and programming.

A research design for this study will be developed by April 1988. The design will specify study objectives, methodology and present a timetable for the study.

## **2. Research Study of the Sex Offender Population**

Despite the general perception that sex offenders are model inmates who do not represent management problems, a number of Superintendents expressed concern that the sex offender population was growing in their institutions. Typically, Superintendents estimated the sex offender population ranging from 25% to 40% of their institution's population even though statistics indicate that overall, sex offenders comprise only 15% of the DOC population.

Our survey identified four potential reasons for the concerns expressed by Superintendents. First, is the apparent lack of programs tailored specifically to incarcerated sex offenders in walled institutions. Second, although they themselves may not represent disciplinary problems, sex offenders, especially child sex offenders, are targets for victimization by other inmates. Third, there are apparent fears over sending sex offenders into the community on work release or furlough. Finally, sex offenses are generally emotionally charged and this is

something which may have led to an exaggerated perception of the size of the sex offender population.

The purpose of this research study would be, therefore, to first provide a system-wide in-depth description of the sex offender population including an examination of the number of sex offenders in the institution, both those with a governing and non-governing sex offense. Secondly, to examine institutional and community-based programs which exist for sex offenders. Finally, to assess the extent to which sex offenders are victimized within institutions by other offenders.

A research design for this study would be completed by March 1988, and upon review and revision by Executive staff, the study would begin soon thereafter. The design would specify research goals, objectives, and a timetable for completion.

### 3. Process Evaluation of MCI-Framingham

As the only DOC institution specifically designated for female offenders, MCI-Framingham represents a unique opportunity for research. In particular, factors identified during our site visit for this survey have led us to propose a process evaluation of MCI-Framingham. First, the staff turnover rate is strikingly high among both correctional officers and correctional counselors. Second, despite popular impressions that there is a lack of programs for female offenders, a review of the 1987 DOC Program Description Book shows Framingham to have among the widest array of programs of all DOC institutions. Finally, despite the existence of a great many programs, the relatively short sentences and consequent rapid turnover of female offenders, especially county commitments, poses unique problems in providing program services to the Framingham inmate.

A process evaluation of MCI-Framingham would provide a comprehensive assessment of the institution itself including an examination of: staffing issues; the

population served; and, program structure and services provided. This evaluation would also identify problems accounting for high staff turnover, program implementation issues, and, difficulties encountered in serving the female offender. An evaluation design which would also list goals, objectives, and a timetable for completion will be developed by March 1988.

4. Outcome Evaluation of the Longwood Treatment Center and Western Massachusetts Correctional Alcohol Center

In the spring of 1987, the Research Division completed a process evaluation of the Longwood Treatment Center. Although some preliminary outcome measures were examined in this study, one of the recommendations presented in the final report was for the DOC Research Division to conduct a post-program outcome evaluation of the Longwood Treatment Center. During the same period, Research staff met with staff of the Western Massachusetts Correctional Alcohol Center (WMCAC) to discuss an outcome evaluation of inmates released from WMCAC which is the county-run equivalent of Longwood serving the western part of the state. In light of the above, the time is especially propitious to conduct a follow-up outcome evaluation of both facilities. This follow-up evaluation would focus on the following outcome measures: recidivism; post-release rearrest for OUI and non-OUI offenses (both alcohol and non-alcohol-related offenses); post-release drinking behavior; post-release participation in alcohol treatment; and, social stability indicators such as employment status. The study would very likely use as an additional comparison group OUI commitments to county facilities who did not enter Longwood or WMCAC.

The design for this study will be completed by November, 1987. The design will describe the study objectives, methodology, and timetable for completion.

5. Research Study of Substance Abuse Unit at MCI-Shirley

In the summer of 1987, MCI-Shirley plans to open a 39 bed unit for housing inmates with substance abuse problems. Statistics indicate that as of January 1, 1987, approximately 245 or 63% of the 389 inmates at Shirley had a present offense or criminal history involving drugs and/or alcohol.

In order to determine which of these 245 inmates with alcohol and/or drug histories should be housed in the substance abuse unit, Shirley staff asked the Research Division to construct a program intake screening and assessment form. This form will be used to obtain information on inmate demographic characteristics, criminal history, drug and alcohol use behavior, and substance abuse treatment history. Information obtained from this form will be analyzed by research staff in order to present a description of the substance abusing population at MCI-Shirley.

This project is scheduled to begin in August 1987.

## **APPENDIX A**

### **Survey Respondents**

Survey Respondents

Division Directors/Staff

Public Affairs

Gail A. Darnell, Director

Legislative

Robert Flanagan, Legislative Aide

Vincent Vitale, Legislative Assistant

Affirmative Action

Carole Montalto, Director

Budget Office

Carl Willis, Director

Personnel

Jeffrey Bolger, Director, Labor Relations

Food and Farm Services

Marianne Luppold, Director

Ray Quirk, Assistant Director, Food

Apprehension/Investigation

Linda Washburn, Chief

Brian Martello, Senior Investigator

Contract Pre-Release Programs

Ike Goudy, Director

Education

Jacqueline Reed-Edwards, Director

Marian Maroney, Resource Development Manager

Programs and Classification

Paul DiPaolo, Director

Psychological Services

William Brickhouse, Ph.D., Director

Industries

Peter Argeropoulos, Director

Training Academy

Joseph Ponte, Director

Health Services

Al De Simone, Director

Theresa Jarmusik, Deputy Director

Mark Gallant, Program Development Specialist

Manpower

Martin Feeney, Director

Institutional Superintendents/Staff

Bay State Correctional Center

George Grigas, Superintendent

Sam Simmons, Deputy Superintendent

Boston Pre-Release Center

Abu Hanif Abdul Khallaq, Superintendent

Bridgewater (MCI)

John Noonan, Superintendent

Concord (MCI)

Norman Carver, Superintendent

Hank Lavalley, Deputy Superintendent, Operations

Steve Jefferson, Deputy Superintendent, Programs, Treatment

Lenny Leo, Steward

Framingham (MCI)

Thomas Newton, Acting Superintendent

Lancaster Pre-Release Center

Paul Dickhaut, Superintendent

Lemuel Shattuck Hospital

William Cameron, Superintendent

Longwood Treatment Center, OUI

David MacDonald, Superintendent

Medfield Prison Project

Ernest Vandergriff, Superintendent

Norfolk (MCI)

Norman Butler, Superintendent

Norfolk Pre-Release

Judi Cyr, Superintendent

North Central Correctional Center

James Bender, Superintendent

Northeastern Correctional Center

Arthur Latessa, Superintendent

Park Drive Pre-Release

Paul Raikey, Superintendent

John Leonard, Deputy Superintendent

Plymouth (MCI)

John Tucker, Superintendent

Shirley (MCI)

Richard Grelotti, Superintendent

Gerald Boyle, Deputy Superintendent, Operations

Jim Matesanz, Deputy Superintendent, Classification, Treatment

Mariellen Fidrych, Director of Programs

Robert Murphy, Director of Classification

Southeastern Correctional Center

Ronald Amaral, Superintendent

South Middlesex Pre-Release Center

Barbara Young, Superintendent

Cedar Junction - MCI at Walpole

Michael Maloney, Superintendent

Timothy Hall, Deputy Superintendent, Programs, Treatment

Warwick (MCI)

John Cooke, Superintendent

Joe Carroll, Deputy Superintendent

## **APPENDIX B**

### **Survey of Research and Evaluation Priorities of DOC Central Office Administrators and Institutional Administrators**

#### **Interview Schedule**

## INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

To be administered to DOC Central Office Senior Level Administrators and Institutional Administrators

### Identifier Information

Name of Respondent: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Description of Position and Duties: \_\_\_\_\_

Introduction: The Research Division of the Massachusetts Department of Correction is conducting a Survey of Research and Evaluation Priorities of DOC Central Office Administrators and Institutional Administrators. As a DOC Central Office Administrator/Institutional (Deputy) Superintendent, you have been selected to participate in this survey. The purpose of this interview is to identify problems you face as an administrator and the ways in which research can be of assistance to you in policy/program development and operations management. In particular, we are interested in your perception of needed research projects which should be conducted by the Research Division in the next three years.

Your response to these questions will remain strictly confidential. We will use the results of this survey to help set the Department's research agenda in the next three years by identifying frequently mentioned research priorities. In addition, the survey results will help us incorporate the necessary information into our data-base, and plan for personnel.

(DESCRIPTION OF RESEARCH DIVISION  
ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES)

Do you have any questions before we begin?

1. What are some of the most critical areas of need which you, as an administrator, face relating to correctional policies and programs?

(TO INTERVIEWER: Below is a list of anticipated needs. Do not read these off in check list form to interviewee - simply use for facilitating questioning and recording).

(INTERVIEWER PROBES)

- \_\_\_\_\_ Identifying target populations
- \_\_\_\_\_ Classification
- \_\_\_\_\_ Developing administrative criteria
- \_\_\_\_\_ Information on cost and cost effectiveness
- \_\_\_\_\_ Process evaluation
- \_\_\_\_\_ Outcome evaluation
- \_\_\_\_\_ Information on program models
- \_\_\_\_\_ Information on statutory models
- \_\_\_\_\_ Bill drafting
- \_\_\_\_\_ Policy development
- \_\_\_\_\_ Support building
- \_\_\_\_\_ Public education strategies

- \_\_\_\_\_ Community attitudes and activity
- \_\_\_\_\_ Communications and media relations
- \_\_\_\_\_ Personnel policies
- \_\_\_\_\_ Staff training
- \_\_\_\_\_ Staff development
- \_\_\_\_\_ Screening and intake procedures
- \_\_\_\_\_ Security measures
- \_\_\_\_\_ Medical care/health services
- \_\_\_\_\_ Overcrowding
- \_\_\_\_\_ Program design and operation
- \_\_\_\_\_ Client plan development (i.e. casework)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Interagency relations
- \_\_\_\_\_ Funding
- \_\_\_\_\_ Other (list and describe briefly):

2. What are the most important problems or needs you faced during the last year in operating a correctional institution?

(INTERVIEWER: Do not read off the following categories, but use to facilitate the response).

(INTERVIEWER PROBES)

- \_\_\_\_\_ Personnel policies
- \_\_\_\_\_ Staff recruitment/retention

- \_\_\_\_\_ Staff training
- \_\_\_\_\_ Staff development
- \_\_\_\_\_ Screening and intake procedures
- \_\_\_\_\_ Security measures
- \_\_\_\_\_ Safety/emergency procedures
- \_\_\_\_\_ Medical care/health services
- \_\_\_\_\_ Overcrowding
- \_\_\_\_\_ Program design and operation
- \_\_\_\_\_ Client plan development (i.e., casework)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Community resource availability
- \_\_\_\_\_ Media relations
- \_\_\_\_\_ Classification
- \_\_\_\_\_ Developing administrative criteria
- \_\_\_\_\_ Information on cost and cost effectiveness
- \_\_\_\_\_ Process evaluation
- \_\_\_\_\_ Outcome evaluation
- \_\_\_\_\_ Information on program models
- \_\_\_\_\_ Community relations
- \_\_\_\_\_ Policy development
- \_\_\_\_\_ Citizen/volunteer involvement
- \_\_\_\_\_ Support building
- \_\_\_\_\_ Facility siting
- \_\_\_\_\_ Funding
- \_\_\_\_\_ Zoning/use permits
- \_\_\_\_\_ Physical plant
- \_\_\_\_\_ Food service
- \_\_\_\_\_ Contract procedure and management

- \_\_\_\_\_ Interagency relations
- \_\_\_\_\_ Funding
- \_\_\_\_\_ Fiscal management
- \_\_\_\_\_ Information systems/record keeping
- \_\_\_\_\_ Research/Evaluation
- \_\_\_\_\_ Others (list and rank)

3. What types of research would be helpful to you for purposes of policy and program development?

(INTERVIEWER PROBES)

- \_\_\_\_\_ Process/formative evaluations
- \_\_\_\_\_ Implementation analysis
- \_\_\_\_\_ Cost-benefit analysis
- \_\_\_\_\_ Impact/outcome analysis/summative evaluation
- \_\_\_\_\_ Experimental research
- \_\_\_\_\_ Survey research
- \_\_\_\_\_ Other (please specify:)

4. What are five research studies you would like to see the DOC Research Division undertake in the next 3 years?

5. What types of information not currently available would you like to have on inmate populations?

6. Are there any inmate programs which you would like to see evaluated? If so, which programs?

7. Is there anything else you would like to say about needed areas of research on correctional issues in the Commonwealth?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION