

State of New Jersey, Department of Corrections
Robert E. Mulcahy, III, Commissioner

AN ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES TO
THE NEW JERSEY CORRECTIONAL MASTER PLAN

NCJRS

FEB 5 1979

ACQUISITIONS

Division of Policy Development
July 7, 1977

181/5

Report Prepared by
James Benedict, Ira Piller,
and Jay Friedman, Ph.D.

Division of Policy Development



STATE OF NEW JERSEY
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
TRENTON, N.J.

ROBERT E. MULCAHY, III
COMMISSIONER

July 7, 1977

Dear Friends,

During the past two years, a 24-member Policy Council, with assistance from staff and consultants, developed a Correctional Master Plan for New Jersey. The direction provided for New Jersey corrections by their recommendations reflected the best resolutions they could achieve of the wide range of interests and concerns which they represented. At the completion of their work, it remained an open question as to whether the plan they developed would appear desirable and feasible to a broader range of New Jersey officials and citizens.

A state-wide conference of citizens, courts personnel, criminal justice planners and educators, state and local corrections personnel, and probation and parole personnel was held in March of 1977. This report is concerned with the response of this initial conference to a questionnaire given at the end of the conference regarding the recommendations that comprise the plan.

It is my feeling that the results of this report will prove to be very useful for two basic reasons. First, it is important that we in the Department of Corrections understand how the criminal justice community views the recommendations, especially in terms of their relative advantages and disadvantages. Then we will be able to identify those issues which require further analysis. Second, it will be beneficial for the reader to compare his or her thoughts on a given recommendation with the conference participants and particularly with persons of similar background and experience.

In reviewing the report, I was impressed by the fact that virtually all of the conference participants are dissatisfied with the current system and that more than two-thirds agree with the direction taken by the Plan in almost every area where recommendations were made.

Despite the fact that the Plan represents a significant change from current policies and practices, three-quarters of the respondents believe that the recommendations can be implemented with only low or moderate difficulty.

Reservations regarding some aspects of the Plan are also apparent.


For example,

- In comparison to other recommendations (with which more than two-thirds of conference participants agree), only slightly more than half of the respondents agree with the recommendations concerning parole decision-making,
- While the strongest support for the plan comes from educators, planners, state corrections personnel and citizens groups, the level of support was somewhat less strong from probation, parole, courts, and county corrections personnel,
- While almost all of the conference participants found the Plan clear, anticipated acceptance by the judiciary, and saw the recommendations as administratively feasible, there were some respondents who saw difficulties in gaining legislative and public acceptance and more respondents who saw difficulties in procuring the needed fiscal resources.

Through the Master Plan conference and the follow-up evaluation process, I think we have made a genuine start toward developing communication between the various criminal justice components and sharing our positions on a number of key correctional issues. I plan to continue this effort in the future.

Once again, I would like to thank the participants in the Master Plan conference for making it the success that it was.

Sincerely,


Robert E. Mulcahy, III
Commissioner of Corrections

REM/ms

AN ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES TO THE NEW JERSEY CORRECTIONAL MASTER PLAN

THE CONFERENCE

In March 1977 the New Jersey Correctional Master Plan was presented at a 2-day state-wide conference held at Somerset County College. The purpose of the conference was two-fold. First, it was intended to make public the policy recommendations of the Master Plan, along with supporting data and analysis. Secondly, the conference was intended to stimulate discussion and review of the Master Plan and to allow participants an opportunity to give their reaction concerning the recommendations to the Department of Corrections.

Underlying this review process is an acknowledgment of the expertise in correctional matters residing in agencies and individuals outside the Department of Corrections. Consequently, the conference was seen as a forum where those who are interested in, or affected by, the Master Plan could respond to it in a structured and effective manner.

The format of the conference called for staff and consultants to present the Master Plan recommendations and the supporting data for these recommendations. Participants then met in small groups to discuss the recommendations in more detail, and finally each participant was requested to complete a questionnaire which elicited his or her particular evaluation of the individual recommendations.

THE PARTICIPANTS

There were 213 registered participants at the conference, identified for response analysis in the following general groupings according to organizational affiliation. Neither participation nor response was determined by a particular sampling procedure, so the response results are not necessarily generalizable beyond the group of respondents. It is felt that the number who registered and failed to submit a completed questionnaire can be attributed to normal conference attrition factors.

For the purpose of analyzing the responses of conference participants, those 145 who responded to the questionnaire were grouped as follows:

- 30 in the citizens category (includes legislative affiliation, citizen groups, offender groups, advisory boards).
- 16 in the education field (includes academic affiliation, specialists in correctional education, and students).
- 19 in courts related occupations (includes court administrators, judges, prosecutors, public advocate).
- 15 in the planning field (includes planning agencies, non-criminal justice government agencies).
- 25 in state corrections (includes correctional institutions, Central Office).

- 20 in county corrections (includes correctional facilities).
- 20 in parole and probation (includes State Parole Bureau, county probation departments, halfway programs).

THE QUESTIONS

The questionnaire completed by the conference participants was designed to measure several factors, and the structure of the questionnaire permitted the respondents to state a degree of response ("low", "med", or "high") rather than a simple yes/no type of response.

The conference participants were asked the following questions in regard to each of the recommendations described below:

- Are you satisfied with the current policies and practices in the area of this recommendation?
- Do you agree with the recommendation?
- Do you think that implementation of the recommendation is feasible?
- Do you think that the general thrust of the recommendations is clear?
- Do you believe that the following can be expected in regard to this recommendation:
 - Public acceptance?
 - Legislative acceptance?
 - Judicial acceptance?
 - Administrative feasibility?
 - Availability of fiscal resources?

THE RESPONSES

The 3 charts on the following pages detail the responses of the different groups who attended the conference in regard to satisfaction with current policies and practices, agreement with the recommendations, and judgments regarding feasibility.

The above charts are supplemented by a special analysis of the judgments of "highly qualified" participants (see page 17) in regard to:

- Clarity of the recommendations,
- Administrative feasibility,
- Judicial acceptability,
- Legislative acceptability,
- Public acceptability, and
- Availability of Fiscal Resources.

THE CORRECTIONAL MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS:

Conference participants were asked to respond to six major recommendations:

SENTENCING

The correctional philosophy for New Jersey should emphasize equity of punishment and the reintegration of offenders into society. This philosophy will be manifest in sentencing and parole practices as well as in the administration of correctional facilities and programs. In practice

this would mean:

- A modified "just deserts" model of sentencing and parole should be adopted for all adult offenders who are sentenced to State-administered correctional facilities. This recommendation stresses the crime more than the offender although the offender is emphasized in the choice of particular sentencing alternatives.
- The latitude of judicial discretion should be guided through the use of formalized sentencing criteria.
- Sentences to institutions should be determinate for a fixed maximum period. The Policy Council recommends amendment of the New Jersey criminal code to reduce maximum terms and eliminate the imposition of minimum terms.

DISPOSITION ALTERNATIVES

The least restrictive of a range of sentencing alternatives should be utilized with incarceration seen as the last resort when no other alternative will suffice to achieve the aim of deterrence and incapacitation. Available sentencing alternatives should include:

- financial sanctions such as fines and restitution
- an expanded probation service
- partial imprisonment (e.g., work release)
- short-term incarceration
- long-term incarceration

PAROLE

- Discretion in parole release should be reduced by the adoption of presumptive parole at first eligibility within specified guidelines by a single parole board.
- Responsibility for making decisions on parole revocation remain with the parole board. As with sentencing decisions, there should be the presumption of using the least restrictive alternatives: revocation of parole status and reincarceration should be used only as a last resort.

RACE AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE:

The data concerning racial disparity in corrections is a primary issue which must be considered as an integral part of any long-range plan. The implications of the overwhelming overrepresentation of minority race members in correctional institutions are profound and a long-range correctional policy cannot ignore or overlook the questions of morality and justice involved.

What is recommended is an immediate in-depth study of racial disparity throughout the criminal justice system. Such a study must be undertaken immediately and should be conducted under the joint auspices of law enforcement, courts, and corrections since the data points to disparity throughout the system. A study of sufficient scope and design should be completed within a reasonable period (6 months) and the findings of that study should be used as a basis for review of the incarceration and institutional construction policies of the Department of Corrections.

A LOCALLY ORIENTED CORRECTIONS PLAN:

It is recommended that a locally oriented corrections plan be adopted to serve New Jersey's correctional needs. Under this plan, only serious offenders should be assigned to state correctional institutions and responsibility for less serious offenders should be transferred to locally based facilities and programs.

The state should provide funding for facilities and services to local units serving offenders who under present practices would be incarcerated in state facilities. (Less serious for projection purposes was taken to mean those types of offenders with expected lengths of stay of one year or less.) Under this plan a single sentencing and release structure would apply to all state offenders.

- The Department of Corrections shall have responsibility to upgrade, expand, and utilize non-institutional services for offenders within its jurisdiction, when consistent with the demands of public safety. To accomplish this, the organizational structure which shall be created for the Department of Corrections shall indicate a unit with a community services mission at the same organizational level as the unit with an institutional services mission.
- The Department of Corrections, with the advice and consent of local correctional officials, shall define minimum standards for county and municipal custodial correctional facilities, operations and programs. The Department shall be charged with the responsibility for inspecting the custodial facilities, operations, and programs; for offering technical assistance to these facilities, and may enter into contractual arrangements with the facilities for the purchase of care. (Legislation should be enacted to authorize the Department of Corrections to enforce in the courts the minimum standards it promulgates.)

LIMITED STATE CONSTRUCTION:

The Council is aware of the current use of substandard and emergency bed-space that can be remedied only by construction. The Council supports only construction which replaces such existing and antiquated facilities and which is consistent with the recommended correctional philosophy.

The present best estimate of required state bedspace construction to accomplish the above is approximately 1200 by the year 1984. When the proposed recommendations are implemented to support programs and services in local communities and to use such programs for less serious offenders (currently 56% of state admissions), it will be necessary to reassess the need for new construction of additional state institution space. Such construction should not be undertaken until attainment of maximum implementation of local correctional services.

There is a severe present deficiency in standard bedspaces. The Correctional Master Plan recommends that:

- for existing facilities, at least 50 square feet of bedspace be provided for every inmate, and other renovations be undertaken as necessary to meet minimal standards.
- before any new construction is undertaken, all suitable existing bedspaces should be utilized.
- for additional or replacement bedspaces, the standards to be adopted should comply with the physical and space standards promulgated by the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals.

CHART I: SATISFACTION WITH CURRENT POLICIES AND PRACTICES

The percentage of each group who are at least moderately satisfied with current policies and practices is reported in this chart.

Percentage Expressing Satisfaction	CORRECTIONAL MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS					
	Sentencing	Disposition Alternatives	Parole Decisions	Race and Criminal Justice	Local Corrections Plan	State Construction
90%-100%						
80%-89%						
70%-79%						
60%-69%						
50%-59%	Courts 54%					
40%-49%		Courts 42%	Parole/ Probation 42%			
30%-39%			County Corrections 30%			
20%-29%		Parole/ Probation 20%		County Corrections 24% Courts 20%	County Corrections 24% Planners 21%	Courts 23%
10%-19%	Educators 13% OVERALL 11% Parole/ Probation 11%	County Corrections 16% OVERALL 15% Citizens 14% State Corrections 12%	OVERALL 18% Citizens 14%	Planners 14% State Corrections 9%	Parole/ Probation 16% OVERALL 12% Citizens 10% Courts 10%	County Corrections 17% Planners 13% OVERALL 10%
0%-9%	Planners 8% State Corrections 4% Citizens 3% County Corrections 0%	Planners 7% Educators 0%	Courts 9% State Corrections 8% Educators 0% Planners 0%	OVERALL 8% Citizens 0% Educators 0% Parole/ Probation 0%	Educators 8% State Corrections 0%	State Corrections 8% Citizens 7% Parole/ Probation 0% Educators 0%

LESS THAN 20% OF CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS ARE SATISFIED WITH CURRENT POLICIES AND PRACTICES IN ANY OF THE AREAS OF THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM WITH WHICH THE CORRECTIONAL MASTER PLAN IS CONCERNED.

The most generally dissatisfied groups are citizens, state corrections personnel, and educators. Less than 15% of these groups are satisfied with policies or practices in any area in which recommendations are made.

However, at least some courts and probation and parole personnel report some degree of satisfaction with policies and practices in their own areas of concern:

- More than forty percent of courts personnel are satisfied with current Sentencing and Disposition Alternatives and
- More than forty percent of parole and probation personnel are satisfied with current policies and practices in the area of Parole Decisions

CHART II: AGREEMENT WITH THE RECOMMENDATIONS

The percentage of each group who agree with each recommendation is reported in this chart.

Percentage Expressing Agreement	CORRECTIONAL MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS					
	Sentencing	Disposition Alternatives	Parole Decisions	Race and Criminal Justice	Local Corrections Plan	State Construction
90%-100%		Educators 94%			Planners 95% Educators 92%	
80%-89%	Planners 83% Educators 80%	State Corrctns 84%	Educators 86%		State Corrctns 87% Parole/ Probate 84%	
70%-79%	State Corrctns 71%	OVERALL 79% Citizens 79% County Corrctns 79% Parole/ Probate 75% Planners 72%		Educators 79% Courts 70%	OVERALL 77% Citizens 70% Courts 70%	State Corrctns 79% Parole/ Probate 79% Planners 73% OVERALL 70%
60%-69%	OVERALL 67% County Corrctns 65% Courts 62% Citizens 62%		Citizens 61%	Citizens 69% OVERALL 64% Planners 64% State Corrctns 64%		Educators 69% Citizens 64% Courts 62% County Corrctns 61%
50%-59%	Parole/ Probate 53%	Courts 58%	Planners 57% OVERALL 56% State Corrctns 54% Parole/ Probate 53%	Parole/ Probate 57%		
40%-49%			Courts 45% County Corrctns 40%	County Corrctns 47%	County Corrctns 47%	
30%-39%						
20%-29%						
10%-19%						
0%-9%						

AT LEAST 56% OF ALL RESPONDENTS AGREE WITH ALL OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 56% AGREE WITH THE PAROLE DECISIONS RECOMMENDATION,
- 64% AGREE WITH THE RACE AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE RECOMMENDATION, AND
- 67% OR MORE AGREE WITH THE OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

In general, the participants comprising the "Citizens" group support each of the recommendations to the same degree as the overall conference consensus concerning each recommendation.

The most consistent supporters of the different recommendations are educators, planners, and state corrections personnel.

- More than 70% of the educators agree with all of the recommendations except for the construction recommendation.
- More than 70% of planners and state corrections personnel agree with all aspects of the plan except for the Parole Decisions and Race and Criminal Justice recommendations.

The probation and parole, courts, and county corrections respondents agree with the recommendations to a lesser degree. However, these groups show significant support for certain recommendations:

- 75% or more of probation and parole personnel support the Disposition Alternatives, the Local Corrections, and the State Constructions recommendations, and
- 60% or more of courts respondents support the Sentencing, Race and Criminal Justice, Local Corrections, and State Construction recommendations.
- 60% or more of the county corrections personnel support the Sentencing, Disposition Alternatives, and State Construction recommendations.

CHART III: JUDGMENTS OF FEASIBILITY

The percentage of each group who think that each recommendation can be implemented with only low or moderate difficulty is reported in this chart.

Percentage Judging Recommendations as Feasible	CORRECTIONAL MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS							
	Sentencing	Disposition Alternatives	Parole Decisions	Race and Criminal Justice	Local Corrections Plan	State Construction		
90%-100%	State Corrcntns 100% Planners 92%	Educators 100% Planners 100%	County Corrcntns 100% Educators 94%	Planners 93% Educators 92%	Educators 93%	Courts 100%		
80%-89%	County Corrcntns 87% OVERALL 83% Educators 81%	State Corrcntns 88% OVERALL 86% County Corrcntns 86% Courts 85% Parole/ Probate 81%	Citizens 86% Planners 85% OVERALL 84%	Courts 84%		Citizens 87% Parole/ Probate 87% State Corrcntns 86% OVERALL 82% Planners 80%		
70%-79%	Citizens 78% Parole/ Probate 78%	Citizens 73%	Parole/ Probate 78% State Corrcntns 72%	OVERALL 76% Parole/ Probate 75% Citizens 72% State Corrcntns 70%	State Corrcntns 76% Citizens 75% Courts 73% OVERALL 71% Parole/ Probate 71%			
60%-69%	Courts 64%		Courts 67%		Planners 62%	Educators 69% County Corrcntns 62%		
50%-59%				County Corrcntns 56%				
40%-49%								
30%-39%					County Corrcntns 38%			
20%-29%								
10%-19%								
0%-9%								

AT LEAST 70% OF ALL RESPONDENTS SEE ALL OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS FEASIBLE WITH ONLY LOW OR MODERATE DIFFICULTY, AND

AT LEAST 80% SEE FOUR OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS SIMILARLY FEASIBLE.

However, among some groups of respondents more than 30% doubt the feasibility of particular recommendations. For example, as compared to other respondents,

- More courts personnel have doubts about the feasibility of the Sentencing and Parole recommendations,
- More county corrections personnel have doubts about the feasibility of the Race and Criminal Justice, the Local Corrections, and the State Construction recommendations,
- More educators have doubts about the feasibility of the State Construction recommendations, and
- More planners have doubts about the feasibility of the Local Corrections plan.

Particularly noted is the wide range of responses by the County Corrections officials regarding the feasibility of the various recommendations. At least 80% believe implementation of the Sentencing, Disposition Alternatives, and Parole Decisions recommendations can be achieved with low or moderate difficulty. However, their belief in the implementation prospects of the Race and Criminal Justice recommendation, the Local Corrections Plan, and State Construction is significantly lower.

SPECIALIZED JUDGMENTS OF FEASIBILITY BY "HIGHLY QUALIFIED" RESPONDENTS

There are a number of areas in which issues in the implementation of the Master Plan recommendations might be expected. Included are the clarity, the administrative feasibility, and the availability of fiscal resources. The acceptability of the recommendations to the public, the legislature, and the judiciary are also clearly important.

The charts on the following pages represent the analysis by "highly qualified" respondents of each recommendation in terms of such specialized issues. By design, there was a wide range of participants at the conference. Levels of experience, expertise, and general familiarity with the criminal justice system varied greatly. In order to derive most benefit from the opinions expressed concerning the Plan's recommendations, it was felt helpful to identify those participants who had special qualifications. A group identified as "highly qualified" has been defined and their judgments are expressed in the following charts. "Highly qualified persons" were those conference participants who reported that they had the following characteristics:

- Four or more years full-time experience in the criminal justice system and
- A moderate to high level of special education or experience in the specific area under discussion.

Finally, some conference participants disqualified themselves in responding to areas under discussion because they simply felt they lacked the essential knowledge and familiarity with the topic. It is felt that this analysis, which utilizes the qualifications of participants by so identifying the respondents, increases the credibility of the responses.

CHART IV: SUMMARY OF JUDGMENTS OF THE FEASIBILITY OF EACH RECOMMENDATION BY "HIGHLY QUALIFIED" RESPONDENTS

Reported in this chart is the percentage of highly qualified respondents who think that only low or moderate difficulties are to be anticipated in regard to such issues as the clarity, the administrative feasibility, and the judicial acceptability of each recommendation.

Note that the summary judgments reported in this chart on the feasibility of each recommendation are based on nearly 700 separate judgments of feasibility in regard to such specific issues as the clarity, the administrative feasibility, and the judicial acceptability of each recommendation.

	CORRECTIONAL MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS					
	Judgments of Feasibility as a Percentage of Total Judgments					
	Disposition Alter- natives	Race and Criminal Justice	Parole Decisions	State Con- struction	Sen- tencing	Local Corrctns Plan
SUMMARY JUDGMENT	79%	79%	78%	72%	71%	69%
Judgments of Clarity	95%	88%	91%	88%	74%	88%
Judgments of Administrative Feasibility	94%	82%	90%	77%	84%	74%
Judgments of Judicial Acceptability	81%	86%	81%	85%	65%	84%
Judgments of Legislative Acceptability	82%	86%	74%	77%	75%	69%
Judgments of Public Acceptability	60%	68%	55%	56%	78%	51%
Judgments of availability of Fiscal Resources	63%	64%	74%	49%	50%	45%

75% OF MORE THAN 4000 SPECIALIZED JUDGMENTS OF FEASIBILITY MADE BY "HIGHLY QUALIFIED" RESPONDENTS ARE THAT THE MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS CAN BE IMPLEMENTED WITH ONLY LOW OR MODERATE DIFFICULTY.

THIS COMPARES TO A SIMILAR JUDGMENT BY 80% OF ALL RESPONDENTS THAT THE MASTER PLAN CAN BE IMPLEMENTED.

Considering all of the judgments by "highly qualified" respondents regarding each recommendation:

- 69% of judgments are that the Local Corrections Plan can be implemented,
- 71% of judgments are that the Sentencing recommendations can be implemented,
- 72% of judgments are that the State Construction recommendations can be implemented,
- 78% of judgments are that the Parole Decisions recommendations can be implemented,
- 79% of judgments are that the Race and Criminal Justice and the Disposition Alternatives recommendations can be implemented.

A detailed analysis is presented on the following pages of difficulties anticipated by different groups of "highly qualified" respondents in regard to the clarity, the administrative feasibility, etc., of each recommendation.

CHART V: JUDGMENTS OF THE CLARITY OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS

The percentage of each group who think that the general thrust of each recommendation is clear is reported in this chart.

Note that, in this and subsequent charts, only "highly qualified" members of each group are included.

Percentage Judging Recommendations as Clear —	CORRECTIONAL MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS					
	Sentencing	Disposition Alternatives	Parole Decisions	Race and Criminal Justice	Local Corrections Plan	State Construction
90%-100%		County Corrctns 100% Educators 100% Courts 100% Planners 100% OVERALL 95% State Corrctns 94% Parole/ Probatn 92%	Educators 100% Planners 100% County Corrctns 100% OVERALL 91% Citizens 91% Parole Probatn 90%	Planners 100% County Corrctns 100%	Educators 100% State Corrctns 90%	Educators 100%
80%-89%	Educators 89% County Corrctns 86% Planners 86%	Citizens 87%	Courts 86% State Corrctns 83%	Educators 89% Courts 89% State Corrctns 89% OVERALL 88% Citizens 82%	County Corrctns 89% Planners 89% Courts 89% OVERALL 88% Parole/ Probatn 86% Citizens 80%	Citizens 89% State Corrctns 89% OVERALL 88% County Corrctns 88% Courts 88% Parole/ Probatn 86%
70%-79%	State Corrctns 78% OVERALL 74% Citizens 73%					Planners 75%
60%-69%	Parole/ Probatn 62%			Parole/ Probatn 67%		
50%-59%	Courts 50%					
40%-49%						
30%-39%						
20%-29%						
10%-19%						
0%-9%						

AT LEAST 74% OF ALL HIGHLY QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS THINK THAT THE GENERAL THRUST OF ALL OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS IS CLEAR

- 74% THINK THAT THE SENTENCING RECOMMENDATIONS ARE CLEAR AND
- 88% OR MORE THINK THAT THE OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS ARE CLEAR.

Most respondents think that the general thrust of the recommendations is clear. However, the respondents express some reservation regarding the clarity of the Sentencing recommendations. Also, the range of responses - between 50% and 89% - is wider in regard to judgments of clarity of the Sentencing recommendations by different groups.

These results may be attributed to the difficulty in interpreting the concepts associated with the modified "just deserts" model of sentencing, which lay at the core of the recommendation. The introduction of such an innovative approach probably requires a more detailed explanation than was attempted at this conference.

It is noted that the Master Plan Policy Council recommended a basically new direction for sentencing in New Jersey but did not believe that their mandate included a detailed statement of the specific changes in statutes and court rules required to put the new sentencing scheme into effect. It is the courts respondents who are most sensitive to the task ahead in making such changes operationally clear. It was, therefore, the courts respondents who had the most difficulty regarding the clarity of the sentencing recommendations.

CHART VI: JUDGMENTS OF ADMINISTRATIVELY FEASIBILITY

The percentage of each group who anticipate only low or moderate difficulties in changing administrative policies or practices is reported in this chart.

Note that in this chart, only "highly qualified" members of each group are included.

Percentage Judging Recommendations as Feasible	CORRECTIONAL MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS					
	Sentencing	Disposition Alternatives	Parole Decisions	Race and Criminal Justice	Local Corrections Plan	State Construction
90%-100%	Educators 100% Planners 100%	Educators 100% Planners 100% County Corrctns 100% OVERALL 94% Citizens 91% Parole/ Probate 91%	Educators 100% Planners 100% Citizens 91% Parole/ Probate 91% OVERALL 90%	Educators 100% Planners 100%	Educators 100%	Planners 100% State Corrctns 94%
80%-89%	State Corrctns 88% OVERALL 84% Citizens 84% Parole/ Probate 83% County Corrctns 83%	Courts 89% State Corrctns 89%	County Corrctns 89% State Corrctns 88%	Parole/ Probate 86% Citizens 85% OVERALL 82%		Educators 83%
70%-79%			Courts 71%	State Corrctns 78% Courts 75%	Citizens 78% State Corrctns 75% OVERALL 74% County Corrctns 71% Parole/ Probate 71%	OVERALL 77% Citizens 73%
60%-69%				County Corrctns 62%	Planners 63%	County Corrctns 67%
50%-59%	Courts 50%				Courts 57%	Courts 57% Parole/ Probate 50%
40%-49%						
30%-39%						
20%-29%						
10%-19%						
0%-9%						

AT LEAST 74% OF ALL HIGHLY QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS THINK THAT ALL OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS ARE ADMINISTRATIVELY FEASIBLE:

- 74% SEE THE LOCAL CORRECTIONS PLAN AS ADMINISTRATIVELY FEASIBLE,
- 77% SEE THE STATE CONSTRUCTION RECOMMENDATION AS ADMINISTRATIVELY FEASIBLE,
- 82% SEE THE RACE AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE RECOMMENDATION AS ADMINISTRATIVELY FEASIBLE,
- 84% SEE THE SENTENCING RECOMMENDATIONS AS ADMINISTRATIVELY FEASIBLE,
- 90% SEE THE PAROLE DECISIONS RECOMMENDATIONS AS ADMINISTRATIVELY FEASIBLE, AND
- 94% SEE THE DISPOSITION ALTERNATIVES RECOMMENDATION AS ADMINISTRATIVELY FEASIBLE.

Educators, planners, and state corrections personnel generally see fewer problems with regard to administrative feasibility than do courts and county corrections personnel.

CHART VII: JUDGMENTS OF JUDICIAL ACCEPTABILITY

The percentage of each group who anticipate either a moderate or high level of judicial acceptance of each recommendation is reported in this chart.

Note that, in this chart only "highly qualified" members of each group are included.

Percentage Judging Recommendations as Acceptable	CORRECTIONAL MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS					
	Sentencing	Disposition Alternatives	Parole Decisions	Race and Criminal Justice	Local Corrections Plan	State Construction
90%-100%		Planners 100% County Corrctns 93% Educators 90%	Educators 100% Parole/ Probate 100%	Courts 100% Citizens 90%	Courts 100% Planners 100% County Corrctns 94%	Educators 100% State Corrctns 94%
80%-89%	State Corrctns 82%	Courts 89% Parole/ Probate 85% OVERALL 81%	County Corrctns 88% Planners 83% OVERALL 81%	Parole/ Probate 88% OVERALL 86% Planners 86% State Corrctns 84% County Corrctns 83%	OVERALL 84% Parole/ Probate 83%	Planners 88% OVERALL 85% Citizens 80%
70%-79%	Educators 78% County Corrctns 73%		State Corrctns 71% Citizens 71% Courts 71%	Educators 78%	Educators 78% State Corrctns 75% Citizens 71%	County Corrctns 77% Courts 75%
60%-69%	Courts 67% Planners 67% OVERALL 65%	Citizens 68% State Corrctns 67%				
50%-59%	Citizens 52%					Parole/ Probate 57%
40%-49%	Parole/ Probate 42%					
30%-39%						
20%-29%						
10%-19%						
0%-9%						

AT LEAST 65% OF ALL HIGHLY QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS ANTICIPATE JUDICIAL ACCEPTANCE OF ALL OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 65% ANTICIPATE JUDICIAL ACCEPTANCE OF THE SENTENCING RECOMMENDATIONS,
- 80% OR MORE ANTICIPATE THE JUDICIAL ACCEPTANCE OF THE OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS.

It should be noted that the percentage of courts respondents anticipating judicial acceptance of almost all of the recommendations is as high or higher than the overall conference expectation.

Those groups with more doubts (compared to the conference consensus) about judicial acceptance of some of the recommendations include the citizens group, the parole and probation group, and the state corrections group.

CHART VIII: JUDGMENTS OF LEGISLATIVE ACCEPTABILITY

The percentage of each group who anticipate either a moderate or high level of legislative acceptance of each recommendation is reported in this chart.

Note that in this chart only "highly qualified" members of each group are included.

Percentage Judging Recommendations as Acceptable	CORRECTIONAL MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS							
	Sentencing	Disposition Alternatives	Parole Decisions	Race and Criminal Justice	Local Corrections Plan	State Construction		
90%-100%	Educators 100% County Corrctns 91%	Planners 100% Parole/ Probate 92% Educators 90%	Planners 100% County Corrctns 100%	Educators 100% State Corrctns 95%				
80%-89%	Planners 86%	County Corrctns 86% OVERALL 82%	Citizens 81%	OVERALL 86% Planners 86% Citizens 85% County Corrctns 83%	Planners 88% Parole/ Probate 83%	Planners 88% Parole/ Probate 83% State Corrctns 82%		
70%-79%	Parole/ Probate 78% State Corrctns 76% OVERALL 75% Courts 70%	State Corrctns 78% Citizens 77%	Educators 75% OVERALL 74% Parole/ Probate 70%	Parole/ Probate 75%	Educators 78% Courts	OVERALL 77% Courts 75% Citizens 73% County Corrctns 71%		
60%-69%		Courts 67%		Courts 68%	OVERALL 69% County Corrctns 67% Citizens 65%	Educators 67%		
50%-59%	Citizens 50%		Courts 57% State Corrctns 56%		State Corrctns 55%			
40%-49%								
30%-39%								
20%-29%								
10%-19%								
0%-9%								

AT LEAST 69% OF ALL HIGHLY QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS ANTICIPATE LEGISLATIVE ACCEPTANCE OF ALL OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS,

- 69% ANTICIPATE LEGISLATIVE ACCEPTANCE OF THE LOCAL CORRECTIONS PLAN,
- 74% ANTICIPATE LEGISLATIVE ACCEPTANCE OF THE SENTENCING AND PAROLE RECOMMENDATIONS,
- 77% ANTICIPATE LEGISLATIVE ACCEPTANCE OF THE STATE CONSTRUCTION RECOMMENDATION, AND
- MORE THAN 80% ANTICIPATE LEGISLATIVE ACCEPTANCE OF THE DISPOSITION ALTERNATIVES AND RACE AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE RECOMMENDATIONS.

Planners, parole and probation personnel, educators, and courts personnel are generally more optimistic about the legislative prospects of the Local Corrections Plan as compared to county corrections personnel, citizens, and state corrections personnel.

CHART IX: JUDGMENTS OF PUBLIC ACCEPTABILITY

The percentage of each group who anticipate either a moderate or high level of public acceptance of each recommendation is reported in this chart.

Note that, in this chart only "highly qualified" members of each group are included.

Percentage Judging Recommendations as Acceptable	CORRECTIONAL MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS					
	Sentencing	Disposition Alternatives	Parole Decisions	Race and Criminal Justice	Local Corrections Plan	State Construction
90%-100%	Planners 100%					
80%-89%	Educators 89% State Corrctns 88% Parole/ Probate 83%	Parole/ Probate 85%			Planners 88%	Educators 83%
70%-79%	OVERALL 78% Citizens 73% Planners 71% Courts 70%	County Corrctns 71% Educators 70%	Educators 75% Citizens 74%	Educators 78% State Corrctns 78% Courts 75% Planners 71%		
60%-69%	County Corrctns 69%	OVERALL 60%		OVERALL 68% Parole/ Probate 67% Citizens 62%		Courts 63% State Corrctns 61%
50%-59%		State Corrctns 56% Courts 56% Citizens 50%	OVERALL 55%	County Corrctns 50%	Citizens 58% Educators 56% Courts 56% OVERALL 51%	OVERALL 56% County Corrctns 55% Citizens 50% Planners 50%
40%-49%			Parole/ Probate 45% Courts 43%		County Corrctns 47% Parole/ Probate 43%	Parole/ Probate 43%
30%-39%			County Corrctns 33%		State Corrctns 30%	
20%-29%		Planners 29%	State Corrctns 28%			
10%-19%						
0%-9%						

AT LEAST 51% OF ALL RESPONDENTS ANTICIPATE PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE OF ALL OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 78% ANTICIPATE PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE OF THE SENTENCING RECOMMENDATIONS,
- 68% ANTICIPATE PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE OF THE RACE AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE RECOMMENDATIONS, AND
- FROM 51% TO 60% ANTICIPATE PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE OF THE OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS.

There was relatively little difference in judgments by different groups concerning the public acceptability of the Sentencing and Race and Criminal Justice recommendations. In contrast, the wide differences in judgments of the public acceptability of the other recommendations, depending on the group making the judgment, shows that there is much less agreement on the public acceptability or lack of public acceptability of these recommendations. For example:

- Public acceptance of the Disposition Alternatives recommendation is anticipated by 85% of parole and probation personnel but by only 29% of planners,
- Public acceptance of the Parole Decisions recommendation is anticipated by 100% of planners but by only 28% of State corrections personnel,
- Public acceptance of the Local Corrections Plan is anticipated by 88% of planners, but by only 30% of state corrections personnel, and
- Public acceptance of the State Construction recommendations is anticipated by 83% of educators but by only 43% of parole and probation personnel.

Several of the ideas and policies suggested in these recommendations represent a departure from current practices in certain areas of corrections. For instance, the Parole Decisions recommendations involve a different procedure than presently exists and the Local Corrections Plan may be viewed as an entirely new approach in operating the correctional system. Thus, it is expected that such new concepts would be expected to meet with some resistance by the public, and the participants have captured that very attitude in their responses. Moreover, the need for additional bedspaces reflected in the State Construction recommendation implies the expenditure of money - a position which is rarely popular with the public.

CHART X: JUDGMENTS OF AVAILABILITY OF FISCAL RESOURCES

The percentage of each group who anticipate only low or moderate difficulties in procuring the fiscal resources needed to implement each recommendation is reported in this chart.

Note that, in this chart, only "highly qualified" members of each group are included.

Percentage Judging Recommendations as Feasible	CORRECTIONAL MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS					
	Sentencing	Disposition Alternatives	Parole Decisions	Race and Criminal Justice	Local Corrections Plan	State Construction
90%-100%			Planners 100% County Corrctns 100%			
80%-89%			Educators 86%			
70%-79%	Educators 75%	County Corrctns 77% Educators 75%	OVERALL 74% Citizens 78%	Citizens 76%		
60%-69%	State Corrctns 63% Parole/ Probatn 60%	Citizens 68% OVERALL 63% State Corrctns 61% Parole/ Probatn 60%	Courts 60% State Corrctns 60%	Courts 67% Planners 67% State Corrctns 67% OVERALL 64% Educators 63%	County Corrctns 64%	Parole/ Probatn 67% County Corrctns 62%
50%-59%	OVERALL 50% Planners 50%	Planners 50%	Parole/ Probatn 50%	County Corrctns 55%	Citizens 59%	Citizens 57%
40%-49%	County Corrctns 45%			Parole/ Probatn 45%	OVERALL 45% Planners 43%	OVERALL 49% State Corrctns 44% Planners 43%
30%-39%	Citizens 37%				State Corrctns 39% Educators 38% Parole/ Probatn 33%	Educators 33%
20%-29%	Courts 25%	Courts 29%				
10%-19%					Courts 14%	Courts 17%
0%-9%						

THE AVAILABILITY OF FISCAL RESOURCES IS ANTICIPATED

- BY MORE THAN 40% OF RESPONDENTS FOR THE LOCAL CORRECTIONS PLAN AND THE STATE CONSTRUCTION RECOMMENDATIONS,
- BY 50% OR MORE OF RESPONDENTS FOR THE SENTENCING RECOMMENDATIONS,
- BY MORE THAN 60% OF RESPONDENTS FOR THE DISPOSITION ALTERNATIVES AND RACE AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE RECOMMENDATIONS, AND
- BY MORE THAN 70% OF RESPONDENTS FOR THE PAROLE DECISIONS RECOMMENDATION.

The expected availability of fiscal resources basically matches the relative dollar costs of the various recommendations and does not appear to be affected by overall judgment that any particular recommendation has extraordinary benefits compared to other recommendations.

However, there are sharp differences in judgments concerning which recommendations could be funded depending on the group of respondents making the judgment.

CHART XI: SUMMARY OF JUDGMENTS OF THE CLARITY, THE FEASIBILITY, AND THE ACCEPTABILITY OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS

Reported in this chart is the percentage of highly qualified respondents who think that only low or moderate difficulties are to be anticipated in regard to such issues as the clarity, the administrative feasibility, and the judicial acceptability of each recommendation. See page 17 for definition of highly qualified respondents.

ISSUE AREAS	CORRECTIONAL MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS Judgments of Feasibility as a Percentage of Total Judgments						
	All Recommen- dations	Dispo- sition Alter- natives	Race and Criminal Justice	Parole Decisions	State Construc- tion	Sen- tencing	Local Corrctns Plan
Judgments of Clarity	87%	95%	88%	91%	88%	74%	88%
Judgments of Administrative Feasibility	84%	94%	82%	90%	77%	84%	74%
Judgments of Judicial Acceptability	81%	81%	86%	81%	85%	65%	84%
Judgments of Legislative Acceptability	77%	82%	86%	74%	77%	75%	69%
Judgments of Public Acceptability	61%	60%	68%	55%	56%	78%	51%
Judgments of Availability of Fiscal Resources	58%	63%	64%	74%	49%	50%	45%

CONSIDERING ALL OF THE JUDGMENTS BY "HIGHLY QUALIFIED" RESPONDENTS CONCERNING EACH POSSIBLE AREA OF DIFFICULTY IN IMPLEMENTATION,

- 87% OF THE JUDGMENTS ARE THAT THE GENERAL THRUST OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS ARE CLEAR,
- 84% OF THE JUDGMENTS ARE THAT THE RECOMMENDATIONS ARE ADMINISTRATIVELY FEASIBLE,
- 81% OF THE JUDGMENTS ARE THAT JUDICIAL ACCEPTANCE OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS CAN BE ANTICIPATED,
- 77% OF THE JUDGMENTS ARE THAT LEGISLATIVE ACCEPTANCE CAN BE ANTICIPATED,
- 61% OF THE JUDGMENTS ARE THAT THAT PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE CAN BE ANTICIPATED, AND
- 58% OF THE JUDGMENTS ARE THAT THE AVAILABILITY OF FISCAL RESOURCES NEEDED TO IMPLEMENT THE VARIOUS RECOMMENDATIONS CAN BE ANTICIPATED WITH ONLY LOW OR MODERATE DIFFICULTIES.

The extremes in regard to specific judgments by "highly qualified" respondents are that

- More than 94% of respondents see the Disposition Alternatives recommendation as clear and administratively feasible,
- Less than 50% of respondents foresee the availability of fiscal resources for the State Construction and Local Corrections Plan.

END