

CR-Sent
12-28-87

REPORT TO
UTAH STATE LEGISLATURE
REPORT NUMBER 83-10



A PERFORMANCE AUDIT
OF
COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS CENTERS

December 1983

106965
596901

Office of
LEGISLATIVE AUDITOR GENERAL
State of Utah



WAYNE L. WELSH, CPA
ACTING AUDITOR GENERAL

STATE OF UTAH
Legislative Auditor General

412 STATE CAPITOL
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH 84114
(801) 533-6481

Wab 9/5/5
106965

AUDIT SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
LEGISLATIVE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
SENATOR WILFORD REX BLACK, CHAIRMAN
SENATOR CARY PETERSON
REPRESENTATIVE GLEN E. BROWN
REPRESENTATIVE TED D. LEWIS

December 30, 1983

TO: JUDICIARY INTERIM STUDY COMMITTEE

Transmitted herewith is our report, A Performance Audit of the Community Corrections Centers, which will be discussed in the committee's upcoming meeting on January 4, 1984. This report is one of a three-part series on the Division of Corrections. A digest of the report is found on the blue pages at the front of the report. The objectives and scope of the audit are explained in the Introduction. The response from the Division of Corrections is not included in this copy of the report. The Division will provide the committee with a written response on January 4th.

We look forward to meeting with you regarding the issues addressed in this report. At that time we will be glad to answer any questions you may have regarding the information contained in the report.

Sincerely,

Wayne L. Welsh
Acting Auditor General

WLW:nd

106965

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by
Utah Legislative Auditor General

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

NCJRS

14 1987

ACQUISITIONS

Digest Of

A PERFORMANCE AUDIT OF COMMUNITY CORRECTION CENTERS

The Division of Corrections management must clearly identify the role community corrections centers (CCC) will play in the corrections program. Currently, over \$3 million is spent on CCC in seven locations, yet what role they are to play within the division has not been clearly defined. In our opinion, centers do little to rehabilitate criminals; but can assist inmates in the transition between prison and community life. The centers also relieve prison overcrowding. Last year the centers served 527 inmates for an average of 3 1/3 months or about 10 percent of total inmate days. These services could be provided at a lower cost. Center costs could be reduced by using technicians rather than counselors for supervisory functions and by increasing center size.

These findings are further described below:

The Division Should Decide the Role Rehabilitation Will Play in the Centers. The division must decide what role rehabilitation will play in CCC. Management has reacted to public pressure and prison overcrowding rather than planning the most effective role for CCC. Centers can help inmates make the adjustment from prison to parole and they do help relieve prison overcrowding. However, based on our discussions with criminologists, review of current literature and analysis of sample results, we found that centers do little to rehabilitate criminals. Criminal behavior is extremely difficult to change. In fact, over 70 percent of the inmates in our sample were assessed as not amenable to treatment. For them the most cost effective supervision should be sought. However, for the few residents who may benefit from intensive therapy, little treatment is given. To be more effective, experts feel that changes should be made in the program offered. The treatment should be individualized, intensive, longer, and integrated within the criminal justice system. These changes can be made through changing the CCC or through contracting with the private sector. It should be noted, however, that even if these

changes are made, there is still no guarantee that criminal behavior will be significantly changed. Thus, if more intensive programs are tried, they should be tried on a limited basis with the results being analyzed periodically and program modifications made as appropriate.

Supervision Is Consistent With Policies, But Can Be Provided More Efficiently. The majority of clients will not benefit from an intensive rehabilitation program but they can be more efficiently supervised. Security at the centers is generally consistent with CCC policies. However, lower cost supervision is possible. Technicians could do some of the supervisory work currently performed by counselors, centers could house more clients, and other changes could occur which would lower supervisory costs. The division should evaluate the type and amount of supervision offered. Also, the division needs to determine optimal center size. This evaluation is important because we believe that more efficient management could yield over \$200,000 in yearly savings.

REPORT TO
UTAH STATE LEGISLATURE

Report No. 83-10

A PERFORMANCE AUDIT
OF
COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS CENTERS

December 1983

Audit Performed By:

Audit Manager	Douglas West
Audit Supervisor	Craig Monson
Audit Staff	Tim Osterstock Chris Falco Bryan Silva

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
DIGEST	i
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
Audit Scope and Objectives.	3
II. THE DIVISION SHOULD DECIDE THE ROLE REHABILITATION WILL PLAY IN COMMUNITY CORRECTION CENTERS.	5
Centers May Help Inmates Reintegrate And Do Relieve Prison Overcrowding	6
Community Correction Centers Do Little To Rehabilitate Inmates	9
Recommendations	17
III. LEVEL OF SUPERVISION IS CONSISTENT WITH OBJECTIVES, BUT CAN BE PROVIDED MORE EFFICIENTLY.	19
Supervision Is Consistent With Objectives	19
Lower Cost Alternatives Are Possible.	21
Evaluation Needed to Determine Acceptable Level of Supervision and Cost.	26
AGENCY RESPONSE.	29

I. INTRODUCTION

This year the Division of Corrections is requesting substantial increases in its operations and capital facilities budgets. Division management bases these increases on a growing prison population and the large number of offenders supervised by Adult Probation and Parole. According to division officials, the corrections system is overloaded with too many offenders and too few places to put them.

National statistics tend to support division management's contention that Utah's corrections system is overloaded. Utah has a higher proportion of its population supervised by corrections than most other states. Currently, the division supervises 737 offenders per 100,000 population. This rate is significantly higher than surrounding states such as Idaho which has only 383 offenders per 100,000 population under supervision. Most other states also have lower supervision rates such as Montana with 428 per 100,000 and New Mexico at 438. Utah's attempt to supervise more offenders than surrounding states is further reflected in the crime statistics. Our state's crime rate is 5,750 crimes committed per 100,000 population. This rate is about average; however, other states with higher crime rates do not attempt to supervise as many offenders as Utah. For example, New Mexico's crime rate is 6,201 crimes per 100,000 population, but New Mexico's supervision rate is only 438 offenders per 100,000 population. Utah's supervision rate is 737 or 68 percent higher than New Mexico.

Overcrowding within the corrections system is made worse by the fact that Utah spends less per offender than most other states. During

fiscal year 1983, the division spent \$30,176,900 to operate its programs. This amounts to an average expenditure of \$2,698 per offender under the supervision of the division. This is significantly less than the amounts spent in the eight other states we compared with Utah. For example, the next lowest state, Idaho, spends an average of \$3,397 per offender supervised. Other states like Washington spend almost twice as much per offender than does Utah. Washington averaged \$5,299 per offender under supervision. This does not mean that Utah spends a smaller proportion of tax dollars on corrections than other states. It only means that because Utah supervises more offenders than other states the corrections budget must be stretched further to support them.

Based on these statistics, the obvious solution appears to be more money for the Division of Corrections. While more money is probably needed, there are other actions that can also be taken. Our audits of the division's three major programs--Utah State Prison, Community Corrections Centers, and Adult Probation and Parole--raises a number of important policy questions that impact on the funds needed. These audits also address actions the division can take to make its programs more efficient and effective and hopefully reduce the funding increases needed.

The Division of Corrections should decide what role rehabilitation will play in the Community Corrections Centers (CCC) and then manage the CCC more efficiently. The division should decide whether more treatment should be offered to the few inmates who may benefit from it. Many will not benefit, however, and so cost-effective supervision should be sought.

Our audit attempts to assess how effectively and efficiently division funds are being utilized in the CCC. Chapter II shows that though CCC offer some benefits, they do not "rehabilitate" inmates. If rehabilitation is deemed important for the few who may benefit, then changes should occur. If changes are made they should be made on a limited basis because there is no assurance that criminal behavior will be changed. Chapter III points out that while CCC residents are closely supervised, lower-cost supervision is possible.

Audit Scope and Objectives

This audit was made in response to a request from the Judiciary Interim Study Committee. The audit attempted to assess how the Community Corrections Centers could be made more effective and efficient. We found that CCC can take a variety of roles and can serve different types of clients. However, we limited our review to assessing the role CCC take in helping prison inmates adjust to the community, relieving prison overcrowding and changing criminal behavior through rehabilitation programs. We also reviewed the supervision given to all residents, whether inmates or not.

Specifically, the audit addresses the following:

1. Determine what role the community corrections centers play in the criminal justice system.
2. Determine if the community corrections centers could be more effective in the services provided to inmates.
3. Determine whether resident supervision is consistent with the center's policies and procedures.
4. Determine whether supervision could be provided at a lower cost.

II. THE DIVISION SHOULD DECIDE THE ROLE REHABILITATION WILL PLAY
IN COMMUNITY CORRECTION CENTERS

2
The Division of Corrections should decide what role rehabilitation will play in Community Correction Centers (CCC). In the past, management has reacted to public pressure and overcrowding at the prison rather than planning the most effective role for CCC. The Utah Code, Section 64-13-10 1(d) states that the division should develop a classification system to "determine the type of service offered for the rehabilitation of individuals...." To meet this responsibility, management must identify client needs and then determine what should be done to meet those needs.

Management should decide if the centers will restrict their role to helping inmates adjust to community life (reintegration) or if they will also include adequate treatment programs to rehabilitate criminal behavior. The centers offer some help to inmates in making the adjustment from prison to community life. Also, they help to relieve prison overcrowding.

Centers do not significantly change criminal behavior. Centers do not rehabilitate through individualized, intensive therapy which attempts to assess the causes of criminal behavior and designs a program to help the individual overcome his criminal tendencies. Rather, centers generally offer a very standardized program for all inmates coming into the centers. Through an individualized rehabilitation program, centers may become more effective in changing criminal behavior. Recidivism statistics indicate that inmates do just as well whether they are placed

in a CCC or not. Recidivism statistics may not measure all the positive benefits an inmate receives through a CCC. However, the recidivism rate was the one statistic we could use in the limited time we had to do the audit. If rehabilitation is important, the division must further develop indicators of program effectiveness and evaluate programs regularly.

The division has recognized the need for role definition and is taking steps to clearly define center roles and the type of services they should offer. For instance, in discussions with the Board of Corrections, the division has proposed several possible roles for centers, such as reintegration to the community through work release programs and extension of existing alcohol and drug treatment programs at the prison. Once the role of centers is clear, client needs can be matched with center services. Additionally, how well centers perform their functions can be effectively evaluated.

Centers May Help Inmates Reintegrate And
Do Relieve Prison Overcrowding

Centers may help inmates make the adjustment from prison life to parole. Also, the centers help to relieve prison overcrowding. One of the ways centers can help the inmate reintegrate is through helping the inmate improve employment skills. We found that inmates who went through a center tended to have more stable employment. However, at least part of this may result from centers accepting lower risk clients. Also, the number of inmate days spent in CCC helps to relieve prison overcrowding.

Centers can play an important role in helping inmates make the adjustment from prison life to parole. Such help includes assisting the inmate in finding employment, establishing community ties, and teaching financial responsibility. We selected a sample of 63 inmates and found that centers appear to provide some employment skills. We examined case files and interviewed caseworkers and parole officers. The percentage of inmates employed after prison was greater for those who completed the center program than for those inmates who did not complete the program. Figure I illustrates this point.

FIGURE I

Employment History of Inmates

Employed	Completed A CCC	Did Not Complete A CCC
Before Prison	86%	89%
After Prison	86%	73%

Not only were more program participants employed after leaving the prison but their employment stability was also greater. Stability was defined as either being at the same job for over a year, still at the same job, or not going without work for more than a month. We found that stability increased for inmates who completed a center's program, but stability decreased for inmates without a center experience (see Figure II).

FIGURE II

Employment Stability of Inmates

Stably Employed	Completed A CCC	Did Not Complete A CCC
Before Prison	19%	17%
After Prison	33%	9%

These facts indicate that centers may help some inmates not only obtain employment but also to keep employment. However, at least part of this result may be due to CCC taking a "better" clientele (see Figure III for a comparison of the type of inmates going to CCC compared to those going directly to parole).

Centers not only give a resident the opportunity to reintegrate into society but also help relieve prison overcrowding. In fiscal year 1982-83 the centers served 527 inmates for an average of 3 1/3 months per inmate. The prison would have needed 146 more beds to incarcerate these inmates if prison were deemed appropriate.

Whether CCC are less costly than prison is a subject of controversy. Some studies suggest that when all costs are considered, CCC are no less costly than a minimum security prison. Other studies indicate different results. Utah's CCC per day cost of \$35 is considerably less than the estimated cost nationally of \$50 per day to operate a prison. We were unable to determine the per day cost of the Utah state prison's minimum security facility. For the entire prison we estimate the cost at \$47 per day. The \$47 does not include depreciation

on capital facilities while the \$35 per day CCC cost does include the annual lease on buildings.

Community Correction Centers Do Little To Rehabilitate Inmates

Though centers can help to reintegrate inmates and relieve prison overcrowding, they do not rehabilitate inmates. Results of our sample and discussions with experts reveal that this lack of rehabilitation is caused by at least two factors. First, inmates in our CCC sample have no desire to change their behavior. Second, there are a few inmates who do not receive intensive therapy but who may benefit from it. Management must decide what role, if any, centers will play in providing therapy to those individuals.

Recidivism Is Not Reduced

CCC have not been shown to reduce recidivism significantly, according to our comprehensive literature review and discussions with criminologists. In addition, we selected a judgmental sample of 63 inmates and found that recidivism rates were about the same for those who were assigned directly to parole versus those who were sent to CCC prior to their parole dates. This result occurred despite centers taking "lower-risk" clients. Though it is difficult to determine the amount of risk the community is subject to when an inmate is placed in a CCC, past criminal history indicates that those sent to a CCC in our sample were lower-risk clients.

To make our assessment, we compared recidivism rates and other characteristics between two groups of inmates with parole dates between February 1982 and August 1982. The results of our sample as of September 30, 1983 are shown below.

FIGURE III

Comparison of Those Entering a Center Prior to Parole
Versus Those Sent Directly to Parole

	Entered CCC	Sent Directly To Parole
Average IQ	104.5	97.4
Average Age at First Arrest	16.9	16.8
Number of Arrests	17.6	22.3
Average Number of Previous Incarcerations	.89	1.46
Percentage With No Drug or Alcohol Problem	14.3%	11.3%
Percentage Returned To Prison	46.4%	45.7%

As Figure III shows, despite having a "better" clientele, centers did not significantly reduce recidivism rates. Over 46 percent of the inmates sent to a CCC are back in prison a year later. This compares directly with less than 46 percent of those sent to parole without a center experience. In addition to these statistics, we interviewed the appropriate counselor (if the inmate went to a center) and the appropriate parole officer concerning the inmate's progress. These interviews revealed that approximately 73 percent of these inmates currently have the same kinds of problems that got them into the criminal justice system in the first place. These inmates had not made a significant change in attitude and still had criminal tendencies.

Centers may not change recidivism rates because most of the inmates in our sample have no desire to change. However, a few inmates with the desire to change need more support and treatment than they currently receive. For these inmates, an appropriate treatment program may help rehabilitate them.

Only a Few May Benefit From Intensive Treatment

Intensive treatment programs may help a limited number of inmates, but most inmates do not want to change their criminal behavior. For most inmates, the lowest cost acceptable method of supervising them should be sought (see Chapter III). Corrections officials, clinical psychologists, and treatment personnel in other programs believe that criminal behavior in prison inmates is very difficult to change. Prison inmates typically have extensive criminal backgrounds and have no desire to change their behavior.

The inmates in our sample reflect these same characteristics. Figure IV describes the criminal history of the 63 individuals.

FIGURE IV

Background of Inmates In Sample

Characteristic	Occurrence
Average Number of Arrests	20.3
Average Number of Previous Incarcerations	1.2
Average Age at First Arrest	16.8
Percentage With Alcohol or Drug Related Problem	87.3%
Percentage Considered Amenable to Treatment ¹	27.0%

¹Assessment made after reviewing the case with the appropriate caseworker and/or parole officer.

As Figure IV points out, inmates released from prison generally have an extensive criminal history accompanied by serious drug and alcohol abuse. Also, our review indicates that only about 27 percent might benefit from an intensive therapy program. The rest have no desire to change their behavior and will just have to "get tired" of being in the criminal justice system, according to their caseworkers and parole officers. However, for the few who may benefit from therapy an intensive program does not exist. Management must decide if they are going to provide such a program and how centers will fit into this role.

Changes Are Needed To Rehabilitate

For the few who may benefit from treatment, CCC provide little therapy. According to clinical psychologists and other experts, an effective treatment program should be individualized, intensive, long,

and integrated within the correctional system. This type of treatment program does not exist for the few inmates who may benefit from it. As a result, some inmates may require a different program than presently exists. If management decides centers should provide this program, changes will have to be made, otherwise the private sector could provide needed services.

Centers Can Be Changed or Private Sector Can Provide Needed Therapy. If centers are going to provide rehabilitative services, the centers will have to be restructured. This restructuring would include changes in the role of employment, the contents of the contract between the centers and the inmate, the length and the type of therapy provided, and the type of clients served in the program.

According to experts, treatment needs must be given first priority in order to rehabilitate. Currently the centers emphasize finding immediate employment to pay for living expenses. Employment can play a role in therapy but the emphasis on employment should not be greater than therapy needs. This may result in centers providing for some inmate's living expenses without being reimbursed.

Also, the inmate's program while in the center, summarized in a document called "The Resident's Contract," must be treatment oriented. According to the clinical psychologists and criminologists, therapeutic contracts must entail specific, expected therapeutic behavioral changes. None of the contracts we reviewed contained any specific, expected behavioral changes. The contract-making process would have to include specific behavioral goals. In addition, staff trained in therapy and treatment may need to be hired.

These experts also said that therapy should be longer and more intensive. For instance, clients in the state hospital's drug and alcohol program are in the program for a minimum of 15 months and have daily therapy sessions. In the CCC, the average length of stay is 3 1/3 months with little formal therapy. The alcohol program generally consists of a weekly group session, and a weekly individual session. The length of stay in centers may have to be longer with more intense therapy.

Finally, if centers are to emphasize rehabilitation, they may have to offer specialized programs that serve specific clientele. Some experts feel that clients in an alcohol program may not mix well with those in a drug abuse, or sex offender, or other type of program. This would limit the type and number of clients served by a center.

Management may feel that centers are best utilized for work release programs. If intensive treatment programs are then desired, they would have to be obtained from the private sector. The private sector currently offers intensive therapy programs at similar per day costs to CCC. As a result, these inmates could be served by established programs if funds were provided.

The division is already operating through the private sector one program, called prison diversion, that provides intensive treatment. This program identifies individuals in need of treatment and direct them to a program rather than putting them into prison. The program can be made available to inmates who are leaving the prison at a cost comparable to the centers.

Management can decide to restructure centers or use existing community resources to provide for the needs of these inmates. Regardless of the decision, other changes must also be made to assure maximum effectiveness.

Therapy Programs Should Be Integrated. Presently, there is little coordination of treatment programs between the prison, CCC, and adult probation and parole. As a result, rehabilitation efforts are minimal and ineffective. To assure the greatest chance of success, inmates needing therapy should begin a program in the prison and continue services throughout the system. Since funds are limited and only a few inmates may benefit from these programs, clientele should be carefully selected and programs evaluated.

For example, none of the ten clients in our sample receiving drug or alcohol therapy had any after-care treatment or follow-up when they went to parole. The parole officers said that they do not require parolees to obtain follow-up or treatment unless it is a condition of parole or unless the client manifests a problem in this area while on parole. According to treatment personnel interviewed, additional funds would be needed to provide both proper after care and an adequate continuum of care throughout the system. They indicated that prison programs lack the funds to adequately identify inmate needs and then treat them not only in prison, but throughout the criminal justice system.

Inmates Need To Be Identified and Programs Evaluated. The earlier an inmate's needs are identified the sooner he/she can be placed in an appropriate program. Presently, when an individual enters the prison a psychological evaluation is performed. This evaluation helps identify a client's needs. However, the prison psychologist said that little time is allowed to effectively identify the inmate's needs. Also, little is presently done to evaluate how well the inmate's needs are served by a program. As a result, inmates may be assigned and remain in an inappropriate program. Since no evaluation is performed, the division does not know if inmates are appropriately identified and assigned to the proper program.

Also, an inmate's needs can change over time. Thus, evaluations would have to be performed periodically. If management decides to use centers or community programs for rehabilitation purposes, then inmates should be reevaluated prior to being released. This reevaluation would ensure that inmate needs would match the services the programs offered.

The division would have to periodically evaluate their selection process and the programs to verify that inmate needs match program services. Also, the literature indicates that there is no promise that any rehabilitation program will significantly change criminal behavior. Hence, any treatment program should be tried on a limited basis and periodically evaluated. This evaluation should result in modification which will assure appropriate use of funds.

Recommendations

The facts presented indicate that the division should determine the role rehabilitation will play in community correction centers. If more intensive therapy and treatment is desired, the centers could be restructured or existing community resources utilized. In either case, additional funds will have to be provided by the Legislature. Hence, the division would have to design programs and provide options for the Legislature to consider. These programs should, however, be tried on a limited basis with results regularly evaluated and program modifications made as appropriate.

Recommendations

1. We recommend that the division determine what role rehabilitation will play within the CCC. Based on this determination, the division should design programs and provide options for the Legislature to consider.
2. We recommend that if more intensive treatment programs are desired, that they be attempted on a limited basis with program results regularly evaluated and modifications made as appropriate.

III. LEVEL OF SUPERVISION IS CONSISTENT WITH OBJECTIVES,
BUT CAN BE PROVIDED MORE EFFICIENTLY

Community Corrections Center residents are supervised consistent with the objectives of a community release program. Whenever prison inmates are released into the community, the public is exposed to a certain degree of risk. While we cannot specifically predict the degree of risk, the CCC is taking precautions to minimize it. Even though security procedures are consistent with policies, the Division of Corrections can take steps to reduce center costs. Savings in excess of \$200,000 per year may be possible if the centers would make changes in their supervisory methods.

Supervision Is Consistent With Objectives

Security is consistent with CCC's objectives. The CCC's policy is to maintain a high level of security through resident accountability. The CCC staff generally adhere to center policies requiring resident accountability. Center staff supervise the resident on the center through bed checks, shakedown, urinalysis samples, disciplinary actions and counseling. Residents are supervised off center through employment checks, check-in/check-out logs, location checks and through following established procedures when a resident is not accounted for.

CCC staff closely monitor client activities while in the center. About 56 percent of a resident's time is spent in the center directly under the supervision of the staff. We reviewed how the staff hold

residents accountable during this period through on-site observations and discussions with staff.

Based on our limited tests, CCC staff adhere to policies regarding on-site accountability. CCC policies generally state that the staff should make frequent, random checks of the residents at the center to account for the residents' whereabouts. Through several on-site visits and discussions with staff we found that the staff do an average of about eight center counts each 24-hour period and account for each resident on every count. Center policies also generally state that urinalysis and shakedowns should be conducted when illegal activity is suspected. In addition, three centers specify that one shakedown each 24-hour period must occur regardless of whether illegal activity is suspected or not. Discussions with staff and data from the state laboratory indicate that the centers average about three urinalyses every week. Further, several shakedowns occurred during our on-site observations, both for suspected illegal activity and as a part of the normal procedures.

Though accountability checks for off-center activities are not as frequent as on-center checks, actual staff checks are within the center's policies. About 44 percent of a resident's time is spent off premises on work or pass. Center policies state that employment should be verified and resident funds tightly controlled. When the resident is off center, his/her sponsor should be approved and resident's destination while on pass should be verified. Finally, daily resident activities should be closely monitored through the sign-in/sign-out log.

Based on our limited tests, staff are adhering to off-premises resident accountability policies. Discussions with center staff

indicated that resident employment is verified monthly. While on site we observed that staff controlled the resident's funds by requiring the resident to obtain staff approval before he/she could have access to his/her money. We reviewed 15 resident sponsor applications and found that all sponsors had been reviewed and approved before the resident was allowed to leave the center. We then had each center contact several residents who were out on pass. In all, 32 calls were made with 78 percent located immediately. The remaining 22 percent checked in within four hours. Finally, we observed that residents signed in and out of the daily log and that activities were closely monitored using the log.

Finally, we found that staff are following established policies regarding escapes. Over 10 percent of inmates sent to CCC's escape custody. Division policy allows the staff up to 72 hours to place an inmate on formal escape status and file a warrant. We randomly selected the files of several escaped residents and found that all escapes were reported within 17 hours of the time the resident was due back and that staff made a reasonable effort to locate the individual.

Lower Cost Alternatives Are Possible

Since most inmates do not want to change their criminal behavior, the lowest cost acceptable method of supervising them should be sought. Utah CCC costs can be reduced by changing the type of supervision offered and/or by increasing the number of residents in a center. Increased efficiency of Utah's CCC is dependent on the increased utilization of CCC staffs since over 85 percent of the daily costs are for staff.

Interviews with the centers' staffs and a survey of other states indicate efficiency can be increased through better staff utilization. Various methods that can be used to improve staff utilization are discussed below.

Change Supervisory Methods

Utah can reduce CCC costs by changing supervisory staffing costs. Utah's method of using a large number of higher grade counselors to perform all center functions results in a per resident day staff cost of \$29.75. Methods suggested by center staffs and used in other states can reduce costs.

One method of lowering costs would be to specialize CCC staff functions. Currently, in addition to their counseling duties, counselors perform supervisory duties such as bed checks, work and pass checks, and shakedowns. Supervisory and clerical functions could be performed by lower grade technicians, reducing the need for large numbers of higher grade counselors and freeing the counseling staff to perform counseling.

During the course of this audit one center developed a proposal for utilizing technicians which they estimate would reduce their costs by about \$65,000 each year. If these savings are projected to the entire CCC system, costs could be reduced by up to \$200,000 per year as the proposal stands right now. However, though Utah CCC directors feel there is benefit through using technicians in less critical jobs, they feel this proposal goes too far. They are concerned that part-time help have the necessary training and desire to adequately supervise clients and

that too many technicians were proposed. Some other states contacted have some degree of job specialization utilizing both counseling staff and security staff as Figure V shows.

FIGURE V

Staffing of Selected State's CCC's
1983 (Two CCC's In Each State)

STATE	RESIDENTS Per:	
	Counselor Staff	Security Staff
Colorado	17.5	7.2
Florida	9.27	0
Massachusetts	5.9	3.6
Nebraska	18.0	9.5
New York	64.1	6.0
AVERAGE	22.9	5.3
UTAH	3.70	0

As Figure V shows, centers in some other states use security personnel to supervise residents. Using the security staff allows counselors to spend more time counseling. Hence, residents-per-counselor ratios can be significantly increased.

Another cost-reducing method used by other states and to a limited extent by Utah, is home supervision. Under this system clients sleep at home, not at the center. Client activity is closely monitored by a parole agent or a center counselor at a greatly reduced cost. Other states estimate that the cost of this form of supervision is approximately \$5.00 per day. The cost reduction is a result of much higher client-to-supervisor ratios, up to 30:1, and reduced facility costs.

Home supervision has been used in the past (called off-center resident status, OCR) and is currently being tried experimentally by adult probation and parole in Utah. All of Utah's CC centers have used home supervision in the past with no more than ten residents out at a time. The program was discontinued because it was not coordinated effectively with adult probation and parole officers. Interviews with some current CCC staff and residents indicate that a majority of the residents would have a place to stay in the community were they to be released to OCR status. The CCC counselors feel that some clients could benefit from home supervision. Other states are utilizing home release directly from prison as an extension of their halfway house programs.

More Clients Can Be Housed In a Center

Cost reductions may also be possible by increasing the number of clients in any given center. The savings is a result of increasing the resident:staff ratio by using the same number of staff or by increasing the number of residents in a center at a greater rate than staff are increased. Utah's present facilities average only 41 beds, while 60-bed facilities are necessary to fully utilize Utah's present staff.

Facility capacity is a function of total facility size and number of residents served in a facility. Other states have found they can serve more clients by using larger and/or more heavily utilized facilities which lowers the staff costs per resident day. Figure VI shows the residents to total staff ratio, and the average center size for the states surveyed.

FIGURE VI

CCC Utilization of Selected States

State	Residents-Total Staff	Average Center Size
California	3.33	21
Colorado	3.85	35
Florida	4.17	70
Georgia	4.2	71
Illinois	4.33	58
Massachusetts	2.5	37
New York	3.8	189
UTAH	2.63	41

As Figure VI shows, Utah's CCC have higher staffing levels and smaller capacity than some other states. Directors at all of the CCC said that this need not be the case, since their staffs could serve significantly more clients without adversely affecting client care or security. Discussions with 20 staff members in six of the CCC indicated that overall resident-to-counselor ratios of up to 6:1 would be acceptable. Currently this ratio can reach a maximum of 4.36:1 and is usually about 3.8:1. A reduction of 15 counselors is theoretically possible with the increased ratio.

A straight reduction in force is not possible because the counselors said and our observations indicate a base staffing level is necessary to provide round-the-clock coverage. Center staff also felt that facilities larger than 60 beds would be unacceptable for proper supervision. If Utah were to use four 60-bed facilities, instead of the six currently used for inmates, and a resident-to-counselor ratio of 6:1,

CCC staff costs could be reduced by up to \$500,000 (23 percent of current staff costs).

In order to have 60-bed facilities larger facilities designed to accommodate 60 residents should be sought. The last two centers opened in Utah have taken this approach and are both designed as 60-bed centers. It should be noted that a larger facility may gain even more benefits from the job specialization proposal mentioned earlier.

The information presented indicates that lower cost alternatives are available. The division needs to evaluate and experiment with types of supervision and center size to reduce costs for acceptable levels of supervision and risk.

Evaluation Needed to Determine Acceptable Level
of Supervision and Cost

Utah's CCC program has lacked any divisional program evaluation since its inception. This has resulted in poor controls and no directed program growth. Specifically, the division has not evaluated the type or amount of supervision, staffing, or optimal center size. Our discussions with previous CCC program directors show the major concern in the past has been in just trying to locate centers. Public relation problems and community objections were the key issues, not management's evaluation of the program.

An evaluation of the CCC program and development of future plans should consider several factors. First, any community-release program will by nature include some degree of public risk. Second, alternatives

to Utah's current supervisory techniques may be available at lower costs for an equivalent community risk.

The division must decide, with the aid of the public, what level of supervision is acceptable and at what cost.

Recommendation

We recommend that the division more efficiently manage the centers by evaluating the type and amount of supervision that is given in the centers. The division should make changes as appropriate. In order to provide the lowest cost acceptable supervision, the division should consider several options. These options are using technicians to perform some supervisory duties, using off-center resident supervision, and housing more residents in a center.

AGENCY RESPONSE

The Division of Corrections will present a written response to this report during the Judiciary Interim Study Committee meeting on January 4, 1984.