

PROGRAM AREA EVALUATION
STATE CORRECTIONAL TREATMENT TEAMS

April 1978

Prepared By:

The Bureau of Professional Services
New Jersey Department of Corrections

62995

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I Introduction.....	1
II Description of New Jersey SLEPA Funded Projects and their Environment.....	4
III Data Analysis and Interpretation.....	12
IV Summary.....	30
V Recommendations.....	32
Bibliography.....	34
Appendices.....	

This report was prepared by Mr. Gary J. Walters, Program Development Specialist I, Bureau of Professional Services.

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
Table 1	General Description of State Facilities..... 2
Table 2	Average Inmate Population Vs. Rated Maximum Capacity..... 3
Table 3	Number and Type of Cell Assignments..... 6
Table 4	Average Length of Incarceration (months) During 1974 - 1975 (Correctional Master Plan 6
Table 5	Funds Expended Fiscal 1977 (Fiscal '79 Governor's Budget Message, 1978)..... 7
Table 6	Institutional Treatment Staff Vs. Custodial Personnel..... 8
Table 7	Academic Background of Social Service Staff on March 15, 1977..... 9
Table 8	Staff Turnover (October, 1976 - October, 1977)..... 9
Table 9	Total Problem Contacts Reported.....13
Table 10	Inmates Receiving General Social Service.....13
Table 11	Problem Contact Analysis.....14
Table 12	Problems Reported of Particular Inmates.....14
Table 13	Source of Problem Detection.....15
Table 14	Nature of Problem Contacts.....16
Table 15	Problems Which Prompt Referrals.....18
Table 16	Problems for Which Counseling was Provided.....19
Table 17	Reported Intake/Orientation Contacts.....20
Table 18	Frequency of Problem Detection at Intake.....21
Table 19	Custody Status of Inmates Receiving Service.....21
Table 20	Problems of Inmates by Maximum and Minimum Custody.....22
Table 21	Ethnic Background of Service Recipients.....23

Table 22	Problems of Inmates with Different Racial Backgrounds.....	24
Table 23	Sex of Service Recipients at Clinton.....	24
Table 24	Nature of Problems of Men and Women at Clinton.....	25
Table 25	Services Provided to Men and Women.....	25
Table 26	Problems Reported to be Resolved.....	26
Table 27	Causes of Non-Resolved Problems.....	27
Table 28	Contacts Initiated to Resolve Problems.....	28
Table 29	Problems Requiring More Than One Contact.....	29

INTRODUCTION

There is a growing appreciation of the significant problems faced by adult correctional institutions throughout the nation. Furthermore, it has been suggested that the correctional institutions which perform least effectively in rehabilitating inmates and reintegrating them into their communities are those that are operated by the individual states (Corrections, 1973: 344).

It is evident that the rehabilitation and reintegration of the inmates from the state institutions is a very difficult task. To begin with, a large proportion of them are educationally deprived.¹ Furthermore, most do not possess the vocational skills that are necessary to obtain employment, and the employment which they do obtain is generally short-term.² It has even been suggested that the inmates in state correctional institutions "are the most troublesome and troubling members of society: the misfits, and the failures, the unrespectable and the irresponsible" (The Challenge of Crime, 1967: 159).

Even acknowledging the difficulty of the task, it still may be said that the capacity of state correctional institutions to rehabilitate inmates is impeded by several significant problems. Among the most acute of these problems are these:

1. A majority of state facilities were built many years ago, and their physical design is more conducive to security than to rehabilitative treatment.
2. Because of their age, the institutions are in almost constant need of repair and renovation.
3. Most of the state correctional institutions must accommodate large numbers of inmates; thus, there is often significant inmate overcrowding, and problems of inmate management are exacerbated.
4. State correctional facilities are frequently located in rural areas. Therefore, inmates are not able to take advantage of the job opportunities that are available in urban centers, and their families have difficulties in making visits.
5. Within the correction's community there is a continuing pervasive emphasis on the maintenance of security and order, and therefore, the provision of rehabilitative service is often a lesser priority.

¹A study of the reading levels of inmates in New Jersey State Prisons indicated that the average grade level was 4.5 (Criminal Justice Plan for New Jersey, 1976).

²In New Jersey it was found that most inmates held one job for an average of less than 6 months (Criminal Justice Plan for NJ, 1976).

6. There is a general failure to gather complete and systematic data about inmate problems and needs and as a result decisions regarding inmates are often made in an arbitrary manner.
7. There are not enough professional staff whose main purpose is the rehabilitation of inmates.
8. State institutions have not been able to secure the employment of professionals who possess advanced credentials (academic and experiential).
9. The lack of comprehensive training programs hinders new staff persons in the performance of their job.
10. The length of time professional personnel are employed is usually short because of the frustration they experience in the job and the lack of advancement opportunities.
11. The non-availability of financial resources hinders the construction of new facilities and the renovation of deteriorating structures. Moreover, the lack of financial resources curtails the hiring of professional personnel and the development of rehabilitation services.
12. Generally, communities are hostile toward state institutions operating within their boundaries and this has limited the establishment of state facilities in urban centers and impeded the development of community based correctional programs.

In summary, state correctional institutions face severe problems¹ that impede their capacity to rehabilitate inmates and reintegrate them into their community. The need for change in state correctional facilities is thus evident.

Even though the state of affairs of New Jersey state institutions is comparable with the bleak situation prevailing in the rest of the country, many important improvements have taken place in the last five years. At that time (1972) the New Jersey State Law Enforcement Planning Agency recognized the need for improving the direct treatment services in state prisons. Since the development of program area D-5 State Correctional Treatment Programs, treatment teams have been established in the adult state correctional facilities at Clinton, Leesburg, Rahway and Trenton.

¹For further information and clarification of the problems confronting state correctional institutions, refer to The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society (1967), A National Strategy to Reduce Crime (1967), Corrections (1973) and Courts (1973).

The central purpose for which these treatment teams have been established is the introduction of professional treatment personnel responsible for providing those rehabilitative services which inmates require. Staffing provided by SLEPA and other funding sources consisted of 43 staff positions among the four state institutions (4 treatment team leaders, 20 social workers, 7 psychologists and 12 drug abuse services).¹

The specific duties of these treatment persons consist of:

1. Increasing the types of availability of services offered.
2. Improving the classification system by identifying inmates who have specialized needs.
3. Developing specialized treatment plans for individuals entering the state facilities.
4. Improving classification and parole decisions by preparing written, evaluative inmate progress reports.

This report will attempt to describe the activities of the treatment teams assigned at Clinton, Leesburg, Rahway and Trenton State Prisons. Attention will be given only to those treatment staffs which provide general short-term social service.²

The SLEPA evaluation team in conjunction with members of each state prison treatment unit designed the Inmate Contact Form (8-6), which is the main data collection instrument for this report (see appendix B). The reason for involving treatment staff in the development of this data collection instrument was to design a form that would not only serve as a basic instrument for a management information system, but would also be a practical tool for the social service staff in performing their jobs. The data collection instrument thus served not only the purpose of the research effort, but also served as an aid to the institutions in improving their inmate information base and delivery of needed service.

The form supplied:

1. inmate characteristics
2. the particular staff person who provided the service
3. the source of referral to the social worker
4. the social worker's assessment of the inmate's problem
5. the action taken by the social worker
6. the number of separate contacts required to resolve the specific problem.

¹With the hiring of this staff the professional personnel to inmate ratio was reduced to 1:90 in 1976 (NJ State Criminal Justice Plan, 1976: 194).

²Analysis will not be concerned with treatment personnel who provide ongoing intensive social services of a more specific nature - for instance those who operate drug programs at Clinton (Genesis) and Leesburg (Alpha-Meta).

The principal portion of this report is based on data collected by individuals assigned to state institutional treatment teams. The main advantage of collecting data in this manner is the volume of information generated. On the other hand a major disadvantage is the absence of direct research supervision of the day-to-day data collection. Thus, the researcher is without sufficient assurance that the data is being collected with the care and accuracy that is desirable.

The treatment personnel participating in the project were directed to fill out a data collection form each time that they identified an inmate problem: e.g. if a particular inmate was assessed to have had both a drug and alcohol problem two forms were to have been completed. Additionally, a data collection form was to be completed - whether a new problem was identified or not - after a routine inmate intake and each time a written report concerned with the inmate was prepared.

Description of NJ SLEPA Funded Projects and their Environment

As indicated earlier state adult institutions throughout the nation are faced with numerous problems which hinder the accomplishment of such significant goals as separating inmates from society, deterring criminal behavior and especially rehabilitating offenders. This section will provide a brief description of the four adult institutions participating in this evaluation effort. The description of the state institutions will pay particular attention to the problems assessed at the national level as they manifest themselves on the institutions under examination. Also, the descriptive information that is provided will be useful in analyzing the data in the following section.

Description of Facilities and Inmates

It is evident that the facilities under the evaluation in New Jersey are faced with problems concerning their physical plant when one investigates the age, condition, design and location of the four state institutions.

Table 1: General Description of State Facilities

Institution	Age	Location	Primary Type of Design
Clinton	1913	Rural	minimum - maximum
Leesburg			
Institution	1968	Rural	medium
Farm	1925	Rural	minimum
Ranway	1896	Urban	minimum - maximum
Trenton	1836	Urban	maximum

Trenton and Rahway are the oldest adult institutions under consideration. As indicated in the New Jersey Correctional Master Plan, they are also the institutions which are in need of the most extensive repair and renovation. However, their urban geographic location is the most desirable of the four institutions. Even though the physical conditions of the facilities at Clinton and Leesburg are generally in good shape (New Jersey Correctional Master Plan, 1976), the location of these facilities away from population centers where most jobs, community services and the inmates' families reside is a drawback to their overall operation.

A comparison of each institutional holding capacity and average daily population during the fiscal year 1976 suggests that none of the four institutions are experiencing a crowding problem.

Table 2: Average Inmate Population Vs. Rated Maximum Capacity

Institution	Average Daily Population	Maximum Rated Capacity	Ratio of Average Daily Population Vs. Rated Capacity
Clinton	305	355	.86
Leesburg	896	900	.99
Rahway	1303	1345	.97
Trenton	1045	1310	.78

However, when it is noted that between 350 and 400 persons serving state prison time are incarcerated in county jails and approximately 600 state prison inmates are incarcerated in the Youth Correctional Complex (Yardville, Bordentown and Annandale) the problem concerning crowding becomes evident. It is also worth noting that the maximum holding capacity of an institution is generally a simple count of the number of possible bed spaces and, therefore, may be set at an unrealistically high level.

The character of cell assignments is also an indicator of the overcrowded and antiquated conditions of the four institutions.

Table 3: Number and Type of Cell Assignments

Institution	Single Cells	Double Occupancy Cells	Triple Occupancy Cells	Dormitory Quarters (Number of Beds)
Clinton ¹	18			320
Leesburg ²	502			40
Rahway	900			160
Trenton	695	27	91	161

When one considers that inmates are incarcerated for extended periods of time at these prison facilities, the problems associated with the provision of treatment services and inmate management are exasperated.

Table 4: Average Length of Incarceration (months) During 1974 - 1975 (Correctional Master Plan).

Institution	Offenses Against Persons	Offenses Against Property and Others
Prisons	30.2	18.3
Clinton	14.2	7.1

¹At Clinton the 18 single cells are utilized as administrative segregation quarters, while the remaining inmate population is housed in cottage structures which have approximately 40 beds arranged in a dormitory atmosphere.

²Leesburg has approximately 280 minimum inmates who live in trailers situated at the full minimum farm and satellite unit (Ancora).

The relative lack of emphasis placed on rehabilitative services is revealed by the budgets of the four institutions.

Table 5: Funds Expended Fiscal 1977 (Fiscal '79 Governor's Budget Message, 1978)

Institution	Adminis- trative	Care	Custodial	Educat- ion	Treatment and Rehabilitation
Clinton	\$302,613 (7)	\$1,413,421 (34)	\$2,123,127 (51)	\$132,493 (3)	\$192,683 (5)
Leesburg	\$301,872 (5)	\$2,949,431 (40)	\$3,289,887 (45)	\$210,240 (3)	\$479,707 (7)
Rahway	\$516,324 (6)	\$3,057,160 (37)	\$3,895,607 (48)	\$280,785 (3)	\$564,201 (7)
Trenton	\$452,467 (4)	\$2,897,041 (28)	\$6,569,524 (60)	\$349,042 (3)	\$594,243 (5)

Description of Institutional Staff

The composition of institutional staffing indicates that the number of positions which could be classified as treatment staff is well below the number of custodial positions. It should be noted that the figures in the following table indicate the number of positions that were budgeted and does not indicate the number of positions that were filled. The number of budgeted social services positions includes a secretary for each department except Rahway where no secretary is assigned.

Table 6: Institutional Treatment Staff vs. Custodial Personnel.

Institution	Custodial Staff		Treatment Staff									Total						
			Academic Teachers		Vocational Teachers		Psychologists		Psychiatrists		Medical Doctors		Dentists		Social Service Staff			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N		%	N	%	N	%	
Clinton	138	(82)	8	(5)	2	(1)	3	(2)	2	(1)	2	(1)	1	(1)	12 ¹	(7)	168	(82)
Leesburg	236	(87)	9	(3)	8	(3)	4	(1)	1	(0)	1	(0)	1	(0)	12 ²	(4)	272	(87)
Rahway	325	(88)	10	(3)	12	(3)	4	(1)	1	(0)	6	(2)	4	(1)	6	(2)	368	(88)
Trenton	416	(90)	16	(3)	5	(1)	7	(2)	0	(0)	3	(1)	2	(0)	13	(3)	461	(90)
Total	1115	(88)	43	(3)	27	(2)	18	(1)	4	(0)	12	(1)	8	(1)	42	(3)	1269	(88)

¹This figure includes three Title XX positions which are assigned to the Social Service Department.

²This figure includes two Community Treatment Services Field Representatives who are assigned to the Social Service Department.

The majority of social service staff have at least obtained a college degree and 40 percent of the department have continued their education beyond this level.

Table 7: Academic Background of Social Service Staff on March 15, 1977

Institution	Some College		College Graduate		Some Graduate Work		Completion of Graduate Program		Total ¹	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Clinton	5	(50)	3	(30)	0	(0)	2	(20)	10	(100)
Leesburg	2	(20)	6	(60)	0	(0)	2	(20)	10	(100)
Rahway	0	(0)	2	(40)	0	(0)	3	(60)	5	(100)
Trenton	0	(0)	4	(33)	3	(25)	5	(42)	12	(100)
Totals	7	(19)	15	(41)	3	(8)	12	(32)	37	(100)

While it seems that Social Service Departments at New Jersey State Prisons are able to attract employees who have advanced academic credentials, one problem which hampers the operation of these departments is the rate of staff turnover. Turnover equals positions vacated divided by the number of allocated positions.

Table 8: Staff Turnover (October, 1976 - October, 1977)

Institution	Number of Social Service Positions ²	% of Staff Turnover
Clinton	11	22
Leesburg	11	50
Rahway	6	200
Trenton	12	30

¹The totals reflect vacant social work positions at Clinton, Leesburg and Rahway.

²This only includes those persons who were in specific social service titles.

Social Service Staff Training

While the major aspect of the training programs developed for social workers usually entails on the job training provided by the director and his/her assistants, staff at these facilities do attend training seminars that are offered by the Department of Corrections Central Office staff. During fiscal year 1977, twelve different training day programs were conducted. Topics of these training programs were:

- 1) Description of particular institutions and the nature of treatment activities.
- 2) Legal issues in correctional casework.
- 3) Description of Morrow Project.
- 4) Interviewing Skills.
- 5) Identification of Drug and Alcohol Abuse.
- 6) Explanation of Departmental Standards.
- 7) Orientation to Group Counseling Techniques.
- 8) Introduction to Psychopharmacology.
- 9) Family Law.
- 10) Parole Eligibility and Sentence Computation.
- 11) Understanding Detainers.
- 12) Post Trial Procedures.

Institutional Activities and Program Offerings

Alcoholism Treatment Programs are offered at each institution and these programs are usually run by community volunteer Alcoholics Anonymous groups. The exception to this is Clinton where an institutional alcohol counseling program has been implemented.

Excluding Trenton, each facility has a drug treatment Program operating (see attached appendix A).

Work Release programs are functioning at each facility, although the average number of inmates participating in this program at the four institutions during the first six months of 1977 was only 28.

Academic Programs ranging from adult basic education to college level courses are offered at each facility.

Vocational courses are also offered at each facility although the type of courses available varies from institution to institution.

Inmates are provided the opportunity to participate in recreational activities and varied religious services at all four of the institutions.

A Voluntary Behavior Modification program which teaches inmates techniques concerned with relaxation, self-image, behavior analysis and assertiveness is offered at each facility.

Inmate institutional jobs range from food services, maintenance, sanitation, state services, clerks and paraprofessional type positions. While an inmate works, he receives state pay which is logged into his account each month.¹

Community Agencies and Volunteers visit these institutions regularly and inmate organizations such as Jaycees are also active.

While it would seem that there are plenty of activities, jobs and programs for the inmate population, it should be noted that there is a limit to the number of inmate participants in each activity because of security, time and spatial problems.

¹Inmates also receive state pay for participation in academic of vocational training programs.

DATA ANALYSIS

The following discussion is mainly based on data that was collected by project staff and recorded on pre-coded inmate contact forms. However, the interpretation of the data draws on both observation of social service activities and interviews with staff members. The principal issues to be addressed are:

1. The total number of problem contacts between inmates and project staff;
2. The nature of the problems with which project staff were concerned;
3. The nature of the service which inmates were provided;
4. The characteristics of the inmates being served;
5. And the proportion of problems which project staff was able to resolve.

An effort is made to identify both similarities and differences among the participating projects.

Total Problem Contacts Reported

Table 9 is a reflection of the total problem/contacts reported by all four projects between March 15, 1977 and May 31, 1977. The following table is important since it presents the pattern of general social service activity of each social service department.

Table 9 : Total Problem Contacts Reported

Institution	Number of Inmates Incarcerated on March 1, 1977 (Correctional Information Systems, 7/6/77)	Number of Problem Contacts
Clinton	297	1058
Leesburg	954	1165
Rahway	1364	2660
Trenton	1208	4473
Totals	3823	9356

The social service departments at Rahway and Trenton contributed disproportionately to the total number of reported problem contacts in the program area. Their high rate of reported problem contacts can be explained partially by the fact that Rahway and Trenton have the largest inmate population (see table 2).

It is important to make a distinction between the number of contacts with inmates and the number of inmates served. Thus, the four projects report 9,356 separate problem contacts with inmates, yet only 2,969 different inmates were served.

Table 10: Inmates Receiving General Social Service

	N	%
Total No. of Incarcerated Individuals	*4,100	(100)
Total No. of Different Inmates Receiving Service	2,969	(72)
No. of Inmates Not Receiving Service	1,131	(28)

*This figure is an estimation of the total number of different inmates incarcerated during the time period of the study. (Correctional Information Systems, July 6, 1977)

This indicates that some inmates had problem contacts more than once. The following table attempts to show how services were distributed among the inmates. It can be seen that some inmates were identified to have as many as 31 different problems, but the average number of different problems of individual inmates was three and most inmates had only one problem contact.

Table 11: Problem Contact Analysis

Range in the No. of Reported Problem Contacts	1 - 31
Mode No. of Problem Contacts	1
Mean No. of Problem Contacts	3.1
Median No. of Problem Contacts	1.8

However, further examination of the data suggests that some inmates were monopolizing the time and attention of project staff. Thus, table 12 shows that 111 inmates were identified as having 1,472 different problem contacts, or 16 $\frac{2}{3}$ of the total reported problem contacts.

Table 12: Problems Reported of Particular Inmates

No. of Problem Contacts	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 & more
No. of Different Inmates	827	609	415	236	201	118	93	60	42	111

Source of Problem Detection

At each institution the majority of problem contacts are initiated by the inmate themselves.

Table 13: Source of Problem Detection

Institution	Self-Referral		Social Worker Initiated		Other Instit. Staff		Classification		Outside Agency		Other Inmate		Other		Total*	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Clinton	638	(61)	103	(10)	67	(6)	12	(1)	106	(10)	45	(4)	84	(8)	1055	(100)
Leesburg	972	(84)	64	(6)	25	(2)	3	(0)	22	(2)	11	(1)	61	(5)	1158	(100)
Rahway	2492	(95)	3	(0)	39	(2)	10	(0)	13	(1)	41	(2)	30	(1)	2628	(100)
Trenton	2727	(61)	962	(22)	349	(8)	214	(5)	53	(1)	73	(2)	73	(2)	4451	(100)
Totals	6829	(73)	1132	(12)	480	(5)	239	(3)	194	(2)	170	(2)	248	(3)	9292	(100)

The large proportion of self-referrals reflects the fact that social service staff spends a majority of their time touring the housing units and are, therefore, visible and available to the inmates.

*Throughout this section totals will vary on different tables because certain questions on the inmate contact forms were left blank or erroneously completed.

Nature of Problems

The nature of the problems reported by the social service staff is revealed in the following table.

TABLE 14: Nature of Problem Contacts

Problem	Clinton N	Clinton %	Leesburg N	Leesburg %	Rahway N	Rahway %	Trenton N	Trenton %	Total N	Total %
<u>Socio-Emotional</u>										
Drug Related	7	(1)	16	(1)	20	(1)	21	(1)	64	(1)
Alcohol Related	4	(0)	9	(1)	4	(0)	10	(0)	27	(1)
Home Assault/Behavior	0	(0)	1	(0)	2	(0)	0	(0)	3	(0)
Mental/Emotional	40	(4)	13	(1)	15	(1)	73	(2)	143	(2)
Total Socio-Emotional	51	(3)	41	(4)	41	(2)	104	(2)	237	(3)
<u>Institutional Management</u>										
Business Office	9	(1)	112	(10)	1400	(53)	355	(9)	1876	(2)
Classification	110	(10)	363	(32)	333	(13)	1405	(32)	2213	(2)
Adjustment Committee	4	(0)	5	(0)	11	(0)	16	(0)	36	(0)
Claims	23	(2)	11	(1)	25	(1)	68	(2)	127	(1)
Mailroom	10	(1)	44	(4)	95	(4)	241	(5)	390	(4)
Parole	93	(9)	155	(13)	149	(6)	309	(7)	706	(7)
Total Instit. Mngmt	249	(24)	692	(60)	2013	(76)	2394	(54)	5348	(5)
<u>Legal</u>										
Legal/Court	93	(9)	105	(9)	143	(5)	480	(11)	821	(9)
<u>Family</u>										
Family Related	322	(31)	72	(6)	134	(5)	307	(7)	835	(9)
Death Bed/Funeral	18	(2)	11	(1)	16	(1)	30	(1)	75	(1)
Total Family Problems	340	(32)	83	(7)	150	(6)	337	(3)	910	(10)
<u>Other</u>										
Publough	5	(1)	4	(0)	17	(1)	24	(1)	50	(1)
Work Release	3	(0)	6	(1)	3	(0)	3	(0)	25	(0)
Medical	73	(7)	27	(2)	26	(1)	95	(2)	221	(2)
Inst. Behavior/Attitude	12	(1)	13	(2)	22	(1)	53	(1)	107	(1)
Educ/Vocational Trng.	20	(2)	16	(1)	45	(2)	134	(3)	215	(2)
Other	207	(20)	166	(14)	170	(7)	333	(8)	1384	(15)
Total Other Problems	320	(30)	237	(21)	296	(11)	1149	(26)	2002	(22)
TAB ALL PROBLEMS	1053	(100)	1153	(100)	2646	(100)	4465	(100)	9313	(100)

The remaining tables will present nature of the problem as either Institutional Management, Socio-Emotional, Legal, Family and other.

Generally, the type of problems reported by the four institutions are fairly similar. However, the data submitted by the Correctional Institution at Clinton and Rahway suggests that either the inmates at their facilities report drastically different problems or the treatment approach is geared around different philosophies.

At Rahway, institutional management problems are the chief areas which are dealt with by social workers. In fact, business office problems¹ comprise 70 percent of the total institutional management problems reported.

Social workers at Clinton reported by far the largest amount of contacts concerning family related problems. This is understandable in view of the fact that the majority of this population is female and that there are four Title XX positions² assigned.

On a majority of cases the response of the social service staff to inmate problems is to make a referral to either another institutional service or to an outside agency.

¹Business office problems pertain to the recordkeeping system which is concerned with the financial accounts of the inmates.

²Title XX funds are federal monies which are specifically used for improving the treatment of those inmates with family related problems. A major reason these funds are made available is for the care of the children of those who are incarcerated.

Table 15: Problems Which Prompt Referrals

Institution	Institutional Management Problems	Socio-Emotional Problems	Legal	Family	Other
Clinton	81	80	85	71	73
Leesburg	41	49	41	36	45
Rahway	45	49	49	27	53
Trenton	40	78	20	34	50

Inmate problems are most frequently referred to other treatment or problem-solving sources at Clinton. Furthermore, the social service staff at Trenton very frequently refers inmates with socio/emotional difficulties.

Table 16 presents data regarding the percentage of time that individual social workers provide counseling type services for particular problems. These services include individual counseling sessions and occasions where counseling the inmate is combined with other general social work activities (i.e., referrals). It is interesting to note how often counseling and related services are received by inmates with socio/emotional problems.

Table 16 : Problems for which Counseling was Provided

Institution	Institutional Management Problems	Socio-Emotional Problems	Legal	Family	Other
Clinton	46	65	32	34	33
Leesburg ¹	47	61	55	72	60
Rahway	23	53	43	37	44
Trenton	19	41	14	28	26
Total	38	55	38	43	41

In addition to services provided in reference to particular problems, the social service staff also conduct intake/orientations as an added aspect of their activities. There are two types of intake orientations. Usually, it entails a meeting between a new admission to the institution in order to explain institutional regulations and possible programming opportunities and to make an initial assessment of the individual inmate.² Secondly an intake/orientation may entail a meeting between the social worker and an inmate who has recently been transferred to his/her caseload.

¹At Leesburg a short-term contract counseling program has been established to fulfill stipulations by the State Parole Board. This program might be the cause of the higher reported rate of counseling provided at this institution.

²In this instance social service staff would prepare a written report for the classification committee concerning the inmate's sentence, socio-economic background and recommended treatment programming while incarcerated.

Table 17: Reported Intake/Orientations Contacts

Institution	Intake/Orientations Completed		Total Problem Contacts	
Clinton	74	(7)	1058	(100)
Leesburg	109	(9)	1165	(100)
Rahway	76	(3)	2660	(100)
Trenton	291	(7)	4473	(100)
Total	550	(6)	9356	(100)

It will be noted that social service staff at Rahway conducts fewer intake/orientations than the other social service departments. This is perhaps because new admissions at Rahway are provided with orientation counseling by members of the educational staff. Also, social service staff at Rahway are assigned to particular work areas, and therefore, intake/orientation sessions are required less frequently.

While Intake/Orientation contacts are initiated by social service staff basically to provide inmates with information concerning their incarceration, a majority of these contacts results in the identification of problem areas. Table 18 indicates the frequency by which certain problems are identified during these contacts.

Table 18 : Frequency of Problem Detection at Intake

Instit.	§	§	§	§	§
	Institutional Management Problems	Socio-Emotional Problems	Legal	Family	Others
Clinton	49	13	3	7	28
Leesburg	14	9	4	3	71
Rahway	70	1	8	13	8
Trenton	43	2	3	2	50

With the exception of Leesburg, institutional management problems are identified more frequently during intake/ orientation contacts than are any other problem area. At Leesburg, the major emphasis placed on intake/orientations regards the preparation of inmate assessment reports which are utilized by the classification committee in making decisions concerning particular inmates.

Description of Service Recipients

The following tables are concerned with describing the inmate population with whom social service staff is dealing. This type of information should be of particular concern to administrative personnel since it should aid in the planning and development of future treatment programs.

Table 19: Custody Status of Inmates Receiving Service

Institution	Minimum		Maximum		Others		Totals	
	N	§	N	§	N	§	N	§
Clinton	513	(49)	479	(45)	63	(6)	1055	(100)
Leesburg	488	(42)	672	(58)	2	(0)	1162	(100)
Rahway	285	(11)	2312	(89)	39	(2)	2636	(100)
Trenton	339	(8)	3997	(90)	122	(3)	4458	(100)
Total	1625	(18)	7460	(80)	226	(2)	9311	(100)

As table 19 indicates, minimum and maximum custody inmates have contacts with social service staff at approximately the same rate at Leesburg and Clinton while maximum custody inmates generally are the inmates with whom staff at Rahway and Trenton have contacts. This finding seems to make sense since this is consistent with the nature of the inmate population at the four institutions.

However, there does not appear to be a significant difference in the types of problems of minimum and maximum status inmates.

Table 20: Problems of Inmates by Maximum and Minimum Custody

Problems	Maximum		Minimum		Totals	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Institutional Management	4351	(84)	843	(16)	5194	(100)
Socio-Emotional	175	(77)	52	(23)	227	(100)
Legal	674	(84)	129	(16)	803	(100)
Family	656	(74)	230	(26)	886	(100)
Other	1580	(81)	364	(19)	1944	(100)
Totals	7436	(82)	1618	(18)	9054	(100)

Thus, institutional management problems are the problems most frequently faced by inmates of both custody statuses.

The largest proportion of services are received by black inmates, and this, too, is consistent with the general population characteristics of the inmates in each facility.¹

Table 21: Ethnic Background of Service Recipients

Institution	Black		White		Hispanic		Unknown: Other		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Clinton	711	(67)	307	(29)	32	(3)	7	(1)	1057	(100)
Leesburg	799	(69)	278	(24)	72	(6)	6	(1)	1155	(100)
Rahway	1774	(69)	541	(21)	228	(9)	20	(1)	2563	(100)
Trenton	3131	(71)	906	(20)	203	(5)	196	(4)	4436	(100)
Total	6415	(70)	2032	(22)	535	(6)	229	(3)	9211	(100)

It is also noteworthy that there are no significant differences in the problems of inmates of different ethnic backgrounds. This is indicated in the following table.

¹The New Jersey Correctional Master Plan indicated that 65 percent of the inmates at Leesburg, Rahway and Trenton and 77 percent of the inmates at Clinton could be classified as non-white in 1975.

Table 22: Problems of Inmates with Different Racial Backgrounds

Problems	Black	White	Hispanic	Unknown Other	Total
Institutional Management	3712 (71)	1061 (20)	329 (6)	142 (3)	5244 (100)
Socio-Emotional	157 (66)	70 (30)	9 (4)	1 (0)	237 (100)
Legal	570 (70)	198 (24)	37 (5)	12 (1)	817 (100)
Family	619 (69)	210 (23)	43 (5)	31 (3)	903 (100)
Other	1339 (68)	485 (24)	116 (6)	42 (2)	1982 (100)
Totals	6397 (70)	2024 (22)	1551 (17)	228 (2)	9183 (100)

While Leesburg, Rahway and Trenton contain only males, the majority of inmates in Clinton are women¹. Furthermore, it does seem that the social service staff at Clinton is focusing its efforts on female inmates.

Table 23: Sex of Service Recipients at Clinton

Institution	Male		Female		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Clinton	68	(6)	990	(94)	1058	(100)

While one might assume that men and women would have different needs and problems, the data submitted by social service staff at Clinton indicates no such differences.

¹During April, 1977, there were 220 women and 65 men incarcerated at Clinton. (Correctional Information Systems, 1977)

Table 24: Nature of Problems of Men and Women at Clinton

Sex	Institutional Management Problems		Socio-Emotional Problems		Legal		Family		Other		Totals	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Male	24	(35)	4	(6)	4	(6)	18	(27)	18	(27)	68	(100)
Female	225	(23)	47	(5)	89	(9)	322	(33)	302	(31)	985	(100)
Totals	249	(24)	51	(5)	93	(9)	340	(32)	320	(30)	1053	(100)

However, the apparent absence of difference in the problems of men and women may not be actual. Rather it may be due to the tendency of social service staff to report only certain kinds of problems--particularly those which the project staff feels most capable of dealing with.

Since it was reported that men and women have basically the same problems it would follow that the services provided would also be similar. The following table supports this.

Table 25: Services Provided to Men and Women

Sex	Counseling Alone		Non-Counseling		Combination		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Male	2	(4)	39	(58)	26	(38)	67	(100)
Female	74	(7)	597	(61)	296	(30)	967	(100)
Total	76	(7)	636	(60)	322	(34)	1034	(100)

Problem Resolution¹

Each Social Service Department reports that a majority of the identified problems are satisfactorily resolved. In fact, Rahway indicates that their Social Service Department resolved practically every problem which came to their attention. This is probably because of the emphasis of the Rahway Social Service staff on providing business office and classification information.

Table 26: Problems Reported to be Resolved

Institution	Problems Resolved	Total Problems Reported
Clinton	787 (76)	1038 (100)
Leesburg	799 (72)	1112 (100)
Rahway	2400 (94)	2555 (100)
Trenton	3674 (83)	4417 (100)
Total	7660 (84)	9128 (100)

¹For this study, resolved problems were those that were satisfactorily settled, or those adjudicated to be satisfactorily determined by the social worker. In other words, if a certain problem required that the social worker make a referral to an institutional or community service agency and the referral was completed, the problem is considered to be resolved.

The failure to resolve problems was due to a variety of reasons--in particular the non-availability of the service.

Table 27: Causes of Non-Resolved Problems

Institution*	Inmate Not Eligible For Service		Service Request Denied		Service Not Available		Inmate Transferred		Lack of Cooperation		Other		Totals	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Leesburg	16	(21)	7	(9)	14	(18)	2	(3)	12	(15)	27	(35)	118	(100)
Rahway	4	(16)	8	(32)	1	(4)	3	(12)	0	(0)	9	(36)	25	(100)
Trenton	7	(8)	8	(9)	18	(21)	13	(15)	7	(8)	33	(38)	86	(100)
Totals	27	(14)	23	(12)	33	(17)	18	(10)	19	(10)	69	(37)	189	(100)

*Clinton is not included in this table because their data was erroneously reported in regard to the number of problems recorded as not resolved and the reason why these problems were not resolved.

A final issue involved with describing general social service staff activities is the number of contacts initiated by the staff in reference to resolving inmate problems.

Table 28: Contacts Initiated to Resolve Problems

Institution	Contacts								Totals							
	One		Two		Three		Four				Five		Six		7 or more	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Clinton	339	(33)	312	(31)	168	(17)	87	(9)	49	(5)	21	(2)	38	(3)	1041	(100)
Leesburg	217	(20)	273	(25)	396	(36)	102	(9)	79	(7)	25	(2)	20	(1)	1112	(100)
Rahway	1168	(48)	737	(30)	362	(15)	120	(5)	31	(1)	5	(0)	19	(1)	2442	(100)
Trenton	1004	(23)	1504	(34)	1320	(30)	404	(9)	87	(2)	32	(1)	42	(1)	4393	(100)
Totals	2728	(30)	2826	(32)	2246	(25)	713	(8)	246	(3)	83	(1)	119	(1)	8961	(100)

Most problems that are resolved typically require only a few contacts. Perhaps this is because of the nature of the problems that are identified and the process by which social service staff handles these problems (see Tables 14, 15 and 16).

However, it also should be noted that some problems require more than a single contact for resolution.

Table 29 : Problems Requiring more than one Contact

Institution	3	3	3	3	3
	Institutional Management Problems	Socio-Emotional Problems	Legal	Family	Others
Clinton	67	55	62	69	67
Leesburg	77	50	81	85	65
Rahway	50	67	54	71	55
Tranton	74	84	74	85	82

SUMMARY

Through this study, the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency has attempted to evaluate the delivery of general social services at the four state prison complexes in New Jersey. Once again it should be noted, that while the main portion of this report is based on the data submitted by social service staff, the interviews and field visits which were also conducted will play an important role in this section.

The conclusion will be presented in outline format, and their basic thrust will be to describe the institutional situation.

1. Approximately 75% of those inmates incarcerated during the time period of this study received service for a general social service problem.
2. The majority of those inmates reported to have had problem contacts with social service staff had two contacts during the two and 1/2 months data was collected.
3. A small number of inmates were reported to have had a majority of the problem contacts with social service staff.
4. Each social service department reported that the majority of the problem contacts were initiated by the inmates themselves.
5. The identified problems of men and women at Clinton were not dissimilar.
6. The services provided to men and women at Clinton also did not vary.
7. Each social service department reported that the majority of the problem contacts concerned institutional management type problems.
8. Services provided by social service staff in regard to identified problems, were either counseling type services or referrals to appropriate institutional or community resources.
9. Counseling type services are usually provided informally and in combination with providing information and alternative means of action to inmates.
10. Referral of inmate problems to other resources is an appropriate response in light of the large caseload size and variance concerning the problems which are presented.
11. The provision of intake/orientation services took on a different meaning at each facility.

12. A majority of the problems which were identified required only a few contacts on the part of the staff to be resolved.
13. Each social service department reported that a majority of the identified problems were resolved at their level.
14. It appears that social service staff were able to effectively deal with inmate problems which are practical and immediate in nature.
15. Each institution seems to be different, that is, the physical plant, inmate population, composition of social service departmental staff and treatment philosophy varied from institution to institution.
16. The lack of training provided social service staff and the high rate of staff turnover were drawbacks to the overall operation of these departments in the institutional setting.
17. The inmate contact form was described by social service staff as a practical tool which aided the delivery of services to inmates.
18. The social service departments at each institution provided a significant contribution to the overall operation of the facilities. Not only are professional staff present who are concerned with problems confronted by those incarcerated; these personnel, also, help bridge the gap between the inmate population and institutional decision makers as well as the outside community.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made to facilitate the overall effectiveness of the four social service departments, and, therefore, will be concerned with the whole program area and not with specific strengths and weaknesses of the individual departments.

1. Presently, social service staff are represented on major institutional decision-making bodies. This practice should be continued and possibly expanded to include social service input in budgeting decisions and the planning process. Therefore, it is recommended that the social service department continue to strive for recognition as an integral part of the administrative structure.
2. While social service departments have meetings to discuss new programs, policy and current problems, it is suggested that Departmental meetings become a formalized process; that is, meetings should be scheduled regularly and agenda should be expanded to include discussions of goals, purpose, objectives and activities of the department. In this way communication flow would improve and the department would provide a uniform front to those incarcerated.
3. Although training opportunities are available to social service staff through the Central Management Unit, training topics are limited in scope because of limited financial resources. While it is safe to assume that the bulk of training offered to new social service staff could be classified as on-the-job training, this is not adequate. Thus, a formalized training program should be developed with a stipulation of mandatory attendance. In this way new social service employees would be better prepared for their job assignments.
4. It is obvious that intake/orientation services vary from institution to institution. A comprehensive intake orientation program should be developed and implemented, since it might alleviate some of the problems concerning inmate requests for institutional information, which seem to be the bulk of social service activities. It should be noted that while it is not totally the responsibility of the social service department to provide this service they should be actively involved in the effort.
5. All social service departments, except Rahway¹ assign social workers by inmate housing units. This practice should be continued since social workers should have fixed caseloads, no matter what the size. With assigned caseloads, duplication of social service efforts would be reduced.

¹At Rahway social service staff are assigned by institutional work area (i.e., one social worker assigned to all vocational shops).

6. Presently all social service departments are continuing to utilize the inmate contact form. It is recommended that some type of standardized inmate contact form be used, although the instrument could possibly be redesigned to meet specific needs of a particular institution.
7. The major inmate problem areas identified by social service staff concerned classification (time and records) and business office concerns. Since this is the case, social service staff in conjunction with departmental supervisors and institutional administrators should meet to develop a reasonable means of alleviating these types of inmate requests.
8. While counseling type services are being provided by social service staff these services are usually offered in conjunction with providing information to inmates and are informal. Therefore, it is recommended that more emphasis be placed on providing formal counseling types of services in a professional manner. This might be accomplished by designating areas inside the institutions where social workers could meet with inmates in a quiet non-threatening atmosphere. Also, increased utilization of institutional authorized absence procedures might be a means of meeting this recommendation.
9. A great deal of social service time is spent in meeting with inmates for the purpose of conducting needs assessment interviews. Since there is a large variance in the types of problems inmates present, the staff is not adequately prepared to deal directly with all problems that are identified. Therefore, social workers should continue to develop institutional and community resources as referral agents.

Also, accountability should be built into this referral process in order to guarantee that the inmate receives the requested aid and that the social worker obtains feedback concerning the inmate that was referred.
10. A secretary is presently assigned (full-time and part-time) to each social service department except Rahway. However, it is recommended that a full-time secretary be assigned to each department so that paperwork (i.e., reports, schedules, record-keeping) would be completed in a timely fashion.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

New Jersey Department of Corrections. Correctional Information Systems, 1977.

Criminal Justice Plan for New Jersey - 1972. New Jersey State Law Enforcement Planning Agency: Trenton.

Criminal Justice Plan for New Jersey - 1973. New Jersey State Law Enforcement Planning Agency: Trenton.

Criminal Justice Plan for New Jersey - 1974. New Jersey State Law Enforcement Planning Agency: Trenton.

Criminal Justice Plan for New Jersey - 1975. New Jersey State Law Enforcement Planning Agency: Trenton.

Criminal Justice Plan for New Jersey - 1976. New Jersey State Law Enforcement Planning Agency: Trenton.

Criminal Justice Plan for New Jersey - 1977. New Jersey State Law Enforcement Planning Agency: Trenton.

Governor's Budget Message (Fiscal 1977). State of New Jersey, 1978.

National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. Corrections. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973.

National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. A National Strategy to Reduce Crime. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973.

New Jersey Correctional Master Plan. State of New Jersey, Department of Corrections, 1976.

President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

Appendix A
Drug Program Descriptions .

Correctional Institution for Women, Clinton

In July, 1973, the Genesis Special Offenders Program was officially started at Clinton. The program activities are set up to encourage the development of personal responsibility, to enhance the development of the individual's positive self-image, to help channel the dependency on drugs to a dependency on self and others, to help each individual develop a better understanding of their problems and subsequent management of such problems, and to facilitate the transition from the prison environment back to the community. Presently, all Genesis participants are housed in one cottage which is shared by the medical wing.

1. Maximum number of possible participants: 23
2. Actual number of inmates participating at this time: 23
3. The number of inmates paroled or discharged after satisfactorily completing the program in the past calendar quarter: 10
4. The number of staff: 1 Assistant Social Work Supervisor
1 Drug Abuse Supervisor
5. The current level of funding for staff: Both positions listed above are federally funded.
6. The criteria for admission: The Genesis program is run strictly on a voluntary basis. Each new inmate who has a drug abuse problem is interviewed and oriented as to just what the Genesis program entails. If the inmate is interested in participating in the program after the initial interview, she is then placed on a waiting list until room is available. Inmates who are classified as suicidal are not eligible to participate in the program.
7. The treatment approach: The Genesis program is a self-help program with the main emphasis placed on peer group pressure as the main therapeutic agent. Besides the normal group therapy sessions, other treatment techniques which are employed include encounter groups, recreational groups, information groups, and individual counseling. Since this program functions almost as an autonomous unit, all participant's activities within the institution are tied into the treatment effort.
8. The Plans for Program Changes this Fiscal Year: No changes in the program are planned at this time.

DRUG TREATMENT SERVICES AT TRENTON STATE PRISON

As of November, 1977, no drug treatment programs are offered to inmates at Trenton State Prison. However, there are plans to implement a drug program as of December, 1977. The following description is based on the preliminary plans for this treatment program.

Beginning in December, drug counseling groups consisting of seven to eight inmates will be formed. These groups will meet for twelve 1 1/2 hour sessions. This group experience will be designed to help participants:

- a) see themselves as trapped in a self-defeating pattern.
- b) to recognize their need for rehabilitative treatment and
- c) to provide information regarding what sort of programs are available in the community.

There will be a strong emphasis on rational-emotive therapy techniques in the groups, as well as information giving and guidance in choosing a post-release program.

Since this program is designed to prepare individuals for participation in a treatment program in the community, admission to the program will be contingent on each individual's eligibility for parole or community release.

Two psychologists and one psychology intern (institutional funds) will supervise this program when it becomes operational.

sdg
11/29/77

RAEWAY STATE PRISON

At Rahway State Prison there are two similar but separate drug treatment programs operating. The first is the in-patient Rahway Alternative Program (RAP) which is the central portion of their drug treatment effort. In addition, Rahway has an outpatient program (20 participants) functioning inside the institution which consists of weekly group therapy sessions supervised by a social worker. This outpatient program is both a terminal program and a preliminary to the inpatient (RAP) treatment. A similar outpatient program (30 participants) is functioning at both the Marlboro and Rahway Camps. The following description will be limited to the inpatient Rahway Alternative Program (RAP).

Rahway Alternative Program (RAP)

1. Maximum number of possible participants: 40
2. Number of inmates participating at this time: 40
3. Number of inmates paroled or discharged after satisfactorily completing the program in the past calendar quarter: 1
4. Number of Staff: 1 Social Worker (full-time)
1 Director
3 Psychologists (part-time)
5. Level of funding for staff: This program functions solely on institutional funds.
6. Criteria for admission to program: Any inmate who is a drug abuser, eligible for full minimum custody status within 18 months and volunteers for the program is eligible.
7. Treatment approach: Group therapy sessions, behavior modification training and individual counseling are the core of this modified therapeutic community. While the main aim of the program is to insure a psychological change in each participant toward a drug free lifestyle, each individual also participates in institutional vocational and/or educational training programs.
8. Plans for program changes this fiscal year: There are no plans to change the program at this time.

sdg

11/29/77

LEESBURG STATE PRISON

As of November 15, 1977, the following are the drug treatment activities at Leesburg Prison:

- a) a drug counseling group in the medium prison, supervised by a social worker. This program meets for approximately 3 hours per week.
- b) a modified therapeutic community (Alpha-Meta) on the minimum unit, supervised by a social worker.
- c) a pre-release program for transferring Leesburg inmates to Integrity House.
- d) a community preparation and referral project (Community Treatment Services) in the medium and minimum units and the Ancora Unit.

1. Maximum number of possible participants:

a) Drug Counseling Groups:	12
b) Alpha-Meta:	30
c) Integrity House:	5
d) Community Treatment Services:	70
 Total	 116

2. Actual number of inmates participating at this time:

a) Drug Counseling Groups:	0
(one group ended in early October; the next begins on December 1)	
b) Alpha-Meta:	23
c) Integrity House:	5
d) Community Treatment Services:	65

3. The number of inmates paroled or discharged after satisfactorily completing the program in the past calendar quarter:

a) Drug Counseling Group:	0
b) Alpha-Meta:	4
c) Integrity House:	0
d) Community Treatment Services:	35

4. The Number of Staff:

- a) Drug Counseling Group: 1 Social Worker II/Drug Abuse
- b) Alpha-Meta: 1 Social Worker II/Drug Abuse
- c) Integrity House: is a community treatment center
- d) Community Treatment Services: 2 Field Representatives

5. The current level of funding for staff positions:

At this time all positions listed above are federally funded. The total cost of all staff salaries is approximately \$50,000.00 per year.

6. The Criteria for Admission:

To be admitted to the Medium drug counseling group, an inmate must have a history of substance abuse and must volunteer to participate in the program and be screened by the group leader. For the Alpha-Meta Program, an inmate must have a history of substance abuse (although there are exceptions to this in the program at present); must give evidence through an orientation period of a desire for treatment; and must agree to observe the rules and regulations of the program. In order to become a CTS client, an inmate must have a documented history of substance abuse and be referred either by himself, by the Parole Board or by institutional staff persons; in addition, he must be willing to participate in treatment in the community.

7. The philosophy or treatment approach:

The philosophy or treatment approach differs in the various phases of the Leesburg drug program. The Medium drug counseling group is a closed-ended group which meets for from six to eight weeks, twice a week; the emphasis is on community re-entry plans which would fortify the individual against returning to substance abuse. The Alpha-Meta program follows a Synanon model of "encounter" group therapy and various learning experiences, such as signs and "commitments", within the wing of the barracks set aside for the program. The CTS philosophy is that treatment is best given to the individual in the community: CTS counseling in the institutions seeks to prepare the inmate for participation either as a resident or an outpatient, in a community facility.

8. Plans for Changes:

At this writing, there are plans to modify significantly the Alpha-Meta program; the new focus of the program will be on groups run by the professional staff, which will prepare an inmate to participate in outpatient or residential treatment upon his release from prison. Thus all the aspects of the program will have the consistent philosophy that substance abuse treatment is better done in the community than in the prison: the function of the prison is to select, screen and prepare for participation in community programs those inmates who wish to participate in such programs and who are good candidates.

Appendix B

Data Collection Instrument

INSTITUTIONAL IDENTIFIER

2. INMATE IDENTIFIER

3. STAFF IDENTIFIER

4. DATE OF CONTACT

/ /
mo day yr

5. IS THIS AN INTAKE/ORIENTATION
1. Yes
2. No

6. INMATE CUSTODY STATUS
1. Work/Educ. Community Release
2. Minimum/Gang Min.
3. Maximum/Medium
4. Farm Placement
5. Management Control Unit
6. Administrative Segregation
7. Protective Custody
8. Vroom
9. Unknown

7. SEX 1. Male 2. Female

8. RACE 1. Black 9. Unknown/Other
2. White
3. Hispanic

9. SOURCE OF CONTACT
11. Prison Reception Center
12. Initial Intake
13. Classification Committee
14. Self-Referral
15. Correction Officer Staff
16. Other Inmate
17. Psychologist/Social Work Staff
18. Outside Agency/Family
19. Adjustment Committee
20. Parole Board
21. Medical Staff
22. Other Institutional Staff
23. Social Worker Initiated
99. Other

10. NATURE OF PROBLEM/CONTACT

- 11. Drug Related
- 12. Alcohol Related
- 13. Homosexual Assault/Behavior
- 14. Mental/Emotional
- 15. Classification
- 16. Parole
- 17. Furlough
- 18. Death Bed/Funeral Situation
- 19. Work Release
- 20. Medical
- 21. Family Related
- 22. Adjustment Committee
- 23. Legal/Court
- 24. Business Office
- 25. Claims
- 26. Mailroom
- 27. Institutional Behavior/Attitude
- 28. Educational/Vocational Training Related
- 99. Other

11. REFERRAL TO OTHER INSTITUTIONAL SERVICE

- 11. Classification Committee
- 12. Psychologist/Psychiatrist
- 13. Work Release
- 14. Educational/Vocational Program
- 15. Medical/Dental
- 16. Custody
- 17. Furlough Coordinator
- 18. Administration
- 19. Inst. Parole Officer
- 20. Parole Counselor
- 21. Voc. Rehab.
- 22. Outside Agency Contact
- 23. Community Treatment Services
- 24. Other
- 99. Referral Not Necessary

12. SERVICE PROVIDED

- 1. Counseled inmate
- 2. Social Work Intervention
- 3. Combination of the above
- 4. None
- 9. Other

13. PROBLEM RESOLVED

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 9. Other

14. IF ANSWER TO #13 IS NO, STATE REASON

- 1. Inmate Not Eligible For Service
- 2. Service/Request Denied
- 3. Service Not Available
- 4. Inmate Transferred
- 5. Lack of Cooperation
- 9. Other

15. NUMBER OF CONTACTS REQUIRED TO RESOLVE PROBLEM

COMMENTS _____

END

END