FINAL REPORT OF THE VIRGINIA STATE CRIME COMMISSION

CORRECTIONAL PROGRAM STANDARDS IN VIRGINIA'S PRISONS

TO THE GOVERNOR AND
THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

HOUSE DOCUMENT NO. 27

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
RICHMOND
1996

COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

Frederick L. Russell
Executive Director

VIRGINIA STATE CRIME COMMISSION
General Assembly Building

(804) 225-4534
(804) 786-7872 Fax

December 12, 1995

TO: The Honorable George Allen, Governor of Virginia, and Members of the General Assembly:

House Joint Resolution 518, agreed to by the 1995 General Assembly, directed the Virginia State Crime Commission to appoint a special task force to study correctional program standards in Virginia's adult correctional institutions, and to submit its findings and recommendations to the Governor and the 1996 session of the General Assembly.

In fulfilling this directive, a task force was appointed by the Virginia State Crime Commission in 1995 and was chaired by Delegate Marian Van Landingham. I have the honor of submitting herewith the study report of the Task Force on Correctional Program Standards.

Respectfully submitted,

Elmo G. Cross, Jr.

Elmo G. Cross, Jr.
Chairman

EGC/jrp

GENERAL ASSEMBLY BUILDING • 910 CAPITOL STREET • SUITE 915 • RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23219

MEMBERS OF THE VIRGINIA STATE CRIME COMMISSION 1995

From the Senate of Virginia:

Elmo G. Cross, Jr., Chairman
Janet D. Howell
Edgar S. Robb

From the House of Delegates:

James F. Almand
Robert B. Ball, Sr.
Jean Cunningham
Howard E. Copeland
Raymond R. Guest, Jr.
Clifton A. Woodrum, Vice Chairman

Appointments by the Governor:

Robert C. Bobb
Robert F. Horan, Jr.
Rev. George F. Ricketts, Sr.

Attorney General:

James S. Gilmore, III

Corrections Subcommittee Studying Correctional Program Standards in Virginia's Correctional Institutions

Crime Commission Members

Rev. George F. Ricketts, Sr., Hallieford, Chairman

Delegate Robert B. Ball, Sr., Richmond

Robert C. Bobb, Richmond

Delegate Howard E. Copeland, Norfolk

Attorney General James S. Gilmore, III, Richmond

Senator Janet D. Howell, Reston

Senator Edgar S. Robb, Charlottesville

Delegate Clifton A. Woodrum, Roanoke

Senator Elmo G. Cross, Jr., Mechanicsville, ex officio

Staff

Judy R. Philpott, Policy Analyst

Frederick L. Russell, Executive Director

Study of Correctional Program Standards in Virginia's Prisons

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Authority for Study 1

II. Members Appointed to Serve 1

III. Executive Summary 2

IV. Background 5

V. Findings 5

Inmate Services

A. Work Programs 5

B. Substance Abuse Treatment Programs 7

C. Educational Services/Academic & Vocational 8

D. Life Skills 9

E. Mental Health Services 10

F. Sex Offender Treatment Programs 10

G. Treatment and Program Targets 11

H. Volunteer Services 11

I. Female Inmate Issues 12

Transition Services

A. Transitional Educational Programs 13

B. Probation & Parole Services 13

C. Correctional Transitional Specialists 14

D. Vocational Assessment 15

E. Inmate Transition to Work 15

F. Mental and Medical Services 15

VI. Study Recommendations 16

VII. Resources 21

VIII. Acknowledgements 22

IX. Appendix 24

Appendix A - House Joint Resolution518/Van Landingham1995
Appendix B - Virginia statutes on Inmate Programming §53.1-32.1
Appendix C - Department of Corrections' Status Report on §53.1-32.1

HJR 518
A Task Force to study Correctional Programming in Virginia's Prisons

I. AUTHORITY FOR STUDY

The 1995 General Assembly approved House Joint Resolution 518 (HJR 518/Van Landingham) directing the Virginia State Crime Commission to conduct a study correctional program standards in Virginia's adult correctional institutions. The resolution directed the Commission to convene a special task force to study educational, transitional and treatment program standards for adult correctional institutions.

Section 9-125 of the Code of Virginia establishes and directs the Virginia State Crime Commission "to study, report, and make recommendations on all areas of public safety and protection." Section 9-127 of the Code of Virginia provides that "the Commission shall have the duty and power to make such studies and gather information in order to accomplish its purpose, as set forth in Section 9-125, and to formulate recommendations to the Governor and the General Assembly." Section 9-134 authorizes the Commission to "conduct private and public hearings." The Virginia State Crime Commission, in fulfilling its legislative mandate, undertook the study of correctional program standards in Virginia's adult correctional institutions.

Recent legislative changes in the sentencing guidelines and the abolition of parole have created the potential for a significant increase in Virginia's prison population in the next decade. The 1995 General Assembly made a substantial commitment to capital costs for new prison beds. The Crime Commission task force examined the increased work, treatment, and education slots which will be needed to address these state policy changes in the next decade.

II. MEMBERS APPOINTED TO SERVE

At the April 27, 1995 meeting of the Crime Commission, Chairman Elmo G. Cross, Jr., selected Rev. George F. Ricketts, Sr., to serve as Chairman of the Corrections Subcommittee, which was directed to work with the special task force to examine correctional program standards in adult correctional institutions in Virginia. The following members of the Crime Commission were selected to serve on the subcommittee:

Rev. George F. Ricketts, Sr., Hallieford, Chairman
Delegate Robert B. Ball, Sr., Richmond
Robert C. Bobb, Richmond
Delegate Howard E. Copeland, Norfolk
Attorney General James S. Gilmore, III, Richmond
Senator Janet D. Howell, Reston
Senator Edgar S. Robb, Charlottesville
Delegate Clifton A. Woodrum, Roanoke
Senator Elmo G. Cross, Jr., Mechanicsville, ex officio

The Task force membership is included in the Acknowledgement Section.

III. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Corrections Subcommittee of the Virginia State Crime Commission appointed a special task force to study correctional program standards pursuant to House Joint Resolution 518 (Van Landingham). The Task Force was chaired by Delegate Marian Van Landingham, with Rev. George Ricketts and Senator Janet Howell of the Crime Commission also serving on the Task Force. Membership included two sheriffs, a circuit court judge, a commonwealth attorney, the current and a past chairman of the Board of Corrections, several treatment specialists, and program staff of both the Department of Corrections and the Department of Correctional Education.

The group divided its work into three main subcommittees: Inmate Services, Transition Services, and Resources. The Task Force adopted as a frame of reference the proposals set forth in HB 1994 (1993-Clement) which established in statute (§53.1-32.1) a plan for incrementally implementing program targets for inmates to be completed by July, 1998. The statute calls for 40 hours a week in programming. The subsequent consultant's study recommended a mix of work-50%, education-25%, and treatment-25% and identified the number of work, education, and treatment slots which would be needed to meet the target of 40 hours in 1998.

The Task Force found that the gap in programs slots needed has widened over the past two years. Staff cuts in 1994 and 1995 plus the unprecedented growth in the prison population has had an adverse impact on the amount of programming available in correctional institutions. The Task Force attempted to address these issues through its recommendations.

The Task Force found that work opportunities for inmates were limited. Institutional work assignments for inmates have decreased as the inmate population has increased. There are not enough institutional jobs available for the number of inmates in any one facility; furthermore, the length of time spent in an institutional work assignment averages only 6 to 10 hours per week. Correctional Enterprises has limited jobs as well. Although they are currently pursuing contracts to expand their job opportunities, the demand far outstrips the current slots available. The Task Force recommended increasing inmate work gangs for public service projects. Another recommendation would eliminate procurement and personnel barriers for Enterprises to make them more competitive in bidding on contracts.

Program staff cuts in the institutions has limited the number of substance abuse and sex offender treatment slots available to eligible inmates. The Task Force recommended increasing resources to expand substance abuse treatment services to 10% of the eligible inmate population in FY97 and 15% in FY98. The Task Force also recommended the restoration of two therapeutic communities for sex offender treatment which were cut in the last budget. The Task Force expressed concerns regarding the lack of appropriate treatment available for chronic mentally ill female inmates. The Task Force has endorsed an earlier proposal to open an unit at the Marian mental health facility which currently houses male chronic mentally ill inmates. The Task Force also recommended the restoration of the pilot at Staunton for behaviorally disordered inmates which was eliminated to provide additional protective custody beds. The program, "Breaking Barriers", which is provided for inmates in the initial stages of incarceration and addresses adjustment to incarceration has been conducted at several major institutions. The Task Force recommended a small amount of funding to cover the maintenance costs for materials which is not in the DOC budget at this time.

Educational programs at the adult correctional institutions have growing waiting lists. Recognizing the need to provide inmates with marketable job skills upon release, the Task Force recommended that resources be added to the Department of Correctional Education to reduce the academic/LIP waiting lists by 25% and reduce the waiting lists for vocational education classes by 50%.

The Task Force discussed at length the utilization of volunteer resources to augment inmate program resources. Testimony was given regarding the increased difficulty of volunteers gaining access in the institutions. The Task Force expressed support for the Department to develop reasonable policies which balance the benefits of volunteers with the security needs of the institutions. Four volunteer directors, one in each region, are recommended to be added to

assist in recruitment and training of volunteers within the institutions in the region. The Task Force felt strongly that volunteers are a valuable resource which are needed to augment the staff of Corrections, particularly in view of recent staff cuts.

Successful transition of inmates from the institution back into their communities is a critical component of the correctional system. The Task Force found that pre-release services are currently offered in a disparate and inconsistent manner. The Department of Corrections has a "Life Skills" program, the Department of Correctional Education conducts a "Social Skills" program, and some community based organizations , such as Virginia Cares,, offer workshops to inmates dealing with adjustment to release and reintegration in the community. Discussions were held on how to achieve the maximum utilization of available resources for these services and insure consistency of delivery. No consensus was reached and the Task Force recommended that JLARC examine pre-release services in the adult correctional institutions and determine if consolidation of these services under one agency would improve delivery and insure that all inmates exiting the system are provided comparable programs to assist in their transition.

On the post-release side, the Task Force found that there is a dearth of services. Included in the JLARC study recommendation is a directive to develop recommendations for expansion of community capacity for ex-offenders. The Task Force also recommended the addition of three transition specialists in the DOC regional offices. Tidewater currently has one. The Task Force recommended the addition of several probation & parole officers, surveillance officers, and clerical support to assist in the supervision of offenders returning to the community.

To facilitate employability of offenders, the Task Force recommended the addition of five vocational assessors be added in the Department of Correctional Education. To expedite job finding strategies, the Task Force directed the Virginia Employment Commission, the Department of Correctional Education, and Correctional Enterprises to execute a memorandum of agreement which allow inmates scheduled for release to register with the VEC at least one month prior to their release date.

Finally, to insure that inmates with chronic medical or mental health problems are referred to the appropriate health service upon release, the Task Force recommended that the Department of Corrections, the Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation & Substance Abuse Services, the Department of Health, and the Department of Medical Assistance Services establish an interagency task force to develop procedures for offender referrals upon release from incarceration.

IV. BACKGROUND

In 1993 the Virginia General Assembly passed a bill, HB 1994 patroned by Delegate Clement of Danville, which required the Department of Corrections to develop incrementally a 40 hour a week schedule of programming for inmates. This was to be completed by July, 1998. The Department subsequently contracted with a consultant firm , Correctional Services Group, Inc., to develop an implementation plan for this legislation. The consultant's report recommended a programming combination of 50% work, 25% education, and 25% treatment to meet the 40 hour goal. The report identified existing resources and the needed work, education, and treatment slots which would be needed each year to reach the 1998 target date for implementation. Unfortunately, funding cuts in the Department of Corrections have made the gap between what is needed each year much greater than those contained within the report. Additionally the abolition of parole and sentencing reforms have and will continue to increase the inmate population beyond the projections within the implementation plan. Concern regarding the hiatus between the proposed programming within the correctional institutions and the budget and policy realities led to the passage of House Joint Resolution 518, patroned by Delegate Van Landingham of Alexandria, in the 1995 General Assembly.

HJR 518 directed the Crime Commission to establish a special task force to study correctional program standards for Virginia's adult correctional institutions. Delegate Marian Van Landingham was appointed chair of the task force, and membership included Senator Janet Howell and Rev. George Ricketts of the Crime Commission as well as numerous other state agency representatives, a circuit court judge, a commonwealth attorney, the current and a former chair of the Board of Corrections, a sheriff, a private treatment specialist and program staff of Corrections and Correctional Education. Ron Jordan of the House Appropriations staff assisted with the study.

The task force was divided into three subcommittees: Inmate Services, Transition Services, and Resources. The Resource subcommittee worked with the recommendations of the other two subcommittees and refined these based upon resource allocation proposals.

V. FINDINGS

INMATE SERVICES SUBCOMMITTEE

a. Work Programs

There is a significant shortfall between the number of inmates eligible for work and the

available work slots. Inmates currently average 26 hours a week of work, with a median work time of only ten hours. Work assignments often mean inmates have long periods of idle time. Furthermore, employment is ill-defined; any work is considered employment. The Task Force expressed support for expansion of work opportunities which would comprise approximately 50% of an inmate's weekly programming. Work not only keeps inmates occupied during incarceration but contributes to their successful transition to employment upon release.

Work is divided into two main categories: Institutional assignments (maintenance-type jobs) and Correctional Enterprises employment. Correctional Enterprises does not maintain waiting lists but there was consensus that there are a significant number of inmates who could be employed with the expansion of Enterprises. Another concern expressed is the finite number of institutional assignments and the increasing population due to double bunking and double celling which means many inmates have no job assignment.

The Task Force found that the number of inmate work gangs is limited, due in large part, to limited work opportunities in the community. The Task Force supports the Department of Corrections aggressively pursuing work assignments with other state agencies such as the Department of Transportation, the Department of Conservation and Recreation, and the Forest Service to expand the use of inmate work gangs. Efforts should also be made to work with local governments through contacts with the Virginia Association of Counties and the Virginia Municipal League, to identify work opportunities for inmate work gangs. A new initiative, Virginia Conservation Corps, with the Department of Conservation and Recreation has recently been announced. Additional security staff will be needed to supervise such work gangs and cross training for staff of these other agencies is also important.

Correctional Enterprises pointed out several obstacles to high productivity, competitiveness and low unit costs (costs for production of a single item): call-outs (inmate roll calls at set times of the day), purchasing regulations and delays in personnel approvals. On the positive side, Correctional Enterprises has entered into several joint ventures with the private sector which will provide 400 new jobs. The Commonwealth recently received certification from the Justice Department under the Prison Industry Enhancement Certification Program to seek contracts with manufacturing interests in other states. As a result Correctional Enterprises has entered into a joint business venture with a North Carolina based firm. More such opportunities should be sought. Expanded Correctional Enterprises contracts mean expanded inmate work opportunities.

b. Substance Abuse Treatment Programs

The task force discussed the large proportion of inmates with some type of substance abuse problem. Over 80% of Corrections' inmates have substance abuse problems. The most effective correctional treatment interventions has been identified as the Therapeutic Community Programs (TCs) which reduce the recidivism rates of participants by more than half the rate of non-program participants.

Therapeutic communities are intensive, long term programs which use positive inmate peer pressure, confrontation, and therapy to counteract the negative influences of the prison population and support recovery. Program participants are housed together so that treatment and confrontation occur 24 hours per day. Psycho-educational, cognitive-behavioral, and relapse prevention treatment techniques are used in the programs. The program also utilizes support programs, such as AA and NA.

In addition to benefitting individual inmates by supporting recovery, positive peer pressure in the TCs also improves prison management. Therapeutic community housing units are cleaner and more orderly than the general population areas, and inmate participants are more respectful and cooperative.

The Department of Corrections currently receives combined grant and state general funds to support 44 field substance abuse positions which provide treatment to approximately 1,350 inmates. Of these inmates, approximately 1,180 are in therapeutic community programs (this includes Indian Creek's full operating capacity). The remaining 150 are in group counseling programs. The recommended staffing ratio for therapeutic community programs is 1 staff to 18 inmates. Recent overcrowding, through double bunking, has diluted the TC staffing ratios in the Department.

Statewide programs (Staunton, Pulaski, Botetourt, Virginia Correctional Center for Women, St. Brides, and Pocahontas) receive approximately $900,000 in funding per year and treat 400 inmates. The per inmate costs of these TC programs is $2,250. Current funding for the Indian Creek Correctional Center may not be a reliable indicator because the program is not fully operational and crowding has greatly diluted the staff/inmate ratios. The current staffing ratio is 1 staff to 36 inmates, double the recommended ratio. Indian Creek receives about $1.4 million to treat 910 inmates. The skewed staffing ratio indicates that the per inmate cost at Indian Creek is approximately $1,500. The current budget for 1180 inmates is $2,3 million.

The Department is currently treating 6% of substance abusers, with a goal of treating 20%. Based on the statewide (excepting Indian Creek) program costs of $2,250 per inmate per year, incremental costs using the current inmate population of 24,600 are as follows:

Percent	Total Inmates	#Inmates Added	Incremental Costs	Accrued Costs
10%	1968	+788	$1,773,000	$4,073,000
15%	2952	+984	$2,214,000	$6,287,000
20%	3936	+984	$2,214,000	$8,501,000

The Task Force recommends that substance abuse treatment be increased to 10% of the eligible inmate population in the first year of the FY96-98 biennium and to 15% in the second year of the biennial budget.

c. Educational Services/ Academic & Vocational

The subcommittee discussed the current waiting lists in major institutions for LIP, Academic, Vocational and Apprenticeship programs average approximately 25% of the inmate population. The Department of Correctional Education's goal is to continue reduction of the inmate population on waiting lists. The following chart indicates the number of inmates on the waiting lists for Department of Correctional Education programs. Waiting lists for apprenticeship programs are not maintained. Eligible inmates are recommended when a program becomes available.

I. Student Waiting Lists as of July, 1995:

A. Literacy Incentive Program (LIP): 1,813

B. Vocational Program: 2,932

C. Academic Program: 769

The Department was requested to provide figures on the resources needed to reduce the waiting lists by 25%, 50%, 75%, and 100%. For each 25% reduction in the Academic/LIP waiting there is a cost of $577,847, and for each 25% reduction in the vocational waiting lists there is a cost of approximately $1.4 million.

Academic /LIP Waiting List:

25%	50%	75%	100%
$577,847	$1,155,693	$1,733,540	$2,311,387

Vocational Waiting List:

25%	50%	75%	100%
$1,421,715	$2,843,429	$4,265,144	$5,686,858

The Task Force recommends a 25% reduction in the academic/LIP waiting lists and a 50% reduction in the vocational waiting list in each year of the biennium.

d. Life Skills

The Task Force decided that the Life Skills category of programming would include Leisure/Recreation Skills, the Cognitive Restructuring course work, such as "Breaking Barriers", the Department of Correctional Education's "Social Skills" program, and the Department of Correction's "Life Skills" program. The Task Force endorsed the concept of Life Skills as a necessary component of prison programming. These courses provide opportunities for inmates to develop more appropriate methods of thinking, behavior management, stress management, and use of leisure time which will improve the environment within the institution and assist the inmate to develop positive behavioral patterns upon his/her release.

Inmate Services concentrated on the component of Life Skills which is provided early in an inmate's incarceration. Other Life Skills programs concentrate on assisting the inmate towards the transition back into the community. Certain programs are designed to be delivered at the front end of incarceration to assist the inmate in his/her adjustment to incarceration, specifically the "Framework for Breaking Barriers" program. This packaged, copyrighted program is directed to helping inmates recognize destructive thinking and behavior patterns that may be barriers to a productive life. The goal of the program is to help inmates to develop positive attitudes, communicate effectively with staff, and to begin to set positive goals to work on during their incarceration. The Department of Corrections has trained staff in 20 facilities to be facilitators for this program. A second session is planned for this winter. The inmate materials are $15.50 each and approximately 6,000 are needed annually. The annual maintenance cost is $93,000 and not currently included in the agency's budget.

The 1994 HJR 70 study group studying pre and post release services recommended that current community based organizations such as OAR, Step-Up and Virginia Cares focus their scarce resources on post-release services and that the responsibility for pre-release services remain with the State. Currently some funds for pre-release and post-release services are allocated through a grant process under the Department of Criminal Justice Services. Since resources for post release services are so limited, the Task Force also recommended that the programs funded through DCJS grants concentrate their services on providing assistance to ex-offenders in the community and pre-release services be the responsibility of the state agencies currently providing them, the Department of Corrections and the Department of Correctional Education.

e. **Mental Health Services**

There are currently four levels of mental health care: Acute Care, Sheltered Care, Outpatient Care and Residential Care for the mentally ill which are available at Brunswick and Marion. There are 130 beds for acute care at the Marion facility; 12 beds at Powhatan, 80 beds at Greensville, 51 beds at Staunton, and 54 beds at VCCW for sheltered care; each major facility has approximately 7% to 8% beds for outpatient care; and there are 48 beds at Marion and 26 beds at Brunswick for residential care. The current status of a much needed designated unit at the Marion mental health facility for acutely mentally ill female inmates in need of residential care is being considered by the Board of Corrections and will be addressed in the near future.

Developmentally delayed inmates (mentally retarded) are inadequately served within the institutions and more specialized services should be made available, according to the Mental Health Director of the Department of Corrections. A 42 bed pilot was initiated at Staunton Correctional Center for behaviorally disordered inmates which targeted inmates with severe behavioral problem but this was eliminated due to the immediate need for protective custody beds.

e. **Sex Offender Treatment Programs**

The Task Force discussed the efficacy of sex offender treatment and agreed that treatment was essential, given the high rate of recidivism of sex offenders. Treatment experts stated that sex offenders often have as many as 100 to 150 victims before conviction. Other studies indicate a high correlation between victims of sexual abuse and perpetrators of sexual abuse. That is, a significant number of sexual offenders have a history of being victims of either sexual abuse, physical abuse, or both, themselves. The data would suggest that reducing the number of victims, while a worthy goal in itself, will also contribute to a reduction in offenders.

Sex offender treatment is a core program requirement for major institutions. Most prisons operate some type of psycho-educational program for sex offenders which is based upon a cognitive-behavioral model with emphasis on relapse-prevention. More intensive treatment in the form of a therapeutic community is not available at this time. Two therapeutic communities for sex offenders were funded by the 1993 General Assembly and established at Bland and Haynesville Correctional Centers. These programs screened and placed certain sex offenders in a separate housing unit with more intense daily treatment. Unfortunately, as a result of budget cuts the Department of Corrections had to make, these two programs were

eliminated in the 1995 budget.

Empirical data shows that sex offender treatment, while not a hundred percent effective, does have a significant impact on offender recidivism. The key issue, according to treatment specialists, is appropriate screening for treatment. Certain types of sex offenders, such as serial rapists and fixated pedophiles, are not amenable to treatment. Staff reviewed a number of studies which suggest that certain sexual offenders, when appropriately assessed and placed into an intensive treatment program, with a strong aftercare component, can be habilitated. This is especially important for first time offenders of certain sex offenses. These individuals do not typically serve long sentences and will be returning to their community. As a public safety issue,t is important to minimize the risk of reoffense, especially given the high number of victims a perpetrator has prior to conviction and the correlation of victim to later perpetration. Virginia has passed a statute for the more violent sex offenses which provides that the second conviction for these offenses will carry a life sentence.

f. Treatment and Program Targets

The Task Force discussed the most effective use of limited program and treatment dollars. There was consensus that program and treatment resources should be targeted to inmates within a reasonable time of release. If inmates with lengthy sentences receive treatment early in their term of incarceration and remain in the general population for a significant period thereafter, there is a strong probability that the effects of treatment and other rehabilitation programs will be lost. Certain programs, however, are designed to assist an inmate to adjust to incarceration, such as the "Breaking Barriers", and these should be provided in all institutions early in the period of incarceration and reinforced periodically throughout and inmate's term of incarceration. Such programs have the benefit of improving security and prison management.

g. Volunteer Services

Utilization of volunteers from medical schools, local institutions of higher learning, community organizations, the business community, etc. provides a valuable adjunct to existing resources within the Department of Corrections. The Department of Corrections provided data concerning the number of volunteer hours in the institutions which resulted in significant savings for the Commonwealth. During 1994-95, DOC institutions reported utilizing over 4,000 volunteers, with service totaling over 107,500 hours. According to the Virginia Office of Volunteerism, the estimated national dollar value of a volunteer hour is

$12.13, making the total value of DOC volunteer services, combined with donations, a cost benefit to DOC of $1,409,399.

In FY 94-95 3,878 volunteers offered assistance in educational services, recreational activities, support services, such as consulting or clerical, and board participation. For major institutions and field units, religious volunteers comprised 53% of the total volunteer force statewide. Education (15%), recreation (9%), board members (8%), and counseling (7%) volunteers were the next most actively involved with inmate populations. All other categories of volunteers were included in the remaining 8 percent.

The Task Force discussed the effect of increased security measures on the use of volunteers. More stringent security measures have resulted in many volunteers previously working within the prisons being denied access. The recent restrictions on volunteers' access to institutions due to security concerns has limited a valuable resource. One major concern in recruitment of volunteers is the access of ex-offenders to institutions. While a valuable resource in some programs, such as AA or NA; security concerns are also a paramount issue. The Task Force discussed the issue of improved dialogue between the Department and volunteer groups to develop policies which address security issues while insuring that volunteer resources are maintained.

Most institutions have a staff whose position description includes some portion dedicated to volunteer services. Only three correctional institutions, Nottoway, Staunton, and Augusta, have a full-time position for a Volunteer Services Director. A volunteer director in each of the four regional offices could assist in facilitating recruitment, security clearance, coordinate training, and retention of volunteers within the institutions in their region. A regional director can work with the institutional staff designee to increase volunteer resources. The increased use of volunteers can also augment transitional specialists' activities. Volunteers provide a valuable resource both in institutional settings and in post-release services.

i. Female Inmate Issues

The Task Force discussed the need for a focus in the Department of Corrections on issues which are unique to female inmates. An earlier study by the Virginia State Crime Commission examined this specific issue and recommended, among other things, that a special staff be designated in the Department of Corrections to address incarcerated women's issues. The Task Force recognized that this is an important topic and felt it could be addressed within the Department through an internal task force.

TRANSITION SERVICES SUBCOMMITTEE

a. Transitional Educational Programs

Transitional education, through the Life Skills, Social Skills, and Pre- Release programs provided by the Department of Corrections, the Department of Correctional Education and community organizations such as Virginia Cares, OAR, and Step-Up provide both instruction on functional life skills, such as job application skills, budget management, etc. and instructional course work designed to break the cycle of criminal behavioral patterns (behavior modification approach) through a systematic curriculum directed at thinking patterns.

The Task Force examined the feasibility of designating a single agency for transitional educational responsibility of pre-release services. The current system provides for three entities to provide such services: the Department of Corrections, the Department of Correctional Education, and private nonprofit organizations such as Virginia Cares, OAR, and Step-Up through grants from the Department of Criminal Justice Services. This has led to duplication, fragmentation, and in some cases, conflicting agendas. The Task Force also found that the greatest gaps exist in post-release services. The Task Force recommended that the community-based organizations, such as Virginia Cares, Step-Up, and OAR, concentrate their programs on the post-release programs and pre-release services would remain the responsibility of the State. Consolidation of pre-release services would enhance the individual personnel resources of the agencies and insure the message and purpose of pre-release transitional programs are consistent. The Task Force also recommended an expansion of the community capacity for post-release services and effective linkages from the institutions to community-based organizations.

The staff of the Crime Commission has requested information from the various agencies currently providing pre-and post-release services regarding waiting lists, the number of inmates served by each program, and the level of financial commitment of each entity. This information will be forwarded to JLARC to be used in their study deliberations.

b. Probation & Parole Services

Funding for reduced caseloads for probation & parole officers at a 1 to 60 ratio was recommended in the 1994 HJR 70 study on pre and post release services(HD 10). This is based upon a Board of Corrections standard. The American Probation & Parole Association suggests

a standard of 1 officer to 50 probation/parolees. There are a few jurisdictions which currently attempt to achieve this staffing ratio but many have seen their caseloads escalate to as many as 100 to 150, making it impossible for parole officers to effectively supervise their clients. A reduced caseload not allows more effective supervision but frees some of the community corrections staff to provide critically needed services, such as substance treatment, employment assistance, cognitive restructuring activities, to name a few. Often substance abuse group therapies, sex offender group therapies, anger management groups are organized and led by probation & parole staff. With the increased caseloads, it is difficult for the staff to find adequate time to provide such services. These services are essential to successfully reintegrating offenders into the community and contribute significantly to the reduction in recidivism, as evidenced by several studies on both community based and institutional based treatment programs.

In areas where services are co-located in a day reporting center, such as in Richmond, Alexandria, and Norfolk, offenders can be easily be transitioned to needed services that are housed in one facility and offer staff more opportunities to provide a comprehensive parole or probation plan. Expansion of day reporting centers would improve the delivery of offender transition services.

One less expensive alternative to addressing the caseload issue, until resources are available to meet the goal of 1 P&P officer to 60 parolees, is to add surveillance officers to assist probation and parole officers. Most jurisdictions use this approach to some degree but Accomac, Urbana, Farmville, South Boston, Warsaw, Fincastle and Rocky Mount have no surveillance officers. These surveillance officers assist in monitoring clients, some of the paperwork and free the probation and parole officers to meet those responsibilities that they must fulfill as officers of the court. Currently 22 district probation and parole offices have caseloads which exceed 80 clients to one officer. Five offices have caseloads of well over a hundred. Forty-one additional surveillance officers are needed to assist in caseload management and five clerical positions are needed to support the district offices. We recommend the addition of twenty-two p&p officers as well.

c. <u>Correctional Transitional Specialists</u>

Funding is needed for additional transitional specialists in community corrections. There should be at least one specialist per region. Currently only the Tidewater Region has such a position. Inmates can be assessed for risk to recidivate and those at highest risk can be assigned to the transition specialist as an additional resource to assist them in getting

stabilized within the community once they leave the institution through service coordination.

d. Vocational Assessment

Vocational assessment for an inmate's particular skills and abilities and training placement based on assessment facilitates appropriate placement in community programs or jobs upon release. It also contributes to the inmate's likelihood of success in vocational training. One vocational assessor is needed at each of the reception centers. The General Assembly funded three positions which are now operating at Deep Meadow part-time, VCCW part-time, and Southampton full-time. Additional positions are needed at Powhatan, Unit 30 (Fairfax), Mecklenberg, Indian Creek (parole violators), and Buckingham. This vocational screening will assist classification (determination of what institution the inmate will be assigned to and custody level of the inmate) in determining appropriate institutional placement for vocational training within the institution based upon the inmate's skills. This will positively impact on their future vocational success as well. Inmates that are trained in jobs that match their interests and skills tend to be more successful in that vocation.

e. Inmate Transition to Work

The Task Force discussed strategies to improve employment opportunities for offenders returning to communities from prison. Employment is a key factor in preventing criminal recidivism. Currently inmates are not allowed to register with the Virginia Employment Commission until their release. The process can often take several weeks, leaving many offenders without any immediate opportunity for employment upon release. A project in Texas provides a staff in local employment offices who work exclusively with offenders. The Task Force indicated interest in evaluating this approach to determine if it could be successfully implemented in Virginia.

f. Mental and Medical Services

Many inmates exit correctional institutions with chronic or severe medical, substance abuse, or mental health needs. There is no formal mechanism for such offenders to be referred to appropriate community based health services. Enhanced collaboration between state agencies providing or funding community based health and substance abuse services and the Department of Corrections would facilitate these referrals.

VI. Recommendations

Work Programs

1. The Task Force recommends that the Department clarify its position on agribusiness: is it to be an industry or a work program? Certainly, as an industry, high tech equipment would be used to maximize production but this would limit job opportunities. As work programs, farming could carried out with less sophisticated tools and require more manpower. A letter will be sent to the Director of the Department requesting such clarification.

2. The Task Force recommends that the Department of Corrections pursue agreements with the Department of Transportation, the Forest Service, the Department of Conservation and Recreation, and other appropriate state and local agencies to increase the number of inmate work gangs. Funding should be requested by the Department for additional security staff to supervise these expanded work gangs, in order to minimize escape risks. Appropriate cross training for the reciprocal agencies' staff should be conducted to enhance the understanding of issues involved in inmate labor.

3. The Task Force recommends that the Department of Corrections maximize employment opportunities for inmates through expansion of jobs. Several impediments to expansion were identified and should be addressed through amendments to the Personnel Act and the Public Procurement Act which will exempt Correctional Enterprises from certain regulations of the Personnel Act and the Procurement Act that constitute barriers to productivity in Enterprises. Several other precedents have already been established in this area, such as the state hospitals, and the Lottery Department, which have exemptions from certain purchase and personnel regulations.

Substance Abuse Treatment Programs

4. The Task Force recommends that the Department of Corrections increase in-depth substance abuse treatment in a therapeutic setting to at least 20% of the inmate population, through increased appropriations. Currently the programs reach approximately 6% of those identified as eligible for the therapeutic community. This can be accomplished through the establishment of therapeutic communities for substance abuse in most major institutions, insuring Indian Creek is maintained as a single purpose facility for substance abuse treatment,

and designation of one more institution as a single purpose facility.

FY97 $1,773,000(10%) FY98 $3,987,000(15%)

Educational Programs

5. The Task Force recommends that educational services, both academic and vocational, should be available to every inmate eligible to participate and eliminate the need for waiting lists.

FY97	$577,847	FY98	$577,847	Academic/LIP Waiting Lists(25%)
FY97	$3,999,122	FY98	$3,999,122	Vocational Waiting Lists(50%)

Life Skills

6. The Task Force recommends that "Breaking Barriers" or a similar behavior modification program which addresses adjustment to incarceration should be made available to all inmates within the major institutions for purposes of improved prison management. Current resources allocated to these programs should maintained and supplemented through volunteer services.

"Breaking Barriers" Materials $93,000

Mental Health Services

7. The Task Force recommends that the Department of Corrections continue to focus on mental health services for special needs offenders while expanding services for this population. Additionally, the Department of Corrections should identify the number of inmates who are developmentally delayed and reinstate a pilot program to address the special needs of this population.

Sex Offender Services

8. The Task Force recommends that the General Assembly reinstate the two therapeutic communities for sex offender treatment providing 100 beds for treatment for three years with a two year aftercare component. Within the context of these programs research and evaluation should be emphasized to measure the effectiveness of treatment on reducing recidivism. The Department of Corrections should also maintain the current psycho-educational groups for sex offender treatment in the major institutions to serve as both an adjunct to intensive treatment and as a screening tool for identifying those inmates most appropriate for treatment.

$970,432 28 FTE

Treatment and Program Targets

9. The Task Force recommends that resources for programs and treatment be targeted to inmates who are not serving long sentences and those who are nearing the end of their sentence and will be returning to the community within one to three years. A certain level of programming should be directed to inmates with significantly long sentences or life which is focused on inmate adjustment to incarceration. Consideration should be given to using programming as an incentive and assignments used as a reward for good behavior.

Volunteer Services

10. The Task Force recommends that the Department of Corrections be encouraged to develop its volunteer policies through dialogue with volunteer groups which balance the benefits of volunteer services with security concerns.

11. The Task Force recommends the use of volunteers be encouraged and memoranda of agreements between the Department of Corrections, institutions of higher learning, and other state and local agencies should be developed to enhance volunteerism in the prisons by July, 1996.

12. The Task Force recommends that a position as volunteer director be added to each of the four regional offices. This position would work with institutions within the region to enhance volunteer resources, provide training, and coordinate volunteer activities within the institutions.

4 Regional Volunteer Directors @ Grade 10, Step 10, @$38,617
$144,188

Women's Issues

13. The Task Force recommends that the Department of Corrections assign an internal task force on incarcerated women's issues to insure policies are appropriate for women as well as men. A recommendation for a designated staff on women's issues in the Director's office was included in the 1993 Crime Commission study on "Special Needs for Incarcerated Women" but has not been implemented.

Transitional Educational Services

14. The Task Force recommends the consolidation of transitional education services within correctional institutions under a single agency. The Task Force also recommends the expansion of community- based services for offenders leaving correctional facilities. To that

end, the Task Force recommends an in-depth study of these issues by JLARC and the development of recommendations regarding the consolidation of pre-release services and the expansion of community capacity for post-release services to be presented to the 1997 General Assembly.

Probation & Parole Services

15. Full funding for probation and parole offices should continue to be a goal. To alleviate the heaviest caseloads, the Task Force recommends that additional staff be funded to assist the 22 district probation and parole offices with caseloads in excess of 80 clients per officer. The Task Force also recommends additional surveillance officers and clerical support for the probation and parole program to assist in case management.

Probation & Parole Officers	22	$717,211
Surveillance Officers	41	$1,052,370
Office Services Specialists	5	$109,878
Total	68	$1,879,459

Correctional Transition Specialists

16. The Task Force recommends that a transition specialist position be funded for each of the four regional offices of the Department of Corrections. The Tidewater Region has one, three additional positions are needed.

3 Transition Specialists at $161,958

Vocational Assessment Services

17. The Task Force recommends that five new vocational assessment positions in the Department of Correctional Education be funded.

5 Vocational Assessors at $257,750.

Transition to Work

18. The Task Force recommends that the Virginia Employment Commission, Correctional Enterprises, and Department of Correctional Education execute a memorandum of understanding which sets forth strategies for employment of ex-offenders by July, 1996. The agreement should provide for inmates who are exiting the system to be registered in the VEC system at least one month prior to their release to expedite their job search. The subcommittee also recommends that the involved agencies evaluate the Texas "Project Rio" to determine if it could be adapted for Virginia. This project assigns one specialist to work specifically with ex-offenders on finding employment.

Mental and Medical Services

19. The Task Force recommends that the Department of Corrections examines chronic medical, substance abuse, and mental health needs of inmates and determine how these health needs will be met upon release.

20. The Task Force recommends that an interagency task force, including the Department of Corrections, the Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation & Substance Abuse Services, the Department of Health, and the Department of Medical Assistance Services, be formed to develop procedures for offender referrals upon release from incarceration. The task force should report back to the Crime Commission by November, 1996 and to the Governor and the 1997 General Assembly on its progress.

VII. RESOURCES

Report on Prison and Jail Overcrowding. 1990.

Sex Offender Treatment Study. Department of Corrections, 1990.

Report on the Inmate Highway Road Crew Status. Department of Corrections, 1990.

Study of the Feasibility of Establishing Special Purpose Institutions for Substance Abuse Treatment. Department of Corrections, 1990.

Response to the Study of Need for Increased Mental Health Services and Substance ABuse Treatment in Correctional Settings (Item 608-E, 1990-92 Appropriations Act). Secretary of Health and Human Resources and Secretary of Public Safety, 1990.

Substance Abuse and Sex Offender Treatment Services for Parole Eligible Inmates. JLARC, 1992.

Department of Corrections' Blueprint for Substance Abuse Services. 1992.

1991 CI-Net Correctional Industries Survey Report. Correctional Industries Information Clearinghouse (CI-Net), 1992.

Correctional Enterprises Competitiveness Study. 1994.

Current and Future Needs for Programs Providing Substance Abuse Treatment for Inmates. State Crime Commission, 1994.

Evaluation of Mental Health Care. JLARC, 1994.

Inmate Work Initiative Implementation Guide/ HB 1994. Correctional Services Group, Inc., 1994.

Report to House Appropriations Public Safety Subcommittee. Department of Correctional Education, 1994.

Specialized Correctional Facility for Substance Abuse Treatment. Progress Report. Department of Corrections, 1994.

Study of the Feasibility of Utilizing Federal Funds to Operate a Medium Security Dormitory Design as a Special Purpose Facility for Mentally Disordered Offenders. Department of Corrections, 1994.

Evaluation of the Department of Corrections' Substance Abuse Treatment Programs: Prison-Based Therapeutic Communities. Criminal Justice Research Center, 1995.

National Data on Prison Programs and Need (1988-1992).
Department of Corrections' Current Inmate Demographics (1995)

Budget Information, 1990-1995.

Site visits to several correctional institutions.

VIII. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Crime Commission would like to extend appreciation to the following members of the HJR 518 Special Task Force on Correctional Programs in Virginia's correctional institutions for their dedication hard work. The members provided valuable input and assistance in the development of the recommendations in this report.

The Honorable Marian Van Landingham, Chair
House of Delegates

The Honorable Janet D. Howell
Senate

Rev. George F. Ricketts, Sr.
Crime Commission

James H. Dunning, Sheriff

Michelle B. Mitchell, Sheriff

Mr. Richard C. Grizzard, Commonwealth Attorney

The Honorable William N. Alexander, II, Twenty-Second Judicial Circuit
Pittsylvania Circuit Court

Joseph G. Lynch, LCSW
Family Counseling Services, Inc.

Renee Robinson, Indian Creek Substance Abuse Program
Therapeutic Community Director, DOC

Robin Hulbert, Ph.D.
Mental Health Director, DOC

Ron Jordan, Committee on Appropriations
House of Delegates

Dan Catley, Program Manager, Adult Correctional Services
Department of Criminal Justice Services

John Taylor, Warden
Buckingham Correctional Center

Kathy Bassett, Regional Program Manager
Western Regional Office. DOC

Ms. Jo G. Holland, Regional Administrator
Community Corrections, Eastern Region, DOC

Diane McClure
Esmore, Inc.

Andrew Winston, Chairman
Board of Corrections

Peter G. Decker, Jr., Past Chairman
Board of Corrections

Scott Richeson
Department of Corrections

Marshall Graham, Regional Clinical Supervisor
Northern Regional Office, DOC

Dave Jones, Administrator of Correctional Enterprises

Mary Reinman
Northern Regional Office, DOC

Mr. Kim Hull, DCE Instructor
VCCW

Robert H. Garrison, Ph.D.
Department of Correctional Education

Robert Allen, Electricity Teacher
Department of Correctional Education, Buckingham C.C.

A special note of appreciation to Virginia CARES, Inc. for their assistance to the Task Force on issues of mutual concern.

IX. APPENDIX

A. House Joint Resolution 518.

B. Virginia Statutes on Inmate Programming §53.1-32.1

C. Department of Corrections' Status Report on the Implementation of §53.1-32.1.

Appendix A

House Joint Resolution 518
Delegate Marian Van Landingham

LD3722476

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 518

FLOOR AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE

(Proposed by Delegate Van Landingham
on February 4, 1995)

(Patron Prior to Substitute—Delegate Van Landingham)

Directing the Virginia State Crime Commission to establish a special task force to study correctional program standards for Virginia's adult correctional institutions.

WHEREAS, recent legislative changes in parole will result in a substantial increase in the prison population of Virginia; and

WHEREAS, because most of Virginia's prison inmates will eventually be released, they should be given opportunities to acquire educational and vocational skills necessary for successful reintegration into their communities following incarceration; and

WHEREAS, it is also important that treatment for substance abuse and sex offenses be made available to ameliorate the problems which contributed to those offenders' crimes; and

WHEREAS, treatment, educational, and vocational programs in Virginia's correctional facilities have been severely limited due to fiscal restraints and inmate overcrowding; and

WHEREAS, such limitations minimize opportunities for inmates to rehabilitate themselves and increase the probability of recidivism upon release; and

WHEREAS, programming and treatment are essential to improve an inmate's chances for successful release and return to a lawful, productive life in the community; and

WHEREAS, future plans for prison construction and operation must include these; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED by the House of Delegates, the Senate concurring, That the Virginia State Crime Commission be directed to establish a special task force to study educational, transitional and treatment program standards for Virginia's correctional institutions. The task force shall consider the type of facility and level of security, the existing resources for programming, and the schedule of programming based upon length of sentence. Technical assistance shall be provided to the task force by the Department of Corrections and the Department of Correctional Education. Membership of the task force shall include a prison warden, a circuit court judge, an attorney for the Commonwealth, a sheriff, a substance abuse counselor, a sex offender therapist, an academic instructor in one of the prisons, and other representatives whose expertise may assist in this study. The task force will recommend appropriate program standards and guidelines for future funding decisions for Virginia's correctional institutions for consideration by the 1996 General Assembly.

The task force of the State Crime Commission shall complete its work in time to submit its findings and recommendations to the Governor and the 1996 Session of the General Assembly as provided in the procedures of the Division of Legislative Automated Systems for the processing of legislative documents.

Official Use By Clerks

Passed By The House of Delegates		Passed By The Senate	
without amendment	☐	without amendment	☐
with amendment	☐	with amendment	☐
substitute	☐	substitute	☐
substitute w/amdt	☐	substitute w/amdt	☐
Date: _____		Date: _____	
Clerk of the House of Delegates		Clerk of the Senate	

LD3722476
HJ518H1
2/4/95 15:40

Appendix B

Virginia's Statute on §53.1-32.1

§ 53.1-32.1. Classification system; program assignments; mandatory participation. — A. The Director shall maintain a system of classification which (i) evaluates all prisoners according to background, aptitude, education, and risk and (ii) based on an assessment of needs, determines appropriate program assignments including vocational and technical training, work activities and employment, academic activities which at a minimum meet the requirements of § 22.1-344.1, counseling, alcohol and substance abuse treatment, and such related activities as may be necessary to assist prisoners in the successful transition to free society and gainful employment.

B. The Director shall, subject to the availability of resources and sufficient program assignments, place prisoners in appropriate full-time program assignments or a combination thereof to satisfy the objectives of a treatment plan based on an assessment and evaluation of each prisoner's needs. Compliance with specified program requirements and attainment of specific treatment goals shall be required as a condition of placement and continuation in such program assignments. The Director may suspend programs in the event of an institutional emergency.

C. For the purposes of implementing the requirements of subsection B, prisoners shall be required to participate in such programs according to the following schedule:

1. From July 1, 1994, through June 30, 1995, an average of twenty-four hours per week.

2. From July 1, 1995, through June 30, 1996, an average of twenty-eight hours per week.

3. From July 1, 1996, through June 30, 1997, an average of thirty hours per week.

4. From July 1, 1997, through June 30, 1998, an average of thirty-six hours per week.

5. From July 1, 1998, and thereafter, an average of forty hours per week.

D. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, prisoners refusing to accept a program assignment shall not be eligible for good conduct allowances or earned sentence credits authorized pursuant to Chapter 6 (§ 53.1-186 et seq.) of Title 53.1. Such refusal shall also constitute a violation of the rules authorized pursuant to § 53.1-25 and the Director shall prescribe appropriate disciplinary action.

E. The Director shall maintain a master program listing, by facility and program location, of all available permanent and temporary positions. The Director may, consistent with § 53.1-43 and subject to the approval of the Board, establish a system of pay incentives for such assignments based upon difficulty and level of effort required.

F. Inmates employed pursuant to Article 2 (§ 53.1-32 et seq.) of Chapter 2 of this title shall not be deemed employees of the Commonwealth of Virginia or its agencies and shall be ineligible for benefits under Chapter 10 (§ 2.1-110 et seq.) of Title 2.1, Chapter 6 (§ 60.2-600 et seq.) of Title 60.2, Chapter 5 (§ 65.2-500 et seq.) of Title 65.2 or any other provisions of the Code pertaining to the rights of state employees. (1993, c. 768; 1994, 2nd Sp. Sess., cc. 1, 2.)

Editor's note. — Acts 1993, c. 768, which enacted this section, in cl. 3 provides that the provisions of the 1993 act shall become effective if sufficient funds are appropriated to implement the provisions of this act. Acts 1993, c. 994, item 457 provides funds to begin implementation.

The 1994, 2nd Sp. Sess., amendments. — The 1994, 2nd Sp. Sess., amendments by cc. 1 and 2, effective October 13, 1994, are identical, and inserted "or earned sentence credits" in subsection D.

Appendix C

Department of Corrections' Status Report on the Implementation of §53.1-32.1

COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

Department of Corrections

RON ANGELONE
DIRECTOR

P. O. BOX 26963
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23261
(804) 674-3000

October 23, 1995

Judy Philpott
Virginia State Crime Commission
General Assembly Building
910 Capitol Street, Suite 915
Richmond, Virginia 23219

RE: Programming Hours Required by Code of Virginia 53.1-32.1

Dear Ms. Philpott:

You requested information about the number of programming hours which could realistically be provided to inmates, assuming unlimited resources were available. As we have previously discussed, the nature of prisons makes it impracticable for the Department to occupy inmates with programming 8 hours per day, or up to 40 hours per week as required by the Code. This letter will explain limits on program hours within a secure setting and will recommend a weekly number of hours which can be realistically achieved.

The Department is interested in providing inmates with as much constructive program activities as possible, to occupy otherwise idle time and to provide self-improvement opportunities for those wishing to change criminal lifestyles. As you have observed during recent visits to our prisons, the Department currently offers a range of innovative programs.

The number of hours in which programming can be provided is limited by activities necessary to ensure the safety of inmates and staff, and the security of the facility. In prisons, a large portion of the daily schedule is required for supervised inmate movement, searches, security counts, meals, and the provision of ancillary services such sick call, clothing exchange, commissary, and the law library.

Institutional lockdowns for security checks, inmate transfer and reception periods, and inclement weather which prevents outside

work and recreation further limit the average number of weekly programming hours that can be achieved.

In spite of staff resources, the physical limitations within a facility also impacts program schedules. Some facilities must limit movement during evening hours due to insufficient lighting; distance between buildings may require closer supervision, increasing time for inmate movement; and smaller mess halls can increase the feeding time.

In addition, the lack of available space in our prisons also prohibits working a full 40 hours per week. You have been in many of our facilities and you know that every usable square foot in a prison is being put to good use. To expand training space or provide additional prison industry opportunities would mean a significant capital expenditure. At a time when we are being required to build new prisons to keep pace with the influx of new prisoners, it is unlikely that the funds necessary to expand existing prisons would be forthcoming.

To further demonstrate the complexities of prison operations and the hours available for programming, attached are sample schedules from several facilities including a maximum/close custody facility, a medium security dormitory facility, and a minimum custody field unit.

You will see from reviewing the attached schedules that a typical maximum/close custody facility has 6.50 hours each weekday potentially available for programming. A medium custody facility has 7.50 hours available, and a minimum custody facility has 7.75 hours available. It is important to stress that these hours are the maximum number available when all activities proceed as scheduled. On a day to day basis schedules may be further limited by unplanned events, such as counts which take longer to clear, and/or searches.

Another factor which must be considered in addition to hours actually available for programming is the inmate population's ability to participate in activities. Currently, over 16% of inmates are unemployable because they are in Segregation, are medically and/or mentally unable, or are being processed through Reception Centers. While a small number of these inmates can participate in some form of programming, across the system they significantly reduce our statewide average of inmate programming.

Considering prison security requirements, operational schedules, and the nature of the inmate population, even if resources were unlimited we do not believe we can on the average exceed 30 hours of programming per week. Therefore, Code of Virginia Section 53.1-32.1 should be allowed to reflect a more realistic goal of an average of 28 hours per week by 1998. The program activities for

an average inmate will be as follows:

14.0 hours	(50%)	work
7.0 hours	(25%)	academic/vocational activities
7.0 hours	(25%)	treatment programming including substance abuse programs, life skills programs, counseling services and leisure time skills activities
28.0 hours		

The actual combination of program activities will vary among inmates based on their treatment needs and their progress in the system. Programming will also vary among facilities based on available resources. To use resources most effectively, more educational and treatment programming will occur at medium and minimum custody facilities, and with less occurring at maximum and close custody facilities where inmates serve longer sentences.

Let me reiterate my commitment to work as many inmates as possible given the constraints which I have outlined above. While I fully understand and support the Crime Commission's interest in seeing inmates involved in productive activities, I would hope that you can also understand the complexities of prison operation which limit the number of hours that inmates can work without jeopardizing the safety and security of our institutions.

I hope this information is helpful and that it answers your questions about this issue.

Sincerely,

Ron Angelone

RA:HSR

Attachment

cc: Gene Johnson
James A. Smith
Mike Leininger
Scott Richeson

10/23/95

MAXIMUM/CLOSE CUSTODY FACILITY

A typical Maximum/Close custody facility schedule allows a maximum of 6.5 hours of programming time.

Buckingham Correctional Center

5:30 a.m.	Wake Up
6:00 a.m.	Breakfast feeding begins
7:20 a.m.	Breakfast feeding completed
7:30 a.m.	Count
8:15 a.m.	Count clears, inmates are available for work, school, and treatment programs
11:00 a.m.	Inmates return to housing unit for count
11:30 a.m.	Count
12:00 p.m.	Count clears/Lunch feeding begins with inmates in early school fed first
12:20 p.m.	Inmates in early school released from lunch to class;other inmates continue feeding process
1:15 p.m.	Lunch feeding completed; inmates available for work, school, and treatment programs
3:15 p.m.	Inmates return to housing area
3:30 p.m.	Count
4:00 p.m.	Dinner feeding begins
5:15 p.m.	First half of inmates released to outside recreation (schedule alternates with other half recreating the following day)
6:00 p.m.	Dinner completed
6:00 p.m.	Program call for inmate/volunteer activities such as Jaycees, AA/NA, religious programs
7:30 p.m.	Inmates return to housing units
8:30 p.m.	Count
9:15 p.m.	Personal time in housing unit day rooms
11:30 p.m.	Evening lockdown

MEDIUM CUSTODY FACILITY

The typical Medium Custody facility has a maximum of 7.50 hours available for programming.

Haynesville Correctional Center

6:00 a.m.	Count
6:15 a.m.	Count Clears; Breakfast feeding begins
7:45 a.m.	Breakfast feeding completed
8:00 a.m.	Count
8:15 a.m.	Count clears, inmates are available for work, school, and treatment programs
11:00 a.m.	Inmates return to housing unit for count
11:30 a.m.	Count (Enterprises counted out)
12:00 p.m.	Count clears/Lunch feeding begins with inmates in early school fed first
12:30 p.m.	Inmates in early school released from lunch to class;other inmates continue feeding process
1:15 p.m.	Lunch feeding completed; inmates available for work, school, and treatment programs
2:00 p.m.	Count of inmates in assigned program areas
3:30 p.m.	Return to housing areas for Dinner
4:00 p.m.	Dinner feeding begins
5:30 p.m.	Dinner completed; inmates return to housing buildings for Count
6:00 p.m.	Count
6:15 p.m.	Count clears; inmates are available for volunteer program activities such as Jaycees, AA/NA, religious programs, outside recreation (daylight savings time)
8:30 p.m.	Inmates return to housing units
9:00 p.m.	Movement/yard closed except for special pre-approved activities or programs
9:15 p.m.	Personal time in housing unit day rooms
11:30 p.m.	Evening lockdown

10/23/95

MINIMUM CUSTODY FACILITY

A typical minimum custody Field Unit has a maximum of 7.75 hours of programming available.

Chatham Correctional Unit #15

6:00 a.m.	Wake up
6:30 a.m.	Breakfast feeding begins
7:00 a.m.	Breakfast feeding completed
7:45 a.m.	Work Call
8:00 a.m.	Road gangs loaded, including vehicle searches, inmate searches, safety equipment issued, lunches loaded
8:30 a.m.	Road gangs leave Unit for work site
8:30 a.m.	Count for non-road gang inmates
8:45 a.m.	Count clears; non-road gang inmates available for work, school, programs
12:00 p.m.	Lunch feeding begins (road gangs eat bag lunches at work site)
12:30 p.m.	Count
1:00 p.m.	Count clears; inmates available for work, school, and treatment programs
4:00 p.m.	Road Gangs return to Unit; inmates searched, vehicle searched, inmate showers.
4:30 p.m.	Dinner feeding begins; commissary, clothing exchange
5:45 p.m.	Count
6:00 p.m.	Count clears; inmates available for programs, free time activities, laundry
7:45 p.m.	Lock down count
8:00 p.m.	Movement/yard closed; inmate personal time in housing unit day rooms
11:30 p.m.	Evening lockdown