

# **NIC Correctional Needs Assessment: Findings of a National Survey of Correctional Leaders**

U.S. Department of Justice  
National Institute of Corrections

Report Prepared by Connie Clem and John Eggers  
Project Team Members:  
Jim Barbee, Carol Bruce, Larry Linke, Tom Reid, and Tracey Vessels

- DRAFT -

**June 21, 2005**

# Contents

Executive Summary . . . . .	1
Full Report . . . . .	5
Project Method . . . . .	5
Approach to Data Analysis . . . . .	9
Key Findings: Overview . . . . .	11
Details on Issues & Categories . . . . .	19
A) Organizational Development and Administration . . . . .	21
B) Budget and Fiscal Management . . . . .	25
C) Relations with the External Environment . . . . .	29
D) Workforce Issues . . . . .	33
E) Leadership and Management Development . . . . .	37
F) Staff Training and Development . . . . .	41
G) Physical Plant . . . . .	45
H) Safety of Staff, Offenders, and the Community . . . . .	49
I) Offender Program Interventions . . . . .	53
J) Other Key Factors (Write-in issues) . . . . .	57
K) Likelihood of Accessing NIC Assistance . . . . .	59
Appendix A. Respondent Survey Package	
Appendix B. Summary of Survey Distribution & Responses	
Appendix C. Data Tables	

---

## **Executive Summary**

### **NIC Balanced Scorecard (C1.1) Needs Assessment Focused at the Executive and Senior Level Leadership Across Jails, Prisons, and Community Corrections**

---

The National Institute of Corrections (NIC), as part of its Balanced Scorecard initiative (C1.1), launched phase one of the needs assessment study in April 2005. The survey was distributed to top correctional administrators nationwide, in all types of agencies, focusing on their greatest concerns in state and local correctional agencies at the Executive/Senior Leader levels.

The survey was delivered to NIC administrator networks, covering all adult state prisons, state probation, state parole, and large jail systems. A semi-random approach was used to reach other, mostly small and medium jails and county probation. Over 900 survey invitations were sent to agency directors. Online and PDF versions of the survey were put on the NIC web server. Accordingly, respondents could take the instrument online or fax/mail their responses to NIC. Paper responses were entered into the online system for analysis. A total of 357 responses were received. No juvenile justice responses were processed in this analysis.

Community corrections agencies provided 106 responses; however, the actual number of community respondents may have been slightly larger as all agencies that checked both the “prisons” and “community corrections” functions were grouped into the prison sample. Jails delivered 198 responses, and prisons provided 50 responses that included data from 32 states, with 19 of these responses being from agencies providing both prisons and community corrections services. An in-depth breakdown analysis of the agency responses is contained in the report.

It was hoped that the random survey sample would include not only agencies that are already aware of NIC and its services, but also agencies that are potential users of NIC services. Regarding use of NIC services over the past five years, 74% of respondents indicated that their agencies had had some use of NIC services, 18% indicated no use, and 8% indicated that they didn’t know.

The survey instrument focused on data collection in nine categories containing a total of 68 issues or questions: Organizational development and administration, budget and fiscal management, relations with the external environment, workforce issues, leadership and management development, staff training and development, physical plant, safety of staff, offenders and the community, and offender program interventions. A separate category asked for information on the likelihood an agency would access specific forms of NIC assistance.

A five point Likert-scale survey approach was used. Respondents were asked to rate each issue in terms of the need for his/her agency to approach that issue in a different way than it is currently being addressed. Scale increments were:

- 0 = No need to address this issue
- 1 = Little need to address this issue
- 2 = Some need to address this issue
- 3 = Strong need to address this issue
- 4 = Critical need to address this issue

Data from respondents in community corrections, jails, and prisons agencies were aggregated for analysis.

Average scores for each item indicate its objective importance to respondents. Based on the distribution of average Likert scale scores for the full sample, we grouped the issues into four levels of importance:

- Top concerns — 2.25 and higher
- Significant concerns — 2.00 - 2.25
- Moderate concerns — 1.75 - 1.99
- Lesser concerns — 1.74 and under

In addition to our primary focus on average scores, we also factored in a percentage analysis of the data for the community corrections, jails, and prisons samples. To be considered significant as a “top concern,” an issue needed to earn a 2.25 Likert scale score or be rated by 50% or more of the respondents in community corrections, jails, and/or prisons as presenting a “strong” or “critical” need for attention or change by the agency.

Issues meeting the scoring and percentage cutoff criteria for the “top concerns” category, and their average scores, are:

■ Ability to evaluate program impact	(2.56)
■ Adequacy of offender mental health care	(2.48)
■ Planning for staff needs	(2.47)
■ Training and developing managers and supervisors	(2.46)
■ Employee motivation	(2.44)
■ Sufficient program capacity for offender population	(2.42)
■ Training and developing executives and leaders	(2.38)
■ Responding to needs of specific offender populations	(2.37)
■ Influencing system policies that affect costs	(2.34)
■ Succession planning	(2.34)
■ Numeric sufficiency of staff to manage offenders	(2.33)
■ Research and evaluation	(2.32)
■ New employee recruitment, screening, and selection	(2.31)
■ Employee salary and benefits	(2.28)
■ Evaluation of training impact	(2.27)
■ Ability to identify and implement programs	(2.25)

Issues at the top tier of concern are not the only items relevant for NIC programs and assistance, but they could be considered priority areas for NIC planning.

- Average scores from 2.25 and higher (the top tier) indicate a **strong need** for agencies to address the issue. These issues are most likely to have strong and relatively balanced interest from community corrections, jails, and prisons.
- Average scores from 1.75 to 2.25 (the significant and moderate tiers) indicate **some need** for agencies to address the issue. Often, these items showed stronger interest from one or two of the functional groups. Details are presented in the full survey report
- Scores below 1.75 (the lesser tier) indicate the issues with **least need** for agencies to address them.

In a separate survey category, respondents were asked, “How likely is it that, within the next 2 years, your agency will access the following forms of no-cost NIC assistance?” A comparable 5-level Likert scale scoring format was used for this section.

NIC services in their order of likely use, as calculated for the full survey sample, are:

- Resources & links on NIC web site
- NIC classroom training, regionally delivered (closer to your agency)
- NIC Information Center document delivery
- NIC training sessions at professional conferences
- NIC Information Center research assistance
- Classroom training, delivered on-site at your agency
- Classroom training at NIC Training Center
- NIC e-mail discussion groups (listervs) and online forums
- On-site technical assistance
- NIC informational or training broadcasts (viewed after the broadcast on DVD)
- NIC online e-learning (web-based training)
- NIC e-learning programs on CD-ROM
- NIC-sponsored peer administrator network meetings
- NIC informational or training broadcasts (viewed live by satellite downlink)
- NIC informational or training broadcasts (viewed live by Internet streaming)
- NIC informational or training broadcasts (viewed after the broadcast via Internet streaming)

The data from this effort will assist other Balanced Scorecard Project Teams and the NIC Executive staff in a coordinated, collaborative fashion to help guide strategic planning for future training and development programs, technical assistance efforts, and Information Center processes.

[This page intentionally left blank.]

---

## NIC Correctional Needs Assessment: Full Report

---

*This project was formulated to tap into the knowledge and expertise of top correctional administrators nationwide, in all types of agencies, to learn which issues are of greatest concern to state and local correctional agencies. By ensuring that its services are aligned with the concerns of its constituency, NIC can remain a strong and effective source of assistance.*

### Project Method

---

#### Research Design

The NIC project team of Academy Division, Jails Division, and Information Center staff began meeting in 2004 to develop the research plan for this project. A Likert-scale survey methodology was chosen to facilitate structured and analyzable data on agency concerns.

The team developed a survey instrument with 68 issues to be independently rated by respondents. We identified these issues through roundtable discussions and fine-tuned their wording to eliminate or reduce leading or value-laden terminology.

Respondents were given the following instructions:

This survey is organized under nine major functional areas in corrections. Under each area, we list factors that are typically important in agency operations and management.

Your agency's way of handling a factor may be satisfactory now, or the agency may need to address the factor by implementing new strategies and techniques for a more effective approach.

Using a scale from 0 to 4, the survey asks how critical it is that your agency address each factor in order to improve the agency's performance in this area.

**For each item, circle the appropriate number** to show whether/how strongly your agency needs to address it:

- 0 – No need** to address this factor
- 1 – Little need** to address this factor
- 2 – Some need** to address this factor
- 3 – Strong need** to address this factor
- 4 – Critical need** to address this factor

The 68 topics were presented in the following categories, reflecting broad concerns of correctional managers and leaders:

- A) ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND ADMINISTRATION
- B) BUDGET AND FISCAL MANAGEMENT
- C) RELATIONS WITH THE EXTERNAL ENVIRONMENT
- D) WORKFORCE ISSUES
- E) LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT
- F) STAFF TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT
- G) PHYSICAL PLANT
- H) SAFETY OF STAFF, OFFENDERS, AND THE COMMUNITY
- I) OFFENDER PROGRAM INTERVENTIONS

The written survey instrument and instructions were piloted in January 2005 with approximately 35 participants in an NIC executive training program. The final written survey, including instructions for respondents, is attached as Appendix A.

## **Data Collection**

The team determined representative target samples for reaching community corrections, jails, and prisons in the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. protectorates. (See Appendix B for details on outreach to agency groupings.) Agency administrators were contacted by e-mail or, as necessary, direct mail.

- All members of relevant NIC administrator networks in adult corrections were invited to participate. This covered all state prisons, state probation, state parole, and large jails systems.
- To reach other correctional audiences (primarily small and medium jails and county probation), staff selected agencies in a semi-random manner for invitation to participate, controlling for representation by state, by county population, and by geographic distribution within the state.
- Indian Country agencies received mailed survey packets.

Overall, NIC sent survey invitations to more than 900 corrections agency directors. Follow-up messages followed from project staff and NIC Division Chiefs. The National Association of Probation Executives assisted by sending a its membership an e-mail reminder to participate in the survey. An additional follow-up invitation was sent through NIC's State Jail Inspectors listserv, reaching 35 states.

Online (direct entry) and PDF versions of the survey were placed on the NIC web server. Those taking the survey could respond online or by faxing or mailing their answers to NIC. Paper responses were entered into the online system for analysis.



## About the Data Sample

A total of 357 responses were received, providing a diversified sample for the project. Three (3) responses were from agencies providing only juvenile justice services and were not included in the data analysis.

**Correctional Functions Represented.** Survey data were grouped for analysis by agency function. Because many agencies perform more than one function, the division of responses into functional categories is approximate. Table 1 presents an overview of the survey sample by level of government and correctional function performed.

**Table 1. Overview: Needs Assessment Survey Sample**

	TOTAL	County, Local, Territorial, or District Agencies	State Agencies	Other
Community corrections	106	77	25	4
Jails	198	194	–	4
Prisons	50	11	38	1
Totals:	354	282	63	9

Comments and qualifiers about the data samples include the following.

- The state community corrections response may have been slightly larger than this breakdown suggests. All agencies that checked both the “prisons” and “community corrections” functions were grouped into the prison sample.
- The jail sample is the cleanest. However, a small number (11) of local government agencies that identified themselves as providing “prison” services could not be separated from the prison sample for this report.
- The prison sample of 50 responses includes data from 32 states. This sample is both the smallest and the least certain in terms of agency nature and function.
  - ▶ Nineteen (19) of these responses are from agencies providing both prisons and community corrections services. Though separate survey responses were requested for institutional operations and community-based services, the project’s ability to segment responses depended on how these functions were reported. Three states represented in the prison sample provided 2 or more prison responses and no community corrections response, possibly meaning that their replies for community corrections have been included in the prison sample.
  - ▶ Eleven (11) prison responses were provided by local government agencies. For example, Pennsylvania submitted five (5) prison responses.
  - ▶ This segment also includes at least seven (7) state unified systems — single agencies that provide jails, prisons, and community corrections services in such locations as Rhode Island and Alaska.

**Agency Sizes Represented.** The data sample represents a range of agency sizes:

- There were 80 agencies in the “very small” size range (under 150 offenders supervised), predominately representing jails.
- There were 86 agencies in the “small” range (150 to 999 offenders supervised), mainly jails.
- There were 114 agencies in the mid-range (1,000 to 7,499 offenders supervised). These were roughly split between community corrections and jails.
- The “large” range (7,500 to 14,999 offenders supervised) had 22 responses, split between community corrections, jails, and prisons.
- The “very large” range (15,000 and more offenders) had 55 responses, with more prisons than community corrections.

**Respondent’s Position in Agency.** This project was intended to focus on top agency leaders, and fully 81% of respondents identified themselves as being in Executive/CEO or Senior Level Leader positions. Another 16% identified themselves as managers.

**Agencies’ Use of NIC Services.** Respondents were asked if their agencies had used any form of NIC assistance in the past 5 years.

- Some use of NIC services — 74%
- No use of NIC services — 18%. This figure was highest in the community corrections sample, at about one-third of responding agencies. About one-fifth (16%) of respondents in jails said their agencies have received no recent NIC assistance.
- Not known by respondent — 8%

## Approach to Data Analysis

---

Project staff examined respondents' Likert response data to identify the top concerns of responding agencies. We also examined how these concerns were consistent or differed across the major functional areas within the corrections field: community corrections, jails, and prisons.

Two main access points were used to quantify and compare the relative importance of the issues covered in the survey:

- **Average scores** for each item indicate its objective importance to respondents. This was the primary measure used in the analysis. The average score is a weighted average that factors in all the ratings for each item, across the 5 Likert scale values. The higher the score value, the more important the issue.

*In this review, top concerns are considered to be those with an average score of 2.25 or higher.*

Average scores from 2.25 to 3.0 indicate a strong need to address the issue under question. Average scores from 1.75 to 2.25 indicate some need to address the issue. Scores below 1.75 show the areas reported as being of least concern to respondents.

- The secondary measure of importance used in this project was the combined **percentage** of agencies rating an issue as either a "strong" or "critical" need.

*In this review, an issue is considered to be a significant concern if it was rated a "strong" or "critical" need by 50% or more of respondents in community corrections, jails, and/or prisons.*

- We also noted instances where the number of "critical" responses was higher than was evident when looking just at the combined "strong"/"critical" percentage. These numbers can be seen in the Appendix C spreadsheets and are occasionally noted in the issue details sections that follow.

The average score and combined percentage both identify the same issues as priority items, but the ranking of issues sometimes differs slightly. We chose to use the average score as the key measure because it incorporates all the Likert data provided by respondents, rather than the data from only 2 of the 5 possible need levels.

Spreadsheets in Appendix C present survey data for the areas of community corrections, jails, and prisons. They show the full Likert raw counts, percentages, and average scores for each item.

To arrive at conclusions about the overall corrections field, staff also calculated average scores for the full survey sample. We did this by averaging the average scores obtained for the community corrections, jails, and prisons samples. This ensured an equal weight for responses from the smaller prison sample, the mid-sized community corrections sample, and the larger jail sample.

Based on the distribution of average scores for the full sample, we grouped the issues into four levels of importance:

- Top concerns — 2.25 and higher *OR* 50% “strong” or “critical” need to be addressed reported by at least one sample group.
- Significant concerns — 2.00 - 2.25
- Moderate concerns — 1.75 - 1.99
- Lesser concerns — 1.74 and under

Interpretation and application of the data presented in this report will be a matter for the NIC community to address. Issues at the top tier of concern are not the only items relevant for NIC programs and assistance, but they could be considered priority areas for NIC planning.

- Average scores from 2.25 and higher (the top tier) indicate a **strong to very strong need** for agencies to address the issue. These issues are most likely to have relatively balanced interest from community corrections, jails, and prisons. Details are presented in the second segment of the report.
- Average scores from 1.75 to 2.25 (the significant and moderate tiers) indicate **some need** for agencies to address the issue. Often, these items showed stronger interest from one or two of the functional groups. Details are presented in the full survey report
- Scores below 1.75 (the lesser tier) indicate the issues with **least need** for agencies to address them.

## Key Findings: Overview

---

As NIC readers review and interpret the project findings that follow, they should keep in mind several points about the project's purpose, its method, and the resulting data and analysis:

- This project represents NIC's first attempt at conducting a field-wide needs assessment. In that sense, this project and report are a test of one possible approach that may be continued, modified, replaced, or discontinued in the future.
- The data sample obtained for this survey represents a broad and diversified segment of the nation's corrections agencies, but it does not constitute a statistically stratified representative sample. A statistically reliable sample is particularly difficult to obtain for the prison sample, based on this project's focus on top administrators, given that there is a maximum of 51 state-level correctional systems.
- Survey findings represent the views of agency leaders, which may differ from other viewpoints in their agencies.
- The survey measured agency leaders' perceptions of areas in which their agencies need to change. (Refer to survey instructions, page 2.) The survey findings are not necessarily a measure of agencies' need for NIC assistance. It will be up to the NIC community to interpret and apply the survey findings in planning future services.
- Respondents were asked to select one answer from a fixed set of five Likert scale responses. The meaning of the scale levels was subject to individual interpretation. It is hypothesized that the somewhat lower-than-expected scores recorded may be an artifact of the survey wording.
- The 68 issues respondents rated were also subject to individual interpretation.
- The average scores calculated for the full survey sample, based on scores from the community, jail, and prison samples, are only approximate representations of field concerns. The full-sample average scores are generally good indicators of higher and lower level concerns, but they should not be relied upon for accurately ranking the concerns of the field.
- Average scores are only one axis for making sense of the survey snapshot. Issue details, presented in the second portion of this report, provide a clearer picture and should be consulted by readers seeking more complete information.
  - For example, some issues have average scores only in the mid-range but still have a significant percentage rating as a strong to critical need.
  - Other issues, such as offender medical care, have low full-sample averages because of the different scope of services provided by community corrections but are a significant area of concern in jails and prisons.
- For full Likert response data from community corrections, jails, and prisons, refer to the data tables in Appendix C.
- Survey findings represent a snapshot of the issues of concern to corrections agencies in the spring of 2005. As always, agency concerns are subject to change.

## Observations on the Samples' Scores

The three survey sample groups showed some overall differences in the way they rated the issues.

- The community corrections sample produced average scores that were, on balance, usually between those of jails and prisons. The top 10 issues as rated by community respondents ranged from 2.88 to 2.32, dropping relatively sharply, by 0.56 points.
- The prisons sample tended to rate issues more highly on the Likert scale than the other two groups, indicating more urgency in addressing them. Their top 10 issues had average scores from 2.79 to 2.55, a more gradual drop of just 0.24 points.
- Jail data indicates a lower degree of urgency than either of the other samples. In the jail top 10, the top score of 2.46 is already below the prison sample scale. The lowest score in the jail top 10 is 2.10, a straight curve drop of 0.36 points.

## Top Field Concerns by Category

Issues were presented in the following categories:

- A) ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND ADMINISTRATION
- B) BUDGET AND FISCAL MANAGEMENT
- C) RELATIONS WITH THE EXTERNAL ENVIRONMENT
- D) WORKFORCE ISSUES
- E) LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT
- F) STAFF TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT
- G) PHYSICAL PLANT
- H) SAFETY OF STAFF, OFFENDERS, AND THE COMMUNITY
- I) OFFENDER PROGRAM INTERVENTIONS

Average scores for the full sample show that three topic categories pose the greatest concern to corrections at this time:

- WORKFORCE ISSUES (D);
- LEADERSHIP & MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT (E); and
- OFFENDER PROGRAM INTERVENTIONS (I)

To review how we calculated the average scores for the full survey sample, see page 8.

## Field Concerns by Issue

Issues covered in the survey rank in the following distribution per their full-sample averages.

### **Tier 1 — Top Concerns (Average scores 2.25 and higher, or 50% "strong" or "critical" rating in at least one sample group)**

■	Ability to evaluate program impact	(2.56)
■	Adequacy of offender mental health care	(2.48)
■	Planning for staff needs	(2.47)
■	Training and developing managers and supervisors	(2.46)
■	Employee motivation	(2.44)
■	Sufficient program capacity for offender population	(2.42)
■	Training and developing executives and leaders	(2.38)
■	Responding to needs of specific offender populations	(2.37)
■	Influencing system policies that affect costs	(2.34)
■	Succession planning	(2.34)
■	Numeric sufficiency of staff to manage offenders	(2.33)
■	Research and evaluation	(2.32)
■	New employee recruitment, screening, and selection	(2.31)
■	Employee salary and benefits	(2.28)
■	Evaluation of training impact	(2.27)
■	Ability to identify and implement effective programs	(2.25)
■	Information systems/data management	(2.21)
■	Identifying staff for management/supervisory positions	(2.20)
■	Facility capacity to handle offender population	(2.19)
■	Identifying staff for leadership/executive positions	(2.17)
■	Staff retention/turnover	(2.08)
■	Managing high-cost functional areas	(2.06)
■	Age and condition of facilities	(2.00)

### **Tier 2 — Significant Concerns (Average scores 2.00 to 2.24)**

■	Adequacy of technology to manage offenders	(2.19)
■	Offender needs assessment	(2.16)
■	Partnerships with other treatment providers	(2.16)
■	Integration of training with supervision	(2.14)
■	Community acceptance of high-risk populations	(2.14)
■	Capability to manage offenders at all risk levels	(2.12)
■	Skill sufficiency of staff to manage offenders	(2.11)
■	Communications within the agency	(2.11)
■	Acceptance/support at community level	(2.08)
■	Readiness to use or adopt new training technologies	(2.04)
■	Training needs assessment	(2.03)
■	Ability to identify innovations & solutions from outside	(2.03)
■	Involvement in justice system planning, policy, and coord.	(2.03)
■	In-service training	(2.02)
■	Internal policy, quality control, auditing, and accountability	(2.01)
■	Adequacy of in-house training capacity	(2.00)
■	Coordination across functional units	(2.00)
■	Adequacy of facilities for safe management of offenders	(2.00)

### **Tier 3 — Moderate Concerns (Average scores 1.75 to 1.99)**

■	Facility planning and development process	(1.98)
■	Offender risk assessment & classification	(1.98)
■	Relations with justice system stakeholders	(1.96)
■	Adequacy of facilities to support mission	(1.95)
■	Collaboration with agencies/service providers	(1.94)
■	Management diversity	(1.91)
■	Technology applications	(1.89)
■	Agency culture and values	(1.86)
■	Employee supports (flex time, nurseries/child care, EAP)	(1.86)
■	Workforce diversity	(1.85)
■	Communicating budgetary needs	(1.84)
■	Strategic planning	(1.82)
■	Relations with governing and funding bodies	(1.81)
■	Creative re-tooling of agency operations	(1.76)
■	Adequacy of offender medical care	(1.75)

### **Tier 4 — Lesser Concerns (Average scores 1.74 or lower)**

■	Pre-service training	(1.67)
■	Relations with the media	(1.61)
■	Litigation by offenders, families, and advocates	(1.44)
■	Contracting/contract management	(1.40)
■	Agency mission, vision, and goals	(1.39)
■	Formulating a workable budget	(1.20)
■	Unions/organized labor	(1.14)
■	Litigation by crime victims	(1.02)
■	Litigation by staff	(1.01)
■	Privatization of correctional services	(0.80)



Table 2 presents details on the field's top-tier concerns, with component scores from community corrections, jails, and prisons.

**Table 2. Top Concerns of Responding Agencies**

Topics [with survey category]	Average Scores			
	Full sample	Community corrections	Jails	Prisons
Ability to evaluate program impact [I]	<b>2.56</b>	2.88	2.33	2.58
Adequacy of offender mental health care [H]	<b>2.48</b>	2.37	2.31	2.76
Planning for staffing needs [D]	<b>2.47</b>	2.32	2.40	2.70
Training and developing managers and supervisors [E]	<b>2.46</b>	2.37	2.30	2.70
Employee motivation [D]	<b>2.44</b>	2.25	2.46	2.60
Sufficient program capacity for offender population [I]	<b>2.42</b>	2.57	1.99	2.70
Training and developing executives and leaders [E]	<b>2.38</b>	2.32	2.22	2.60
Responding to needs of specific offender populations [I]	<b>2.37</b>	2.40	2.11	2.59
Influencing system policies that affect costs [B]	<b>2.34</b>	2.30	2.19	2.53
Succession planning [E]	<b>2.34</b>	2.24	2.02	2.77
Numeric sufficiency of staff to manage offenders [H]	<b>2.33</b>	2.43	2.16	2.40
Research and evaluation [A]	<b>2.32</b>	2.64	1.99	2.32
New employee recruitment, screening, and selection [D]	<b>2.31</b>	1.96	2.38	2.60
Employee salary and benefits [D]	<b>2.28</b>	2.29	2.06	2.49
Evaluation of training impact [F]	<b>2.27</b>	2.20	2.18	2.43
Ability to identify and implement programs [I]	<b>2.25</b>	2.88	2.23	2.58
Information systems/data management [A]	<b>2.21</b>	2.06	2.01	2.55
Identifying staff for management/supervisory positions [E]	<b>2.20</b>	1.93	2.02	2.64
Facility capacity to handle offender population [G]	<b>2.19</b>	1.66	2.38	2.52
Identifying staff for leadership/executive positions [E]	<b>2.17</b>	1.91	1.98	2.62
Staff retention/turnover [D]	<b>2.08</b>	1.61	1.98	2.64
Managing high-cost functional areas [B]	<b>2.06</b>	1.23	2.16	2.79
Age and condition of facilities [G]	<b>2.00</b>	1.53	1.98	2.48

## Concerns of Community Corrections

In addition to the issues listed in Table 2, several other areas were rated high by community corrections respondents — 40% or more of respondents listed the following items as a “strong” or “critical” need:

- Capability to manage offenders across all risk levels [category H] – 2.36, 49%
- Offender needs assessment [I] – 2.33, 44%
- Offender risk assessment & classification [H] – 2.32, 47%
- Community acceptance of high-risk populations [C] – 2.27, 45%
- Involvement in planning, policy, & coordination [C] – 2.24, 45%
- Strategic planning [A] – 2.17, 43%
- Information systems/data management [A] – 2.06, 40%
- Internal policy & accountability [A] – 2.05, 41%

Overall, the top 10 issues identified by community corrections executives as needing attention or a change in approach were:

- 1) Ability to evaluate program impact [category I]
- 2) Research and evaluation [A]
- 3) Sufficient program capacity (slots) for offender population [I]
- 4) Ability to identify and implement programs [I]
- 5) Numeric sufficiency of staff to manage offenders [H]
- 6) Responding to needs of specific populations [I]
- 7 (tie) Adequacy of offender mental health care [H]
- 7 (tie) Training and developing managers/supervisors [E]
- 8) Capability to manage offenders at all assessed risk levels [H]
- 9) Offender needs assessment [I]
- 10 (tie) Offender risk assessment and classification [H]
- 10 (tie) Training and developing executives/leaders [E]
- 10 (tie) Planning for staffing needs [D]

## Concerns of Jails

For the jail sample, 35% or more of respondents listed these issues as a “strong” or “critical” need, in addition to issues identified in Table 2. (A lower cut-off percentage is used for jails because their scores were lower overall.)

- Facility capacity to handle offender population [G] – 2.38, 49%
- Managing high-cost functional areas (e.g., offender medical care, employee health insurance) [B] – 2.16, 41%
- Adequacy of facilities for safe offender management and supervision [G] – 2.14, 42%
- Facility planning and development process [G] – 2.13, 42%
- Strategic planning [A] – 2.10, 35%
- Adequacy of facilities to support mission [G] – 2.09, 43%
- Age and condition of facilities [G] – 1.98, 37%
- Staff retention/turnover [D] – 1.98, 36%

Overall, the top 10 issues identified by jail executives as needing attention or a change in approach were:

- 1) Employee motivation [category D]
- 2) Planning for staffing needs [D]
- 3 (tie) New employee recruitment, screening, and selection [D]
- 3 (tie) Facility capacity to handle offender population [G]
- 4) Adequacy of offender mental health care [I]
- 5) Training and developing managers/supervisors [E]
- 6) Ability to evaluate program impact [I]
- 7) Training and developing executives/leaders [E]
- 8) Influencing justice system policies that affect costs [B]
- 9) Evaluation of training impact [FI]
- 10 (tie) Numeric sufficiency of staff to manage offenders [H]
- 10 (tie) Managing high-cost functional areas (e.g., offender medical care, employee health insurance) [B]
- 10 (tie) Planning for staffing needs [D]

## Concerns of Prisons

In the prisons sample, 45% or more of respondents listed the following issues as “strong” or “critical” needs, in addition to the issues presented in Table 2. (A higher cut-off percentage was used for prisons because prison scores were higher overall.)

- Managing high-cost functional areas (e.g., offender medical care, employee health insurance) [B] – 2.79, 63%
- Staff retention/turnover [D] – 2.64, 57%
- Information systems/data management [A] – 2.55, 53%
- Community acceptance of high-risk populations [C] – 2.49, 60%
- Communications within agency [A] – 2.43, 45%
- Adequacy of technology to manage offenders [H] – 2.35, 46%
- Technology applications [A] – 2.34, 49%

Overall, the top 10 issues identified by prison executives as needing attention or a change in approach were:

- 1) Managing high-cost functional areas (e.g., offender medical care, employee health insurance) [B]
- 2) Succession planning [E]
- 3) Adequacy of offender mental health care [H]
- 4 (tie) Sufficient program capacity (slots) for offender population [I]
- 4 (tie) Planning for staff needs [D]
- 5 (tie) Staff retention/turnover [D]
- 5 (tie) Identifying staff for management/supervisory positions [E]
- 6) Identifying staff for executive/leadership positions [E]
- 7 (tie) New employee recruitment, screening, and selection [D]
- 7 (tie) Employee motivation [D]
- 7 (tie) Training and developing executives/leaders [E]
- 8) Responding to the needs of specific populations [I]
- 9) Ability to evaluate program impact [I]

## **Details on Issues & Categories**

---

The project generated considerable detail on agency concerns. This section provides additional review and synthesis of the findings under each category.

The profile for each category includes:

- An overview of top-level issues for the full survey sample;
- A table summarizing the full-sample and functional area average scores for the issues in the category; and
- For each of the issues in the category, a separate table with average scores by sample, the percentage “strong” or “critical” need by sample, and observations on the data.

These sections present compiled data. For raw data and percentage analysis of full Likert scale responses, readers can refer to the spreadsheets that appear in Appendix C.

[This page intentionally left blank.]

## A) ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

### OVERVIEW

Two issues in this category were ranked in the top tier of concerns for the full sample (2.25 Likert average score and/or 50% “strong” or “critical” need to address in at least one of the data samples):

- Research and evaluation
- Information systems/data management

Other issues presented in this category were:

- Agency mission, vision, & goals
- Agency culture and values
- Strategic planning
- Communications within agency
- Coordination across units
- Internal policy, quality control, auditing, and accountability
- Technology applications
- Contracting/contract management
- Ability to identify relevant innovations, ideas, & solutions from outside your agency

**Table 3. Scores by Full Sample Rank — Organizational Development and Administration**

		Average Scores			
		Full sample	Community corrections	Jails	Prisons
TOP	Research and evaluation	<b>2.32</b>	2.64 [2nd]	1.99	2.32
	Information systems/data management	<b>2.21</b>	2.06	2.01	2.55 [10th]
SIGNIFICANT	Communications within the agency	<b>2.11</b>	1.96	1.93	2.43
	Ability to identify relevant innovations & solutions from outside your agency	<b>2.03</b>	2.08	1.94	2.06
	Internal policy, quality control, auditing, and accountability	<b>2.01</b>	2.05	1.90	2.09
	Coordination across functional units	<b>2.00</b>	1.93	1.78	2.28
MODERATE	Technology applications (intranets, teleconferencing, etc.)	<b>1.89</b>	1.82	1.85	2.34
	Agency culture and values	<b>1.86</b>	1.79	1.55	2.23
	Strategic planning	<b>1.82</b>	2.17	2.10	1.19
LESSER	Contracting/contract management	<b>1.40</b>	1.11	1.38	1.70
	Agency mission, vision and goals	<b>1.39</b>	1.43	1.55	2.23

## ISSUE DETAILS

### A-1 Agency mission, vision, & goals

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	1.39		
COMMUNITY	1.43	19%	—
JAILS	1.49	16%	—
PRISONS	1.26	15%	—

### A-2 Agency culture and values

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	1.86		
COMMUNITY	1.79	28%	—
JAILS	1.55	20%	—
PRISONS	2.23	40%	—

- “Culture and values” was a significant issue in rankings by prison respondents.

### A-3 Strategic planning

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	1.82		
COMMUNITY	2.17	43%	—
JAILS	2.10	35%	—
PRISONS	1.91	32%	—

- All groups ranked strategic planning as a moderate to significant concern.

### A-4 Communications within agency

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.11		
COMMUNITY	1.96	29%	—
JAILS	1.93	29%	—
PRISONS	2.43	45%	—

- The prisons sample rated this item much higher than the other groups.



### A-5 Coordination across units

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.00		
COMMUNITY	1.93	27%	—
JAILS	1.78	22%	—
PRISONS	2.28	43%	—

- The prisons sample rated this item as a significant concern.

### A-6 Research and evaluation

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.32		
COMMUNITY	2.64	60%	2nd
JAILS	1.99	33%	—
PRISONS	2.32	51%	—

- This is the only issue in the ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND ADMINISTRATION category that reached the top tier. It was rated a moderate concern by jails but quite high by community corrections and prisons respondents.

### A-7 Internal policy and accountability

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.01		
COMMUNITY	2.05	41%	—
JAILS	1.90	28%	—
PRISONS	2.09	38%	—

### A-8 Information systems and data management

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.21		
COMMUNITY	2.06	40%	—
JAILS	2.01	34%	—
PRISONS	2.55	53%	10th

- Information/data was the 10th ranked item in prisons and significant for all groups.

**A-9 Technology applications (e.g., intranets, teleconferencing, office productivity)**

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	1.89		
COMMUNITY	1.82	30%	—
JAILS	1.85	27%	—
PRISONS	2.34	49%	—

- Though a lower rated item for the full sample, the high percentage from the prisons sample nearly pushed technology applications item to a top-tier concern. (See also item H-3, technology for offender management.)

**A-10 Contacting and contract management**

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	1.40		
COMMUNITY	1.11	6%	—
JAILS	1.38	14%	—
PRISONS	1.70	23%	—

- Though a low scorer overall, contracting is a moderate concern in prisons.

**A-11 Access to outside ideas and innovations**

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.03		
COMMUNITY	2.08	27%	—
JAILS	1.94	23%	—
PRISONS	2.06	32%	—

- Scores for this issue were significant to moderate across all divisions.

## B) BUDGET AND FISCAL MANAGEMENT

### OVERVIEW

Two issues in this category were ranked in the top tier of concerns for the full sample (2.25 Likert average score and/or 50% “strong” or “critical” need to address in at least one of the data samples):

- Influencing system policies that affect costs
- Managing high-cost functional areas

Items ranked at lower levels were:

- Formulating a workable budget
- Communicating budgetary needs
- Eliminating/reducing programs, services
- Eliminating/reducing staff positions
- Creative re-tooling of agency operations

**Table 4. Scores by Full Sample Rank — Budget & Fiscal Management**

		Average Scores			
		Full sample	Community corrections	Jails	Prisons
TOP	Influencing justice system policies that affect costs	<b>2.34</b>	2.30	2.19 [8th]	1.88
SIGNIFICANT	Eliminating/reducing programs, services	<b>2.20</b>	1.13	1.06	1.41
	Managing high-cost functional areas	<b>2.06</b>	1.23	2.16 [10th]	2.79
MODERATE	Communicating budgetary needs	<b>1.84</b>	1.84	1.79	1.88
	Creative re-tooling of agency operations	<b>1.76</b>	1.86	1.58	1.84
LESSER	Formulating a workable budget	<b>1.47</b>	1.34	1.45	1.61
	Eliminating/reducing staff positions	<b>0.95</b>	0.82	0.80	1.22

## ISSUE DETAILS

### B-1 Formulating a workable budget

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	1.47		
COMMUNITY	1.34	13%	—
JAILS	1.45	15%	—
PRISONS	1.61	24%	—

### B-2 Communicating budgetary needs

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	1.84		
COMMUNITY	1.84	30%	—
JAILS	1.79	29%	—
PRISONS	1.88	29%	—

- Fiscal planning was a moderate interest area for all survey segments. Ratings are relatively high for jails and community corrections, compared to prisons, which for most issues tends to give issues a higher score.

### B-3 Influencing system policies that affect costs

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.34		
COMMUNITY	2.30	46%	—
JAILS	2.19	41%	8th
PRISONS	2.53	51%	—

- Influencing justice system policies is a top tier issue for the full sample. It was ranked in 8th place by the jails sample, though its average and percent scores are lower than those for prisons and community corrections.

#### **B-4 Eliminating/reducing programs and services**

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	1.20		
COMMUNITY	1.13	13%	—
JAILS	1.06	7%	—
PRISONS	1.41	18%	—

#### **B-5 Eliminating/reducing staff positions**

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	0.95		
COMMUNITY	0.82	11%	—
JAILS	0.80	6%	—
PRISONS	1.22	12%	—

#### **B-6 Creative re-tooling of agency operations**

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	1.76		
COMMUNITY	1.86	30%	—
JAILS	1.58	19%	—
PRISONS	1.84	20%	—

- Concern for creatively improving or redesigning agency operations was significant in community corrections and prisons and had a strong percentage showing in community corrections.

#### **B-7 Managing high-cost functional areas (e.g., offender health care and staff medical insurance)**

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.06		
COMMUNITY	1.23	17%	—
JAILS	2.16	41%	10th
PRISONS	2.79	63%	1st

- Big-ticket costs (mainly related to medical care, as per the survey's examples) were the top concern for prison respondents and the 10th ranked issue for jails. Strong percentage prison interest pushed this issue to the top tier for the study.

[This page intentionally left blank.]

## C) RELATIONS WITH THE EXTERNAL ENVIRONMENT

### OVERVIEW

Though several issues in this category are of moderate concern to respondents, only one was ranked in the top tier of concerns for the full sample (2.25 Likert average score and/or 50% “strong” or “critical” need to address in at least one of the data samples).

- Community acceptance of high-risk populations

Other issues in this category include:

- Relations with governing and funding bodies
- Involvement in planning, policy and coordination
- Collaboration with agencies/providers
- Acceptance/support at community level
- Relations with justice system stakeholders
- Relations with media
- Privatization of correctional services

**Table 5. Scores by Full Sample Rank — Relations with the External Environment**

	Average Scores			
	Full sample	Community corrections	Jails	Prisons
Community acceptance of high-risk populations	<b>2.14</b>	2.27	1.66	2.49
Acceptance, partnership, & support at community level	<b>2.08</b>	2.15	1.87	2.21
Involvement in planning, policy and coordination	<b>2.03</b>	2.24	1.88	1.98
Relations with justice system stakeholders	<b>1.96</b>	1.85	1.82	2.21
Collaboration with other agencies & service providers	<b>1.94</b>	2.04	1.75	2.02
Relations with governing and funding bodies	<b>1.81</b>	1.88	1.79	1.77
Privatization of correctional services	<b>0.80</b>	0.59	0.65	1.16

## ISSUE DETAILS

### C-1 Relations with governing and funding bodies

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	1.81		
COMMUNITY	1.88	28%	—
JAILS	1.79	21%	—
PRISONS	1.77	19%	—

- All groups identified a moderate concern in this area, with the strongest concern among community corrections respondents.

### C-2 Involvement in justice system planning, policy, and coordination

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.03		
COMMUNITY	2.24	45%	—
JAILS	1.88	24%	—
PRISONS	1.98	28%	—

- A significant concern overall, justice system planning and coordination posed the greatest concern for the community corrections sample.

### C-3 Collaboration with other agencies and service providers

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	1.94		
COMMUNITY	2.04	34%	—
JAILS	1.75	20%	—
PRISONS	2.02	26%	—

- Maximizing collaborative relationships is of significant concern in community corrections and prisons.



#### **C-4 Acceptance, partnership, & support at community level**

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.08		
COMMUNITY	2.15	36%	—
JAILS	1.87	26%	—
PRISONS	2.21	43%	—

- Prisons and community corrections noted a significant concern about community support, partnerships, and acceptance, with greater urgency reported by prisons. (See also item C-7.)

#### **C-5 Relations with justice system stakeholders (e.g., judges, victims, families of offenders)**

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	1.96		
COMMUNITY	1.85	29%	—
JAILS	1.82	26%	—
PRISONS	2.21	43%	—

- The prison sample rated this issue as a much greater concern (at the upper end of the “significant” level) than the other groups, which rated it as a moderate concern.

#### **C-6 Relations with the media**

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	1.61		
COMMUNITY	1.72	21%	—
JAILS	1.40	13%	—
PRISONS	1.72	21%	—

- Media relations was rated as a moderate concern overall, with fewer than 25% of respondents in any group identifying it as a strong or critical need area.

### C-7 Community acceptance of high-risk populations

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.14		
COMMUNITY	2.27	45%	—
JAILS	1.66	23%	—
PRISONS	2.49	60%	—

- Finding ways to improve community acceptance of high-risk populations is a top concern of prison and community corrections respondents. Its high prison score and strong-to-critical rating show its importance, though by average score it did not make that group's top 10. The jails sample gave this item a much lower rating.

### C-8 Privatization of correctional services

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	0.80		
COMMUNITY	0.59	2%	—
JAILS	0.65	5%	—
PRISONS	1.16	11%	—

## D) WORKFORCE ISSUES

### OVERVIEW

The “workforce” category is one of two categories with the most top-tier issues, shown to include several issues of high importance to respondents. Jail respondents identified their top three issues in this category. Three issues in the top 10 for prisons occur here, as does one issue in the community corrections top 10.

For the full sample, five issues in this category were ranked in the top tier of concerns (2.25 Likert average score and/or 50% “strong” or “critical” need to address in at least one of the data samples):

- Planning for current and future staffing needs
- Employee motivation
- New employee recruitment, screening, and selection
- Employee salary and benefits
- Staff retention/turnover

Each of these issues was rated a “strong” or “critical” need area by half or more of respondents in at least one of the responding audience sectors.

Items ranked at lower levels were:

- Employee supports (e.g. flextime, nursery/child care, assistance programs)
- Workforce diversity
- Unions/organized labor
- Litigation by staff

**Table 6. Scores by Full Sample Rank — Workforce Issues**

	Average Scores			
	Full sample	Community corrections	Jails	Prisons
Planning for current and future staffing needs	<b>2.47</b>	2.32 [10th]	2.40	2.70 [4th]
Employee motivation	<b>2.44</b>	2.25	2.46 [1st]	2.60 [7th]
New employee recruitment, screening, and selection	<b>2.31</b>	1.96	2.38	2.60 [7th]
Employee salary and benefits	<b>2.28</b>	2.29	2.06	2.49
Staff retention/turnover	<b>2.08</b>	1.61	1.98	2.64 [5th]
Employee supports (e.g. flextime, nursery/child care, assistance programs)	<b>1.86</b>	1.59	1.85	2.15
Workforce diversity	<b>1.85</b>	1.65	1.70	2.21
Unions/organized labor	<b>1.14</b>	0.89	1.05	1.47
Litigation by staff	<b>1.01</b>	0.73	1.07	1.24

## ISSUE DETAILS

### D-1 Planning for staffing needs

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.47		
COMMUNITY	2.32	48%	10th
JAILS	2.40	46%	2nd
PRISONS	2.70	66%	4th

- Improving agency planning around staffing needs was ranked as the 3rd highest concern for the full data sample. All three sample groups ranked it among their top 10 issues.

### D-2 New employee recruitment, screening, and selection

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.31		
COMMUNITY	1.96	33%	—
JAILS	2.38	46%	3rd (tie)
PRISONS	2.60	53%	7th (tie)

- Recruitment and selection was another top-tier concern for the full survey sample. It poses the greatest relative concern in jails, at 3rd place (rated “critical” by 18%), and it is also in the top 10 concerns for prison respondents (rated “critical” by 21%).

### D-3 Workforce diversity

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	1.85		
COMMUNITY	1.65	20%	—
JAILS	1.70	22%	—
PRISONS	2.21	43%	—

- Addressing diversity within the corrections workforce was a moderate concern in community corrections and jails, but it was rated a significant concern in prisons.

#### D-4 Staff retention/turnover

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.08		
COMMUNITY	1.61	19%	—
JAILS	1.98	36%	—
PRISONS	2.64	57%	5th (tie)

- The need to address staff retention/turnover is a top tier concern, driven by very high interest in prisons, where it was tied at the 5th rank. It was also rated relatively high in jails.

#### D-5 Employee motivation

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.44		
COMMUNITY	2.25	46%	—
JAILS	2.46	45%	1st
PRISONS	2.60	51%	7th (tie)

- Motivating employees was rated a top-level concern by all three sample groups. This was the 5th-highest ranked issue in the full survey sample.

#### D-6 Employee salary and benefits

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.28		
COMMUNITY	2.29	50%	—
JAILS	2.06	38%	—
PRISONS	2.49	57%	—

- With strong interest from prisons and community corrections, employee salaries and benefits represent a major agency expenditure. The jail rating is also relatively high.

**D-7 Employee supports (e.g. flextime, nursery/child care, assistance programs)**

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	1.86		
COMMUNITY	1.59	21%	—
JAILS	1.85	26%	—
PRISONS	2.15	38%	—

- Additional supports and non-monetary benefits to employees are of moderate concern to the corrections field overall, with significant interest reported by prison executives.

**D-8 Unions/organized labor**

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	1.14		
COMMUNITY	0.89	9%	—
JAILS	1.05	10%	—
PRISONS	1.47	20%	—

**D-9 Litigation by staff**

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	1.01		
COMMUNITY	0.73	3%	—
JAILS	1.07	12%	—
PRISONS	1.24	7%	—

## E) LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT

### OVERVIEW

Five issues in this category were ranked in the top tier of concerns for the full sample (2.25 Likert average score and/or 50% “strong” or “critical” need to address in at least one of the data samples):

- Training and development of executive/leaders
- Training and development of managers and supervisors
- Succession planning
- Identifying staff for leadership/executive positions
- Identifying staff for management/supervisory positions

The remaining issue in this category is:

- Management diversity

**Table 7. Scores by Full Sample Rank — Leadership & Management Development**

	Average Scores			
	Full sample	Community corrections	Jails	Prisons
Methods and strategies for training and developing managers and supervisors	<b>2.46</b>	2.37 [7th]	2.30 [5th]	2.70 [4th]
Methods and strategies for training and development of executive/leaders	<b>2.38</b>	2.32 [10th]	2.22 [7th]	2.60 [7th]
Succession planning	<b>2.34</b>	2.24	2.02	2.77 [2nd]
Identifying staff for management/supervisory positions	<b>2.20</b>	1.93	2.02	2.64 [5th]
Identifying staff for leadership/executive positions	<b>2.17</b>	1.91	1.98	2.62 [6th]
Management diversity	<b>1.91</b>	1.72	1.66	2.34

## ISSUE DETAILS

### E-1 Identifying staff for leadership/executive positions

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.17		
COMMUNITY	1.91	36%	—
JAILS	1.98	31%	—
PRISONS	2.62	62%	6th

- Identifying candidates for promotion or hire to top positions was a significant concern overall, though rated only a moderate concern by community corrections and jails respondents. It was the 6th highest issue among prisons executives.

### E-2 Identifying staff for management/supervisory positions

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.20		
COMMUNITY	1.93	36%	—
JAILS	2.02	32%	—
PRISONS	2.64	66%	5th

- Identifying candidates for promotion or hire to management and supervisory positions was rated slightly higher by all groups than executive/leadership promotions. The rating by prisons was, again, much higher than the other groups. It was ranked 5th by prisons executives.

### E-3 Training and development of executives/leaders

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.38		
COMMUNITY	2.32	49%	10th
JAILS	2.22	42%	7th
PRISONS	2.60	57%	7th

- Executive development is one of the top-tier concerns identified through the research, ranking in the top 10 for all three sample groups.



#### E-4 Training and developing managers and supervisors

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.46		
COMMUNITY	2.37	51%	7th
JAILS	2.30	47%	5th
PRISONS	2.70	60%	4th

- Manager and supervisor development was rated an even stronger concern than executive development, and it also appeared in the top 10 for all three sample groups.

#### E-5 Management diversity

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	1.91		
COMMUNITY	1.72	26%	—
JAILS	1.66	21%	—
PRISONS	2.34	43%	—

- Diversity among management staff was rated as a moderate concern on average for the full sample, but it is of far greater concern to prison executives. (See also item D-3, workforce diversity.)

(For related background data, see the 2003 NIC assessment of leadership development needs, <http://www.nicic.org/library/018898>, which discusses findings related to leadership diversity in the major corrections sectors.)

#### E-6 Succession planning

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.34		
COMMUNITY	2.24	48%	—
JAILS	2.02	30%	—
PRISONS	2.77	62%	2nd

- Succession planning is a top-tier concern for the full sample and was 2nd among the concerns of prison executives. Its rating was lower but still significant in jails.

[This page intentionally left blank.]

## F) STAFF TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT

### OVERVIEW

One issue in this category was ranked in the top tier of concerns for the full sample (2.25 Likert average score and/or 50% “strong” or “critical” need to address in at least one of the data samples):

- Evaluation of training impact

Other issues in this category are:

- Pre-service training
- In-service training
- Integration of training with supervision
- Adequacy of in-house training capacity
- Readiness to use new training technologies

Jail scores in this section tend to be closer to the scores given by prisons and community corrections than is the case in other categories, suggesting that jails are experiencing a higher urgency to improve staff training.

**Table 8. Scores by Full Sample Rank — Staff Training and Development**

	Average Scores			
	Full sample	Community corrections	Jails	Prisons
Evaluation of training impact	<b>2.27</b>	2.20	2.18 [9th]	2.43
Integration of training with supervision and policy/procedure	<b>2.14</b>	2.14	2.04	2.24
Readiness to use or adopt new training technologies	<b>2.04</b>	2.03	2.03	2.04
Training needs assessment	<b>2.03</b>	1.95	2.11	2.04
In-service training	<b>2.02</b>	1.98	2.02	2.07
Adequacy of in-house training capacity	<b>2.00</b>	1.83	1.95	2.20
Pre-service training	<b>1.67</b>	1.57	1.67	1.78

## ISSUE DETAILS

### F-1 Training needs assessment

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.03		
COMMUNITY	1.95	26%	—
JAILS	2.11	31%	—
PRISONS	2.04	35%	—

- Training needs assessment may be the only category that jails respondents scored higher than did the other sample groups. Overall, it was rated a significant concern.

### F-2 Pre-service training

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	1.67		
COMMUNITY	1.57	20%	—
JAILS	1.67	19%	—
PRISONS	1.78	15%	—

- Respondents placed pre-service training in the lesser concern tier, suggesting they mainly find their agencies' current approaches adequate.

### F-3 In-service training

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.02		
COMMUNITY	1.98	28%	—
JAILS	2.02	30%	—
PRISONS	2.07	35%	—

- In-service training received higher need scores than pre-service training across all sample groups. It poses a moderate to significant concern.

**F-4 Integration of training with supervision and policy/procedure**

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.14		
COMMUNITY	2.14	37%	—
JAILS	2.04	34%	—
PRISONS	2.24	39%	—

- The concept of improving integration of training, policy, and supervision is a significant concern across all groups.

**F-5 Adequacy of in-house training capacity**

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.00		
COMMUNITY	1.83	20%	—
JAILS	1.95	30%	—
PRISONS	2.20	37%	—

**F-6 Readiness to use or adopt new training technologies**

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.04		
COMMUNITY	2.03	31%	—
JAILS	2.03	30%	—
PRISONS	2.04	37%	—

- Use of new technology to deliver training is a significant concern.

**F-7 Evaluation of training impact**

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.27		
COMMUNITY	2.20	40%	—
JAILS	2.18	36%	9th
PRISONS	2.43	37%	—

- The need to better evaluate the impact of training is a top issue for executives in all three survey samples. The jails sample ranked this issue 9th in importance.

[This page intentionally left blank.]

## G) PHYSICAL PLANT

### OVERVIEW

Two issues in this category were ranked in the top tier of concerns for the full sample (2.25 Likert average score and/or 50% “strong” or “critical” need to address in at least one of the data samples).

- Capacity of facilities to handle offender population
- Age & condition of facilities

Other issues in this category are:

- Adequacy of facilities for safe management & supervision of offenders
- Adequacy of facilities to support agency’s mission & operational philosophy
- Facility planning and development process

**Table 9. Scores by Full Sample Rank — Physical Plant**

	Average Scores			
	Full sample	Community corrections	Jails	Prisons
Capacity of facilities to handle offender population	<b>2.19</b>	1.66	2.38 [3rd]	2.52
Age & condition of facilities	<b>2.00</b>	1.53	1.98	2.48
Adequacy of facilities for safe management & supervision of offenders	<b>2.00</b>	1.75	2.14	2.11
Facility planning & development process	<b>1.98</b>	1.65	2.13	2.17
Adequacy of facilities to support the agency’s mission & operational philosophy	<b>1.95</b>	1.62	2.09	2.15

## ISSUE DETAILS

### G-1 Capacity of facilities to handle offender population

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.19		
COMMUNITY	1.66	29%	—
JAILS	2.38	49%	3rd
PRISONS	2.52	50%	—

- Facility capacity is a top-level concern in jails, where it was ranked 3rd, and in prisons, where it was ranked near the top 10. Half of both prison and jail respondents identified capacity as a “strong” or “critical” issue.

### G-2 Adequacy of facilities for safe management and supervision of offenders

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.00		
COMMUNITY	1.75	31%	—
JAILS	2.14	42%	—
PRISONS	2.11	35%	—

- Adequate safety within facilities is a significant concern in jails and prisons. The jails score and percentage at strong or critical are higher than the figures from prisons, unusual in this research and suggesting added importance for jails. Facility safety is a moderate concern in community corrections.

### G-3 Adequacy of facilities to support the agency’s mission & operational philosophy

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	1.95		
COMMUNITY	1.62	25%	—
JAILS	2.09	43%	—
PRISONS	2.15	35%	—

- The ability of facilities to support the functional mission of the agency is a moderate interest area for all survey segments. It rises to the “significant” tier as rated by prisons and jails. Its rating by jail respondents is, again, relatively high for that sample group.



#### **G-4 Age and condition of facilities**

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.00		
COMMUNITY	1.53	25%	—
JAILS	1.98	37%	—
PRISONS	2.48	52%	—

- The high level of concern indicated by the prisons sample pushed age and condition of facilities to the top tier of issues surveyed. The jail response is also relatively high for that sample group.

#### **G-5 Facility planning and development process**

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	1.98		
COMMUNITY	1.65	27%	—
JAILS	2.13	42%	—
PRISONS	2.17	39%	—

- Facility planning fell into the “moderate concern” category despite a near top-10 showing in the jail sample. It was also rated fairly high by prison respondents.

[This page intentionally left blank.]

## H) SAFETY OF STAFF, OFFENDERS, AND THE COMMUNITY

### OVERVIEW

Two issues in this category were ranked in the top tier of concerns for the full sample (2.25 Likert average score and/or 50% “strong” or “critical” need to address in at least one of the data samples):

- Adequacy of offender mental health care
- Numeric sufficiency of staff to manage offenders

Other issues reviewed here are:

- Offender risk assessment and classification\*
- Capability to manage & supervise offenders across all assessed risk levels\*
- Adequacy of technology to manage offenders
- Skill sufficiency of staff to manage offenders
- Litigation by offenders, families, and advocates
- Litigation by crime victims
- Adequacy of offender medical care

\* These issues pose strong concern among community corrections agencies, though their ratings were not high enough to bring them above the cut-off level used in this report.

**Table 10. Scores by Full Sample Rank — Safety of Staff, Offenders, and the Community**

	Average Scores			
	Full sample	Community corrections	Jails	Prisons
Adequacy of offender mental health care	<b>2.48</b>	2.37 [7th]	2.31	2.76 [3rd]
Numeric sufficiency of staff to manage & supervise offenders	<b>2.33</b>	2.43 [5th]	2.16 [10th]	2.40
Adequacy of technology to manage offenders	<b>2.19</b>	2.17	2.06	2.35
Capability to manage & supervise offenders at all assessed risk levels	<b>2.12</b>	2.36 [8th]	2.89	2.11
Skill sufficiency to staff to manage offenders	<b>2.11</b>	2.17	1.95	2.20
Offender risk assessment & classification	<b>1.98</b>	2.32 [10th]	1.84	1.78
Adequacy of offender medical care	<b>1.75</b>	1.37	1.86	2.02
Litigation by offenders, offenders' families, or offender advocacy groups	<b>1.44</b>	1.06	1.49	1.76
Litigation by crime victims	<b>1.02</b>	0.89	1.06	1.11

## ISSUE DETAILS

### H-1 Offender risk assessment & classification

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	1.98		
COMMUNITY	2.32	47%	10th (tie)
JAILS	1.84	26%	—
PRISONS	1.78	24%	—

- Community corrections respondents ranked assessment and classification in 10th place in importance to be addressed. Nearly 50% of that sample considered this issue of “strong” or “critical” need to be addressed, not enough to move it to the top tier. The issue was scored as a moderate concern by jails and prison respondents.

### H-2 Capability to manage & supervise offenders at all assessed risk levels

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.12		
COMMUNITY	2.36	49%	8th
JAILS	1.89	27%	—
PRISONS	2.11	35%	—

- Community corrections ranked this issue in 8th place, and at 49% it was very close to the 50% cutoff to make the top tier of field concerns. Jail respondents showed a somewhat lower level of concern.

### H-3 Adequacy of technology to manage & supervise offenders (e.g., GPS, biometrics, chemical sensors, locking systems)

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.19		
COMMUNITY	2.17	39%	—
JAILS	2.06	33%	—
PRISONS	2.35	46%	—

- Technology concerns related to offender management are a top-tier issue for the prison sample and also significant in community corrections and jails.

#### H-4 Numeric sufficiency of staff to manage & supervise offenders

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.33		
COMMUNITY	2.43	47%	5th
JAILS	2.16	36%	10th
PRISONS	2.40	51%	—

- Staffing levels are a top-tier concern for the full sample and important to the leadership of all three groups surveyed. Though the issue did not rank in the top 10 for prisons, it was still rated as a strong or critical need by more than half of prison respondents.

#### H-5 Skill sufficiency of staff to manage & supervise offenders

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.11		
COMMUNITY	2.17	36%	—
JAILS	1.95	28%	—
PRISONS	2.20	39%	—

- Concern about the skills of staff in managing offenders was significant in all three groups surveyed.

#### H-6 Litigation by offenders, offenders' families, or offender advocacy groups

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	1.44		
COMMUNITY	1.06	6%	—
JAILS	1.49	14%	—
PRISONS	1.76	24%	—

- Litigation by offenders and others was a lesser concern overall but of moderate concern in the prison sample.

### H-7 Litigation by crime victims

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	1.02		
COMMUNITY	0.89	3%	—
JAILS	1.06	9%	—
PRISONS	1.11	11%	—

### H-8 Adequacy of offender medical care

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	1.75		
COMMUNITY	1.37	22%	—
JAILS	1.86	29%	—
PRISONS	2.02	33%	—

- Adequacy of offender medical care was ranked as a moderate concern in jails and community corrections and a significant concern in prisons. (But see also the related question in Section B on managing high-cost functional areas.)

### H-9 Adequacy of offender mental health care

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.48		
COMMUNITY	2.37	48%	7th
JAILS	2.31	49%	4th
PRISONS	2.76	62%	3rd

- Offender mental health care is the 2nd most critical issue for correctional agencies to address, according to overall survey results. Mental health issues are in the top 10 for all three groups surveyed.

## I) OFFENDER PROGRAM INTERVENTIONS

### OVERVIEW

The offender programs category was one of two categories with the most top-tier issues. Four issues in this category were ranked in the top tier of concerns for the full sample (2.25 Likert average score and/or 50% “strong” or “critical” need to address in at least one of the data samples):

- Ability to identify and implement programs
- Sufficient program capacity for offender population
- Ability to evaluate program impact
- Responding to needs of specific populations

Other issues included in this section are:

- Offender needs assessment
- Partnerships with other treatment providers

Both of these items scored relatively high, but not high enough to make the top tier.

**Table 11. Scores by Full Sample Rank — Offender Program Interventions**

	Average Scores			
	Full sample	Community corrections	Jails	Prisons
Ability to evaluate program impact	<b>2.56</b>	2.88 [1st]	2.23 [6th]	2.58 [9th]
Sufficient program capacity (“slots”) for offender population	<b>2.42</b>	2.57 [3rd]	1.99	2.70 [4th]
Responding to programmatic needs of specific populations (e.g., women, sex offenders)	<b>2.37</b>	2.40 [6th]	2.11	2.59 [8th]
Ability to identify & implement effective programs	<b>2.25</b>	2.44 [4th]	1.95	2.35
Offender needs assessment	<b>2.16</b>	2.33 [9th]	1.91	2.24
Partnerships with other treatment providers	<b>2.16</b>	2.15	2.08	2.24

## ISSUE DETAILS

### I-1 Offender needs assessment

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.16		
COMMUNITY	2.33	44%	9th
JAILS	1.91	27%	—
PRISONS	2.24	41%	—

- A significant concern overall, offender needs assessment was rated at 9th place by community corrections respondents.

### I-2 Ability to identify & implement effective programs

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.25		
COMMUNITY	2.44	47%	4th
JAILS	1.95	31%	—
PRISONS	2.35	50%	—

- The need to identify and develop effective programs is a top-tier concern for the full sample. Community corrections scores put this issue in 4th place, and concern is also quite high in prisons.

### I-3 Sufficient program capacity (“slots”) for offender population

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.42		
COMMUNITY	2.57	57%	3rd
JAILS	1.99	32%	—
PRISONS	2.70	61%	4th

- Program capacity is a top-tier concern for the full sample. Though it received a lower score from jails, this was balanced against very high scores from community corrections (3rd ranked) and prisons (4th ranked).



#### I-4 Partnerships with other treatment providers

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.16		
COMMUNITY	2.15	36%	—
JAILS	2.08	33%	—
PRISONS	2.24	37%	—

- Partnerships with other treatment providers is a significant concern in all the sample segments.

#### I-5 Responding to programmatic needs of specific populations (e.g., women, sex offenders)

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.37		
COMMUNITY	2.40	51%	6th
JAILS	2.11	35%	—
PRISONS	2.59	57%	8th

- The program needs of special populations pose a top-tier concern throughout corrections. Though the average score for jails appears low, it is not far below the cut-off for the jails top 10 ranking.

#### I-6 Ability to evaluate program impact

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING STRONG OR CRITICAL NEED TO ADDRESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.56		
COMMUNITY	2.88	71%	1st
JAILS	2.23	39%	6th
PRISONS	2.58	60%	9th

- The need to better evaluate the impact of correctional programming has the top average score among issues covered by the survey. It was ranked in the top 10 across all three survey sample groups. Likert scale scores are very high for community corrections and prison respondents, as are the percentage responses.

[This page intentionally left blank.]

## J. OTHER KEY FACTORS (Write-In Issues)

.....

Respondents could write in additional issues that they felt had not be covered in the basic survey instrument. The data are not available in a community corrections/jails/prisons breakdown and have not been evaluated at the time of this writing.

WE PLAN TO PROVIDE THIS SECTION LATER AS "APPENDIX D"

(In many cases, write-in answers tend to re-emphasize issues covered in the existing survey questions.)

[This page intentionally left blank.]

## K. LIKELIHOOD OF ACCESSING NIC ASSISTANCE

---

### OVERVIEW

Respondents were asked, “How likely is it that, within the next 2 years, your agency will access the following forms of no-cost NIC assistance?” The purpose of this section was to gain an approximate sense of what NIC services are most appealing or accessible to constituent agencies. A variety of factors can influence the use of specific NIC services, such as program timing, availability of appropriate staff or other resources, computer access, and end-user comfort levels with technology. Also, some respondents may have had little or no awareness of the range of NIC services. In that sense, the survey may have had added value as an informational tool on behalf of NIC.

A comparable 5-level Likert scale scoring format was used for this section. However, the qualitative relationship is different than the other survey sections:

- 0 = Not likely to access
- 1 = Minimally likely to access
- 2 = Somewhat likely to access
- 3 = Very likely to access
- 4 = Extremely likely to access

Average scores for the full sample ranged from 2.19 to 3.20 and, overall, they indicated high levels of likely usage. NIC web services had by far the highest reported likelihood of usage. The prisons sample tended to rate all services at higher levels of likely use than did the other sample groups.

The mid-range value for this category was 2.51. Services with scores above this level are most likely to be accessed by constituent agencies, according to survey data. The services ranking in the top half for the full survey sample are:

- Resources & links on NIC web site
- NIC classroom training, regionally delivered (closer to your agency)
- NIC Information Center document delivery
- NIC training sessions at professional conferences
- NIC Information Center research assistance
- Classroom training, delivered on-site at your agency

Services ranked in the lower half of scores for the full sample are:

- Classroom training at NIC Training Center
- NIC e-mail discussion groups (listervs) and online forums
- On-site technical assistance
- NIC informational or training broadcasts (viewed after the broadcast on DVD)
- NIC online e-learning (web-based training)
- NIC e-learning programs on CD-ROM
- NIC-sponsored peer administrator network meetings
- NIC informational or training broadcasts (viewed live by satellite downlink)
- NIC informational or training broadcasts (viewed live by Internet streaming)
- NIC informational or training broadcasts (viewed after the broadcast via Internet streaming)

**Table 12. Scores by Full Sample Rank — Likelihood of Accessing NIC Assistance**

	Average Scores			
	Full sample	Community corrections	Jails	Prisons
Resources and links on NIC web site	<b>3.20</b>	3.06 (1st)	2.91(1st)	3.61(1st)
Classroom training, regionally delivered (closer to your agency)	<b>2.77</b>	2.40 (4th)	2.55 (3rd)	3.35 (2nd)
NIC Information Center document delivery	<b>2.75</b>	2.61 (2nd)	2.64 (2nd)	3.00
NIC training sessions at conferences	<b>2.68</b>	2.56 (3rd)	2.41	3.07
NIC Information Center research assistance	<b>2.57</b>	2.28	2.44 (4th)	2.98
Classroom training, delivered on-site at your agency	<b>2.57</b>	2.18	2.32	3.20 (4th)
Classroom training at NIC Training Center	<b>2.49</b>	1.84	2.33	3.30 (3rd)
NIC e-mail discussion groups (listservs) and online forums	<b>2.46</b>	2.11	2.10	3.17
On-site technical assistance	<b>2.45</b>	2.13	2.10	3.11
NIC informational or training broadcasts (viewed after the broadcast on DVD)	<b>2.37</b>	2.12	2.02	2.96
NIC online e-learning (web-based training)	<b>2.37</b>	2.26	2.21	2.63
NIC e-learning programs on CD-ROM	<b>2.36</b>	2.22	2.26	2.59
NIC-sponsored peer administrator network meetings	<b>2.35</b>	2.14	2.01	2.89
NIC informational or training broadcasts (viewed live by satellite downlink)	<b>2.35</b>	2.14	1.79	3.11
NIC informational or training broadcasts (viewed live by Internet streaming)	<b>2.29</b>	2.10	1.89	2.89
NIC informational or training broadcasts (viewed after the broadcast via Internet streaming)	<b>2.19</b>	1.98	1.76	2.82

## SERVICE DETAILS

### J-1 On-site technical assistance

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING VERY OR EXTREMELY LIKELY TO ACCESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.45		
COMMUNITY	2.13	41%	—
JAILS	2.10	39%	—
PRISONS	3.11	80%	—

- Prison respondents ranked this item the highest by quite a margin.

### J-2 Resources and links on NIC web site

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING VERY OR EXTREMELY LIKELY TO ACCESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	3.20		
COMMUNITY	3.06	74%	1st
JAILS	2.91	74%	1st
PRISONS	3.61	93%	1st

- Web access was ranked first by all three sample groups.

### J-3 NIC Information Center document delivery

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING VERY OR EXTREMELY LIKELY TO ACCESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.75		
COMMUNITY	2.61	61%	2nd
JAILS	2.64	62%	2nd
PRISONS	3.00	74%	—

#### J-4 NIC Information Center research assistance

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING VERY OR EXTREMELY LIKELY TO ACCESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.57		
COMMUNITY	2.28	47%	—
JAILS	2.44	49%	—
PRISONS	2.98	73%	—

- Prisons ranked this item much higher than the other two samples.

#### J-5 NIC-sponsored peer administrator network meetings

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING VERY OR EXTREMELY LIKELY TO ACCESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.35		
COMMUNITY	2.14	40%	—
JAILS	2.01	35%	—
PRISONS	2.89	65%	—

- Results for this question may reflect a relatively high proportion of responses from NIC network group members in prisons.

#### J-6 NIC e-mail discussion groups (listservs) and online forums

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING VERY OR EXTREMELY LIKELY TO ACCESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.46		
COMMUNITY	2.11	40%	—
JAILS	2.10	40%	—
PRISONS	3.17	74%	—

- Results for this question may reflect a relatively high proportion of responses from NIC deputy director listserv members in prisons.



**J-7 Classroom training at NIC Training Center**

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING VERY OR EXTREMELY LIKELY TO ACCESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.49		
COMMUNITY	1.84	27%	—
JAILS	2.33	45%	—
PRISONS	3.30	83%	3rd

**J-8 Classroom training, regionally delivered (closer to your agency)**

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING VERY OR EXTREMELY LIKELY TO ACCESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.77		
COMMUNITY	2.40	47%	—
JAILS	2.55	54%	3rd
PRISONS	3.35	85%	2nd

**J-9 Classroom training, delivered on-site at your agency**

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING VERY OR EXTREMELY LIKELY TO ACCESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.57		
COMMUNITY	2.18	46%	—
JAILS	2.32	43%	—
PRISONS	3.20	89%	4th

**J-10 NIC online e-learning**

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING VERY OR EXTREMELY LIKELY TO ACCESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.37		
COMMUNITY	2.26	43%	—
JAILS	2.21	37%	—
PRISONS	2.63	50%	—

**J-11 NIC e-learning programs on CD-ROM**

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING VERY OR EXTREMELY LIKELY TO ACCESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.36		
COMMUNITY	2.22	39%	—
JAILS	2.26	41%	—
PRISONS	2.59	46%	—

**J-12 NIC training sessions at professional conferences**

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING VERY OR EXTREMELY LIKELY TO ACCESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.68		
COMMUNITY	2.56	62%	3rd
JAIL	2.41	45%	—
PRISONS	3.07	70%	—

**J-13 NIC informational or training broadcasts (viewed live by satellite downlink)**

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING VERY OR EXTREMELY LIKELY TO ACCESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.35		
COMMUNITY	2.14	40%	—
JAILS	1.79	25%	—
PRISONS	3.11	70%	—

- Prison respondents scored this item much higher than community corrections and jails.

**J-14 NIC informational or training broadcasts (viewed live by Internet streaming)**

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING VERY OR EXTREMELY LIKELY TO ACCESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.29		
COMMUNITY	2.10	37%	
JAILS	1.89	29%	
PRISONS	2.89	64%	

**J-15 NIC informational or training broadcasts (viewed after the broadcast via Internet streaming)**

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING VERY OR EXTREMELY LIKELY TO ACCESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.19		
COMMUNITY	1.98	30%	
JAILS	1.76	25%	
PRISONS	2.82	60%	

**J-16 NIC informational or training broadcasts (viewed after the broadcasts on DVD)**

	AVERAGE SCORE	PERCENTAGE STATING VERY OR EXTREMELY LIKELY TO ACCESS	ITEM RANK
FULL SAMPLE	2.37		
COMMUNITY	2.12	36%	
JAILS	2.02	34%	
PRISONS	2.96	67%	

- Prisons ranked this item the highest by quite a margin.

[This page intentionally left blank.]

## **Appendix A**

### **Written Survey Package**





## **NIC Survey: Correctional Needs Assessment**

U.S. Department of Justice  
National Institute of Corrections

March 2005

- End Date Extended -  
- Please reply by Friday, May 20 -      **THANK YOU!**

☆☆ **Complete this survey online at <http://www.nicic.org/surveys/NeedsAssessment>** ☆☆

- OR -

**FAX TO: (303) 682-0558**  
**MAIL TO: NIC Information Center**  
1860 Industrial Circle, Longmont, Colorado 80501

*Project Coordinator/Contact for questions:*

Connie Clem, Senior Communications Specialist, NIC Information Center  
Telephone: (800) 877-1461 or (303) 682-0213  
[cclem@nicic.org](mailto:cclem@nicic.org)

### **U.S. Department of Justice National Institute of Corrections**

*Community Corrections / Prisons Division*  
320 First Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20530  
800-995-6423

*Jails & Academy Divisions*  
1960 Industrial Circle  
Longmont, CO 80501  
800-995-6429

*NIC Information Center*  
1860 Industrial Circle  
Longmont, CO 80501  
800-877-1461

## About NIC

The National Institute of Corrections (NIC) is a small, Federal agency created by the U.S. Congress in 1974 to assist state and local corrections agencies. All services are provided at no cost to the recipient agency. Most NIC staff have come to NIC from careers in state or local corrections.

NIC's range of services includes:

- ◆ Correctional management and specialty staff training (including instructor-led classes, broadcast programs, e-learning, and professional conference workshops),
- ◆ Information assistance (NIC Information Center and web site), and
- ◆ Custom technical assistance that addresses the needs of individual agencies.

For more background on NIC, please visit our web site, **[www.nicic.org](http://www.nicic.org)**.

---

## Why Your Response Is Important

This survey is being distributed to top correctional administrators nationwide, in all types of agencies. By tapping into your knowledge and experience, NIC seeks to learn which issues are of greatest concern to our colleagues in state and local correctional agencies.

Later surveying will gather input from correctional staff at other levels of the agency structure.

Your response will help create meaningful survey findings to shape future NIC services. We appreciate your help and time in sharing your views.

---

## How to Respond

- ◆ We encourage agency directors to complete this survey with a team of key staff, for a balanced perspective on broad agency aims and on-the-ground operations.
- ◆ This survey is organized under nine functional areas in corrections (sections A – I). In each area, we list factors typically important in correctional agency operations and management. You will rate each factor on whether and how strongly your agency needs to address it. In Section J, you can add other factors we did not cover. In Section K, please indicate your agency's level of interest in using several types of NIC assistance.
- ◆ Complete the survey online at **[www.nicic.org/surveys/NeedsAssessment](http://www.nicic.org/surveys/NeedsAssessment)** or send your completed survey to the NIC Information Center at the fax number or mailing address provided on the cover page.
- ◆ **Please send only one response for your agency** – Do not send a written copy if you complete the online survey. Do not mail a paper copy if you fax your reply to NIC.



## Instructions for Completing the Survey

This survey is organized under nine major functional areas in corrections. Under each area, we list factors that are typically important in agency operations and management.

Your agency's way of handling a factor may be satisfactory now, or the agency may need to address the factor by implementing new strategies and techniques for a more effective approach.

Using a scale from 0 to 4, the survey asks how critical it is that your agency address each factor in order to improve the agency's performance in this area.

**For each item, circle the appropriate number** to show whether/how strongly your agency needs to address it:

- 0 – No need** to address this factor
- 1 – Little need** to address this factor
- 2 – Some need** to address this factor
- 3 – Strong need** to address this factor
- 4 – Critical need** to address this factor

In Section J, page 7, you can add other items that we did not cover in our survey questions.

In Section K, page 8, we ask how likely it is that your agency will access NIC assistance in several specific forms. All NIC services are provided free of charge.

**Your input is essential  
to help NIC identify the issues of greatest concern to you and  
your colleagues in corrections  
and develop effective strategies for addressing them.**

***Thank you very much for responding!***

## About Your Agency

***Your agency's survey response will remain anonymous. The following information will be accessed **only** to ensure a representative survey sample and to group the survey data for analysis.***

1. At what level of government is your agency?

\_\_\_\_\_ Agency operates statewide      \_\_\_\_\_ Agency operates at county, local, judicial district, regional, tribal, or territorial level

\_\_\_\_\_ Federal agency      \_\_\_\_\_ Not a governmental agency

2. In what state is your agency located? \_\_\_\_\_  
(If a tribal or territorial government agency, indicate "other.")

3. Primary function(s) performed by your agency (check all that apply):

\_\_\_\_\_ Prisons      \_\_\_\_\_ Jails

\_\_\_\_\_ Community corrections (including pretrial services)      \_\_\_\_\_ Juvenile justice

4. How large is the offender population under your jurisdiction?

\_\_\_\_\_ <150    \_\_\_\_\_ 150 - 999    \_\_\_\_\_ 1,000 - 7,499    \_\_\_\_\_ 7,500 -14,999    \_\_\_\_\_ 15,000+

5. Which of the following best describes your position in your agency?

\_\_\_\_\_ Executive/CEO

Agency directors and deputy directors in institutional corrections; sheriffs; chief probation officers or equivalent in large jurisdictions.

\_\_\_\_\_ Senior level leader

Directors of probation, parole, or institutional services within state DOCs; regional directors; wardens/superintendents; jail administrators; chief probation officers in medium-sized jurisdictions; directors of medical care, training, programs, human resources, or similar.

\_\_\_\_\_ Manager

Department heads; district managers; facility unit or program managers; institutional majors and captains; deputy jail administrators; chief probation officers in small jurisdictions; other positions that report to a facility or division administrator.

\_\_\_\_\_ Supervisor

Housing unit supervisors; institutional lieutenants and sergeants; first-line probation supervisors; accounting, budget, legal, purchasing, or contracts supervisors; industry supervisors; other supervisors of personnel or program operations.

\_\_\_\_\_ Other

6. Has your agency received any form of NIC assistance (training, technical assistance, or information services) in the past 5 years?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes      \_\_\_\_\_ No      \_\_\_\_\_ Unsure

## Priority Needs for Your Agency

**For each item, circle the appropriate number** to show whether/how strongly your agency needs to address it:

- 0 – No need to address** this factor
- 1 – Little need** to address this factor
- 2 – Some need** to address this factor
- 3 – Strong need** to address this factor
- 4 – Critical need** to address this factor

### **A) Organizational Development and Administration**

	No need to address	Little need to address	Some need to address	Strong need to address	Critical need to address
7. Agency mission, vision, & goals	0	1	2	3	4
8. Agency culture & values	0	1	2	3	4
9. Strategic planning	0	1	2	3	4
10. Communications within the agency	0	1	2	3	4
11. Coordination across functional units	0	1	2	3	4
12. Research & evaluation	0	1	2	3	4
13. Internal policy, quality control, auditing, and accountability	0	1	2	3	4
14. Information systems / data management	0	1	2	3	4
15. Technology applications (e.g., intranets, teleconferencing, office productivity)	0	1	2	3	4
16. Contracting / contract management	0	1	2	3	4
17. Ability to identify relevant innovations, ideas, and solutions from outside your agency	0	1	2	3	4

### **B) Budget & Fiscal Management**

	No need to address	Little need to address	Some need to address	Strong need to address	Critical need to address
18. Formulating a workable budget	0	1	2	3	4
19. Communicating budgetary needs to decision-makers	0	1	2	3	4
20. Influencing justice system policies and mandates that affect correctional costs	0	1	2	3	4
21. Eliminating/reducing programs, services	0	1	2	3	4
22. Eliminating/reducing staff positions	0	1	2	3	4
23. Creative re-tooling of agency operations	0	1	2	3	4
24. Managing high-cost functional areas (e.g., staff medical insurance, offender health care)	0	1	2	3	4

**C) Relations with the External Environment**

	No need to address	Little need to address	Some need to address	Strong need to address	Critical need to address
25. Relations with governing, funding, and oversight bodies	0	1	2	3	4
26. Involvement in justice system planning, policy, and coordination	0	1	2	3	4
27. Collaboration with other agencies & service providers	0	1	2	3	4
28. Acceptance, partnership, and support at the community level	0	1	2	3	4
29. Relations with justice system stakeholders (e.g., judges, victims, families of offenders)	0	1	2	3	4
30. Relations with the media	0	1	2	3	4
31. Community acceptance of high-risk populations	0	1	2	3	4
32. Privatization of correctional services	0	1	2	3	4

**D) Workforce Issues**

	No need to address	Little need to address	Some need to address	Strong need to address	Critical need to address
33. Planning for current & future staffing needs	0	1	2	3	4
34. New employee recruitment, screening, & selection	0	1	2	3	4
35. Workforce diversity (gender, ethnic, generational)	0	1	2	3	4
36. Staff retention / turnover	0	1	2	3	4
37. Employee motivation	0	1	2	3	4
38. Employee salary & benefits	0	1	2	3	4
39. Employee supports (e.g., flextime, nursery/ child care, assistance programs)	0	1	2	3	4
40. Unions / organized labor	0	1	2	3	4
41. Litigation by staff	0	1	2	3	4

**E) Leadership & Management Development**

	No need to address	Little need to address	Some need to address	Strong need to address	Critical need to address
42. Identifying appropriate staff for promotion to leadership & executive positions	0	1	2	3	4
43. Identifying appropriate staff for promotion to management & supervisory positions	0	1	2	3	4
44. Methods & strategies for training and developing executives / leaders	0	1	2	3	4
45. Methods & strategies for training and developing managers / supervisors	0	1	2	3	4
46. Management diversity	0	1	2	3	4
47. Succession planning	0	1	2	3	4

## F) Staff Training and Development

	No need to address	Little need to address	Some need to address	Strong need to address	Critical need to address
48. Training needs assessment	0	1	2	3	4
49. Pre-service training	0	1	2	3	4
50. In-service training	0	1	2	3	4
51. Integration of training with supervision & policy/procedure	0	1	2	3	4
52. Adequacy of in-house training capacity	0	1	2	3	4
53. Readiness to use or adopt new training technologies (e.g., e-learning)	0	1	2	3	4
54. Evaluation of training impact	0	1	2	3	4

## G) Physical Plant

	No need to address	Little need to address	Some need to address	Strong need to address	Critical need to address
55. Capacity of facilities to handle offender population	0	1	2	3	4
56. Adequacy of facilities for safe management & supervision of offenders	0	1	2	3	4
57. Adequacy of facilities to support the agency's mission & operational philosophy	0	1	2	3	4
58. Age & condition of facilities	0	1	2	3	4
59. Facility planning & development process	0	1	2	3	4

## H) Safety of Staff, Offenders, and the Community

	No need to address	Little need to address	Some need to address	Strong need to address	Critical need to address
60. Offender risk assessment & classification	0	1	2	3	4
61. Capability to manage & supervise offenders at all assessed risk levels	0	1	2	3	4
62. Adequacy of technology to manage & supervise offenders (e.g., GPS, biometrics, chemical sensors, locking systems)	0	1	2	3	4
63. Numeric sufficiency of staff to manage & supervise offenders	0	1	2	3	4
64. Skill sufficiency of staff to manage & supervise offenders	0	1	2	3	4
65. Litigation by offenders, offenders' families, or offender advocacy groups	0	1	2	3	4
66. Litigation by crime victims	0	1	2	3	4
67. Adequacy of offender medical care	0	1	2	3	4
68. Adequacy of offender mental health care	0	1	2	3	4

**I) Offender Program Interventions**

	No need to address	Little need to address	Some need to address	Strong need to address	Critical need to address
69. Offender needs assessment	0	1	2	3	4
70. Ability to identify & implement effective programs	0	1	2	3	4
71. Sufficient program capacity ("slots") for offender population	0	1	2	3	4
72. Partnerships with other treatment providers	0	1	2	3	4
73. Responding to programmatic needs of specific populations (e.g., women, sex offenders)	0	1	2	3	4
74. Ability to evaluate program impact	0	1	2	3	4

**J) Other Key Factors**

Please note any major factors that were not covered in previous survey questions.

	Some need to address	Strong need to address	Critical need to address
FACTOR 1	2	3	4
FACTOR 2	2	3	4
FACTOR 3	2	3	4

## K) Likelihood Agency Will Access NIC Assistance

How likely is it that, within the next 2 years, your agency will access the following forms of no-cost NIC assistance?

	Not likely to access	Minimally likely to access	Somewhat likely to access	Very likely to access	Extremely likely to access
75. On-site technical assistance	0	1	2	3	4
76. Resources & links on NIC web site	0	1	2	3	4
77. NIC Information Center document delivery	0	1	2	3	4
78. NIC Information Center research assistance	0	1	2	3	4
79. NIC-sponsored peer administrator network meetings	0	1	2	3	4
80. NIC e-mail discussion groups (listservs) and online forums	0	1	2	3	4
81. Classroom training at NIC Training Center	0	1	2	3	4
82. Classroom training, regionally delivered (closer to your agency)	0	1	2	3	4
83. Classroom training, delivered on-site at your agency	0	1	2	3	4
84. NIC online e-learning (web-based training)	0	1	2	3	4
85. NIC e-learning programs on CD-ROM	0	1	2	3	4
86. NIC training sessions at professional conferences	0	1	2	3	4
87. NIC informational or training broadcasts (viewed live by satellite downlink)	0	1	2	3	4
88. NIC informational or training broadcasts (viewed live by Internet streaming)	0	1	2	3	4
89. NIC informational or training broadcasts (viewed after the broadcast via Internet streaming)	0	1	2	3	4
90. NIC informational or training broadcasts (viewed after the broadcast on DVD)	0	1	2	3	4

***Thank you very much for sharing your views.***

*Your input will help NIC remain responsive to your needs and those of your colleagues in corrections.*





## **Appendix B**

### **Summary of Survey Distribution & Responses**



## Survey Deployment

Phase I/CEO Deployment method		Total agencies (approx)	Sample needed for 95% reliability	Resps needed (75%)	Invites sent (approx)	Resps recorded (approx)
Large jails	Send e-mail invitation to NIC's LJM listserv. -Orig. sent March 29 -Follow-up sent Apr. 19-21 -Richard's follow-up sent May 5	150	110	82	150	65
Small & med jails	1) Contact jails by e-mail and/or direct mail. -Orig. sent March 30-31 -Follow up e-mails & new contacts sent Apr. 19-21 2) Send e-mail invite to NIC's state jail inspectors listserv (to ~35 states) for forwarding to county jails. -Sent May 2	3200	340	255	400	133
State DOCs (prisons)	Send e-mail invitation to NIC deputies' listserv. -Orig. sent Mar. 29 -Follow-up sent Apr. 19-21 -George's follow-up sent May 2	51	48	36	51	32
State P&P	Send e-mail invite to NIC's cc-net listserv -Orig. sent Mar. 29	30	30	22	30	25
State parole only	-Follow-up sent Apr. 19-21	15	15	11	15	
State probation only	-George's follow-up sent May 2 -NAPE follow-up sent May 6	12	12	9	12	
State CCA/ "capacity building" oversight		16	16	12	16	
County/district probation	1) Send e-mail invite via cc-net (NIC network members). 2) Contact by e-mail and/or direct mail. -Orig. sent Mar. 30-31 -Follow-up sent Apr. 19-21 -NAPE follow-up sent May 6	621	239	179	200	77
Indian Country	Send by direct mail.	~60	53	40	60	13
U.S. territories	Send e-mail invite via NIC deputy directors' listserv.	~6	6	5	6	4
U.S. BOP	(Not directly included in Phase I, but will accommodate if any reply)	(1)	(1)	(-)	1	1
Non-supervising parole authorities	(Not directly included in Phase I, but will accommodate if any reply)	(~35)	(35)	(26)	-	-
TOTALS:		4,175	883	661	941	357*

(\* Column does not total to this number. Some responses did not fit these categories.)



## **Appendix C**

### **Raw Data Tables**



## COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

	No need	, as %	Little need	, as %	Some need	, as %	Strong need	, as %	Critical need	, as %	Total ans	Score	AVG SCORE	STR+CRIT	, AS %
Agency mission, vision, & goals	27	25.2%	28	26.2%	32	29.9%	19	17.8%	1	0.9%	107	153	1.43	20	19%
Agency culture & values	17	15.9%	22	20.6%	38	35.5%	27	25.2%	3	2.8%	107	191	1.79	30	28%
Strategic planning	11	10.3%	14	13.1%	36	33.6%	38	35.5%	8	7.5%	107	232	2.17	46	43%
Communications within agency	9	8.4%	25	23.4%	42	39.3%	23	21.5%	8	7.5%	107	210	1.96	31	29%
Coordination across units	12	11.3%	16	15.1%	49	46.2%	25	23.6%	4	3.8%	106	205	1.93	29	27%
Research & evaluation	3	2.8%	7	6.5%	33	30.8%	46	43.0%	18	16.8%	107	283	2.64	64	60%
Internal policy, accountability	11	10.3%	28	26.2%	24	22.4%	33	30.8%	11	10.3%	107	219	2.05	44	41%
Information systems/data mgmt	14	13.1%	21	19.6%	29	27.1%	31	29.0%	12	11.2%	107	220	2.06	43	40%
Technology applications	16	15.0%	25	23.4%	34	31.8%	26	24.3%	6	5.6%	107	195	1.82	32	30%
Contracting/contract mgmt	29	27.6%	43	41.0%	27	25.7%	4	3.8%	2	1.9%	105	117	1.11	6	6%
Access to outside ideas & innovs	4	3.7%	22	20.6%	52	48.6%	19	17.8%	10	9.3%	107	223	2.08	29	27%
Formulating a workable budget	30	29.4%	22	21.6%	37	36.3%	11	10.8%	2	2.0%	102	137	1.34	13	13%
Communicating budgetary needs	17	16.5%	22	21.4%	33	32.0%	22	21.4%	9	8.7%	103	190	1.84	31	30%
Influencing system policies that affect costs	8	7.6%	13	12.4%	36	34.3%	36	34.3%	12	11.4%	105	241	2.30	48	46%
Eliminating/reducing programs, services	35	34.0%	34	33.0%	21	20.4%	12	11.7%	1	1.0%	103	116	1.13	13	13%
Eliminating/reducing staff positions	53	51.5%	30	29.1%	9	8.7%	8	7.8%	3	2.9%	103	84	0.82	11	11%
Creative re-tooling of agency operations	17	16.2%	19	18.1%	38	36.2%	24	22.9%	7	6.7%	105	195	1.86	31	30%
Managing high-cost functional areas	39	39.4%	20	20.2%	23	23.2%	12	12.1%	5	5.1%	99	122	1.23	17	17%
Relations with governing and funding bodies	12	11.8%	24	23.5%	37	36.3%	22	21.6%	7	6.9%	102	192	1.88	29	28%
Involvement in planning, policy and coord.	9	8.7%	12	11.7%	36	35.0%	37	35.9%	9	8.7%	103	231	2.24	46	45%
Collaboration with agencies/providers	9	8.7%	22	21.4%	37	35.9%	26	25.2%	9	8.7%	103	210	2.04	35	34%
Acceptance/support at community level	9	8.7%	15	14.6%	42	40.8%	26	25.2%	11	10.7%	103	221	2.15	37	36%
Relations with justice system stakeholders	13	12.6%	23	22.3%	37	35.9%	26	25.2%	4	3.9%	103	191	1.85	30	29%
Relations with the media	11	10.7%	32	31.1%	38	36.9%	19	18.4%	3	2.9%	103	177	1.72	22	21%
Community acceptance of high-risk pops.	7	6.9%	14	13.7%	35	34.3%	36	35.3%	10	9.8%	102	232	2.27	46	45%
Privatization of correctional services	57	60.0%	23	24.2%	13	13.7%	1	1.1%	1	1.1%	95	56	0.59	2	2%
Planning for staffing needs	7	6.7%	18	17.1%	30	28.6%	34	32.4%	16	15.2%	105	244	2.32	50	48%
New employee recruitmt, screening, selectn	14	13.3%	21	20.0%	35	33.3%	25	23.8%	10	9.5%	105	206	1.96	35	33%
Workforce diversity	24	23.1%	18	17.3%	41	39.4%	12	11.5%	9	8.7%	104	172	1.65	21	20%
Staff retention/turnover	21	20.0%	30	28.6%	34	32.4%	9	8.6%	11	10.5%	105	169	1.61	20	19%
Employee motivation	5	4.8%	20	19.0%	32	30.5%	40	38.1%	8	7.6%	105	236	2.25	48	46%
Employee salary & benefits	10	9.5%	22	21.0%	21	20.0%	32	30.5%	20	19.0%	105	240	2.29	52	50%
Employee supports	17	16.2%	37	35.2%	29	27.6%	16	15.2%	6	5.7%	105	167	1.59	22	21%
Unions/organized labor	48	48.5%	24	24.2%	18	18.2%	8	8.1%	1	1.0%	99	88	0.89	9	9%
Litigation by staff	46	46.5%	37	37.4%	13	13.1%	3	3.0%	0	0.0%	99	72	0.73	3	3%
IDing staff for leadership/executive positions	15	14.4%	24	23.1%	28	26.9%	29	27.9%	8	7.7%	104	199	1.91	37	36%
IDing staff for management/supervisory posits	15	14.4%	24	23.1%	28	26.9%	27	26.0%	10	9.6%	104	201	1.93	37	36%
Training and developing executives/leaders	9	8.7%	10	9.6%	34	32.7%	41	39.4%	10	9.6%	104	241	2.32	51	49%
Training and developing managers/supervis	6	5.8%	13	12.5%	32	30.8%	43	41.3%	10	9.6%	104	246	2.37	53	51%
Management diversity	18	17.5%	24	23.3%	34	33.0%	23	22.3%	4	3.9%	103	177	1.72	27	26%
Succession planning	10	9.6%	15	14.4%	29	27.9%	40	38.5%	10	9.6%	104	233	2.24	50	48%

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS, PG 2

Training needs assessment	9	8.7%	22	21.4%	45	43.7%	19	18.4%	8	7.8%	103	201	1.95	27	26%
Pre-service training	21	21.0%	26	26.0%	33	33.0%	15	15.0%	5	5.0%	100	157	1.57	20	20%
In-service training	9	8.7%	17	16.5%	48	46.6%	25	24.3%	4	3.9%	103	204	1.98	29	28%
Integration of training with supervision	8	7.8%	17	16.5%	40	38.8%	29	28.2%	9	8.7%	103	220	2.14	38	37%
Adequacy of in-house training capacity	11	10.7%	23	22.3%	48	46.6%	14	13.6%	7	6.8%	103	189	1.83	21	20%
Readiness to use new training technologies	10	9.7%	15	14.6%	46	44.7%	26	25.2%	6	5.8%	103	209	2.03	32	31%
Evaluation of training impact	8	7.8%	10	9.7%	45	43.7%	33	32.0%	7	6.8%	103	227	2.20	40	39%
Capacity to handle offender population	26	28.3%	15	16.3%	24	26.1%	18	19.6%	9	9.8%	92	153	1.66	27	29%
Adequacy of facilities for safe mgmt & sup	21	22.6%	19	20.4%	24	25.8%	20	21.5%	9	9.7%	93	163	1.75	29	31%
Adequacy of facilities to support mission	22	23.7%	23	24.7%	25	26.9%	14	15.1%	9	9.7%	93	151	1.62	23	25%
Age & condition of facilities	28	30.4%	19	20.7%	22	23.9%	14	15.2%	9	9.8%	92	141	1.53	23	25%
Facility planning & development process	25	26.9%	18	19.4%	25	26.9%	15	16.1%	10	10.8%	93	153	1.65	25	27%
Offender risk assessment & classification	11	10.8%	12	11.8%	31	30.4%	29	28.4%	19	18.6%	102	237	2.32	48	47%
Capability to manage across all risk levels	9	8.8%	12	11.8%	31	30.4%	33	32.4%	17	16.7%	102	241	2.36	50	49%
Adequacy of technology to manage offenders	9	8.9%	15	14.9%	38	37.6%	28	27.7%	11	10.9%	101	219	2.17	39	39%
Numeric sufficiency of staff to manage offenders	7	6.9%	13	12.7%	34	33.3%	25	24.5%	23	22.5%	102	248	2.43	48	47%
Skill sufficiency of staff to manage offenders	5	4.9%	20	19.6%	40	39.2%	27	26.5%	10	9.8%	102	221	2.17	37	36%
Litigation by offenders, families, advocates	26	26.5%	47	48.0%	19	19.4%	5	5.1%	1	1.0%	98	104	1.06	6	6%
Litigation by crime victims	36	36.4%	42	42.4%	18	18.2%	2	2.0%	1	1.0%	99	88	0.89	3	3%
Adequacy of offender medical care	30	34.5%	21	24.1%	17	19.5%	12	13.8%	7	8.0%	87	119	1.37	19	22%
Adequacy of offender mental health care	8	8.1%	14	14.1%	29	29.3%	29	29.3%	19	19.2%	99	235	2.37	48	48%
Offender needs assessment	11	10.8%	9	8.8%	37	36.3%	25	24.5%	20	19.6%	102	238	2.33	45	44%
Ability to identify & implement programs	4	3.9%	9	8.8%	41	40.2%	34	33.3%	14	13.7%	102	249	2.44	48	47%
Sufficient program capacity for offender pop.	5	5.0%	9	8.9%	29	28.7%	39	38.6%	19	18.8%	101	260	2.57	58	57%
Partnerships with other treatment providers	9	8.9%	14	13.9%	42	41.6%	25	24.8%	11	10.9%	101	217	2.15	36	36%
Responding to needs of specific populations	7	6.9%	9	8.8%	34	33.3%	40	39.2%	12	11.8%	102	245	2.40	52	51%
Ability to evaluate program impact	2	2.0%	9	8.8%	19	18.6%	41	40.2%	31	30.4%	102	294	2.88	72	71%
On-site technical assistance	17	16.8%	14	13.9%	29	28.7%	21	20.8%	20	19.8%	101	215	2.13	41	41%
Resources & links on NIC web site	3	2.9%	3	2.9%	21	20.6%	33	32.4%	42	41.2%	102	312	3.06	75	74%
NIC Information Center document delivery	7	6.9%	7	6.9%	25	24.8%	41	40.6%	21	20.8%	101	264	2.61	62	61%
NIC Information Center research assistance	6	5.9%	17	16.8%	31	30.7%	37	36.6%	10	9.9%	101	230	2.28	47	47%
NIC-sponsored network meetings	12	12.1%	20	20.2%	27	27.3%	22	22.2%	18	18.2%	99	212	2.14	40	40%
NIC e-mail discussion groups and forums	14	13.7%	19	18.6%	28	27.5%	24	23.5%	17	16.7%	102	215	2.11	41	40%
Classroom training at NIC Training Center	16	15.7%	24	23.5%	34	33.3%	16	15.7%	12	11.8%	102	188	1.84	28	27%
Classroom training, regionally delivered	4	4.0%	14	13.9%	36	35.6%	32	31.7%	15	14.9%	101	242	2.40	47	47%
Classroom training, on-site at agency	12	12.0%	19	19.0%	23	23.0%	31	31.0%	15	15.0%	100	218	2.18	46	46%
NIC online e-learning (web-based)	5	5.0%	16	15.8%	37	36.6%	34	33.7%	9	8.9%	101	228	2.26	43	43%
NIC e-learning programs on CD-ROM	6	5.9%	19	18.8%	37	36.6%	25	24.8%	14	13.9%	101	224	2.22	39	39%
NIC training sessions at conferences	3	2.9%	17	16.7%	19	18.6%	46	45.1%	17	16.7%	102	261	2.56	63	62%
Broadcasts viewed live by download	6	6.0%	24	24.0%	30	30.0%	30	30.0%	10	10.0%	100	214	2.14	40	40%
Broadcasts viewed live by streaming	6	6.0%	27	27.0%	30	30.0%	25	25.0%	12	12.0%	100	210	2.10	37	37%
Broadcasts viewed later by streaming	9	9.0%	27	27.0%	34	34.0%	17	17.0%	13	13.0%	100	198	1.98	30	30%
Broadcasts viewed later on DVD	5	5.0%	30	30.0%	29	29.0%	20	20.0%	16	16.0%	100	212	2.12	36	36%



JAILS DATA, upd. 5/26/06

	No need	, as %	Little need	, as %	Some need	, as %	Strong need	, as %	Critical need	, as %	Total ans	Score	AVG SCORE	STR+CRIT	, AS %
Agency mission, vision, & goals	42	22.1%	55	28.9%	62	32.6%	20	10.5%	11	5.8%	190	283	1.49	31	16%
Agency culture & values	33	17.3%	64	33.5%	56	29.3%	32	16.8%	6	3.1%	191	296	1.55	38	20%
Strategic planning	12	6.2%	42	21.8%	72	37.3%	48	24.9%	19	9.8%	193	406	2.10	67	35%
Communications within agency	21	10.8%	37	19.1%	80	41.2%	46	23.7%	10	5.2%	194	375	1.93	56	29%
Coordination across units	21	10.9%	48	24.9%	82	42.5%	36	18.7%	6	3.1%	193	344	1.78	42	22%
Research & evaluation	13	49.0%	49	25.7%	66	34.6%	52	27.2%	11	5.8%	191	381	1.99	63	33%
Internal policy, accountability	22	11.5%	45	23.4%	71	37.0%	39	20.3%	15	7.8%	192	364	1.90	54	28%
Information systems/data mgmt	17	8.8%	48	24.7%	63	32.5%	49	25.3%	17	8.8%	194	389	2.01	66	34%
Technology applications	27	14.1%	40	20.8%	73	38.0%	39	20.3%	13	6.8%	192	355	1.85	52	27%
Contracting/contract mgmt	38	19.9%	73	38.2%	53	27.7%	24	12.6%	3	1.6%	191	263	1.38	27	14%
Access to outside ideas & innovs	12	6.3%	39	20.3%	96	50.0%	39	20.3%	6	3.1%	192	372	1.94	45	23%
Formulating a workable budget	36	18.7%	71	36.8%	57	29.5%	22	11.4%	7	3.6%	193	279	1.45	29	15%
Communicating budgetary needs	33	17.0%	46	23.7%	58	29.9%	43	22.2%	14	7.2%	194	347	1.79	57	29%
Influencing system policies that affect costs	17	8.8%	34	17.5%	63	32.5%	55	28.4%	25	12.9%	194	425	2.19	80	41%
Eliminating/reducing programs, services	64	33.7%	67	35.3%	45	23.7%	12	6.3%	2	1.1%	190	201	1.06	14	7%
Eliminating/reducing staff positions	94	50.3%	56	29.9%	25	13.4%	5	2.7%	7	3.7%	187	149	0.80	12	6%
Creative re-tooling of agency operations	31	16.2%	63	33.0%	60	31.4%	30	15.7%	7	3.7%	191	301	1.58	37	19%
Managing high-cost functional areas	18	9.3%	43	22.2%	53	27.3%	50	25.8%	30	15.5%	194	419	2.16	80	41%
Relations with governing and funding bodies	23	12.0%	47	24.6%	80	41.9%	29	15.2%	12	6.3%	191	342	1.79	41	21%
Involvement in planning, policy and coord.	13	6.8%	50	26.3%	82	43.2%	36	18.9%	9	4.7%	190	358	1.88	45	24%
Collaboration with agencies/providers	16	8.3%	63	32.8%	75	39.1%	29	15.1%	9	4.7%	192	336	1.75	38	20%
Acceptance/support at community level	17	8.9%	50	26.0%	75	39.1%	41	21.4%	9	4.7%	192	359	1.87	50	26%
Relations with justice system stakeholders	23	12.0%	49	25.7%	70	36.6%	37	19.4%	12	6.3%	191	348	1.82	49	26%
Relations with the media	39	20.4%	67	35.1%	60	31.4%	20	10.5%	5	2.6%	191	267	1.40	25	13%
Community acceptance of high-risk pops.	30	15.7%	60	31.4%	57	29.8%	33	17.3%	11	5.8%	191	317	1.66	44	23%
Privatization of correctional services	104	57.1%	50	27.5%	19	10.4%	6	3.3%	3	1.6%	182	118	0.65	9	5%
Planning for staffing needs	10	5.2%	25	13.1%	69	36.1%	53	27.7%	34	17.8%	191	458	2.40	87	46%
New employee recruitmt, screening, selectn	10	5.2%	28	14.6%	66	34.4%	55	28.6%	33	17.2%	192	457	2.38	88	46%
Workforce diversity	24	12.5%	66	34.4%	59	30.7%	30	15.6%	13	6.8%	192	326	1.70	43	22%
Staff retention/turnover	23	12.0%	52	27.2%	48	25.1%	42	22.0%	26	13.6%	191	378	1.98	68	36%
Employee motivation	3	1.6%	23	12.0%	79	41.1%	57	29.7%	30	15.6%	192	472	2.46	87	45%
Employee salary & benefits	18	9.4%	47	24.6%	54	28.3%	49	25.7%	23	12.0%	191	394	2.06	72	38%
Employee supports	16	8.5%	61	32.4%	62	33.0%	33	17.6%	16	8.5%	188	348	1.85	49	26%
Unions/organized labor	76	40.2%	55	29.1%	39	20.6%	10	5.3%	9	4.8%	189	199	1.05	19	10%
Litigation by staff	67	35.3%	72	37.9%	29	15.3%	14	7.4%	8	4.2%	190	204	1.07	22	12%
IDing staff for leadership/executive positions	20	10.6%	37	19.6%	73	38.6%	44	23.3%	15	7.9%	189	375	1.98	59	31%
IDing staff for management/supervisory posits	16	8.5%	38	20.1%	74	39.2%	48	25.4%	13	6.9%	189	382	2.02	61	32%
Training and developing executives/leaders	13	6.9%	29	15.3%	67	35.4%	63	33.3%	17	9.0%	189	420	2.22	80	42%
Training and developing managers/supervis	10	5.3%	25	13.2%	65	34.4%	76	40.2%	13	6.9%	189	435	2.30	89	47%
Management diversity	27	14.3%	59	31.2%	64	33.9%	29	15.3%	10	5.3%	189	314	1.66	39	21%
Succession planning	15	8.0%	37	19.8%	78	41.7%	43	23.0%	14	7.5%	187	378	2.02	57	30%

Training needs assessment	6	3.2%	43	22.9%	80	42.6%	43	22.9%	16	8.5%	188	396	2.11	59	31%
Pre-service training	22	11.7%	62	33.0%	68	36.2%	28	14.9%	8	4.3%	188	314	1.67	36	19%
In-service training	13	6.9%	39	20.7%	79	42.0%	45	23.9%	12	6.4%	188	380	2.02	57	30%
Integration of training with supervision	16	8.5%	36	19.1%	72	38.3%	52	27.7%	12	6.4%	188	384	2.04	64	34%
Adequacy of in-house training capacity	14	7.4%	46	24.5%	72	38.3%	47	25.0%	9	4.8%	188	367	1.95	56	30%
Readiness to use new training technologies	9	44.0%	44	45.0%	79	42.0%	45	23.9%	11	5.9%	188	381	2.03	56	30%
Evaluation of training impact	7	3.7%	33	17.6%	80	42.6%	56	29.8%	12	6.4%	188	409	2.18	68	36%
Capacity to handle offender population	21	11.2%	30	16.0%	44	23.5%	41	21.9%	51	27.3%	187	445	2.38	92	49%
Adequacy of facilities for safe mgmt & sup	23	12.3%	39	20.9%	46	24.6%	46	24.6%	33	17.6%	187	401	2.14	79	42%
Adequacy of facilities to support mission	24	12.9%	45	24.2%	37	19.9%	50	26.9%	30	16.1%	186	389	2.09	80	43%
Age & condition of facilities	32	17.3%	40	21.6%	45	24.3%	36	19.5%	32	17.3%	185	366	1.98	68	37%
Facility planning & development process	29	15.6%	35	18.8%	43	23.1%	41	22.0%	38	20.4%	186	396	2.13	79	42%
Offender risk assessment & classification	20	10.8%	54	29.0%	64	34.4%	32	17.2%	16	8.6%	186	342	1.84	48	26%
Capability to manage across all risk levels	16	8.6%	50	26.9%	70	37.6%	38	20.4%	12	6.5%	186	352	1.89	50	27%
Adequacy of technology to manage offenders	18	9.8%	32	17.5%	73	39.9%	41	22.4%	19	10.4%	183	377	2.06	60	33%
Numeric sufficiency of staff to manage offenders	16	8.6%	30	16.1%	73	39.2%	42	22.6%	25	13.4%	186	402	2.16	67	36%
Skill sufficiency of staff to manage offenders	12	6.5%	51	27.4%	71	38.2%	38	20.4%	14	7.5%	186	363	1.95	52	28%
Litigation by offenders, families, advocates	26	14.1%	73	39.7%	60	32.6%	18	9.8%	7	3.8%	184	275	1.49	25	14%
Litigation by crime victims	56	31.3%	77	43.0%	30	16.8%	12	6.7%	4	2.2%	179	189	1.06	16	9%
Adequacy of offender medical care	17	9.2%	53	28.6%	62	33.5%	44	23.8%	9	4.9%	185	345	1.86	53	29%
Adequacy of offender mental health care	13	7.0%	36	19.5%	46	24.9%	61	33.0%	29	15.7%	185	427	2.31	90	49%
Offender needs assessment	14	7.6%	45	24.5%	76	41.3%	41	22.3%	8	4.3%	184	352	1.91	49	27%
Ability to identify & implement programs	15	8.2%	45	24.6%	66	36.1%	49	26.8%	8	4.4%	183	356	1.95	57	31%
Sufficient program capacity for offender pop.	15	8.2%	40	21.9%	70	38.3%	48	26.2%	10	5.5%	183	364	1.99	58	32%
Partnerships with other treatment providers	15	8.2%	30	16.3%	79	42.9%	45	24.5%	15	8.2%	184	383	2.08	60	33%
Responding to needs of specific populations	12	6.6%	33	18.0%	74	40.4%	51	27.9%	13	7.1%	183	386	2.11	64	35%
Ability to evaluate program impact	6	3.3%	31	16.8%	75	40.8%	58	31.5%	14	7.6%	184	411	2.23	72	39%
On-site technical assistance	21	11.5%	42	23.0%	49	26.8%	39	21.3%	32	17.5%	183	385	2.10	71	39%
Resources & links on NIC web site	8	4.4%	14	7.7%	26	14.2%	73	39.9%	62	33.9%	183	533	2.91	135	74%
NIC Information Center document delivery	11	6.0%	15	8.2%	43	23.6%	72	39.6%	41	22.5%	182	481	2.64	113	62%
NIC Information Center research assistance	6	3.3%	22	12.1%	64	35.2%	66	36.3%	24	13.2%	182	444	2.44	90	49%
NIC-sponsored network meetings	20	11.2%	47	26.3%	50	27.9%	35	19.6%	27	15.1%	179	360	2.01	62	35%
NIC e-mail discussion groups and forums	23	12.7%	50	27.6%	36	19.9%	29	16.0%	43	23.8%	181	381	2.10	72	40%
Classroom training at NIC Training Center	19	10.4%	27	14.8%	54	29.5%	40	21.9%	43	23.5%	183	427	2.33	83	45%
Classroom training, regionally delivered	7	3.8%	18	9.8%	60	32.8%	64	35.0%	34	18.6%	183	466	2.55	98	54%
Classroom training, on-site at agency	12	6.6%	24	13.1%	68	37.2%	52	28.4%	27	14.8%	183	424	2.32	79	43%
NIC online e-learning (web-based)	14	7.7%	34	18.8%	66	36.5%	34	18.8%	33	18.2%	181	400	2.21	67	37%
NIC e-learning programs on CD-ROM	15	8.2%	25	13.7%	68	37.4%	45	24.7%	29	15.9%	182	412	2.26	74	41%
NIC training sessions at conferences	10	5.4%	25	13.6%	66	35.9%	45	24.5%	38	20.7%	184	444	2.41	83	45%
Broadcasts viewed live by download	29	15.8%	44	24.0%	64	35.0%	28	15.3%	18	9.8%	183	328	1.79	46	25%
Broadcasts viewed live by streaming	22	12.2%	47	26.0%	59	32.6%	35	19.3%	18	9.9%	181	342	1.89	53	29%
Broadcasts viewed later by streaming	30	16.6%	46	25.4%	60	33.1%	28	15.5%	17	9.4%	181	318	1.76	45	25%
Broadcasts viewed later on DVD	20	10.9%	41	22.4%	60	32.8%	39	21.3%	23	12.6%	183	370	2.02	62	34%

## PRISONS

	No need	, as %	Little need	, as %	Some need	, as %	Strong need	, as %	Critical need	, as %	Total ans	Score	AVG SCORE	STR+CRIT	, AS %
Agency mission, vision, & goals	15	31.9%	14	29.8%	11	23.4%	5	10.6%	2	4.3%	47	59	1.26	7	15%
Agency culture & values	3	6.4%	6	12.8%	19	40.4%	15	31.9%	4	8.5%	47	105	2.23	19	40%
Strategic planning	5	10.6%	12	25.5%	15	31.9%	12	25.5%	3	6.4%	47	90	1.91	15	32%
Communications within agency	1	2.1%	6	12.8%	19	40.4%	14	29.8%	7	14.9%	47	114	2.43	21	45%
Coordination across units	3	6.4%	6	12.8%	18	38.3%	15	31.9%	5	10.6%	47	107	2.28	20	43%
Research & evaluation	6	12.8%	5	10.6%	12	25.5%	16	34.0%	8	17.0%	47	109	2.32	24	51%
Internal policy, accountability	5	11.1%	9	20.0%	14	31.1%	11	24.4%	6	13.3%	45	94	2.09	17	38%
Information systems/data mgmt	5	10.6%	5	10.6%	12	25.5%	9	19.1%	16	34.0%	47	120	2.55	25	53%
Technology applications	4	8.5%	8	17.0%	12	25.5%	14	29.8%	9	19.1%	47	110	2.34	23	49%
Contracting/contract mgmt	6	12.8%	15	31.9%	15	31.9%	9	19.1%	2	4.3%	47	80	1.70	11	23%
Access to outside ideas & innovs	4	8.5%	6	12.8%	22	46.8%	13	27.7%	2	4.3%	47	97	2.06	15	32%
Formulating a workable budget	11	22.4%	13	26.5%	13	26.5%	8	16.3%	4	8.2%	49	79	1.61	12	24%
Communicating budgetary needs	8	16.3%	10	20.4%	17	34.7%	8	16.3%	6	12.2%	49	92	1.88	14	29%
Influencing system policies that affect costs	2	4.1%	4	8.2%	18	36.7%	16	32.7%	9	18.4%	49	124	2.53	25	51%
Eliminating/reducing programs, services	15	30.6%	11	22.4%	14	28.6%	6	12.2%	3	6.1%	49	69	1.41	9	18%
Eliminating/reducing staff positions	17	34.7%	12	24.5%	14	28.6%	4	8.2%	2	4.1%	49	60	1.22	6	12%
Creative re-tooling of agency operations	7	14.3%	6	12.2%	26	53.1%	8	16.3%	2	4.1%	49	90	1.84	10	20%
Managing high-cost functional areas	1	2.1%	4	8.3%	13	27.1%	16	33.3%	14	29.2%	48	134	2.79	30	63%
Relations with governing and funding bodies	4	8.5%	13	27.7%	21	44.7%	8	17.0%	1	2.1%	47	83	1.77	9	19%
Involvement in planning, policy and coord.	2	4.3%	11	23.4%	21	44.7%	12	25.5%	1	2.1%	47	93	1.98	13	28%
Collaboration with agencies/providers	2	4.3%	10	21.3%	23	48.9%	9	19.1%	3	6.4%	47	95	2.02	12	26%
Acceptance/support at community level	2	4.3%	9	19.1%	16	34.0%	17	36.2%	3	6.4%	47	104	2.21	20	43%
Relations with justice system stakeholders	2	4.3%	9	19.1%	16	34.0%	17	36.2%	3	6.4%	47	104	2.21	20	43%
Relations with the media	7	14.9%	12	25.5%	18	38.3%	7	14.9%	3	6.4%	47	81	1.72	10	21%
Community acceptance of high-risk pops.	5	10.6%	5	10.6%	9	19.1%	18	38.3%	10	21.3%	47	117	2.49	28	60%
Privatization of correctional services	16	35.6%	11	24.4%	13	28.9%	5	11.1%	0	0.0%	45	52	1.16	5	11%
Planning for staffing needs	1	2.1%	5	10.6%	10	21.3%	22	46.8%	9	19.1%	47	127	2.70	31	66%
New employee recruitmt, screening, selectn	2	4.3%	3	6.4%	17	36.2%	15	31.9%	10	21.3%	47	122	2.60	25	53%
Workforce diversity	4	8.5%	6	12.8%	17	36.2%	16	34.0%	4	8.5%	47	104	2.21	20	43%
Staff retention/turnover	4	8.5%	4	8.5%	12	25.5%	12	25.5%	15	31.9%	47	124	2.64	27	57%
Employee motivation	1	2.1%	2	4.3%	20	42.6%	16	34.0%	8	17.0%	47	122	2.60	24	51%
Employee salary & benefits	5	10.6%	3	6.4%	12	25.5%	18	38.3%	9	19.1%	47	117	2.49	27	57%
Employee supports	3	6.4%	8	17.0%	18	38.3%	15	31.9%	3	6.4%	47	101	2.15	18	38%
Unions/organized labor	16	35.6%	6	13.3%	14	31.1%	4	8.9%	5	11.1%	45	66	1.47	9	20%
Litigation by staff	13	28.3%	12	26.1%	18	39.1%	3	6.5%	0	0.0%	46	57	1.24	3	7%
IDing staff for leadership/executive positions	1	2.1%	5	10.6%	12	25.5%	22	46.8%	7	14.9%	47	123	2.62	29	62%
IDing staff for management/supervisory posits	1	2.1%	7	14.9%	8	17.0%	23	48.9%	8	17.0%	47	124	2.64	31	66%
Training and developing executives/leaders	1	2.1%	4	8.5%	15	31.9%	20	42.6%	7	14.9%	47	122	2.60	27	57%
Training and developing managers/supervis	1	2.1%	2	4.3%	16	34.0%	19	40.4%	9	19.1%	47	127	2.70	28	60%
Management diversity	1	2.1%	8	17.0%	18	38.3%	14	29.8%	6	12.8%	47	110	2.34	20	43%
Succession planning	1	2.1%	2	4.3%	15	31.9%	18	38.3%	11	23.4%	47	130	2.77	29	62%

Training needs assessment	4	8.7%	8	17.4%	18	39.1%	14	30.4%	2	4.3%	46	94	2.04	16	35%
Pre-service training	4	8.7%	11	23.9%	24	52.2%	5	10.9%	2	4.3%	46	82	1.78	7	15%
In-service training	4	8.7%	7	15.2%	19	41.3%	14	30.4%	2	4.3%	46	95	2.07	16	35%
Integration of training with supervision	1	2.2%	8	17.4%	19	41.3%	15	32.6%	3	6.5%	46	103	2.24	18	39%
Adequacy of in-house training capacity	3	6.5%	7	15.2%	19	41.3%	12	26.1%	5	10.9%	46	101	2.20	17	37%
Readiness to use new training technologies	5	10.9%	8	17.4%	16	34.8%	14	30.4%	3	6.5%	46	94	2.04	17	37%
Evaluation of training impact	2	4.3%	2	4.3%	19	41.3%	20	43.5%	3	6.5%	46	112	2.43	23	50%
Capacity to handle offender population	5	10.9%	2	4.3%	16	34.8%	10	21.7%	13	28.3%	46	116	2.52	23	50%
Adequacy of facilities for safe mgmt & sup	5	10.9%	7	15.2%	18	39.1%	10	21.7%	6	13.0%	46	97	2.11	16	35%
Adequacy of facilities to support mission	5	10.9%	4	8.7%	21	45.7%	11	23.9%	5	10.9%	46	99	2.15	16	35%
Age & condition of facilities	5	10.9%	4	8.7%	13	28.3%	12	26.1%	12	26.1%	46	114	2.48	24	52%
Facility planning & development process	6	13.0%	5	10.9%	17	37.0%	11	23.9%	7	15.2%	46	100	2.17	18	39%
Offender risk assessment & classification	5	10.9%	13	28.3%	17	37.0%	9	19.6%	2	4.3%	46	82	1.78	11	24%
Capability to manage across all risk levels	3	6.5%	8	17.4%	19	41.3%	13	28.3%	3	6.5%	46	97	2.11	16	35%
Adequacy of technology to manage offenders	3	6.5%	4	8.7%	18	39.1%	16	34.8%	5	10.9%	46	108	2.35	21	46%
Numeric sufficiency of staff to manage offenders	4	8.9%	6	13.3%	12	26.7%	14	31.1%	9	20.0%	45	108	2.40	23	51%
Skill sufficiency of staff to manage offenders	2	4.3%	7	15.2%	19	41.3%	16	34.8%	2	4.3%	46	101	2.20	18	39%
Litigation by offenders, families, advocates	3	6.7%	17	37.8%	14	31.1%	10	22.2%	1	2.2%	45	79	1.76	11	24%
Litigation by crime victims	12	26.7%	22	48.9%	6	13.3%	4	8.9%	1	2.2%	45	50	1.11	5	11%
Adequacy of offender medical care	4	8.9%	8	17.8%	18	40.0%	13	28.9%	2	4.4%	45	91	2.02	15	33%
Adequacy of offender mental health care	1	2.2%	2	4.4%	14	31.1%	18	40.0%	10	22.2%	45	124	2.76	28	62%
Offender needs assessment	4	8.7%	4	8.7%	19	41.3%	15	32.6%	4	8.7%	46	103	2.24	19	41%
Ability to identify & implement programs	3	6.5%	4	8.7%	16	34.8%	20	43.5%	3	6.5%	46	108	2.35	23	50%
Sufficient program capacity for offender pop.	3	6.5%	2	4.3%	13	28.3%	16	34.8%	12	26.1%	46	124	2.70	28	61%
Partnerships with other treatment providers	2	4.3%	4	8.7%	23	50.0%	15	32.6%	2	4.3%	46	103	2.24	17	37%
Responding to needs of specific populations	2	4.3%	1	2.2%	17	37.0%	20	43.5%	6	13.0%	46	119	2.59	26	57%
Ability to evaluate program impact	3	6.7%	1	2.2%	14	31.1%	21	46.7%	6	13.3%	45	116	2.58	27	60%
On-site technical assistance	1	2.2%	2	4.4%	6	13.3%	18	40.0%	18	40.0%	45	140	3.11	36	80%
Resources & links on NIC web site	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	6.5%	12	26.1%	31	67.4%	46	166	3.61	43	93%
NIC Information Center document delivery	0	0.0%	2	4.3%	10	21.7%	20	43.5%	14	30.4%	46	138	3.00	34	74%
NIC Information Center research assistance	0	0.0%	3	6.7%	9	20.0%	19	42.2%	14	31.1%	45	134	2.98	33	73%
NIC-sponsored network meetings	2	4.3%	1	2.2%	13	28.3%	14	30.4%	16	34.8%	46	133	2.89	30	65%
NIC e-mail discussion groups and forums	1	2.2%	5	10.9%	6	13.0%	7	15.2%	27	58.7%	46	146	3.17	34	74%
Classroom training at NIC Training Center	1	2.2%	2	4.3%	5	10.9%	12	26.1%	26	56.5%	46	152	3.30	38	83%
Classroom training, regionally delivered	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	15.2%	16	34.8%	23	50.0%	46	154	3.35	39	85%
Classroom training, on-site at agency	1	2.2%	1	2.2%	3	6.5%	24	52.2%	17	37.0%	46	147	3.20	41	89%
NIC online e-learning (web-based)	0	0.0%	4	8.7%	19	41.3%	13	28.3%	10	21.7%	46	121	2.63	23	50%
NIC e-learning programs on CD-ROM	0	0.0%	5	10.9%	20	43.5%	10	21.7%	11	23.9%	46	119	2.59	21	46%
NIC training sessions at conferences	0	0.0%	4	8.7%	10	21.7%	11	23.9%	21	45.7%	46	141	3.07	32	70%
Broadcasts viewed live by download	2	4.3%	3	6.5%	9	19.6%	6	13.0%	26	56.5%	46	143	3.11	32	70%
Broadcasts viewed live by streaming	2	4.4%	5	11.1%	9	20.0%	9	20.0%	20	44.4%	45	130	2.89	29	64%
Broadcasts viewed later by streaming	1	2.2%	5	11.1%	12	26.7%	10	22.2%	17	37.8%	45	127	2.82	27	60%
Broadcasts viewed later on DVD	1	2.2%	3	6.7%	11	24.4%	12	26.7%	18	40.0%	45	133	2.96	30	67%

