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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Introduction

Correctional practitioners in the United States are moving toward consensus in establishing uniform standards for adult corrections. By means of offering accreditation to correctional systems in return for compliance with standards, the American Correctional Association (ACA) appears to be establishing itself as the lead agency in the development of correctional standards, most notably for adult corrections (Allinson 54-55). The courts frequently use ACA standards as guidelines for improvements in corrections, thereby creating a more consistent pattern (Sechrest and Reimer 22-24).

Among the numerous ACA Standards pertinent to family policy which are supported by numerous officially known conceptual endorsements by other correctional standard setting bodies are the following:

**Communication, Mail and Visiting**

**Mail**

Standard 2-4371 (ACA 1981)
Written policy and procedure provide that indigent inmates, as defined in policy, receive a specified postage allowance to maintain community ties.

Discussion: Provision should be made to ensure that indigent inmates are able to send a reasonable minimum number of letters per month. Community ties include family, personal friends, etc., but not privileged communication to attorney, public officials and courts. An indigent inmate is a person found to be without financial resources.

-Visiting

Standard 2-4384 (ACA 1981)

Where statute permits, written policy and procedure specify the conditions for extended visits between inmates and their families.

Discussion: Written policy and procedure should provide guidelines for determining which inmates are permitted extended visits with their families, the length of the visit, where the visit should take place and other conditions for the visit. An opportunity to spend from 48 to 72 continuous hours with family members can help inmates re-establish or strengthen family ties. Inmates with appropriate security classifications should be permitted furloughs home of up to three days. The institution should provide suitable private accommodations for extended visits between inmates and their families on institution grounds.

Standard 2-4387 (ACA 1988)

Written policy and procedure provide that inmates with appropriate security classifications are allowed furloughs to the community in order to maintain community and family ties, to seek employment opportunities, and for other purposes consistent with the public interest.
Discussion: Unescorted leaves of absence for a predetermined period of time may be appropriate to allow inmates to participate in work and study release programs, seek post-release employment, make residential plans for parole, conduct business affairs when a personal appearance is necessary, visit family to strengthen or preserve relationships, participate in community activities, or for any other purpose deemed consistent with an inmate's rehabilitation.

Informal discussion with State of Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction (hereafter ODRC or the Department) officials prior to initiation of the study indicated that Departmental family programming had to date been most fully implemented within the Ohio Reformatory for Women (ORW), one of only two correctional institutions for adult female offenders in the state at that time, the other being a pre-release center. The questions guiding this research are first, whether the Department encourages family programming, including but not limited to visiting, and, secondly, how this encouragement manifests itself at the central (state) and facility (ORW) levels.

Purpose of the Research

The purpose of this research effort is to explore why and how centrally formulated policies pertaining to corrections are modified during the implementation process; and why, as a result, local programs derived from such policies may have little in common with the programs
described in the original planning document. This research concerns programs designed by the ODRC to maintain the ties between prisoners and their families, and specifically, examines opportunities for personal interaction at the Ohio Reformatory for Women.

This study compares the intent with the implementation of the family policy of the Department. The research investigates how implementation of centrally formulated policies is affected by local concerns at the prison level and whether the resultant programs are perceived by the families as meeting objectives of re-establishing, maintaining, preserving and strengthening family ties. The question guiding the research is whether the Department complies with ACA Standards pertinent to family policy and how this encouragement is manifested.

This study represents in part a replication of a case study of the New York Correctional System conducted by Valerie Bauhofer (1985) who examined whether the New York State Department of Correctional Services (DOCS) complies with another correctional standard setting body, the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals (1973) which asserts in Standard 2.17 "that correctional authorities should not merely tolerate visiting but should encourage it (68)." Bauhofer
investigated how implementation of centrally formulated policies is affected by local concerns at the prison level and whether the resultant programs are perceived by the families as meeting DOCS objectives of "strengthening family ties."

**Research Objectives**

The following three research objectives duplicate those of the Bauhofer study:

1. To ascertain the expressed or implied existence or absence of a commitment by the Department to families as socialization agents.

2. To assess the relative importance, from a variety of stakeholding perspectives, of family support activities within the hierarchy of Departmental mandates, and particularly in relation to security.

3. To examine closely the major vehicles for face to face family interaction in prison and to determine whether they meet the objective of "maintaining and strengthening ties," and meet the needs of inmate families.

Additionally, the present research will extend the effort begun by Bauhofer by working:
To examine the fit between the information provided by this research effort and the following models of implementation representing current thinking in the field:

(a) The Mazmanian and Sabatier framework: The general framework identifies stages usually involved in the implementation of public programs including: the policy decisions of the implementing agencies; compliance with agency decisions by target groups including the public or private actors whose behavior must ultimately be changed if program objectives are to be realized; the program's actual impacts on the problems being addressed, as well as any unintended impacts; and the perceived impacts of the program and major revisions (or attempted revisions) in the initial statute or other authoritative decision (Mazmanian and Sabatier xii).

(b) Programmed implementation: "The programmed approach calls for "clarity, precision, comprehensiveness ... ." Once the decision is taken pre-programmed
implementation procedures are supposed to be followed by all levels of the organization or government involved (Berman 208, cited in Palumbo and Harder 103)."

(c) Adaptive implementation: "The ideal of adaptive implementation is the establishment of a process that allows policy to be modified, specified and revised—in a word, adapted—according to the unfolding interaction of the policy with its institutional setting . . . it would look more like a disorderly learning process than a predictable procedure" (Berman 211, cited in Palumbo and Harder 104).

(d) Planned implementation: occurs when changes in the original innovation bundle are an expected part of the innovation process and provision is made for them (Rice and Rogers 508, cited in Palumbo and Harder xii).

(e) Reactive implementation: changes occur because they are required by unexpected and unsatisfactory consequences of the original innovation (Rice and Rogers 509, cited in Palumbo and Harder xii).
Assumptions

Confusion and controversy surround the purpose of imprisonment. Two major correctional ideologies are distinguishable which continue to play an important role in the American correctional system. "A punitive ideology justifies the intentional use of strategies that impose pain, suffering, or prolonged discomfort on offenders (Shover and Einstadter 22). Restricted freedom of movement within a correctional facility (security) is in itself a form of punishment. "Rehabilitative ideologies justify intentional modifications of the conditions of offenders' lives in the belief that they will help them" (Shover and Einstadter 22). These models of treatment and prison management typically feature therapy, mental health services and self-help groups (Sechrest and Reimer 19). In beginning her study, Bauhofer postulated ten possible reasons for the apparent discrepancy which she perceived between the official stance of the New York Department of Correctional Services on families, and the uninviting conditions encountered by families at various prisons. During the course of her study Bauhofer examined these assumptions as possible factors contributing to the (perceived) incongruence between the Department's stated intent and the actual experiences of the families at the
local level. To strengthen replication of the New York study, five of these assumptions have been incorporated into the present research effort for examination against observations, against written statements on families in Department documents, and against verbal statements by corrections officials and families.

These assumptions are as follows:

1. The Department has not made a clear commitment to the family as a primary socialization/resocialization agent.

2. The Department has no comprehensive policy on inmate families.

3. The Department is overwhelmingly security oriented; this orientation is reflected in the Department's organization and staffing.

4. Security considerations override programmatic concerns in all circumstances.

5. Facility operations are security oriented, not program oriented. Facility personnel, in general, are not committed to family oriented activities, and consider them a security risk.

Five additional assumptions underpinning Bauhofer's work have not been incorporated into the present research ef-
fort out of concern that these particular assumptions more accurately represent research conclusions rather than assumptions, and, accordingly, might contribute to researcher bias in the present effort.

**Approach**

This research effort consists of an organizational case study utilizing qualitative methods consisting of three types of data collection: indepth, open-ended interviews with a variety of stakeholders; direct observation; and the examination of relevant documents. As in the Bauhofer study, the emphasis within this research effort is upon the human service, rather than the criminal justice, implications of a correctional policy (Bauhofer 22). That is, the focus is directed toward "programs and services designed to enhance people's development and well-being" (Barker 72) rather than upon "the programs, policies, sociopolitical and legal institutions and physical infrastructure designed to help prevent and control crime and to adjudicate, incarcerate and rehabilitate people engaged in illegal behavior" (Barker 36).
Significance of the Study

This research project contributes insights regarding theory building concerning implementation and, further, it contributes to hypothesis generation appropriate for testing in subsequent research. The importance of this research area is articulated by Williams and Elmore who assert that "The greatest difficulty in devising better social programs is not determining what are reasonable policies on paper but finding the means for converting these policies into viable field operations that correspond reasonably well to original intentions" (Williams and Elmore xii).

In discussing the significance of her study, Bauhofer noted in part, "It is expected that the research will contribute significantly to the relatively small pool of information on the problems faced by prisoners' families. It will add to the information on the operation of the so-called 'Total Institutions'" (Bauhofer 23), a term employed by sociologist Erving Goffman to describe "... a place where a large number of like-situated individuals, cut off from the wider society for an appreciable length of time, together lead an enclosed, formally administered round of life (Goffman viii)."
To date there has been only minimal validation of policy and organizational research through replication (Jick 146). The proposed study, representing as it does, replication of an existing study by a different researcher in a new setting with new informants, re-examines the design and method of the previous effort, allowing for comparability.

It is expected that the findings can be used to inform public policy and program designers, and/or to inform its implementation. As articulated by Williams and Elmore, "Only when we look in detail at the interrelationship of decisionmaking and implementation will we be able to unravel some of the mysteries of putting programs in place" (Williams and Elmore xii).
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CHAPTER II
PARADIGM AND METHODOLOGY

Research Problem

Policy implementation has been defined as "the stage of policy making between the establishment of a policy--such as the passage of a legislative act, the issuing of an executive order, the handing down of a judicial decision, or the promulgation of a regulatory rule--and the consequences of a policy for the people whom it affects" (Edwards 1). In a classic work on implementation, Pressman and Wildavsky (1973) described the process of implementing policy as so difficult that it should come as a surprise when policies have any favorable accomplishments. They noted that little research had been carried out on the topic and that no theory of implementation existed.

Writing nearly a decade later, Palumbo and Harder concluded that, despite "an explosion of research on the subject," no great advances had been made toward the development of a theory of implementation (Palumbo and Harder ix). Mazmanian and Sabatier (1981) support these observations:
... little consensus has emerged on the appropriate framework within which to conduct implementation research or even on the relevant range of variables to be included. Thus the present generation of studies is not cumulative; each is usually focused on particular portions of specific programs or on a narrow slice of the implementation process (for example, the general problem of bureaucratic resistance to change) with few attempts to develop the kinds of broad generalizations that could be forthcoming from more comparative studies within or across policy arenas and from a concerted effort to develop a broader conceptual framework (xi).

This policy research effort is meant to expand understanding of why and how social policies are implemented. The specific focus of the policy analysis deals with operational, fiscal and political viability of implementation of family policy in corrections. The research describes the implementation of family policy in corrections. Furthermore, the research examines the process of policy implementation in correctional settings. This research contributes to hypothesis generation appropriate for testing in subsequent research.

Subsidiary Questions

This research project requires information concerning the process of program implementation. It is necessary to know how and to what extent the program has actually been implemented (Patton 27). Clarification and understanding
of the internal dynamics of program implementation are needed. This includes attention to how the programming is perceived by participants and staff (Patton 23).

Definitions

The major concepts of this study were defined as follows:

Department:

State of Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction, a cabinet level department of the state of Ohio government with central offices located in Columbus, Ohio, which is responsible for the administration and operation of the institutional and community phases of Ohio's adult correctional system (Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction 2).

Family:

A primary group whose members are related by blood, adoption, or marriage and who usually have shared common residences, have mutual rights and obligations, and assume responsibility for the primary socialization of their children (Barker 53).

Innovation:

The willingness and readiness of government to adopt and implement creative and novel policies and programs (Krutschke and Jackson 85).

Policy:

A course or line of action adopted and pursued by an agency which guides and determines present and future decisions and actions. Policies indicate the general course or direction of an organization, within which the activities of the personnel and units must operate. They are
statements of guiding principles which should be followed in directing activities toward the attainment of objectives. Their attainment may lead to compliance with standards as well as compliance with the overall goals of the agency/system (American Correctional Association, 1981, 128).

Policy Implementation:

The stage of policy making between the establishment of a policy--such as the passage of a legislative act, the issuing of an executive order, the handing down of a judicial decision, or the promulgation of a regulatory rule--and the consequences of a policy for the people whom it affects (Edwards 1).

Program:

The plan or system through which a correctional agency works to meet its goals; often this program requires a distinct physical setting, such as a correctional institution (American Correctional Association, 1981, 128).

Rehabilitation:

Restoring to a healthy and useful capacity or to as satisfactory a condition as possible . . . (Barker 138).

Security:

The degree of restriction of inmate movement within a correctional facility, usually divided into maximum, medium and minimum levels (American Correctional Association, 1981, 129).

Design Type

The research goal calls for the utilization of an exploratory design which is most appropriate for the achievement of new insights leading to concept generation.
and formulation. To insure that the substantive conceptualization fits with correctional contexts, the design must facilitate the inductive development of conceptualization from insights gained in a correctional setting and from the insights of correctional literature, along the lines suggested by Glaser and Strauss (1967) for the development of grounded theory.

The research effort consists of an organizational case study utilizing qualitative methods consisting of three types of data collection:

- indepth, open-ended interviews with key informants;
- direct observation; and
- examination of relevant documents.

Perspectives on models of implementation representing current thinking in the field provide an a priori axiomatic framework to guide the inductive inquiry.

As in all naturalistic inquiry, the design could only be partly known at the beginning. Data collection methods have drawn heavily upon state of the art recommendations concerning topics to be addressed in evaluation of the process of program implementation. Most data analysis has been carried out in an open-ended way following the constant comparative method suggested by Glaser and Strauss.
(1967) for the development of grounded theory. Such continuous data processing allowed for the unfolding of the design along with the successive focusing of the study (Miles and Huberman 11). Comparative analysis has been used to generate insights relevant to both substantive and formal theory development. At the substantive level, these insights are specific to implementation of family policy in correctional settings; at the level of formal theory, the insights concern relationships which occur during implementation of diverse policies in correctional settings.

According to Glaser and Strauss:

Our approach, allowing substantive concepts and hypotheses to emerge first, on their own, enables the analyst to ascertain which, if any, existing formal theory may help him generate his substantive theories. . . .

Substantive theory, in turn helps to generate new grounded formal theories and to re-formulate previously established ones (34).

Glaser and Strauss emphasize that the move from substantive to formal theory requires additional analysis of the insights related to the substantive theory in conjunction with secondary analysis of other researchers' theories (in this case, models) of import across diverse substantive contexts (115). The present research examines the fit between the information provided by this research
effort concerning implementation of family policy in correctional settings and models of implementation previously identified as representing current thinking in the field.

Study Sites

The Ohio Reformatory for Women, the only long term correctional institution for adult female offenders in Ohio, is located in central Ohio on 260 acres outside the town of Marysville in Union County. The facility houses both young first offenders as well as older repeat offenders and includes all security levels.

Constructed in 1916, the Reformatory originally consisted of one building designed to accommodate seventy-four inmates. A hospital building and five cottages were subsequently added. Although its present capacity is 950, the Reformatory has an inmate population which has recently exceeded 1,600.

The Reformatory is operated by the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction.

The mission of the department is to provide community protection and public safety through the operation of safe, secure and humane facilities that offer inmates rehabilitation opportunities (Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction 2).
Starting in 1985 the Department began to create a database for study and analysis of Ohio's inmate population. A study based on this database utilized data gathered on all females entering the Ohio prison system during September and October of 1985 (N=169). 42.6 percent of the women were initially assigned to the Ohio Reformatory for Women while 57.4 percent were assigned to the Correctional Pre-release Center at Pickaway.

Fifty-five percent of the female intake population was black and 43.8 percent white, although black females comprised only 10 percent of the female population of Ohio according to the 1980 United States Census Report for Ohio. Over 70 percent of the women in this study were committed from the six most heavily populated of Ohio's eighty-eight counties. Twenty-three percent of these women were married (including separated and common law) at the time of admission and 16 percent were divorced. Fifty-seven and one-half percent of Ohio's families were married (including separated), according to the 1980 United States Census Report.

The median age of the women in the sample at first arrest was nineteen years, 23.5 years for first felony conviction, and thirty years at the time of the most recent admission. Eighty-four percent of these women were
new admissions from court in contrast with returned parole violators (2.4 percent), parole violators recommissioned for a new crime (10.1 percent), and shock probationers whose probation was revoked (3.6 percent).

Among additional patterns observed in this descriptive study are the following:

- 78% of the women committed their most serious current crime against property rather than against persons. A similar pattern is evident for most recent offense and most serious prior offense.

- Grand theft was the most serious current offense for the largest proportion of the sample, followed by forgery/bad check writing and drug law violations. Again, the same pattern is apparent when most serious prior offense and most recent offense are considered.

- Almost two-thirds (64.5%) of the women in the intake sample received determinate sentences, the largest proportion of whom received one year sentences. Of these women, 68.8% were eligible for release in one year or less.

- The most common minimum indeterminate sentence for most serious offense was three years, and the most common maximum indeterminate sentence for most serious offense was five years.

- Of those women receiving indeterminate sentences, almost two thirds (65%) were to reach their first parole hearing date in less than three years.

- Just over half of the women in the intake sample had prior adult felony convictions, but less than one third had prior adult
incarcerations. In addition, less than half the women had adult supervisions for parole or probation.

- Only 8.3% had ever been convicted for violent crimes.

- A high prevalence of substance abuse as well as mental illness was present among the women in the intake sample (Sussman 1988).

In an extension of the above research, data was gathered on a 33 percent random sample of the women on whom intake data were gathered. The number of children claimed by this smaller group of women was 2.2 (Sussman 1989, 1).

Research Agreements and Informed Consent

Permission to conduct this study was obtained from the Research Committee of the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction and from the Warden of the Ohio Reformatory for Women. Of note, the Warden indicated that the use of tape recorders would not be permitted at the Reformatory. Additionally, clearance to conduct the study was secured from the Behavioral and Social Sciences Human Subjects Review Committee of The Ohio State University.
Interviews

Respondent Groups

The research design called for interviews to be conducted with up to twenty-five (25) State of Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction officials who are key policy and decision makers at the central and facility levels. As in the Bauhofer study, the criteria for informant selection were as follows:

a. The person has a specific and comprehensive knowledge of the family support programs by virtue of his/her position;

b. The person is in a decision-making position at the central or institutional level; and

c. The person is willing to participate in the research.

The plan likewise called for interviews to be conducted with ten (10) relatives of women incarcerated in the Ohio Reformatory for Women, as well as with five (5) to ten (10) persons representing neither the Department nor the families, but who have a specific interest in, or expert knowledge of, family matters within the Department.

One of several types of purposive sampling identified by Patton, maximum variation sampling, was employed based upon its suitability for "capturing and describing the
central themes or principal outcomes that cut across a great deal of participant or program variation" (Patton 53). For the most part, the emergent sampling process concerning each of the above groups of respondents began with a gatekeeper or someone nominated by the gatekeeper with successive units "selected in accord with the need to extend, test, or fill in information. As insights and data accumulate, the sample will be refined in an effort to focus more specifically on the most relevant units" (Lincoln and Guba 201-202).

Consideration was given to the inclusion of persons employed by the Department at the central or facility (ORW) level within the recent past but who are no longer so employed. This decision was made after informal discussion with corrections staff indicated that it might prove difficult to locate twenty-five (25) staff having a thorough knowledge of the family support programs. Of note, here, Miles and Huberman admonish researchers to avoid the danger of sampling too narrowly by working a bit at the peripheries--"to talk to people who are not central to the phenomenon but are neighbors to it, to people no longer actively involved, to dissidents and renegades and eccentrics" (Miles and Huberman, 42).

Fourteen (14) interviews were conducted with
Department officials who are key policy and decision makers at the central and facility levels. Two interviews with individuals employed by the Department at the central or facility (ORW) level in the recent past were also completed. Interviews were likewise completed with eleven (11) relatives of women incarcerated at the Ohio Reformatory for Women, as well as with nine (9) persons representing neither the Department nor the families, but who have a specific interest in, or expert knowledge of, family matters within the Department. In addition, a number of informal interviews involving members of each of the stakeholder groups took place throughout the course of the research project and provided valuable data.

It is not possible to identify the respondents further without compromising the commitment made to them by the researcher concerning preserving the confidentiality of their responses. In large part, potential respondents were identified by means of the researcher asking the individual respondents for suggestions concerning other individuals possessing a perspective on the research topic. Attention was given to identifying persons who might have a divergent perspective from the respondent.

A decision was made to include family members of women recently released or transferred from the
Reformatory. This was in part a pragmatic move made at a point when it became apparent that, as a group, these individuals were more willing to participate in the research project than were current inmates' families who feared drawing negative attention to themselves. This was determined to strengthen the research effort by enhancing the possibility of candid responses from persons who viewed themselves as having less to lose than did the families of women currently incarcerated.

Active efforts were made to seek out black families who have an incarcerated family member due to the fact that the majority of the ORW inmate population is black. Six of the eleven family respondents are black persons. Interviews were completed with two family members who, while not biologically related to the inmate, had informally "adopted" her and expect to provide a home for her upon release. This appears to be in line with the recommendation of Miles and Huberman cited above to avoid sampling too narrowly by working a bit at the peripheries.

The Interview Process

Nonstructured, indepth, focused interviews were employed in all cases. Open-ended questions were used based on an interview guide approach. The open-ended questions
were used as guidelines rather than rigid rules. Questions to be asked were determined by the unfolding of dialogue between researcher and respondent. (See topical outline Appendix A).

Information regarding the study pertinent to each of the three respondent groups was provided orally and in written form. (See Appendix B). The researcher cultivated mutual respect and interaction. Both the respondent and the researcher signed the consent form prior to beginning the interview. The respondent was informed of the option of turning off the recorder at any time if there should be anything he/she would not want on the tape.

Documents

Policy and operating documents including, among others, ODRC Administrative Regulations, ORW custody orders, and Departmental annual reports, were two of the seven data sources used. Also included for analysis were a number of unofficial documents such as newsletters from criminal justice organizations and pertinent articles from newspapers. Being unfamiliar with the bureaucratic workings of the Department, the researcher sought information from individual interview respondents regarding the avail-
ability and pertinence of many documents. More than sixty documents were reviewed.

In general, the following criteria established by Bauhofer determined the selection of documents for content analysis:

1. The documents relate in a significant way to the Department's family support programs;
2. The documents reflect discrepancy between intent and implementation, or between program goals and security considerations; and
3. The documents reflect special concern or disregard for the needs of families.

Observations

Much of the observation of necessity took place immediately before, during, and immediately subsequent to the formal interviews with the interviewer noting her impressions regarding the respondents and their environment. Additionally, opportunity to observe arose during reading of documents. As recommended by Blalock, a specific format for observing and recording observations was devised prior to data collection, based in part on previous knowledge of the phenomenon, to include reflections upon how the interviewer's style and approach affected the interviews (97).
Adequacy of Data Base

Determination that an adequate qualitative data base had been achieved was based upon criteria suggested by Guba and Lincoln for determining when to stop collecting information to include the following: only incremental gains realized from additional respondents, exhaustion of sources, saturation, emergence of regularities and over-extension (1981, 310) with informational redundancy being the primary criterion for terminating sampling (1985, 202).

Data Analysis

Data analysis proceeded in an open-ended way according to the following four stages of the constant comparative method for developing grounded theory described by Glaser and Strauss (1967) and refined by Lincoln and Guba (1985):

1) comparing incidents applicable to each category;
2) integrating categories and their properties;
3) delimiting the theory; and
4) writing the theory.

This inductive method which places high emphasis upon process relies upon the underlying operation of simultaneous collection, coding and analysis of data. Glaser and
Strauss emphasize, "The generation of theory as process requires that all three operations be done together as much as possible. They should blur and intertwine continually, from the beginning of an investigation to its end...(43).

Within the study data summary sheets were prepared for each of the three procedures to be used (i.e., observation, interview and document review). As recommended by Miles and Huberman, display formats were generated "near the end of data collection when they can be more contextually and empirically grounded" (89).

Comparative analysis has been used to generate insights relevant to both substantive and formal theory development. As stated previously, at the substantive level, these insights are specific to implementation of family policy in correctional settings; at the level of formal theory, the insights concern relationships which occur during implementation of diverse policies in correctional settings.

The move from substantive to formal theory required additional analysis of the insights related to the implementation of family policy in correctional settings in conjunction with secondary analysis of other researchers' models of implementation across diverse substantive
contexts. These models include: The Mazamanian and Sabatier framework; Berman's models of programmed and adaptive implementation; and the models of planned and reactive implementation proposed by Rice and Rogers.

Adequacy of the Research Design

Both conventional and qualitative research require that the design fit the characteristic of the research problem and criteria for rigorous procedure. Qualitative research design demands attention to each of the following criteria for establishing adequacy of design (Lincoln and Guba, 1985, 226-249).

Fits Realistic Limits

The Ohio Reformatory for Women was selected for study of family policy programming implementation because initial assessment indicated that departmental family programming has been most fully developed within this facility. As in the Bauhofer study, the focus of this effort has been directed toward the human service rather than the criminal justice implications of a correctional policy. "Therefore the statements of families and officials will be given equal attention, even though in the real world of
corrections, they are of vastly different importance" (Bauhofer 22).

The selection of three diverse stakeholder groups, "including people who formulate, implement and are affected by family policy," incorporates unique experiences and expectations to the assessment (Bauhofer 26). Throughout the study attention has been given to cultivating mutual respect and interaction with the researcher presenting herself to the respondents as one wanting to know and understand.

Perspectives on implementation representing current thinking in the field set forth in the Introduction provide an a priori axiomatic framework to guide the inductive inquiry. The ultimate model surfacing through inductive analysis has been confronted with this dominant systematized knowledge in the field. This design strategy heeds the warning of Glaser and Strauss:

> Without theoretical criteria, delimiting a universe of data, if done at all, can become very arbitrary and less likely to yield an integrated product; the analyst is also more likely to waste time on what may later prove to be irrelevant incidents and categories (1967, 113, cited in Lincoln and Guba, 1985, 344).

On the other hand, the use of multiple perspectives on implementation successfully overcomes the risk of using
theories or premises which are so narrow as to bias the results (Anderson 165). Glaser and Strauss likewise point to the need for multiple formal theories, "since one theory never handles all relevancies, and because by comparing many theories we can begin to arrive at more inclusive, parsimonious levels" (35).

Fits The Research Topic

The primary method used to study implementation is the case study which enables the identification of factors to be considered in the development of theory (Palumbo and Harder xii). Furthermore, the case study appears most appropriate for matching the concern and methodology of the proposed research because the process of family policy implementation in correctional settings is an area which has not been explored extensively and about which the state of knowledge is relatively poor.

Viano illustrates that one of the primary advantages of qualitative methods concerns the possibility of studying program implementation. "In this way one is in a position to observe and identify the various uncontrolled factors affecting a social experiment and to take account of the possibility that some of these factors may be more salient to the outcome of a given program than any of the independent variables introduced" (109). Specifically,
the constant comparative method of qualitative analysis is particularly well suited to facilitating the generation of theories of process and change pertaining to organizations (Glaser and Strauss 114).

Triangulation of methods can surface different viewpoints which produce elements that do not fit existing theories or models, thereby stimulating the refashioning of old theories or the development of new ones. Divergent results from the use of multi-methods can contribute to an enriched explanation of the research problem.

The use of multi-methods can also lead to a synthesis or integration of theories. In this sense, methodological triangulation closely parallels theoretical triangulation (Denzin, 1978, 295); that is, efforts to bring diverse theories to bear on a common problem (e.g., LeVine and Campbell, 1972; Marris 1975). Finally, triangulation may also serve as the critical test, by virtue of its comprehensiveness, for competing theories (Jick 145).

Qualitative analysis, "guided by questions, issues, or a search for patterns" (Patton 15) is particularly appropriate for the evaluation of program implementation as well as for developing grounded theory (Patton 39-41).

Patton explains:

Because it is impossible to anticipate in advance how programs will adapt to local conditions, needs, and interests, it is impossible to anticipate what standardized
quantities could be used to capture the essence of each program's implementation. Under these evaluation conditions a strategy of naturalistic inquiry is particularly appropriate (28).

This view is likewise supported by Miles and Huberman: "With qualitative data one can preserve chronological flow, assess local causality, and derive fruitful explanations. Then, too, qualitative data are more likely to lead to serendipitous findings and to new theoretical integrations; they help researchers go beyond initial preconceptions and frameworks." Furthermore, in discussing the substantive level, Miles and Huberman cite Smith's description of the manner in which the findings from qualitative studies have concrete meaning for policy makers and practitioners, thereby enhancing the possibility that proposed research can be of help toward improving family programming in corrections (15).

In regard to this study, the researcher is relatively unfamiliar with the bureaucratic workings of the Department including the existence and/or quality of specific written family program documents. In addressing similar problems, King, Morris and Fitz-Gibbon recommend that a qualitative strategy "may be necessary if there is no written plan for the program you are evaluating and you find that the planner cannot retrospectively construct one
with a reasonable degree of consistency. Even if there is a plan, it may be vague or, from your perspective, unrealistic to implement" (22). Likewise, in considering the practical level, the characteristics of the naturalistic paradigm including triangulation with nonverbal clues and unobtrusive measures enable the researcher to more readily uncover discrepancies among the responses of the various stakeholders in public policy analysis situations who are likely to fear they will have something to lose related to status or position by being forthright (Lincoln and Guba, 1985, 231).

Achieves Credibility

Four techniques adopted from suggestions by Lincoln and Guba (1985, 301-331) to support the trustworthiness of naturalistic research have been employed in the following manner:

1. negative case analysis
   - by constantly searching throughout data collection and analysis for instances which do not fit the emerging pattern of the data and by working to understand these deviant cases.

2. member checking
by submitting write-ups of the interviews to the respondents for verification of accuracy and completeness; and by sharing emerging categories of information in successive interviews.

3. peer debriefing
- by the provision of methodological guidance through criticism and suggestion contributed at periodic intervals by the dissertation committee membership.

4. a comprehensive strategy of triangulation encompassing triangulation of:
   a) methods—including interviews, observation and document analysis;
   b) data—involving information found in interviews and documents as well as information obtained through observation; also extends to the participation of respondents in different status positions or with different points of view;
   c) researcher—with the present research effort representing in part a replication by a different researcher of an earlier study conducted by Bauhofer; and
d) theory—involving the use of multiple perspectives, in this case models of implementation, to interpret a single set of data

Achieves Dependability and Confirmability

Audit Trail

Dependability and confirmability of data collection and concept-generation processes and products have been further safeguarded by the establishment of an audit trail. To this end records have been collected within the following audit trail categories operationalized by Halpern (Lincoln and Guba, 1985, 319-320): (1) raw data consisting of interview audio recordings and transcripts, handwritten interview notes, observational records, and documents; (2) data reduction products consisting of write-ups of field notes, condensed notes; (3) data synthesis products including the text of the dissertation; and (4) instrument development information including interview request forms, topical interview outline, and observation and document summary forms.

Reflexive Journal

Additionally, overall trustworthiness of the study is
strengthened by the maintenance of a reflexive journal to include the following parts as suggested by Lincoln and Guba (1985, 327):

1. schedule and logistics of the study;
2. a personal diary focused upon catharsis, self reflection, and speculations concerning emerging insights; and
3. a methodological log in which design decisions are documented.

Allows Transferability

As recommended by Lincoln and Guba, purposive sampling was used to allow the widest possible range of information for inclusion in the thick description required for transferability (1985, 316). Also of significance for transferability, triangulation can potentially generate "holistic work" or "thick description" (Jick, 146). Furthermore, Lincoln and Guba explain that "purposive sampling can be pursued in ways that will maximize the investigator's ability to devise grounded theory that takes adequate account of local conditions, local mutual shapings, and local values" (for possible transferability) (1985, 40).
Upholds Standards of Ethical Research

As is usually the situation in research, this effort involved in part a relatively more powerful person studying "powerless" individuals. In this case the prisoner families can be assumed to be predominately female, poor and disproportionately non-white. Bauhofer reflects that "This has important implications: non-white females and children are the least powerful members of this society, and the least able to challenge authority successfully" (Piven and Cloward, 1971, and Stack, 1974, cited in Bauhofer, 128).

Corrections is an awesomely intimidating system with almost absolute authority. Accordingly, perceived powerlessness on the part of prisoner families could inhibit their full participation in the study. Similarly, corrections personnel could fear that their standing in the organization could be negatively affected by their participation in the project. These issues were addressed in several ways as outlined below.

The research involved no attempts to manipulate, change or deceive either the individual respondents or the social system under study. Ongoing attention was directed toward cultivating mutual respect and interaction between researcher and respondents. As in the Bauhofer study, the
researcher presented herself as one wanting to know and understand. Respect for the rights of participants has been further demonstrated by obtaining both the informed consent of the individual respondents as well as permission of the social system to be studied. Tape recording was done at the option of the individual respondent and refusal by Department personnel to permit taping in specific Department facilities was adhered to fully. Respondents were allowed to stop tape recording at any point in the interview process. The status of all stakeholders as informed participants was further enhanced by submitting write-ups of the interviews to the respondents to be checked for accuracy and completeness.

As in the Bauhofer study, information was not gathered as to the nature of the crime for which the prisoner was incarcerated. This appears to be a prudent measure to prevent researcher bias particularly considering the widespread racial and sexual biases operating within the correctional system which are reflected in sentencing outcomes. Of note, it proved to be important for the researcher to become familiar with language unique to prisoner families and corrections personnel.

The social categories from which the participants
were selected appear to be identical to those which might benefit from the research. However, the researcher made conscious efforts to proceed cautiously in not promising more to the participants than can reasonably be expected by the research effort in terms of drawing attention to the problem at hand.

The researcher has given active attention to exercising all reasonable precautions to protect confidentiality and anonymity of respondents. A code was assigned for each respondent and identifying information removed from field notes and transcripts in order to render the information anonymous. Actual identifying information was stored separately from the data. In preparing the final report, effort has been made to present aggregated information in which individual identities of respondents other than public officials are undetectable.

Provides Relevant Information for the Profession

The profession of social work in the United States, rooted in the Judeo-Christian ethic, has demonstrated an historical preference for service provision on behalf of vulnerable groups of people including prisoners. The present study follows in this tradition by focusing in part upon the needs of an often forgotten minority, the fami-
lies of prisoners. This research contributes to social work's considerable knowledge base with regard to understanding and enhancing the transactions between and among individuals and groups by examining these transactions as they occur within the policy arena of corrections.
REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER TWO


Jick, Todd D. "Mixing Qualitative and Quantitative Methods: Triangulation in Action." Administrative Science Quarterly. 1979, 24, 602-611.


CHAPTER III
LITERATURE REVIEW

The Development of Standards in Corrections

Historically, United States courts have for the most part exhibited a "hands-off" policy of noninterference in corrections and offender rights under which the Federal courts often have refused to accept jurisdiction over prisoner complaints. Judges typically have deferred to the expertise of prison officials and have demonstrated concern over the possibility of impairing their ability to carry out the complex tasks of operating a penal system.

During the late 1960's and early 1970's, a period of escalating violence within correctional settings and of increased public awareness of atrocious prison conditions, U.S. Federal District courts for a time altered their "hands-off" policy of noninterference and began to review the claims of prisoners and to regularly intervene on their behalf. The statute most frequently used to challenge prison conditions is the Federal Civil Rights Act with the constitutional basis for inmate suits most often focused upon the first, eighth or fourteenth amendments.
Among the inmate complaints most frequently litigated by the courts in recent years are visitation and association rights, along with issues related to mail (Palmer 1985, 173).

Although state statutes regulating the provision of correctional services have typically been nonexistent or vague, many states have recently modified their statutes or administrative codes to provide more detailed regulations which in some instances have incorporated recognition of offenders rights. Shover and others speculate that these changes have been motivated in various circumstances by the desire to curtail the flood of prisoner litigation made possible under the Civil Rights Act (Shover 167).

In similar fashion, judicial decisions affecting the operation of correctional facilities have resulted in a resurgence of interest in national corrections standards and their use in a system of voluntary accreditation designed to improve correctional agencies. This strategy at times has been a means of making changes while retaining control within the institution.

Problems persist in the use of correctional standards to improve correctional systems due in part to resistance by state legislators to outside intervention coupled with
the financial burdens involved in creating humane institutions. Additionally, difficulties arise due to the inability to separate the concept of providing humane conditions from the concept of rehabilitation which has often failed or proved only marginally successful (Sechrest and Reimer 20-21). As Shover explains, the implementation and actual impact of minimum standards of humane treatment of offenders are "variously interpreted" within the contexts of state and federal jurisdictions and the administrative machinery of their enforcement, making implementation and actual impact of these standards difficult to assess (Shover 160).

Model standards for the protection of offenders' rights in the United States were first promulgated in the early 1970's by a National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals governed by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA). The six volumes published by the Commission in 1973 included a Report on Corrections which defined the rights of offenders and included guidelines within Standard 2.17 concerning 'Access to the Public' written in the context of regulations affecting mail, personal visitation and the communications media (to be found in Appendix C).

Beginning in 1973, the Ohio Criminal Justice
Supervisory Commission worked to "develop, establish and implement" criminal justice standards and goals. A major impetus for this effort appears to have been the desire at the state level to meet eligibility requirements for Federal Law Enforcement Administration Assistance funding.

Toward this end, in October of 1973, the Administration of Justice section of the Ohio Department of Economic and Community Development awarded a grant to the Program for the Study of Crime and Delinquency at The Ohio State University for the purpose of completing a standards comparison report. Five teams of graduate students researched the project and produced a final report which compared the model standards for the protection of offenders' rights adopted in 1973 by the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals with standards developed by more than 100 other criminal justice groups in the United States (Administration of Justice, Department of Economic and Community Development B-250).

The Comparison Project Final Report cites officially known endorsements of Standard 2.17 concerning 'Access to the Public' by the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) and by the Association of State Correctional Administrators (ASCA) with no conceptual objections or
special considerations on the part of these or other
criminal justice groups noted (94). Within the Final
Report attention is addressed to the official standard of
the American Correctional Association (ACA 1966) which
states that "correspondence and visiting privileges can be
an important and valuable part of a realistic treatment
plan (The Ohio State University Program for The Study of
Crime and Delinquency 27). Subsequent revisions of the
ACA standards including the Standards For Adult
Correctional Institutions (1981, 1990) and the
Correctional Standards Supplement (1988) have likewise
addressed these issues. (A listing of the standards per­
tinent to family policy contained in the 1981, 1988 and
1990 publications can be found in Appendix C.)

Additionally, The Comparison Project Final Report
references the recommendation of the Association of State
Correctional Administrators (ASCA) concerning visits and
correspondence with family and friends:

As visits with family and friends are an
important part of any treatment program, inmates
should be encouraged and given an opportunity to
maintain constructive outside contacts.

Visiting should be conducted informally and
openly, consistent with the security require­
ments and availability of space in each insti­
tution. Visitors should be identified and may
be searched as a protection to the visitors, the
inmates and others in the institution. This
should be done as privately as possible to
facilitate good public relations.
And, as to mail, the ASCA feels that correspondence to family and friends is beneficial for morale . . . . (Comparison Project Final Report 26-27).

Subsequent to the publication of the Comparison Project Final Report, the American Bar Association (ABA) likewise addressed the issue of standards for the rights and treatment of prisoners. The ABA standards, written in consultation with the ACA, include numerous standards related to family policy (to be found in Appendix C). Whereas the ACA standards are written from the operational perspective, of the corrections administrator, the ABA standards represent a legalistic view of the issues involved (Allinson 57). Nevertheless, the two documents are harmonious in their approach to issues related to family policy/programming.

Another source of standards not referenced by the Standards Project which confined its review to a survey of American correctional groups is the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners and Related Recommendations adopted in 1955. These standards state in part:

re: contact with the outside world -- Prisoners shall be allowed under necessary supervision, to communicate with their family and reputable friends at regular intervals, both by correspondence and by receiving visits. . . .
re: social relations and after-care -- Special attention shall be paid to the maintenance and improvement of such relations between a prisoner and his family as are desirable in the best interests of both.

From the beginning of a prisoner's sentence, consideration shall be given to his future after release and he shall be encouraged and assisted to maintain or establish such relations with persons or agencies outside the institution as may promote the best interests of his family and his own social rehabilitation (Palmer 955-961).

As stated previously, the American Correctional Association has, by means of offering accreditation to correctional systems in return for compliance with standards, established itself in many quarters as the lead agency in the development of correctional standards, most notably for adult corrections (Allinson 54-55), Sechrest and Reimer cite examples of the courts using American Correctional Association accreditation standards as guidelines for improvements in corrections, thereby creating a more consistent pattern (22-24).

Approximately nine hundred correctional agencies are active participants in the ACA accreditation process (American Correctional Association). The Dayton Correctional Institution became the first correctional facility in Ohio to achieve ACA accreditation. Subsequently, the Lima Correctional Institution and the Hocking Correctional Institution were granted ACA
certification in the areas of food service and health service programming respectively. A 5-year plan has been undertaken by the ODRC whereby all correctional institutions within the Department will pursue accreditation.

The Special Needs of Prisoners' Families

The American correctional system treats prisoners as individuals rather than as family members. Yet, existing research clearly indicates the special needs of this group.

The first study of prisoners' families appears to have been made in the state of Kentucky in 1928 by Ruth Bloodgood for the United States Department of Labor. This empirical study was conducted to determine the effect of the state's system of compensation for prison labor upon the families of prisoners. Bloodgood found that most families were undergoing great financial difficulties which were more severe for rural than urban families due to the complete lack of rural social services or public welfare (Schneller 4-5). The state of Kentucky subsequently increased its rate of payment for prison labor (Bloodgood 3).

The second study was an unpublished master's thesis
completed in 1938 by Jerome G. Sacks in Washington, D.C. Sacks found that a majority of prisoners' families could not make satisfactory economic and social adjustments with the basic problem appearing to be the lack of communication between the families and the prison and between the families and the social service agencies in the community. Sacks recommended an extension of parole work to include work with families during the period of inmates' incarceration (Sacks, cited in Schneller 5-6).

James Blackwell appears to have been the first researcher to utilize family-crisis theory in studying prisoners' families. In his doctoral thesis research (1959) conducted in the state of Washington, Blackwell attempted to discover variables related to family adjustment to the incarceration of the husband and/or father. He found that the marital adjustment before the separation was significantly and positively related to the marital adjustment during the separation. Blackwell concluded that marital and family adjustment during and after imprisonment could be predicted with a significant degree of accuracy (Blackwell 51, cited in Swan 42-43) with the following variables positively related to good adjustment to the separation:
1. High family income before separation
2. High level of education by the couple
3. Wife pregnant at time of marriage
4. Couple divorced at the time of incarceration
5. Good marital adjustment before separation
6. Short minimum sentence
7. Separation not seen by wife as a crisis
8. Present marriage of long duration
9. Large amount of mail correspondence during incarceration
10. Good institutional adjustment by inmate

The most thorough of these studies involved a 3-year research project conducted in England and Wales by Pauline Morris (1965) who studied large numbers of inmates and their wives. Additionally, she conducted intensive interviews with a smaller subsample of wives. The problems cited by the women in the Morris study as being most difficult included: money, management of children, loneliness and sexual frustration, fears regarding the husband's discharge, and housing. Based on her research findings, Morris concluded that family relationships following conviction and imprisonment will follow a pattern set by the family relationship before imprisonment. Wives with wide kinship networks were found to seek additional support from them during the husband's imprisonment. Social service agencies did not have extensive contact with the prisoners' families despite the need for social services (Morris, cited in Schneller 9-10).
Nancy Anderson (1965) studied prisoners and prisoners' families in Melbourne, Australia to discover whether community services were meeting the needs of prisoners' families. Anderson concluded that the disruption of economic resources and of interpersonal roles and relationships had the greatest impact on prisoners' families with variation in the amount of crisis appearing to lie in differences in social class and the husband's previous criminal record (Anderson, cited in Swan 44).

Williams and Elder (1970) found that the wives of inmates suffer social ostracism, guilt, loneliness, anxiety, and depression with the greatest impact being psychosexual. On the basis of their research, they concluded:

The evidence would tend to show that the complete isolation of the husband from the wife for a number of years had deleterious effects on the family and places it under such strain that its survival or rebuilding potentialities were exceedingly small. Some new approach must of necessity be found if society and the community in general are not to become the victims of their own vigilance (Williams and Elder 212, cited in Burstein 1977, 21-22).

Howlett (1973) reported that the first two years of imprisonment are critical for determining whether the wife will maintain the relationship. He discovered that the first victims of marital dissolution in prisons are newly-
weds. Family relationships of longer duration survive imprisonment longer although the emotional pain is proportionately greater (Howlett 8, cited in Burstein 1977, 21).

Schwartz and Weintraub (1974) found that many of the women in their Buffalo, New York study were completely drained emotionally and financially after using all their resources to keep their men out of jail (Schwartz and Weintraub 1974, cited in Bauhofer 48). Weintraub (1976) recommended specific types of assistance to be provided by social service agencies to families at specific crisis points including arrest, sentencing, incarceration and release. She encouraged institutions to develop volunteer components to help provide these services.

A study conducted by Brodsky (1975) focused upon the interpersonal relationships of incarcerated adult males. His findings indicated that the largest number of subjects maintained their interpersonal relationships with free-world persons at about the same level that existed in pre-confinement. Specifically, in every way in which the relationships were examined, mothers or parents maintained contact at overall same levels as before. In contrast, the outcome of relationships with wives was unpredictable, with spouses demonstrating a pattern of getting very close or very distant (Brodsky 122-123).
Donald P. Schneller (1976) examined the effects of imprisonment on the families of ninety-three legally married black inmates who were in a medium-security prison in Washington, D.C. His findings suggest that change in social acceptance of the families was not a problem of significance for a majority of the families, but financial status and sexual-emotional frustration were significantly altered for the worse and presented real problems for a majority of wives (Schneller, cited in Swan 44-45). Schneller recommended expanded visiting privileges and a free visitors' transportation service for poor families, the increase of family counseling in prison, and the introduction of conjugal visits and home furloughs for married inmates (Schneller 90).

Swan (1981) studied the families of black prisoners to determine the nature and extent of the problems these families face before, during, and after the imprisonment of a family member. As a result of his research, Swan recommended intervention services to be provided for these families at each stage in the imprisonment crisis.

A growing body of literature exists on the impacts of separation on the children of incarcerated parents. Studies of the effects of fathers' absence on child development have consistently indicated its negative consequences
such as relationships between fathers' absence and children's delinquent behavior, low intellectual functioning, and poor emotional health (Earl and Lohmann 1978).

William and Joan McCord (1959), in researching the etiology of psychopathy, indicate that children of prisoners become delinquent due to rejection by their fathers and being ignored by their troubled families. Friedman and Esselstyn (1965) studied 100 children of jail inmates confined in California and found the children demonstrating academic and social adjustments far below those of other children six months after the imprisonment of the fathers (Friedman and Esselstyn 1965, cited in Brodsky 13). Although the casual connection was not precisely articulated, evidence of greater damage in the girls than the boys when the father is committed was found (Friedman and Esselstyn 59).

Recognizing the large number of children who were not told about their fathers' imprisonment at San Quentin Prison, Wilmer, Marks, and Pogue (1966) studied the "need to deceive" and the parents' illusion that they were "protecting" their children. The researchers found that deception contributes to trends toward delinquency in prisoners' children. They concluded that the children should be told the truth and the deception was dealt with
through the family counseling program operated at the prison.

In studying families of male, caucasian prisoners, Sack, Seidler, and Thomas (1976) concluded that the father's incarceration led to temporary problematic behavior on the part of their children, anti-social behavior on the part of a few pubertal youngsters, and stigmatizing and traumatizing effects upon the spouse and child left behind (Sack, Seidler, and Thomas, cited in Baunach 5).

Serapio R. Zalba conducted a study of "Women Offenders and Their Families" in California. The primary focus of the study concerned the problems faced by children who are separated from their mothers because of the women's imprisonment. Zalba also investigated community services available to assist these children. Zalba describes a very poor level of cooperation and communication among the various agencies working with the mothers and children. Zalba stressed the need for family oriented planning, both for the welfare of the children and the rehabilitation of their mothers, which, she indicated, required cooperation among the agencies involved (Zalba, cited in Schneller 8).

Gibbs (1967) studied the effects of the imprisonment of women upon their children. She found the position of
children whose mothers were incarcerated in Holloway prison in London to involve serious social and familial disorganization.

A frequently cited study of women's correctional facilities conducted by McGowan and Blumenthal during 1974-75 for the Children's Defense Fund documented a range of problems children and families experience at each point in the criminal justice process due to the lack of appropriate services and social concern. McGowan and Blumenthal elaborate:

As this study demonstrates, American society continues to punish children for the crimes of their parents . . . often they (the children) are removed abruptly from their homes, schools, and communities, shuttled from one caretaker to another, deprived of seeing their parents or siblings, teased and avoided by their peers, and left to comprehend on their own what is happening. That these experiences are the result of neglect, not malicious intent, does not lessen their punitive consequences for the children involved.

A society that would not deliberately punish children for the offenses of their parents permits this neglect for several reasons . . . because of the lack of a national family policy, no effort is made to evaluate the impact of criminal justice policies and practices on family life . . . no one agency or group of agencies is assigned responsibility for considering the total needs of children or families . . . (and) children of women prisoners are usually poor and are often non-white -- they are part of that group of children whose needs are consistently disregarded by the larger society (1-2).
Whether or not the parents' incarceration or criminal behavior may be totally or mostly responsible for the negative psychological effects evidenced by their children has not been demonstrated to date. In part, this is because little is known about the quality of the parent-child relationship before the arrest. As noted by Ross and Fabiano in discussing mother-child separation, family breakdown may have occurred long before the parent's arrest or incarceration (56).

**Family Programming**

Prison colonies offering opportunities for parents and children to live together have been established in Brazil, Peru, India, Jordan, Mexico, the Philippines and the Soviet Union. The structure of some colonies including Mexico's *Tres Marias* Penal Colony, enable the prisoners to support their families during incarceration by holding jobs. Among the benefits of penal colonies cited by Murton (1983a and 1983b) is the opportunity to learn responsibility by accepting responsibility for dependents. Murton also argues that an inmate's transition on release would be enhanced by the experience (Murton 1983a and Murton 1983b, cited in Bourdouris).
To date, prisons in the United States have not experimented with allowing families of prisoners to live on the grounds. Bourdouris asserts that, given adequate funding and support, penal colonies may prove worthwhile and he calls for adequate research and evaluation in this area (31).

The American prison reform movement of the 1960's generated concern about pregnant inmates, incarcerated mothers and their children, and the disruption of families. Slow but significant progress has been made in creating and maintaining a more humane environment. This is particularly evident in women's institutions which have benefitted in some ways from benign neglect and stereotypical attitudes which have allowed innovative programming to be tried in some institutions because they house women (Hunter 134). As noted by Neto and Bainer, theoretical support for this kind of program comes from bonding theory, psychoanalytic theory and numerous studies of the impact of parent-child separation, whatever the reasons (1983, 129).

Approximately two-thirds of incarcerated women have dependent children eighteen years old or younger and a substantial proportion of women are pregnant upon entering prison. Often these inmate mothers are head of a house-
hold. In general, they are young, low-skilled, poor and often black (Baunach, 1982, 155).

One of the greatest concerns of these women is their children (Ward and Kassebaum 1965; Baunach and Murton 1975; Glick and Neto 1977; Stanton 1980; Baunach 1982; and Henriques 1982). Women in prison are more likely than male inmates to have been the primary caretaker and, in many instances, the sole parent before incarceration (Datesman and Cales 142).

The vast majority of children of incarcerated men remain with the children's mothers. In contrast, children of women prisoners are most often placed with relatives (seldom with fathers) which represents a change of physical environment for a significant number of the children.

**Child Placement**

Ross and Fabiano cite several studies indicating that 10 to 12 percent of the children are placed into foster care (Skoler and McKeown 1974; McGowan and Blumenthal 1976; and Rogers and Carey 1979). It appears somewhat unclear how many children were removed from the mother's care prior to her arrest.
A program in place at the Purdy Treatment Center for Women in Washington State permits children to be placed in foster homes close to the prison. The inmate mother participates in the selection of her child's foster home and the mother is permitted to visit in the home. The foster mother and natural mother meet regularly to discuss the child's needs and progress.

**Pregnant Inmates**

The presence of pregnant inmates requires that matters of health care, counseling, placement and adoption services be addressed. Furthermore, for the numerous pregnant inmates wishing to keep their children, correctional managers and child care agencies must confront the issue of separating infants from their mothers at birth in view of the importance of early contact between mother and child and the long-term effects of a serious rupture in the bonding process (Ross and Fabiano 61). Research evidence indicates that persons who miss the "bonding" experience between a baby and its parents (particularly the mother) during the first year are hampered in their ability to develop normal relationships with individuals and society in later life (Klaus and Kennel 1976).
Nurseries

The Neil J. Houston House which opened in December, 1988, in Boston, represents a new kind of state prison designed to keep mothers and their babies together. Operating under a contract between a non-profit advocacy group for women prisoners and the commonwealth Department of Correction, the program serves pregnant prisoners only who must be eligible for early release to be considered for admission. It is expected that the women will complete their sentences at the Houston House which has an atmosphere of a halfway house (The Columbus Dispatch, 12 December, 1988).

In 1975 a Children's Home opened at Preungesheim Prison in Frankfurt, West Germany. The Home can accommodate twenty women and up to twenty-five of their children who are permitted to reside within the facility from infancy to six years of age. In Japan and Venezuela incarcerated mothers are likewise permitted to keep young children in the penal institution (Bourdouris 8).

Early in this century women in the United States routinely kept their children with them in prison until concerns surfaced regarding the stigma attached to the circumstance of a person being born in prison. Currently, the Bedford Hills Correctional Facility for Women in New
York state has the only prison nursery in the United States where infants may live with their mothers for an extended period of time. Most inmate mothers keep their infants with them for the maximum allowable period of one year in the sixty year old Bedford Hills nursery program. Five other states have had nurseries and/or laws mandating nurseries for the children of incarcerated mothers but these programs have been discontinued.

Criticisms of nursery programming typically focus upon: the need for special facilities and additional staff; the perceived inappropriateness of the Department of Correction functioning as a babysitting service; concerns related to security and liability; and paternity rights and the potential for suits to be brought by other relatives regarding the appropriateness of such a placement. Neto and Bainer contend: "Certainly, one could make a case that imprisonment of an infant is cruel and unusual punishment" (1983, 137).

To date, adequate research has not been conducted on the effects upon children of living in a prison for short or long periods of time. Reporting upon his study of prison programming for parents and children, Bourdouris writes:
The reasons for discontinuing prison nurseries seem to have been administrative or political ones. There is no research evidence indicating their abandonment was related in any way to the program's benefits or lack of benefits to children, inmates, or the institution. It may be useful, therefore, to reinstate previously existing programs. With appropriate funding and support, they may yet prove worthwhile... Without adequate research and evaluation we will never know.

Given the experience of several states with prison nurseries, a valuable retrospective study could be made of former prison mothers and children who lived with them in correctional institutions in Florida, Illinois, Kansas, Massachusetts, New York, and Virginia (31).

**Furloughs**

Eighty percent of the fifty-seven women's prisons surveyed by Bourdouris provide furloughs to allow inmates to spend time off the grounds with their families and children. In Georgia qualified pregnant inmates receive a furlough of six to eight weeks in order to give birth outside the prison and arrange for the placement of their infants. Bourdouris noted liberal furlough programs in Maryland, Missouri, New York and Iowa. In Maryland an inmate may leave for a weekend every two weeks under certain conditions. Women incarcerated in Iowa could theoretically spend 14 percent of a year on furlough with
their families, in contrast with 8 percent of a year's sentence in Missouri or New York (15-16).

Bourdouris cited a number of researchers who have recommended furlough programs for mothers to be with their children (Palmer 1972; McGowan and Blumenthal 1978; McCarthy 1979, 1980; Sametz 1980; and Stanton 1980). McCarthy, who described the furlough programs in New York and Connecticut, observed that while furloughs may preserve mother-child ties, they may not prepare the inmate mothers to assume parental responsibilities. She found that the home visit may not be focused upon parenting but upon visiting with relatives and friends and sharing activities with the children.

Community Programs

In the 1970's community facilities and programs designed to offer living accommodations to both mothers and their children became popular. Such mother-child residences serve a small proportion of the women in community corrections. Bourdouris found five states having community facilities for mothers and their children at various stages in the mother's incarceration. While used occasionally as an alternative to prison for offender mothers, these community residences are more often provided as part
of a furlough, home visit, or temporary release program (Ross and Fabiano 58).

**Prison Visiting**

Correctional specialists have viewed prison visiting as an aid to control of behavior during incarceration. Prisoners having close ties with their families and frequent visits are considered less troublesome than those without family support (Scudder 1954; Hopper 1969; Burstein 1977; and Grossman 1981). Thirty-five of the forty inmates interviewed in the Burstein study believed that family programming sharply reduced both violence and contraband among the participants. Research indicates that inmates who feel abandoned by loved ones are more likely to engage in acts of self-destruction (Toch 1975; Johnson 1977; and Rieger 1973).

Correctional experts likewise view prison visiting as rehabilitative in and of itself (Schafer 47). A consistent positive relationship exists between the strengths of family ties and success on parole or reduced recidivism (Ohlin 1954; Glaser 1964; Kirkstra 1967; Holt and Miller 1972; Lambert and Madden 1976; Adams and Fischer 1976; McGowan and Blumenthal 1976; and Homer 1979). This correlation has resulted in recommendations for encouraging
visiting as well as practical suggestions for facilitating the visiting experience (Fenlon 1972; National Advisory Commission 1973; and Weintraub 1976).

Ohlin (1954) constructed a parole success prediction scale for the state of Illinois. He found that 70 percent of those parolees with active family interests, but only 35 percent of the loners, experienced parole success. Daniel Glaser (1964) followed prisoners and releasees from five federal penitentiaries over a five year period. Glaser's study of a sample of 1956 releases from federal prison indicated parole success for 71 percent of the men who had active family interests, and for 50 percent of those who had no family contacts. Holt and Miller (1972) reported in a study of California parolees that "loners" were six times more likely to return to prison during the first year following release than were prisoners who had three or more visits.

Visitation policies and procedures determine the extent to which families can maintain contact with inmates. Historically, visiting in United States prisons took place according to a rigid framework of scheduled hours, days and clearance lists. While this remains true in many correctional settings, the attitudes of American prison administrators and of the general public toward the inter-
action of convicted criminals with the outside world have undergone considerable change (Zemans and Cavan 1958; Schafer 1976; and Moeller 1983). In numerous institutions, visiting environments have been enhanced to provide a more normal setting for family interaction. This appears to be more pronounced in women's institutions which have benefitted from recent attention to the needs of incarcerated women as mothers. Visiting hours have been extended and allowance has been made for both indoor visits as well as outdoor visiting in picnic or play areas.

Twenty-one of fifty-seven women's institutions surveyed by Bourdouris (1985) either provided for or planned to initiate overnight visits between children and their mothers. Bourdouris cited a study conducted by Neto and Bainer (1982) who found that seventy-eight percent of forty state prisons surveyed had traditional visitation policies of fixed hours, searches and contact visits, and 60 percent provided play areas for children. One prison did not permit contact visits.

Comeau notes the scarcity of information about the experiences of prison visitors which prison administrators could draw upon in attempting to facilitate visiting.
In summary, for visitor or family programs to work, administrators need to be aware of how visitors are handled by staff members during the actual prison entrance, shakedown and visitation process, before they can begin to dissolve visitor suspicion and distrust. Additionally, administrators should become familiar with visitors' methods of handling social stigma and family member deprivation in the community and, where possible, avoid identification of program participants as prison visitors or prisoner family members (79).

Bauhofer's study (1985) supports Comeau's suggestion that officers often equate the visitor's status with that of the inmates.

**Conjugal Visiting**

Conjugal visiting refers to programs permitting extended visits and/or overnight stays in private settings on the prison grounds to preserve and maintain the marital bond and the family unit. This programming is frequently referred to as extended family visiting because, in addition to legal spouses, visitors typically include children, parents and grandparents, along with legal guardians. The first program for conjugal visiting in the United States, established in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in South Carolina and Mississippi, was originally available only to male pris-
oners. According to Bourdouris, by 1985, five states allowed conjugal visiting in women's facilities (17).

Jules Burstein, who has studied conjugal visiting extensively, observes:

The existence of conjugal visiting programs in the penitentiaries of many countries outside the United States is generally attributable to two basic factors: a less puritanical and hypocritical attitude about sex, and/or a greater emphasis on the cultural value of the family as a primary and vital social unit (1977, 24).

Hayner (1972) conducted an international survey of conjugal visiting in which he found that conjugal visiting improves family relationships in many cases. The work of Burstein (1976, 1977) represents the most comprehensive analysis of conjugal visiting in United States prisons. In his study of the Family Visiting Program of the California Department of Corrections, Burstein concluded that prisoners who have regular conjugal visits have a significantly lower rate of separation, divorce and serious marital problems (22 percent) than did those who did not have such visits (64 percent).

Holt and Miller (1972) conducted a study of California's family visiting program which included evaluations of the impact of regular visits as well as conjugal visits. On the basis of their findings, Holt and Miller stated:
The positive relationship between strength of family ties and success on parole has held up for 45 years of releases across very diverse offender populations and in different localities. It is doubtful if there is any other research finding in the field of corrections which can approximate this record (Holt and Miller 61, cited in Burstein 1977, 35).

Burstein explains that this statement is based primarily upon two previous research studies whose findings were congruent with those obtained by Holt and Miller. One, carried out by Ohlin (1954) using a sample of men paroled over a twenty year period, demonstrated a similar relationship between the strength of family ties as expressed in frequency of visits and a man's likelihood of becoming a productive citizen after being paroled (or at least avoiding further trouble with the law). In a second study, Glaser (1964) found that the rate of parole success went from 43 percent to 74 percent depending upon whether visits from family members were nonexistent or active and sustained (Burstein 35).

Support Services

High priority support services required in visiting programs include transportation and lodging particularly where prisons are geographically remote and inaccessible by public transportation. Increasingly, private agencies
are meeting these demands, either by contracting with the state department of correction or through their own fund-raising and grant writing efforts (Neto and Bainer 1983, 129). Transportation is likewise required in specific situations to maintain contact with foster homes. Volunteers are sometimes tapped in this role.

Social service personnel skilled in crisis intervention are needed to provide support, advice and advocacy to the inmates as they attempt to deal successfully with bureaucracies. Inmate mothers are more often than not in need of survival skills to enable them to function as the head of a household and as the principal or only wage earner (Ross and Fabiano 60). Legal services are needed regarding custody problems, as well as the current offense and conviction.

Counseling services are called for concerning such issues as what and how to tell their children about their separation. Peer group services are appropriate in dealing with a range of issues, for example, the use of Parents Anonymous discussion groups to confront child abuse problems.

Approximately 97 percent of the fifty-seven institutions surveyed by Bourdouris offered classes on parenting and related subjects or were planning such
courses. Bourdouris notes, however, that this figure may include subjects not specifically designed for incarcerated mothers (14). Most of this training takes place in classroom settings, although on occasion male inmates have been engaged as volunteers for institutionalized children (Gendreau, Burke, and Grant 1980) and female offenders have been employed as day care aides.

Marriage counseling programs for inmates and their spouses are reported in the literature (Fenton 1959; and Neussendorfer 1969). Fenton provided a thorough description of a family counseling program which enlisted the cooperation of family members in the rehabilitation and treatment of the prisoner. Schafer, whose Ph.D. dissertation addressed policies and practices related to visiting of inmates, observed that counseling services are usually aimed at preserving the marriage since this is thought to assure parole support including a guaranteed place of residence for the prisoner upon release.

Models of Policy Implementation

Recently, significant gains have been made toward understanding policy implementation. At an earlier stage, the assumption was widely held that policy is made by
legislators and carried out by administrators. It is now known that administrators likewise make policy. Furthermore, it has been recognized that policy is made not only by those at the top, but by all parts of the hierarchy of administrative agencies, including "street-level bureaucrats" (Lipsky 1978, cited in Palumbo and Harder xi).

A major question yet to be answered concerns how much change should occur in policy during implementation. "A theory of implementation must be able to explain the changes that occur in a policy during implementation" (Palumbo and Harder xi). Toward this end, contemporary research has resulted in two alternative types of implementation models. The classic models, illustrated by the framework of Mazmanian and Sabatier (1981) as well as by Berman's (1980) programmed approach, view the policy process in terms of compliance with centralized decision making. The classic models have been challenged by recent research documenting adaptive processes in bureaucracies and the use of street-level discretion. These models are best represented by Berman's adaptive approach (1980) and by the work on innovation by Rice and Rogers (1980).

**Mazmanian and Sabatier's Framework**

The general framework developed by Mazmanian and Sabatier evolved from their work in the use of regulatory
mechanisms to achieve environmental protection. Accordingly, the framework highlights the manner in which legal directives can constrain the behavior of implementing officials and other actors. Mazmanian and Sabatier state that their general framework of the implementation process is designed to serve as a common reference for research in a variety of substantive policy areas.

The Mazmanian and Sabatier framework identifies stages usually involved in the implementation of public programs including:

- the policy decisions of the implementing agencies;
- compliance with agency decisions by target groups including the public or private actors whose behavior must ultimately be changed if program objectives are to be realized;
- the program's actual impacts on the problems being addressed, as well as any unintended impacts; and
- the perceived impacts of the program and major revisions (or attempted revisions) in the initial statute or other authoritative decision.

The framework examines the effects on one or more stages of three sets of independent variables:
1. The tractability of the problem being addressed, for example, the availability of a valid theory of the factors affecting a problem and the extent of change required in target group behavior;

2. A variety of ways in which a statute or other policy directive can constrain the implementation process through the clarity of its directives and the assignment of rights and responsibilities to various actors; and

3. The nonstatutory variables, for example, the attitudes and resources of various sovereigns and constituency groups, affecting policy implementation (Mazmanian and Sabatier xii).

Berman's Programmed Implementation Approach

The programmed approach calls for 'clarity, precision, comprehensiveness . . . of the preliminary policy or design specifications' (Williams 1976, 281). Such specificity is sought before the final decision on policy alternatives. Once the decision is taken, pre-programmed implementation procedures are supposed to be followed by all levels of the organization or government involved (Berman 208).

Berman stresses the need to match implementation strategy to the policy situation. He explains that programmed implementation is only appropriate when all of the following characteristics are present in a policy situation:

1. where the policy calls for incremental rather than major change;

2. where the theory underlying policy is certain;
3. where there is little conflict over the policy's goals;
4. where the institutional setting is "tightly coupled;" and
5. where the environment is stable.

According to Berman's analysis, when any of these characteristics is not present, it becomes necessary to incorporate one or more adaptive implementation strategies (Berman, cited by Sharp 106).

**Berman's Adaptive Implementation Approach**

The ideal of adaptive implementation is the establishment of a process that allows policy to be modified, specified, and revised— in a word adapted— according to the unfolding interaction of the policy with its institutional setting...it would look more like a disorderly learning process than a predictable procedure (Berman 211).

Berman contends that an adaptive strategy is more likely to be successful if the following elements are present in the policy situation:
- large change is desired;
- conflict over goals and/or means exists;
- many loosely connected participants are involved; and/or
- the environment is unstable (Ingram and Mann 27).
Taking a pragmatic approach, Berman advocates a search for mixing, matching and switching programmed and adaptive strategies to improve policy performance. He calls for further work toward applying this broad framework to concrete situations. Implementation strategies could be matched to the situation and switched according to the stages of the implementation process. Furthermore, implementation strategies could be mixed and switched across levels of a policy system (Berman 221-222).

Rice and Rogers' Model of Reinvention in the Innovation Process

The process model proposed by Rice and Rogers emphasizes the innovation process as a matching of the adopter's perceived problem with the innovation, thereby identifying the potential for reinvention to occur.

The process of adopting (and, at some stages, rejecting) an innovation is conceptualized as a sequence of sub-processes in which the innovation moves from a general concept to its expression as a specific set of organizational behavior (Rice and Rogers 500-501).

Reinvention is defined as "the degree to which an innovation is changed by the adopter in the process of adoption and implementation after its original development (Rogers 1978)."
The nature of a reinvention might be categorized as follows:

1. **Operation/service:** concerns the operational components apparent to the user;
2. **Technical:** concerns specific techniques and hardware, mostly invisible to the public user, performed and modified within the system;
3. **Management/organizational:** concerns conceptual approaches of the system and organizational restructuring.

Additionally, the type of reinvention can be categorized as follows:

1. **Planned:** the changes from the original innovation bundle are an expected part of the innovation process.
2. **Vicarious:** a planned reinvention which occurs as a preventive reaction to a problem experienced by some other adopting system.
2a. **Secondary:** a result of a previous reinvention's causing problems affecting some other aspect of the innovation bundle (Rice and Rogers 508-509).

Rice and Rogers write that, whereas many research studies have focused upon sets of innovations, their investigations indicate the potential for insights to be
gained from a focused approach to the study of particular innovation processes. They also call for the inclusion of the variable of reinvention in research on the diffusion of innovations (512).
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CHAPTER IV
RESEARCH FINDINGS

Introduction

Within this chapter major findings of the research effort representing various topics pertinent to family policy and programming at the ODRC central and facility levels are presented. The introductory section to this chapter describes the context within which implementation of family policy occurs if at all and serves to highlight factors which may impinge upon certain of the research findings.

Departmental Constraints

The largest employer in Ohio, the ODRC is presently experiencing serious administrative problems with resultant litigation and negative media publicity which may be in part attendant to overcrowding. A two million dollar lawsuit filed by the family of a murdered woman charges the Department with not protecting visitors. The woman's common-law husband was arraigned on a charge of aggravated murder after she was slain in the visiting room of a male correctional institution located at Mansfield,
Ohio. Following the murder, ODRC Director George W. Wilson ordered both Department staff and the Highway Patrol to study visiting room procedures and staffing. Also during 1989, upon his release from the Ross Correctional Institute, a male inmate made allegations to the media concerning the extent of drug abuse in prison and accused corrections employees of smuggling drugs. In response, Governor Richard F. Celeste called for more stringent procedures regarding searching visitors who might try to smuggle drugs into prisons.

During the thirty months ending February 1990 eighteen employees have resigned or been dismissed from ORW for illicit relations with female inmates as reported to Governor Celeste by Director Wilson who had been ordered by the Governor to clarify allegations of sexual harassment of women at ORW (The Columbus Dispatch 13 April 1990).

Nine ORW inmates and former inmates have filed two lawsuits against the State of Ohio charging that they were sexually assaulted by sixteen male prison employees. Seven men have been indicted by a grand jury on charges involving several incidents at ORW. Other men have been sent to prison or are awaiting sentencing (The Columbus Dispatch 29 December 1989). Three employees of the
Franklin Pre-Release Center have been dismissed or resigned since the facility opened in November 1988 because of illicit relationships with inmates (The Columbus Dispatch 13 April 1990).

**Prison Overcrowding**

A recently released projection by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency cites Ohio's prison population among the fastest growing in the country. The Council projects a 51.2 percent increase among Ohio's prison population during the next five years and explains, "Growth in prison populations can best be explained by the unrelenting passage of laws designed to sentence more offenders to prison and for longer periods of time (The Columbus Dispatch 21 December 1989). During a news conference held on 18 April 1990 to announce release of the final report and recommendations of the Governor's Committee on Prison and Jail Crowding, Ohio Governor Richard F. Celeste stated that "We're hanging on by our fingertips," with state prisons operating at 57 percent over capacity (The Columbus Dispatch 19 April 1990). The report of the Governor's Committee represents in part a search for alternatives to incarceration which the public will accept. The Celeste Administration has publicly
supported consideration of the concept of community corrections as an alternative to incarceration for non-violent felony offenders.

Since 1979 the Ohio female prison population has grown more than 240 percent from 580 prisoners to more than 1,973. Intake of adult female prisoners during 1989 (1,488) jumped 25.8 percent compared to female intake during 1988 (1,183) (The Columbus Dispatch 5 December 1989). The ODRC estimates that Ohio will have 2,000 female prisoners by 1997 (The Columbus Dispatch 17 September 1988). As recently as April 1990 the ORW has housed in excess of 1,600 women although the facility is designed to accommodate 950 inmates.

Several actions have been taken by the Department in response to the crowding emergency caused by rapid and record growth in the state's female population. Basement areas at ORW have been converted to bed space. A 150-bed dormitory is scheduled for completion during 1990. A new facility, the Franklin Pre-Release Center (FPRC), located immediately south of Columbus, and originally designed to house men, opened in November 1988 to house female inmates. Women were immediately transferred from ORW to FPRC to reduce overcrowding. The Northeast Pre-Release Center located near downtown Cleveland which previously
housed male inmates was converted as of March 1990 into a women's facility because of overcrowding at ORW and FPRC which is utilizing double bunking. As of this writing inmates are being transferred to the Northeast Pre-Release Center with the goal of reducing the ORW population to approximately 1,200 inmates.

The ODRC continues efforts to ease crowding in institutions in part through a prison construction program. In 1982 the Ohio General Assembly authorized a $638 million dollar prison construction project which will add 10,000 beds to the state system. When the project is completed in 1992, Ohio will have twenty-four correctional institutions along with a Corrections Medical Center and a Corrections Training Academy (Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction 1988 Annual Report 9). The Department is analyzing the need for additional prisons and local jails with costs estimated to run as high as $500 million over a ten year period although no budget has been determined (The Columbus Dispatch, 13 October 1989).

Management of the ODRC

Professionalization and Programming

Richard P. Seiter, Director of the ODRC from 1983 to 1988, worked to professionalize the Department. Toward
this end he established a training academy for corrections. During this time staff positions related to various aspects of treatment programming at ORW were filled by professionally trained individuals. Harrison Morris, the current Warden at ORW, has continued to support programming by placing expectations upon staff in diverse areas of the facility to develop programming.

**Accreditation**

Direct Seiter demonstrated support of ACA accreditation and moved the Department in this direction by bringing the Department in line with the federal corrections management system. Current Director Wilson's agenda includes securing accreditation of most if not all institutions supervised by the Department. A five year plan has been developed in this regard and the position of Accreditation Manager established at the central office level. According to this plan, ORW is to apply for accreditation candidacy within the five year period. Knowledgeable respondents both inside and outside ORW view compliance with ACA standards pertinent to family policy as relatively easy to meet and as posing no particular problems. No indicators were found that adjustments specific to family policy and/or procedure have been made.
or are anticipated in an effort to comply with the ACA standards.

Unit Management

The form of unit management initially implemented during the administration of former Director Seiter and currently in effect is based upon a model in use within the U.S. federal corrections system from which Director Seiter was on leave during his tenure as Director of the ODRC. Unit management is defined as:

an approach to inmate and institutional management, designed to improve control and relationships by dividing the larger institutional population into smaller, more manageable groups, and to improve the delivery of correctional services. This is directly related to two major goals: (1) to establish a safe, humane environment which minimizes the detrimental effects of confinement, and (2) to provide a variety of counseling, social, educational, and vocational training opportunities and programs which are most likely to aid offenders in their successful return to the community (Ohio Reformatory for Women, 1988, Post Orders regarding Institutional Schedule, Inmate Activities).

ORW is divided into five units based upon inmate security levels. Respondents were for the most part positive for a variety of reasons in their assessments of unit management. The exception to this concerns criticisms expressed by some ORW respondents in regard to the qualifications of certain unit staff members who
provide counseling services on behalf of the inmates.

According to one respondent,

The unit managers represent a variety of education/experiential backgrounds. The move to unit management has changed staff services significantly for the better. Previously no exchange of information took place between the social workers and the correctional officers. With the merging of this staff into units, working relationships have been strengthened.

A different perspective was presented by another facility level respondent:

Unit management was initiated to aid the inmates by putting more staff at their disposal. Before unit management was implemented, those staff providing social services had degrees in the social and behavioral sciences. With unit management, many case managers are not degreed people; therefore they do not have the social work skills. Some case managers now do have the education and they do have the social work skills. I have seen this change affect families and inmates. With the onset of unit management, the social service manager became like a technical manager. Previously, social service was a nucleus which had interactions with every other department. Not all unit managers have college backgrounds.

A third ORW respondent offers these observations:

Inadequate numbers of qualified staff are available. Money must be spent on the physical plant . . . . Staff are underskilled and overpaid. Higher skilled staff move on to higher salaries in the private sector.
Departmental Regionalization

The ODRC functioned as one division overseeing prison operations prior to 1988 when the Department underwent a reorganization wherein the various institutions were assigned to North and South Regions. A Deputy Director supported by a regional staff is responsible for overseeing the operation of the prisons in each of the two regions, as indicated by the ODRC Table of Organization (Fig. 1). The regional staffs include administrators for medical services, psychological services, religious services and social services/unit management. The institution wardens report directly to the Deputy Director responsible for their geographic area.

Standardization of Departmental Policy and Procedure

Each correctional institution develops its own rules for carrying out the State of Ohio Administrative Regulations pertaining to the ODRC. Former Director Seiter's agenda included standardization of Departmental application of the Administrative Regulations. The Department is presently in the process of standardizing the rules promulgated by the individual institutions. Respondents from within and outside ORW explained that
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efforts to standardize policy and procedure produce mixed results when regulations written primarily for male institutions are implemented within a female facility. Typical of the comments is the following statement by an ORW respondent who noted, "Efforts to uniformly apply the administrative regulations were made under the last Administrator but I am not certain this is for the better. Women have unique needs not met in a male bureaucracy."

The Celeste Administration

As articulated by one respondent employed within ORW during the recent past, Governor and Mrs. Celeste have made it clear that the platform of the Celeste Administration includes attention to families, women and children. In his most recent annual State of the State address, the Governor spoke of the need for "family friendly" policies. Departmental respondents indicate awareness of a degree of encouragement and/or pressure coming from the Governor's Office concerning upgrading family programming.

Dagmar Celeste, wife of the Governor, has demonstrated a special interest in female offenders and their children. She has visited ORW on several occasions and has focused upon specific issues including substance
abuse programming and the needs of inmates experiencing postpartum depression. She was a driving force behind the development of the Family Violence Task Force, the forerunner of the Ohio Children's Trust Fund (OCTF). Respondents within and outside the Department indicated that Mrs. Celeste is credited in many quarters with playing a role in securing funding through the OCTF for the initiation of the "Strengthening Family Ties" parenting program currently offered at ORW. During one visit to the institution, she called attention to the need for an outside playground area for use by the inmates' children. The present playground was constructed within a short time following this visit.

Family Policy and Programming

Orientation of Families

The Admissions phase of incarceration is described by ORW respondents as the most stressful period for families and staff alike. The only orientation provided for family members is contained in printed ORW materials outlining rules and regulations pertinent to visiting which is mailed to approved visitors "to provide information needed prior to each visitor's first visit to the institution" (Ohio Reformatory for Women. Summary Information for
Approved Visitors). One state level respondent stated in this regard,

The only orientation for the family would be the standard letter they get when the inmate puts them down as somebody who wants to visit. They get a standard letter that says you have been identified as someone who might be wanting to visit inmate such and such. These are the procedures and this is what you have to do, these are the rules you have to abide by or this is what you have to do to get visiting, get on the list or whatever. But it does not talk about this is what prison's like or this is what's going to happen now.

One husband indicated that his inmate spouse was his only source for such information. Another husband explained,

They gave you a list of rules when you initially went down to visit on the first visit. And there's always a list of rules on the table . . . . My wife and I would communicate in letters about requirements. I didn't get anything from the institution other than what they had written down . . . .

Initially when she went down there they channelled everything to her parents. It seemed kind of funny to me. All of my information had to come from them as far as visiting and the structure, the visiting list and everything.

The mother of a recently released ORW inmate, when asked by the researcher how she learned the rules, stated, "Trial and error. No orientation. No anything. Just trial and error all the way."

According to the written Summary Information for
Approved Visitors, "... visitors may ... consult with the Visiting Hall staff if there are any questions regarding the printed guideline." Formal orientation regarding available channels for addressing other family concerns is not carried out. The ORW Post Orders regarding the Visiting Hall state, "The inmate will inform the Approved Visitor when a package may be received, the items which may be included, and from whom the package shall be sent" (Ohio Reformatory for Women, 1988).

Changes pertaining to visitation practice are frequent. The expectation on the part of the ORW staff and the experience of family members with an occasional exception is that the responsibility for communicating changes to family members rests with the inmate. One ORW respondent remarked:

It is the responsibility of the inmate to communicate rule changes to her family. There are always changes. Staff could be on the phone all day.

The Experience of Visiting

ORW, one of the older correctional facilities operated by the Department, resembles at first glance a college campus surrounded by fencing. Buildings representing architectural styles in vogue during
different decades were added as the inmate population increased. Ample parking including areas designated for use by handicapped persons is available for visitors near the Entrance Building. Lockers are available for storage of disallowed property brought in by visitors.

Visits between inmates and their family members take place in a large public room termed the Visiting Hall, located within a short walking distance from the Entrance Building, which is furnished with institutional style tables and chairs. A typed list of seventeen rules pertaining to ORW visitors is kept on each of the tables in the Visiting Hall. According to these instructions, visitors are encouraged to ask questions as needed concerning visiting of the correctional officers assigned to monitor the Visiting Hall.

The room contains vending machines, a microwave oven and a one dollar bill changer. One restroom is available for use by male and female visitors. This was mentioned by two family member respondents as being an awkward and uncomfortable arrangement.

One section of the room, designated the Kiddie Korner, is equipped with a color television and video cassette player along with a selection of VCR tapes of cartoons. An outdoor playground furnished with new
equipment is adjacent to the Visiting Hall. This area, enclosed by fencing, is designed to be accessed by means of a doorway in the Visiting Hall. At present the playground is off limits to visitors and inmates. As reported by ORW respondents, this is due to lack of staffing required to monitor this area which cannot be seen from the vantage point of correctional officers assigned to the Visiting Hall. One facility level respondent noted, "Inmates walk by (the playground) constantly. The possibility exists that the children will be carrying drugs."

Warden Morris has brought about cosmetic improvements in the Visiting Hall, namely the repainting of the walls and the addition of a mural. Plans to install air conditioning have been included within the capital improvements budget.

The small size of the Visiting Hall relative to the number of inmates and visitors does not permit privacy during visiting. Seating is at times assigned by the correctional staff and the room is frequently filled to near capacity. Cigarette smoking is permitted with the result that the room becomes smoke filled.

According to one ORW respondent, "Visiting is considered a nuisance at times because of the amount of
contraband." Visitors are not permitted to bring in food and drink other than liquids which are permissible for infant use only. A facility level respondent explained:

Formerly visitors were able to bring in food but this was discontinued due to the possibility of drugs being hidden in the food. The food in the Visiting Hall vending machines is kind of expensive but not that bad.

Radios, TV's, newspapers, books, magazines and other items termed "distractions" according to the list of rules for visitors are not permitted in the Visiting Hall. The ORW Post Orders regarding the Entrance Building stipulate that children age three and under are permitted to bring one toy into the institution (Ohio Reformatory for Women, 1988). Inmate aides are assigned to provide books and coloring materials for use by the children present.

According to the list of rules for visitors, displays of physical affection appropriate to public places are permitted only upon entering and leaving the Visiting Hall. Family and Departmental respondents representing central and facility levels indicated that the degree to which this rule is enforced depends in part upon the judgment of the correctional officers monitoring visiting at the time.

The correctional system is geared primarily to
monthly visitation. Each visitor approved by ORW is permitted to visit once a month with the exception of twice a month visits with minimum security status inmates. At present visiting is permitted Tuesday through Sunday excluding legal holidays, from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Large numbers of visitors were observed to stay more than half of the allotted time. Of relevance here, the mother of one recently released ORW inmate remarked,

The chairs are very uncomfortable. We stayed ten to four at the table unless we were buying food or using the restroom. There is no air conditioning.

Restrictions on the length and/or location of the visit exist in regard to inmates in specific security status categories including, for example, discipline control or administrative control.

In response to the severe overcrowding situation, ORW has made repeated changes in visitation rules resulting in an increasingly more restrictive visitation practice and procedure. One change involved limiting the number of visitors including children per visiting period to five. A reservation system has been introduced for weekends and requests for reservations must be submitted in writing one month in advance. One family respondent who visits monthly at ORW, in reflecting upon the difficulty which
his family experiences in anticipating their schedule a month in advance, speculated that this requirement would, in his opinion, be particularly burdensome to less functional families. An ORW respondent explained that foster parents who accept other children into care on short notice find themselves unable to bring a child to ORW as scheduled, resulting in loss of the reservation for visitation. Other family respondents cited the potential problems posed by inclement weather and by sick children.

The institution reserves the right to terminate visits prematurely on a "first come, first gone" basis once seating capacity is reached in the Visiting Hall in order to permit "partial" visits for others. Visitors traveling from out of state are exempt from this practice. On one occasion when the researcher entered the crowded Visiting Hall, a correctional officer present indicated that eight visits had been terminated due to overcrowding during that morning.

Individuals currently on parole which include some family members of inmates are not permitted to visit. ORW respondents indicated that in the past certain requirements related to documenting common law marital status were a source of agitation for some families. This process has been relaxed somewhat in accordance with a
procedural memo issued by the ODRC central office. One ORW respondent observed,

Some case managers are making it very difficult for couples in common law marriages to maintain their relationships. Ohio recognized common law marriages. Many decisions deteriorate to personality... Our humanity clouds our thinking.

Review of the ODRC Inmate Grievance Procedure Annual Report for the fiscal year July 1, 1988 through June 30, 1989 showed two grievances having been filed concerning visiting out of a total of 383 grievances filed by ORW inmates. The ORW Inspector of Institutional Services monitors visiting on a frequent basis and investigates complaints in this regard.

Transportation

ORW cannot be reached by public transportation and the city of Marysville is not a stop on the Greyhound-Trailways route. Several private bus services operated by churches and other nonprofit organizations provide limited access to ORW from larger urban areas of Ohio. Some if not all of these bus services charge a fee which in certain cases is supplemented by charitable monies.

The majority of visitors rely on private vehicles. Problems addressed by interview respondents representing
families, outsiders, and Department staff at both the central and facility levels concern the inability of many low income families to obtain reliable transportation for the trip. Frequent references were made to families who attempted the trip only to have their vehicles break down along the way. ORW does not assist families with transportation costs.

Residents of Cuyahoga County (Cleveland) and Hamilton County (Cincinnati) comprise 31 percent of the ORW inmate population. Families residing in the Cleveland and Cincinnati areas are two to three hours driving time from the Reformatory.

No freeway signs direct travelers to ORW. A highway sign identifies the location. One respondent cited the difficulty he experienced in locating the institution as one of his biggest frustrations during his wife's incarceration.

Children are most often brought to the institution by a family member and less frequently by social service staff and foster parents. One county children services agency was reported by an ORW respondent to have decreased the frequency of visits provided by the social service staff as the number of children of inmate parents in care of the county agency has increased. Another facility
level respondent explained:

Limitations on weekend visitation necessitate that children miss school in order to visit their mothers. This draws attention to the child with attendant embarrassment along with good intentioned solicitousness toward the child which nevertheless heightens the child's sense of being different not only in foster care but also at school. Social services staff become upset at the prospect of taking the child out of school for visits. Preference for visiting is usually given to social workers and lawyers. Visitation for families is more restrictive.

At a minimum it is a thirty-two to thirty-five mile distance from ORW to the nearest correctional facility. A social worker for a child of two incarcerated parents must invest a great deal of time to carry out visitation between the child and each parent.

The Parenting Program

Inquiries of Department staff at both the central and facility levels regarding the existence of family programming at ORW most frequently resulted in reference to a program known as "Strengthening Family Ties" which was initiated during the tenure of Warden Dorothy Arn. The program's written goals include:

1) Improved parenting skills through parenting education;

2) More frequent and higher quality visits between the incarcerated mothers and their children; and

3) Assistance and support to the women as they prepare to leave the prison system and reunite with their families.
The program has five components:

1) A series of classes which meet once a week for ten weeks. The women in these classes deal with parenting issues such as parent/child relationships, communication, discipline, self-esteem, stress management, etc.

2) Mother/child visits which allow for more privacy and occur in a more homelike setting than in the visiting hall.

3) Assistance to the families and caretakers of the children in making arrangements for transportation for their visits.

4) Individual and family counseling as needed.

5) A reference library of community resources and support services (Ohio Reformatory for Women, Strengthening Family Ties).

According to the most recent ORW survey, 81 percent of the inmates are mothers of minor children. Fifteen women can be accommodated with one teacher per class and the program is full to capacity. During the calendar year 1990 between 500 and 620 women are expected to participate. Some mothers are transferred to one of the two female pre-release centers while awaiting their turn.

The parenting classes are held once a week for ten weeks. Course curriculum is based upon The Parent's Handbook ("systematic training for effective parenting"). Near the end of the ten week course the inmate mothers become eligible for parenting visits to be held in the
parent center (formerly the Warden's residence) which is an attractively furnished two story dwelling located on the grounds of ORW. Inmates eligible for parental visits are entitled to one visit per month lasting two and one half hours until they are released from the institution.

With permission of the inmate, program staff contact family members regarding coordination of visitation for the children of inmates participating in the program. The individual who brings the child to the institution remains across the hall from the room in which the mother/child(ren) visits take place. Television and videos, including some covering parenting topics, are available for the use of the person who brings the child to visit.

Program staff sit in on the first parenting visit and are required by the institution to be present in the case of a maximum security status inmate. According to one respondent, staff observe to see "if reception is still there" in terms of rapport between the mother and child.

Written program materials state that the family is "encouraged to contact staff, who can answer questions, give guidance, or provide the names of resource organizations in their city or county" (Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction. Recovery Needs of Women in
Prison and in Transition From Prison 2). However, family and ORW respondents indicated that this inclusiveness does not extend to engaging the family members of the inmates in the actual parenting visits. One ORW respondent reported:

I am only aware of one male, who appeared to be a friend of the inmate's family, who participated in the parental visiting. This was particularly important because the child in question was in the custody of one of the children's services agencies which are only going to keep children so long.

A second ORW respondent reflected:

The parenting program at ORW is not presently as inclusive as I would like to see in regard to engaging family members of the inmates. Those in higher places would say they are but inclusiveness is basically limited to the parenting class graduation.

The husband of a former inmate denied knowledge of the program's existence although he and his wife are the parents of two young children. A husband who brought his daughter to the parenting center stated:

They more or less wanted the interaction to occur between mother and daughter. And then they would allow us some time to be together as a family, the three of us. But it was more or less after they worked on their interacting . . . I was more or less left out of the room in the beginning. And they usually had some tapes, behavior tapes on the family and that, that I could watch. And they were very nice about bringing coffee and everything. I had the idea too that that was mainly just for the mother and daughter.
For a time the inmates' families were invited to a graduation ceremony held on a Saturday upon the occasion of the inmate having completed the parenting program. A decision has been reached to discontinue the graduation ceremony based upon the amount of work and time needed to obtain security clearance for the families as well as upon the low turnout of families for the ceremony. In its place a less formal recognition of the inmates is held during the last class to which the families are not invited.

A research project is presently being conducted by The Ohio Research Institute for the Prevention of Child Abuse for the purpose of exploring the relationship between participation in the parenting program and recidivism. Additionally, an evaluation system is in place whereby the inmate mothers are asked to complete written evaluations of the visits a few days afterward.

The initiative for this programming came from the personal commitment of two female professional ORW staff members, a psychologist and a master's degree social worker. The parenting program was established by and continues to be funded by means of a grant from the Ohio Children's Trust Fund which necessitates periodic application for grant renewal. In addition, a funding
proposal drafted by a parenting program staff member has recently been approved at the central office level. This will support staff positions including a secretary and a teacher.

Assistance to the families and other caregivers regarding transportation is limited to the provision of directions and the sharing of information concerning the availability of bus service. In drafting the original proposal to the Ohio Children's Trust Fund, ORW staff requested support for transportation of the children and their caregivers but funding was not forthcoming for this aspect of the programming.

The possibility of overnight visits for children with their inmate mothers has been discussed among ORW staff as has the feasibility of children residing on the institution grounds. To date children have not been permitted to visit their mothers overnight due to security risks and space limitations. No extension of mother/child contact is planned. One ORW respondent shared her viewpoint:

Children visiting at ORW is good. A few inmates do not want their husbands and children and/or other immediate family members to visit. I encourage social service workers to bring the children to visit.
A second facility level respondent stated, "These kids have a right to see their mothers." This respondent focuses on the children's welfare and views the parenting program as being geared to prevention of child abuse. A respondent employed at ORW within the recent past indicated having major reservations related to safety concerning infants residing in a facility such as ORW which houses maximum security inmates.

Access to the Institution

Access to the prison by families is limited to the areas described previously which include the Visiting Hall (and adjacent playground when available) and the parenting center (in the case of the relatively small number of inmates who complete the parenting program). The only access in addition to these areas involves the attendance of family members at the graduation of inmates who complete one of the educational degree programs available at ORW. These graduation ceremonies are held in the gym.

Several family members interviewed expressed interest in having a tour of the institution. The mother of a former inmate stated that the only time she and her husband saw part of the institution in addition to the
Visiting Hall was on the occasion of their daughter's graduation.

The ceremony was held in the gym and my husband and I were permitted to attend along with one other family member. We were not allowed to see other parts of the institution. I would have liked to take a tour and, in particular, I had a desire to see the room in which my daughter slept.

Infants Born to Inmates

Women are transferred to the Franklin Pre-Release Center for the duration of their pregnancies upon completing their first trimesters at ORW. This arrangement allows close proximity to The Ohio State University (OSU) Hospitals with which the ODRC maintains a contract for obstetrical services. Prior to the opening of the FPRC, pregnant women participated in prenatal education as a component of the parenting curriculum offered at ORW. This programming is currently available at the FPRC.

Following delivery, the inmates room on the same women and infant floor as the other OSU maternity patients. The inmates interact with their newborns during a normally brief hospital stay. Upon discharge, those inmates having minimum security status are returned to the FPRC whereas the remainder are transported directly to ORW.
Family members are not permitted to visit either the inmate mother or her infant in the hospital due to security risks. Respondents noted the inappropriateness of this restriction in view of current understanding of bonding.

As assessed by an outside respondent:

It is almost as if the family bonding with the newborn is set up for failure up front. I mean normally the family comes and the father of the child and how wonderful and warm that's supposed to be at the time of the birth. At OSU the inmates return to ORW shortly after delivery. The babies are whisked off and something is lost concerning motherhood and bonding. And yet I have some understanding of why this occurs from a corrections standpoint . . . .

I find ORW procedures to be so impersonal, so mean. For example, no one can visit the newborn baby of an inmate at the hospital. On the other hand, I recognize that, as a prisoner, a woman loses her rights. There is a need for striking a balance between the regimen of a military institution contrasted with what we consider appropriate to family.

One central level respondent recalled that at an earlier time infants born to inmates were discharged from the hospital to ORW where they remained for periods of up to two months. Eventually this ended with clarification that jurisdiction regarding these children lies with the Ohio Department of Human Services. The central level respondent elaborated:
The whole issue of the babies came up . . . It was initiated on the central level. The Department of Human Services and the Department of Corrections finally came head to head on who has authority over these babies. And the Department of Human Services said they did and the Department was glad. It really wasn't that much of a conflict. I think the Department of Human Services expected our Department to want to keep them and it really didn't want to keep them so that worked out nicely except for the bonding process because the babies are not returned then to the institution so once they're born they don't have that bonding with the mother.

According to present policy and procedure, an expectant inmate is asked to express a first and second preference of a caregiver for her baby. Effort is made by the corrections staff in cooperation with public child caring agencies to explore the suitability of one or both of these placements. The first preference is usually the inmate's mother.

If approved, the intended caregiver will be contacted by OSU Hospitals social services staff following the birth. Arrangements are made to release the newborn directly to the caregiver from the hospital. A very small number of inmates choose adoption for their children. If an appropriate caregiver is not identified, the child will be placed into the care of the public children's services agency in the county where the inmate resided at the time of her incarceration. One respondent considered to be an expert related:
Most of the grandmothers with whom I talk are willing to keep the babies short term. These families may be on welfare or divorced, or dysfunctional in some fashion. The primary caregiver may be a working person. Even though the inmate mothers are upset over the care plans for the babies, they do not want adoption. The big thing heard all the time is, "I don't want my child placed for adoption."

Planful efforts have been made among representatives of OSU Hospitals social services staff, ORW and FPRC staff members, and Franklin County Children's Services staff to strengthen coordination of child placement. Attention has been given to timely determination of caregivers with concern for decreasing the length of hospital stay on the part of the infants and lessening the stress which the process causes staff involved in coordinating baby placements at the point of delivery.

A recently enacted Ohio law permits permanency planning to begin immediately when a mother is sentenced to two or more years in prison. Inmate mothers frequently seek to transfer temporary custody of their children to their mothers or other relatives often with encouragement to do so from children's services staff.

Respondents representing each of the stakeholder groups interviewed described the majority of inmate families as matriarchal in structure with grandmother as
the head of the family. According to the respondents, this often is not the first time that the grandmother has been the primary caregiver for one of her grandchildren. Respondents communicated that these families ordinarily place considerable value upon family in whatever form it presents itself. Relatives will endure significant hardships in caring for an inmate's child(ren), sometimes while working full time outside the home. At times grandparents in their seventies are caring for very young children.

As described by one ORW respondent:

The grandmother is often the matriarch who sets the philosophy and maintains the whole structure of the family. The grandmother is doing far more than the average person is aware. She often owns the family home to which the inmate mother may return periodically, at times bringing another child to the grandmother. Caring for children during the mother's incarceration is not always a new experience for the grandmother.

An outside respondent commented:

I am amazed that the children's grandmothers are willing to accept these children into their homes. These dysfunctional families still have a lot of family ties. Inmate mothers many times have children fathered by several men. At times these men will be involved in parenting their children and the other children in the home do not demonstrate resentment. A grandmother who works every day will nevertheless take in her grandchild who has a medical problem. Whatever" "family" is, that's important.
Grief Issues

ORW has two full time chaplain positions. In addition to conducting religious services, the chaplains provide individual counseling for the inmates. This often involves sharing painful news and the provision of grief counseling related to serious illness and death of family members. The chaplains likewise deal with grief issues accompanying child placement including the process of permanent loss of custody experienced as a death. Family issues comprise a major focus of the inmate counseling provided by the chaplains.

The Ohio Administrative Code (Section 5120-9-50) addresses inmate release for "sickbed" or funeral attendance of a relative.

(A) It is the policy of the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction to permit trustworthy inmates of the department to be temporarily released under supervision to visit a seriously ill relative, or to attend the funeral of a deceased relative.

(B) For the purpose of this regulation the sick or deceased relative must not be more distant than parent, spouse, offspring, or sibling, or other person who has, in effect, been in such a relationship with the inmate.

This interpretation excludes grandparents and, as ORW respondents noted, at times excludes a grandmother who in
fact raised the inmate if the inmate's mother was technically in the home during the inmate's childhood. One ORW respondent explained that effort is made by corrections staff to clarify inmate/family relationships from summary material contained in the inmate's file which does not always capture the detail needed to make such judgment calls. According to one facility level respondent:

Recognition is important on the part of institutional staff that family is everyone. In the situation of a death in the family, I become deeply worried that the institution excludes grandparents from death bed or funeral home visitation.

ORW practice permits funeral home visits but disallows attendance at funeral services. A facility level respondent spoke to this distinction:

I would prefer to see decisions made on a case by case basis with the option that an honorable inmate in a trust situation could be permitted to attend a family member's funeral service. Corrections personnel tend to be reactors rather than actors. Present practice is still influenced by the fact that during the turbulent '60's, several men ran away while attending their mother's funerals.

A much smaller segment of the inmate population would meet the eligibility requirements for consideration in regard to home furlough for the purpose of "visiting a dying relative and/or attending the funeral of a relative"
In relation to such home furloughs, the term relative is interpreted to include grandparents.

**Telephone Contacts**

Family members are not permitted to place phone calls to inmates and messages from family members are not routinely communicated to inmates with the exception of family emergencies, e.g., a death in the family. Collect calls placed to the outside by the inmates originate from the living units and are frequently placed during the day time hours at the higher long distance rates.

Restrictions are not placed upon the family members with whom an inmate can communicate by phone. Inmates are required to sign up for a time slot in which to place a phone call which is limited to ten minutes. The overcrowding crisis has clearly negatively affected access to phone communication with persons outside the institution. In response, various methods for assigning phone times including a lottery have been attempted in the individual living units.

As related by an ORW respondent, "Some inmates say it is difficult to get on a telephone list. If they are working in another area, they can lose out."
According to the mother of a recently released inmate:

There was no privacy. Telephones were located in a hallway. Other inmates were there. It was very noisy. My daughter had to yell out, "Keep quiet!" There was no phone booth or door to close.

Mail

In compliance with the Ohio Administrative Code (5120-9-17) ORW policy and procedure permit anyone to correspond with the inmates. While incoming mail is not to be censored, it is opened and inspected for contraband. According to the ORW Post Orders concerning Mailroom Procedures, "Outgoing, first class letters shall not be opened, censured, copied or read" (Ohio Reformatory for Women, 1988). Printed materials may be received by the inmate from the publisher or distributor and from other sources including the family with prior approval. The inmate is permitted to receive four packages referred to as sundry boxes along with two food packages each year from an approved visitor in the immediate family. One of the food boxes must be sent during the month of December. The weight limit for any package is twenty-five pounds. Itemized lists detail allowable items with attention to value, quantity, sizes and colors (where applicable). As noted previously, the ORW Summary Information for Approved
Visitors handout stipulates, "The inmate will inform the Approved Visitor when a package may be received, the items which may be included, and from whom the package shall be sent" (Ohio Reformatory for Women, 1988).

Document review as well as respondent interviews gave no indication that restrictions are placed upon either the number of letters an inmate may send or the persons with whom an inmate may correspond. The inmate is permitted to send one letter each week at state expense. Each inmate "earns" a small amount of money which varies according to her work assignment. This money is needed for the purchase of personal items including postage and stationery.

Indicators are present that timely receipt of mail surfaces as a sporadic problem caused by overcrowding and insufficient staffing levels. Interviews with family respondents and outsiders indicated some anxiety and frustration related to adhering to the twenty-five pound weight limit for packages. Considerable more difficulty was noted in regard to locating the allowable quantities and packaging of various food items. It appears that correctional officers demonstrate a degree of flexibility in permitting entry of some items which do not strictly qualify according to the sizing regulations for allowed
One family respondent described her experiences related to sending packages:

We send her packages. We have some things rejected and they send them back. And we send her food packages... twenty-five pounds is a hard limit... On the food there's so many limits. It seems odd. And, well you can understand some things like glass containers and stuff. But things like the little international coffees that aren't in glass containers, you'd think they could have that. But no, coffee has to be in a glass container. Then they pour it out into a bag... Very odd and odd weight limits. And you never know should I really go by this weight limit on this thing? Oh, let me see. I'm not exactly sure what but maybe like cream cheese should only be a six ounce. And I just ignore those type things and hopefully it'll go through. Usually they do.

The husband of a woman recently released from ORW described a similar experience:

It was aggravating because one of the things they listed like they'd say a six ounce size of something. Well, there is no six ounce size. And it had to be in plastic. Well, some things don't come in plastic. You know, and that got real aggravating after awhile. You'd sometimes have to go to several stores to try to find the right item or what they would accept. Sometimes I would just send it anyways and it would go through. But their lists were fairly ambiguous and the sizes and the limits and that were, they're unreasonable...

And then sending books and that, you couldn't send, books had to come from the publisher. So the store could send the book where I couldn't send the book. That I could understand.
As with visiting, the Inspector of Institutional Services monitors mail service on a regular basis and investigates complaints concerning incoming and outgoing mail, incoming publications and packages. Review of the ODRC Inmate Grievance Procedure Annual Report indicates that, of a total of 383 grievances filed by ORW inmates during the fiscal year July 1, 1988 through June 30, 1989, two concerned visiting and nineteen concerned communications including fifteen directed at incoming mail problems. In general, grievances regarding mail revolve around loss of money and property.

**Recovery and "Self Improvement" Services**

Included among the programs operated at ORW for inmates which indirectly benefit families are the education services and the non-traditional jobs program, as well as a domestic violence counseling group. The latter was initiated with grant money as was an eight-week residential treatment program for recovering substance abusers which brings a counselor into the institution from a local social service agency. A waiting list exists for the substance abuse program and, due to factors including overcrowding and shock parole, a proportion of the inmates in need of such services leave ORW without participating.
Recognition is apparent among central and facility level respondents that contact by inmates with recovering outsiders is necessary for successful treatment. Accordingly, persons from the outside are permitted to take part in Alcoholics Anonymous, Narcotics Anonymous, and Alonon meetings held at the prison. Family members of inmates are not permitted to attend and have no involvement in any other aspect of the substance abuse programming. In response to the researcher's inquiry, one ORW respondent remarked sarcastically that families might be included "in thirty years or so."

The mother of a recently released inmate who participated in the substance abuse program expressed the opinion that families of inmates as well as very close friends should be permitted to attend Alcoholics Anonymous meetings at ORW. She asks:

What harm? If the inmates are willing to attend the meetings, the institution should be flexible in allowing family and friends to participate.

In the recent past a project was developed at the program staff level directed toward holding a "family day" on a Saturday for the purpose of providing an education program concerning family issues and substance abuse. Permission to implement the program was denied at the ORW
administrative level. As reported by one central level respondent, this decision was based upon security risks and the inconvenience involved in making security arrangements.

The physical setting of the substance abuse programming could not adequately accommodate family counseling. During the researcher's observation of this area, no phone was available to support one of the substance abuse counselor positions. Indications are evident that present staffing levels would not permit interaction between program staff and families of inmates.

ORW staff express a high level of awareness that the vast majority of the inmates experienced incest and other forms of abuse during childhood. As articulated by one respondent, victimization by incest is "screaming" at ORW as an inmate problem. Treatment programming to address the problems of this inmate population group is a need identified by the staff and one which could likewise indirectly benefit family members of inmates.

One ORW respondent made a connection between the family experiences of the inmates and their suspicious reactions to the concept of a patriarchal God. "Many of these women have been abused, used by the fathers in their lives as have their siblings."
Furlough and Parole

Eligibility for furlough and parole is controlled by Administrative Regulations. Respondents are aware of stresses inherent in reunification of the inmate families. ORW does not at present provide services to aid the families in making this transition. Among the obstacles noted by respondents inside and outside the Department are insufficient levels of staffing and funding, ignorance on the part of staff regarding the needs of families during this transition, as well as an expectation that any effort would be futile because the inmate will almost inevitably be incarcerated again in the future.

According to one ORW respondent:

Home furlough is an excellent program. It allows forty-eight hours leave at a maximum of every three hours. The parole board investigates to determine that the home setting is free of weapons and is wholesome. What better way is there to keep family ties? I think that every inmate should be sent out on home furlough during the last six months of incarceration and that family members should be asked their impressions of the furlough experience. At present we do not ask family members their impressions.

Regular furlough to a halfway house in one of five furlough centers located throughout the state is available to female inmates and is especially beneficial to inmates who do not have family support but who satisfy the
eligibility requirements for furlough. As explained by an ORW respondent:

These furloughs afford opportunity to find a job, to accumulate savings, and serve as an avenue for getting children back. A woman who needs ADC prior to securing housing in order that children's services will return her children can file an ADC application while on furlough before the end of her sentence. Supervised visits with children can be initiated while a woman resides at a furlough center.

Respondents at both the central and facility levels expressed the opinion that in some cases family members are afraid of the turmoil which an inmate can bring into their home. However, according to an ORW respondent, "The family will tell something different to the parole authority." A central level respondent indicated that family members will ask the Department to deny parole for inmates who are mentally ill and/or violent but that the family members will attempt to conceal such actions from the inmate.

The Issue of Shame

Shame is an issue for many of the families. A proportion of the inmates do not want their families, and particularly their children, to visit. Due in part to the restricted visitation schedule, school age children visit during the week. As respondents from within and outside
the institution pointed out, visiting during school hours increases awareness among their peers and teachers that these youngsters are the children of inmates.

Respondents representing all stakeholder groups recognized the potential for "guilt by association" in regard to family members viewing themselves and/or being viewed as criminals by the correctional staff. As articulated by one ORW respondent:

I know . . . that incarceration is really bad for families. A family member is not viewed as one of the 'good guys' but rather as one of the 'bad guys.' Family members become alienated and are stigmatized by newspaper publicity.

Another ORW respondent observed:

The inmates' main concern is that they do not want to die in prison. They don't want to be an embarrassment to their families. Thus, the need for reconciliation becomes apparent as well as the problems which arise from the lack of opportunity to say good-bye to a dying family member.

**Family/Staff Interactions**

Family members typically approach the correction system with apprehension and experience varying degrees of discomfort with the screening process required of visitors. This is most pronounced during initial visits and appears to be more pronounced on the part of black visitors.
A black woman who visited frequently during her daughter's incarceration at ORW described her experience with the screening process:

I never did think that they made it where you wanted to visit. I never did. I just never did. They were very slow and very deliberate in their actions. You know. I thought they took too much time in doing what they wanted to do. And they were very unfriendly, very unfriendly. Not that I wanted them to embrace me every time I went down there but I thought perhaps that, dealing with people and dealing with the public that they should have made it a little more pleasant.

In discussing the experiences of families visiting at ORW, a caucasian family member shared the following thoughts:

Anyone who's been around in Ohio would surely know that there's, among what I would call the white rural people, there's quite a bit of racial discrimination. And it's not really overt stuff like they'll go out and run them out of town or stuff like that. But it's just, I know all the time I was growing up, blacks were always talked badly about. I mean it's just a common thing in my family . . . There are very few black people in the (Marysville) community and I think you will find that white people drawn from these areas just put black people down.

The majority of the researcher's observations of correctional staff with inmates took place in the Entrance Building. Staff were observed to be courteous and respectful. Interpretation of rules to family members was done with a degree of flexibility. On one occasion the
A researcher observed a black family evidencing obvious discomfort as they submitted to the screening process (removing jewelry, emptying pockets, walking through a metal detector, etc.).

Despite an affirmative action plan, ORW has difficulty recruiting sufficient numbers of black correctional officers. Upon arriving at ORW, the families' first interaction is with correctional officers assigned to the Entrance Building. Staff assigned to this area are predominately if not entirely of Caucasian background. As a group, these individuals are residents of the local rural Caucasian community who have had limited contact with persons from diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds prior to beginning employment at ORW.

Respondents representing the Department acknowledge the need to treat family members with respect for a variety of reasons including that doing so makes the job of staff easier. According to the ORW Post Orders regarding the Entrance Building, "Officers are expected to be courteous and professional in behavior at all times" (Ohio Reformatory for Women, 1988).

For the duration of an inmate's incarceration, the vast majority of communication between families and ORW staff takes place by phone and is handled by the unit
staff. Family members call to inquire regarding their inmate family member's wellbeing and to obtain clarification concerning specific rules related primarily to mail and visitation. According to one ORW respondent:

Unit personnel receive many phone calls from family members including husbands some of whom hold custody of their children. The family members see stereotypically negative images of incarceration . . . The biggest share of the phone calls concerns clarifying and verifying specific rules. Parenting program staff have contact with family members regarding coordination of visitation for the children of inmates participating in the parenting program . . .

It is important for family members to know that unit personnel have talked with the inmate family member. It is significant that someone representing the institution sounds approachable and normal. Staff need to practice public relations. The family members are not felons. Treating them with respect makes the job easier.

A second ORW respondent noted:

The family members of an inmate are in a tenuous situation and cannot assert themselves because they are afraid of repercussions. They worry, for instance, that they might need a special visit. The families have the notion that they should not call the staff whom they perceive to be the enemy . . . .

In corrections you see things which you don't see in society. Why are we prejudiced against these families? The families are ignored. I don't know what we in corrections do for the families--we do nothing . . . .

Correctional staff are so overwhelmed just dealing with the inmates and are very suspicious. They are overburdened due to inadequate numbers of staff . . .
Because of suspicions, staff do not establish relationships with families or with inmates.

Another ORW respondent recalled:

I was not given any directions upon beginning employment regarding relating to inmate families . . . No one told me what to do or not do with families.

Respondents representing each of the stakeholder groups interviewed were uniform in communicating to the researcher that institutional practice requires that families be directed to the unit staff. The impetus for this channel of communication appears to rest in large part in concern regarding adhering to policy and procedure related to privacy of information. Before information concerning an inmate can be shared with a family member, required release of information forms must be forwarded to the Warden's office and subsequently to the inmate. This process is described as time consuming and is identified by some respondents as significantly limiting the amount of potentially beneficial interaction which can occur between families and staff.

One ORW respondent commented:

Case managers have a lot more family contacts than do the other staff. The law says that ORW staff cannot tell the family members anything. ORW staff contacted by family members are required to direct
them to the case manager . . . Why should family members call, only to be told, "I can't tell you that?"

Another facility level respondent stated:

I receive some phone calls from family members of inmates. Institutional policy requires that these calls be handled by the unit managers who have access to the approved visiting lists for inmates and can therefore screen phone calls. On occasions when the family is upset and the unit manager cannot understand the nature of the pertinent . . . information, she might consult with me. Concerns regarding breach of security are always operative when communicating with families . . . I do not talk to family members unless this is cleared through the inmate's unit manager and Warden Morris.

Family and ORW respondents indicated that the inmates and their families place a higher level of trust in the chaplaincy staff relative to other ORW personnel and will look to the chaplains as a potential resource in the event of stressful family situations calling for communication from the family to the inmate. Numerous family respondents indicated that their inmate family member had given them the chaplains' phone number for use in case of an emergency. Families likewise attempt to use the chaplain's office inappropriately as an informal communication channel regarding more routine concerns due to frustrations experienced in contacts with other ORW staff. Communication between the chaplains and the families is limited to telephone calls. One ORW
respondent stated, "Family members sometimes pressure the chaplains regarding making phone calls to inmates."

Similarly, another facility level respondent related:

The chaplains receive phone calls from husbands and boyfriends who complain that communication is not getting through. These individuals are at times very upset. The most frustrating experiences of this nature take place at admission time.

Central level staff have on occasion met individually and collectively with persons representing families of inmates. The vast majority of the families participating in such organized family activities have a male incarcerated family member. One inmate family support group is known to have distributed Christmas gifts to the children of ORW inmates. This effort has, at least on occasion, been coordinated through the Chaplain's office.

**Family Counseling**

Review of documents indicates that family counseling is available through both social services and the parenting program at ORW. It quickly became clear that the term family counseling is used within the Department to refer to counseling with an inmate concerning family issues. The intent is not to imply that counseling is available to families of inmates. The latter is not
available and ORW staff respondents cited physical space limitations, lack of funding, security risks and insufficient numbers of qualified staff as the factors involved. One facility level respondent reflected:

I have reached a brick wall in terms of bringing the family into the institution. It doesn't appear that the institution recognizes where we are. Concern for the wellbeing of the inmates' children arises and touches the chords. Security becomes the umbrella explanation for disallowing more involvement with the families. I am not sure that the Administration thinks there are competent people on staff who can achieve the balance required between security and skill. Corrections personnel have a suspicious nature. We don't trust and think that the best way to prevent a problem is don't let it happen.
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CHAPTER V
RESEARCH CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

The State of Ohio is in a crisis as described by Governor Celeste during a recent news conference as he released the final report and recommendations of the Governor's Committee on Prison and Jail Crowding (The Columbus Dispatch, 19 April 1990). Public demands for a stern response to criminal activity and resultant mandatory sentencing laws for certain crimes have contributed to the rapid increase in the Ohio prison population which has overwhelmed the Department both at the central and facility levels. The availability of physical space as well as levels of staffing have not increased in equal proportion to the exploding inmate population. Corrections staff are overwhelmed by the day to day demands of housing inmates and responding to their basic needs.

The entire range of programming at ORW has been impacted with, for example, staff having less time available to work with individual inmates and inmates frequently leaving ORW before they can take advantage of
needed programming. As explained by one ORW respondent, judges sentence women to the Reformatory in part to ensure their participation in programming which may not be available due to overcrowding. Sheer numbers of inmates threaten to swamp programming. Concrete steps are being taken to reduce and hopefully maintain the inmate population at a more manageable level albeit still in excess of facility design capacity.

Standards can be viewed as establishing minimum levels of performance deemed to be in keeping with quality performance. The Department at both the central and facility levels considers that it not only meets but exceeds ACA standards relevant to family policy. Consistent attention is directed to maintaining the appearance of portions of the physical plant accessed by visitors, and to assuring courteous and respectful treatment of visitors by staff. Interactions between correctional staff and families are for the most part subdued and not openly hostile. Ongoing effort is made to monitor mail and visiting by the ORW Inspector of Institutional Services who likewise investigates informal and formal inmate complaints related to visiting and other forms of communication, achieving a high resolution rate concerning inmate grievances.
Family Policy

In this section consideration will be given to the first and second assumptions underpinning this study:

1. The Department has not made a clear commitment to the family as a primary socialization/resocialization agent; and

2. The Department has no comprehensive policy on inmate families.

Efforts to identify the existence of a family policy at the central and facility levels were unsuccessful. Inquiries of respondents typically were answered with reference to specific ORW programming. In most instances the researcher was referred to the parenting program operating at the Reformatory. One ORW respondent stated, "The closest to policy on families would be the parenting program which is limited to participation by only a few inmates." A state level respondent remarked that "Family policy is probably most fully developed at ORW."

Responsibility related to families of inmates is not centered in any specific office or administrative subdivision at either the central or facility levels which deals exclusively and/or comprehensively with family matters. The majority of family contact with staff involves correctional officers at ORW with content
centering upon the visiting process and clarification of rules specific to mail. As documented within Chapter IV, formal orientation for families of newly admitted inmates is limited to sharing of information regarding regulations specific to visiting and mail. Staff interaction with families is on an "as needed" basis with family members initiating the contact except within the parenting program. 

ORW unit staff have considerable phone contact with family members who inquire regarding the wellbeing of their inmate family members and, again, for clarification of process and rules. The role of the unit staff extends beyond information at least among individual staff to the provision of reassurance. As described in Chapter IV, the need to preserve the privacy of the inmates creates a barrier to communication with family members in daily practice. 

For those eligible inmates who gain entry to the parenting program, the possibility of staff/family contact exists. Again, coordination of visiting is the primary focus with attention to information provision regarding outside resources. While program materials reference the availability of "guidance" and "family counseling," little substantiation was found that this extends beyond the provision of information concerning community resources.
and the availability of reading materials and videos addressing parenting topics for use on site.

No formal mechanism exists specifically to coordinate the above family programs, some of which are more accurately described as activities supervised by security personnel. Numerous correctional system respondents expressed a lack of information concerning what was being done in relation to family programming outside their own area of responsibility.

Much of the ODRC budget is restricted for support of the physical plant and construction costs. Older facilities such as ORW can be expected to require improvements in physical plant in order to achieve ACA accreditation. A distinct budget for family programming does not exist with the exception of the "Strengthening Family Ties" parenting program. The Department does not provide any financial or material assistance to families such as transportation.

Support of families can be said to be reflected in staff salaries because staff develop and implement programs and activities which either directly or indirectly support family life. Such a broad view of family support staff extends beyond the relatively few program staff to the inclusion of correctional officers involved for example in
visiting and mail activities. Formal programming relies to a significant extent upon outside funding from grants. The recently announced decision of the Department to take on continuing support of the parenting program which to the present time has been supported by a grant from the Ohio Children's Trust Fund is a significant move forward for family programming.

As stated previously, Departmental respondents indicated that the family programming within the ODRC has been most fully developed at ORW. Attention to the family as a socialization agent focuses primarily upon: 1) permitting communication between inmates and families, with special focus upon the children of inmates, by means of visiting, mail and telephone contact; and 2) providing parenting education available to inmates through the parenting program. "Strengthening Mother/Child Bond" would be a more accurate program name for the "Strengthening Family Ties" program operated at ORW. Children of inmates benefit from the opportunity to visit with their mothers once a month in private, pleasant surroundings. As evidenced by the responses of ORW staff and family members contained in Chapter IV, efforts directed toward strengthening parenting skills of inmates' family members are in practice an insignificant component of the parenting program.
Departmental respondents noted that visiting and mail, along with food service, are priority services because experience indicates that problems in these areas are high risk for causing disruptions in correctional settings. In contrast, neglect of family programming is not likely to attract negative attention to the correctional system.

This research uncovered no directives originating at either the central or facility levels calling for expansion of family programming beyond visiting, mail and telephone communication. Support was found at both levels for the development of educational and treatment programming on behalf of inmates. ORW has made significant advances within the past five years related to programming. Two prominent examples, in addition to numerous other life skill groups, are the parenting program, and the Lima rehabilitation project in which inmates learn marketable skills regarding home construction techniques by renovating houses in poor physical condition (Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction 2). Corrections staff are justifiably proud of these accomplishments. ORW is often held out as an example of progressive programming in large part because of the ORW parenting program which is not available within the male correctional facilities of the ODRC. Understandably, Departmental respondents
demonstrated a tendency to measure the quality of family programming at ORW in relation to programming in other parts of the correctional system. For example, the researcher was told by one ORW respondent that the size of the ORW Visiting Hall compares favorably to the size of the visiting rooms at male institutions.

ORW respondents indicated that the majority of staff appear to be supportive of the current family programming at ORW. Numerous staff respondents spoke directly of the benefits of family programming in maintaining a stable atmosphere within the institution. According to one facility level respondent:

The inmate population as well as the majority of the ORW personnel support family programming. A very small portion of the staff identify with the militaristic aspects of corrections, are ignorant of and not in favor of the programming.

According to another ORW respondent,

Only a few individuals within the institution actually oppose the parenting program. These persons represent all levels of the organization. Their opposition basically has nothing to do with security. These individuals just feel that an inmate does not deserve such programming. These same persons would probably be against most forms of rehabilitation.

This respondent observes, "It is easy to sell family programming to the ORW Administration."
However, programming for families extending beyond visiting, mail and telephone contact is viewed by staff as optional in terms of meeting Departmental requirements and ACA standards. By and large, staff do not appear to be philosophically opposed to greater inclusion of families. Hesitation in this regard was expressed among a significant segment of the respondents in terms of this type of programming not falling within the area of responsibility of the corrections system and in terms of staff being overextended in trying to meet the immediate needs of the inmate population. As explained by one respondent employed at the facility level in the recent past, it has been the respondent's experience in corrections that if someone will do the work to put programming together, the Administration will approve it. The Warden has a limited amount of attention to give to programming because so many other things including food service, security and budget require attention. In some quarters the sentiment was expressed that expenditure of resources toward families is futile because the inmates will almost inevitably return to ORW after release. One ORW respondent stated:

I think that corrections staff should get together with families at least once as part of pre-release planning in an effort to let the families know what to expect, what to do. This does not take place due to a lack of money and a lack of
recognition on the part of staff that this is a problem, as well as an attitude on the part of the staff that the inmate will be coming back to ORW.

In a similar vein, another ORW respondent explained:

Commitment is needed on the part of qualified staff to stay awhile knowing that the institution is overcrowded. If a program is put in place, then the inmates must remain at the institution long enough to benefit from it. Some inmates are at ORW only long enough to dry out. Then the rate of recidivism goes up. It is now considered a success to remain out three or four weeks upon release.

Apparent particularly among ORW respondents with formal education in counseling and allied fields is an awareness that incarceration presents a window of opportunity for engaging some family members in a range of services which could conceivably reduce the likelihood of recidivism on the part of the inmates. Among the possibilities cited by facility level respondents are: preparation of family members for inmate home furlough and parole; couple counseling with emphasis upon clarification of commitment to maintaining marriages and other relationships; and family counseling concerning a range of issues including incest and chemical abuse, among others.

In practice, ostensibly due to overcrowding, family programming is taking small steps backward. To illustrate,
the number of visitors permitted to each inmate in a given visiting session has been reduced from six to five. Of greater significance, reservations for weekend visits are now required to be made in writing a month in advance.

Security

This section deals with assumptions three, four and five which collectively suggest that the Department is security oriented to the extent that programmatic concerns are routinely outweighed by security considerations.

3. The Department is overwhelmingly security oriented; this orientation is reflected in the Department's organization and staffing.

4. Security considerations override programmatic concerns in all circumstances.

5. Facility operations are security oriented, not program oriented. Facility personnel, in general, are not committed to family oriented activities, and consider them a security risk.

The current Warden is credited with firming up security at ORW. This seems to be an inevitable sign of the times and a reflection of the experience noted by respondents that the Reformatory now houses a different (read more difficult to manage) kind of inmate. One central level respondent explained:
We started seeing increases in the aggressiveness of the crimes. If you had a woman in for rape or child molestation or sexual abuse of a child or something, it was rare. And now we have probably enough that if they chose to or someone decided that it was to be that they could actually do programming specifically for those women and even house them separately which might not be a bad idea. Child molestation and child abuse, especially in transexual child abuse, is still the lowest on the totem pole in prison among the women. Women offenders, they don't like other women who have hurt their children. So they really do get a lot of abuse from the other inmates, emotional abuse, maybe even some physical abuse.

An ORW respondent observed:

At present we have too many violations of furlough primarily because they (the inmates) do not respect the program.

A significant breach of security is bound to bring negative media publicity and public criticism along with the possibility in certain instances of litigation. Of note, numbers of correction officers employed far exceed the numbers of program staff at ORW. The charges cited earlier regarding illicit sexual relations between inmates and correctional officers employed at ORW present a puzzle in relation to the increased attention to security issues. While these matters, some of which represent pending litigation, remain outside the parameters of the present research effort, they are of serious import and thus worthy of note.
In a sense, visitors other than family members are treated better than are family members in that they have access to the institution denied to family members who are viewed as greater security risks in terms of bringing drugs into the institution. This extends, for example, to non-family members being permitted institutional tours on occasion, and to participation by non-family members in the Alcoholics Anonymous, Narcotics Anonymous and Alanon groups held at ORW to benefit the inmates. Instances have been cited wherein family programming activities which were either planned or held in the past have subsequently been denied administrative approval due to concern regarding security.

The process of obtaining security clearance for family members is time consuming and tedious. This led to a decision to terminate the inclusion of family members in the parenting program graduations.

Accreditation Standards

This research effort has afforded opportunity to measure implementation of family policy at ORW against pertinent ACA Standards for Adult Corrections (1981, 1988) which are referenced within Appendix C. The 1990 revisions of the Standards, also referenced within Appendix C, had
not been released at the onset of this research project. The following concerns related to compliance by ORW with ACA Standards pertinent to family policy and practice surfaced in the course of this study as worthy of consideration:

The discussion section of Standard 2-4140 regarding Physical Plant indicates that a visiting room should have separate restrooms for male and female visitors. Such an arrangement is not in place at the Reformatory.

Standard 2-4381 regarding Visiting provides that "the number of visitors an inmate may receive and the length of visits may be limited only by the institution's schedule, space and personnel constraints, or when there are substantial reasons to justify such limitations . . . ." While it is apparent that overcrowding does not presently permit visiting more frequently than once per month for the majority of visitors, the question arises as to whether visitation restricted to once per month lies within the "spirit" of this standard.

Standard 2-4384 regarding Visiting indicates that "written policy and procedure should specify the conditions for extended visits (e.g., forty-eight to seventy-two hours) between inmates and their families on institution grounds." Nothing vaguely approaching this definition of extended visits is presently available at ORW.

The discussion section related to Standard 2-4386 regarding Visiting states: "If there is considerable distance between the public transit terminal and the institution, the institution should seek to provide transportation for visitors. This is particularly important where transportation costs are significant." ORW does not assist with transportation despite being located in an isolated area.
Standard 2-4472 regarding Social Services states, "There is a social service program that provides a range of resources appropriate to the needs of inmates, including individual and family counseling ..." Respondents indicate that family counseling is not currently available at ORW and note that staffing does not include sufficient numbers of persons qualified by education to provide family counseling to meet the needs of the inmate families.

The Implementation Process

Historically, the Reformatory was the only correctional facility for adult women in the ODRC and it housed an even smaller proportion of the total inmate population of the Department than it does today. Accordingly, ORW both suffered and benefitted from benign neglect in that staff were not always held accountable by central office for carrying out all of the Department policies and procedures. It was understood in many quarters that these regulations were written for male institutions and did not pertain to ORW as a unique women's facility. The Administration of the Reformatory prior to the arrival of Director Seiter has variously been described by Departmental and outside respondents as matriarchal, "mom and pop" and family style. This management style was evident in such areas as visiting, telephone contact, furlough and parole, and in a relatively closed posture toward outsiders.
In recent years efforts to ensure implementation of a minimum level of standards compliance concerning family policy at ORW have been carried out "top down" as part of the striving for standardization and professionalization within the Department. This has been expressed through directives, an audit format based upon ACA standards, the monitoring of inmate grievances, and most recently by the initiation of a five year plan to achieve system wide ACA accreditation.

In contrast, efforts evident within ORW which exceed minimum standards of quality have been initiated from the "street level." The parenting program represents the fullest implementation of family policy within ORW. This programming arose from the personal commitment of program staff at ORW who developed the program design and pursued funding from outside the Department.

The parenting program appears to have arisen in a friendly environment. It began operating during the tenure of a director known to be empathetic toward families. The ORW Warden at this time had been accustomed to infants being housed at ORW for periods of up to a month at a time following delivery. As discussed by one state level respondent, the institution was pressured to "do something" for families given the professional and
public attentiveness to family issues including research specific to relationships between incarcerated mothers and their children.

Clearly the correctional system reacts to influential outsiders. Witness the initiation of the playground at ORW. Significantly, this family programming which was in essence forced upon the institution has not to date been utilized (implemented) fully due to insufficient staffing as reported by ORW respondents. The recently announced decision by the Department to provide ongoing support of the ORW parenting program raises questions as yet unanswered concerning the degree of influence which the Celeste Administration as well as the Ohio Children's Trust Fund may have exerted in this decision making process.

Models of Implementation

Planned Reinvention In The Innovation Process

Certain efforts to implement family policy within ORW have been judged by numerous respondents to exceed minimum standards of quality as expressed by pertinent ACA accreditation standards and thereby to be optional. These include the parenting program as well as other efforts to include families in correctional programming that move beyond visiting, mail and telephone communication. In
measuring these efforts against models of implementation in the field, it appears that they are most fully explained by Rice and Rogers' model of planned reinvention given the model's emphasis upon the importance of the innovation process as a matching of the adopter's perceived problem with the innovation, allowing for reinvention to occur. By way of illustration, two family policy implementation processes, one successful and one unsuccessful, will be examined as they unfolded at ORW. These implementation processes are outlined within Tables 1 and 2.

Implementation of the parenting program arose from innovations developed at the central level concerning two general concepts, namely decisions to professionalize the Department staffing and to introduce treatment programming within ORW. Key planners were brought into program positions within the Reformatory as part of the move to implement the innovations conceptualized as professionalization and treatment programming. The qualifications of these key players are important. Two of these "change agents" had professional social work training; a third key player identified by Departmental respondents was the staff psychologist. Two of these three key players were keenly alert to family issues in part because they were at the time mothering very young children.
**TABLE I**

**REINVENTION: INNOVATION OF THE PARENTING PROGRAM AT THE OHIO REFORMATORY FOR WOMEN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Concept Identified at ODRC Central Level</th>
<th>Introduction of Programming and Professionalization at ORW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adopter's Perceived Problem:</td>
<td>Mother/Child Separation; Lack of Parenting Skills Among Inmate Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Reinvention:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) operation/service</td>
<td>Parenting Classes; Mother/Child Visits; Assistance with Transportation; Individual and Family Counseling; Availability of Reference Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) management/organization</td>
<td>Classroom Teaching; Advice Giving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) management/organization</td>
<td>Educational Program Built Around STEP Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Reinvention</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress in Implementation</td>
<td>Generally Successful With Exception of Family Counseling Component</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Concept Identified at ODRC Central Level</th>
<th>Introduction of Substance Abuse Programming for Inmates at ORW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adopter's Perceived Problem</td>
<td>Lack of Knowledge Regarding Substance Abuse Programming Among Families of ORW Inmates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Reinvention:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) operation/service</td>
<td>Formal Educational Workshop Curriculum On Site For Inmates' Families Regarding Substance Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) technical</td>
<td>Not Possible to Identify Since This Program Activity Was Not Successfully Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) management/organization</td>
<td>Disease Model With Education Provided For the Families of Inmates Regarding the Nature of This Disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Reinvention</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress in Implementation</td>
<td>Unsuccessful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the Rice and Rogers model, reinvention can extend to operation/services; techniques; and management/organization (508). With respect to operation/service, the concern for programming was reinvented by professionals at the facility level into parenting classes, mother/child visits held in pleasant surroundings, assistance with transportation, individual and family counseling, and the availability of a reference library of community resources and support services. The general concern for programming was reinvented into techniques including among others, classroom teaching, advice giving and participant evaluation. Concerning management/organization, the players at the facility level had many choices among conceptual approaches to implementation which would have satisfied the policy intent of providing treatment programming. They chose to implement the parenting program primarily as an educational program built around the STEP (Systematic Training for Effective Parenting) curriculum.

According to the Rice and Rogers model, the type of reinvention can clearly be categorized as planned in that the width of the original program definition allows broad leeway for implementation of policy in accordance with the adopter’s perceived needs. The implementation of the
parenting program, while still in process, has been institutionalized as evidenced by the recently announced decision on the part of the Department to provide ongoing fiscal support.

Examination of implementation of substance abuse programming at ORW affords a look at an unsuccessful implementation process related to a family policy program activity. This concerns a reinvention of a policy decision made at the ODRC central level to the effect that programming to be developed at ORW was to include substance abuse services for inmates. This need was reinvented by at least one key player, a professionally trained social worker working at the facility level, to include the need among families of inmates for education regarding substance abuse. With respect to operation/service, the need to implement substance abuse services for inmates was reinvented to include a formal educational workshop curriculum on site for the inmates' families regarding substance abuse. It is not possible to identify the specific techniques used since this program activity was not successfully implemented. The intent of this effort was to manage/organize substance abuse programming according to a disease model with education provided for the families of inmates regarding the nature of this disease.
The type of reinvention illustrated here would again be classified as planned in that the substance abuse coordinator was expected to take a creative approach including networking with outsiders in an effort to develop substance abuse programming at ORW. Efforts to extend substance abuse programming to include educational services provided on behalf of inmates' families within the institutional setting were blocked at the ORW Administration level based upon security risks.

Comparison of the successful and unsuccessful implementation efforts described above calls attention to the following points which warrant further consideration. The components of the parenting program represent in large part an extension of family programming already in place at ORW, namely mother/child visitation and telephone contact by staff with family members of inmates. The possibility of providing formal substance abuse education programming on site for families of inmates represents a greater leap from previous facility experience regarding levels of responsibility accepted by correctional staff on behalf of inmates' families.

Different key players, namely the Wardens, were assigned to ORW at the point that the successful and unsuccessful implementation efforts were initiated. The
Warden in charge when permission to provide substance abuse education services for families was denied was at that time working to enhance security at the institution.

Indicators are present that influential outsiders, while supportive of both the parenting and substance abuse programs, were more specific in their encouragement of greater inclusion of children in visiting than they were of greater inclusion of family members in substance abuse programming. Furthermore, the question surfaces regarding whether it is easier politically to disallow a program activity or component than to disallow an entire program.

Mixed Programmed and Adaptive Implementation Model

A final decision has been reached at the ODRC central level to pursue system-wide standardization of policy and procedure as well as ACA accreditation. Accordingly, a move is underway originating from the central level to implement on a system-wide basis minimum standards of quality regarding family policies among others. Tightly coupled, preprogrammed implementation procedures are supposed to be followed by all levels of the organization. This is encouraged at the central level through a combination of strategies including: requiring each correctional institution in the Department to develop standardized
policy and procedure in keeping with ACA standards; and monitoring of a grievance and appeal procedure.

Only incremental change is desired regarding ORW in that the institution already has established policies and procedures concerning many if not most of the areas to be addressed including visiting, mail and telephone communications. The theory underlying the implementation effort is certain in that it is based upon ACA accreditation standards which have been developed by experts in the field and are widely accepted within the U.S. corrections system.

At an earlier stage in the implementation of Departmental policy and procedure, implementation efforts were carried out at ORW in a manner which allowed the policy to be modified and specified according to the unique needs of the only adult female institution within the Department. The present implementation effort still permits and requires individual institutions including ORW to write their own policies and procedures but with close attention to conformance with standards. As such this implementation effort represents a mixture of programmed and adaptive strategies as articulated by Berman with the theme of programmed implementation clearly predominate as illustrated in Table 3.

It is too early to know how much movement toward an adaptive strategy might be required due to an unstable
# TABLE 3

**IMPLEMENTATION OF MINIMUM STANDARDS OF QUALITY REGARDING FAMILY POLICY AT OHIO REFOMATOR Y FOR WOMEN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Incremental Change</td>
<td>ORW Has Established Policy and Procedure Addressing Visiting, Mail and Telephone Contact, Among Other Family Policies</td>
<td>(a) Major change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Theory Certain</td>
<td>Based Upon Widely Accepted Accreditation Standards</td>
<td>(b) Theory Uncertain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Little Conflict Over Policy Goals</td>
<td>Final Decision Achieved at Central Level to Pursue System Wide Standardization of Policy and Procedure/ACA Accreditation</td>
<td>(c) Significant Conflict Over Policy Goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Institutional Setting &quot;Tightly Coupled&quot;</td>
<td>Move Toward Standardization of Policy and Procedure; Audit Mechanism; Grievance and Appeal Procedure; Five Year Plan to Achieve ACA Accreditation</td>
<td>(d) Institutional Setting &quot;Loosely Coupled&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Environment Stable</td>
<td>Questionable in View of Overcrowding and the Unique Needs of a Female Institution Within a Male Oriented Correctional System</td>
<td>Introduction of Adaptive Strategies to Improve Policy Performance According to Stages of the Implementation Process</td>
<td>(e) Environment Unstable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

environment brought about primarily by overcrowding and other potential management problems including the unique needs of a female institution within a male dominated system. Clearly the theme will remain one of programmed adaptation.

To summarize, this research indicates that an implementation model permitting a degree of movement between programmed and adaptive strategies has been adopted and to date has proved to be at least partially successful in regard in achieving and maintaining minimum standards of quality concerning correctional policy within ORW. This assessment must be qualified by acknowledging that this implementation process is presently underway and has not yet been fully operationalized in that individual institutions including ORW have not completed rewriting their policies and procedures to meet standardization requirements.

Insights

The patterns identified by this research include: 1) implementation of a minimum standard of quality pertaining to policy being carried out in a correctional setting by means of a combination programmed/adaptive approach such as has been described by Berman; whereas 2) in contrast,
efforts to implement a level of quality concerning policies which exceed minimum standards have taken place in a correctional setting by means of a reinvention approach as articulated within the Rice and Rogers' model. Concerning the latter, indications exist that, within the case under study, the presence of staff with advanced training in the social and behavioral sciences (specifically, social work and psychology) were significant factors in the attempt to implement family policies. It appears that professionally trained staff, by virtue of their specialized education, possess the knowledge and skills required to identify and plan appropriately for client population needs within the local correctional setting in a manner which exceeds minimum standards of quality.

This study likewise points to the importance of the personal preference of key players at the facility level in terms of implementation of correctional policies. Also of import are the personal preferences of key players such as the Celeste Administration who are technically outside but very close to the correctional system.

The present research effort supports observations made by Friedmann who contends that innovative planning is usually carried out by "a creative minority" who
experience dissatisfaction with the status quo (245) and who "prefer the device of pilot schemes, where the utility of an idea can be observed in action" (246).

The innovations scrutinized within this research effort took place within a rapidly changing system. According to Friedmann,

Innovative planning is especially prevalent in rapidly changing social systems. It is, in fact, a method for coping with problems that arise under conditions of rapid change, and it will tend to disrupt existing balances. There is much still to be learned about the different ways that major changes are introduced into an established society or how new social systems emerge.

But it is certain that equal progress cannot be made on all fronts simultaneously. Rather, the image that comes to mind is that of successive waves and wavelets of innovation spreading outwards from a number of unrelated focal points, or innovating institutions, from Clarence Thurber's 'islands of development' (246-247).

Key players working in bureaucratic systems such as corrections can become demoralized by formidable barriers to the implementation of policy, including obstacles imposed by the external environment. Thurber's concept of "islands of development" can be of use in organizing the work to be done into manageable components upon which key players can realistically expect to make an impact both individually and through linkages with others engaged in
the implementation of innovations. The above discussion suggests that questions regarding the extent to which the likelihood of innovations being successfully implemented is enhanced by increasing the number of key players in leadership positions within the facility setting at a given time is a topic worthy of further examination.

Two other models of implementation examined in relation to this research effort were eliminated as not able to fully explain the research findings. The Mazmanian and Sabatier framework, a traditional model which defines successful and unsuccessful implementation in terms of goal directed behavior (Palumbo and Harder x), was determined to be limited based upon its lack of consideration of switching implementation strategies as needed in order to accommodate local needs. The reactive model identified by Rice and Rogers was likewise determined to be inappropriate given that the research did not surface indications that the reinvention of policy at the ORW level was required "by unexpected and unsatisfactory consequences of the original innovation" (Rice and Rogers 509).

This research supports the findings of Bauhofer concerning five of the assumptions underpinning her research as well as the present effort. Furthermore, as
the above discussion indicates, the results of the present research effort support several other findings of the Bauhofer study as follows:

6. Family matters are no one's responsibility on the state or facility level.

7. The few programs dealing with families operate in isolation, and have little departmental support in terms of resources and prestige.

8. Some of the programs that involve families are not programs at all, but uncoordinated activities supervised by security personnel.

Insufficient evidence was found within the current case study to support or refute two additional findings of the Bauhofer study. These include:

9. The nature of the correctional system discourages intervention from the "outside" in general, and organized activities on the part of inmate families in particular.

10. The majority of family members/prison visitors are poor minority females who represent the most powerless, least vocal segment of our society. They are perceived as politically expendable by legislators and appointed officials.

Limitations of the Study

The themes emerging from the constant comparison of the three data sources were remarkably consistent. A limited number of negative cases surfaced in regard to
specific details related to ORW regulations pertaining to visitors. This was most pronounced in relation to one respondent who was considered to be a knowledgeable outsider. This respondent had the mistaken understanding that diaper bags are not permitted in the ORW Visiting Hall. The same respondent likewise seemed unaware of the availability of lockers in the Reception Hall for storage of disallowed articles. It appears likely that this respondent, who had contact with male correctional institutions, and who acknowledged having limited experience with ORW, tended to generalize knowledge of Departmental practices. Other discrepancies concerning specific procedures appear at times to reflect a lack of communication among various sectors of the institution and also to indicate the continuous changes in correctional practices.

Several respondents shared a considerable amount of pertinent information which they qualified as being "off the record." In reporting the outcome of this research effort, the researcher carefully omitted this material, some of which would have further strengthened the credibility of the research findings as would identification of the interview respondents. Generalizability of these findings is likewise limited by the focus upon a single gender inmate population group.
Also of note is the considerable difficulty experienced by the researcher in locating respondent families of currently incarcerated family members. Numerous indicators were present that families were reluctant to become involved in part out of concern that, despite the researcher's assurances to the contrary, they might draw negative attention to their inmate family member. This calls into question the extent to which inmates may refrain from acting upon the desire to file complaints and/or formal grievances related to family policies. Further, the possibility must be considered that the extent to which the overt quality of staff and family interaction is impacted by such fears leads to a falsely positive assessment of family/staff interactions. Nevertheless, family respondents interviewed appeared quite candid in sharing potentially damaging information lending credibility to the findings.

Implications for Social Work Practice

Among the roles ascribed to social work is that of change agent. This research provides in part a case study of social workers functioning in this capacity within a correctional setting. One respondent, considered an outside expert, remarked in reference to one of the ODRC
institutions, "... but as far as actual social workers go, and I don't think the prison's particularly interested in them because what's a social worker going to do? They're going to try to make changes and they don't want changes."

The ever present dynamic tension between security and programming concerns illustrated by this research effort points to the need for creative problem solving in an effort toward humanizing the corrections system. Social workers must not only be creative but most demonstrate adherence to a rational problem solving process in which they work to balance security and programming concerns. Such an approach is necessitated in part because their work is scrutinized by other correctional staff and interested outsiders whose highest priorities are in most instances security oriented.

Social workers have an ethical responsibility to select work environments in which they can give life to their professional values, skills and knowledge. Those social workers considering employment in corrections should seek out environments which give indications of affording such opportunities however limited. In this respect, the present research effort points to the significance of strategic placement of social workers in
leadership positions within the correctional setting. Ideally, administrators at the central and facility levels must be attentive to delegating authority with responsibility by allowing for broad reinvention of policy according to local needs.

Considering the insufficient numbers of professionally trained staff in relation to the size of the inmate population at ORW, it appears to be of heightened importance that social workers join their efforts to implement programming with those of other professional staff members from allied disciplines. Furthermore, social workers can conceivably serve as role models for those corrections staff who do not bring to their work roles advanced training in the social and behavioral sciences. This may help toward keeping the reliance upon a militaristic approach to corrections management to a minimum.

Given the current stresses in corrections, Departmental funding priorities within the foreseeable future will not address family programming on a broad scale. In view of the prevailing punitive public attitudes toward criminals, it would be politically imprudent for elected officials to publicly promote a major move toward strengthening family programming in corrections. Accord-
ingly, social workers and other like minded individuals choosing to further family programming in corrections will in many instances need to consider the strategic benefits of incorporating this goal as a program component within larger program designs.

The broad range of knowledge and skills demanded of the social worker in the correctional setting requires a strong generalist academic preparation. At the micro level of practice, this preparation calls for acquiring a knowledge base and intervention skills specific to diverse population groups who have multiple needs related to a family history of abuse and chemical dependency, among other problems. Macro practice draws heavily upon the ability to design and administer programming specific to local needs. Of utmost importance is the savvy required to work effectively within the political arena both inside and outside the correctional system in order to secure funding and philosophical support. Toward this end, research skills are needed with particular focus upon both identifying needs of the population groups to be served and evaluating the impact of implemented programming in light of issues of public concern such as recidivism rates. The social worker's public relations role includes communicating such knowledge to the public in an effort to
call attention to the issues involved in a productive manner.

The families of inmates, which include a large number of children, represent a largely forgotten population group. Working within carefully selected correctional settings affords an opportunity to carry out social work's historic commitment to enhancing the quality of life for highly vulnerable groups of people.

Implications For Future Research

This research effort surfaced several possibilities appropriate to hypothesis generation suitable for testing within further research. One obvious question concerns the significance of levels of formal education on the part of both street level bureaucrats and other key players in relation to implementation of policy in correctional settings. Similarly, the relationship between implementation of correctional policies and education specific to social work and other closely allied fields on the part of key players with particular scrutiny of the street level bureaucrats appears clearly warranted.

Understanding of the effects of strategic placement of key players both inside and outside the correctional system and at varied levels of the system can be further
refined through comparison of studies involving different subjects across diverse correctional settings. The influence of personal preference on the part of key players in relation to implementation of correctional policy could likewise be examined by means of experimental research designs.

Furthermore, attempts to replicate the findings of the present research effort in other settings is needed. This should include study of implementation of family policy involving male inmate population groups.

Observations

ACA standards are neither particularly enlightened nor difficult to meet in regard to the minimum level of quality required relevant to family policy and programming. Of significance, review of the 1990 standards revisions reveals a lowering of standards in this regard when compared with earlier editions. This is most evident in regard to the exclusion within the 1990 edition of language contained within the 1988 edition requiring the provision of "a reasonable degree of privacy" in the visiting area (2-4140). Also eliminated in the 1990 revision is the requirement that separate restrooms for male and female visitors be provided in the
visiting area. Accordingly, certain observations made in the process of conducting this research are offered for consideration by persons sincerely committed to fully implementing family policy in corrections.

A comprehensive, written family policy is lacking at the central and ORW levels. Such a policy, if desired, should address the system's posture toward the family as a socialization agent. Based upon the findings of this research, a fully developed family policy would be best served by building in broad leeway for reimplementation of family policy in response to local needs. Full implementation might be attempted by delegation of authority and responsibility at both the central and facility levels for coordination of family programming including facilitation of system wide communication regarding family issues. Some of the implications of such an approach in terms of staffing are outlined within the previous discussion of implications for social work practice.

The delineation of separate cost centers with designated budgets for the above activities as well as for other specific components of family programming would help to legitimize them. It is likewise worth examining whether the extraordinary projected spending levels for prison construction within the State of Ohio could not
somehow be adjusted to accommodate relatively modest costs for additional physical space and staffing required for expansion of family programming. This would entail an insignificant amount of the monies anticipated to be sought by ODRC for prison construction which, as previously stated, have been estimated to run as high as $500 million over the next decade.

Furthermore, highly specific monitoring of family programming could be added to both the institution audit format and to the monitoring of the inmate grievance and appeal process. Inclusion of a family programming component whenever appropriate within grant proposals developed by Departmental staff could be required by policy. Continuation of the Department's demonstrated openness to research, to include serious scrutiny of research findings, could serve family programming well.

Planning for prison construction currently underway will hopefully give careful attention to locating women's facilities, including any required for long term residence, in varied geographic locations selected to maintain proximity of inmates to their families. The Department's expressed commitment to community corrections could include alternatives such as halfway houses and in-home detention by means of which nonviolent offenders
could continue parenting their children. Conversion of a small facility into a co-ed prison could accommodate incarcerated married couples who are parents of minor children, thereby allowing for intensive family counseling.

At the micro level of family programming, provision of direct services on behalf of families of inmates could begin at admission time with a formal orientation program for family members to include provision of a handbook. Orientation should also include identification of channels of communication with correctional staff members regarding specific concerns. Due to the frequency of changes in rules and procedures, this initial orientation needs to be supplemented by written communication of changes to the family members in a systematic, all inclusive manner. Revisions of the ORW regulations regarding the contents of packages sent to inmates with the aim of simplifying the requirements to the degree possible would clearly be welcomed by inmate families.

Exploration of ways to streamline the process related to securing authority to release information to inmates' families appears to be warranted. Among possible solutions might be the assignment of a staff member to trouble shoot in this area, as well as the maintenance of
time limited written release of information forms within the inmate's file.

Assignment of black correctional officers to the Reception Hall could conceivably contribute to the comfort on the part of the large number of black families coming to visit. Orientation and in-service training for correctional staff could be expanded to include modules specific to interacting effectively with family members representing diverse ethnic and racial groups.

Another staff development need centers upon helping correctional staff appreciate and achieve an appropriate balance between security and programming needs. This was brought to the researcher's attention most vividly by one ORW respondent who questioned whether the ORW Administration considers the staff to have the necessary skills to accommodate both security and programming concerns.

Once a month visitation strikes this researcher as very restrictive. The rationale underpinning the limitation appears questionable particularly in consideration of the current knowledge base related to mother/child bonding. Noncustodial parents typically have far more liberal visitation rights within the State of Ohio. The need for additional space and staffing appears to be the critical issue here which if accomplished could likewise
eliminate the problems surrounding requesting visitation a month in advance. Expanded visitation should be designed to eliminate as much as possible visiting by school age children during school hours. In keeping with ACA standards, suitable accommodations for extended visits between inmates and their families should be provided on institutional grounds.

Ideally, the visiting area should permit some degree of privacy and be outfitted with comfortable furnishings. The planned installation of air conditioning and reopening of the playground area would be significant improvements. Given the remote location of ORW, study of concrete ways in which the Department can assist with transportation of family members is urgently required.

Installation of additional phones in the living units for inmate use would ease the excessively high demand for a limited number of phones. In accomplishing this, attention should be given to the provision of a degree of privacy in making phone calls. Use of a message service based on tape recordings or some other means for use by family members who wish to communicate with their inmate family members, if affordable, could be a compromise solution to the families' expressed difficulty in communicating with the inmates.
Two regulations concerning visiting deserve reconsideration. At present, in-laws are not considered family for purposes of visitation. In order to be approved, in-laws must be treated as one or both of the two friends permitted to visit an inmate. Secondly, the Administrative Regulation excluding grandparents from sick bed and funeral visits appears to be a source of considerable and unnecessary pain to the inmates and their family members. In addition, the ORW practice of denying permission for attendance by inmates at funeral services for close relatives deserves reconsideration as does the prohibition against hospital visits by family members to the inmates and their newborns following childbirth.

Finally, a change in perspective at both the central and facility levels concerning the appropriate balance to be sought and maintained between security and program needs is required before families will be included to a greater degree in the inmates' prison experience. Such inclusiveness could encompass social occasions, religious and educational services, as well as the varied family counseling agendas outlined within this research report. This can only be accomplished by means of expanded numbers of qualified staff.

In keeping with the ethics of qualitative research, this researcher has worked consciously to treat the view-
points of all stakeholders with a high degree of respect. Through this process the researcher has become more keenly aware of the exasperation experienced at times on the part of individuals working in the corrections field at the arrival of outside "experts" purporting to tell correctional staff how to better carry out what is clearly a difficult function. It is hoped that the above observations will be considered by policy makers and other interested persons in the spirit in which they are offered, one of attentiveness to contributing toward the creation of humane correctional environments wherein family ties can be strengthened and maintained.
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TOPICAL INTERVIEW OUTLINE

A. Policy/Program Context
B. Policy/Program Origins and History
C. Policy/Program Rationale, Goals, and Objectives
D. Policy/Program Personnel
E. Policy/Program Participants
F. Budget and Administrative Arrangements
G. Planned Program Characteristics
H. Program Materials and Facilities
I. Program Activities
J. Policy/Program Public Relations and Education
K. Policy/Program Grievance Procedures and Experience
L. Significant Experiences Related to Prison Visiting
   - expense, family income, financial assistance
   - visiting schedule
   - processing
   - accommodations for children and babies
   - activities permitted/prohibited to include physical contact with inmates
   - opinions regarding children visiting inmates
   - interaction among facility staff, visitors, inmates, volunteers, representatives of outside organizations
extended visitation and furlough

M. Significant Experiences Related to Telephone Contact With Inmates
   - restrictions, frequency, privacy

N. Significant Experiences Related to Correspondence With Inmates
   - restrictions including censorship, frequency, assistance with expense

O. Significant Experiences Related to Prison Services
   - classes, groups, programs, counseling, special events

P. Significant Experiences Related to Notification of Family Concerning Illness of Inmate

APPENDIX B
OUTLINE OF ORAL SOLICITATION

Introduction of student researcher and identification that research is being conducted at The Ohio State University

Purpose of research project

Possible benefits of this study

Format of the interview and request for permission to tape record interview (not applicable regarding employees of the Ohio Reformatory for Women)

Duration of informant participation

Inducement for participation (applicable only in case of the families of inmates)

Steps to safeguard confidentiality and anonymity

Explanation of consent form and right of informant to withdraw consent at any time and to discontinue participation in the study without prejudice

Opportunity to ask questions and to obtain additional information concerning this study including receipt of written copy of interview
Hello, I am Martha Armstrong, a Ph.D. candidate at The Ohio State University where I am currently working within a research project concerning implementation of family policy in corrections. This research effort is being conducted under the direction of principal investigator Beverly Toomey, Ph.D., Associate Professor, College of Social Work, The Ohio State University. The purpose of this project is to study the family policy and family programs of the State of Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction. We are interested in learning about the experiences of families of the inmates concerning the family policy and family programs (such as visiting) at the Reformatory.

I would like to interview individual family members age eighteen and older about this topic. The interview can be conducted in the family's home if preferred and would probably last 45 to 90 minutes depending upon how much the family member wishes to share. I will request permission to tape record the interview in order to
accurately document the content but I can substitute handwritten notes if the family member prefers. After the interview the family member will receive a typed copy of the interview and I will attempt to recontact the family member to check for accuracy and completeness of the material. In exchange for the family member's participation in this research, I would be able to offer transportation, for example, on a shopping trip or on a visit to the Reformatory.

Participation or non-participation by family members will have no effect on the incarcerated family member. The family members to be interviewed will be asked to sign a written consent to participation in the project and they have the right to discontinue participation in the project at any time without harm to themselves or to the inmate. The identities of the families will be concealed during the study and in the final report of this project.

It is hoped that this research can educate correctional personnel and other policy makers concerning the experiences and needs of the families of inmates. Families of inmates can help because they have important information about the family policy and family programs at the Reformatory.
Principal Investigator
Beverly Toomey, Ph.D.
College of Social Work
The Ohio State University
614/292-5532

Co-Investigator
Martha Armstrong
College of Social Work
The Ohio State University
614/263-7419 (h)
Hello, I am Martha Armstrong, a Ph.D. candidate at The Ohio State University where I am currently working within a research project concerning implementation of family policy in corrections. This research effort is being conducted under the direction of principal investigator Beverly Toomey, Ph.D., Associate Professor, College of Social Work, The Ohio State University. Specifically, this research examines the State of Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction family policy and family programs as they are implemented at the Ohio Reformatory for Women. It is hoped that this research can provide new information of use to correctional personnel and other public policy analysts and program planners concerning the implementation of family policy and family programs in corrections.

Presently I am interviewing State of Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections officials who are key policy and decision makers at the central level. Criteria for participant selection is as follows:
1. The person has a specific and comprehensive knowledge of family programs by virtue of her/his position;

2. The person is in a decision-making position at the central level;

3. The person is willing to participate in the research.

The interview can be scheduled at the participant's convenience and would probably last 45 to 90 minutes depending upon how much information the person wishes to share. I will request permission to tape record the interview in order to document the interview precisely but I can substitute hand written notes if preferred. Following the interview, each participant will receive a transcript of his/her interview and I will attempt to recontact the participant to check for accuracy and completeness of the interview data.

Each individual to be interviewed will be asked to sign a written consent to participation in the project and each person reserves the right to withdraw participation in the project at any time without prejudice. The data will be reported with attention to concealing the identities of all participants who are not public officials by virtue of their appointed or elected positions.
Principal Investigator  Beverly Toomey, Ph.D.
College of Social Work
The Ohio State University
614/292-5532

Co-Investigator  Martha Armstrong
College of Social Work
The Ohio State University
614/263-7419 (h)
Hello, I am Martha Armstrong, a Ph.D. candidate at The Ohio State University where I am currently working within a research project concerning implementation of family policy in corrections. This research effort is being conducted under the direction of principal investigator Beverly Toomey, Ph.D., Associate Professor, College of Social Work, The Ohio State University. Specifically, this research examines the State of Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction family policy and family programs as they are implemented at the Ohio Reformatory for Women. It is hoped that this research can serve to educate correctional personnel and other public policy and program planners concerning the implementation of family policy and family programs in corrections.

Presently I am interviewing persons representing neither the Department nor the families, but who have a specific interest in, or expert knowledge of, family matters within the Department, including members of criminal justice advocacy groups. The interview can be scheduled at the participant's convenience and would probably last
45 to 90 minutes depending upon how much information the person wishes to share. I will request permission to tape record the interview in order to document the interview precisely but I can substitute hand written notes if preferred. Following the interview, each participant will receive a transcript of his/her interview and I will attempt to recontact the participant to check for accuracy and completeness of the interview data.

Each individual to be interviewed will be asked to sign a written consent to participation in the project and each person reserves the right to withdraw participation in the project at any time without prejudice. The data will be reported with attention to concealing the identities of the participants.
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Hello, I am Martha Armstrong, a Ph.D. candidate at The Ohio State University where I am currently conducting a research project concerning implementation of family policy in corrections. Specifically, this research examines the State of Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction family policy and family programs as they are implemented at the Ohio Reformatory for Women. It is hoped that this research can provide new information of use to correctional personnel and other public policy analysts and program planners concerning the implementation of family policy and family programs in corrections.

Presently I am interviewing State of Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction officials who are key policy and decision makers at the Ohio Reformatory for Women and/or at the central (state) level. Criteria for participant selection is as follows:

1. The person has a specific and comprehensive knowledge of the family programs by virtue of her/his position;
2. The person is in a decision-making position at the central or institutional level; and

3. The person is willing to participate in the research.

The interview can be scheduled at the participant's convenience and would probably last 45 to 90 minutes depending upon how much information the person wishes to share. I will record the interview by means of hand written notes. Following the interview, each participant will receive a typed copy of the interview notes and I will attempt to recontact the participant to check for accuracy and completeness of the interview data.

Each individual to be interviewed will be asked to sign a written consent to participation in the project and each person reserves the right to withdraw participation in the project at any time without prejudice. The data will be reported with attention to concealing the identities of all participants who are not public officials by virtue of their appointed or elected positions.

Principal Investigator    Beverly Toomey, Ph.D.
College of Social Work
The Ohio State University
614/292-5532

Co-Investigator           Martha Armstrong
College of Social Work
The Ohio State University
614/263-7419
LISTING OF AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION STANDARDS
PERTINENT TO FAMILY POLICY (1981, 1988)

Standard 23-1.1. General Principle

Prisoners retain the rights of free citizens except:

(a) as specifically provided to the contrary in these standards or;
(b) when restrictions are necessary to assure their orderly confinement and interaction; or
(c) when restrictions are necessary to provide reasonable protection for the rights and physical safety of all members of the prison system and the general public.

Standard 23-5.7. Services for Women Prisoners

Pending determination of child welfare and placement by courts having appropriate jurisdiction, correctional authorities should assure:

(a) that accommodations for all necessary prenatal and postnatal care and treatment are available for women prisoners. Arrangements should be made whenever practical for children to be born in a hospital outside an institution. The fact that a child was born in a correctional institution should not be mentioned in the birth certificate; and

(b) that it is possible for women prisoners to keep their young children with them for a reasonable time, preferably on extended furlough or in an appropriate community facility or, if that is not feasible, that alternative care be promptly arranged. Where the young children remain with the mother in an institution, a nursery staffed by qualified persons should be provided.

Standard 23-6.1. Communication Rights

(a) Any limitations on prisoners' communications should be the least restrictive to serve the legitimate interests of institutional order and security and the protection of the public.
(b) An envelope, package, or container sent to or by a prisoner may be opened and inspected to determine if it contains contraband or other prohibited material, provided that a communication which is reasonably anticipated to be between a prisoner and his or her attorney may be opened and inspected only in the presence of the prisoner.

(c) Correctional authorities may authorize the intentional reading of written communications and the intentional hearing of oral communications upon obtaining reliable information that a particular communication may jeopardize the safety of the public or the security or safety within a correctional institution, or is being used in furtherance of illegal activity.

(d) A communication not otherwise subject to reading or hearing should not be intercepted except pursuant to a court order, or unless authorized by law, when the communication is reasonably anticipated to be:

(i) between a prisoner and his or her attorney; or

(ii) between a prisoner and a member of a specified class of persons and organizations, including but not limited to courts, officials of the confining authority, state and local chief executive officers, legislators, administrators of grievance systems, and the paroling authority.

(e) Indigent prisoners should be afforded a reasonable amount of stationery and free postage for letters to attorneys, courts, and public officials, and to permit them to maintain contact with family and friends in the community . . . .

Commentary

. . . . Because maintenance of community ties also is important to inmate adjustment, * paragraph (e) suggests that prisoners be provided with reasonable amounts of free stationery and postage to enable them to maintain contact with their families* and friends in the community*. . . .
Standard 23-6.2. Visitation; General

(a) Home furlough programs should be established, giving due regard to institutional and community security, to enable prisoners to maintain and strengthen family and community ties.

(b) Subject to the provisions of Standard 23-1.1, correctional authorities should accommodate and encourage visiting by establishing reasonable visiting hours, including time on weekends and holidays, suited to the convenience of visitors.

(c) Subject to the provisions of Standard 23-1.1, institutional visiting facilities should promote informal communications and afford opportunities for physical contact. Extended visits between prisoners and their families in suitable accommodations should be allowed for prisoners who are not receiving home furloughs.

(d) Prisoners should be able to receive any visitor not excluded by correctional authorities for good cause. A prisoner may have the exclusion of a prospective visitor reconsidered through a grievance procedure. All visitors may be subjected to nonintrusive forms of personal search.

(e) Visitation periods should be at least one (1) hour long, and prisoners should be able to accumulate visitation periods to permit extended visits. Visits with attorneys, clergy, and public officials should not be counted against visiting periods, and should be unlimited except as to time and duration.

(f) Where resources and facilities permit, correctional authorities are encouraged to facilitate and promote visitation by providing transportation or by providing guidance, directions, and assistance as to available travel to visitors arriving in local terminals...

Commentary

Because almost all inmates will be returned to the community at the expiration of their terms, it is important to preserve, wherever possible, family and community
ties. In accordance with preferred administrative practice*, paragraph (a) recommends establishment and implementa-
tion of programs for home furloughs under conditions compatible with institutional and community security.
Programs of this sort reduce the need to consider directly the question of conjugal visits at penal facilities.*

Of greater practical importance to most prisoners, however, is the matter of visits by family members and friends* at correctional facilities. Although it has been implied that long-term prisoners cannot be denied visits if such deprivation will be detrimental to physical or mental health*, the more relevant constitutional standard appears to be that there is no absolute right to visits.* Therefore, reasonable limitations can be invoked on contacts with former inmates* and casual acquaintances*, smuggling of weapons and contraband can be forestalled through reasonable security measures*, and visitor attire can be subjected to reasonable restrictions.* Because such questions in this context can be resolved through invocation of the general principle of Standard 23-1.1., they are not dealt with further in this Standard.

The standard goes beyond minimum constitutional concerns to provide for times of visitation accommodating the convenience of visits. Paragraph (b) notes that weekend and holiday visitation hours are important. Paragraph (e) recommends that visiting periods be at least one (1) hour in length* and that prisoners be allowed to forego frequent short visits in order to accumulate unused hours to permit longer visits. Visitation under this standard is intended to promote the retention of family ties. Therefore, professional or business consultations should not be counted against social-visit allowances and should be subject only to reasonable limitations on time and duration based on institutional administrative requirements.

Paragraph (c) recommends that provisions be made by prison administrators for physical contact between inmates and their visitors.* In the instance of family visits, including those deliberately lengthened through relinquishment of frequent brief visits under Paragraph (e), the Standard would not bar making available suitably private accommodations to permit conjugal visits if correctional authorities wish to allow this.* The standard, of course, does not make conjugal visits a norm.
Because so many of the nation's prisons are remote from urban centers from which a majority of inmates come,* consideration needs to be given to facilitation of family travel.* Prisons generally have buses to transport inmates during business hours, and these might well be used to carry visitors from and to public transportation terminals. Although the resulting administrative and financial burdens should not necessarily fall on the correctional system, Paragraph (f) recommends that authorities provide either limited transportation or information about available public transportation.

Security considerations dictate that visitors be subject to nonintrusive searches or screening to forestall introduction of contraband; Paragraph (d) sets forth this obligation.* Some persons also may have to be excluded from approved visitor status because they have abused visitation regulations on earlier occasions* or because officials reasonably suspect that criminal activity may ensue.* The standard contemplates that such exclusions may be challenged through grievance proceedings.*

Standard 23-6.3. Visitation; Prisoners Undergoing Discipline

Prisoners who have violated a disciplinary rule should have the same opportunity to receive visitors as prisoners in the general population of the institution, subject to the provisions of Standard 23-1.1 . . . .

Commentary

The Constitution probably allows reduction or elimination of visiting opportunities for persons in special disciplinary status.* The premise on which these standards are based is that deprivation of visiting privileges should not be used for punishment and that only concerns for institutional safety and order form the basis for reasonable restrictions on visitation.* Therefore, visits are specifically included among the factors bearing on the psychological well-being of prisoners in disciplinary segregation.*

Standard 23-8.6. Domestic Rights

(a) The domestic relationships of convicted persons should be governed by rules applicable to the general public. Conviction or confinement alone
should be insufficient to deprive a person of any of the following domestic rights:

(i) the right to contract or dissolve a marriage;

(ii) parental rights, including the right to direct the rearing of children;

(iii) the right to grant or withhold consent to the adoption of children; and

(iv) the right to adopt children.

(b) Conviction or confinement alone should not constitute neglect or abandonment of a spouse or child, and persons convicted or confined should be assisted in making appropriate arrangements for their spouse or children during periods of confinement...

Commentary

One of the resources upon which many persons convicted of a crime must rely is their families. The criminal process, particularly when it involves incarceration, dramatically alters the domestic relationships of offenders. Imprisonment deprives a nonimprisoned spouse of consortium and, often, of financial support. It makes maintenance of existing relationships and initiation of new relationships difficult at best. Yet strong family ties can be a valuable aide for some offenders, both during confinement and after release.

In addition to the fact of imprisonment, a variety of legal provisions and processes further erodes an offender's domestic relationships. Prisoners are generally prohibited from marrying.* A criminal conviction may be grounds for divorce, although non-fault divorce laws make this a decreasing practical concern. Confinement may be considered evidence of neglect sufficient to support the placement of a convict's children in foster homes. Some statutes eliminate the need to obtain an imprisoned parent's consent to adoption of his or her children.*

The United States Supreme Court has often declared that the cluster of relationships, both marital and parental, that arise out of the family are fundamental rights protected against governmental intrusions.* Legislative
or administrative provisions that interfere with domestic relationships of offenders should be justified by some compelling state interest. The ABA can discern such interest arising solely from a conviction or the fact of confinement. Societal interests that legitimate official intervention are normally codified in provisions applicable to the public at large; offenders should be subject to them like anyone else. The age limitations on marriage are enforceable against prisoners. Child-neglect statutes apply to offenders, but courts should focus on arrangements actually made by them for their children and their attitudes and activities rather than on the mere fact of conviction or confinement.* Implicit in the standard is a confirmation of the ability of offenders to manage personal affairs without advance approval by correctional officials.

Many states provide nursery facilities for children born to incarcerated women. A newborn child generally remains with the mother during the nursing period. American institutions should experiment by providing facilities for a more extended period to allow prisoners of either sex to keep their children with them during confinement, either continuously or for short periods, regardless of a child's age.* European countries have done this for some time. It should be noted, however, that Subparagraph (a)(ii) is not intended to permit prisoners to have custody of a child while incarcerated in regular prison accommodations.

Listing Of American Correctional Association Standards Pertinent To Family Policy (1981, 1988)

Physical Plant

2-4140 Existing, renovation, addition, new plant

There is a visiting room or area for contact visiting and, if necessary, a visiting area for noncontact visiting, both of which provide a reasonable degree of privacy . . . .

Discussion: While security must be observed, some degree of privacy can enhance the value of visits for both the inmate and the visitor. There should be separate restrooms for inmates and visitors, both male and female. There should be adequately designed space to permit screening and searching of both inmates and visitors. Space should be provided for the proper storage of visitors' coats, handbags, and other possessions not allowed into the visiting area . . . .

Special Management Inmates

2-4226 Written policy and procedure provide that inmates in segregation are provided the same opportunities for the writing and receipt of letters available to the general inmate population.

Discussion: Letters should be delivered promptly. If any item consistent with the policy and procedure is rejected, the inmate should be advised of the reason for the rejection, and the item should be returned to the sender.

2-4227 Written policy and procedure provide that inmates in segregation are provided opportunities for visitation, unless there are substantial reasons for withholding such privileges.

Discussion: Every effort should be made to notify approved visitors of any restrictions on visiting. This procedure will avoid disappointment and unnecessary inconvenience for visitors. If time allows, the burden of this notification may be placed on the inmate . . . .
2-4228 Written policy and procedure provide that inmates in disciplinary detention are allowed limited telephone privileges, except for calls related specifically to access to the attorney of record, unless authorized by the warden/superintendent or designee...

Discussion: Inmates in disciplinary detention ordinarily may be provided telephone privileges. There should be only limited use of the telephone for emergency calls and calls to and from designated practicing attorneys in connection with prospective or pending litigation.

2.4229 Written policy and procedure provide that inmates in administrative segregation and protective custody are allowed telephone privileges.

Discussion: None.

Medical And Health Care Services

2-4315 Written policy and procedure specify the process by which those individuals so designated by the inmate are notified in case of serious illness or injury. Permission for notification is obtained from the inmate prior to need, if possible . . . .

Discussion: There may be situations in which the inmate does not want his next of kin notified of his/her injury or illness; therefore, his/her consent should be obtained whenever possible. The next of kin, or other individuals identified by the inmate to be notified in emergencies, should be included in the institution admission form.

Inmate Rights

2-4333 Written policy and procedure require that comprehensive counseling and assistance are provided to pregnant inmates in keeping with their expressed desires in planning for their unborn children . . . .

Discussion: Counseling and social services should be available from either facility staff or community agencies to assist inmates in making decisions such as whether to keep their child, give the child
up for adoption or consent to an abortion. It is advisable that a formal legal opinion as to the law relating to abortion be obtained, and based upon that opinion, written policy and defined procedures should be developed for each jurisdiction.

Communication, Mail, and Visiting

Mail

2-4369 Written policy and procedure governing inmate correspondence are developed and reviewed annually.

Discussion: All regulations pertaining to inmate correspondence should be specified in writing and made available to staff members, inmates, and their correspondent.

2-4370 When the cost is borne by the inmate, there is no limit on the volume of letters an inmate may send or receive, or on the length, language, content or source of mail or publications, except when there is a reasonable belief that the limitation is necessary to protect public safety or institutional order and security.

Discussion: The number of approved correspondents for an inmate should be unlimited, and there should be no limitation on the number of letters an inmate may send or receive from them.

2-4371 Written policy and procedure provide that indigent inmates, as defined in policy, receive a specified postage allowance to maintain community ties.

Discussion: Provision should be made to ensure that indigent inmates are able to send a reasonable minimum number of letters per month. Community ties include family, personal friends, etc., but not privileged communication to attorney, public officials and courts. An indigent inmate is a person found to be without financial resources.
2-4374 Revised August 1983. Written policy and procedure require that incoming and outgoing letters are held for no more than 24 hours or packages for no more than 48 hours, excluding weekends and holidays.

Discussion: Inspection for contraband in letters should take no longer than 24 hours to complete, so that incoming letters should be distributed to inmates and outgoing letters sent to the post office within 24 hours of receipt. Inspection of packages should take no longer than 48 hours to complete; packages should be distributed or sent to the post office within 48 hours of receipt.

2-4375 Revised May 1986. Written policy and procedure provide that inmate mail, both incoming and outgoing, may be opened and inspected for contraband. Mail is read, censored, or rejected when based on legitimate institutional interests of order and security. Inmates are notified when incoming or outgoing letters are withheld in part or in full.

Discussion: Inmates should be permitted uncensored correspondence as long as such correspondence poses no threat to the safety and security of the institution, public officials, or the general public and is not being used in the furtherance of illegal activities. Case law has defined legal limits. When inmate mail is censored or rejected, the inmate or author should be notified of the reasons for the action and provided with an opportunity to appeal that decision. Such complaints should be referred to officials who did not participate in the original disapproval of the correspondence.

2-4376 Written policy and procedure provide for the inspection of inmate letters and packages to intercept cash, checks, and money orders.

Discussion: Cash, checks and money orders should be removed from incoming mail and credited to the offender's account. If discovered in either incoming or outgoing mail, they should be removed and disposed of appropriately. A receipt is given to the sender and addressee, and the episode is documented.

2-4377 Written policy and procedure govern the inspection for and the disposition of contraband.
Discussion: Written policy and procedure should specify how seizures can be challenged, what should be done with the contraband, and under what conditions receipts are given the sender and addressee. Policy should indicate when the matter is referred for prosecution.

2-4378 Revised May 1984. Written policy and procedure specify that inmates are permitted to send sealed letters to a specific class of persons and organizations, including, but not limited to, the following: courts; counsel; officials of the confining authority; state and local chief executive officers; administrators of grievance systems; and members of the paroling authority. Mail to inmates from this specified class of persons and organizations may be opened only to inspect for contraband and only in the presence of the inmate, unless waived in writing . . .

Telephone

2-4379 Written policy and procedure provide for inmate access to public telephones . . .

Discussion: Telephone facilities should be provided to permit reasonable and equitable access to all inmates. Written procedures should specify the hours of telephone availability, maximum length of calls, and any limitation on telephone calls. Telephone facilities should allow for a reasonable amount of privacy. All long distance calls should be made collect.

Visiting

2-4381 Written policy and procedure provide that the number of visitors an inmate may receive and the length of visits may be limited only by the institution's schedule, space, and personnel constraints, or when there are substantial reasons to justify such limitations . . .

Discussion: Inmates should not be denied access to visitation with persons of their choice, except when the warden/superintendent or designee can present clear and convincing evidence that such visitation jeopardizes the safety and security of the institution or the visitors . . .
2-4382 Written policy and procedure specify visitor registration upon entry into the institution and the circumstances under which visitors may be searched...

Discussion: Each visitor should be required to register his/her name, address, and relation to the inmate upon entry. Following written procedures staff may search visitors and their belongings.

2-4383 Written policy and procedure provide that inmate visiting facilities permit informal communication, including opportunity for physical contact. Devices that preclude physical contact are not used except in instances of substantiated security risk...

Discussion: The degree of informality of inmate visiting facilities should be consistent with the institution's overall security requirements...

2-4384 Where statute permits, written policy and procedure specify the conditions for extended visits between inmates and their families...

Discussion: Written policy and procedure should provide guidelines for determining which inmates are permitted extended visits with their families, the length of the visit, where the visit should take place and other conditions for the visit. An opportunity to spend from 48 to 72 continuous hours with family members can help inmates re-establish or strengthen family ties. Inmates with appropriate security classifications should be permitted furloughs home of up to three days. The institution should provide suitable private accommodations for extended visits between inmates and their families on institution grounds.

2-4385 Written policy and procedure govern special visits...

Discussion: Special visits may include visits from persons who have come long distances, visits to hospitalized inmates, visits to inmates in disciplinary status and visits between inmates and their attorneys, clergy, social service agency representatives, etc. Written policy and procedure should specify the conditions of such visits...
2-4386 The institution provides information to visitors about transportation to the institution and facilitates transportation between the institution and nearby public transit terminals.

Discussion: If there is considerable distance between the public transit terminal and the institution, the institution should seek to provide transportation for visitors. This is particularly important where transportation costs are significant.

2-4387 Revised August 1983. Written policy and procedure provide that inmates with appropriate security classifications are allowed furloughs to the community in order to maintain community and family ties, to seek employment opportunities, and for other purposes consistent with the public interest.

Discussion: Unescorted leaves of absence for a predetermined period of time may be appropriate to allow inmates to participate in work and study release programs, seek post-release employment, make residential plans for parole, conduct business affairs when a personal appearance is necessary, visit family to strengthen or preserve relationships, participate in community activities, or for any other purpose deemed consistent with an inmate's rehabilitation.

Reception And Orientation

2-4389 Written procedures for admission of inmates new to the system include, but are not limited to, the following:

... Assisting inmates in notifying their next of kin and families of admission

Explanation of procedures for mail and visiting...

Social Services

2-4472 Revised August 1984. There is a social service program that provides a range of resources appropriate to the needs of inmates, including individual and family counseling, family planning and parental education, and community services.
2-4473 Revised August 1983. Written policy and procedure provide that institutional staff identify at least annually the needs of the inmate population to ensure that the necessary programs and services are available, including programs to meet the needs of inmates with specific types of problems.

Discussion: The review should include an evaluation of the academic, vocational, library, religious, and leisure time programs and services.

Release Preparation And Temporary Release

2-4482 Written policy and procedure provide that all inmates have access to a program of release preparation prior to their release to the community.

Discussion: Inmates should have the opportunity to prepare for release and to understand the purpose and function of parole supervision. Programs to prepare inmates for release could include the following: lectures and discussions that address the concerns of soon-to-be-released inmates; individual counseling that focuses on each inmate's particular needs; pre-release visits by parole officers and family members; and, graduated release through short furloughs.

2-4484 Written policy and procedure include graduated release through a systematic decrease in supervision and corresponding increase in inmate responsibility as part of the classification program.

Discussion: When possible, provision should be made for work or study release, extended visits to family and community, or placement in a pre-release center or halfway house. Supervision should be decreased systematically and the inmate's progress should be evaluated on the basis of specified behavioral criteria rather than on sentence, time served, or subjective judgments based on attitude.

2-4485 Revised August 1983. Written policy and procedure provide for escorted leaves into the community.
Discussion: Inmates should be allowed escorted leaves of absence from the institution to obtain medical care not available in the institution, to visit a critically ill family member or attend the funeral of a family member, to participate in community events as a member of a group or team, or to participate in other community activities that can have a positive influence on the inmate.

Sources:


LISTING OF AMERICAN CORRECTIONAL ASSOCIATION
STANDARDS PERTINENT TO FAMILY POLICY (1990)

Program and Service Areas

Visiting
(Ref. 2-4140)
Sufficient space is provided for a visiting room
or area for contact visiting and, if necessary,
noncontact visiting. There is adequately
designed space to permit screening and searching
of both inmates and visitors. Space is provided
for the proper storage of visitors' coats,
handbags, and other personal items not allowed
into the visiting area.

Special Management Programs and Services

Mail
(Ref. 2-4226)
Written policy, procedure and practice provide
that inmates in segregation can write and
receive letters on the same basis as inmates in
the general population.

Comment: Letters should be delivered promptly.
Any items rejected consistent with policy and
procedure should be returned to the sender, and
the inmate should be advised of the reason for
the rejection.

Telephone Privileges
3-4259
(Ref.2-4229)
Written policy procedure, and practice provide
that inmates in administrative segregation and
protective custody are allowed telephone
privileges.

Comment: This standard also applies to inmates
held in disciplinary detention for more than 60
days.
3-4260
(Ref. 2-4228)
Written policy procedure, and practice provide that, unless authorized by the warden/superintendent or designee, inmates in disciplinary detention are allowed limited telephone privileges except for calls related specifically to access to the attorney of record.

Admissions

3-4272
(Ref. 2-4389)
Written policies and procedures govern the admission of inmates new to the system. These procedures include at a minimum the following:

... recording basic personal data and information to be used for mail and visiting list

explanation of mail and visiting procedures

assistance to inmates in notifying their next of kin and families of admission ...

Comment: Staff should explain the procedures being undertaken at each step in the admission process. When necessary these procedures should be reviewed for inmates transferred from within the system.

Social Services

Principle:
The institution makes available the professional services necessary to meet the identified needs of inmates. Such services may include individual and family counseling, family planning and parent education, and programs for inmates with drug and alcohol addiction problems.
Scope of Services

3-4380
(Ref.2-4472)
There is a social service program that provides a range of resources appropriate to the needs of inmates, including individual and family counseling, family planning and parental education, and community services.

Comment: Social services provide guidance and professional assistance to inmates with family and personal problems; some services may be provided through contractual arrangements with community agencies.

Institutional Services

Counseling For Pregnant Inmates

3-4387
(Ref.2-4333)
Written policy, procedure, and practice require that comprehensive counseling and assistance are provided to pregnant inmates in keeping with their expressed desires in planning for their unborn children.

Comment: Counseling and social services should be available from either facility staff or community agencies to assist inmates in making decisions such as whether to keep their child, give the child up for adoption, or consent to an abortion. The written policy and defined procedures should be developed based on a formal legal opinion.

Release

Release Preparation
3-4389
(Ref.2-4482)
Written policy, procedure, and practice provide that all inmates have access to a program of release preparation prior to their release to the community.
Comment: Inmates should have the opportunity to prepare for release and to understand the purpose and function of parole supervision. Programs to prepare inmates for release could include the following: lectures and discussions addressing the concerns of soon-to-be-released inmates; individual counseling focusing on the inmate's particular needs; prerelease visits by parole officers and family members; and graduated release through short furloughs.

Temporary and Graduated Release

3-4391
(Ref.2-4484)
Written policy, procedure, and practice include graduated release through a systematic decrease in supervision and corresponding increase in inmate responsibility as part of the classification program.

Comment: When possible, provision should be made for work or study release, extended visits to family and community, or placement in a prerelease center or halfway house. Supervision should be decreased systematically, and the inmate's progress should be evaluated on the basis of specified behavioral criteria rather than on sentence, time served, or subjective judgements regarding attitude.

Escorted Leaves

3-4392
(Ref.2-4485)
Written policy, procedure, and practice provide for escorted leaves into the community.

Comment: Inmates should be allowed escorted leaves of absence from the institution to obtain medical care not available in the institution, to visit a critically ill family member or attend the funeral of a family member, to participate in other community activities that can have a positive influence on the inmate.
Mail, Telephone, Visiting

Mail

Inmate Correspondence

3-4429
(Ref.2-4369)

Written policy and procedure govern inmate correspondence; the policies and procedures are reviewed annually and updated as necessary.

Comment: All regulations concerning inmate correspondence should be specified in writing and made available to staff members, inmates, and their correspondents.

3-4430
(Ref.2-4370)

When the inmate bears the mailing cost, there is no limit on the volume of letters the inmate can send or receive or on the length, language, content, or source of mail or publications except when there is reasonable belief that limitation is necessary to protect public safety or institutional order and security.

Comment: The number of approved correspondents for an inmate should be unlimited, and there should be no limit on the number of letters an inmate may send or receive from approved correspondents. Limit may be placed on use of mail for the conduct of an inmate business.

3-4431
(Ref.2-4371)

Written policy, procedure, and practice provide that indigent inmates, as defined in policy, receive a specified postage allowance to maintain community ties.

Comment: An inmate without financial resources should be provided the means to send a reasonable number of letters per month. Community ties include family, personal friends, etc., but not privileged communication to attorney, public officials, and courts.
Inspection of Letters and Packages

3-4433
(Ref. 2-4375)
Written policy, procedure, and practice provide that inmate mail, both incoming and outgoing, may be opened and inspected for contraband. Mail is read, censored, or rejected when based on legitimate institutional interests of order and security. Inmates are notified when incoming or outgoing letters are withheld in part or in full.

Comment: Case law has defined legal limits on censorship of mail. Inmates should be permitted uncensored correspondence so long as the correspondence poses no threat to the safety and security of the institution, public officials, or the general public and is not being used to further illegal activities. When inmate mail is censored or rejected, the inmate or author should be notified of the reasons for the action and have an opportunity to appeal that decision; such appeals should be referred to officials who did not participate in the original disapproval of the correspondence.

3-4434
(Ref. 2-4378)
Written policy, procedure, and practice specify that inmates are permitted to send sealed letters to a specified class of persons and organizations, including but not limited to the following: courts; counsel; officials of the confining authority; state and local chief executive officers; administrators of grievance systems; and members of the paroling authority. Mail to inmates from this specified class of persons and organizations may be opened only to inspect for contraband and only in the presence of the inmate, unless waived in writing.

Comment: None

3-4435
(Ref. 2-4376)
Written policy, procedure, and practice provide for the inspection of inmate letters and packages to intercept cash, checks, and money orders.
Comment: Cash, checks, and money orders should be removed from incoming mail and credited to the inmate's account. They should also be removed from outgoing mail and disposed of appropriately. Any interception should be documented, with receipts given to both the sender and the addressee.

3-4436
(Ref. 2-4377)
Written policy and procedure govern inspection for and disposition of contraband.
Comment: The policies and procedures should specify what should be done with contraband, under what conditions receipts should be given the sender and addressee, how seizures can be challenged, and when matters should be referred for prosecution.

3-4437
(Ref. 2-4374)
Written policy, procedure, and practice require that, excluding weekends and holidays, incoming and outgoing letters are held for no more than 24 hours and packages are held for no more than 48 hours.
Comment: Inspection for contraband in letters should take no longer than 24 hours to complete so that incoming letters should be distributed to inmates and outgoing letters sent to the post office within 24 hours of receipt. Similarly, inspection of packages should take no longer than 48 hours to complete. The standard does not prohibit the holding of mail for inmates who are temporarily absent from the facility (e.g., hospital, court).

Telephone

3-4439
(Ref. 2-4379)
Written policy, procedure, and practice provide for inmate access to public telephones.

Comment: Telephone facilities should permit reasonable and equitable access to all inmates
and permit a reasonable amount of privacy. Procedures should specify the hours during which the telephone is available, the maximum length of calls, and any limitation on calls. All long-distance calls should be made collect.

**Visiting**

**Regular Visitation**
3-4440 (Ref.2-4381)
Written policy, procedure, and practice provide that the number of visitors an inmate may receive and the length of visits may be limited only by the institution's schedule, space, and personnel constraints, or when there are substantial reasons to justify such limitations.

Comment: Inmates should not be denied access to visits with persons of their choice except when the warden/superintendent or designee can present clear and convincing evidence that such visitation jeopardizes the safety and security of the institution or the visitors.

3-4441 (Ref.2-4383)
Written policy, procedure, and practice provide that inmate visiting facilities permit informal communication, including opportunity for physical contact. Devices that preclude physical contact are not used except in instances of substantiated security risk.

Comment: The degree of informality of inmate visiting facilities should be consistent with the institution's overall security requirements.

**Extended and Special Visits**

3-4442 (Ref.2-4385)
Written policies and procedure govern special visits.

Comment: Special visits may include visits from persons who have come long distances, visits to
hospitalized inmates, visits to inmates in disciplinary status, and visits between inmates and their attorneys, clergy, social service agency representatives, etc. Policy and procedure should specify the conditions of such visits.

3-4443
(Ref.2-4384)
Where statute permits, written policy, procedure, and practice provide for extended visits between inmates and their families.

Comment: Policy and procedure should provide specific guidelines for determining which inmates are permitted extended visits with family, the length of the visit, where the visit should take place, and other conditions. Inmates with appropriate security classifications should be permitted furloughs home of up to three days. Also, if permitted by statute the institution should provide suitable private accommodations for extended visits between inmates and their families on institutional grounds.

3-4444
(Ref.2-4387)
Written policies, procedure, and practice provide that inmates with appropriate security classifications are allowed furloughs to the community to maintain community and family ties, seek employment opportunities, and for other purposes consistent with the public interest.

Comment: Unescorted leaves of absence for a set period of time may be appropriate to allow inmates to participate in work and study release programs, make residential plans for parole, or any other purpose consistent with the inmate's security classification.

Visitor Registration

3-4445
(Ref.2-4382)
Written policy, procedure, and practice provide that visitors register upon entry into the
institution and specify the circumstances under which visitors may be searched.

Comment: Each visitor should register his or her name, address, and relation to the inmate. Staff may search visitors and their belongings following written procedure.

3-4446
(Ref. 2-4386)
The institution provides information to visitors about transportation to the institution and facilitates transportation between the institution and nearby public transit terminals.

Comment: Institutions situated considerable distance from public transit terminals should try to provide transportation for visitors, particularly when transportation costs are significant.
LISTING OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE STANDARDS AND GOALS PERTINENT TO FAMILY POLICY (1973)

Standard 2.17 Access To The Public

Each correctional agency should develop and implement immediately policies and procedures to fulfill the right of offenders to communicate with the public. Questions of right of access to the public arise primarily in the context of regulations affecting mail, personal visitation and the communications media.

MAIL. Offenders should have the right to communicate or correspond with persons or organizations and to send and receive letters, packages, books, periodicals, and any other material that can be lawfully mailed. The following additional guidelines should apply:

1. Correctional authorities should not limit the volume of mail to or from a person under supervision.

2. Correctional authorities should have the right to inspect incoming mail, but neither incoming nor outgoing mail should be read or censured. Cash, checks, or money orders should be removed from incoming mail and credited to offenders' accounts. If contraband is discovered in either incoming or outgoing mail, it may be removed. Only illegal items and items which threaten the security of the institution should be considered contraband.

3. Offenders should receive a reasonable postage allowance to maintain community ties.

VISITATION: Offenders should have the right to communicate in person with individuals of their own choosing. The following additional guidelines should apply:

1. Correctional authorities should not limit the number of visitors an offender may receive or the length of such visits except in accordance with regular institutional schedules and requirements.
2. Correctional authorities should facilitate and promote visitations of offenders by the following acts:

a. Providing transportation for visitors from terminal points of public transportation. In some instances, the correctional agency may wish to pay the entire transportation costs of family members where the offender and the family are indigent.

b. Providing appropriate rooms for visitation that allow ease and informality of communication in a natural environment as free from institutional or custodial attributes as possible.

c. Making provisions for family visits in private surroundings conducive to maintaining and strengthening family ties.

3. The correctional agency may supervise the visiting area in an unobtrusive manner but should not eavesdrop on conversations or otherwise interfere with the participant's privacy.