

902

HJ

CORRECTIONS

3

services, the Bureau's major division would be a community intake, probation and contract services division.

° An adolescent residential treatment facility with a capacity of 15 beds should be developed either at API or at McLaughlin. If developed at McLaughlin, it should utilize existing capacity rather than increase the capacity of that facility.

° A small group residential facility with a capacity of 20 beds should be developed to serve the Fairbanks community. Preference should be given to contracting these services as that would enable more flexibility in specialization.

° Development of a child-based transactional information system should be taken immediately.

° Alternatives to detention -- the Alaska Division of Corrections should launch a major initiative immediately, develop alternatives to detention for children awaiting court dispositions.

Alaska is presently detaining at the rate of 15.6 per 1,000, not including that group of children who are detained less than 24 hours. If they were included, the rate would escalate to 44 per 1,000 (national rates are 9.8 per 1,000). "Alaska does seem to have a penchant for detention, no matter what standard you use for comparison," according to the planners. If the state does not pursue alternatives, the planners project that 120 secure detention beds will be needed by 1980. There are now 35 (MYC). A major building program will be required if alternatives to detention are not developed.

° The Alaska State Police and local law enforcement agencies should develop training in the use of discretion and diversion by police officers in handling juveniles.

° The Division of Corrections should immediately increase its efforts to develop alternative detention and correctional resources, especially in the Second Judicial District.

Staff requirements to perform DOC juvenile corrections functions by judicial districts are estimated for 1978, 1990 and the year 2,000. It is recommended that reorganization of juvenile service within the Division of Corrections and the staffing of community services functions be the first priority. Once that step is accomplished, alternative care should receive top priority, followed by alternative services for children in committed status.

Juneau and Fairbanks have both had bond issues passed approving the construction of juvenile detention facilities. Juneau clearly does not need a secure detention facility for children, neither should the Fairbanks community construct a secure juvenile detention facility. Fairbanks might develop as an alternative a generic facility with intensive programming not to exceed 20 beds in capacity and should not be a maximum security facility. (Elsewhere the planners have also recommended that no juvenile facility be built in Nome as permitted with passage of the 1978 bond issue.)

RURAL CORRECTIONS

This portion of the plan commences with two succinct statements: "the problems confronting corrections in rural Alaska are enormous," and "solutions in any instance must be unique in Alaska." Various geographic, climatic, cultural and economic problems are cited with a major focus on alcohol abuse. The

problems are more fully analyzed by examining standards, reports, studies and policies dating back more than a decade.

In Alaska, because of the significant differences between urban and rural life styles, regionalized service delivery to the extent it is economically feasible seems essential to a reintegrative or community based approach to corrections. There can be no easy or inexpensive solutions to the problems of corrections in rural Alaska. Compromises will be necessary and, at best, even the compromises will be expensive. The full range of correctional resources cannot be made available to all communities desiring them. Most communities are too small and their requirements for these resources are too limited to permit economical or efficient operations. Difficult decisions must be made requiring justification from the perspective of policy, needs and cost (both capital and operational).

A "partial regionalization" plan is promoted by the planners as the best compromise toward meeting inadequate facility needs. (However, the term is not well defined nor are there any priorities identified.) The planners feel that the need for formal diversionary alternatives and resources is substantially less in rural Alaska since "informal alternatives already exist and are relatively widely used."

Probation aides hired on a part time fee-for-services basis are recommended for increasing probation alternatives and supervision for rural clients while providing a meaningful mechanism for involving local communities in the corrections process.

Although alcohol plays an important role in rural crime, the planners recommend that the public drunk should not be the responsibility of the corrections system. The resources of the system should be reserved only for those charged or convicted of criminal offenses. The public drunk should be diverted to other agencies, both local and state. The legislature should authorize the State Office of Alcoholism and provide necessary appropriations to establish sleep-off centers in all communities where state operated correctional institutions or contract jails are now being used for persons detained under the 12 hour law. A plan similar to that of the North Slope Borough, but associating the use of the 12 hour law with a sleep-off center rather than jail confinement, should be adopted elsewhere. The Office of Alcoholism should be allowed full authority to design and operate alcoholism treatment programs, both in correctional institutions and in the community.

The Governor's order to set up advisory boards for state operated or contract correctional facilities in local areas should be promptly implemented. Local participation and community involvement should be achieved through the development of a highly cooperative relationship between the state and the communities. These measures would give local citizens opportunities for significant roles in the correctional process of their own communities and a means of providing input in the development of policies and programs in the state system as they affect offenders from rural areas.

Also recommended is that the legislature should clarify the authority of rural communities to enforce their own ordinances administratively with noncriminal sanctions, the courts should take action to enable the local communities to adopt the conciliation board concept, and corrections should develop standards for institutions and carry out a continuing program of inspection and enforcement.

TECHNICAL SERVICES

Although management style and structure are basic to the achievement of correctional goals, maintenance of adequate quality and quantity of staff at all levels of the organization is also essential. In order to attain this objective, corrections staff must receive adequate training for their positions and they must be encouraged through appropriate career ladders and salary incentives to maintain a professional involvement with the corrections field.

A current "staff profile" of the Division of Corrections is provided which includes various demographic characteristics, education and training levels, an analysis of staff morale and job satisfaction factors.

Staff training is discussed in some detail following the comment that correctional agencies have traditionally been granted low priority within state government budgets and "personnel training programs are all too often regarded as an unaffordable luxury, left unfunded or given only token funding. Alaska has in the past been no exception."

Various national standards as well as local task force, commission, plan and grand jury reports are analyzed for their focus on correctional training. The basic training issues outlined by the planners include: questions concerning the most appropriate type of training for each staff member, the context of training needed which varies with the level of education of the staff member, the amount of work experience in the corrections field, type of responsibilities of the job, location of the statewide training academy, residential vs. nonresidential approach to corrections staff training, and the balance between the use of in-house corrections training staff and tapping outside training resources.

A summary of recommendations would include: a move of the residential form of academy at Sitka to a nonresidential setting in Anchorage (Alaska Pacific University), a balancing of first year training hours to meet national correctional standards of 160 hours (down from DOC present 240 hour academy), a balancing of curriculum so that the emphasis on security does not obscure the need for other knowledge and services in working effectively with correctional clientele, participation of personnel from other sections of the criminal justice system in corrections training (Public Safety, Parole Board, Judiciary, Department of Law, Mental Health, Social Services, Office of Alcoholism and Drug Abuse), preparation of Division-wide annual training plans, formation of an Advisory Training Committee, on-the-job and in-service training programs, and legislative support for personnel and funds.

A long discussion is presented on a corrections career ladder which effectively destroys a militaristic component or functional unit concept which had previously been proposed by the Division of Corrections. The planners stress the necessity for career ladder structure which is available to all correctional employees. Lateral transfers among the three major service units of the Division, lateral entry at any level from outside the system, the use of paraprofessionals, and a reasonable degree of flexibility in substituting education for experience requirements (or vice-versa) are recommended.

Policy development and management support services are explored with particular attention focused on an effective computerized corrections information system. The policy development unit should include a unit head and a staff of two researcher-planners and at least one full time inspector (all correctional facilities -- contract and local jails -- statewide). Management services include fiscal and budget personnel and clerical support. The addition of an accountant to this unit is recommended.

The fiscal management staff of the Division should work closely with the researcher-planners of policy development to ensure that anticipated policy and work changes are accommodated in the budgeting process. Funding should be tied to evaluation performance so that cost effectiveness can be maximized.

Similarly, personnel management is closely related to staff development and training and should be closely coordinated.

Career ladder issues, in particular, affect personnel management within the Division. All of the administrative support services planned within the Technical Services unit (including health care) seem as being very closely related functions.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE DECISION MAKING

Although each is in a separate branch of government, the corrections system is really the instrument of the courts and effective use of a corrections system is therefore highly dependent on the quality of sentencing. Imprisonment is the most serious and most costly of the sentencing alternatives. Unfortunately, offenders have frequently been required to undergo both an inequitable sentencing process and an inconsistent parole process. In addition, the courts largely determine the size of the unsentenced prisoner population detained in Alaska's corrections facilities.

The planners explore various issues in pretrial release and recommend that there is a substantial need to explore more fully the potential for expanded use of summons in felony cases as an alternative to arrest and booking and that legislation should be undertaken to create a uniform pretrial release procedure for Alaska.

Sentencing issues are explored in detail citing several recent research studies, reports and Commission policy statements.

This section's primary focus is on the impact of the Revised Criminal Code. The Code directly affects the sentencing

process and therefore the corrections system. The primary aim of the Code is to increase equity in sentencing while also protecting the public from and punishing multiple offenders. In this regard, the Code is quite consistent with the philosophy of corrections outlined in the first chapter of this plan. The section provides a brief summary of the Code and discusses a method of estimating the impact of the Code on the size of the sentenced inmate population. This type of impact estimate must form the basis for future correctional facility planning for the State of Alaska.

For the corrections system, the consequences of the new Criminal Code would appear to be the substantial reduction in the use of parole and an increase in the average time served and, therefore, an increase in prisoner population. Conclusions are drawn that indicate:

1. the current average length of stay of sentenced felons (including murderers) is 36 months;
2. the minimum average length of stay of sentenced felons (a conservative estimate of impact) may rise to 62 months under the Revised Criminal Code.

The difference in average lengths of stay represent a 72 percent increase in the sentenced inmate average length of stay (ALS) attributable to the new Criminal Code.

The capacity requirements for correctional institutions thus could increase substantially over the next several years due to implementing the Revised Criminal Code. The cost implementation of this increased inmate population, both in capital

and operating expenditures, are significant. The unintended consequence of enacting the Revised Criminal Code may well be to inflate the sentenced inmate population of Alaska's correctional institutions to extraordinarily high levels (emphasis added). Unfortunately, the Code may not go far enough to eliminate sentencing disparity and may go too far in imposing lengthy sentences on recidivist felons.

Implementing any sentencing reform requires the highest level of cooperation between the judiciary, the legislature, law enforcement and the Division of Corrections. Corrections alone cannot hope to improve Alaska's sentencing or pretrial release practices; only with cooperation of the other decision makers involved can true and lasting improvements be achieved. In the relationship between corrections and the courts, corrections planning necessarily must become criminal justice system planning as well.

PAROLE DECISION MAKING

Parole policies and practices have as direct an effect on corrections as do court actions in pretrial release and sentencing decisions. Parole policies determine, within statutory and judicially determined limits, the length of time a sentenced inmate serves in prison, and the type of conditions that are imposed on his or her parole. Even if a sentencing guidelines model is adopted and the need for parole as a means of adjusting for sentencing disparities disappears, parole reintegration

services should not be discontinued. Pre-release programs operated by the Division of Corrections, such as work release and furloughs, will become even more critical if parole is abolished. However, it is not likely that parole decision making will be abolished in Alaska in the near future. It may also prove to be necessary to statutorily provide for some portion of the end of every sentence to incarceration to be served under community supervision (similar to the mandatory release law now in effect).

Given that the Parole Board will continue to function in Alaska for the foreseeable future, it is important that the Parole Board's policies and practices are consistent with the state's overall corrections philosophy and that the Board is provided with sufficient resources and authority to efficiently accomplish its responsibilities.

At present, the Board hears about 300 cases annually, although there may be a considerable variation in number by quarter, from about 60 to 100 or more. On the average, prisoners serve nearly half their terms before being released on parole, approximately two-thirds are eventually granted parole and at any one time there are about 200 offenders on parole.

The planners offer a lengthy discussion of current Alaska Parole Board practices in comparison to the American Correctional Association Accreditation Commission's "Manual of Standards for Adult Parole Authorities" and arrive at the following recommendations:

1. the Alaska Board of Parole be composed of three full time professional members with salaries equivalent to that of a superior court judge.

2. The staff of the Board should be reorganized and augmented.
3. Hearing procedures should be changed upon initiation of a full time Board.
4. A formal prisoner or parolee appeals process should be established.
5. The Board should adopt a parole guideline or matrix system, to be considered as a long term project and the guidelines, based on research, should be used as an aid to decision making and should not entirely replace the discretion of Board members.
6. The Board should prepare and keep up-to-date a manual of policy, rules and procedures, and an administrative manual subject to the provisions of the Alaska Administrative Procedures Act.
7. Legislation should be considered to allow the Board to give credit to parolees whose paroles have been revoked for "time on the street," i.e., under written policy criteria for allowing or disallowing credit for time served in the community.
8. The Board should be authorized by legislation to discharge parolees from parole status at any time after two years of successful community reintegration.
9. Consideration should be given to legislation, and/or changes in Board procedure, under which the Board would conduct initial hearings in the case of prisoners with maximum sentences of five years or less within four months of their commitment, for the purpose of setting a presumptive release date. Prisoners with maximum terms of more than five years would be heard within a month prior to the completion of their maximum terms.
10. A mechanism should be established within the Department of Health and Social Services to assure that the Board of Parole and the Division of Corrections function under a common correctional philosophy and policy.

STAFF SERVICES

Although management style and structure are basic to the achievement of correctional goals, maintenance of adequate quality and quantity of staff at all levels of the organization is also essential. In order to attain this objective, corrections staff must receive adequate training for their positions, and they must be encouraged through appropriate career ladders and salary incentives to maintain a professional involvement with the corrections field. In this section, both staff training and career ladders are discussed. As part of the planning process, a survey of corrections staff was conducted by Moyer Associates and the Division of Corrections; results of this survey are summarized as a preface to outlining and evaluating the issues and options which have evolved in regard to training and career ladders.

Staff Profile

The survey, designed by Moyer Associates, was distributed to all Division staff, excluding clerical and maintenance workers. Of the approximately 400 professional staff, 250 returned the anonymous questionnaires to Moyer Associates' offices. The respondents were distributed across the Division's institutions and field offices as follows:

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Central Office, Juneau	13	5
Probation/parole offices	51	21
Anchorage CC	21	8
Anchorage Annex	-	-
Eagle River CC	29	12
Palmer CC	15	6
Ridgeview CC	16	6
Fairbanks CC	12	5
Juneau CC	12	5
Ketchikan CC	13	5
Nome CC	6	2
McLaughlin Youth Center	<u>62</u>	<u>25</u>
	250	100%

The survey was distributed during August, 1978; no responses were received from staff of the Anchorage Annex, so that the 250 received actually represent an over 70 percent response rate from the remainder of the Division's staff. Although the MYC staff may be slightly over-represented, responses were received in representative proportions from the remainder of the DOC's offices and institutions.

Further indication of the sample's representativeness is the distribution across position types, represented below in ascending order of frequency (as reported by staff members).

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Administrative staff, juvenile institution	4	2
Training staff	7	3
Security staff, juvenile institution	10	4
Central administrative staff	11	4
Administrative staff, adult institutions	17	7
Probation/parole staff	53	21
Institutional program staff*	63	25
Security staff, adult institutions	<u>83</u>	<u>34</u>
	250	100%

* The vast majority of these were staff of McLaughlin Youth Center.

Demographic Characteristics

All of the respondents had at a minimum completed high school, and a distinct majority had at least completed some college-level courses.

<u>Educational level</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
High school diploma	34	14
Some college	92	37
Bachelor's degree	47	19
Some graduate or professional school	58	23
Graduate or professional degree	17	7
	<u>248</u>	<u>100%</u>

Of the respondents, 27 percent were female. Although 65 percent of these female staff report having at least a Bachelor's degree (as compared to only 42 percent of males, a difference significant at $p < .01$), and even though nearly equivalent proportions of male and female staff report having more than three years of work experience with the Alaskan DOC (14 and 13 percent, respectively), all of the central administrative staff respondents are male. In terms of staff positions, the following summarizes the proportion of female respondents holding each type of position:

<u>Position</u>	<u>Percent of Total Female Staff</u>	<u>Percent Which Comprise in each position</u>	<u>Number of Females</u>
Central administration	-	-	-
Juvenile institution administration	-	-	-
Adult institution administration	2	6%	1
Training	2	14%	1
Juvenile institution security	3	20%	2
Institution program	27	27%	17
Probation/parole	31	41%	20
Adult institution security	35	27%	22
TOTAL STAFF	<u>100%</u>	<u>27%</u>	<u>64</u>

In fact, the great majority (76 percent) of female respondents were located at Ridgeview CC, McLaughlin Youth Center, or in the probation

and parole field offices ($p < .001$).

The ethnic background of staff is represented in the following table:

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Caucasian	202	84
Black	17	7
Other	10	4
Indian	8	3
Eskimo	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>
	241	100

As has been noted by others, this ethnic distribution does not parallel that of the Alaska's offenders, who are much more likely than the staff to be either Native Alaskan or Black, especially if incarcerated. However, this is reflected in the distribution of the relatively few Native Alaskan staff across position types; nearly 60 percent of all Native Alaskan employees responding to the survey were employed as adult institution security staff. In terms of educational background, a significantly higher ($p < .05$) proportion of Caucasians (52 percent) than either Native Alaskans (17 percent) or Blacks (35 percent) had at least a Bachelor's degree. All of the central administrative staff responding were Caucasian.

Corrections staff reported the following age distribution:

<u>Age</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
21-25	33	14
26-30	70	29
31-40	71	30
41-50	45	19
51-60	17	7
Over 60	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>
	239	100%

As might be expected, age is directly and significantly associated ($p < .001$) with length of time employed by the Alaska Division of

Corrections: the older the staff member, the longer has been his or her association with the Division.

The following table summarizes, by age group, the proportions of respondents who: 1) have at least a Bachelor's degree; 2) consider their chances of promotion to be good or very good; and, 3) who feel that their co-workers are either satisfied or very satisfied with their jobs:

<u>Age</u>	<u>Bachelor's Degree</u>	<u>Good/Very Good Promotion Chances</u>	<u>Co-Workers' Satisfaction With Job</u>
21-25	42%	62%	73%
26-30	50%	55%	59%
31-40	56%	40%	50%
41-50	40%	50%	60%
51-60	64%	47%	77%
Over 60	33%	33%	67%

The group from 31 to 40 years of age, which makes up the largest proportion of staff, thus has a relatively higher proportion of well-educated persons the majority of whom feel that their chances of promotion within the Division are poor to very poor; and fully half of whom feel that their co-workers are dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with their jobs. Therefore, it is not surprising that a larger proportion among this age group is considering leaving the Division of Corrections:

<u>Age</u>	<u>Percent in each Group Considering leaving</u>
21-25	31%
26-30	34%
31-40	44%
41-50	27%
51-60	29%
Over 60	67%

of those with preservice training said that it was not at all useful, while only three percent said their on-the-job training was not at all useful.

Staff were asked to evaluate whether the preservice and/or on-the-job training they received in 22 specific areas related to corrections prepared them well, adequately, inadequately or poorly for their present positions. If they had not received training in an area, or did not consider it necessary for their present position, staff could so indicate, and thus not evaluate the training in that area. Following are the results of this evaluation; the subject areas are listed in descending order of the relative proportions of staff who reported receiving no training in the area. The second column summarizes the percent of staff who said training in the area was not needed for their present position. The third column contains the percentages of those receiving needed training in the areas who found that the training prepared them either inadequately or poorly for their present position.

<u>Subject Area</u>	<u>No Training</u>	<u>Training Not Needed</u>	<u>Training Inadequate or Poor</u>
Research and/or Planning	43	14	58
Investigative techniques	41	12	50
Supervision of volunteers	38	18	27
Public relations	37	3	34
Riot control	37	15	47
Crisis intervention	34	3	49
Human relations	33	2	35
First aid	32	5	26
Counseling	31	2	36
Firearms	30	30	27
Organizational management skills	30	9	34
Self defense	29	5	48
Administrative report writing	26	7	28
Interpersonal communications skills	26	1	29
Offender assessment and classification	25	9	27

of those with preservice training said that it was not at all useful, while only three percent said their on-the-job training was not at all useful.

Staff were asked to evaluate whether the preservice and/or on-the-job training they received in 22 specific areas related to corrections prepared them well, adequately, inadequately or poorly for their present positions. If they had not received training in an area, or did not consider it necessary for their present position, staff could so indicate, and thus not evaluate the training in that area. Following are the results of this evaluation; the subject areas are listed in descending order of the relative proportions of staff who reported receiving no training in the area. The second column summarizes the percent of staff who said training in the area was not needed for their present position. The third column contains the percentages of those receiving needed training in the areas who found that the training prepared them either inadequately or poorly for their present position.

<u>Subject Area</u>	<u>No Training</u>	<u>Training Not Needed</u>	<u>Training Inadequate or Poor</u>
Research and/or Planning	43	14	58
Investigative techniques	41	12	50
Supervision of volunteers	38	18	27
Public relations	37	3	34
Riot control	37	15	47
Crisis intervention	34	3	49
Human relations	33	2	35
First aid	32	5	26
Counseling	31	2	36
Firearms	30	30	27
Organizational management skills	30	9	34
Self defense	29	5	48
Administrative report writing	26	7	28
Interpersonal communications skills	26	1	29
Offender assessment and classification	25	9	27

<u>Subject Area</u>	<u>No Training</u>	<u>Training Not Needed</u>	<u>Training Inadequate or Poor</u>
Legal rights of inmates	25	5	40
Transportation and movement of inmates outside institutions	22	8	28
Disciplinary procedures for offenders	19	9	18
Search and seizure of contraband	18	2	18
Supervision of offenders	14	2	15
Division policies & procedures	13	1	23
Institutional security	12	6	18

In general, it appears that in those areas where the largest proportion of the staff received training, the highest levels of satisfaction with the training were reported (see the last five subject areas listed). However, in other areas where fewer staff reported receiving training, a higher proportion of those who did receive training evaluated it as inadequate or poor in preparing them for their present position. There are also several subject areas, knowledge of which most staff apparently felt were necessary to their work (see low percentages in second column), but in which a high proportion of staff reported receiving no training. These areas include public relations, crisis intervention and management, human relations, counseling and communications skills; in nearly all of these areas, over one-third of those who did receive training reported it to be inadequate or poor. It must be noted that the question on the survey did not refer only to Division-sponsored training, so this should not be viewed as solely a critique of the Division's training of staff, but rather as a needs assessment by staff outlining areas in which they feel they need more adequate training to function in their present positions.

In fact, the Division has recently acted to begin to increase the amount of training offered in some of these areas, most notably in

communications and institutional organization. Thus, findings of the survey and recommendations offered later should be seen as reinforcing trends already apparent within the Division.

Staff Morale

The final type of questions included on the survey are indications of the attitude of staff toward their jobs and the Division. Some of the results have previously been summarized, but they are here discussed in greater detail.

Staff were asked how often they participated in decision-making which affected their jobs:

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Never	23	9
Seldom	74	30
Often	79	32
Very often	<u>72</u>	<u>29</u>
	248	100%

They were also asked what they felt their chances for promotion were:

Very poor	62	25
Poor	62	25
Good	80	33
Very Good	41	17

Another question asked respondents to estimate how satisfied their co-workers were with their jobs.

Very dissatisfied	18	7)	40
Dissatisfied	81	33)	
Satisfied	141	58)	60
Very satisfied	6	2)	

A final attitudinal question asked whether the staff members were considering leaving the Division of Corrections.

Yes	88	36
No	154	64

Other less direct, behavioral indicators of the staff members' morale and commitment to their work were also included on the survey, but results here summarized must be cautiously interpreted due to the highly skewed nature of some of the response distributions.

Staff were asked to estimate how many hours they work in an average week:

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Less than 40 hours	-	-
40 hours	115	47
45 hours	95	39
50 hours	28	11
55 hours	6	2
60 or more	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>
	247	100%

This demonstrates that a distinct majority of staff work at or only slightly above the expected level of hours for a full-time employee. Though it is not desirable that employees be required to work overtime (adequate staffing should be provided so that the system can function without employees working overtime on a regular basis), some level of voluntary overtime work can be regarded as an indication of professional career orientation on the part of staff. In fact, fully 85 percent of staff stated that when they do work overtime, they do so voluntarily. However, the career orientation possibly indicated by this is confounded by the fact that nearly 40 percent of the respondents are paid on an hourly basis, so that, for those individuals, the monetary incentive to work overtime may well outweigh any other considerations. Another behavioral indicator of morale often used is absenteeism. Only three

percent of respondents reported that they were absent more than once in an average month due to illness.

The attitudinal indicators of staff morale show associations which might be expected. The crosstabulation of promotion chances with job satisfaction (of co-workers) estimates shows the following pattern, significant at $p < .001$. In the table, the upper figure in each cell is the number of staff, and the lower figure is the percent this number is of the total number of respondents.

Job Satisfaction

<u>Promotion Chances</u>	<u>Very Dissatisfied</u>	<u>Dissatisfied</u>	<u>Satisfied</u>	<u>Very Satisfied</u>
Very Poor	6 2%	25 10%	28 12%	-
Poor	5 2%	29 12%	26 11%	2 1%
Good	2 1%	20 8%	56 23%	1 1%
Very Good	5 2%	5 2%	28 12%	3 1%

Total N=241

Thus, a total of 26 percent of respondents both felt their promotion chances are poor (at best) and think their co-workers are relatively dissatisfied with their jobs, while 37 percent thought their chances of promotion at at least good and that their co-workers are relatively satisfied.

One factor which may contribute to perceived dissatisfaction is the level of employee participation in decisions affecting their work. Numbers in the table should be read as in the one immediately preceding.

<u>Frequency of Decision-making Participation</u>	<u>Very Dissatisfied</u>	<u>Dissatisfied</u>	<u>Satisfied</u>	<u>Very Satisfied</u>
Never	3 1%	12 5%	8 3%	- -
Seldom	5 2%	36 15%	31 13%	1 1%
Often	3 1%	19 8%	55 23%	2 1%
Very often	7 3%	14 6%	45 18%	3 1%

Total N=244

Thus, only 16 percent of respondents who never or seldom participated in such decisions thought their co-workers are relatively satisfied, while 43 percent of those who often or very often participate in decisions affecting their work also feel their co-workers to be satisfied (or very satisfied) with their jobs. This association is significant at P .01.

Finally, of course, the majority of staff who are considering leaving the Division also feel their co-workers are dissatisfied (63 percent), while most of those who aren't considering leaving also feel that their co-workers are relatively satisfied (74 percent).

In a December 1978 memorandum to the DHSS Commissioner, the Division of Corrections reports that the staff termination rate of the Correctional Officer series has decreased about 13 percent in the past two years, from 33 to 20 percent. Since staff turnover rates are often used as an indicator of organizational morale, this decrease in terminations, if maintained over a period of several years, logically would seem to indicate a gradual improvement in staff morale. This improvement can in turn be traced to the Division's efforts to:*

*Adapted in large part from the aforementioned memorandum.