

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS COMMUNITY CORRECTIONAL CENTERS AS TRANSITIONAL FACILITIES

Vivian W. Stallworth

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of community correctional centers (CCC's) as transitional facilities in the Florida Department of Corrections. The study focused on three research questions: (1) the effectiveness of the current transitional process used in the centers; (2) the level of uniformity in the process; and, (3) what changes needed to be made in the process. The results of a survey consisting of 17 items completed by each of 30 CCC's in the department is presented. Several recommendations are offered for consideration with regards to the centers.

Introduction

The Florida Department of Corrections currently has nearly 62,000 inmates incarcerated in its correctional facilities. To supervise and care for these inmates costs the Department an average total of \$44.57 per day per inmate.

Among its facilities, the Department of Corrections has thirty community correctional centers with a total capacity of 2,769 beds to provide transitional services for inmates released from major correctional institutions prior to returning to their communities. These centers are located in five designated regions of the Department with five centers in Region I, six centers in Region II, four centers in Region III, eight centers in Region IV, and seven centers in Region V. Each region has a regional director and numerous division directors. The centers are under the direction of the community correctional division director in Regions I, II, III, and under the direction of the superintendent of Community Corrections in Regions IV and V.

Inmates assigned to these transitional facilities are housed at a much lower cost. In addition, these inmates are afforded the opportunity to work in the community in paid employment, provide financial assistance to dependents, establish family ties, and attend schools. The inmates pay the state of Florida 45% of their earnings for subsistence.

These centers seem to play a useful role in the Department of Corrections incarceration strategy for inmates, particularly in their use as transitional facilities for inmates serving the final period of their sentence and approaching eligibility for release back into society. The effectiveness of these centers in serving this purpose has not been systematically reviewed. This study seeks to fill this void. This research examines the community correctional centers in the Department of Corrections to determine their effectiveness as transitional facilities.

Background

Crime with its attendant costs has created a great stir among citizens. There are mixed feelings regarding the desire to incarcerate offenders versus the ever increasing cost of providing for their incarceration. With the ever rising cost to maintain prisons, a comment about the prison system is that while it may be inhumane, expensive, and ineffective, it does what society wants (Sommer, 1975).

There are some movements in the country to identify alternatives to incarceration. This notion has not received great response. The literature reporting on

the use of transitional facilities is very limited. However there is a need to review such facilities for their use as transitional facilities for offenders as a part of their period of confinement.

Florida's Department of Corrections has developed several levels of incarceration to manage inmates under its supervision, and has different facilities that are designed to serve specific purposes. Among these facilities are major correctional institutions, road prisons, and work camps, all which provide a level of supervision and security that do not allow for integration back into the community while still incarcerated. Probation and restitution centers provide inmates with a level of supervision, without incarceration, that allows for community contact, employment, and payment of restitution while on probation. Community correctional centers are the only facilities that provided incarcerated inmates with transitional services while still incarcerated. Community correctional centers are typically staffed with correctional personnel that include a major, lieutenant, sergeants, officers, probation officers, and a secretary. All centers are similarly staffed varying only when dictated by facility size. The centers house minimum custody inmates within 24 months of release that are screened for participation while housed in major correctional institutions. It costs the Department of Corrections approximately \$24.95 per day per inmate to provide services to inmates housed in the transitional facilities.

When these facilities are fully utilized as alternatives to incarceration, inmates have the opportunity to leave and practice a variety of social skills in less restricted settings, ultimately enabling them to reenter the community better prepared to live in a free society. They allow inmates to work, pay fines, provide restitution to victims and assistance to their families. It has been noted that when an inmate pays restitution it allows the victim to come back into the picture. Repayment of victims is central to what historian David Rothman calls a failure model in which society recognizes its "inability to achieve such heady and grandiose goals as eliminating crime and remaking the offender" (Rothman, 1974, p. 54). Restitution is no more than a reverse of society, "paying back" the inmate for his misdeeds through the pain and suffering of incarceration but to also repay the victim for any monetary loss caused by the inmate in the commission of the crime. Community correctional centers as transitional facilities play a viable role in the reintegration of inmates back into their communities and Florida, despite some problems, still seems to be in the forefront with its facilities.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of community correctional centers as transitional facilities according to the correctional officer majors responsible for the overall management of the facilities. The study focused on three (3) research questions:

1. How effective is the current transitional process in community correctional centers?
2. What is the level of uniformity in the current process?
3. What, if any, changes need to be made in the current process?

Methods

The Department of Corrections has a total of thirty (30) community correctional centers (CCC's) within the Department. All of these centers were included for examination in the study.

Available literature for background information germane to the study was quite limited; therefore, annual reports, historical perspectives, and survey results were relied upon heavily. Individual discussions were also held with knowledgeable staff responsible for the overall management of the facilities.

To determine the effectiveness of the centers as transitional facilities, a survey consisting of seventeen (17) questions was constructed. One section contained a Likert scale of five response options consisting of strongly disagree, mildly disagree, neither agree nor disagree, mildly agree and strongly agree. Another section offered open-ended questions for response. A third section required forced selection. The survey was electronically transmitted to thirty centers allowing five days for responding. All of the surveys were returned within the five days deadline for a 100% rate of return. Survey data received from correctional officer majors was formulated, analyzed, and placed in tabular form for interpretation. Percentages were the primary statistical method used for reporting the data.

For the section containing the Likert scale response options, the "neither agree nor disagree" response was chosen as a neutral point to determine the difference between a positive or negative response. The percentages of responses were used as a basis to make a decision regarding the responses to the questions. For the open-ended response questions, decisions were made based upon the percentages of centers responding.

One weakness was that the survey was not field tested before distribution. Another weakness was subjective interpretation of the intent of some of the items included on the survey with varied responses. Another weakness of the survey was that some data was not available to the respondents resulting in "no response." The limited response time also may have had some effect on the response provided.

An overall review of the survey responses was used to arrive at a decision regarding the effectiveness of the community correctional centers as transitional facilities.

Results

A presentation of the responses to the survey is reported in this section. A response was received from all of the centers included in the survey for a 100 percent return. The respondents to the survey were the correctional officer majors, supervisors of the centers, in 93 percent of the cases (28), with the remaining 7 percent completed by other staff.

As mentioned earlier, a neutral point (neither agree or disagree) was selected to differentiate between positive (mildly agree to strongly agree) and negative (mildly disagree to strongly disagree) responses. Percentages were used as the statistical measure for the data.

Table 1 shows responses as to whether the centers were utilized to their fullest potential. Fifteen centers, 50 percent, disagreed that they were being utilized, while 13

of the centers, 43 percent, thought they were being utilized to their full potential. One center did not respond to the question.

Table 1: Community Correctional Centers are Utilized to Their Fullest Potential

Regions	# of Sites	Strongly Disagree	Mildly Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Mildly Agree	Strongly Agree	No Response
I	5	-	2	1	1	1	-
II	6	1	2	-	2	1	-
III	4	2	1	-	1	-	-
IV	8	0	1	-	5	2	-
V	7	2	4	-	-	-	1
All Regions	30	5 (17%)	10 (33%)	1 (3%)	9 (30%)	4 (13%)	1 (3%)

When the centers were asked if less violent inmates should be sentenced directly to centers, 26 respondents, 87 percent, disagreed with this notion. Only four centers, 13 percent, agreed with this (Table 2).

Table 2: Courts Should Sentence Less Violent Inmates Directly to Community Correctional Centers

Regions	# of Sites	Strongly Disagree	Mildly Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Mildly Agree	Strongly Agree	No Response
I	5	5	-	-	-	-	-
II	6	4	1	-	-	1	-
III	4	3	-	-	1	-	-
IV	8	7	-	-	-	1	-
V	7	5	1	-	-	1	-
All Regions	30	24 (80%)	2 (7%)	-	1 (3%)	3 (10%)	-

Fourteen respondents, 46 percent, disagreed that the number of centers designated as transitional centers were adequate, with eight of the respondents, 25 percent, agreeing that the number of centers were adequate. Nine respondents, 30 percent, neither agreed nor disagreed with this item (Table 3).

Table 3: The Number of Community Correctional Centers Designated as Transitional Facilities are Sufficient

Regions	# of Sites	Strongly Disagree	Mildly Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Mildly Agree	Strongly Agree	No Response
I	5	-	1	3	1	-	-
II	6	2	2	1	1	-	-
III	4	1	1	1	1	-	-
IV	8	1	2	3	2	-	-
V	7	3	1	1	2	1	-
All Regions	30	7 (23%)	7 (23%)	9 (30%)	7 (23%)	1 (3%)	-

In response to the question that inmates most likely to benefit from work release were targeted for placement in the centers, 19 respondents, 63 percent, disagreed with this. Only 10 respondents, 33 percent, agreed that this was happening (Table 4).

Table 4: Inmates More Likely to Benefit From Work Release are Targeted for Placement in the Community Correctional Centers

Regions	# of Sites	Strongly Disagree	Mildly Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Mildly Agree	Strongly Agree	No Response
I	5	-	4	-	1	-	-
II	6	1	4	-	3	-	-
III	4	3	1	-	-	-	-
IV	8	1	5	-	-	2	-
V	7	2	-	1	2	2	-
All Regions	30	7 (23%)	12 (40%)	1 (3%)	6 (20%)	4 (13%)	-

Table 5 depicts the response to the statement that academic services needed by inmates to assist them in transition have been received prior to recommendation to a community correctional center. Twenty-four, 80 percent, of the respondents disagreed with this. Four respondents, 13 percent, neither agreed nor disagreed with this statement. One center did not respond to this question.

Table 5: Academic Services Needed by Inmates to Assist Them in Transition Have Been Received Prior to Recommendations to a Community Correctional Center

Regions	# of Sites	Strongly Disagree	Mildly Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Mildly Agree	Strongly Agree	No Response
I	5	3	1	1	-	-	-
II	6	3	2	-	1	-	-
III	4	3	1	-	-	-	-
IV	8	4	4	-	-	-	-
V	7	2	1	3	-	-	1
All Regions	30	15 (50%)	9 (30%)	4 (13%)	1 (3%)	-	1 (3%)

When asked if the skills possessed by inmates upon assignment to a community correctional center are adequate to assist in the transitional process, 17 respondents, 56 percent, responded negatively; 10 respondents, 33 percent answered positively (Table 6). One center did not provide a response.

Table 6: Skills Possessed by Inmates Upon Assignment to Community Correctional Centers are Adequate to Assist in the Transition Process

Regions	# of Sites	Strongly Disagree	Mildly Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Mildly Agree	Strongly Agree	No Response
I	5	-	1	1	3	-	-
II	6	1	1	-	4	-	-
III	4	4	-	-	-	-	-
IV	8	5	1	1	1	-	-
V	7	3	1	-	2	-	1
All Regions	30	13 (43%)	4 (13%)	2 (7%)	10 (33%)	-	1 (3%)

Interestingly, the centers responded positively when asked if community correctional centers provide inmates with the opportunity for better transition and integration back into society. Twenty-eight of the centers, 93 percent, agreed with this; one center neither agreed nor disagreed and one center did not respond (Table 7).

Table 7: Community Correctional Centers Provide Inmates with the Opportunity for Better Transition and Integration Back into Society

Regions	# of Sites	Strongly Disagree	Mildly Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Mildly Agree	Strongly Agree	No Response
I	5	-	-	-	-	3	-
II	6	-	-	-	-	5	1
III	4	-	-	-	1	3	-
IV	8	-	-	1	-	7	-
V	7	-	-	-	2	5	-
All Regions	30	-	-	1 (3%)	3 (10%)	25 (83%)	1 (3%)

Twenty-five respondents, 83 percent, agreed that the community correctional centers were instrumental in the reduction of recidivism. Three respondents, 10 percent, neither agreed nor disagreed, and one center each strongly disagreed and provided no response (Table 8).

Table 8: Community Correctional Centers are Instrumental in the Reduction of Recidivism

Regions	# of Sites	Strongly Disagree	Mildly Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Mildly Agree	Strongly Agree	No Response
I	5	-	-	1	-	4	-
II	6	-	-	-	-	5	-
III	4	-	-	1	1	2	-
IV	8	-	-	-	2	5	1
V	7	1	-	1	4	2	-
All Regions	30	1 (3%)	-	3 (10%)	7 (23%)	18 (60%)	1 (3%)

Table 9 presents responses to the statement that programs available at community correctional centers are effective. As can be noted, 24 respondents, 80 percent, agreed that the available programs are effective, with three respondents, 10 percent, disagreeing and three centers not responding.

Table 9: Programs Available at Community Correctional Centers are Effective

Regions	# of Sites	Strongly Disagree	Mildly Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Mildly Agree	Strongly Agree	No Response
I	5	-	2	-	2	1	-
II	6	-	-	-	2	3	1
III	4	-	-	-	3	3	1
IV	8	-	-	-	2	5	1
V	7	1	-	-	3	3	-
All Regions	30	1 (3%)	2 (7%)	-	12 (40%)	12 (40%)	3 (10%)

The average number of disciplinary infractions per inmate per week ranged from none in three centers, 10 percent, to a high of more than four infractions per week in one center, 3 percent. Two centers, 7 percent, did not respond. Fifteen centers averaged one or less infractions per week, 50 percent (Table 10).

Table 10: The Average Number of Disciplinary Infractions Charged to Inmates Per Week

Regions	# of Sites	0 Per week	.01-1.00 Per week	1.01-2.00 Per week	2.01-3.00 Per week	3.01-4.00 Per week	4.00 + Per week	No Response
I	5	1	2	1	-	1	-	-
II	6	2	1	1	-	-	1	1
III	4	-	3	-	-	1	-	-
IV	8	-	4	2	-	1	-	1
V	7	-	5	2	-	-	-	-
All Regions	30	3 (10%)	15 (50%)	6 (20%)	-	3 (10%)	1 (3%)	2 (7%)

The average length of time to secure employment upon arrival at the 30 centers ranged from one to 35 days. In 81 percent of the centers, it took less than 14 days to secure employment. Fourteen centers, 47 percent, placed inmates in employment in 8 to 14 days and 10 centers, 34 percent, took one to seven days for an inmate to secure employment (Table 11).

Table 11: The Average Length of Time for Inmates to Secure Employment

Regions	# of Sites	1 - 7 Days	8 - 14 Days	15 - 21 Days	22 - 28 Days	29 - 35 Days	No Response
I	5	3	2	-	-	-	-
II	6	2	3	1	-	-	-
III	4	1	3	-	-	-	-
IV	8	2	2	2	1	1	-
V	7	2	4	1	-	-	-
All Regions	30	10 (34%)	14 (47%)	4 (13%)	1 (3%)	1 (3%)	-

The average length of stay for inmates in the centers ranged from four months to more than 13 months (Table 12). The greatest stay was from seven to nine months, which related to 11 centers, 37 percent. This was followed by four to six months, 20 percent; 10 to 12 months, 20 percent; and 13 or more months, 20 percent for six centers each responding. One center did not respond to this item.

Table 12: Average length of Stay for Inmates in the Community Correctional Center

Regions	# of Sites	1-3 Months	4-6 Months	7-9 Months	10-12 Months	13+ Months	No Response
I	5	-	1	3	-	1	-
II	6	-	2	1	3	-	-
III	4	-	1	-	-	2	1
IV	8	-	1	5	1	1	-
V	7	-	1	2	2	2	-
All Regions	30	0	6 (20%)	11 (37%)	6 (20%)	6 (20%)	1 (3%)

The average number of terminations per week ranged from none to three per week. As shown in Table 13, seven centers averaged none per week, 23% and 24 or 80 percent averaged less than one per week.

Shown in Table 14 are the responses of the centers as to what services are offered in the community correctional centers. Of the 10 services listed, only centers in Region II offered all of them, as well as some others. Overall, most centers offered eight of the services listed, and in many cases, additional services such as life skills, etc. Interestingly, only three centers located in Region IV indicated that health services were available. Two centers did not respond to this item on the survey.

Drug treatment and job placement were offered in 23 centers or 77 percent, followed by GED programs being offered in 19 centers or 63 percent. These were followed by counseling, which was offered in 16 centers or 53 percent. The remaining services were offered in three to six different centers.

Table 13: The Average Number of Terminations Per Week

Regions	# of sites	0 Per week	.01 - .50 Per week	.51 - 1.00 Per week	1.01-1.50 Per week	1.51-2.00 Per week	2.01-2.50 Per week	2.51-3.00 Per week	3.01-3.50 Per week	3.51-4.00 Per week	No response
I	5	1	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	1	-
II	6	2	-	3	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
III	4	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
IV	8	1	4	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
V	7	2	3	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
All Regions	30	7 23%	8 27%	9 30%	2 7%	-	-	1 3%	1 3%	1 3%	1 3%

Table 14: What Services are Presently Offered at Your Community Correctional Center

Regions	# of sites	Mental Health	Education	GED	VOC	Counseling	Health	Drug Treatment	Job Placement	Housing Services	Family Assistance	Other	No Response
I	5	-	-	5	1	4	-	4	4	3	2	4	-
II	6	-	2	2	-	2	-	3	5	-	4	1	1
III	4	1	2	4	1	2	-	3	2	-	-	3	-
IV	8	1	3	3	3	5	3	7	6	2	6	3	-
V	7	1	1	5	-	3	-	6	6	1	2	2	1
All Regions	30	3 10%	8 27%	19 63%	5 17%	16 53%	3 10%	23 77%	23 77%	6 20%	14 47%	13 43%	2 7%

In response to the questions as to what changes should be made in community correctional centers to make them more effective as transitional facilities, the centers submitted 58 different recommendations. No responses were received from three centers (Table 15).

Table 15: District Changes Recommended by Community Correctional Centers

Center	Staffing	Program / Training	Administrative Management	Space	Selection Process	No Response
Marianna		X				
Panama City						
Pensacola	X		X			
Tallahassee	X					
Park House		X				
Daytona	X					
Beach						
Dinsmore		X	X			
Duval		X				
Gainesville						X
Lake City		X				
Santa Fe	X		X		X	
Cocoa					X	
Orlando	X	X		X		
Pine Hills	X	X	X			
Kissimmee		X				
Ft. Pierce	X				X	
Hollywood						X
Atlantic		X	X	X		
Miami						
Miami North		X				
Opa Locka		X			X	
Pompano	X					
West Palm						
Bartow		X				
Ft. Myers					X	
Hillsborough					X	
Pinellas		X				
St. Pete						X
Tampa		X			X	
Tarpon Springs	X					
Total	9	14	5	2	7	3

When the recommendations were analyzed, they appeared to relate to five distinct areas: staffing, program/training, administrative/management, spacing, and selection process. The 58 recommendations were collapsed to these five areas. Nine

centers made recommendations relating to staffing; 14 centers suggested changes concerning program/training offered in the centers; five centers made administrative/management recommended changes, and seven centers suggested changes in the inmate selection process. Two centers made recommendations regarding spacing in and/or for the centers.

There was no indication of consensus among the centers as to what changes should be made. However, there appeared most concerns were about program/training and staffing of the center. The inmate selection process received the next highest level of concern.

In summary, these data revealed that consensus among the centers was very much absent based upon the responses provided. There was close agreement in only three cases. The remaining reports varied considerably between centers.

Discussion

Although Community Correctional Centers in the Department of Corrections have been established for a reasonably long period of time, this examination revealed some interesting findings regarding their effectiveness.

The purpose of this study was to examine the effectiveness of community correctional centers as transitional facilities. Three (3) specific questions were postulated for examination. A survey instrument was developed and distributed to each of the centers for response with a 100 percent return rate. Upon return, the surveys were analyzed, formulated, and placed in tabular form for interpretation, using percentages as the statistical measure. A review of the responses indicated that there was little uniformity and consensus among the various centers. They were most alike or agreed in such areas as using community correctional centers for the direct placement of inmates by the courts, the services received by inmates prior to their placement in the centers, their use as transitional facilities for inmates back into the community, and their use in the reduction of recidivism. They were far apart as a uniform group in such areas as the length of stay of inmates in the centers, the adequacy of skills possessed by inmates upon assignment to centers, and the number of available centers being sufficient. Conclusions reached regarding the three questions posed for examination are as follows.

Regarding the effectiveness of the current transitional process in correctional centers, there is disagreement among the centers concerning the transitional process. Seven of the centers made specific recommendations for changes in the transitional process and numerous others made recommendations regarding administration and management of the process as well as in the program/training available for inmates. As to the level of uniformity of the current "transitional" process, a conclusion can be reached that there is a lack of uniformity in the process presently in place. The most uniform part of the process is the criteria for inmates to be considered for assignment to the centers. Beyond this, the process appears to vary extensively among the centers, Regions of the Department, and the inmates skills.

Concerning the need for any changes in the current process as posed in the third question, it can be concluded that there is a dire need for this process to be reviewed towards achieving more uniformity and consistency. Supporting the need for change

are the levels of disciplinary infractions imposed, variations in the type of programs offered, and differences in the size of the centers.

The conclusion reached regarding the effectiveness of community correctional centers as transitional facilities would appear to be that, notwithstanding, a lack of uniformity among the centers, variation in the process used in the selection of inmates, differences in size of centers, and staffing and programs offered, they have been effective as transitional centers in the Department of Corrections. The data reflects difference of opinions in a number of areas. Nevertheless, the centers do appear to be functioning with some success as transitional facilities.

The following recommendations are presented for consideration with regards to the centers:

1. An effort be made to determine those areas where uniformity would lead to improvements.
2. The staffing of the centers be examined for its adequacy in meeting the operational needs of the centers.
3. Those programs that should be offered in the centers be identified and provided in a consistent manner.
4. A decision be made as to the feasibility of making health services available in some manner for all centers.
5. Additional research be undertaken regarding other aspects of the center e.g., success of inmates following release from the centers and differences required between centers for males and females.
6. A comparison study be made between the centers in Florida and other states.

What changes do you think should be made to make the community correctional centers more effective as transitional facilities?

Region I

Panama City Community Correctional Center

- More Staff

Tallahassee Community Correctional Center

- More Staff

Park House Community Correctional Center

- More utilization of community resources

Marianna Community Correction Center

- More programs

Pensacola Community Correctional Center

- Extend furlough hours
- Reassign supervisory responsibilities on the regional level.

Region II

Lake City Community Correctional Center

- More programs
- Type "B" furloughs approved prior to arrival

Dinsmore

- Accept only those inmates that have completed required academic/vocational programs.
- Less restrictions as far as rules and regulations.

Santa Fe CCC

- More center work assignment inmates
- Adequate equipment
- More Staff

Duval Community Correctional Center

- All inmates should receive basic education prior to CWR/ or provide funds to achieve during work release.
- More programs

Gainesville CCC

No response

Daytona Community Correctional Center

- More staff
- Space for programs

Region III

Cocoa Community Correctional Center

- Not approve inmates for participation just because they meet the minimum criteria
- Inmates with an extensive disciplinary history should not be approved

Kissimmee Community Correctional Center

- Include ABE and GED programs at community correctional centers
- More staff

Orlando Community Correctional Center

- More staff
- Space for more programs
- Increase bed space

Pine Hills Community Correctional Center

- More staff
- More flexibility at centers in rule making
- More programs

Region IV

Atlantic Community Correctional Center

- More programs
- Part-time jobs to allow for school
- More community correctional centers
- more flexibility in furlough process
- Free clinics
- Use of more public transportation

Fort Pierce Community Correctional Center

- Relief factors for staff
- More transportation
- Better screening
- More clerical

Hollywood Community Correctional Center

- No response

Miami Community Correctional Center

- Only inmates that have completed academic and vocational programs should be assigned

Opa Locka Community Correctional Center

- Inmates should be assigned to centers in their area of location
- More community based activities
- More training
- Community Correctional Centers should unite inmates with families

Pompano community Correctional Center

- More flexible work schedule
- More staff
- More vans for transportation

West Palm Beach Community Correctional Center

- Inmates being sent to community correctional centers for longer periods of time

Region V

Bartow Community Correctional Center

- Educational programs at center

Fort Myers Community Correctional Center

- Job skills and attitude should be a determining factor in selection of work release inmates

Hillsborough Community Correctional Center

- Better screening for inmates
- Assign inmates with fewer disciplinary problems

Pinellas Community Correctional Center

- Increase adequately trained staff
- More work assignment positions
- More educational programs
- On-site halfway house

St. Petersburg Community Correctional Center

- No response

Tarpon Springs Community Correctional Center

- More staff

Tampa Community Correctional Center

- Provide inmates with only one opportunity for participation in community work release
- More space for programs
- More than 10% of net income should be going to the court ordered payment system

References

Banks, W. and Hamilton, A., Jr., (1993). Father Behind Bars. Waco: WRS Publishing

Bender, D.L. (1980). American Prisons: Opposing Viewpoint (3rd Edition). St. Paul: Franklin Watts.

Bender, D.L. (1986). American Prisons: Opposing Viewpoint (4th Edition). St. Paul: Franklin Watts

Clark, P.E. and Lehrman, R. (1980). Doing Time: A Look at Crime and Prisons. New York: Hasting House

Davis, B. (1986). Instead of Prison. New York: Watts

Foster, C.D., Siegel, M.A., and Landress, A. (1990). Crime - A Serious American Problem. Wylie: Information Plus

Jones, R. (1997, February). Crossing in DC History: A History of Work Release. Paper presented at the meeting of the Community Residential Programs for Circuit Administrators, Tampa, Florida.

Rothman, D.J. (1974). Prisons: The failure model. The Nation

Sommer, R. (1976). The end of imprisonment. New York: Oxford University.

1995-1996 Annual Report: The Guidebook to Corrections in Florida.
Tallahassee, Florida. Bureau of Research and Data Analysis , Florida Department of Corrections, 1996.