Results of Data Analysis:

NIC Needs Assessment on Correctional Management and Executive Leadership Development

Connie Clem
U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Corrections
Information Center

May 28, 2003

Contents

NIC Needs Assessment on Correctional Management and Executive Leadership Development

Project Background

The National Institute of Corrections (NIC) Information Center, working at the request of the NIC Academy Division, launched a study in April 2003 to explore issues related to staff development at management and leadership levels in corrections. The research was intended to help guide strategic planning for future training programs provided by the Institute.

The survey requested information on turnover, training, and demographics at four levels of correctional management. The levels include executive leaders, senior leaders, management, and supervisors. Definitions provided in the survey for each of these levels included specific positions in large and small prisons, jails, and community corrections agencies. (See survey instrument, Appendix A.)

To begin the project, staff sent a survey by e-mail to members of four private, NIC-sponsored listservs for correctional administrators. The surveys reached deputy directors of state prison agencies (departments of correction), administrators in the nation's largest jails, administrators in state and local probation and parole agencies, and state jail inspectors, who were asked to forward the survey to county-level respondents.

Project staff analyzed agency data across agency size and functional parameters to produce this report of findings. Responses were received from 141 agencies employing a total of 216,769 staff. The survey sample included 82 jails; 13 prison-only agencies plus 10 jointly managing prisons and community corrections; and 36 community corrections agencies plus the same 10 jointly managing prisons and community corrections. County agencies totaled 103, and state agencies totaled 38.

There were 38 agencies in the "very small" size range (under 100 staff) and 41 agencies in the "small" range (100 to 499 staff). Twenty-three (23) agencies were in the mid-range with between 500 and 999 staff. Jails were the dominant agency type in each of these categories, with two-thirds or more of each sample. "Large" agencies (1,000 to 4,999 staff) totaled 24, fairly evenly split between prisons and jails, with some community agencies. "Very large" agencies (>5,000 staff) totaled 12, representing mostly prisons.

About this Document

- The Key Findings section discusses the highlights found through analysis of the data.

- Sections I through IX present survey data on leadership development. The data have been tabulated in various ways to illustrate comparative findings for the entire survey pool and for subsets based on agency function, agency size, and/or specific leadership level.

- Section X presents tabulated data on leadership demographics, plus raw data for the entire survey pool and for subsets based on agency function, agency size, and leadership level.

Key Findings

Workforce and Management Statistics

Survey respondents reported a total of 389 Executive positions, 1,668 Senior Leader positions, 4,892 Management positions, and 20,320 Supervisory positions. Compared to a total of 216,769 staff employed by these agencies, the proportion of leadership positions at each level is as follows:

Executives:	1.8 positions per 1,000 staff
Senior Leaders:	7.7 positions per 1,000 staff
Managers:	23 positions per 1,000 staff
Supervisors:	94 positions per 1,000 staff

Leadership Turnover

Management-level turnover reported by the responding agencies has been high and is not expected to abate.

• Across all agency types, 29% of Executive level positions were filled in the past 12 months. Nearly 60% of Executive level personnel are eligible to retire in the next 5 years, and more than 25% are expected to retire.

• At the Senior level, 17% are expected to retire within 5 years. Lower percentages are expected to retire at the Management (9%) and Supervisory (4%) levels.

• By agency function, expected retirements within 5 years at the Executive level are 26% in jails, 24% in prisons, and 29% in community corrections.

• Expected retirements at the Senior level drop but are still significant: 22% in jails, 15% in prisons, and 12% in community corrections.

Leadership Development

Agencies are in general unsatisfied with the development opportunities they provide to their upper leadership staff. Smaller agencies reported less satisfaction than larger agencies with their leadership development capacity. NIC is a significant source of classroom-type leadership development for upper-level leaders and is the top source among prison and community corrections agencies.

Types of development opportunities provided:

- Classroom training is the most used delivery method at all leadership levels, at over 95%. Informal mentoring and on-the-job (OJT) training is next highest, used by 50% to 65% of agencies at various levels. Formal mentoring/OJT are most often used at the Management and Supervisory levels.

- From 10% to 17% of agencies overall either provide no development opportunities for staff at the Executive level or did not answer the question.

Sources of training:

- Professional associations consistently rank on top as a training source at each level. NIC is most used to train staff at the higher leadership levels. The highest percentage of in-house training was found in lower level leadership positions. Colleges are used the least, but are still a significant source, used by around 50% of agencies.

- At the Executive level, NIC is a training source for 63% of jails, 87% of prisons, and 91% of community corrections. (The low figure for jails may reflect the small size of many of the jails in the sample.)

- In jails, professional associations provide Executive leader classroom training in 89% of responding agencies, followed by "other" sources with 67%. At the Senior level, professional associations provide training in 84% of jails, followed by NIC with 74%.

- In prisons, NIC provides Executive leader classroom training in 87% of responding agencies, followed by "other" with 52%. At the Senior level, NIC is also the leader with 87%, followed by 70% of agencies using professional associations.

- For community-based corrections, NIC provides Executive leader classroom training in 91% of responding agencies, followed by "other" with 62%. At the Senior level, 83% of agencies cited other state or local agencies as a training source, followed by 78% for both NIC and professional associations.

Agencies' capacity to train/Sufficiency of training provided:

- Inadequate capacity to train Executive level leaders was reported by 46% of responding agencies. The percentage drops to 41% for Senior leaders, 32% for Management level leaders, and 19% at the Supervisory level. Smaller agencies are less satisfied with their development capacity.

- For Executive leadership development, community corrections agencies were less satisfied with their capacity (29% considering it adequate) than jails (63%) or prisons (43%).

- Asked whether their Executive leadership development is sufficient, community corrections answered "yes" in 25% of agencies, prisons in 34% of agencies, and jails in 40% of agencies.

- At the Senior level, 37% of jails said their training capacity was inadequate, as did 43% of prisons and 46% of community corrections agencies. Half of community corrections agencies consider their Management-level training inadequate as well.

Comments on leadership development:

- Agencies citing budget issues as a factor in development opportunities provided: 7

- Agencies noting that exposure to peers in other agencies is important: 3

- Agencies observing that upper level staff come into the job with sufficient experience: 2

- Agencies referring favorably to NIC programs: 10.
  Programs cited: Large Jail Network, Executive Women Leadership, jail administrator programs, executive and senior training courses, Executive Excellence, ASCA/NIC new directors program, New Wardens, probation/parole executives training in Texas.

Comparative Demographics

A review of demographic data shows that, in general, gender and racial/ethnic breakdowns reflected in the correctional management ranks are fairly comparable with national percentages for correctional agency staff as a whole. Variations were found between the different functional agency categories.

- Across all levels, women hold 29% of jail leadership positions, 23% of prison leadership positions, and 26% of community corrections leadership positions.

- Across all leadership levels, blacks hold 34% of jail leadership positions, 12% of prison leadership positions, and 11% of community corrections leadership positions.

- Across all leadership levels, Hispanics/Latinos hold 7% of jail leadership positions, 6% of prison leadership positions, and 4% of community corrections leadership positions.

- Across all leadership levels, whites hold 53% of jail leadership positions, 80% of prison leadership positions, and 82% of community corrections leadership positions.

Women in corrections leadership —

- Women hold the highest percentage of leadership positions in community corrections (30% - 34%), except at the Supervisory level, where the highest percentage of women is in jails (31%).

- The smallest percentage representation of women is at the Executive leadership level in jails (12%).

- Across all levels, women hold 29% of jail leadership positions, 23% of prison leadership positions, and 26% of community corrections leadership positions.

- Women hold 12% of Executive positions in jails, 23% in prisons, and 30% in community corrections.

Native Americans and Alaskans, Asians/Pacific Islanders, and Other/Multiple in corrections leadership —

- All these groups were at 1% or less of each leadership level.

Blacks in corrections leadership —

- Blacks hold the highest percentage of leadership positions in jails at all four levels, ranging from 38% of Supervisory level positions to 18% of Executive positions.

- Across all leadership levels, blacks hold 34% of jail leadership positions, 12% of prison leadership positions, and 11% of community corrections leadership positions.

- Blacks hold 18% of Executive positions in jails, 15% in prisons, and 14% in community corrections.

Hispanics/Latinos in corrections leadership —

- Hispanics/Latinos make up less than 10% of all leadership categories surveyed, except at the Senior Leader level in community corrections, where their representation is 13%.

- Across all leadership levels, Hispanics/Latinos hold 7% of jail leadership positions, 6% of prison leadership positions, and 4% of community corrections leadership positions.

- Hispanics/Latinos hold 5% of Executive positions in jails, 8% in prisons, and 8% in community corrections.

Whites in corrections leadership —

- Whites hold more than 50% of the leadership positions in each category surveyed, except at the Supervisory level in jails.

- Across all leadership levels, whites hold 53% of jail leadership positions, 80% of prison leadership positions, and 82% of community corrections leadership positions.

- Whites hold 77% of Executive positions in jails, 77% in prisons, and 78% in community corrections.

Section I. About the Survey Sample

1. Total responses: 141 responses

2. Agency types represented:

Jails:	82
Prisons:	23 *
Community corrections:	46

State-level agencies	38
County or local-level agencies	103

* Responses from 10 agencies provided combined data for community corrections and prison staff.

3. Size of agencies represented in survey sample, by agency function:

	Number of Staff Employed				
	Fewer than 100	100 to 499	500 to 999	1,000 to 4,999	5,000 or more
Prisons:	0	1	1	11	10
Community corrections:	15	12	4	10 (5)*	4 (0)*
Jails:	23	28	17	8	2
Total	38	41	23	29 (24)	16 (12)

* The larger numbers are agencies reporting combined data for prisons and community corrections. The smaller numbers are agencies reporting for community corrections only.

Section II. Overview: Analysis of Data for All Responses

Leadership Staff Turnover

4. Turnover in leadership positions:

	Positions Filled in Past 12 Mo.	No. Eligible to Retire in 5 Yrs.	No. Expected to Retire in 5 Yrs.
Executive level	112 (29%)	220 (57%)	111 (29%)
Senior leader level	240 (14%)	659 (40%)	290 (17%)
Managerial level	737 (15%)	1,238 (25%)	440 (9%)
Supervisory level	3,365 (17%)	3,106 (15%)	772 (4%)
Total	4,454	5,223	1,613

5. Leadership position turnover by agency size (positions filled):

	Agency Size (Number of Staff Employed)				
	Fewer than 100	100 to 499	500 to 999	1,000 to 4,999	5,000 or more
Executive level	17%	17%	33%	36%	31%
Senior leader level	7%	16%	17%	16%	14%
Managerial level	9%	14%	10%	9%	19%
Supervisory level	13%	18%	12%	11%	19%

6. Retirement eligibility within 5 years, by agency size:

	Agency Size (Number of Staff Employed)				
	Fewer than 100	100 to 499	500 to 999	1,000 to 4,999	5,000 or more
Executive level	50%	69%	54%	50%	60%
Senior leader level	44%	57%	38%	37%	38%
Managerial level	14%	39%	24%	20%	27%
Supervisory level	11%	18%	21%	18%	14%

7. Leadership staff expected to retire, by agency size:

	Agency Size (Number of Staff Employed)				
	Fewer than 100	100 to 499	500 to 999	1,000 to 4,999	5,000 or more
Executive level	30%	35%	31%	20%	31%
Senior leader level	28%	31%	19%	9%	19%
Managerial level	9%	19%	13%	4%	9%
Supervisory level	7%	10%	8%	6%	2%

Leadership Staff Development

8. Training and development opportunities provided:

	Formal "Classroom" Training	Formal Distance Education	Formal Mentoring/ On-the-Job Training	Informal Mentoring/ On-the-Job Training	Other	None/ Not answered
Executive level	95%	20%	15%	50%	9%	17%
Senior leader level	98%	23%	20%	59%	6%	10%
Managerial level	97%	24%	28%	63%	5%	16%
Supervisory level	99%	23%	31%	60%	6%	14%

9. Sources of formal, "classroom" training, where provided:

	Own Agency	Other State or Local Agency	College or University	Professional Association	Commercial Provider or Consultant	NIC
Executive level	50%	62%	41%	84%	47%	75%
Senior leader level	60%	72%	46%	82%	52%	78%
Managerial level	75%	75%	42%	76%	56%	71%
Supervisory level	82%	68%	42%	70%	49%	57%

10. Agency views on capacity to train and develop leadership staff, by managerial level:

a)   "Does your agency have adequate capacity to train and develop staff at [this] level?"

	Yes	No	Not sure
Executive level	45%	46%	8%
Senior leader level	50%	41%	9%
Managerial level	59%	32%	8%
Supervisory level	75%	19%	6%

b)   Percentage answering "yes," by agency size

	Agency Size (Number of Staff Employed)				
	Fewer than 100 (N=38)	100 to 499 (N=41)	500 to 999 (N=23)	1,000 to 4,999 (N=29)	5,000 or more (N=16)
Executive level	26%	24%	52%	41%	50%
Senior leader level	26%	39%	61%	45%	50%
Managerial level	26%	49%	74%	45%	50%
Supervisory level	47%	61%	87%	45%	62%

c)   Percentage answering "yes," by agency function

	Jail	Prison	Community Corrections
Executive level	51%	48%	34%
Senior leader level	56%	48%	39%
Managerial level	65%	62%	43%
Supervisory level	80%	71%	62%

11. Agency views on sufficiency of training and development for leadership staff, by managerial level:

a)   "Does your agency consider the training and development opportunities it provides to [staff at this level] to be *sufficient*?"

	Yes	No	Not sure
Executive level	52%	37%	11%
Senior leader level	51%	40%	8%
Managerial level	59%	34%	7%
Supervisory level	68%	25%	7%

b)   Percentage answering "yes," by agency size

	Agency Size (Number of Staff Employed)				
	Fewer than 100	100 to 499	500 to 999	1,000 to 4,999	5,000 or more
Executive level	56%	48%	50%	43%	67%
Senior leader level	47%	49%	57%	43%	67%
Managerial level	52%	53%	73%	57%	73%
Supervisory level	64%	67%	82%	52%	82%

c)   Percentage answering "yes," by agency function

	Jail	Prison	Community Corrections
Executive level	63%	43%	29%
Senior leader level	63%	43%	32%
Managerial level	66%	52%	43%
Supervisory level	76%	57%	50%

Section III. Analysis of Data on Executive Level Positions

Executive Level Turnover

13. Turnover in Executive level leadership positions by agency function:

	Positions Filled in Past 12 Mo.	No. Eligible to Retire in 5 Yrs.	No. Expected to Retire in 5 Yrs.
Jails	64 (32%)	125 (62%)	53 (26%)
Prisons	49 (37%)	63 (47%)	32 (24%)
Community corrections	55 (41%)	55 (41%)	39 (29%)
Total	168	243	124

14. Executive level turnover by agency size (positions filled):

	Turnover by Agency Size (Number of Staff Employed)				
	Fewer than 100	100 to 499	500 to 999	1,000 to 4,999	5,000 or more
Jails:	5 (15%)	7 (17%)	17 (37%)	22 (44%)	12 (60%)
Prisons:	–	0	1 (50%)	34 (52%)	14 (22%)
Community corrections:	3 (25%)	4 (18%)	5 (23%)	1 (8%)	–
Total	8	11	23	57	26

15. Executive turnover by agency size – staff eligible/expected to retire:

	Positions Filled in Past 12 mos.	No. Eligible to Retire in 5 yrs.	No. Expected to Retire in 5 yrs.
Fewer than 100 staff	8 (17%)	23 (50%)	14 (30%)
100 to 499 staff	11 (17%)	45 (69%)	23 (35%)
500 to 999 staff	23 (33%)	38 (54%)	22 (31%)
1,000 to 4,999 staff	41 (36%)	57 (50%)	22 (20%)
5,000 or more staff	26 (31%)	50 (60%)	26 (31%)

Executive Level Training and Development

16. Training and development opportunities provided at Executive level:

	Formal "Classroom" Training	Formal Distance Education	Formal Mentoring/ On-the-Job Training	Informal Mentoring/ On-the-Job Training	Other	None or Not Answered
Jails	93%	23%	14%	26%	9%	16%
Prisons	100%	13%	9%	70%	9%	0%
Community corrections	97%	14%	17%	57%	9%	24%

17. Sources of formal, "classroom" training for Executive level:

	Own Agency	Other State or Local Agency	College or University	Professional Association	Commercial Provider or Consultant	NIC
Jails	54%	67%	46%	89%	54%	63%
Prisons	43%	52%	35%	43%	43%	87%
Community corrections	44%	62%	35%	47%	47%	91%

18. Agency views on capacity to train and develop Executive level staff:

a)   "Does your agency have adequate capacity to train and develop staff at the Executive level?"

	Yes	No	Not sure
Jails	51%	41%	8%
Prisons	48%	43%	9%
Community corrections	34%	57%	9%

b)   Percentage of agencies answering "yes", by agency size

	Agency Size (Number of Staff Employed)				
	Fewer than 100	100 to 499	500 to 999	1,000 to 4,999	5,000 or more
Jails	35%	32%	53%	88%	100%
Prisons	–	0%	100%	36%	60%
Community corrections	13%	8%	50%	40%	–

19. Agency views on the sufficiency of the training and development provided for Executive staff:

a)   "Does your agency consider the training and development opportunities it provides to Executive level staff to be sufficient?"

	Yes	No	Not sure
Jails	63%	26%	11%
Prisons	43%	52%	4%
Community corrections	29%	59%	12%

b)   Percentage answering "yes", by agency size

	Agency Size (Number of Staff Employed)				
	Fewer than 100	100 to 499	500 to 999	1,000 to 4,999	5,000 or more
Jails	52%	46%	59%	75%	100%
Prisons	–	100%	0%	27%	60%
Community corrections	13%	17%	25%	30%	–

For comments about Executive level training, see compiled responses in report sections on jails, prisons, and community corrections.

Section IV. Analysis of Data on Senior Leader Positions

Senior Leader Turnover

20. Turnover in Senior leader leadership positions by agency function:

	Positions Filled in Past 12 Mo.	No. Eligible to Retire in 5 Yrs.	No. Expected to Retire in 5 Yrs.
Jails	62 (20%)	147 (47%)	67 (22%)
Prisons	157 (13%)	430 (37%)	177 (15%)
Community corrections	81 (14%)	184 (31%)	74 (12%)
Total	300	761	318

21. Senior level turnover by agency size (positions filled):

	Agency Size (Number of Staff Employed)				
	Fewer than 100	100 to 499	500 to 999	1,000 to 4,999	5,000 or more
Prisons:	–	0	4 (21%)	35 (12%)	118 (14%)
Community corrections:	2 (7%)	8 (13%)	4 (6%)	12 (26%)	–
Jails:	2 (7%)	13 (20%)	16 (26%)	24 (26%)	7 (23%)
Total	4	21	24	71	125

22. Senior level turnover by agency size – positions filled and staff eligible/expected to retire:

	Positions Filled in Past 12 Mos.	No. Eligible to Retire in 5 Yrs.	No. Expected to Retire in 5 Yrs.
Fewer than 100 staff	7%	44%	28%
100 to 499 staff	16%	57%	31%
500 to 999 staff	17%	38%	19%
1,000 to 4,999 staff	16%	37%	9%
5,000 or more staff	14%	38%	19%

Senior Leader Training and Development

23. Training and development opportunities provided at Senior Leader level:

	Formal "Classroom" Training	Formal Distance Education	Formal Mentoring/ On-the-Job Training	Informal Mentoring/ On-the-Job Training	Other	None or Not answered
Jails	96%	25%	23%	56%	7%	10%
Prisons	100%	13%	18%	65%	4%	0%
Community corrections	100%	22%	17%	56%	2%	11%

24. Sources of formal, "classroom" training for Senior Leader staff:

	Own Agency	Other State or Local Agency	College or University	Professional Association	Commercial Provider or Consultant	NIC
Jails	60%	66%	45%	84%	51%	74%
Prisons	61%	65%	48%	70%	48%	87%
Community corrections	56%	83%	41%	78%	58%	78%

25. Agency views of training and development for Senior Leaders:

a) "Does your agency have adequate capacity to train and develop staff at the senior level?"

	Yes	No	Not sure
Jails	56%	37%	7%
Prisons	48%	43%	9%
Community corrections	39%	46%	15%

b) Percentage answering "yes," by agency size

	Agency Size (Number of Staff Employed)				
	Fewer than 100	100 to 499	500 to 999	1,000 to 4,999	5,000 or more
Jails	34%	50%	53%	88%	100%
Prisons	–	–	100%	36%	60%
Community corrections	13%	17%	100%	50%	–

26. Agency views on sufficiency of training provided at senior leader level:

a) "Does your agency consider the training and development opportunities it provides to Senior Leader staff to be sufficient?"

	Yes	No	Not sure
Jails	63%	29%	8%
Prisons	43%	48%	9%
Community corrections	32%	58%	10%

b) Percentage answering "yes," by agency size

	Agency Size (Number of Staff Employed)				
	Fewer than 100	100 to 499	500 to 999	1,000 to 4,999	5,000 or more
Jails	48%	57%	53%	75%	100%
Prisons	–	100%	0%	27%	60%
Community corrections	20%	17%	15%	15%	–

For comments about Senior Leader level training, see compiled responses in report sections on jails, prisons, and community corrections.

Section V. Analysis of Data on Management Positions

Management Level Turnover

27. Turnover in Management level positions by agency function:

	Positions Filled in Past 12 Mo.	No. Eligible to Retire in 5 Yrs.	No. Expected to Retire in 5 Yrs.
Prisons	584 (16%)	898 (24%)	302 (8%)
Jails	110 (14%)	239 (31%)	91 (12%)
Community corrections	219 (11%)	340 (17%)	68 (3%)
Total	913	1,477	461

Training and Development at Management Level

28. Training and development opportunities provided at Management level:

	Formal "Classroom" Training	Formal Distance Education	Formal Mentoring/ On-the-Job Training	Informal Mentoring/ On-the-Job Training	Other	None or Not Answered
Jails	94%	27%	29%	57%	6%	6%
Prisons	100%	19%	29%	71%	5%	9%
Community corrections	100%	22%	27%	68%	3%	20%

29. Sources of formal, "classroom" training for Management level, where provided:

	Own Agency	Other State or Local Agency	College or University	Professional Association	Commercial Provider or Consultant	NIC
Jails	71%	71%	47%	85%	59%	67%
Prisons	90%	81%	38%	52%	57%	76%
Community corrections	78%	81%	30%	70%	62%	81%

30. Agency views on training and development provided for Management level staff:

a) "Does your agency have adequate capacity to train and develop staff at the Management level?"

	Yes	No	Not sure
Jails	65%	27%	8%
Prisons	62%	24%	14%
Community corrections	43%	51%	5%

b) Percentage answering "yes," by agency size

	Agency Size (Number of Staff Employed)				
	Fewer than 100	100 to 499	500 to 999	1,000 to 4,999	5,000 or more
All responding agencies	43%	53%	77%	62%	73%

31. Agency views on sufficiency of training provided to Management level staff:

a) "Does your agency consider the training and development opportunities it provides to Management level staff to be sufficient?"

	Yes	No	Not sure
Jails	66%	28%	6%
Prisons	52%	38%	10%
Community corrections	43%	49%	8%

b) Percentage answering "yes," by agency size

	Agency Size (Number of Staff Employed)				
	Fewer than 100	100 to 499	500 to 999	1,000 to 4,999	5,000 or more
All responding agencies	52%	53%	73%	57%	73%

For comments about Management level training, see compiled responses in report sections on jails, prisons, and community corrections.

Section VI. Analysis of Data on Supervisory Positions

Supervisory Staff Turnover

32. Turnover in Supervisory level positions by agency function:

	Positions Filled in Past 12 Mo.	No. Eligible to Retire in 5 Yrs.	No. Expected to Retire in 5 Yrs.
Jails	605 (14%)	804 (18%)	272 (6%)
Prisons	2,644 (18%)	2,094 (14%)	442 (3%)
Community corrections	649 (10%)	1,134 (18%)	91 (1%)
Total	3,898	4,032	805

Supervisory Staff Training and Development

33. Training and development opportunities provided at the Supervisory level:

	Formal "Classroom" Training	Formal Distance Education	Formal Mentoring/ On-the-Job Training	Informal Mentoring/ On-the-Job Training	Other	None or Not Answered
Jails	99%	23%	35%	54%	8%	10%
Prisons	100%	19%	19%	71%	0%	9%
Community corrections	100%	26%	29%	63%	3%	24%

34. Sources of formal, "classroom" training for Supervisory level:

	Own Agency	Other State or Local Agency	College or University	Professional Association	Commercial Provider or Consultant	NIC
Jails	81%	63%	47%	71%	49%	56%
Prisons	95%	75%	35%	45%	45%	60%
Community corrections	80%	83%	31%	71%	51%	54%

35. Agency views on capacity to train and develop Supervisory staff:

a) "Does your agency have adequate capacity to train and develop staff at the Supervisory level?"

	Yes	No	Not sure
Jails	80%	16%	4%
Prisons	71%	19%	10%
Community corrections	62%	26%	12%

b) Percentage saying "yes," by agency size

	Agency Size (Number of Staff Employed)				
	Fewer than 100	100 to 499	500 to 999	1,000 to 4,999	5,000 or more
All responding agencies	32%	69%	91%	62%	91%

36. Agency views on sufficiency of training and development provided to Supervisory staff:

a) "Does your agency consider the training and development opportunities it provides to Supervisory staff to be sufficient?"

	Yes	No	Not sure
Jails	76%	19%	5%
Prisons	57%	33%	10%
Community corrections	50%	41%	9%

b) Percentage saying "yes," by agency size

	Agency Size (Number of Staff Employed)				
	Fewer than 100	100 to 499	500 to 999	1,000 to 4,999	5,000 or more
All responding agencies, all functions	64%	67%	82%	52%	82%

For comments about Supervisory level training, see compiled responses in report sections on jails, prisons, and community corrections.

Section VII. Analysis of Data on Jails

Leadership Turnover in Jails

37. Turnover in jail leadership positions:

	Positions Filled in Past 12 Mo.	No. Eligible to Retire in 5 Yrs.	No. Expected to Retire in 5 Yrs.+
Executive level	64 (32%)	125 (62%)	53 (26%)
Senior leader level	62 (20%)	147 (47%)	67 (22%)
Managerial level	110 (14%)	239 (31%)	91 (12%)
Supervisory level	605 (14%)	804 (18%)	272 (6%)

38. Turnover in jail leadership positions by agency size (positions filled):

	Agency Size (Number of Staff Employed)				
	Fewer than 100	100 to 499	500 to 999	1,000 to 4,999	5,000 or more
Executive level	5	7	17	22	12
Senior leader level	2	13	16	24	7
Managerial level	5	20	41	23	18
Supervisory level	17	107	147	179	135

39. Jail leadership retirement eligibility within 5 years, by agency size

	(Number of Staff Employed)				
	Fewer than 100	100 to 499	500 to 999	1,000 to 4,999	5,000 or more
Executive level	50%	69%	54%	50%	60%
Senior leader level	44%	57%	38%	37%	38%
Managerial level	14%	39%	24%	20%	27%
Supervisory level	11%	18%	21%	18%	14%

40. Jail leadership staff expected to retire, by agency size

	(Number of Staff Employed)				
	Fewer than 100	100 to 499	500 to 999	1,000 to 4,999	5,000 or more
Executive level	30%	35%	31%	20%	31%
Senior leader level	28%	31%	19%	9%	19%
Managerial level	9%	19%	13%	4%	9%
Supervisory level	7%	10%	8%	6%	2%

Jail Leadership Training and Development

41. Training and development opportunities provided for jail leadership:

	Formal "Classroom" Training	Formal Distance Education	Formal Mentoring/ On-the-Job Training	Informal Mentoring/ On-the-Job Training	Other	None or Not Answered
Executive level	93%	23%	14%	26%	9%	16%
Senior leader level	96%	25%	23%	56%	7%	10%
Managerial level	94%	27%	29%	57%	6%	6%
Supervisory level	99%	23%	35%	54%	8%	10%

42. Sources of formal, "classroom" training, where provided:

	Own Agency	Other State or Local Agency	College or University	Professional Association	Commercial Provider or Consultant	NIC
Executive level	54%	67%	46%	89%	54%	63%
Senior leader level	60%	66%	45%	84%	51%	74%
Managerial level	71%	71%	47%	85%	59%	67%
Supervisory level	81%	63%	47%	71%	49%	56%

43. Agency views on capacity to train and develop jail leadership staff, by managerial level:

"Does your agency have adequate capacity to train and develop staff at [this] level?"

	Yes	No	Not sure
Executive level	51%	41%	8%
Senior leader level	56%	37%	7%
Managerial level	65%	27%	8%
Supervisory level	80%	16%	4%

44. Agency views on sufficiency of training and development provided to jail leadership staff:

"Does your agency consider the training and development opportunities it provides to [staff at this level] to be sufficient?"

	Yes	No	Not sure
Executive level	63%	26%	11%
Senior leader level	63%	29%	8%
Managerial level	66%	28%	6%
Supervisory level	76%	19%	5%

Comments on Leadership Staff Development in Jails

Executive-level training

■   The Sheriff is an elected position, and does attend training provided by the state and local agencies. The Sheriff will also attend the FBI Academy for 3 months. Our current Chief Deputy has already attended the FBI Academy.

■   This department does not hesitate to send individuals such as our current Sheriff to the FBI NA & Northwestern University Center for Public Safety.

■   While Yakima County works closely with the State of Washington and local community college to provide executive-level training, additional training opportunities are always welcomed.

■   Same training and development as senior level leader positions. Attend regular Large Jail Network training through NIC.

■   No management training offered.

■   Florida Department of Law Enforcement (FDLE) Chief Executive Institute is outstanding.

That course, along with the NIC Executive and Senior training course, are models for criminal justice field.

- It would be difficult for in-house staff to train "the boss". So we provide funding for the top executive to attend outside training.

- We send executive staff to professional training courses.

Senior leader training

- We send senior leaders to professional training courses.

- Training available through professional organizations (AJA, ACA, AWEC), as well as NIC and state's Chief Executive District constitutes the core of senior level training appropriate to this level in our organization. The Executive Women's Leadership Program was excellent for building capacity of our senior female manager.

- I attend AJA conference and other outside training.

- I would like to see senior level staff take advantage of opportunities available. We need a formal mentoring program for this level.

- Must complete the ICMA certificate; 40 hours of continued education; certification with American Jail Association as a Certified Jail Manager.

- Jail Administrator sent to Northwestern University's School for Police Staff and Command.

- The Jail Administrator attends three months of training at the FBI Academy, when they have an opening. The Sheriff and Chief Deputy are also looking into training at NIC that the Jail Administrator should attend.

- Willing to send to school at appropriate time

- Several considerations limit the capacity of Dauphin County Prison to train senior level staff. The training budget must cover the following: state mandated Correctional Officer Basic Training for newly hired C.O.'s; state mandated annual recertifications; technical training for line staff (computer training); training to maintain professional certifications required by the County; annual conferences for Treatment and Security staff. The budget we are working within does not even meet the expenses of mandated training, making additional training for Staff Development purposes impossible.

- Adequate training is available outside of agency.

Management level training

- State has just begun to build capacity at sergeant's level through it's criminal justice leadership training (FDLE-sponsored), training at lieutenant's level is a critical component to capacity-building. Agency does not have capacity to train at this level due to budgetary constraints, which affect training section.

- St. Louis County implemented the County Leadership Initiative Pilot Program in 2002 to train managers in the core values and competencies that were established to achieve the County's Mission. Currently 5 supervisors/managers from Justice Services are enrolled. All managers must obtain ICMA certificate and 40 hours of training. . .

- Staff are provided up to 6 hours of training per month, in addition to this, training staff receive 1st and 2nd level training through the state.

- We send management to professional training courses.

- Several considerations limit the capacity of Dauphin County Prison to train managerial staff. The training budget must cover the following: state mandated Correctional Officer Basic Training for newly hired C.O.'s; state mandated annual re-certifications; technical training for line staff (computer training); training to maintain professional certifications required by the County; annual conferences for Treatment and Security staff. The budget we are working within does not even meet the expenses of mandated training, making additional training for Staff Development purposes impossible.

Supervisory training

- When a deputy is promoted to Sergeant they attend a 40 hour formal training class at one of the local colleges (MATC or WCTC). "Field Training and Mentoring for New Sergeants" "Supervision of Police Personnel"

- Newly promoted Lieutenants must complete 32 hours of training and the ACA Correspondence Course. All supervisors must work toward completing the ICMA Certificate and complete specific O-T-J for their specific duties.

- Supervisory attend a 40-hour course at the state criminal justice academy (NIC curriculum).

- State has just begun to build capacity at sergeant's level through its criminal justice leadership training (FDLE-sponsored). Training at lieutenant's level is a critical component to capacity-building. Agency does not have capacity to train at this level due to budgetary constraints, which affect training section.

- Several considerations limit the capacity of Dauphin County Prison to train supervisory staff. The training budget must cover the following: state mandated Correctional Officer Basic Training for newly hired C.O.'s; state mandated annual re-certifications; technical training for line staff (computer training); training to maintain professional certifications required by the County; annual conferences for Treatment and Security staff. The budget we are working within does not even meet the expenses of mandated training, making additional training for Staff Development purposes impossible.

- Need more first line supervisory training.

- Optional currently. Arguably, should be mandatory.

Section VIII. Analysis of Data on Prisons

Turnover in Prison Leadership

45. Turnover in prison leadership positions:

	Positions Filled in Past 12 Mo.	No. Eligible to Retire in 5 Yrs.	No. Expected to Retire in 5 Yrs.
Executive level	49 (37%)	63 (47%)	32 (24%)
Senior leader level	157 (13%)	430 (37%)	177 (15%)
Managerial level	584 (16%)	898 (24%)	302 (8%)
Supervisory level	2,644 (18%)	2,094 (14%)	442 (3%)

46. Turnover in leadership positions by agency size (positions filled)

	Agency Size (Number of Staff Employed)				
	Fewer than 100 (N=0)	100 to 499 (N=1)	500 to 999 (N=1)	1,000 to 4,999 (N=11)	5,000 or more (N=#)
Executive level	–	0	1	34	14
Senior leader level	–	0	4	35	118
Managerial level	–	0	0	70	514
Supervisory level	–	6	0	240	2,398

47. Prison leadership retirement eligibility within 5 years, by agency size

	(Number of Staff Employed)				
	Fewer than 100	100 to 499	500 to 999	1,000 to 4,999	5,000 or more
Executive level	–	0	0	27 (41%)	36 (57%)
Senior leader level	–	2 (67%)	6 (32%)	101 (35%)	321 (37%)
Managerial level	–	6 (27%)	11 (18%)	177 (19%)	704 (26%)
Supervisory level	–	12 (16%)	15 (16%)	516 (22%)	1,551 (13%)

48. Prison leadership staff expected to retire, by agency size:

	(Number of Staff Employed)				
	Fewer than 100	100 to 499	500 to 999	1,000 to 4,999	5,000 or more
Executive level	–	0	0	7 (11%)	25 (40%)
Senior leader level	–	1 (33%)	2 (11%)	10 (4%)	164 (19%)
Managerial level	–	3 (14%)	6 (10%)	36 (4%)	257 (10%)
Supervisory level	–	8 (11%)	5 (5%)	123 (5%)	306 (3%)

Prison Leadership Training and Development

49. Training and development opportunities provided for prison leadership staff:

	Formal "Classroom" Training	Formal Distance Education	Formal Mentoring/ On-the-Job Training	Informal Mentoring/ On-the-Job Training	Other	None or Not Answered
Executive level	100%	13%	9%	70%	9%	16%
Senior leader level	100%	13%	18%	65%	4%	0%
Managerial level	100%	19%	29%	71%	5%	9%
Supervisory level	100%	19%	19%	71%	0%	9%

50. Sources of formal, "classroom" training:

	Own Agency	Other State or Local Agency	College or University	Professional Association	Commercial Provider or Consultant	NIC
Executive level	43%	52%	35%	43%	43%	87%
Senior leader level	61%	65%	48%	70%	48%	87%
Managerial level	90%	81%	38%	52%	57%	76%
Supervisory level	95%	75%	35%	45%	45%	60%

51. Agency views on capacity to train and develop prison leadership staff, by managerial level:

"Does your agency have adequate capacity to train and develop staff at [this] level?"

	Yes	No	Not sure
Executive level	48%	43%	9%
Senior leader level	48%	43%	9%
Managerial level	62%	24%	14%
Supervisory level	71%	19%	10%

52. Agency views on sufficiency of training and development provided to prison leadership staff:

"Does your agency consider the training and development opportunities it provides to [staff at this level] to be sufficient?"

	Yes	No	Not sure
Executive level	43%	52%	4%
Senior leader level	43%	48%	9%
Managerial level	52%	38%	10%
Supervisory level	57%	33%	10%

Comment on Leadership Staff Development in Prisons

Executive level

■ Consider the executive position coming to the department with an adequate background to complete assignment.

■ We have the Training Academy, however we need outside trainers/instructors/consultants.

■ Capacity is adequate only with help from NIC. Executive Excellence was "excellent." The classes ASCA puts on for new directors w/NIC's assistance are also well received.

■ Current focus is on basic training with correctional officers. Planning efforts target upper-level development over time.

Senior leaders

■ Capacity is inadequate, met only with help from outside sources. Opportunities are sufficient only with help from outside sources. NIC's class for new wardens is a real asset for us in a small state.

■ Current focus is on basic training with correctional officers. Planning efforts target upper-level development over time.

Management level

■ Current focus is on basic training with correctional officers. Planning efforts target upper-level development over time.

Supervisory level

■ Formal program established and updated on a regular basis for Sergeants and Lieutenants run at the Custody Staff Training Academy.

■ Supervisory training is a particular focus, appearing in two academies that are offered regularly, however more training of this nature could be provided if the resources were available.

■ Optional currently. Arguably, should be mandatory.

■ Current focus is on basic training with correctional officers. Planning efforts target upper-level development over time.

Section IX. Analysis of Data on Community Corrections

Leadership Turnover in Community Corrections

53. Turnover in community corrections leadership positions:

	Positions Filled in Past 12 Mo.	No. Eligible to Retire in 5 Yrs.	No. Expected to Retire in 5 Yrs.
Executive level	55 (41%)	55 (41%)	39 (29%)
Senior leader level	81 (14%)	184 (31%)	47 (12%)
Managerial level	219 (11%)	340 (17%)	68 (3%)
Supervisory level	649 (10%)	1,134 (18%)	91 (1%)

54. Turnover in leadership positions by agency size (positions filled):

	Agency Size (Number of Staff Employed)				
	Fewer than 100	100 to 499	500 to 999	1,000 to 4,999	5,000 or more
Executive level	25%	18%	23%	64%	–
Senior leader level	7%	13%	6%	14%	–
Managerial level	3%	17%	3%	8%	–
Supervisory level	4%	20%	6%	9%	–

55. Community corrections leadership retirement eligibility within 5 years, by agency size:

	(Number of Staff Employed)				
	Fewer than 100	100 to 499	500 to 999	1,000 to 4,999	5,000 or more
Executive level	5 (42%)	12 (55%)	7 (32%)	18 (36%)	–
Senior leader level	15 (52%)	35 (55%)	16 (25%)	53 (29%)	–
Managerial level	7 (20%)	39 (35%)	32 (17%)	61 (11%)	–
Supervisory level	2 (7%)	45 (21%)	18 (8%)	198 (16%)	–

56. Community corrections leadership staff expected to retire, by agency size:

	(Number of Staff Employed)				
	Fewer than 100	100 to 499	500 to 999	1,000 to 4,999	5,000 or more
Executive level	5 (42%)	8 (36%)	6 (27%)	11 (22%)	–
Senior leader level	8 (28%)	16 (25%)	6 (10%)	24 (13%)	–
Managerial level	4 (11%)	12 (11%)	22 (12%)	26 (5%)	–
Supervisory level	2 (7%)	19 (9%)	7 (3%)	63 (5%)	–

Leadership Training and Development in Community Corrections

57. Training and development opportunities provided:

	Formal "Classroom" Training	Formal Distance Education	Formal Mentoring/ On-the-Job Training	Informal Mentoring/ On-the-Job Training	Other	None or Not Answered
Executive level	97%	14%	17%	57%	9%	16%
Senior leader level	100%	22%	17%	56%	2%	11%
Managerial level	100%	22%	27%	68%	3%	20%
Supervisory level	100%	26%	29%	63%	3%	24%

58. Sources of formal, "classroom" training:

	Own Agency	Other State or Local Agency	College or University	Professional Association	Commercial Provider or Consultant	NIC
Executive level	44%	62%	35%	47%	47%	91%
Senior leader level	56%	83%	41%	78%	58%	78%
Managerial level	78%	81%	30%	70%	62%	81%
Supervisory level	80%	83%	31%	71%	51%	54%

59. Agency views on capacity to train and develop leadership staff, by managerial level:

"Does your agency have adequate capacity to train and develop staff at [this] level?"

	Yes	No	Not sure
Executive level	34%	57%	9%
Senior leader level	39%	46%	15%
Managerial level	43%	51%	5%
Supervisory level	62%	26%	12%

60. Agency views on the sufficiency of the training and development opportunities provided to leadership staff:

"Do you consider the training and development opportunities it provides to [staff at this level] to be sufficient?"

	Yes	No	Not sure
Executive level	29%	59%	12%
Senior leader level	32%	58%	10%
Managerial level	43%	49%	8%
Supervisory level	50%	41%	9%

Comments on Leadership Staff Development in Community Corrections

Executive level

■ Capacity is adequate, however in some cases we don't provide exposure to other executive level leaders from external organizations.

■ On the job training would be very beneficial. Although when I was appointed to the executive level I received training through NIC in Texas. The PA Board of Prob/Parole did not have this level of training at that time. (The former Director resigned and did not provide any guidance.)

■ Funding has been inadequate to meet all needs.

■ Our agency is small and therefore uses external sources for executive training. All of the current executives have held executive positions previously in other governmental and criminal justice agencies.

■ The department uses both outside professional training and in-house development. Executive staff are required to attend 40 hours of job related training each year in addition

to completion of an 80 hour training program within one year of appointment.

- Very limited executive level training.

- We have the Training Academy – however we need outside trainers/instructors/consultants.

Senior leaders

- Senior staff are required to attend 40 hours of job related training each year in addition to completion of an 80 hour training program within one year of appointment. Outside training is used to enhance internal training.

- County offers leadership training for supervisors but nothing for dept. heads.

- Definitely needed! Present budget does not allow.

- Lack of staff to allow time for staff to take advantage of many opportunities.

- We have attended NIC [training] in the past. Funds have not been available in the last few years for travel & subsistence.

- Exposure to senior level leaders in other organizations is beneficial. Unless a senior leader seeks out external learning opportunities, they will not have many internal opportunities to interact with others in their line of business.

- Funding has been inadequate to meet all needs.

Management level

- Management level staff are required to complete 80 hours of formal training within the first year of appointment and 40 hours of annual job related training thereafter. Outside training is used to enhance internal training.

- Not enough opportunities, budget constraints.

- Training not specifically targeted toward managerial skills.

- We have limited resources, I have taken advantage of several trainings provided by NIC.

- Lack of staff to allow time for staff to take advantage of many opportunities.

- With budget cuts occurring now and in the future, we will have less money to spend on training and development. Scholarship money from external organizations to send . . .

- Funding has been inadequate to meet all needs.

Supervisory level

- Supervisors are required to complete an 80 hour training course within their first year of appointment and 40 hours of annual job related training thereafter. Outside training is used to enhance internal training.

- Opportunities not yet sufficient

- Optional currently. Arguably, should be mandatory.

- County offers leadership training for supervisors.

- We are developing our own, based on small number of positions and technical nature. Lack of staff to allow time for staff to take advantage of many opportunities.

- Funding has been inadequate to meet all needs.

- We could do better. Our on-going training is weak, and we could do better at skill building.

Section X. Correctional Leadership Demographics

Data Summary

61. Women in correctional leadership positions:

	Jail	Prison	Community Corrections
Executive level	25 (12%)	31 (23%)	40 (30%)
Senior leader level	89 (29%)	333 (28%)	201 (34%)
Managerial level	193 (25%)	937 (25%)	591 (30%)
Supervisory level	1,359 (31%)	3,234 (22%)	1,510 (24%)
Total	1,666 (29%)	4,535 (23%)	2,342 (26%)

62. Native Americans and Alaskans in correctional leadership positions:

	Jail	Prison	Community Corrections
Executive level	0	0	0
Senior leader level	0	4 (0%)	2 (0%)
Managerial level	0	18 (0%)	16 (1%)
Supervisory level	8 (0%)	81 (0%)	40 (1%)
Total	8 (0%)	103 (0%)	58 (1%)

63. Asians and Pacific Islanders in correctional leadership positions:

	Jail	Prison	Community Corrections
Executive level	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Senior leader level	2 (1%)	10 (1%)	6 (1%)
Managerial level	3 (0%)	22 (1%)	21 (1%)
Supervisory level	43 (1%)	87 (1%)	69 (1%)
Total	48 (1%)	119 (1%)	96 (1%)

64. Blacks in correctional leadership positions:

	Jail	Prison	Community Corrections
Executive level	36 (18%)	20 (15%)	19 (14%)
Senior leader level	55 (18%)	157 (13%)	76 (13%)
Managerial level	164 (21%)	374 (10%)	186 (9%)
Supervisory level	1,691 (38%)	1,855 (12%)	689 (11%)
Total	1,946 (34%)	2,406 (12%)	970 (11%)

65. Hispanics/Latinos in correctional leadership positions:

	Jail	Prison	Community Corrections
Executive level	11 (5%)	10 (8%)	11 (8%)
Senior leader level	13 (4%)	100 (8%)	78 (13%)
Managerial level	37 (5%)	178 (5%)	88 (4%)
Supervisory level	362 (8%)	928 (6%)	168 (3%)
Total	423 (7%)	1,216 (6%)	345 (4%)

66. Whites in correctional leadership positions:

	Jail	Prison	Community Corrections
Executive level	154 (77%)	103 (77%)	105 (78%)
Senior leader level	243 (78%)	902 (77%)	436 (73%)
Managerial level	559 (73%)	3,118 (84%)	1,691 (84%)
Supervisory level	2,058 (47%)	11,764 (79%)	5,239 (83%)
Total	3,014 (53%)	15,887 (80%)	7,471 (82%)

67. Other or multiple demographic background in correctional leadership positions:

	Jail	Prison	Community Corrections
Executive level	0	7 (5%)	6 (4%)
Senior leader level	0	0	0
Managerial level	3 (0%)	2 (0%)	3 (0%)
Supervisory level	13 (0%)	2 (0%)	3 (0%)
Total	16 (0%)	11 (0%)	12 (0%)

Demographic Data by Managerial Level

Data reports on the following pages include profiles for:

All corrections agencies
State agencies
County/local agencies
Jails
Prisons
Community corrections
By agency size (x 5 levels)

SEARCH: findall

Total agency staff, this sample: 216,769
Total agencies, this sample: 141

Total Exec Level Positions	389				
Total execs, Male	308	.79	**Total execs, Female**	74	.19
Native/Alaskan	0	.00	Native/Alaskan	0	.00
Asian/Pacific	0	.00	Asian/Pacific	0	.00
Black	46	.12	Black	20	.05
Hispanic/Latino	17	.04	Hispanic/Latino	7	.02
White	252	.65	White	47	.12
Other or multi	6	.02	Other or multi	1	.00

Total Senior Leader Positions	1668				
Total seniors, Male	1182	.71	**Total seniors, Female**	487	.29
Native/Alaskan	4	.00	Native/Alaskan	0	.00
Asian/Pacific	7	.00	Asian/Pacific	7	.00
Black	140	.08	Black	98	.06
Hispanic/Latino	77	.05	Hispanic/Latino	41	.03
White	955	.57	White	340	.20
Other or multi	0	.00	Other or multi	0	.00

Total Manager Positions	4,892				
Total managers, Male	3,600	.74	**Total managers, Female**	1,291	.26
Native/Alaskan	18	.00	Native/Alaskan	5	.00
Asian/Pacific	27	.01	Asian/Pacific	11	.00
Black	435	.09	Black	192	.04
Hispanic/Latino	177	.04	Hispanic/Latino	54	.01
White	2,938	.60	White	1,028	.21
Other or multi	5	.00	Other or multi	1	.00

Total Supervisory Positions	20,320				
Total supervisors, Male	15,053	.74	**Total supervisors, Female**	5,145	.25
Native/Alaskan	69	.00	Native/Alaskan	24	.00
Asian/Pacific	116	.01	Asian/Pacific	40	.00
Black	2,296	.11	Black	1,548	.08
Hispanic/Latino	1066	.05	Hispanic/Latino	288	.01
White	11,329	.56	White	3,192	.16
Other or multi	11	.00	Other or multi	7	.00

Appendix A. Survey Materials

TO:	**State and Local Corrections Agency Administrators**
FROM:	Connie Clem, Senior Communications Specialist, NIC Information Center
DATE:	March 28, 2003
RE:	**NIC Survey: Needs Assessment for Correctional Management and Executive Leadership Development**

The National Institute of Corrections (NIC) requests your agency's help with an assessment of management and leadership development in corrections. Findings will be used to guide strategic planning for training provided by the Institute.

About the project

This project will collect data on: a) demographics and turnover in correctional management positions; and b) the development opportunities currently available to correctional managers. NIC is requesting this data separately for four levels of correctional agency management. These levels are defined on Page 1 of the survey. Each of the subsequent pages of the survey collects data at one of the four levels of correctional management.

NIC recognizes that some of the data may be difficult to report at this level of detail. If "hard data" are not accessible, please give your best estimate of the actual numbers. Also, if a full response is too difficult or time-consuming, agencies can give answers (or estimates) for only Pages 2 and 3 of the survey, which focus on top agency positions.

Data generated through this survey will be reported in aggregate form, not on a state-by-state level. The analysis will include reviews by agency function and size. Findings will be used for internal NIC purposes only and will be available to responding agencies on request.

Agencies surveyed

The survey is being distributed to correctional administrators who participate in four practitioner networks facilitated by NIC.

State prisons, deputy directors network	—	To provide data on prison management
State and local community corrections network	—	To provide data on management in community-based corrections
State jail inspectors network	—	To provide data on management in small- to medium-sized jails
Large Jail Network	—	To provide data on management in large jails and jail systems

If your agency receives more than one copy of the survey, please disregard any duplicates. See additional instructions on Page 2 of this cover message.

Who should respond

The survey should be completed by your agency's human resources director or another high-level administrator.

Special instructions

Special instructions for <u>NIC Deputy Directors network</u>:

1. Only one reply is needed from each state institutional corrections agency. If your state has more than one network participant, please choose one to coordinate your state's response.

2. If your agency is responsible for both prisons and probation and/or parole, please include ONLY <u>prison management</u> data in your survey response.

3. If your agency is a unified system responsible for both prisons and jails, please disregard any duplicate survey received through NIC's Large Jail Network.

Special instructions for <u>NIC Chief Jail Inspectors network</u>:

1. Please forward the survey to a representative sample of 5 correctional agencies in your state. This will help ensure that smaller and medium-sized agencies are represented in the survey sample.

Special instructions for <u>NIC Community Corrections network</u>:

1. If probation and/or parole functions in your state are within the corrections department, please DO NOT include prison management data in your survey response.

2. If your agency does not manage offenders, please forward the survey to a representative sample of 5 supervising correctional agencies in your state or locality. This will help ensure that smaller and medium-sized agencies are represented in the survey sample.

How to respond

<u>Please complete and return the survey by</u> **Wednesday, April 30, 2003.** Mail or fax to:

Connie Clem, Senior Communications Specialist
NIC Information Center
1860 Industrial Circle, Longmont, CO 80501
Telephone (800) 995-6429, ext. 712 — Fax (303) 682-0558
cclem@nicic.org

Thank you very much for your help with this research.

NIC Survey: Needs Assessment for
Correctional Management and Executive Leadership Development

U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections
April 2003

** Please reply by Wednesday, April 30, 2003 **

Fax or mail your response to:	Connie Clem, Senior Communications Specialist, NIC Information Center Mailing address: 1860 Industrial Circle, Suite A, Longmont, Colorado 80501 Fax (303) 682-0558 Telephone (800) 995-6429, ext. 712, or (303) 682-0213; E-mail cclem@nicic.org

Agency & Respondent Information

Respondent name & title _____

Telephone _____ Fax _____ Email _____

Agency _____

City and State _____

Total staff employed by agency: _____

Agency is part of (check one):   State government _____   Local or county government _____

Agency is responsible for: Prison _____   Community corrections _____   Jail _____

Definitions — Survey questions are based on the following four levels of management in correctional agencies:

<u>Executive level positions:</u>	Agency directors and deputy directors in institutional corrections; sheriffs; chief probation officers or equivalent in large jurisdictions.
<u>Senior level leader positions:</u>	Directors of probation, parole, or institutional services <u>within</u> state departments of corrections; regional directors; wardens/superintendents; jail administrators; probation division directors in large jurisdictions; chief probation officers in medium-sized jurisdictions; directors of correctional industries, medical services, programs, budget, human resources, information systems, or similar.
<u>Managerial positions:</u>	Operational department heads; regional or district managers; institutional unit or program managers; institutional majors and captains; deputy jail administrators; chief probation officers in small jurisdictions; purchasing or contracts supervisors; legal affairs supervisors; accounting supervisors; public information officers; training supervisors; program managers; industry managers; other positions that report to a facility or division administrator.
<u>Supervisory positions:</u>	Housing unit supervisors; institutional lieutenants and sergeants; first-line probation supervisors; accounting, budget, legal, purchasing, or contracts supervisors; industry supervisors; other supervisors of personnel or program operations.

Part 1. Executive Level Positions. As defined for this research project, this category includes: Agency directors and deputy directors in institutional corrections; sheriffs; chief probation officers or equivalent in large jurisdictions.

1.   Please provide demographic data (numbers, not percentages) on your agency's personnel at the **executive level**.

	Alaskan or Native American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic/ Latino(a)	White	Other, or Multiple Ethnicities
Men:	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Women:	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

2.   In your agency, how many executives at this level assumed their positions in the past 12 months?

Executive-level positions filled: _____

3.   Please provide the following data on possible retirements at this level in your agency:

Number of executive-level staff <u>eligible</u> for retirement within next 5 years: _____

Number of executive-level staff anticipated to <u>actually retire</u> within next 5 years: _____

4.   What types of training and development does your agency make available to personnel at the executive level? (Check all that apply.)

_____ Formal, structured, "classroom" training
                  Indicate source(s) of this training, if applicable:
                  _____ Our agency   _____ Professional association
                  _____ Another state or local agency _____ Commercial provider or consultant
                  _____ College or university   _____ National Institute of Corrections
_____ Formal distance education/e-learning
_____ Formal mentoring, coaching, or on-the-job training
_____ Informal mentoring, coaching, or on-the-job training
_____ Other (describe)_____

5.   Does your agency have adequate capacity to train and develop staff at the executive level?

Yes _____   No _____   Not sure _____

6.   Does your agency consider the training and development opportunities it provides to executive-level staff to be sufficient?

Yes _____   No _____   Not sure _____

Comments about capacity or content of executive-level training and development (optional).

Part 2. Senior Level Leader Positions. As defined for this research project, this category includes: Directors of probation, parole, or institutional services <u>within</u> state departments of corrections; regional directors; wardens/ superintendents; jail administrators; probation division directors in large jurisdictions; chief probation officers in medium-sized jurisdictions; directors of correctional industries, medical services, programs, budget, human resources, information systems, or similar.

1.   Please provide demographic data (numbers, not percentages) on your agency's personnel at the **senior leader level**.

	Alaskan or Native American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic/ Latino(a)	White	Other, or Multiple Ethnicities
Men:	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Women:	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

2.   In your agency, how many senior level leaders assumed their positions in the past 12 months?

Senior level leader positions filled: _____

3.   Please provide the following data on possible retirements at this level in your agency:

Number of senior level leaders <u>eligible</u> for retirement within next 5 years: _____

Number of senior level leaders anticipated to <u>actually retire</u> within next 5 years: _____

4.   What types of training and development does your agency make available to personnel at the senior leader level? (Check all that apply.)

_____ Formal, structured, "classroom" training
            Indicate source(s) of this training, if applicable:
            _____ Our agency   _____ Professional association
            _____ Another state or local agency _____ Commercial provider or consultant
            _____ College or university   _____ National Institute of Corrections
_____ Formal distance education/e-learning
_____ Formal mentoring, coaching, or on-the-job training
_____ Informal mentoring, coaching, or on-the-job training
_____ Other (describe)_____

5.   Does your agency have adequate capacity to train and develop staff at the senior leader level?

Yes _____   No _____   Not sure _____

6.   Does your agency consider the training and development opportunities it provides to senior level leader staff to be sufficient?

Yes _____   No _____   Not sure _____

Comments about capacity or content of training and development for senior level leaders (optional).

Part 3. Managerial Positions. As defined for this research project, this category includes: Operational department heads; regional or district managers; institutional unit or program managers; institutional majors and captains; deputy jail administrators; chief probation officers in small jurisdictions; purchasing or contracts supervisors; legal affairs supervisors; accounting supervisors; public information officers; training supervisors; program managers; industry managers; other positions that report to a facility or division administrator.

1. Please provide demographic data (numbers, not percentages) on your agency's personnel at the **managerial level**.

	Alaskan or Native American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic/ Latino(a)	White	Other, or Multiple Ethnicities
Men:	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Women:	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

2. In your agency, how many managers at this level assumed their positions in the past 12 months?

    Management-level positions filled: _____

3. Please provide the following data on possible retirements at this level in your agency

    Number of management-level staff <u>eligible</u> for retirement within next 5 years: _____

    Number of management-level staff anticipated to <u>actually retire</u> within next 5 years: _____

4. What types of training and development does your agency make available to personnel at the management level? (Check all that apply.)

    _____ Formal, structured, "classroom" training
    　　　　　Indicate source(s) of this training, if applicable:
    　　　　　_____ Our agency　　　　　　_____ Professional association
    　　　　　_____ Another state or local agency _____ Commercial provider or consultant
    　　　　　_____ College or university　　　　_____ National Institute of Corrections
    _____ Formal distance education/e-learning
    _____ Formal mentoring, coaching, or on-the-job training
    _____ Informal mentoring, coaching, or on-the-job training
    _____ Other (describe)_____

5. Does your agency have adequate capacity to train and develop staff at the management level?

    Yes _____　　　No _____　　　Not sure _____

6. Does your agency consider the training and development opportunities it provides to management-level staff to be sufficient?

    Yes _____　　　No _____　　　Not sure _____

    Comments about capacity or content of management-level training and development (optional).

Part 4. Supervisory Positions. As defined for this research project, this category includes: Housing unit supervisors; institutional lieutenants and sergeants; first-line probation supervisors; accounting, budget, legal, purchasing, or contracts supervisors; industry supervisors; other supervisors of personnel or program operations.

1.   Please provide demographic data (numbers, not percentages) on your agency's personnel at the **supervisory level**.

	Alaskan or Native American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic/ Latino(a)	White	Other, or Multiple Ethnicities
Men:	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Women:	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

2.   In your agency, how many staff at this level assumed their positions in the past 12 months?

   Supervisory-level positions filled: _____

3.   Please provide the following data on possible retirements at this level in your agency:

   Number of supervisory-level staff <u>eligible</u> for retirement within next 5 years: _____

   Number of supervisory-level staff anticipated to <u>actually retire</u> within next 5 years: _____

4.   What types of training and development does your agency make available to personnel at the supervisory level? (Check all that apply.)

   _____ Formal, structured, "classroom" training
           Indicate source(s) of this training, if applicable:
           _____ Our agency   _____ Professional association
           _____ Another state or local agency _____ Commercial provider or consultant
           _____ College or university   _____ National Institute of Corrections
   _____ Formal distance education/e-learning
   _____ Formal mentoring, coaching, or on-the-job training
   _____ Informal mentoring, coaching, or on-the-job training
   _____ Other (describe)_____

5.   Does your agency have adequate capacity to train and develop staff at the supervisory level?

   Yes _____   No _____   Not sure _____

6.   Does your agency consider the training and development opportunities it provides to supervisory-level staff to be sufficient?

   Yes _____   No _____   Not sure _____

   Comments about capacity or content of supervisory-level training and development (optional).