

Nebraska Department of Correctional Services Culture Study

BACKGROUND: To improve the culture of NDCS among staff and to increase transparency overall, NDCS took the proactive initiative to commission a department-wide, in-depth culture study. The results of this study are available to interested parties and to the public and will be used to diagnose and correct identified challenges at NDCS. The goal is to shift the culture at NDCS to provide better services in alignment with the mission of the organization.

COMMUNICATION AND LEADERSHIP

Employees perceive a fear of retaliation, lack of respect, and inconsistent application of principles.

Principle:

The leadership of NDCS must demonstrate they value all agency staff.

Progress:

- Staff input solicited by Director Frakes on NDCS culture resulted in 80+ responses
- Commissioned independent, department-wide, in-depth Culture Study
- Instituted Employee Positive Impact Councils at each facility to facilitate open communication
- Laid out employee expectations including:
 - Everyone must be treated with respect at all times
 - Retaliation will not be tolerated
 - Behave ethically in all decisions and actions
 - Treat inmates with respect, even when they do not show respect

EMPLOYEE SAFETY

Corrections work is inherently dangerous as more than 50 percent of the 5,400 individuals are serving time for a violent crime.

Principle:

Staff safety is foundational to everything NDCS does.

Progress:

- Included a formal review in the critical incident review process to implement improvements
- Created an intelligence team at the agency to identify organized activity that contributes to assaults
- Met with the New Mexico Department of Corrections to examine techniques to reduce gang violence
- Partnered with State Patrol to train special teams on emergency response
- Increased potency of OC spray, acquired up-to-date radios, assessing additional equipment needs

INMATE CULTURE

A perceived shift in the inmate population as more demanding, disrespectful of authority, and violent.

Principle:

The punishment for inmates is the period of incarceration imposed by the court system. NDCS's mission is to protect the

public. NDCS is to be firm in enforcing the rules, fair in the individual circumstances and consistent in applying the rules fairly every day.

Progress:

- Formed Inmate Councils at all facilities to improve communication
- Communication that embracing a reentry philosophy creates safer prisons and communities
- Created an intelligence team to identify organized activity that contributes to assaults
- Expanding use of cognitive-behavioral interventions to address criminal thinking
- Prioritizing programming space for inmates

TRAINING

Employees feel they are not trained on risks and needs.

Principle:

Professional development increases skills, knowledge, and job satisfaction and is a wise investment of taxpayer dollars.

Progress:

- Established a work group to review training and professional development
- Holding a new risk/needs assessment training in June

COMPENSATION

Pay compression means long-term employees often make the same wage as brand-new employees.

- **Principle:**
Compensation should reflect the accumulation of skills and knowledge to do the job safe and effectively.
- **Progress:**
This is an issue that is being examined in the collective bargaining process with the state employees union, the Nebraska Association of Public Employees, for the collective bargaining period of 2017-2019. More than 16,000 state employees will be impacted by this process and NDCS is working to ensure the Department of Administrative Services understands the needs of NDCS.

FACILITIES

Under previous administrations it was standard practice to delay repairs or improvements including equipment replacement until failure would justify “emergency” use of funds.

Principle:

Updating facilities and equipment is necessary for security. NDCS budgeting will prioritize taking care of people both staff and inmate.

Progress:

- Analyzing and prioritizing needs
- Money appropriated for the Community Corrections Center –Lincoln expansion

Media Release

June 1, 2016
For Immediate Release

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:
Andrew D. Nystrom, Communications Director
402-479-5713; andrew.nystrom@nebraska.gov

NDCS Releases Culture Study Results, Outlines Way-Ahead

(LINCOLN) – Today, the Nebraska Department of Correctional Services (NDCS) released a final report on the culture study conducted by a team led by Sharon Rues Pettid as the Governor's Chief Human Resources Officer.

More than 470 NDCS employees from across the agency voiced their opinions in a Department of Administrative Services-administered culture study conducted in late 2015, with results indicating current initiatives by Director Scott Frakes are aimed at the right areas. After completion of the interviews, data analysis was conducted by the study team and a final report was prepared by Rues Pettid.

At the request of Frakes, the culture survey was to examine the culture within the agency to support the development of and implementation of the NDCS Strategic Plan.

"This survey is a valuable tool and I value every employee's contribution to the study and I appreciate and commend their honesty. Our teammates cannot focus on their critically important jobs in an unhealthy environment. We will use the study results to identify areas that need attention," Frakes said. "Thanks to the many employees who took the time to communicate with us on these issues so we may better focus our efforts where they will do the most good."

Along with compensation, safety, resources and training effectiveness were identified as areas requiring attention.

"Morale is affected by a perceived wage inadequacy and finding ways to be the most effective with limited resources," Frakes said. "It is my challenge - every NDCS leader's challenge - to find innovative ways to accomplish the mission without overburdening our people," he said. "Morale is also affected by recognition, or lack of it, and that is an area where every NDCS teammate can have a positive impact."

The study was a confidential outlet where employees were free to express their concerns and the study provides NDCS leaders with information specific to their area of responsibility.

“The leaders within our agency can’t address problem-areas they don’t know about. The study results provide candid feedback from employees about what needs improvement within the agency, as well as a guide to help leaders act on the information,” Frakes said.

Similar studies conducted previously by other states’ departments of corrections, including Oregon, Wisconsin, Virginia and Florida, found similar concerns and challenges to the ones identified by Nebraska’s survey. Employee concerns regarding compensation, safety and leadership were all identified to some degree and are not unique to Nebraska.

“Feedback and engagement from our employees is critical,” Frakes said. “NDCS is on the right path to making ‘the best in the business of corrections’ not just an expression, but the way we do business every day by ensuring employees’ voices are heard. By becoming One Team with One Vision we will achieve this standard.”

The report includes additional information about the methodology, data analysis, data summary, training assessment, policy and procedures review, respondent data and demographics. The study can be found on the NDCS web site at <http://www.corrections.nebraska.gov/news.html>

-30-

Points of Contact.

NDCS Central Office Communications Office: Drew Nystrom, Comm: (402) 479-5713, (402) 850-9495; Email: andrew.nystrom@nebraska.gov

Office of the Governor/Communications Office: Eric Maher, Comm: (402) 471-1974, Email: eric.maher@nebraska.gov

Pete Ricketts, Governor

TO: Director Scott Frakes
FROM: Sharon Rues Pettid
DATE: May 25, 2016
SUBJECT: NDCS Culture Study Report

As requested, I have completed a culture study for the Nebraska Department of Corrections to examine the current culture within the agency to support the development and implementation of the agency's strategic plan. The report provides a cultural baseline and key indicators to leverage while driving agency cultural change, and to positively impact NDCS services. The final report is attached for your review and consideration.

Survey Process

To ensure statistical validity, the survey project originally intended to interview approximately 300 NDCS employees (i.e., location, job group). The volume increased as employees volunteered to complete the survey lengthening the study time.

The study, consisting of 471 NDCS staff interviews, utilized four instruments and included both quantitative and qualitative research. The study also included a training assessment and review of policy and procedures administrative components. Interviews were conducted at all locations between September and November 2015. Data analysis occurred between December 2015 and February 2016. Further analysis was conducted and the report was prepared during March and April 2016. A final draft was given to you in May 2016.

Survey Results

Identified themes from the data include: employee pay, employee safety, organizational leadership, communication, inmate culture, training, processes and procedures, performance management, and facilities. These emerged from both the quantitative and qualitative data gathered and substantial analysis.

Survey Responses

These responses represent the individual opinions and statements of NDCS employees. Neither NDCS nor DAS can validate the veracity or accuracy of responses provided. The study was informational and not investigatory in nature.

**June 1, 2016
Culture Study
Memorandum**

Last year, I commissioned an agency-wide staff culture survey to assess the state of the organization. An independent team canvassed our facilities from Omaha to McCook interviewing staff to identify their most pressing concerns and the root causes of those concerns.

While the culture survey was being conducted, NDCS undertook a number of reforms and initiatives spanning all areas of the agency. The long-term results of these changes are making their way through the agency and the full effects will not be felt for some time. The cultural change required to move our agency toward becoming the “best in the business of corrections” is underway now.

The survey highlights several areas of concern that need to be addressed. My promise to Nebraska, the Legislature and, in particular all NDCS employees, is we will prioritize and address them. Working together, we can change how this organization operates. We must prioritize the issues and respond to them in a strategic manner.

Compensation

The survey confirmed what I have been hearing for the last year. Pay is a significant issue for NDCS employees. There is a sense of inequality when long-term employees make the same wage as brand-new employees. Experienced staff members mentor and teach new staff the nuances of corrections work that can only be learned from actually doing the job. They do this because they are teammates, regardless of tenure, and because it is how we keep each other safe.

Compensation should be linked to the skills and knowledge to do the job effectively and safely. This issue is complicated and does not affect NDCS alone. There are collective bargaining processes for staff represented under labor contracts, and over 16,000 state employees impacted by the current compensation methods. I am working with the Department of Administrative Services to make sure the compensation needs of our department are identified and understood.

Employee Safety

Staff safety is a priority for me and staff safety is foundational to everything we do. Corrections work is inherently dangerous. We house 5,400 men and women who are incarcerated due to their risk to society; more than 50 percent of our population is serving time for a violent crime. While corrections work inherently involves risk, there are things we are doing and can do to reduce the number of assaults.

We have recently revised our internal critical incident review process to include formal reviews of all serious staff assaults in addition to larger-scale incidents, which is similar to approaches used by military, law enforcement and medical professions when serious incidents occur. The key is to identify and implement recommendations for improvement. The inmate is always responsible for his or her actions, but we learn from each incident and make changes to help keep staff safe.

In November 2015, NDCS created an intelligence team at the agency level dedicated to identifying organized activity contributing to assaults and other disruptive behavior. This allows us to target interventions which will ultimately reduce violence. We are also expanding the use of cognitive-behavioral interventions that specifically address criminal thinking. There are no simple solutions to this problem, but that does not mean there are no solutions.

NDCS staff have met with the New Mexico Department of Corrections to examine the changes they have made to reduce the use of restrictive housing and a team they created to specifically reduce gang violence. We have also partnered with the Nebraska State Patrol, who have expressed their willingness to assist NDCS in any way they can, including training with our special teams. NDCS investigates staff assaults and forwards the results to the appropriate county attorney who determines if criminal charges will be filed.

In an attempt to convert a restrictive housing unit at the Tecumseh State Correctional Institution to a maximum-custody general population unit, there was concern from employees that the unit's physical layout did not afford a sufficient level of safety needed for inmate movement. Given these concerns, the decision was made to halt this conversion and solicit employee input as to determine the best use for this unit. This is just one example of listening to employees and putting their safety first. We will continue to solicit input from staff and leverage their expertise as we provide quality care in a safe and secure manner.

The agency is continuously working to ensure correctional staff are properly equipped as well. The department recently increased the potency of the OC (oleoresin capsicum) spray and has procured more up-to-date radios and is reviewing the need for upgrades to other security equipment, such as cameras and intercoms.

Communication and Leadership

One of our vision points is Commitment to Staff. The leadership of NDCS must demonstrate they value the staff of the agency. We will continue to address those leaders who do not embrace the vision of this agency. In correspondence to the entire agency, I have laid out my expectations for all employees, including those in leadership positions:

- Everyone in NDCS treats each other with respect at all times, without exception.
- Retaliation will not be tolerated.

- We behave ethically in all decisions and actions.
- We are all timely and responsive to any request for information.
- Leaders are accessible.
- Leaders listen at least as much as they talk.
- Diversity amongst the leadership ranks will increase.
- We will treat the inmates with respect, even when they do not show us respect.

The survey confirms what I have been working to change since my arrival. When I solicited staff for examples of the “good ole’ boy & girl club” or “fear of retaliation,” I received more than 80 responses. Communication issues were mentioned as well as examples of lack of respect between co-workers, and between supervisors and employees. Lastly, there was a strong belief that it wasn’t advisable to challenge the status quo and people were promoted based on who they knew rather than their performance. Conversely, some teammates believe people are being promoted on merit and they had no fear of retaliation.

This is a problem that must be addressed head-on as even the perception of inequity or favoritism negatively impacts an organization’s culture. The agency has instituted Employee Positive Impact Councils (EPIC) at each facility, and they have already held their first meetings. The councils are an opportunity to bring staff together for open and honest dialogue. This perception took years to develop, which means dispelling it will not occur overnight. But, I am committed to it changing. I will be inviting a non-management representative from each of the councils to meet with the NDCS Executive Team and share how the process is going.

Creating promotional processes that are objective, thorough, and effective is challenging, but doable. “Time in grade” or experience with NDCS should be considered, but only in concert with education, other experience, and demonstrated performance. The agency has formed a workgroup to analyze the promotional processes, collect input from staff, and design a better system.

I recently solicited input from employees asking them to share one good thing about NDCS they wanted me to know. More than 140 employees responded. People talked about how NDCS is their second family, the positive relationships they have with coworkers and supervisors, and how proud they are of the work they do.

Inmate Culture

There are those who believe it is this agency’s job to “punish” those under our care. That could not be further from the truth. The punishment is the period of incarceration imposed by the courts. The department’s mission is to protect the public. More than 93 percent of the individuals

sentenced to prison will return to our communities. We achieve our mission by providing an environment conducive to making the choice to engage in positive change.

Those who succeed in this business embrace the reentry philosophy and recognize providing inmates with programming and pro-social activities creates safer prisons and communities. Discipline is applied for the purpose of changing behavior and is ineffective if used as a punitive measure. A mantra in corrections is “firm, fair and consistent.” Firm refers to enforcing the rules, fair takes into account the individual circumstances, and consistent is applying the rules firmly and fairly every day.

We have an obligation to provide for the basic needs of our inmate population. We have a constitutional responsibility to meet their healthcare needs. NDCS provides healthcare services consistent with the community standard of care, as required by state statute. All healthcare decisions take into account medical necessity and any decision to allow an inmate to see a specialist in the community requires approval of the medical director. A department work group is looking at options to reduce the number of medical travel orders.

My personal communication with staff, the feedback provided in this survey and conversations with leaders of other correctional systems indicate a perceived shift in the inmate population. This shift suggests an inmate population that is more demanding, more prone to violence and more disrespectful of authority.

NDCS will continue to provide, and expand, treatment and programming opportunities for inmates. We have formed Inmate Councils at all of the facilities to improve communication and provide the inmates an effective way to voice their concerns and ideas. We will not allow inmates to dictate policy or compromise the safety of our staff, but there is great value in building open lines of communication.

Training

Training and professional development present opportunities to expand the knowledge and skills of our employees and contribute to job satisfaction. Professional development provides everyone in the agency with worthwhile benefits and is a wise investment of taxpayer dollars.

I have established a work group to address this issue, identify options, and determine what is feasible to implement in the near future. Initial recommendations from this team and from the Inspector General include:

- resiliency training for correctional staff
- reimbursement of licensure and continuing education for health services and behavioral health staff
- research-based employee engagement training to develop a better work environment
- enhanced supervisory training

- evaluating pre-service and in-service training for opportunities to better meet the practical needs of our employees

One challenge will be to make sure as we make progress in our efforts to reduce overtime, we do not simply replace the hours spent at the facilities with time spent in training. An appropriate work/life balance for our staff is important to me and will be taken into consideration when tackling this issue.

Facilities

The need to invest in our facilities is clear. They all need varying degrees of improvements and repairs. Under previous administrations, it was standard practice to delay equipment replacement projects until well past the expected lifespan, waiting for complete failure to justify the “emergency” use of funds. This practice is short-sighted and not consistent with good security practices.

As we prepare for the next biennium, we will make sure it is done in a way that prioritizes taking care of people; strikes the right balance between today's requirements and future modernization; and makes every dollar count as good stewards. When dealing with an issue of this magnitude, the planning phase is as important to get right as the implementation in order to allocate limited resources in the most cost-effective manner.

NDCS is analyzing and prioritizing a large number of competing needs to ascertain the total cost. In the near-term, we will identify whether we can achieve that in one biennium or if it will require allocations through multiple bienniums.

The Community Corrections Center - Lincoln expansion, approved by the Legislature this past session, will construct a 160-bed unit, a multi-purpose building for food service, gender-specific housing, program space and a warehouse.

This expansion is just the first step in my long-term strategy to address capacity and facility needs. Many of our facilities were constructed at a time when sufficient program and treatment space were considered to be less important. We must expand capacity and update current facilities to include program and treatment space to address inmate needs which will provide a better work environment for our employees.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to assist me in assessing the staff culture of this agency. It was an effective tool for capturing both positive and negative feedback. It is my belief that every single employee at NDCS has ideas that would make the department better. I value every employee's contribution to the study and want them to know I appreciate and commend their honesty.

Our agency is undergoing remarkable changes. We will thoughtfully and strategically address each area of concern, recognizing that changing rules, practices and cultures takes valuable time and energy, as does anything worthwhile. We will continue to monitor staff engagement in a variety of ways to ensure progress toward a healthy work culture.

NDCS is on the right path to making “the best in the business of corrections” not just an expression, but the way we do business every day by ensuring employees’ voices are heard. By becoming One Team with One Vision we will achieve this standard.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "S. Frakes". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "S" and a long, sweeping underline.

Scott R. Frakes, NDCS Director

TIMELINE OF NDCS CULTURE STUDY

JULY 2015

- Director Scott Frakes requests a culture study of the Nebraska Department of Correctional Services (NDCS) be conducted to provide a tool to support the development and implementation of the NDCS strategic plan and to identify culture change.
- Chief Human Resource Officer, Sharon Rues Pettid, is commissioned to lead and conduct the survey at no cost.

AUGUST 2015 – SEPTEMBER 2015

- The Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) creates and refines the interview instrument and survey database.
- Pilot of survey 1 and survey 2 is conducted at the Lincoln Correctional Center (LCC) to test the validity of the survey instrument.

SEPTEMBER 2015 – NOVEMBER 2015

- Sharon Rues Pettid leads a team of human resource and legal professionals from the Department of Administrative Services (DAS), the Department of Labor (DOL), the Nebraska Commission on Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice (Crime Commission), and the Nebraska State Patrol to conduct interviews of 471 NDCS staff at all NDCS locations.

DECEMBER 2015 – FEBRUARY 2016

- Quantitative and qualitative data analysis is conducted by Sharon Rues Pettid with technical assistance provided by DHHS.

MARCH 2016 – APRIL 2016

- Further qualitative data analysis is conducted by Sharon Rues Pettid to identify key cultural themes.
- Legal team comprised of DAS, NDCS, and Department of Roads employees redacts information found within individual survey results in accordance with Neb. Rev. Stat. §84-712.05.
- Draft Culture Study Report is compiled and prepared by Sharon Rues Pettid.

MID-APRIL 2016

- Director Frakes is presented with a draft copy of the Culture Study Report from Sharon Rues Pettid.

MAY 25, 2016

- Final copy of the Culture Study Report is provided to Director Frakes by Sharon Rues Pettid.

Nebraska Department of Correctional Services

Culture Study

May 2016

Prepared by Sharon Rues Pettid

Contents

Executive Summary 3

Methodology 4

Data Analysis 7

Data Summary 9

Training Assessment 15

Survey Data 24

Executive Summary

During 2015, Director Scott Frakes requested Chief Human Resources Officer Sharon Rues Pettid conduct a culture study of the Nebraska Department of Correctional Services (NDCS) to examine the current culture within the agency to support development and implementation of the agency's strategic plan.

When the study launched, NDCS was experiencing employee recruiting and retention issues, population issues, and political pressure to improve.

The self-funded study was led by the Governor's CHRO and conducted by a multi-agency, multi-disciplinary team.

The study, consisting of 471 NDCS staff interviews, leveraged four instruments and included both quantitative and qualitative research. The study also included a training assessment and review of policy and procedure administration components.

Identified themes from the data include: employee pay, employee safety, organizational leadership, communication, inmate culture, training, processes and procedures, performance management, and facilities.

This report provides the methodology, data analysis, data summary, a training assessment, a policy and procedures review, and respondent data and demographics.

Methodology

The study model was designed from the Correctional Officer Wellness and Safety Literature Review (*U.S. Department of Justice Office of Justice Programs Diagnostic Center, Jamie Brower, Psy.D, ABPP, July 2013*) examining sources and effects of stress.

This voluntary study was conducted using four separate survey instruments with randomly selected employees. If not selected, employees were given the opportunity to volunteer. Every participant was read a disclosure explaining the project and their participation options. Each instrument was tailored to specific job classifications within the Department of Corrections: one for staff in one of four specific protective services positions: corrections officer, corrections corporal, corrections sergeant, and corrections unit case worker (this survey is henceforth referred to as Survey 1); one for all other staff, excluding those in human resources positions and management at or above the level of lieutenant (henceforth referred to as Survey 2); one for human resources staff (henceforth referred to as the HR survey); and one for upper-level management (henceforth referred to as the Leadership survey). Surveys 1 and 2 included both quantitative and qualitative questions; the HR and Leadership surveys were strictly qualitative, except for one question on the HR survey. Because a substantial portion of the department's employees do not have access to e-mail, all surveys were conducted in person by one of a team of nine interviewers from several different agencies within state government.

Survey 1 consisted of 32 items, on the following topics:

- role clarity
- facility leadership
- management/management conflict
- performance evaluation
- pay and benefits
- overtime
- shifts
- resources/equipment/system access
- location/transportation
- processes/procedures
- confidential services
- work/family conflict
- media impact
- perceptions of profession
- retention
- corrections philosophy
- ideas for improvement

Most of the questions on Survey 1 were quantitative, with follow-up by the interviewer asking the participant to explain their response. Several items at the beginning of the survey recorded whether or not the participant was a volunteer or was randomly-selected (or both), current job title, facility where assigned, length of tenure at the Department of Corrections, age, gender, and shift.

Survey 2 was structured much like Survey 1, but was shorter in length, with 19 items on the following topics:

- role clarity
- facility leadership
- management/management conflict
- performance evaluation
- pay and benefits
- stressors
- satisfaction measures
- confidential services
- media impact
- retention
- corrections philosophy
- ideas for improvement

Most of the questions on Survey 2 were quantitative, with follow-up by the interviewer asking the participant to explain their response. Several items at the beginning of the survey recorded whether or not the participant was a volunteer or was randomly-selected (or both), current job title, facility where assigned, length of tenure at NDCS, age, gender, and shift.

The HR survey consisted of 12 items, all but one of which was qualitative in format; topics included:

- human resource and workforce challenges
- performance evaluation
- facility leadership
- communication
- department philosophy
- workplace culture

The Leadership survey was structured much like the HR survey, except it consisted of only nine items and all were qualitative in format; topics included:

- workplace culture
- challenges
- communication
- decision-making
- department philosophy

Several items at the beginning of both the HR and Leadership surveys recorded current job title, facility where assigned, shift, and length of tenure at NDCS.

Prior to conducting Surveys 1 and 2, a pilot test of the first draft of both surveys was conducted at the Lincoln Corrections Center (LCC) during August and September 2015. Prior to the pilot tests, electronic versions of both survey instruments were created using Epi-Info™ 7 software; each interviewer was then provided with a copy of the surveys for use on a laptop computer. Survey responses were subsequently uploaded to a single protected shared drive. For each survey, 18 LCC employees were randomly selected from the most current employee list, with each interviewer conducting two surveys. At the conclusion of the pilot tests of both surveys, the interviewers met together to discuss their experiences using the survey instruments, and numerous revisions were made in response to their comments and suggestions.

Upon revising Surveys 1 and 2, the study officially began, with interviews for all four surveys taking place between September and November 2015. Using the random number-generating function in Microsoft Excel, all employees selected to participate in Surveys 1 and 2 were assigned a random number for the purposes of selecting a study sample. The target sample size for the two surveys combined was 300, which represented 14.6% of the total number of employees who were eligible to participate in either survey according to the most current department employee roster (2052). For Survey 1, the target sample size number was 176, which represented 15.1% of the total number of employees in this group (1163). For Survey 2, the target sample size number was 124, which represented 19.6% of those employees whose positions required some inmate contact (92/469) and 7.6% of the remainder (32/420). The number of surveys was also apportioned on the basis of the number of employees at each facility and to ensure all facilities had some representation. In addition to those employees who were randomly selected, the NDCS director also stipulated anyone who asked to participate in either survey should be allowed to do so. For the HR and Leadership surveys, all employees in these two groups were included in the study. As with Surveys 1 and 2, electronic versions of the HR and Leadership survey instruments were created using Epi-Info™ 7; each interviewer was then provided with a copy for their laptop computer, and survey responses were subsequently uploaded to the same single protected shared drive. The final participant tally for all four surveys was 199 for Survey 1, 142 for Survey 2, 23 for the HR survey, and 107 for the Leadership survey, for a total of 471 survey participants.

Analysis of the survey data took place during January and February 2016. Frequencies for all of the quantitative survey items were generated using Epi-Info™ 7. Responses to the qualitative items on Surveys 1 and 2, along with quantitative findings, were reviewed and discussed by the entire project team. Responses to qualitative items from all surveys were selected and summarized in this document.

Data Analysis

The study identified the following employee perceptions:

1. Over 60% of Survey 1 respondents believe there is at least **some difference between their job description and the actual demands of their job**. Seventy percent (70%) of Survey 2 respondents feel there is at least some difference between their job description and the actual demands of their job.
2. Survey 1 respondents are much more satisfied with their immediate supervisor than they are with the **leadership** at their facility. Just over one-third (34%) are satisfied with leadership at their facility, while 72% are satisfied or highly satisfied with their **immediate supervisor**. This is reinforced by the fact relatively few respondents indicated conflict with their immediate supervisor. Nearly half (49%) of Survey 2 respondents are satisfied or highly satisfied with the leadership at their facility, and 68% with their immediate supervisor.
3. Satisfaction with **performance evaluation** data indicated 34% of Survey 1 respondents are either satisfied or highly satisfied with the way their job performance is evaluated, and slightly less feel job performance is consistently or very consistently evaluated at their facility (28%). Just over 40% of Survey 2 respondents are either satisfied or highly satisfied with the way their job performance is evaluated, and about the same percentage feel job performance is consistently or very consistently evaluated at their facility. Qualitative comments suggest employees perceive inconsistency with **guidance and discipline** and **performance evaluations** and the process is not of value.
4. There is a lot of dissatisfaction concerning **pay**; 69% of Survey 1 respondents and 63% of Survey 2 respondents indicated they were dissatisfied or highly dissatisfied with pay. Qualitative responses support employees' belief **starting wages** are not competitive locally with Nebraska employers or other state governments, and **pay compression** is an issue.
5. **Communication from facility management** was the greatest source of dissatisfaction (39%) among the Survey 2 respondents, with as many people expressing dissatisfaction as expressed satisfaction (39%). **Notification of new policies and procedures** was a close second (32%). Qualitative responses support employees' perception of being overwhelmed with processes and procedures, including the volume of revisions and poor communication regarding them. Staff thinks organizational communication is poor upward and downward.
6. Those who are dissatisfied with **mandatory OT** outnumber those who are satisfied with it by nearly a 2-1 margin with Survey 1. Satisfaction with voluntary OT is pretty high (almost two-thirds are satisfied or highly satisfied with it).
7. While 58% of Survey 1 participants indicated the **media** does not influence the way they feel about their job, 59% of Survey 1 participants feel the **media portrays them unfavorably**, and 38% believes the **public portrays them unfavorably**.
8. When asked about the **philosophy of NDCS**, 37% of Survey 1 participants described it as "rehabilitation of inmates", however, 43% described the philosophy of a "blend of both"

rehabilitation and punishment. Qualitative comments suggest employees may need clarity as to the purpose and philosophy of corrections. Staff perception is inmates are not consistently held accountable for their actions and behaviors, a medical standard of care is not defined, and more programming is needed.

9. Survey 2 results suggest the most frequent causes of stress are **caseload/workload volume** (75%), **work-life balance** (67%), **lack of co-workers job experience** (61%), and the **volume of policies and procedures** (60%). These four factors were cited by at least half of all survey respondents as causing stress either sometimes, often, or very often. Employees perceive **training** is not as effective as it could be and the **work environment** is not as safe as it should be.

Data Summary

Employee Pay

There is significant dissatisfaction concerning pay (69% survey 1, 63% survey 2), but much less so with benefits. Employees perceive starting wage issues and pay compression problems. Employees believe NDCS is losing people for higher paying wages to surrounding counties, Nebraska employers, and state governments. Pay was a common answer for retention and department improvements.

Management and employees expressed concern compensation is not market competitive for several positions (i.e., protective services, mental health) and compare their wages to county, Nebraska employers, and surrounding states.

Some employees indicated they had to seek a promotion to get a pay increase. Staff noted Sergeants are reluctant to promote to Lieutenant, as they feel the work is the same and they lose overtime earnings. Employees reported leveraging overtime to compensate for low pay or working two jobs to pay their bills, and volunteer for overtime to avoid mandatory overtime. Employees believe additional mandatory overtime creates a strain on work-life balance.

Some employees would also like to see higher pay for positions involving more physical risk. Food service specialists have requested their job be reclassified as they have inmate training and monitoring duties (i.e., knife handling). In addition, staff indicated the Unit Caseworker and Unit Case Manager positions need clarity of duties. Staff shared the current job descriptions are vague and do not include many duties for which NDCS employees are responsible.

Other monetary rewards employees expressed interest in include gym membership reimbursement and student loan forgiveness. Non-monetary rewards employees asked for include onsite fitness facilities and learning opportunities for all staff levels and corrections support groups.

Some employees also expressed concern tuition reimbursement is not attractive as they are unable to take advantage of the benefit with mandatory overtime.

While employees are not compensated for having college degrees, some have college degrees and want NDCS to utilize their expertise.

Employee Safety

While not asked directly, employee safety was a dominant theme surfaced through the qualitative responses.

Employees expressed concern for their safety and ability to perform their jobs after working a 16-hour day because of exhaustion. Employees recognize some overtime will always be required. Employees perceive other employees often call in sick when put on mandatory overtime creating further strain on management and employees.

Employees acknowledged NDCS is challenged with finding quality candidate pools and employee selection quality has been negatively impacted.

Employees believe there is an increased volume of inmate transports (not limited to inmate facility to facility transfers) which increases overtime in order to provide coverage for the transport and facility.

Employees shared that newer staff need to be trained to speak to inmates respectfully.

Many employees believe the elimination of physical standards for employees has significantly impacted the quality of new hires. Employees requested administration reinstitutes physical standards and ensure new hires are fit to do the job. Employees said the lack of physical standards forces NDCS to put unfit employees on light duty, 2nd or 3rd shift, and NDCS cannot hold them over for overtime for shifts in need of staff.

Due to staff shortages, many employees shared they are being assigned duties outside their job classification.

Employees believe inmate violence against staff needs to be addressed.

Employees consider the ratio of inmates to employees out of balance. Employees feel inmate population levels have also impacted workloads, and existing staffing levels are expected to handle the increasing inmate levels. Case workers shared they don't work on caseloads because they don't have time (i.e., working custody) and feel the caseload is stressful due to the number of inmate mental health issues and volume of paperwork associated with this work. Survey 2 results suggest caseload/workload volume as a frequent cause of stress.

- The 2nd and 3rd shift is perceived as less stressful, self-managed, and has the least amount of work.
- Employees believe there are obstacles to information access, impacting their ability to do their job as effectively as possible.
- Employees are concerned NDCS is promoting unqualified staff.
- Employees want more information about how to best manage inmates. Employees feel there is disconnect between corrections and law enforcement.
- Employees want more tools to control inmate movement.
- Some employees want onsite employee mental health care.

Leadership

Survey 1 and 2 participants were asked questions regarding their satisfaction with leadership and their immediate supervisor.

Survey 1 respondents are much more satisfied with their immediate supervisor than they are with the leadership at their facility. Barely one-third are satisfied with leadership at their facility, while 70% are satisfied or highly satisfied with their immediate supervisor. This is reinforced by the data relatively few respondents have had even occasional conflicts with their immediate supervisor.

Survey 2 results are similar to Survey 1; survey respondents are more satisfied with their immediate supervisor than they are with the leadership at their facility, but the gap between the two is much narrower than it is for Survey 1. Survey 2 respondents are more satisfied with both their immediate supervisor and facility leadership than Survey 1 participants. Almost half are satisfied with leadership at their facility, while about two-thirds are satisfied or highly satisfied with their immediate supervisor. About one in five have had at least occasional conflicts with their immediate supervisor, a slightly higher percentage than participants in Survey 1.

Employees perceive a culture of fear remains prevalent among all levels at NDCS. Employees speculate leadership is more interested in their day going smoothly and shifting accountability than doing what is best.

Employee qualitative responses suggest inconsistent leadership and direction at NDCS facilities. Some employees believe decision making is predominantly top down, yet leaders try to create a perception of being inclusive.

Employees shared decision making is substantial from Central Office and often conflicts with the facility administration. Employees would like to see decisions made based on safety and the right decisions without budget being the dominating factor. Employees working 2nd and 3rd shift perceive having less communication and input.

Staff feels there is not a sense of teamwork across NDCS. Employees perceive administration leadership supports the Major level up, but not down. Employees expressed some leaders are intimidating and not approachable.

Staff perceives employees are not consistently held accountable for poor behavior and their leaders do not listen and hear their concerns. Several employees shared their management believes inmates over employees. Some leaders indicated they must get permission to discipline staff.

Employees perceive favoritism and a “good old boys/girls club” culture exists. Employees speculate leaders politicking for promotions and positions.

Employees feel a lack of recognition in the facilities, yet indicated Central Office receives recognition.

Some employees perceive leaders are not visible enough. Employees suggest Wardens and Assistant Wardens be more visible at their facilities, especially out in the yards and units. Employees think Central Office Administration leaders need to be more visible at all facilities.

Some employees feel management is not around; therefore, they have little supervision.

Communication

Employees feel Director Frakes has made significant strides in improving communication. Employees believe the new director is trying to facilitate transparency and open communication, but management below him is communicating contradictory messages. Employees suspect issues are not rising to the director.

Survey 2 respondents indicated communication from facility management was the single greatest source of dissatisfaction, with as many equal numbers expressing dissatisfaction as expressed satisfaction.

Many employees believe communication does not flow upward or downward. Employees indicated the level of communication from the Director and Warden to line staff is terrible. Employees perceive communication between line staff and mid-management is poor. Messages get diluted from shift to shift or when they have days off. Many employees commented administration believes inmates over employees.

Ten to 11 percent of protective service employees do not have email access; this complicates access to information and the ability to reference back to information.

Medical staff perceives difficulty balancing their medical confidentiality with what management thinks should be disclosed or feel it is medically permissible. Unless safety and security are at risk, medical staff feels people's health information should not be shared.

Inmate Culture

Employees perceive inconsistent inmate discipline and rules. Employees believe inmates are favored and trusted over employees. Employees feel NDCS gives inmates too much trust and management needs to take into consideration what is best for staff and inmates. Employees think the lack of inmate accountability results in inmates being treated as residents.

Employees do recognize a change in inmate behaviors from prior decades due to a shift in population. Employees described an increase in younger inmates, some with gang affiliation, who are uncooperative and noncompliant. Employees shared inmates are more violent and aggressive, have mental health or substance abuse issues, and are more confrontational and push rule limitations. Staff believes the population age blend is a source of problems.

Employees believe there is not a standard of care for inmates' medical treatment and the Ombudsman influences NDCS to approve all medical specialist care requests made by inmates. Employees perceive inmates are abusing the privilege of seeing medical specialists, thus increasing the number of medical transports, straining custody staffing.

Employees repeatedly shared their concern for the lack of programming for inmates. They recognize the inmates need more productive ways to spend free time, such as; vocational rehabilitation and rehabilitation programs.

Training

Employees believe they are not trained on assessing risks and needs. Employees feel in-service training is not high quality or helpful, and receive training on things they never do. Some employees think training is geared for correctional officers and not tailored for other jobs.

Employees are concerned everyone passes in-service training. There is a perception all new employees pass rather than assure the person is trained adequately to perform. Employees believe this approach creates safety concerns for other employees.

Employees would like to see more training content on key issues they face daily, such as substance abuse and mental health. Employees feel it would be helpful to teach them how the brain works and why certain offenders do certain things, focusing more on the psychological aspects of behavior to support the rehabilitation focus of NDCS.

Regarding field training officers (FTOs), employees indicated some are strong and some are not.

- Employees would like continuing education for medical staff.
- The 3rd shifts noted daytime training is disruptive for them.
- Employees state they get short notice for training, requiring 3 consecutive days.
- Employees are sometimes on vacation and don't get notified about required training.

- Employees do not like online training as it allows for distraction; the training can play while the employee does other work.

Processes and Procedures

While Survey 1 question data regarding process and procedures appear positive, qualitative information suggests the opposite. Unfortunately, we were not able to independently verify their knowledge of processes and procedures. Survey 2 respondents did rate the volume of policies and procedures as a frequent cause of stress.

Employees feel they are burdened with layers and volumes of policies. Employees shared policies are issued by the Central Office administration and by facility. Employees feel policies and procedures are not thought through and are often prepared for anomalies.

Some employees believe the intensive focus on policies and procedures is driven by the administration's focus on American Correctional Association (ACA) accreditation rather than practicality or need.

Employees feel discontent with how policy and procedure communication is handled. Employees think communication is slow and policies and procedures are always changing.

Different mediums are used to distribute policies and procedures, creating inconsistencies of knowledge. Some individuals receive notification via email, information may be posted, information may be shared by a co-worker, and information may be shared at roll call. Some employees believe they may find out through the grapevine or a month later when they've done a process/procedure wrong and are then disciplined.

Many employees believe decisions about policies and procedures are made without any input. Employees indicated a policy or procedures may not fit their location so staff adapts it. Employees recommend Central Office to be onsite at a facility location before they develop policies and procedures.

Employees feel policies and procedures are implemented without warning, adequate materials, or guidance. Employees think they need more context and clarity regarding the implementation of a policy or procedure to fully understand its purpose.

Performance Management

For Survey 1, 34% were satisfied and 28% of Survey 2 respondents are satisfied with how their performance is managed. The qualitative information revealed several problems. Management thinks the performance management system is cumbersome, repetitive, ineffective, and does not fit their needs.

Employees consider performance reviews inconsistent in evaluation timing and completion. Because there is no connection to compensation or career progression, management and employees perceive reviews to not be meaningful.

Several employees stated they are reviewed by an individual who either does not directly oversee their performance or they have never met. Some employees consider much of the evaluation content to be personal opinion and lacks value.

Some employees complained they are disciplined in front of inmates or employees and staff members gossip in front of inmates.

Facilities

Employees expressed concern regarding the current standards of their buildings and lack of facility space. Poor building location and lack of space diminish the ability to offer programming. Staff mentioned sinks leak and toilets don't flush and overflow.

Employees perceive differences in facility needs for the population they serve (i.e., men, women, youth, max) and there is not one-size-fits all approach.

Some employees advised computers systems in facilities are out of date or not working. The GED proctoring equipment is in poor working condition. Employees said chairs and tables break regularly. Employees said they want safe, functional, working equipment.

Administration

NDCS staff believes many of the challenges the department faces today are due to the prior administration's focus on budget and lack of support.

NDCS employees said they like Director Frakes' philosophy, vision, perspective, recognition for culture change, and new ideas. Employees expressed much positivity with the new administration from support to transparency.

Employees believe the Ombudsman portrays a negative image of NDCS. Employees perceive inmates can get whatever they want from calling the Ombudsman.

Employees perceive the Legislature to be making money decisions and creating laws about a system they know nothing about.

Media

Survey 1 respondents both indicated they feel they are portrayed unfavorably by the media (58%). Both Survey 1 (29%) and Survey 2 (37%) respondents indicated the media affects how they feel about their job.

Staff believes NDCS does not furnish information or enough information to get an accurate story. Employees suspect newspapers print what they get from inmates, which may not be true or accurate. Employees perceive the media puts a greater emphasis on inmate complaints.

Training Assessment

Scope

This training assessment reviewed training provided through the Nebraska Department of Correctional Services (NDCS) Staff Training Academy (STA) and facility specific training from Field Training Officers (FTO) and on-the-job (OTJ) training. For the facility review, the study utilized the Nebraska State Penitentiary (NSP). In addition, administration-issued and facility-issued policies and procedures were reviewed.

This included:

- Reviewing training records and specific curricula associated with the six-week Pre-Service training including:
 - Lesson plans listed in the Pre-Service lesson plans matrix
 - Pre-Service training schedule
 - Pre-Service training annual calendar
 - STA Pre-Service manual for participants
 - NDCS Rules and Regulations, Title 68 of Nebraska Administrative Code (NAC)
 - Physical Capacity Testing Survey (completed in September of 2011)
 - Administrative Regulation (AR) 112.42, Minimum Physical Standard

- Reviewing training records and specific curricula associated with In-Service training for Fiscal Year (FY) 14-15 and FY 15-16 including:
 - FY 14-15 and 15-16 training calendars
 - 2014 STA Annual Report from the STA (includes evaluation and plans for FY 14-15)
 - 2014 six-month evaluation report
 - (AR) 114.05, In-Service Training

- Reviewing STA training record keeping practices including:
 - Training records for randomly selected Training Specialists
 - Training Specialist/Coordinator list
 - Random employee training records

- Reviewing FTO and OJT training materials including:
 - NSP FTO manual
 - NDCS FTO observation report
 - FTO observation report guidelines
 - FTO critique form
 - FTO evaluation
 - FTO program critique
 - FTO module implementation information form

- Conducting three STA on-site visits including:
 - Observation of training lessons in progress
 - Discussion with training staff, administrators, and students
 - Review of additional on-site training materials

- Tour of facilities
 - Discussions of staffing issues
 - Discussions of the program and staff recommendations for addressing areas of concern
- Conducting two visits to the NSP Training facilities including:
 - Tour of facilities
 - Staff discussions
 - Review of FTO and OJT training materials
 - Review of FTO and OJT training structure
 - Discussions of the program and staff recommendations for addressing areas of concern
- Reviewing policy and procedure documents including:
 - ARs listed in the Table of Contents dated November 4, 2015
 - OMs in the Table of Contents for the NSP dated November 2, 2015
 - POs listed in the Current Dates Table of Contents dated April 9, 2015
 - Master List for Post Order Books for the NSP dated June 3, 2009
 - NSP, OM, 001.001.101, Administrative Regulation Manual and Distribution Procedures

Methodology

The qualitative assessment of the NDCS training program and policy and procedure structure included:

Evaluation of the existing instructor lesson plans and student handbook materials for both Pre-Service and In-Service training including:

- Lesson plan format
- Performance objective evaluation
- Classroom presentation observation
- Testing requirements
- Instruction methods
- Student materials
- Learning theory application
- Onsite interviews and discussions with STA staff
- Onsite interviews with training and FTO staff from the NSP

Evaluation of the existing policy and procedure structure including:

- ARs
- OMs from the NSP
- POs from the NSP
- Onsite interviews and discussions with staff who develop policies and procedures

Overview of the Existing NDCS Training Program

Facilities

The NDCS operates and is responsible for the STA located in Lincoln, Nebraska. The facility includes classrooms, offices, and a gymnasium. No lodging or dining services are available at this facility. Each correctional institution has either full-time training personnel or training coordinators. Training space is available at the larger institutions.

Built in the 1950s, the STA has not had significant updates or remodels since July 2001. Facilities issues to be addressed include:

- Classroom projection technology (in process of updating with new projectors and televisions)
- Projection technology in the gymnasium
- Paint
- Computer technology, including the computer lab
- Simulator repair or replacement

There is 3,500 sq. ft. of empty space in the lower level of this facility could be converted into classrooms, record storage, and office space. Staff could also use another cell area for participants to use for practicing searches.

The classrooms are crowded. Current table design limits classroom activities, such as small group work, role play or games to leverage other learning styles (i.e., more discussion, less lecture). A change in table design could benefit the learning environment, as would reduction in class size. In 2015, average class sizes were 35 participants, and 50% of classes had higher participant counts up to 56.

Training Programs

STA include Pre-Service training (new hire training), In-Service training programs (annual training for all employees), and specialized training. Each year an annual training plan is created with significant employee input. This training plan outlines all training to be completed for each employee class to sufficiently meet ACA standards. It includes a Pre-Service schedule.

Pre-Service Training

The existing Pre-Service training course is a six-week course. The course curriculum has been updated regularly over the years; however, a task analysis has not been completed in some time.

There are no significant problems with the content of the current lesson plans. Overall the content of the lesson plans was pertinent, current, and defensible. However, the lesson plan format and dependence on PowerPoint slides and lecture should be addressed.

Many lesson plans are presentation outlines. Outlines are not sufficient support for substitute instructors and create concern with defensibility (i.e., detail on exactly what was taught). The training should reflect the lesson plan, including activities and discussions. A well-designed lesson plan and class roster supports defensibility by identifying what material was instructed, who facilitated, who

participated, course time, materials and methods used, and how the course was evaluated to measure competency.

Currently, the primary method of instruction is lecture supported with a slideshow. It does not appear curriculum is designed with all adult learning styles in mind.

Learning objectives need to be limited, include more demonstration/practice sessions, and leverage Bloom's Taxonomy. Bloom's Taxonomy is a tool developed through research on how adults learn and defines six levels of learning:

1. Knowledge
2. Comprehension
3. Application
4. Analysis
5. Synthesis
6. Evaluation

NIC has a program that teaches curriculum development and utilizes the Instructional Theory into Practice (ITIP) Lesson plan model. This education would be a benefit to STA.

In 2015, 462 participants completed the Pre-Service training, with 42 participants leaving before completion for a variety of reasons, including failure, withdrawal, and personal reasons resulting in an incomplete. Class sizes ranged from 14 participants up to 56 participants, with an average of 35.5 students per session. STA provides Pre-Service training for all facilities except WEC, which has its own Pre-Service training program.

FTO/OJT

Each facility conducts its own FTO/OJT program. New hires begin OJT at their assigned facility each Friday during their 6-week program. Each employee is provided a facility-specific field training manual to complete during their first six months of employment.

This manual includes 45 checklists detailing tasks employees must demonstrate proficiency in. Tasks are related to security, safety and sanitation checks, restraints, emergency equipment, searches, security equipment, and inmate services. Each checklist provides step-by-step descriptions. Upon completion of the task, the checklist must be signed and dated by both the FTO and employee, and kept in the employee's file at their assigned institution. It appears the information on how to perform the skills is passed on from the FTO to the participant through the checklists. It does not appear policy and procedure documents are utilized in this training methodology.

Staff noted recordkeeping is a problem due to the paper intensity and cannot be shared with another institution if the employee transfers to a work assignment in another institution. If an employee does not complete their FTO program they will not be removed from probation with the Department.

Employees who wish to be FTO instructors must go through two-day training for trainers for FTOs. There is no extra pay for FTO trainers.

In-Service Training

Minimum training requirements for all In-Service training are clearly listed in AR 114.05, In-Service Training for each of the eight classes of employees. All employees are required to attend some form of In-Service training annually. This training is coordinated by the STA and hosted at various sites. During FY 14-15, 1,099 employees received In-Service training.

During FY 14-15, In-Service classroom training included:

- Basic First Aid/Basic Life Support – 7 hours
- Pressure Point Control Tactics (PPCT) Level III Review – 1 hour
- PPCT Level III - Subject Control/Knife Defense – 8 hours
- Prison Rape Elimination Act – 1.5 hours
- Emergency Preparedness – 1 hour
- Ethics – 1.5 hours
- Inmate Rules – 1 hour
- Use of Force Policy Review – 1 hour
- Security Threat Groups – 1 hour
- Oleoresin Capsicum (OC) Recertification – 1 hour

During FY 14-15, In-Service training provided online included:

- Suicide
- Discrimination and Harassment
- Computer Usage Policy
- Employee Assistance Program
- Infectious Disease
- Social Work Services

Not all employees would participate in all the courses. They complete enough hours to meet the minimum requirements of the AR.

Evaluation of Training Classes and Programs

Class and course evaluation is conducted. It is based upon participant written tests in the classroom and a participant self-report six months after course completion. Currently, there is not results-based evaluation to assess organizational impact on the NDCS mission.

Records

All records at STA are maintained in a secure database operated by NDCS. Training records include the following:

- Employee name
- Agency (institution)
- Job classification
- Start date
- Training class title
- Type of training
- Training registration dates
- Training date(s)
- Training hours
- Completion status
- Completion date

One staff member completes the training record entry and also has other assigned duties. On one visit, training record entry was backlogged about six months.

Trainer Documents

There are no guidelines or manuals to provide direction for trainers beyond the lesson plans, participant documents and some policy and procedure.

Staff Challenges

Seven instructors are responsible for the majority of Pre-Service training. Their responsibilities include:

- Develop new lesson plans
- Review and update lesson plans they currently teaching
- Present lesson plans to participants during class
- Prepare test questions
- Conduct participant testing, both written and practical
- Other duties as assigned (i.e., backup instructors)

Each instructor has lesson plans for what they are responsible for instructing, as well as be prepared to facilitate backup instructor lesson plans.

All staff attends a 40-hour instructor development course within their first year of employment. Additional conferences and training seminars have not been supported due to lack of funding and staff shortages. Continuing education is also limited to funding.

All instructors must complete the mandatory department employee training every year. There is no internal instructor development training. STA has experienced significant turnover over the past two

years. Two staff has been at the Academy since before November 2014. Advancement opportunities are limited.

Overview of Current NDCS Policy and Procedure Structure

Administrative Regulations

Administrative Regulations (AR) are maintained by the NDCS Administration and apply to all facilities. Currently, there are 216 different ARs, 1,473 pages of Regulations, and 537 pages of attachments. Employees are expected to be familiar with all ARs.

ARs are written by NDCS administrative staff. Some ARs, but not all, receive legal review by a qualified person. No particular training or resources appear to be required of, or made available to, those writing or approving the policy documents.

Operational Memorandums

Operational Memorandums (OM) are maintained by and only apply to each facility. For this study, NSP OMs were reviewed identifying 252 different OMs and 3,251 memorandums. Employees are expected to be familiar with all OMs.

OMs are written by institutional staff, do not receive legal review (unless requested by the Warden), and are signed off by the facility Warden. No particular training or resources appear to be made available to the Wardens who have to take responsibility for assuring these policy documents are consistent with case law and statute and defensibility.

Post Orders

Post Orders (PO) are maintained by and only apply to each facility. For this study, NSP POs were reviewed identifying 43 different POs, totaling 1,944 pages.

POs are written by institutional staff, do not receive legal review (unless requested by the Warden), and are signed off by the facility Warden. No particular training or resources appear to be made available to the Wardens who have to take responsibility for assuring these policy documents are consistent with case law and statute and defensibility.

Legal Review

It should be noted ARs, OMs, and POs can all create inmate liberty interests. A documented, consistent process for policy writer qualification and training would be prudent.

Communication

When any policy and procedure documents are created or revised, there is no consistent mechanism to ensure all staff have access and have reviewed the document. New policy and procedure documents are placed in the policy manuals which require them, and if the document should be read by security staff, it

is made available at the staff briefing on the television monitors at NSP. Policy and procedures changes may or may not be discussed in the staff briefing prior to shift. If it is discussed in the staff briefing, many staff working overtime does not attend. It is not uncommon for security staff to lack awareness of new or updated policy documents.

Most security line staff does not have email access which could be used to distribute these documents and confirm receipt. At NSP, staff must sign off they know post orders.

Analysis

Training, policies, and procedures reflect the NDCS culture. In some organizations, there is emphasis on policy deemphasizes training, and vice versa. NDCS must balance the emphasis of policy and procedures and developing and empowering staff. The culture is the result of how you train staff to behave and the supervision to support this. When issues are examined within NDCS, consideration should be given the training, empowerment and guidance by policy, or are employees navigating alone.

After reviewing the volume of policy and procedure documents and training materials from the NDCS, here are some things which seem apparent:

Resources

Staff involved in policy and training development is knowledgeable and dedicated to NDCS. They want to do a great job. In discussions, staff shared there were many things they wished they could do, yet do not have resources available. This does not suggest the state provide unlimited resources to NDCS, however, the department needs to recognize limits to what can be achieved when fiscal and human resources are not available.

It has been at least a decade since the fiscal needs of the NDCS have been satisfactorily addressed and the fact requests for resources have remained relatively static sends a message of not caring about employee needs.

Administration and management identified resources to optimize their work as:

- New computers to replace older computers with limited capabilities/memory
- Laptop computers to allow unit management staff and other designated staff to work from multiple areas within the facility
- Computer pads/tablets to allow designated staff to work from multiple areas within the facility
- Upgrade to Telestaff (from 2.92 version to Workforce Central 5.0)
- Designated IT support and electronic staff assigned to each facility
- Electronic tracking system for inmate (using ID cards to swipe in/out)
- Electronic classification system
- Electronic medical files
- Cell check system to record 15/30 minute checks
- E-mail access for all staff
- Electronic log books
- Automated check-in for food service

These resources would improve efficiency, safety, and security for staff and inmates.

NDCS also needs to hire qualified applicants and determine any change in position for physical fitness for hire standard. Whether a standard is reinstated, redeveloped or no change, NDCS may continue to be challenged in meeting hiring demands of the institutions.

In 2015, 10% percent of NDCS new hires could not pass their initial training.

Volume of Documents

The volume of documents employees are expected to know is large and repetitive in places. Administration could benefit from defining criteria for what warrants an AR, OM, or PO.

The six week Pre-Service Training compresses a large volume of information into a short time. Students pass the tests and complete the FTO program. It is unclear the level of comprehension they have regarding policies and procedures. Employees are not provided work time to read policy and procedure documents. However, they may have confidence to do their job resulting from the OJT from the FTO.

NDCS is encouraged to evaluate the volume of documents employees and determine the expectations of fluency. A consistent delivery method is needed, as well as expectations of knowledge accountability.

Staff should be able to review every policy and procedure and explain how the information aligns with the mission of the NDCS. If alignment is not achieved, NDCS should evaluate if the policy or procedure is needed.

Completing task analysis on the protective services staff, leveraging NIC to do so, would identify actual work performed. This analysis would be the basis for a review of all training to determine which tasks are completed most frequently and which are most critical to safety and security; it would allow training staff to identify the knowledge, skills and abilities it takes to complete those tasks; and it would also be a basis for a review of the policy and procedure documents already in effect at NDCS.

Staff Challenges

STA staff should be regularly exposed to the changing case law and statute. If given availability to publications and case law subscriptions, they can stay abreast of the changing world of corrections. They should be exposed to advances in technology will improve efficiency and safety and security within the institutions.

Survey Data

Survey 1

| Ask interviewed | Frequency | Percent |
|-----------------|------------|-----------------|
| Selected | 128 | 71.11 % |
| Volunteered | 37 | 20.56 % |
| Both | 15 | 8.33 % |
| TOTAL | 180 | 100.00 % |

| Job title | Frequency | Percent |
|------------------------------|------------|-----------------|
| Corrections Officer | 30 | 16.67 % |
| Corrections Corporal | 65 | 36.11 % |
| Corrections Sergeant | 24 | 13.33 % |
| Corrections Unit Case Worker | 52 | 28.89 % |
| Missing | 9 | 5.00 % |
| TOTAL | 180 | 100.00 % |

| Years | | | | | |
|-------|-----|--------|--------|--------|---------|
| | Obs | Mean | Min | Median | Max |
| Years | 159 | 8.4654 | 0.0000 | 6.0000 | 37.0000 |

| Age | | | | | |
|-----|-----|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| | Obs | Mean | Min | Median | Max |
| Age | 174 | 39.1782 | 19.0000 | 37.0000 | 64.0000 |

| Gender | Frequency | Percent |
|--------------|------------|-----------------|
| Male | 121 | 67.22 % |
| Female | 51 | 28.33 % |
| Missing | 8 | 4.44 % |
| TOTAL | 180 | 100.00 % |

| Shift | Frequency | Percent |
|-------------------------------|------------|-----------------|
| 1 st Shift | 105 | 58.33 % |
| 2 nd Shift | 37 | 20.56 % |
| 3 rd Shift | 20 | 11.11 % |
| 4 th Shift Custody | 1 | 0.56 % |
| Missing | 17 | 9.44 % |
| TOTAL | 180 | 100.00 % |

| Gender | Frequency | Percent |
|---------|-----------|---------|
| Male | 135 | 70.68 % |
| Female | 56 | 29.32 % |
| Missing | 8 | 4.02% |

Role Clarity

1. On a scale from one to five, how would you rate your understanding of the responsibilities of your position?

| | | | | |
|--------------------|------------------|----------------------|-----------|------------------|
| 1 Highly Uncertain | 2 Some Uncertain | 3 Neutral/No Opinion | 4 Certain | 5 Highly Certain |
|--------------------|------------------|----------------------|-----------|------------------|

| Q1 | Frequency | Percent |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|
| Neutral/No Opinion | 7 | 3.52 % |
| Highly Uncertain | 0 | 0.00 % |
| Some Uncertain | 13 | 6.53 % |
| Certain | 71 | 35.68 % |
| Highly Certain | 102 | 51.26 % |
| Missing | 6 | 3.02 % |
| TOTAL | 199 | 100.00% |

2. On a scale from one to five, how would you rate the difference between your job description and what is actually the demands of your job?

| | | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| 1 No Difference | 2 Not Much Difference | 3 Some Difference | 4 A lot of Difference | 5 Completely Different |
|-----------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|

| Q2 | Frequency | Percent |
|----------------------|------------|----------------|
| No Difference | 32 | 16.08 % |
| Not Much Difference | 38 | 19.10 % |
| Some Difference | 77 | 38.69 % |
| A lot of Difference | 37 | 18.59 % |
| Completely Different | 7 | 3.89 % |
| Missing | 8 | 4.02 % |
| TOTAL | 199 | 100.00% |

Leadership

3. On a scale from one to five, how would you rate your satisfaction with the leadership at your facility?

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------|--------------------|
| 1 Highly Dissatisfied | 2 Dissatisfied | 3 Neutral/No Opinion | 4 Satisfied | 5 Highly Satisfied |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------|--------------------|

| Q3 | Frequency | Percent |
|---------------------|------------|-----------------|
| Highly Dissatisfied | 21 | 10.55 % |
| Dissatisfied | 56 | 28.14 % |
| Neutral/No Opinion | 46 | 23.12 % |
| Satisfied | 49 | 24.62 % |
| Highly Satisfied | 17 | 8.54 % |
| Missing | 10 | 5.03% |
| TOTAL | 199 | 100.00 % |

Management/Management Conflict

4. On a scale from one to five, how would you rate your satisfaction with the management that you receive from your immediate supervisor?

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------|--------------------|
| 1 Highly Dissatisfied | 2 Dissatisfied | 3 Neutral/No Opinion | 4 Satisfied | 5 Highly Satisfied |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------|--------------------|

| Q4 | Frequency | Percent |
|---------------------|------------|-----------------|
| Highly Dissatisfied | 7 | 3.52 % |
| Dissatisfied | 17 | 8.54 % |
| Neutral/No Opinion | 25 | 12.56 % |
| Satisfied | 86 | 43.22 % |
| Highly Satisfied | 54 | 27.14 % |
| Missing | 10 | 5.03 % |
| TOTAL | 199 | 100.00 % |

5. On a scale from one to five, how would you rate the frequency of conflict you have with your immediate supervisor?

| | | | | |
|---------|----------|----------------|---------|--------------|
| 1 Never | 2 Rarely | 3 Occasionally | 4 Often | 5 Very Often |
|---------|----------|----------------|---------|--------------|

| Q5 | Frequency | Percent |
|--------------|------------|-----------------|
| Never | 76 | 38.19 % |
| Rarely | 81 | 40.70 % |
| Occasionally | 27 | 13.57 % |
| Often | 7 | 3.52 % |
| Very Often | 1 | 0.50 % |
| Missing | 7 | 3.52 % |
| TOTAL | 199 | 100.00 % |

Performance Evaluation

6. On a scale from one to five, how satisfied do you feel about the way your job performance is evaluated?

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------|--------------------|
| 1 Highly Dissatisfied | 2 Dissatisfied | 3 Neutral/No Opinion | 4 Satisfied | 5 Highly Satisfied |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------|--------------------|

| Q6 | Frequency | Percent |
|---------------------|------------|-----------------|
| Highly Dissatisfied | 16 | 8.04 % |
| Dissatisfied | 41 | 20.60 % |
| Neutral/No Opinion | 61 | 30.65 % |
| Satisfied | 50 | 25.13 % |
| Highly Satisfied | 18 | 9.05 % |
| Missing | 13 | 6.53 % |
| TOTAL | 199 | 100.00 % |

7. On a scale from one to five, how consistently do you feel that employee job performance is evaluated at your facility?

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|------------------|----------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| 1 Very Inconsistently | 2 Inconsistently | 3 Neutral/No Opinion | 4 Consistently | 5 Very Consistently |
|-----------------------|------------------|----------------------|----------------|---------------------|

| Q7 | Frequency | Percent |
|---------------------|------------|----------------|
| Very Inconsistently | 18 | 9.05 % |
| Inconsistently | 59 | 29.65 % |
| Neutral/No Opinion | 57 | 28.64 % |
| Consistently | 37 | 18.59 % |
| Very Consistently | 18 | 9.05 % |
| Missing | 10 | 5.03 % |
| TOTAL | 199 | 100.00% |

Pay and Benefits

8. On a scale from one to five, how would you rate your satisfaction with pay?

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------|--------------------|
| 1 Highly Dissatisfied | 2 Dissatisfied | 3 Neutral/No Opinion | 4 Satisfied | 5 Highly Satisfied |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------|--------------------|

| Q8 | Frequency | Percent |
|---------------------|------------|-----------------|
| Highly Dissatisfied | 41 | 20.60 % |
| Dissatisfied | 97 | 48.74 % |
| Neutral/No Opinion | 25 | 12.56 % |
| Satisfied | 27 | 13.57 % |
| Highly Satisfied | 0 | 0.00 % |
| Missing | 9 | 4.52 % |
| TOTAL | 199 | 100.00 % |

9. On a scale from one to five, how would you rate your satisfaction with benefits?

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------|--------------------|
| 1 Highly Dissatisfied | 2 Dissatisfied | 3 Neutral/No Opinion | 4 Satisfied | 5 Highly Satisfied |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------|--------------------|

| Q9 | Frequency | Percent |
|---------------------|------------|-----------------|
| Highly Dissatisfied | 14 | 7.04 % |
| Dissatisfied | 36 | 18.09 % |
| Neutral/No Opinion | 50 | 25.13 % |
| Satisfied | 73 | 36.68 % |
| Highly Satisfied | 18 | 9.05 % |
| Missing | 8 | 4.02 % |
| TOTAL | 199 | 100.00 % |

Overtime

10. On a scale from one to five, how would you rate your satisfaction with the amount of mandatory overtime you perform?

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------------------------------|-------------|--------------------|
| 1 Highly Dissatisfied | 2 Dissatisfied | 3 Neutral/No Opinion/No Overtime | 4 Satisfied | 5 Highly Satisfied |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------------------------------|-------------|--------------------|

| Q10 | Frequency | Percent |
|--------------------------------|------------|----------------|
| Highly Dissatisfied | 38 | 19.10 % |
| Dissatisfied | 34 | 17.09 % |
| Neutral/No Opinion/No Overtime | 81 | 40.70 % |
| Satisfied | 33 | 16.58 % |
| Highly Satisfied | 5 | 2.51 % |
| Missing | 8 | 4.02 % |
| TOTAL | 199 | 100.00% |

11. On a scale from one to five, how would you rate your satisfaction with the amount of voluntary overtime you perform?

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------------------------------|-------------|--------------------|
| 1 Highly Dissatisfied | 2 Dissatisfied | 3 Neutral/No Opinion/No Overtime | 4 Satisfied | 5 Highly Satisfied |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------------------------------|-------------|--------------------|

| Q11 | Frequency | Percent |
|--------------------------------|------------|----------------|
| Highly Dissatisfied | 9 | 4.52 % |
| Dissatisfied | 12 | 6.03 % |
| Neutral/No Opinion/No Overtime | 42 | 21.11 % |
| Satisfied | 88 | 44.22 % |
| Highly Satisfied | 38 | 19.10 % |
| Missing | 10 | 5.03 % |
| TOTAL | 199 | 100.00% |

Shifts

12. On a scale from one to five, how would you rate your satisfaction with the shift you work?

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------|--------------------|
| 1 Highly Dissatisfied | 2 Dissatisfied | 3 Neutral/No Opinion | 4 Satisfied | 5 Highly Satisfied |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------|--------------------|

| Q12 | Frequency | Percent |
|---------------------|------------|-----------------|
| Highly Dissatisfied | 10 | 5.03 % |
| Dissatisfied | 13 | 6.53 % |
| Neutral/No Opinion | 17 | 8.89 % |
| Satisfied | 82 | 41.21 % |
| Highly Satisfied | 68 | 34.17 % |
| Missing | 9 | 4.52 % |
| TOTAL | 199 | 100.00 % |

13. Data omitted due to collective bargaining negotiations

Resources/Equipment/System Access

14. On a scale from one to five, how would you rate your satisfaction with the resources, equipment, and systems that are provided to you to do your job?

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------|--------------------|
| 1 Highly Dissatisfied | 2 Dissatisfied | 3 Neutral/No Opinion | 4 Satisfied | 5 Highly Satisfied |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------|--------------------|

| Q14 | Frequency | Percent |
|---------------------|------------|-----------------|
| Highly Dissatisfied | 14 | 7.04 % |
| Dissatisfied | 56 | 28.14 % |
| Neutral/No Opinion | 40 | 20.10 % |
| Satisfied | 68 | 34.17 % |
| Highly Satisfied | 13 | 6.53 % |
| Missing | 8 | 4.02 % |
| TOTAL | 199 | 100.00 % |

Location/Transportation

15. Does transportation to and from your facility present any concerns, challenges, or stress for you? Please mark

| | |
|-------|------|
| 1 Yes | 2 No |
|-------|------|

| Q15 | Frequency | Percent |
|--------------|------------|-----------------|
| Yes | 28 | 14.07 % |
| No | 158 | 79.40 % |
| Missing | 13 | 6.53 % |
| TOTAL | 199 | 100.00 % |

Processes/Procedures

16. On a scale from one to five, how would you rate your understanding of the processes that are required for your position, such as searches or application of restraints?

| | | | | |
|----------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|--------------|------------------------|
| 1 Weak Understanding | 2 Some Lack of Understanding | 3 Neutral/No Opinion | 4 Understand | 5 Strong Understanding |
|----------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|--------------|------------------------|

| Q16 | Frequency | Percent |
|----------------------------|------------|----------------|
| Neutral/No Opinion | 5 | 2.51 % |
| Weak Understanding | 0 | 0.00% |
| Some Lack of Understanding | 4 | 2.01 % |
| Understand | 64 | 32.16 % |
| Strong Understanding | 118 | 59.30 % |
| Missing | 8 | 4.02 % |
| TOTAL | 199 | 100.00% |

17. On a scale from one to five, how would you rate your confidence to perform the processes required for your position?

| | | | | |
|------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|-------------|------------------|
| 1 Not Confident At All | 2 Some Lack of Confidence | 3 Neutral/No Opinion | 4 Confident | 5 Very Confident |
|------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|-------------|------------------|

| Q17 | Frequency | Percent |
|-------------------------|------------|--------------|
| Not Confident at All | 1 | 0.50 % |
| Some Lack of Confidence | 4 | 2.01 % |
| Neutral/No Opinion | 7 | 3.52 % |
| Confident | 69 | 34.67 % |
| Very Confident | 111 | 55.78 % |
| Missing | 7 | 3.52 % |
| TOTAL | 199 | 100.0 |

18. On a scale from one to five, how would you rate your understanding of the procedures that are required for your position, such as Use of Force or Inmate Discipline?

| | | | | |
|----------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|--------------|------------------------|
| 1 Weak Understanding | 2 Some Lack of Understanding | 3 Neutral/No Opinion | 4 Understand | 5 Strong Understanding |
|----------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|--------------|------------------------|

| Q18 | Frequency | Percent |
|----------------------------|------------|-----------------|
| Weak Understanding | 2 | 1.01 % |
| Some Lack of Understanding | 8 | 4.02 % |
| Neutral/No Opinion | 20 | 10.05 % |
| Understand | 82 | 41.21 % |
| Strong Understanding | 77 | 38.69 % |
| Missing | 10 | 5.03 % |
| TOTAL | 199 | 100.00 % |

19. On a scale from one to five, how would you rate your confidence to perform the procedures required for your position?

| | | | | |
|------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|-------------|------------------|
| 1 Not Confident At All | 2 Some Lack of Confidence | 3 Neutral/No Opinion | 4 Confident | 5 Very Confident |
|------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|-------------|------------------|

| Q19 | Frequency | Percent |
|-------------------------|------------|-----------------|
| Not Confident At All | 0 | 0.00% |
| Some Lack of Confidence | 12 | 6.03 % |
| Neutral/No Opinion | 7 | 3.52 % |
| Confident | 90 | 45.23 % |
| Very Confident | 82 | 41.21 % |
| Missing | 8 | 4.02 % |
| TOTAL | 199 | 100.00 % |

20. On a scale from one to five, how would you rate your satisfaction with the way you receive notification and training about new processes and procedures?

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------|--------------------|
| 1 Highly Dissatisfied | 2 Dissatisfied | 3 Neutral/No Opinion | 4 Satisfied | 5 Highly Satisfied |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------|--------------------|

| Q20 | Frequency | Percent |
|---------------------|------------|----------------|
| Highly Dissatisfied | 15 | 7.54 % |
| Dissatisfied | 48 | 24.12 % |
| Neutral/No Opinion | 53 | 26.63 % |
| Satisfied | 60 | 30.15 % |
| Highly Satisfied | 15 | 7.54 % |
| Missing | 8 | 3.89 % |
| TOTAL | 199 | 100.00% |

Confidential Services

21. Are you familiar with the confidential support services available to NDCS employees, such as the Employee Assistance Program?

| | | |
|-------|------|------------------|
| 1 Yes | 2 No | 3 Maybe/Not sure |
|-------|------|------------------|

| Q21 | Frequency | Percent |
|-----------------|------------|----------------|
| Yes | 172 | 86.43 % |
| No | 6 | 3.02 % |
| Maybe/ Not sure | 14 | 7.04 % |
| Missing | 7 | 3.52 % |
| TOTAL | 199 | 100.00% |

22. Have you ever utilized these services? Responses omitted due to employee personal information.

23. Are there any personal support services you would like to see offered to you that are not currently offered today? Responses omitted due to employee personal information.

Work/Family Conflict

24. On a scale from one to five, how would you rate your work/life balance?

| | | | | |
|--------------|----------------|----------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| 1 No Balance | 2 Poor Balance | 3 Neutral/No Opinion | 4 Good Balance | 5 Great Balance |
|--------------|----------------|----------------------|----------------|-----------------|

| Q24 | Frequency | Percent |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|
| No Balance | 9 | 4.52 % |
| Poor Balance | 37 | 18.59 % |
| Neutral/No Opinion | 38 | 19.10 % |
| Good Balance | 90 | 45.23 % |
| Great Balance | 14 | 7.04 % |
| Missing | 11 | 5.53 % |
| TOTAL | 199 | 100.00% |

25. On a scale from one to five, how would you rate the level of personal emotional support you receive from your family and/or friends?

| | | | | |
|--------------|----------------|----------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| 1 No Support | 2 Poor Support | 3 Neutral/No Opinion | 4 Good Support | 5 Great Support |
|--------------|----------------|----------------------|----------------|-----------------|

| Q25 | Frequency | Percent |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|
| No Support | 4 | 2.01 % |
| Poor Support | 6 | 3.02 % |
| Neutral/No Opinion | 18 | 9.05 % |
| Good Support | 62 | 31.16 % |
| Great Support | 101 | 50.75 % |
| Missing | 8 | 4.02 % |
| TOTAL | 199 | 100.00% |

Media Impact

26. Have media reports about the Department of Corrections affected the way you feel about your job?

| | | |
|-------|------|----------------------|
| 1 Yes | 2 No | 3 Neutral/No Opinion |
|-------|------|----------------------|

| Q26 | Frequency | Percent |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|
| Yes | 58 | 29.15 % |
| No | 112 | 56.28 % |
| Neutral/No Opinion | 22 | 11.06 % |
| Missing | 7 | 3.52 % |
| TOTAL | 199 | 100.00% |

Perceptions of Profession

27. On a scale from one to five, how do you feel that front-line correctional staff, such as yourself, are portrayed by the media?

| | | | | |
|--------------------|---------------|----------------------|-------------|------------------|
| 1 Very Unfavorably | 2 Unfavorably | 3 Neutral/No Opinion | 4 Favorably | 5 Very Favorably |
|--------------------|---------------|----------------------|-------------|------------------|

| Q27 | Frequency | Percent |
|--------------------|------------|-----------------|
| Very Unfavorably | 26 | 13.07 % |
| Unfavorably | 95 | 47.74 % |
| Neutral/No Opinion | 54 | 27.14 % |
| Favorably | 12 | 6.03 % |
| Very Favorably | 2 | 1.01 % |
| Missing | 10 | 5.03 % |
| TOTAL | 199 | 100.00 % |

28. On a scale from one to five, how do you feel that front-line correctional staff, such as yourself, are perceived by the public?

| | | | | |
|--------------------|---------------|----------------------|-------------|------------------|
| 1 Very Unfavorably | 2 Unfavorably | 3 Neutral/No Opinion | 4 Favorably | 5 Very Favorably |
|--------------------|---------------|----------------------|-------------|------------------|

| Q28 | Frequency | Percent |
|--------------------|------------|-----------------|
| Very Unfavorably | 6 | 3.02 % |
| Unfavorably | 68 | 34.17 % |
| Neutral/No Opinion | 72 | 36.18 % |
| Favorably | 39 | 19.60 % |
| Very Favorably | 6 | 3.02 % |
| Missing | 8 | 4.02 % |
| TOTAL | 199 | 100.00 % |

Retention

29. What is the most important factor that keeps you working at the Department of Corrections? *No statistical data/qualitative question.*

30. What is the most important factor that would cause you to leave the Department of Corrections? *No statistical data/qualitative question.*

Corrections Philosophy

31. Would you describe the philosophy of the Department of Corrections as one of rehabilitation of inmates, punishment of inmates, or a blend of both? Why?

| | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| 1 Rehabilitation of Inmates | 2 Punishment of Inmates | 3 A Blend of Both |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|

| Q31 | Frequency | Percent |
|---------------------------|------------|-----------------|
| Rehabilitation of Inmates | 61 | 30.65 % |
| Punishment of Inmates | 9 | 4.52 % |
| A Blend of Both | 89 | 44.72 % |
| Missing | 40 | 20.10 % |
| TOTAL | 199 | 100.00 % |

Improvement Ideas

32. Do you have any suggestion for improvement or changes that you would like to see implemented either at your facility or for NDCS as a whole? *No statistical data/qualitative question.*

Close Out

33. Is there anything you'd like to share that I haven't asked you already? *No statistical data/qualitative question.*

Survey 2 Data

How were you asked to be interviewed?

| Ask interviewed | Frequency | Percent |
|-----------------|------------|-----------------|
| Selected | 95 | 66.90 % |
| Volunteered | 38 | 26.76 % |
| Both | 9 | 6.34 % |
| TOTAL | 142 | 100.00 % |

| Years | | | | | |
|-------|-----|---------|--------|--------|---------|
| | Obs | Mean | Min | Median | Max |
| Years | 134 | 11.7313 | 0.0000 | 9.0000 | 41.0000 |

| Age | | | | | |
|-----|-----|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| | Obs | Mean | Min | Median | Max |
| Age | 136 | 45.4779 | 23.0000 | 46.0000 | 67.0000 |

| Gender | Frequency | Percent |
|--------------|------------|-----------------|
| Male | 69 | 48.59 % |
| Female | 69 | 48.59 % |
| Missing | 4 | 2.82 % |
| TOTAL | 142 | 100.00 % |

What shift do you currently work?

| shift | Frequency | Percent |
|-----------------------|------------|-----------------|
| 1 st Shift | 16 | 11.27 % |
| 2 nd Shift | 5 | 3.52 % |
| Day Shift | 112 | 78.87 % |
| Other | 7 | 4.93 % |
| Missing | 2 | 1.41 % |
| TOTAL | 142 | 100.00 % |

Role Clarity

1. On a scale from one to five, how would you rate your understanding of the responsibilities of your position?

| | | | | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|--------------|------------------------|
| 1 Little Understanding | 2 Some Lack of Understanding | 3 Neutral/No Opinion | 4 Understand | 5 Strong Understanding |
|------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|--------------|------------------------|

| Q1 | Frequency | Percent |
|----------------------------|------------|-----------------|
| Little Understanding | 3 | 2.11 % |
| Some Lack of Understanding | 4 | 2.82 % |
| Neutral/No Opinion | 5 | 3.52 % |
| Understand | 36 | 25.35 % |
| Strong Understanding | 93 | 65.49 % |
| Missing | 1 | 0.70 % |
| TOTAL | 142 | 100.00 % |

2. On a scale from one to five, how would you rate the difference between your job description and what are actually the demands of your job?

| | | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| 1 No Difference | 2 Not Much Difference | 3 Some Difference | 4 A lot of Difference | 5 Completely Different |
|-----------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|

| Q2 | Frequency | Percent |
|----------------------|------------|-----------------|
| No Difference | 18 | 12.68 % |
| Not Much Difference | 22 | 15.49 % |
| Some Difference | 63 | 44.37 % |
| A lot of Difference | 29 | 20.42 % |
| Completely Different | 7 | 4.93 % |
| Missing | 3 | 2.11 % |
| TOTAL | 142 | 100.00 % |

Leadership

3. On a scale from one to five, how would you rate your satisfaction with the leadership at your facility?

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------|--------------------|
| 1 Highly Dissatisfied | 2 Dissatisfied | 3 Neutral/No Opinion | 4 Satisfied | 5 Highly Satisfied |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------|--------------------|

| Q3 | Frequency | Percent |
|---------------------|------------|-----------------|
| Highly Dissatisfied | 12 | 8.45 % |
| Dissatisfied | 29 | 20.42 % |
| Neutral/No Opinion | 29 | 20.42 % |
| Satisfied | 49 | 34.51 % |
| Highly Satisfied | 20 | 14.08 % |
| Missing | 3 | 2.11 % |
| TOTAL | 142 | 100.00 % |

Management/Management Conflict

4. On a scale from one to five, how would you rate your satisfaction with the management that you receive from your immediate supervisor?

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------|--------------------|
| 1 Highly Dissatisfied | 2 Dissatisfied | 3 Neutral/No Opinion | 4 Satisfied | 5 Highly Satisfied |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------|--------------------|

| Q4 | Frequency | Percent |
|---------------------|------------|-----------------|
| Highly Dissatisfied | 8 | 5.63 % |
| Dissatisfied | 16 | 11.27 % |
| Neutral/No Opinion | 18 | 12.68 % |
| Satisfied | 53 | 37.32 % |
| Highly Satisfied | 44 | 30.99 % |
| Missing | 3 | 2.11 % |
| TOTAL | 142 | 100.00 % |

5. On a scale from one to five, how would you rate the frequency of conflict you have with your immediate supervisor?

| | | | | |
|---------|----------|----------------|---------|--------------|
| 1 Never | 2 Rarely | 3 Occasionally | 4 Often | 5 Very Often |
|---------|----------|----------------|---------|--------------|

| Q5 | Frequency | Percent |
|--------------|------------|-----------------|
| Never | 40 | 28.17 % |
| Rarely | 66 | 46.48 % |
| Occasionally | 24 | 16.90 % |
| Often | 5 | 3.52 % |
| Very Often | 4 | 2.82 % |
| Missing | 3 | 2.11 % |
| TOTAL | 142 | 100.00 % |

Performance Evaluation

6. On a scale from one to five, how satisfied do you feel about the way your job performance is evaluated?

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------|--------------------|
| 1 Highly Dissatisfied | 2 Dissatisfied | 3 Neutral/No Opinion | 4 Satisfied | 5 Highly Satisfied |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------|--------------------|

| Q6 | Frequency | Percent |
|---------------------|------------|-----------------|
| Highly Dissatisfied | 18 | 12.68 % |
| Dissatisfied | 26 | 18.31 % |
| Neutral/No Opinion | 35 | 24.65 % |
| Satisfied | 37 | 26.06 % |
| Highly Satisfied | 21 | 14.79 % |
| Missing | 5 | 3.52 % |
| TOTAL | 142 | 100.00 % |

7. On a scale from one to five, how consistently do you feel that employee job performance is evaluated at your facility?

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|------------------|----------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| 1 Very Inconsistently | 2 Inconsistently | 3 Neutral/No Opinion | 4 Consistently | 5 Very Consistently |
|-----------------------|------------------|----------------------|----------------|---------------------|

| Q7 | Frequency | Percent |
|---------------------|------------|-----------------|
| Very Inconsistently | 14 | 9.86 % |
| Inconsistently | 34 | 23.94 % |
| Neutral/No Opinion | 32 | 22.54 % |
| Consistently | 44 | 30.99 % |
| Very Consistently | 15 | 10.56 % |
| Missing | 3 | 2.11 % |
| TOTAL | 142 | 100.00 % |

Pay and Benefits

8. On a scale from one to five, how would you rate your satisfaction with pay?

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------|--------------------|
| 1 Highly Dissatisfied | 2 Dissatisfied | 3 Neutral/No Opinion | 4 Satisfied | 5 Highly Satisfied |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------|--------------------|

| Q8 | Frequency | Percent |
|---------------------|------------|-----------------|
| Highly Dissatisfied | 37 | 26.06 % |
| Dissatisfied | 53 | 37.32 % |
| Neutral/No Opinion | 19 | 13.38 % |
| Satisfied | 24 | 16.90 % |
| Highly Satisfied | 4 | 2.82 % |
| Missing | 5 | 3.52 % |
| TOTAL | 142 | 100.00 % |

9. On a scale from one to five, how would you rate your satisfaction with benefits?

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------|--------------------|
| 1 Highly Dissatisfied | 2 Dissatisfied | 3 Neutral/No Opinion | 4 Satisfied | 5 Highly Satisfied |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------|--------------------|

| Q9 | Frequency | Percent |
|---------------------|------------|-----------------|
| Highly Dissatisfied | 10 | 7.04 % |
| Dissatisfied | 28 | 19.72 % |
| Neutral/No Opinion | 22 | 15.49 % |
| Satisfied | 56 | 39.44 % |
| Highly Satisfied | 23 | 16.20 % |
| Missing | 3 | 2.11 % |
| TOTAL | 142 | 100.00 % |

Stressors

10. On a scale from one to five, describe the frequency of stress the following factors cause you?

| | | | | |
|------------------------|----------------|-------------|---------|--------------|
| 1 Never/Not Applicable | 2 Almost Never | 3 Sometimes | 4 Often | 5 Very Often |
|------------------------|----------------|-------------|---------|--------------|

Work-life balance

| Work-life balance | Frequency | Percent |
|----------------------|------------|-----------------|
| Never/Not Applicable | 13 | 9.15 % |
| Almost Never | 33 | 23.24 % |
| Sometimes | 50 | 35.21 % |
| Often | 34 | 23.94 % |
| Very Often | 11 | 7.75 % |
| Missing | 1 | 0.70 % |
| TOTAL | 142 | 100.00 % |

Mandatory Overtime

| Mandatory Overtime | Frequency | Percent |
|----------------------|------------|-----------------|
| Never/Not Applicable | 105 | 73.94 % |
| Almost Never | 12 | 8.45 % |
| Sometimes | 9 | 6.34 % |
| Often | 9 | 6.34 % |
| Very Often | 4 | 2.82 % |
| Missing | 3 | 2.11 % |
| TOTAL | 142 | 100.00 % |

Voluntary Overtime

| Voluntary Overtime | Frequency | Percent |
|----------------------|------------|-----------------|
| Never/Not Applicable | 91 | 64.08 % |
| Almost Never | 22 | 15.49 % |
| Sometimes | 17 | 11.97 % |
| Often | 7 | 4.93 % |
| Very Often | 2 | 1.41 % |
| Missing | 3 | 2.11 % |
| TOTAL | 142 | 100.00 % |

Shift

| Shift | Frequency | Percent |
|----------------------|------------|-----------------|
| Never/Not Applicable | 78 | 54.93 % |
| Almost Never | 22 | 15.49 % |
| Sometimes | 30 | 21.13 % |
| Often | 11 | 7.75 % |
| Very Often | 0 | 0.00 % |
| Missing | 1 | 0.70 % |
| TOTAL | 142 | 100.00 % |

On a scale from one to five, how often do you feel stress from the following factors?

| | | | | |
|---------|----------|-------------|---------|--------------|
| 1 Never | 2 Rarely | 3 Sometimes | 4 Often | 5 Very Often |
|---------|----------|-------------|---------|--------------|

Lack of experience in your job

| Lack of experience in your job | Frequency | Percent |
|--------------------------------|------------|-----------------|
| Never | 60 | 42.25 % |
| Rarely | 44 | 30.99 % |
| Sometimes | 31 | 21.83 % |
| Often | 5 | 3.52 % |
| Very Often | 0 | 0.00 % |
| Missing | 2 | 1.41 % |
| TOTAL | 142 | 100.00 % |

Lack of coworkers' job experience

| Lack of coworkers job experience | Frequency | Percent |
|----------------------------------|------------|-----------------|
| Never | 26 | 18.31 % |
| Rarely | 26 | 18.31 % |
| Sometimes | 47 | 33.10 % |
| Often | 26 | 18.31 % |
| Very Often | 14 | 9.86 % |
| Missing | 3 | 2.11 % |
| TOTAL | 142 | 100.00 % |

Work relationships

| Work relationships | Frequency | Percent |
|--------------------|------------|-----------------|
| Never | 32 | 22.54 % |
| Rarely | 43 | 30.28 % |
| Sometimes | 47 | 33.10 % |
| Often | 14 | 9.86 % |
| Very Often | 4 | 2.82 % |
| Missing | 2 | 1.41 % |
| TOTAL | 142 | 100.00 % |

Caseload/Workload volume

| Caseload volume | Frequency | Percent |
|-----------------|------------|-----------------|
| Never | 13 | 9.15 % |
| Rarely | 19 | 13.38 % |
| Sometimes | 47 | 33.10 % |
| Often | 35 | 24.65 % |
| Very Often | 25 | 17.61 % |
| Missing | 3 | 2.11 % |
| TOTAL | 142 | 100.00 % |

Volume of policies and/or procedures

| Volume of policies and or procedures | Frequency | Percent |
|--------------------------------------|------------|-----------------|
| Never | 10 | 7.04 % |
| Rarely | 46 | 32.39 % |
| Sometimes | 49 | 34.51 % |
| Often | 28 | 19.72 % |
| Very Often | 8 | 5.63 % |
| Missing | 1 | 0.70 % |
| TOTAL | 142 | 100.00 % |

Inmate interactions

| Inmate interactions | Frequency | Percent |
|---------------------|------------|-----------------|
| Never | 23 | 16.20 % |
| Rarely | 47 | 33.10 % |
| Sometimes | 49 | 34.51 % |
| Often | 17 | 11.97 % |
| Very Often | 5 | 3.52 % |
| Missing | 1 | 0.70 % |
| TOTAL | 142 | 100.00 % |

Satisfaction Measures

11. Please rate your degree of satisfaction with the following features of your work environment.

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------|--------------------|
| 1 Highly Dissatisfied | 2 Dissatisfied | 3 Neutral/No Opinion | 4 Satisfied | 5 Highly Satisfied |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------|--------------------|

Training

| Training | Frequency | Percent |
|---------------------|------------|-----------------|
| Highly Dissatisfied | 2 | 1.41 % |
| Dissatisfied | 25 | 17.61 % |
| Neutral/No Opinion | 32 | 22.54 % |
| Satisfied | 68 | 47.89 % |
| Highly Satisfied | 13 | 9.15 % |
| Missing | 2 | 1.41 % |
| TOTAL | 142 | 100.00 % |

Career path options

| Career path options | Frequency | Percent |
|---------------------|------------|-----------------|
| Highly Dissatisfied | 12 | 8.45 % |
| Dissatisfied | 23 | 16.20 % |
| Neutral/No Opinion | 42 | 29.58 % |
| Satisfied | 54 | 38.03 % |
| Highly Satisfied | 10 | 7.04 % |
| Missing | 1 | 0.70 % |
| TOTAL | 142 | 100.00 % |

Communication from Facility Management

| Communication from Facility Management | Frequency | Percent |
|----------------------------------------|------------|-----------------|
| Highly Dissatisfied | 16 | 11.27 % |
| Dissatisfied | 40 | 28.17 % |
| Neutral/No Opinion | 27 | 19.01 % |
| Satisfied | 45 | 31.69 % |
| Highly Satisfied | 11 | 7.75 % |
| Missing | 3 | 2.11 % |
| TOTAL | 142 | 100.00 % |

Personal wellness

| Personal wellness | Frequency | Percent |
|---------------------|------------|-----------------|
| Highly Dissatisfied | 3 | 2.11 % |
| Dissatisfied | 18 | 12.68 % |
| Neutral/No Opinion | 36 | 25.35 % |
| Satisfied | 67 | 47.18 % |
| Highly Satisfied | 14 | 9.86 % |
| Missing | 4 | 2.82 % |
| TOTAL | 142 | 100.00 % |

Notification and training of new processes and procedures

| Notification and training of new processes and procedures | Frequency | Percent |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|------------|-----------------|
| Highly Dissatisfied | 10 | 7.04 % |
| Dissatisfied | 35 | 24.65 % |
| Neutral/No Opinion | 41 | 28.87 % |
| Satisfied | 46 | 32.39 % |
| Highly Satisfied | 6 | 4.23 % |
| Missing | 4 | 2.82 % |
| TOTAL | 142 | 100.00 % |

Confidential Services

12. Are you familiar with the confidential support services available to DOC employees, such as the Employee Assistance Program?

| | | |
|-------|------|------------------|
| 1 Yes | 2 No | 3 Maybe/Not sure |
|-------|------|------------------|

| Q12 | Frequency | Percent |
|----------------|------------|-----------------|
| Yes | 137 | 96.48 % |
| No | 3 | 2.11 % |
| Maybe/Not sure | 1 | 0.70 % |
| Missing | 1 | 0.70 % |
| TOTAL | 142 | 100.00 % |

13. Have you ever utilized these services? *Responses omitted as employee personal information.*

14. Are there any personal support services you would like to see offered to you that are not currently offered today? *Responses omitted as employee personal information.*

Media Impact

15. Have media reports about the Department of Corrections affected the way you feel about your job?

| | | |
|-------|------|----------------------|
| 1 Yes | 2 No | 3 Neutral/No Opinion |
|-------|------|----------------------|

| Q15 | Frequency | Percent |
|--------------------|------------|-----------------|
| Yes | 53 | 37.32 % |
| No | 71 | 50.00 % |
| Neutral/No Opinion | 15 | 10.56 % |
| Missing | 3 | 2.11 % |
| TOTAL | 142 | 100.00 % |

Retention

16. What is the most important factor that keeps you working at the Department of Corrections? *No statistical data/qualitative question.*

17. What is the most important factor that would cause you to leave the Department of Corrections? *No statistical data/qualitative question.*

Corrections Philosophy

18. Would you describe the philosophy of the Department of Corrections as one of rehabilitation of inmates, punishment of inmates, or a blend of both? *Why? No statistical data/qualitative question.*

Improvement Ideas

19. Do you have any suggestions for improvement or changes that you would like to see implemented either at your facility or for DOC as a whole? *No statistical data/qualitative question.*

Close Out

20. Is there anything you'd like to share that I haven't asked you already? *No statistical data/qualitative question.*

Human Resources Survey Demographics

| Years | | | | | |
|-------|-----|---------|--------|--------|---------|
| | Obs | Mean | Min | Median | Max |
| Years | 17 | 12.1176 | 1.0000 | 9.0000 | 37.0000 |

| Shift | Frequency | Percent |
|-----------------------|-----------|-----------------|
| 1 st Shift | 16 | 69.57 % |
| 2 nd Shift | 0 | 0.00 % |
| 3 rd Shift | 0 | 0.00 % |
| Missing | 7 | 30.43 % |
| TOTAL | 23 | 100.00 % |

No statistical data is available for the eleven qualitative survey questions.

Human Resources

1. What are the 3 most common issues employees come to you for? *No statistical data/qualitative question.*
2. What are the 3 most common management comes to you for? *No statistical data/qualitative question.*
3. What do you believe are the 3 biggest challenges the workforce at your facility face? *No statistical data/qualitative question.*
4. What do you believe are the 3 biggest human resource challenges at your facility? *No statistical data/qualitative question.*
5. Have you ever approached the management at your facility about a specific HR-related? What was the issue? What was the outcome? *No statistical data/qualitative question.*
6. What is your opinion about the employee performance evaluation system at your facility? *No statistical data/qualitative question.*
7. On a scale from one to five, how would you rate the effectiveness of the leadership at your correctional facility?

| | | | | |
|------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------------|------------------|
| 1 Not Effective at All | 2 Some Effectiveness | 3 Neutral/No Opinion | 4 Effective | 5 Very Effective |
|------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------------|------------------|

| Q7 | Frequency | Percent |
|----------------------|-----------|-----------------|
| Not Effective at All | 1 | 4.35 % |
| Some Effectiveness | 6 | 26.09 % |
| Neutral/No Opinion | 7 | 30.43 % |
| Effective | 4 | 17.39 % |
| Very Effective | 4 | 17.39 % |
| Missing | 1 | 4.35 % |
| TOTAL | 23 | 100.00 % |

Communication

8. How would you describe the frequency and quality of communication between management and employees at your facility? *No statistical data/qualitative question.*

Department Philosophy

9. Would you describe the philosophy of Corrections as one of rehabilitation of inmates, punishment of inmates, or a blend of both? Why? *No statistical data/qualitative question.*

Culture

10. How would you describe the work environment at your corrections facility? *No statistical data/qualitative question.*
11. How has the work environment at your corrections facility changed (if any) since you began working here, and if so, how? *No statistical data/qualitative question.*

Close Out

12. Is there anything else you'd like to share? *No statistical data/qualitative question.*

Leadership Survey Demographics

| Years | | | | | |
|-------|-----|---------|--------|---------|---------|
| | Obs | Mean | Min | Median | Max |
| Years | 103 | 19.0777 | 1.0000 | 18.0000 | 41.0000 |

| Shift | Frequency | Percent |
|-----------------------|------------|-----------------|
| 1 st Shift | 68 | 63.55 % |
| 2 nd Shift | 13 | 12.15 % |
| 3 rd Shift | 10 | 9.35 % |
| Missing | 16 | 14.95 % |
| TOTAL | 107 | 100.00 % |

No statistical data is available for the nine qualitative survey questions.

Culture

Organizational culture is a system of shared assumptions, values, and beliefs, which governs how people behave in organizations. These shared values have a strong influence on the people in the organization and dictate how they dress, act, and perform their jobs.

1. Using this definition, please describe the culture of this correctional facility. *No statistical data/qualitative question.*
2. How has the culture of your facility changed (if any) since you began here? *No statistical data/qualitative question.*

Challenges

3. What do you believe are the 3 biggest challenges at this corrections facility? *No statistical data/qualitative question.*

Communication

4. How often and by what means do you communicate with your direct reports? *No statistical data/qualitative question.*
5. How would you describe the communication with your direct supervisor? *No statistical data/qualitative question.*

Decision Making

6. Describe how decision making occurs at your facility. Is it collaborative? Is it one way? *No statistical data/qualitative question.*
7. Do you feel your feedback is valued? Please explain. *No statistical data/qualitative question.*

Department Philosophy

8. Would you describe the philosophy of Corrections as one of rehabilitation of inmates, punishment of inmates, or a blend of both? Why? *No statistical data/qualitative question.*

Close Out

9. Is there anything else you'd like to share? *No statistical data/qualitative question.*