

**Chapter 1 : Crime Victims, Crime and Correction Committee, New York State Senate - Ballotpedia**

*The crime & corrections rankings evaluated states on two general measures: their rates of both violent and property crimes, and their management of prison systems.*

Doble Research is a New York-area firm with extensive experience studying public opinion about crime and other policy issues from a nonpartisan perspective. Doble Research subsequently conducted studies in Vermont, Oklahoma, and Oregon and, in conjunction with Public Agenda, in Pennsylvania. To explore public opinion in North Carolina, we first conducted a series of four focus groups across the state in June. Each group, lasting two hours, consisted of a cross section of adults chosen to reflect the adult population in terms of age, gender, and education level. Groups were held in Durham, Greenville, Charlotte and Asheville to ensure geographical representation. The group in Durham was made up of only African-American respondents, while the other three reflected a cross section of the community. Results from the focus groups were analyzed and a series of hypotheses developed for testing in phase two, the telephone survey. The sample was a random or probability sample, drawn using scrambled telephone numbers so that every household in the state had an equal chance of being called. We used a larger sample to enable us to explore with greater statistical confidence the views of people in different parts of the state. Interviews lasted an average of 25 minutes. Respondents were first asked about crime and its causes, then to assess the criminal justice system and corrections policy, and whether the state should make greater use of community-based sanctions or alternative sentences. The sampling error for each item is plus or minus 4 percentage points, at a confidence interval of 95 percent. This report integrates the survey results with comments from the focus groups. In addition to an Executive Summary, we include two summary tables: Some tables compare the North Carolina results with results from similar studies conducted in Alabama, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Vermont, Oregon and Oklahoma over the past six years. The major themes are strikingly similar. But where differences exist, it is unclear whether attitudes in North Carolina are different from those in other states or whether U. That is, if they were surveyed today, people in Alabama might feel differently than they did in. In view of the volatility of public opinion about certain aspects of this issue, readers are advised to take into consideration differences in geography and state experience, along with shifts in the national mood when comparing results. North Carolinians overwhelmingly believe crime has increased in the past five years, in spite of the fact that data from the FBI and other reliable sources show crime has leveled off or even decreased. Large numbers also think that violent crime, juvenile crime, and illegal drug use are increasing. A number of North Carolinians speak from experience. Nearly one in four said that within the past five years, they or a member of their immediate family had been a crime victim. Similarly, 1 family in 11 was reportedly victimized by a violent crime. Beliefs About the Causes of Crime 4. But to most North Carolinians, such "family values" lack a political context and ideological overtones. People in North Carolina have similar beliefs about the causes of crime as do people in Oregon, Oklahoma and other states. Truth-in-Sentencing and Sentencing Guidelines 6. Large majorities say the courts and the police treat rich people better than the poor. Most whites say the courts and police treat people equally, regardless of race. But solid majorities of black, Hispanic and Native Americans say that both the police and the courts treat whites better than minorities. North Carolinians overwhelmingly support truth-in-sentencing. The idea of bringing time served into conformity with what a judge hands down in court is very popular. When people learn that truth-in-sentencing would also mean longer sentences for violent offenders, support increases to near unanimity. North Carolinians solidly support the idea of "structured sentencing. North Carolinians see the criminal justice system as a single entity, drawing little distinction between, for example, federal or state prisons, or city and county jails. Like people in other states studied by Doble Research, North Carolinians have a set of beliefs, perceptions and misperceptions that influence their thinking about the whole issue. Their views about corrections, therefore, should not be seen as a judgment of current officials or recent policies, but rather as an assessment about the entire country. North Carolinians see four goals for corrections: When asked to rate the system -- and here again, the rating North Carolinians give actually applies to the entire American criminal justice system North Carolinians hand out

low marks for each goal. North Carolinians believe that almost anyone convicted of a violent crime using a gun or a knife should be sent to prison. But only one in ten believes that actually occurs. Of the violent offenders who are sent to prison, the vast majority, North Carolinians believe, do not serve the full sentence given by the judge. Nearly two-thirds of the people in North Carolina believe most prison inmates are idle all day, instead of working productively at a prison job. About two-thirds believe that after a stay in prison, offenders are more dangerous, not less. Taken together, these beliefs are a major source of public discontent with the corrections system. They also fuel public support for using alternative sentences or community-based punishments. By large margins, North Carolinians favor three changes in corrections policy: While a large majority says that prison sentences should be longer, North Carolinians are split about whether that would have much effect on the crime rate. North Carolinians feel that juveniles who are 15 or older and commit a very violent crime should receive the same sentence as an adult. North Carolinians believe that offenders who successfully complete drug or alcohol treatment are not rehabilitated most of the time. Yet North Carolinians overwhelmingly favor providing such treatments for any offenders in need, even if that means higher spending. Large majorities also favor psychiatric treatment for every mentally ill offender and ensuring that every inmate has a chance to earn a high school diploma, even if that means increased spending.

**Views About the Use of Alternative Sentences** North Carolinians want, by lopsided margins, to make much greater use of alternative sentences with nonviolent offenders currently sent to prison. While 84 percent also favor using capital punishment more often with murderers, overwhelming majorities reject building more prisons if that means paying for them by either cutting social services or raising taxes. North Carolinians are enthusiastic supporters of alternatives, even though people do not believe that offenders sentenced to an alternative are usually rehabilitated. The more passive, control-centered alternatives such as the halfway house and house arrest are comparatively much less well regarded.

**Sentencing Preferences in a Variety of Cases** Even after learning about the cost of incarceration and about various alternative or intermediate punishments, North Carolinians wanted to incarcerate three violent offenders -- a rapist, an armed robber, and a man who beat his spouse for the third time. Solid majorities also want to incarcerate two drug traffickers and a burglar convicted for the second time. There are four cases where North Carolinians are split about alternatives or incarceration. From the focus groups we know that in such cases, people generally want more details about the offender and the offense before determining whether to incarcerate. North Carolinians do not necessarily want to incarcerate every violent offender. Most want to know the details of the case before determining whether an offender should go to prison. While North Carolinians want to be tough on drug dealers, large numbers do not want to incarcerate offenders in a wide variety of property crimes. When calling for the use of alternatives, the most popular sentencing option changes, depending on the offense and offender. In effect, North Carolinians want to make the punishment fit the crime.

**Beliefs About Crime in the State Finding 1.** North Carolinians overwhelmingly believe crime has increased in the past five years.

## Chapter 2 : Crime and Corrections - Unsustainable California

*Get updates on important news and legislation from the Crime Victims, Crime and Correction Committee.*

They are hidden away from the eyes of the public unless there is a prison escape or if someone released on parole re-offends. However, prisons and policing are also in the process of radical restructuring. Generally the debate in this restructuring has been between rehabilitation, humanizing the prisons, and punishment, seeking stricter and longer punishment for offenders. But the external changes through the field of genomics, ecological design and through soft technologies such as meditation, yoga and biopsychology are changing prisons as well. Moreover, prisons themselves are being seen as organizations and thus in need of strategic planning, and indeed, some correctional facilities are attempting to become learning organizations, reflecting on their alternative futures and their desired visions. Based on literature on prisons and foresight workshops with correctional and police leaders, alternative futures of prisons are explored. One way to understand the futures of crime and corrections is through popular movies. Population and the consumption of resources are maintained at a steady state through policing. Demography is the primary issue. And as we rapidly age throughout the world, criminal activity toward the aging will likely increase and new crime categories, unthinkable today, will be created. In the Blade Runner, the criminals were replicants – biogenetically engineered individuals who performed tasks humans did not desire. Crime was associated with the undesirability of co-existing with a new species one that, ironically, we created. As the Science and technology revolution continues to explode, certainly wildly new crimes associated with out-of-control robots and vicious digital viruses are likely to increase and grow becoming far more serious threats than they are today. For example, new forms of lie detection, based not on anxiety, but on brain scanning are likely to enhance the likelihood of apprehending criminals. Already a woman in India was found guilty of murder due to brain scan evidence in Police appear at a crime scene just before the criminal act is actually committed. However, and not surprisingly, mistakes are made. Eventually the program must be abandoned, but not before considerable harm is done. Increasingly, we can expect very varied attempts to intervene earlier in the crime cycle. These will likely be in the form of enhanced surveillance technologies: As climate change continues to disrupt the planet – creating droughts, floods, tidal waves, and typhoons, to begin with – the move toward sustainability will no longer be merely a feel good green option; rather, it will become mandatory and need to be policed. Environmental crime – crimes that make an eco system more vulnerable, at national, corporate and personal levels – will grow. As regulation thickens and expands, police and others branches of law enforcement will be called into ensure compliance. Unfortunately, given that policing tends to be reactive – waiting for legislatures and judiciaries at the nation-state jurisdictional level – they are unlikely to have the necessary skill sets to proactively and transparently police new arenas ageing, environment, cyberspace, global, genomics, to begin with. In any case, prisons, within the current paradigm are likely to grow as crimes expand. Futures of Crime What then are the futures of crime? First we need to challenge how we define crime. Postmodernists, such as philosopher Michel Foucault, suggest we consider crime as a social constructed, historically defined, and not as an a priori universal. For example, thirty years ago in developed parts of the world, forecasts of water scarcity and water crimes were dismissed. However, already today because of water scarcity, watering lawns in many cities is a punishable activity. Will a water mafia develop in the near future? Already in poorer countries, electricity theft is common. Policing energy, however, is challenging as corruption ensures that offenders merely pay a personal fine to the local police officer or electric company. Or imagine a future vegetarian society where those who eat meat are sent to prison. What would our prisons look like then? What would be an appropriate sentence for a meat eater? What would early intervention be like? Given the link between our diet choices and climate change, is this really a far off scenario? Should prisons become totally green? Should police and correction facilities engage in green audits? In what ways should police and prisons be representative of a changing society? And as we continue to globalize what is the appropriate jurisdiction for these types of questions. While there are certainly some geographical distinctions, as we continue to move toward a fully globalized society capital, technologies, climate and crime do not

respect national boundaries! As Foucault suggests, to understand the futures of prisons and the futures of crime we need to understand the nature of society: What do we value today? What might we value tomorrow? Rehabilitation In the USA and most developed nations, the main debate as to the futures of justice is between rehabilitation and punishment. Those on the rehabilitation side believe crimes are generally committed because of social and economic reasons. Born into a poor family, or a single parent family, a person goes to a second-rate public school that labels them under-achievers. Overtime, they see themselves as not very worthwhile. Imprisoning someone like that merely adds to the problem. In jail, offenders rarely learn new skills, except how to be a more successful criminal. Their peer group consists of other prisoners, with similar stories. When they are released from prison, they stay within their learned behavior and thus are likely to commit crimes again. Ensure that the possibility to move from lower to middle class and even to the upper class is there for all. Society should be based on merit. By ensuring that children of single-parent families do not fall into the poverty trap, the chances of future crimes is reduced. Funding can come through various programs. Ensuring a nutritious breakfast for children for body and brain development, housing allowance, unemployment insurance, counseling; indeed, any intervention that helps those outside of the merit system get the benefits that others are getting, and that increases the possibility of them feeling they are part of society is to be encouraged. Social justice should not be confused for psychological entitlement. As children grow, and develop peer groups, intervention comes through job training, sports camps, and community clubs again anything to ensure that children do not start on paths of crime, and that they remain integrated in the family and broader community. Ultimately intervention is about healing communities, reweaving the fabric of friendship, helping peers see that we are all in this together. The rehabilitation model in prisons as well works to ensure that when the prisoner is released he will leave behind his previous behavior and start afresh. Interventions go from the simple of changing diet research suggests that diets rich in fruits and vegetables and low in refined sugar reduce prison violence, changing the colors of prison cells, giving prisons meaningful work, prison gardens so inmates can connect with nature, and work training. As much as possible, and where appropriate, keep those who have committed crimes out of prisons: Once balance is restored, the chances of the prisoner re-offending are diminished. The scientific evidence is that this model does work. Re-integrating back to the community may mean not using the dominant legal system but using restorative justice that is more culturally attuned. This is not universally applicable but there are cases where culture is crucial in policing and sentencing. Punishment In contrast, is the punishment model. The argument is that all the rights are given to the offender and to the marginal. And the victim who may have been raped, or maimed has none. In this approach, the best way to reduce present-day and future crimes is to keep serious offenders in jail. And there is evidence that backs this up twenty-five percent of criminal activity can be reduced by lengthy prison sentences. We have sinned, whether against our community, ourselves, or our understanding of God. Merely focusing on rehabilitation sends a signal of weakness to potential criminals. It also frustrates police who tire of repeat offenders. Thus, the most extreme version of this is the death penalty. While most Western nations have eliminated it seeing it as repugnant murder grievously committed by the State the USA continues this ancient practice. As do most traditional feudal nations some of which would have an adulterous woman stoned to death, a sentence generally protested by certain other nations, including the USA. The punishment model as well supports the: Genomics A New Variable? The debate between rehabilitation and punishment is being challenged on a multiple fronts, especially from revolutions in science and technology, hard and soft. The genetics revolution, for one, is searching for the roots of crime in our DNA. If certain individuals are more inclined toward committing crimes as by their risk-taking proclivities we should intervene to ensure they do not behave in this way in the future. This means mapping our genes and our theories of the factors of crime. Intervention could take the form of gene therapy healing the damaged gene array or germ line intervention ensuring the faulty gene is eliminated so that future generations do not inherit that fault. Thus, the science of genetics joins criminology in a search for genetic solutions to crimes. If we know that an offender is more likely to have the genetic variation that enhances his likelihood for criminal behavior is more punishment warranted or does it behoove society to enhance rehabilitation or is genetic modification the next route? Digitalization Digitalization is important largely to

prevent current and future crimes. With increased video surveillance, poorly lit areas can be made safer. Child nabbing is far less likely as surveillance cameras will be able to capture a picture of the abductor. Over time, biometric devices linked to general positioning systems GPS can be fitted on most humans so that the capacity to prevent crimes is dramatically decreased and new types of crime invented. Bio-devices are already being used in electronic sentencing. For crimes that do not hurt others " such as many drug crimes " home sentencing is already gaining in use. Over time, certain parts of the city could be seen as digital no-gos. In this sense the new technologies allow us to place the prisoner in limited exile. Instead of being sent far away, his capacity to move is limited. This enhances his chances of being rehabilitated as well his chances of not offending again.

## Chapter 3 : Crime and Corrections

*Crime and corrections each pose policy challenges. Rising crime rates threaten public safety, and California's overcrowded, costly system requires reform.*

The criminal justice system is the set of agencies and processes established by governments to control crime and impose penalties on those who violate laws. There is no single criminal justice system in the United States but rather many similar, individual systems. How the criminal justice system works in each area depends on the jurisdiction that is in charge: Different jurisdictions have different laws, agencies, and ways of managing criminal justice processes. State criminal justice systems handle crimes committed within their state boundaries. The federal criminal justice system handles crimes committed on federal property or in more than one state.

**System Components** Most criminal justice systems have five components-law enforcement, prosecution, defense attorneys, courts, and corrections, each playing a key role in the criminal justice process. Law enforcement officers take reports for crimes that happen in their areas. Officers investigate crimes and gather and protect evidence. Law enforcement officers may arrest offenders, give testimony during the court process, and conduct follow-up investigations if needed. Prosecutors are lawyers who represent the state or federal government not the victim throughout the court process-from the first appearance of the accused in court until the accused is acquitted or sentenced. Prosecutors review the evidence brought to them by law enforcement to decide whether to file charges or drop the case. Prosecutors present evidence in court, question witnesses, and decide at any point after charges have been filed whether to negotiate plea bargains with defendants. They have great discretion, or freedom, to make choices about how to prosecute the case. They are either hired by the defendant or for defendants who cannot afford an attorney they are assigned by the court. While the prosecutor represents the state, the defense attorney represents the defendant. Courts are run by judges, whose role is to make sure the law is followed and oversee what happens in court. They decide whether to release offenders before the trial. Judges accept or reject plea agreements, oversee trials, and sentence convicted offenders. Correction officers supervise convicted offenders when they are in jail, in prison, or in the community on probation or parole. In some communities, corrections officers prepare pre-sentencing reports with extensive background information about the offender to help judges decide sentences. The job of corrections officers is to make sure the facilities that hold offenders are secure and safe. They oversee the day-to-day custody of inmates.

**How the Criminal Justice Process Works** Below is a basic outline of the sequence of events in the criminal justice process, beginning when the crime is reported or observed. The process may vary according to the jurisdiction, the seriousness of the crime felony or misdemeanor, whether the accused is a juvenile or an adult, and other factors. Not every case will include all these steps, and not all cases directly follow this sequence. Many crimes are never prosecuted because they are not reported, because no suspects can be identified, or because the available evidence is not adequate for the prosecutor to build a case.

**Entry into the System** Report: Law enforcement officers receive the crime report from victims, witnesses, or other parties or witness the crime themselves and make a report. Law enforcement investigates the crime. Officers try to identify a suspect and find enough evidence to arrest the suspect they think may be responsible. If they find a suspect and enough evidence, officers may arrest the suspect or issue a citation for the suspect to appear in court at a specific time. This decision depends on the nature of the crime and other factors. If officers do not find a suspect and enough evidence, the case remains open.

**Prosecution and Pretrial Charges:** The prosecutor considers the evidence assembled by the police and decides whether to file written charges or a complaint or release the accused without prosecution. If the prosecutor decides to file formal charges, the accused will appear in court to be informed of the charges and of his or her rights. The judge decides whether there is enough evidence to hold the accused or release him or her. If the defendant does not have an attorney, the court may appoint one or begin the process of assigning a public defender to represent the defendant. At the first court appearance or at any other point in the process-depending on the jurisdiction the judge may decide to hold the accused in jail or release him or her on bail, bond, or on his or her "own Recognizance" OR, " OR means the defendant promises to return to court for

any required proceedings and the judge does not impose bail because the defendant appears not to be a flight risk. To be released on bail, defendants have to hand over cash or other valuables such as property deeds to the court as security to guarantee that the defendant will appear at the trial. Defendants may pay bail with cash or bond an amount put up by a bail bondsman who collects a non-refundable fee from the defendant to pay the bail. The judge will also consider such factors as drug use, residence, employment, and family ties in deciding whether to hold or release the defendant.

**Grand Jury or Preliminary Hearing:** In about one-half of the states, defendants have the right to have their cases heard by a grand jury, which means that a jury of citizens must hear the evidence presented by the prosecutor and decide whether there is enough evidence to indict the accused of the crime. If the grand jury decides there is enough evidence, the grand jury submits to the court an indictment, or written statement of the facts of the offense charged against the accused. In other cases, the accused may have to appear at a preliminary hearing in court, where the judge may hear evidence and the defendant is formally indicted or released. The defendant is brought before the judge to be informed of the charges and his or her rights. The defendant pleads guilty, not guilty, or no contest accepts the penalty without admitting guilt. If the defendant pleads guilty or no contest, no trial is held, and offender is sentenced then or later. If the defendant pleads not guilty, a date is set for the trial. If a plea agreement is negotiated, no trial is held.

**Adjudication Trial Process Plea Agreements:** The majority of cases are resolved by plea agreements rather than trials. A plea agreement means that the defendant has agreed to plead guilty to one or more of the charges in exchange for one of the following: The law does not require prosecutors to inform victims about plea agreements or seek their approval. Trials are held before a judge bench trial or judge and jury jury trial , depending on the seriousness of the crime and other factors. The prosecutor and defense attorney present evidence and question witnesses. The judge or jury finds the defendant guilty or not guilty on the original charges or lesser charges. Defendants found not guilty are usually released. If the verdict is guilty, the judge will set a date for sentencing. Victims are allowed to prepare for the judge and perhaps to read at the sentencing hearing a victim impact statement that explains how the crime affected them. In deciding on a sentence, the judge has a range of choices, depending on the crime. These choices include restitution paying the victim for costs related to the crime , fines paid to the court , probation, jail or prison, or the death penalty. In some cases, the defendant appeals the case, seeking either a new trial or to overturn or change the sentence. A judge may suspend a jail or prison sentence and instead place the offender on probation, usually under supervision in the community. Offenders who have served part of their sentences in jail or prison may-under certain conditions-be released on parole, under the supervision of the corrections system or the court. Offenders who violate the conditions of their probation or parole can be sent to jail or prison.

**If You Are a Victim** The criminal justice system can be overwhelming, intimidating, and confusing for anyone who does not work within it every day. As a victim, you will need to know what to expect and have support throughout the process. You will also want to know your rights and the choices you may have to make. For example, if you are harassed or stalked by the offender at any point in the criminal justice process, you should immediately report these violations to the police and inform the prosecutor. Also, while the offender is in jail or prison, the corrections staff is generally required to notify you if the offender is released or escapes or if a parole hearing is pending, if you request such notification. Also, most states have automated notification systems that allow registered victims those who sign up to check on the status of an offender at any time. Defense attorneys sometimes contact victims about their case. Victims do not have to talk to defense attorneys or their investigators and are encouraged to contact the prosecutor if they have any concerns about such requests. Felonies are punishable by more than one year in prison; misdemeanors are punishable by up to one year in jail. This information may be freely distributed, provided that it is distributed free of charge, reprinted in its entirety, and includes this copyright notice.

**Chapter 4 : Corrections - Wikipedia**

*Relates to integrating community supervision programs into an individual's employment, educational or vocational training schedule.*

Messenger This article is part of the Beyond Prison series, which examines better ways to reduce re-offending, following the recent State of Imprisonment series. Instead, they have produced an expanding prison system. This has the potential to do more harm than good and places considerable strain on government budgets. Increasing prison sentences does little to deter criminal behaviour. Longer sentences are associated with higher rates of re-offending. When prisoners return to their communities, as the vast majority inevitably do, the problems multiply. Exposing the limitations of punishment In this context, it becomes important to think carefully about public policy responses that aim to punish and deter offenders. Psychologists have been studying punishment under well-controlled laboratory conditions with both animals and humans for nearly years. Its effectiveness in promoting short-term behavioural change, or even in suppressing negative behaviour, depends on rather specific conditions being in place. For punishment to work it has to be predictable. Punishment also has to be applied at maximum intensity to work, or else tolerance and temporary effects result. Yet applying very intense levels of punishment for many offences goes against our sense of justice and fairness. The threat of punishment, no matter how severe, will not deter anyone who believes they can get away with it. It will also not deter those who are too overcome by emotion or disordered thinking to care about the consequences of their behaviour. Punishment also has to be immediate. Delayed punishment provides opportunities for other behaviours to be reinforced. In reality, it often takes months – if not years – for someone to be apprehended, appear in court and be sentenced. Working towards more effective rehabilitation Many of the conditions required for punishment to be effective will not exist in any justice system. It follows that policies and programmes that focus on rehabilitating offenders will have a greater chance of success in preventing crime and improving community safety. The origins of offender rehabilitation in Australia can be traced back to the early penal colonies and, in particular, to the work of Alexander Maconochie , a prison governor on Norfolk Island in Much more is known about punishment and rehabilitation than when John Howard first gave evidence to a House of Commons committee in These days, though, offender rehabilitation is often thought about in terms of psychological treatment. We can chart the rise of current programmes according to the broad traditions of psychodynamic psychotherapy , behaviour modification and behaviour therapy and, more recently, the cognitive-behavioural and cognitive approaches that characterise contemporary practice. The earliest therapeutic work in the psychoanalytic tradition saw delinquent behaviour as the product of a failure in psychological development. It was thought this could be addressed through gaining insight into the causes of offending. A wide range of group and milieu therapies were developed for use with offenders, including group counselling and psychodrama. Community-style therapeutic programmes for prisoners with substance use problems in Victoria, NSW and the ACT represent substantial advances in practice. They actively encourage offenders to assume responsibility not only for their own behaviour, but for that of others. However, rehabilitation today is almost always associated with cognitive-behavioural therapy. Programmes also dedicate a lot of time to trying to change personality traits, such as low self-control, hostility, pleasure- or thrill-seeking and lack of empathy. Not everyone can be successfully treated. Substantial evidence now exists, though, to suggest that this type of approach does produce socially significant reductions in re-offending. Essential steps in making corrections policy work The challenges lie in ensuring that the right programmes are delivered to the right people at the right time. First, it is important that low-risk offenders have minimal contact with higher-risk offenders. Extended contact is only likely to increase their risk of recidivism. This has implications for prisoner case management, prison design and for the courts. Courts have the power to divert low-risk offenders from prison and thus minimise contact with more entrenched offenders. Related to this is the need to develop effective systems of community-based rehabilitation, leaving prisons for the most dangerous and highest-risk offenders. Innovative community rehabilitation policies are needed to reduce the overrepresentation of Indigenous people in prison. They are

grossly over-represented across all levels of the criminal justice system. Third, staff need to be properly selected, trained, supervised and resourced to deliver the highest-quality rehabilitation services to the most complex and challenging people. Finally, it is important to demonstrate that programmes actually make offenders better, not worse. The types of evaluation that are needed to attribute positive change to programme completion are complex, require large numbers of participants and cross-jurisdictional collaboration. A national approach to programme evaluation is sorely needed. We need to create a true system of rehabilitation that can enhance the corrective impact of punishment-based approaches. It may work reasonably well with some people – perhaps those who are future-oriented, have good self-monitoring and regulation skills, and who can make the connection between their behaviour and negative consequences months later. The challenge, then, is two-fold: Correctional services often get little credit for their efforts. They are widely criticised when things go wrong. However, their efforts to rehabilitate offenders are not only sensible, but also cost-efficient and practical. We need to support efforts to create a true system of rehabilitation. Such a system will be comprehensive, coherent and internally consistent in applying evidence-based practice at all levels. You can read other articles in the Beyond Prison series [here](#).

**Chapter 5 : The Criminal Justice System**

*Crime and Corrections Tracking trends and evaluating interventions aimed at reducing delinquent and criminal behavior  
Crime and violence are best understood in the context of surrounding social challenges and factors.*

No comments Recently, one of my fellow Corrections. From there he goes south and comes up with the following conclusions: Facebook and other social media entities plus the justice system face an immense challenge as to keeping people safe. As offenders change tactics, will we be astute enough to recognize ongoing criminal behavior? If that changes, do we have societal and legal approvals? Do parole and probation agencies really want to know? Probably not; it will greatly increase their rate of failure. Thus for all the reasons above, social media monitoring is a quagmire. Remember this the next time a mass murderer broadcasts and acts, or a sex or violent offender uses Facebook and someone is hurt or killed. There are reasons why. Social Media is Too Big Yes, social media is big. But there are ways to make things manageable. They have made a policy that criminal behavior will not be tolerated on their platform. Remember, they own that platform and we as users agree to their terms of use. If they determine that something violates their policy they remove it. There is no judge or jury to decide these things. We as users agree to their terms. They are putting these rules in place to make their site safer for all users. Do they catch everyone the minute it happens? No, they do not. But what would you have them do? Should they allow criminals to run a muck on their platform? That would be like Walmart saying drug dealers, muggers, etc. Many police agencies and private sector companies are using software that search for key terms in social media. These programs are very sophisticated and allow for searches to target multiple terms, geographic areas, etc. These programs are being used to help secure big events, such as the Super Bowl, World Series, etc. Law enforcement also uses social media to investigate after the fact, particularly if they have a suspect and want to see if they can find further evidence. There is not only software out there but there is law enforcement training on conducting social media investigations which cover techniques and the law. One such event is coming up Washington, DC from August , But then again they not are supposed to be looking at everyone. Is their entire caseload on social media? No of course not, so that limits the number further. Do all their offenders require that kind of scrutiny? Again, the answer is of course not. This issue paper provides guidance about the issues associated with conducting these kinds of investigations. By the way, they are updating this issue paper too. Those groups that focus on training noted below are also resources for probation and parole agencies. Sure there can be concerns in doing social media investigations but those can be addressed with training. Sure agencies might have to update their policies but it can be done. Heck, take a look at that issue paper I mentioned above. It gives some guidance on legal concerns. My fellow contributor gave an example of what if you see a social media post of an offender with a gun. Well, a gun is not only a technical violation but in the case of an felony offender on supervision, it is a violation of federal and state law. Guns by the way are bad things for offenders to possess. Yes, you have to prove it is a gun but this is not a small technical issue. Yes, there will be plenty of technical violations that might be uncovered. For instance, you have social media posts of an offender using drugs. Maybe that results in the person going to treatment. A social media investigation does not equate with someone going back to prison every time. Social media investigations can be a useful tool. What other tools should we stop using as they might end up with someone going back to prison? The objective is NOT to keep offenders in the community at all costs. Conclusion My advice to my fellow contributor or for that matter anyone writing on cybercrime and corrections is to take a look at my past posts on corrections. I have been writing about this topic since They will give you a bit more information that just shooting from the hip. On that note I left my cigar lit somewhere. Be safe out there.

## Chapter 6 : Crime and Corrections | RTI

*Chapter Study Outline Categorizing Crime in Texas. 1. Crimes have different levels of seriousness and punishments vary according to the legislature's classification of the seriousness of the crime.*

Prisoner to Full-Time Employee Ratio 2. Prisons housed inmates in aging buildings, forced them to triple-bunk, placed them in solitary confinement due to lack of space, and converted gymnasiums into cramped housing. As facility quality declined, some prisons resorted to placing inmates in solitary confinement for over a decade. Several lawsuits, resulted in the United States Supreme Court ruling that state prison conditions were unconstitutionally poor with inadequate medical treatment for both physical and mental ailments. Property and Violent Crime Rate vs. The Court-issued mandate stated that occupancy levels decline to below After the state failed again to meet required occupancy levels in early , the Court granted an extension until February to meet the mandated level. Plata In response to the U. The intent would be to reduce overcrowding in state facilities and to adhere to the court-ordered mandate. Not all counties receive the same funding per additional inmate they take from the state. Housing prisoners in county jails which are cheaper to maintain and operate is estimated to cost about half the amount that state prison sentences would cost. Realignment also includes a focus on reducing recidivism during the population transfer from prisons to jails. Furthermore, housing inmates closer to their homes is intended to aid rehabilitation because it will keep them closer to nearby friends and family in preparation for release. During that time, auto theft grew the largest amount, The report suggests that spending funds on policing rather than incarceration would be a more effective use of tax-payer funds to lower crime. In theory, realignment has the potential to be very positive for California. If California decides to take a more pro-rehabilitation approach, there are other ways to reduce recidivism that the state simply has not pursued as aggressively. For example, an initiative known as Prison University, which educates inmates, boasted a 5. Overall recidivism rates for all felons was found to be Instead of releasing prisoners early or transferring them to county jails, it may be possible to devote funds to prisoner education to reduce spending down the road. Conclusion Realignment is a costly program that aims to lower state prison population, which could lower long-term costs. Should it fail, it would be seen as a poor policy decision that adversely affected the safety of tens of millions of people. Our safety depends on it. The New York Times. Snyder and Jeanne B. Official Voter Information Guide. An Analysis of the Preliminary Data.

## Chapter 7 : Crime and Prisons: Beyond the rehabilitation and punishment debate |

*Chapter Outline This first chapter covers the history of crime and punishment by exploring crime prior to the 18th century and how society responded in turn. The information covers what "corrections" actually is, in cooperation with its primary mission and use as part of the criminal justice system.*

## Chapter 8 : The Three C's™s (Computers, Crime, and Corrections)

*Crime and Prisons. Learn about reporting crimes or criminals and find frequently requested information about prisons. Crimes Involving Children. Find information about crimes involving children including abductions, abuse, and neglect.*

## Chapter 9 : The History of Crime and Corrections

*Respondents were first asked about crime and its causes, then to assess the criminal justice system and corrections policy, and whether the state should make greater use of community-based sanctions or alternative sentences.*