

**Issues in Jail Operations, 2003:
Perspectives from State Jail Inspection Agencies**

**Connie Clem
Dave Sheanin
LIS, Inc.**



**U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Corrections
Information Center**

September 2003

Contents

Section I. About the Research

Section II. Study Highlights

Section III. Tables

- Table 1. Type of Organization That Administers State Jail Standards Program
- Table 2. Assistance Provided to Jails by Inspection Agency
- Table 3. Recency of Standards' Revision and Number of Accredited Jails
- Table 4. Elements of Policies/Procedures and Post Orders Addressed by Standards
- Table 5. Elements of Staffing Addressed by Standards
- Table 6. Elements of Staff Training Addressed by Standards
- Table 7. Percentage of State's Jails that Regularly Exceed their Rated or Design Capacity
- Table 8. Aspects of Jail Population Management
- Table 9. Number of Jails in State that Use Day Reporting Centers
- Table 10. Number of Jails in State that Use Home Detention
- Table 11. Number of Jails in State that Use Electronic Monitoring
- Table 12. Number of Jails in State that Use Community Work Programs
- Table 13. Elements of Classification, Supervision, and Behavior Management Addressed by Standards
- Table 14. Percentage of Jails with Objective Jail Classification Systems
- Table 15. Percentage of State's Jails by Inmate Housing Configuration
- Table 16. Percentage of Jails in Full Compliance with Standards Relating to Classification, Supervision, and Behavior Management
- Table 17. Elements of Security Addressed by Standards
- Table 18. Elements of Documentation Addressed by Standards
- Table 19. Types of Documentation Required by Standards
- Table 20. Percentage of State's Jails That Use an Automated MIS for Inmate Data
- Table 21. Working Relationships Between Most of the State's Jails and Their Funding Authorities
- Table 22. Elements of Fire, Safety, and Sanitation Addressed by Standards

Issues in Jail Operations, 2003: Perspectives from State Jail Inspection Agencies

Section I. About the Research

The National Institute of Corrections (NIC) Information Center, in collaboration with the NIC Jails Division, initiated a project in July 2003 to gather information about a range of issues related to effective jail operation. The intent of the research was to identify areas in which jails tend to be deficient, suggesting the need for new or revised forms of NIC assistance. The study focused on issues that could be explored at a statewide level with the assistance of jail inspection agencies in the states where such programs exist. This report of findings summarizes the status of jails in these states.

To gather information for this study, NIC distributed a survey to the chief jail inspector in each state with a jail inspection program (N = 35). Surveys were provided in electronic format, on disk to participants in an NIC program and by e-mail to jail inspectors who were not present at the program. Respondents were asked to answer as many questions as possible, but were free to skip questions that were not applicable or for which data was unavailable. A total of 21 surveys were returned from inspection agencies in 10 states and the District of Columbia. The agencies in the survey sample reported more than 1,600 full-service jails and nearly 1,900 temporary holding facilities. (Not all responses included data on the number of temporary holding facilities.)

Staff used the survey responses to create a profile of jail standards and operations in each state. The profiles make up the second half of this report. For selected questions, response data were tabulated for a comparative review of issues across the states. Together, the state profiles and comparative tables provide considerable detail about jail operations in the responding states.

Because of the breadth of the issues covered by the research, only a limited cross-state analysis of the survey data could be conducted within the time frame of the study. Nevertheless, the study findings provide a unique overview of jail needs and issues both in individual states and as a representative sample of U.S. jails.

Section II. Study Highlights

Selected observations from the survey results follow. Additional summary information and state-by-state details on key questions are presented in the tables in Section III.

- **Age of facilities in the sample.** States were most likely to have built the most jails in the 1980s or 1990s. The next largest category is pre-1950. Total facilities by year built:
 - Before 1950: 312 jails
 - 1950 to 1969: 280 jails
 - 1970 to 1979: 389 jails
 - 1980 to 1989: 430 jails
 - 1990 to 1999: 503 jails
 - 2000 or later: 166 jails
- **Accreditation.** Respondents identified 55 jails as having received accreditation from the American Correctional Association. Sixty-seven (67) jails have been accredited by the National Commission on Correctional Health Care.
- **Compliance with standards: policies and procedures.** About half of the survey respondents rated at least 76% of their states' jails as being compliant with standards. (76%-95% of counties: 7 states; more than 95% of cases: 5 states)
- **Adequacy of policy and procedure manuals.** Most respondents rated their states' manuals as adequate (6 states) or better than adequate (9 states).
- **Adequacy of staffing.** Most respondents (12 states) described their states' jails as having "minimally adequate" staffing. A few (4 states) indicated "inadequate" staffing. One (1) state reportedly has "fully adequate" staffing in its jails.
- **Staff turnover.** Respondents in eight (8) states estimated jail staff turnover to be in the 10%-20% range. In four (4) states, turnover is greater than 30%.
- **Compliance with standards: staffing.** States were evenly distributed in their levels of compliance with standards concerning facility staffing, from 26%-50% compliant in four (4) states to more than 95% compliant in three (3) states. Only one (1) state reported compliance levels below 25%.
- **Compliance with standards: staff training.** States tended to report higher levels of compliance with training standards. Eleven (11) responding states reported 76% compliance or better. (76%-95% of counties: 5 states; more than 95% of cases: 6 states)

- **Exceeding capacity.** The largest number of respondents (7) indicated that from 26%-50% of the jails in their states regularly exceed their design or rated capacity. In four (4) states, from 51%-75% of jails exceed their capacity, and in three (3) states, more than 95% of jails exceed their capacity.
- **Coordinating councils.** Several respondents did not provide information about the number of jurisdictions that have criminal justice coordinating councils or similar groups that monitor the use of the jail. Where reported, the percentage of jurisdictions with these groups was often very small.
- **Pretrial services programs.** In eight (8) states surveyed, more than half the local jurisdictions reportedly have a pretrial services program. In four (4) other states, programs exist in fewer than half of the local jurisdictions.
- **Availability of specific pretrial services.** Among the 21 responding states, availability of specific pretrial services in a majority of local jurisdictions is as follows: Pretrial release screening, 13 states; Diversion screening, 10 states; Pretrial supervision, 8 states; Monitoring/expediting detention cases, 7 states; Service referral and coordination, 7 states.
- **Use of jail alternatives.** Fifteen (15) states reported the use of alternative programs to reduce crowding or improve supervision of inmates released early. Day reporting and home detention are typically available in fewer than half of the state's jurisdictions. Electronic monitoring and community work release programs appear to be available in more jurisdictions.
- **Compliance with standards: classification.** States ranged widely in their levels of compliance with standards concerning classification, from 26%-50% compliant in five (5) states, 51%-75% compliant in six (6) states, 76%-95% compliant in two (2) states, and more than 95% compliant in five (5) others.
- **Objective jail classification.** In six (6) states, more than 95% of jails are reported to have objective jail classification systems. In four (4) more states, the proportion is between 76% and 95%. In seven (7) states, the proportion is below 50%.
- **Housing configurations.** Direct supervision housing is most often available in 0% to 10% of the jails in the responding states. Podular remote supervision is typically available in from 10% to 40% of jails. Linear style housing makes up half or more of the housing in six (6) states. Hybrid facilities make up 0% to 30% of jails in the states surveyed.
- **Compliance with standards: security.** Most respondents indicated that their states are in high levels of compliance with standards concerning security. (76%-95% compliant in nine [9] states; more than 95% compliant in six [6] states)

- **Adequacy of security capabilities.** Respondents in all states but one indicated that, for most jails in their states, security capabilities are adequate for the custody categories of the inmates housed.
- **Compliance with standards: documentation.** At least half of the jails in most states are in compliance with standards concerning documentation. (50%-75% compliant in five [5] states; 76%-95% compliant in seven [7] states; more than 95% compliant in five [5] states)
- **Quality of documentation.** The overall quality of documentation maintained by jails was described as “adequate” in 13 states and better than adequate in an additional four (4).
- **Use of automated jail management systems.** In all but four (4) states, at least 50% of jails use computer-based systems to manage jail inmate data. Respondents in seven (7) states indicated that more than 95% of jails have automated systems.
- **Data exchange with other criminal justice agencies.** Data exchange capabilities showed two extremes: in five (5) states, fewer than 25% of jails exchange data with other agencies; in seven (7) states, more than 95% of jails exchange data.
- **Internet access.** States are broadly distributed on the proportion of jails that have Internet access. In the largest number of states (five [5]), more than 95% of jails have Internet access.
- **Funding authority relations.** Few respondents were able to affirm their jails’ positive relationships with funding authorities statewide, on any of the eight parameters addressed in the survey. Relationships were most often described as “mixed.”
- **Compliance with standards concerning fire codes.** Thirteen (13) respondents estimated that at least 76% of their states’ jails are in compliance with standards concerning fire codes. (76%-95% compliant in four [4] states; more than 95% compliant in nine [9] states)
- **Compliance with standards: work site safety.** Respondents in eight (8) states did not answer this question, some noting they did not understand it. The second most frequent answer was more than 95% compliance, reported by five (5) states.
- **Compliance with standards: health and sanitation.** At least half of the jails in most states are in compliance with standards concerning health and sanitation. (50%-75% compliant in four [4] states; 76%-95% compliant in six [6] states; more than 95% compliant in eight [8] states)
- **Cleanliness and sanitation.** All respondents but one described overall cleanliness and sanitation in their states’ jails as “adequate” (10 states) or better (5 states).

Section III. Tables

Table 1. Type of Organization That Administers State Jail Standards Program

	State Corrections Agency	Other State Agency	Sheriffs' Association	Jail Board or Commission
Alabama	✓			
California				✓
Florida			✓	
Georgia			✓	
Hawaii		✓		
Idaho			✓	
Indiana	✓			
Iowa	✓			
Kentucky	✓			
Maryland		✓		
Massachusetts	✓			
Michigan	✓			
Minnesota	✓			
Nebraska				✓
New Jersey	✓			
Ohio	✓			
Oklahoma		✓		
Pennsylvania	✓			
Texas				✓
Virginia	✓			
District of Columbia	✓			

Table 2. Assistance Provided to Jails by Inspection Agency

	Facility assessments	Operational assessments	Staffing needs assessments	Facility planning	Jail crowding help	Help developing policies & procedures	Training	Other
Alabama	✓					✓		
California	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Florida	✓							
Georgia	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Hawaii	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	
Idaho	✓	✓	✓				✓	
Indiana	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Iowa	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	
Kentucky	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	
Maryland		✓				✓	✓	
Massachusetts	✓	✓				✓	✓	
Michigan			✓	✓		✓		
Minnesota	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Nebraska	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
New Jersey	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Ohio	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Oklahoma	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Pennsylvania	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Texas	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Virginia		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
District of Columbia	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	

California – *Staffing analyses; death in custody reviews; security reviews; inspections and consultation to resolve areas of non-compliance*

Texas – *Any technical assistance*

Table 3. Recency of Standards' Revision and Number of Accredited Jails

	Standards revised	Revision planned		Accredited jails		
		Yes	No	ACA	NCCHC	Other
Alabama	1975		✓	<i>Unknown</i>	<i>Unknown</i>	
California	2003	✓		<i>Unknown</i>	<i>Unknown</i>	
Florida	2003	✓		13	<i>Unknown</i>	22
Georgia	1997		✓	2	4	
Hawaii	<i>Not answered</i>		✓	0	<i>Not answered</i>	
Idaho	2003		✓	<i>Not answered</i>	1	24
Indiana	1996	✓		2	5	
Iowa	2001	✓		1	2	
Kentucky	2003		✓	0	0	
Maryland	1995	✓		5	<i>Unknown</i>	
Massachusetts	1999	✓		8	<i>Unknown</i>	
Michigan	1998		✓	<i>Not applicable</i>	<i>Not applicable</i>	
Minnesota	1999	✓		<i>Unknown</i>	<i>Unknown</i>	
Nebraska	2001	✓		0	3	
New Jersey	2000	✓		5	10	
Ohio	2002		✓	5	14	
Oklahoma	2003		✓	1	0	
Pennsylvania	2000	✓		1	12	
Texas	2002		✓	1	1	
Virginia	2002		✓	11	5	
District of Columbia	2002		✓	<i>Not answered</i>	1	

Florida – Florida Corrections Accreditation Commission

Idaho – Idaho Sheriffs' Association

Table 4. Elements of Policies/Procedures and Post Orders Addressed by Standards

	Written polices and procedures manual	Annual review of policies and procedures	Staff training in policies and procedures	Policies and procedures available to all staff	Post orders for key positions	
					Yes	No
Alabama	✓					✓
California	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Florida	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
Georgia	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
Hawaii	<i>Not answered</i>				✓	
Idaho		✓			✓	
Indiana	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
Iowa	✓		✓	✓		✓
Kentucky	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
Maryland	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Massachusetts	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Michigan	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Minnesota	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Nebraska	✓		✓	✓		✓
New Jersey	✓		✓	✓	✓	
Ohio	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Oklahoma	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Pennsylvania	✓		✓	✓	✓	
Texas	✓	✓	✓			✓
Virginia	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
District of Columbia	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	

Table 5. Elements of Staffing Addressed by Standards

	Written staffing plan	Annual review of staffing plan	Written job descriptions	Minimum staffing level requirements	Female staff present when female inmates are housed
Alabama	<i>None of the above</i>				
California	✓	*	✓	✓	✓
Florida					✓
Georgia	✓	✓	✓		✓
Hawaii	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Idaho	✓	✓	✓		✓
Indiana					✓
Iowa					✓
Kentucky					✓
Maryland	<i>None of the above</i>				
Massachusetts	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Michigan	✓	✓			
Minnesota	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Nebraska			✓	✓	✓
New Jersey	✓				
Ohio	✓	✓	✓		✓
Oklahoma	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Pennsylvania				✓	✓
Texas	✓			✓	
Virginia	<i>None of the above</i>				
District of Columbia	✓		✓	✓	✓

California – *Expected to be current at all times. Reviewed biennially by BOC.

Table 6. Elements of Staff Training Addressed by Standards

	Written training plan	Designated training coordinator	Annual review of training plan	Plan must cover all categories of jail staff	Prescribed hours of pre-service training	Prescribed hours of annual in-service training	All staff training must be documented
Alabama	<i>None of the above</i>						
California	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Florida					✓	✓	✓
Georgia		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Hawaii	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Idaho	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Indiana	✓				✓	✓	✓
Iowa	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
Kentucky					✓	✓	✓
Maryland	✓		✓	✓			✓
Massachusetts	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Michigan							✓
Minnesota	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Nebraska		✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
New Jersey		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
Ohio		✓			✓	✓	✓
Oklahoma	✓	✓*					
Pennsylvania	✓						✓
Texas					✓	✓	✓
Virginia					✓*	✓*	✓
District of Columbia	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Oklahoma – For facilities with over 100 employees

Virginia – Required by Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services

Table 7. Percentage of State’s Jails that Regularly Exceed their Rated or Design Capacity

	<25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-95%	>95%
Alabama		✓			
California		✓			
Florida	<i>Unknown</i>				
Georgia		✓			
Hawaii					✓
Idaho	✓				
Indiana		✓			
Iowa	✓				
Kentucky			✓		
Maryland	<i>Unknown</i>				
Massachusetts		✓			
Michigan		✓			
Minnesota			✓		
Nebraska		✓			
New Jersey			✓		
Ohio		✓			
Oklahoma					✓
Pennsylvania			✓		
Texas	✓				
Virginia					✓
District of Columbia			✓		

Table 8. Aspects of Jail Population Management

	Percentage of jurisdictions with criminal justice coordinating council or similar	Percentage of jurisdictions with a pretrial services program	Services Provided by Most Pretrial Programs Statewide				
			Pretrial release screening	Pretrial supervision	Diversion screening	Monitor/ expedite detention cases	Service referral and coordination
Alabama	<i>Unknown</i>		<i>None of the above</i>				
California	<i>Unknown</i>		✓	<i>Data not available</i>			
Florida	<i>Unknown</i>						
Georgia	2%	5%			✓	✓	✓
Hawaii	0%	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Idaho	5%	5%	✓		✓		
Indiana	5%	50%	✓	✓	✓		
Iowa	5%	100%	✓	✓			
Kentucky	0%	5%			✓	✓	
Maryland	25%	<i>Not answered</i>					
Massachusetts	0%	<i>Unknown</i>	✓				
Michigan	<i>Not applicable</i>	<i>Unknown</i>	<i>None of the above</i>				
Minnesota	<i>Unknown</i>						
Nebraska	10%	80%	✓		✓		
New Jersey	<i>Unknown</i>	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Ohio	10%	75%	✓	✓	✓		✓
Oklahoma	5%	10%	✓				
Pennsylvania	15%	40%	✓		✓	✓	
Texas	<i>Unknown</i>			✓	✓	✓	✓
Virginia	0%	60%	✓	✓		✓	✓
District of Columbia	100%	100%	✓	✓	✓		✓

Table 9. Number of Jails in State that Use Day Reporting Centers

	Very Few	Some	About half	More than half	Most
Alabama	✓				
California	<i>Unknown</i>				
Florida	<i>Unknown</i>				
Georgia	✓				
Hawaii			✓		
Idaho	✓				
Indiana			✓		
Iowa	✓				
Kentucky	✓				
Maryland	<i>Not answered</i>				
Massachusetts	<i>Not answered</i>				
Michigan				✓	
Minnesota	✓				
Nebraska			✓		
New Jersey					✓
Ohio				✓	
Oklahoma	✓				
Pennsylvania		✓			
Texas	✓				
Virginia	<i>None</i>				
District of Columbia	<i>Not applicable*</i>				

District of Columbia – *This authority primarily comes under a federal agency, Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency (CSOSA).*

Table 10. Number of Jails in State that Use Home Detention

	Very few	Some	About half	More than half	Most
Alabama	✓				
California	<i>Unknown</i>				
Florida	<i>Unknown</i>				
Georgia	✓				
Hawaii			✓		
Idaho	✓				
Indiana			✓		
Iowa	✓				
Kentucky	✓				
Maryland	<i>Not answered</i>				
Massachusetts	<i>Not answered</i>				
Michigan	✓				
Minnesota		✓			
Nebraska		✓			
New Jersey				✓	
Ohio			✓		
Oklahoma	✓				
Pennsylvania			✓		
Texas	✓				
Virginia	<i>None</i>				
District of Columbia	<i>Not applicable*</i>				

District of Columbia – *This authority primarily comes under a federal agency, Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency (CSOSA).*

Table 11. Number of Jails in State that Use Electronic Monitoring

	Very few	Some	About half	More than half	Most
Alabama	✓				
California	<i>Unknown</i>				
Florida	<i>Unknown</i>				
Georgia	✓				
Hawaii				✓	
Idaho	✓				
Indiana		✓			
Iowa	✓				
Kentucky	✓				
Maryland	<i>Not answered</i>				
Massachusetts	<i>Not answered</i>				
Michigan			✓		
Minnesota			✓		
Nebraska			✓		
New Jersey				✓	
Ohio			✓		
Oklahoma	✓				
Pennsylvania				✓	
Texas	✓				
Virginia	✓				
District of Columbia	<i>Not applicable*</i>				

District of Columbia – *This authority primarily comes under a federal agency, Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency (CSOSA).*

Table 12. Number of Jails in State that Use Community Work Programs

	Very few	Some	About half	More than half	Most
Alabama		✓			
California	<i>Unknown</i>				
Florida	<i>Unknown</i>				
Georgia	✓				
Hawaii			✓		
Idaho		✓			
Indiana					✓
Iowa	✓				
Kentucky		✓			
Maryland	<i>Not answered</i>				
Massachusetts	<i>Not answered</i>				
Michigan					✓
Minnesota				✓	
Nebraska			✓		
New Jersey					✓
Ohio			✓		
Oklahoma	✓				
Pennsylvania		✓			
Texas		✓			
Virginia	✓				
District of Columbia	<i>Not applicable*</i>				

District of Columbia – *This authority primarily comes under a federal agency, Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency (CSOSA).*

Table 13. Elements of Classification, Supervision, and Behavior Management Addressed by Standards

	Screening at admission for suicide risk, medical problems, safety and security risks, and special needs	Orientation of newly admitted inmates to the jail	Inmate handbook with rules and expectations for inmate behavior	Written classification process to determine housing assignments, supervision requirements, and program eligibility	Separate housing and management of specified categories of inmates (e.g. male/female, violent/non-violent, etc.)	Well-being checks	Posting of staff close to inmate areas	Written inmate disciplinary procedures	Written inmate grievance procedures
Alabama			✓		✓				
California	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Florida	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
Georgia	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
Hawaii	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
Idaho	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Indiana	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Iowa	✓		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Kentucky	✓	✓			✓				✓
Maryland		✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓
Massachusetts	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓*	✓	✓	✓
Michigan	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Minnesota	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Nebraska	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
New Jersey	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Ohio	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Oklahoma	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Pennsylvania	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	
Texas	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Virginia	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
District of Columbia	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Massachusetts – mandated for high security and special management inmates only

Table 14. Percentage of Jails with Objective Jail Classification Systems

	<25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-95%	>95%
Alabama		✓			
California				✓	
Florida	<i>Unknown</i>				
Georgia		✓			
Hawaii	✓				
Idaho					✓
Indiana		✓*			
Iowa				✓	
Kentucky		✓			
Maryland					✓
Massachusetts					✓
Michigan			✓		
Minnesota				✓	
Nebraska				✓	
New Jersey					✓
Ohio			✓		
Oklahoma	✓				
Pennsylvania		✓			
Texas					✓
Virginia		✓			
District of Columbia					✓

Indiana – *New standards will require jails implement an objective based classification system within 3 years.*

Table 15. Percentage of State's Jails by Inmate Housing Configuration

	Linear style housing	Podular remote housing	Direct supervision housing	Hybrid facilities (not including special housing)
Alabama	45%	36%	1%	18%
California	<i>Not available</i>			
Florida	<i>Unknown</i>			
Georgia	38%	60%	2%	0%
Hawaii	0%	25%	0%	75%
Idaho	60%	30%	5%	5%
Indiana	19%	65%	1%	15%
Iowa	60%	30%	5%	5%
Kentucky	10%	60%	0%	30%
Maryland	<i>Not answered</i>			
Massachusetts	30%	5%	60%	5%
Michigan	60%	35%	5%	0%
Minnesota	55%	20%	20%	5%
Nebraska	60%	20%	15%	5%
New Jersey	5%	30%	30%	35%
Ohio	35%	35%	15%	15%
Oklahoma	75%	24%	1%	0%
Pennsylvania	20%	40%	10%	30%
Texas	75%	12%	3%	10%
Virginia	40%	20%	15%	25%
District of Columbia	0%	0%	100%	0%

Table. 16. Percentage of Jails in Full Compliance with Standards Relating to Classification, Supervision, and Behavior Management

	<25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-95%	>95%
Alabama	<i>Unknown</i>				
California					✓
Florida	<i>Unknown</i>				
Georgia		✓			
Hawaii		✓			
Idaho				✓	
Indiana		✓			
Iowa			✓		
Kentucky					✓
Maryland					✓
Massachusetts				✓	
Michigan			✓		
Minnesota			✓		
Nebraska					✓
New Jersey					✓
Ohio				✓	
Oklahoma		✓			
Pennsylvania		✓			
Texas				✓	
Virginia			✓		
District of Columbia			✓		

Table 17. Elements of Security Addressed by Standards

	Maintenance of a secure perimeter	Security features and devices operable and maintained in good working order	Head counts	Staff training in the use of security and restraint equipment and in the use of force	Written policies and procedures governing use of force and restraints	Written policies and procedures governing the management of inmates in disciplinary detention, administrative segregation and protective custody	Internal security inspections	Written policies and procedures governing searches of inmates, property, visitors, facilities, and vehicles	Written policies and procedures governing the controlled use and storage of keys, tools, equipment, and supplies used in the jail
Alabama	✓		✓						
California	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Florida		✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	✓
Georgia	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Hawaii			✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
Idaho	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Indiana	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Iowa				✓	✓			✓	✓
Kentucky		✓						✓	✓
Maryland	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Massachusetts	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Michigan	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		
Minnesota	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Nebraska	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
New Jersey	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Ohio	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Oklahoma	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Pennsylvania				✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
Texas	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Virginia	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
District of Columbia	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Table 18. Elements of Documentation Addressed by Standards

	Written policy and procedure governing records management	Separate maintenance/confidentiality of medical records	Release of information	Master log of all forms/records
Alabama	<i>None of the above</i>			
California	✓	✓	✓	
Florida	✓	✓	✓	
Georgia	✓	✓	✓	✓
Hawaii	✓	✓	✓	✓
Idaho	✓	✓	✓	✓
Indiana	✓	✓	✓	
Iowa	✓	✓		✓
Kentucky		✓		
Maryland	✓		✓	
Massachusetts	✓	✓	✓	
Michigan	<i>None of the above</i>			
Minnesota	✓	✓	✓	✓
Nebraska	✓	✓	✓	✓
New Jersey	✓	✓	✓	
Ohio		✓		✓
Oklahoma	✓	✓	✓	
Pennsylvania	<i>None of the above</i>			
Texas	✓	✓	✓	✓
Virginia	✓	✓	✓	
District of Columbia	✓	✓	✓	✓

Table 19. Types of Documentation Required by Standards

	Well-being checks	Inmate counts	Shift activities	Incidents	Intake and release	Classification decisions	Inmate grievances	Inmate disciplinary action	Use of force	Non-routine use of restraints	Staff training	Medical services provided	Inmate account transactions	Inspections (safety, security, sanitation)	Special management	Food services	Program participation
Alabama		✓			✓												
California	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Florida	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Georgia	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Hawaii	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Idaho	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Indiana	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Iowa	✓			✓	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓		✓	
Kentucky				✓	✓						✓						
Maryland	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Massachusetts	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Michigan									✓		✓	✓		✓		✓	
Minnesota	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Nebraska	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
New Jersey	*	✓	✓	✓	*	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	*	*		*	✓	*	✓
Ohio	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Oklahoma	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Pennsylvania				✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓	
Texas	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓			
Virginia	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
District of Columbia	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

New Jersey – Also required in municipal detention facilities (lock-ups).

Table 20. Percentage of State's Jails That Use an Automated MIS for Inmate Data

	<25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-95%	>95%
Alabama	✓				
California					✓
Florida	<i>Unknown</i>				
Georgia		✓			
Hawaii	✓				
Idaho					✓
Indiana				✓	
Iowa				✓	
Kentucky		✓			
Maryland			✓		
Massachusetts				✓	
Michigan					✓
Minnesota					✓
Nebraska					✓
New Jersey					✓
Ohio			✓		
Oklahoma			✓		
Pennsylvania			✓		
Texas				✓	
Virginia					✓
District of Columbia					✓

Table 21. Working Relationships Between Most of the State’s Jails and Their Funding Authorities

Across the state’s jurisdictions overall, the funding authority typically:

	Has a good working relationship with the jail	Is knowledgeable about jail issues and trends	Helps educate the community about the jail	Helps jail access resources of other county departments	Helps establish goals and objectives for the jail	Helps address issues and solve jail problems	Provides adequate budget	Is responsive regarding unanticipated expenses
Alabama	Mixed	No	No	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
California	<i>Not answered</i>							
Florida	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Georgia	Mixed	Mixed	Mixed	Mixed	Mixed	Mixed	Mixed	Mixed
Hawaii	Unknown	Mixed	No	No	Mixed	Mixed	No	Mixed
Idaho	Mixed	Mixed	Mixed	Mixed	Mixed	Mixed	Mixed	No
Indiana	Mixed	Mixed	No	No	No	Mixed	Mixed	Mixed
Iowa	Mixed	No	No	Unknown	No	No	Mixed	Mixed
Kentucky	Mixed	No	No	No	No	No	Mixed	Mixed
Maryland	<i>Not answered</i>							
Massachusetts	Yes	Mixed	No	Unknown	Mixed	Mixed	Yes	Mixed
Michigan	Mixed	No	Mixed	Mixed	Unknown	Mixed	Mixed	Mixed
Minnesota	Mixed	Mixed	Mixed	Mixed	Mixed	Mixed	Mixed	Mixed
Nebraska	Yes	Yes	Mixed	<i>Not answered</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Mixed
New Jersey	Unknown	Mixed	No	Unknown	Mixed	Mixed	Mixed	Unknown
Ohio	Mixed	Mixed	No	No	No	No	No	No
Oklahoma	Mixed	Mixed	Mixed	No	Mixed	Mixed	No	No
Pennsylvania	Mixed	Mixed	No	Mixed	No	Mixed	No	No
Texas	Mixed	Mixed	No	No	Mixed	Mixed	Mixed	Mixed
Virginia	Yes	Mixed	Mixed	Mixed	Yes	Yes	Yes	Mixed
District of Columbia	Yes	Yes	Mixed	Yes	Yes	Yes	Mixed	Mixed

Table 22. Elements of Fire, Safety, and Sanitation Addressed by Standards

	Written emergency response plan	Written evacuation plan with routes posted in the jail	Fire drills	Staff training in emergency policies and procedures	Written housekeeping and sanitation plan	Internal fire, safety, and sanitation inspections	Designated fire, safety, and sanitation officer
Alabama	✓	✓		✓		✓	
California	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
Florida	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Georgia	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Hawaii	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Idaho		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Indiana	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Iowa	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Kentucky	✓	✓			✓	✓	
Maryland	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
Massachusetts	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Michigan	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Minnesota	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Nebraska	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
New Jersey	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓
Ohio	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Oklahoma	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Pennsylvania	✓	✓					
Texas	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Virginia	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	
District of Columbia	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓