

About the Summary Reports

I. Vera's Process for Managing and Synthesizing the Comments Received During the Public Comment Period for the Adult Prison and Jail Draft Standards

During the public comment period for the Adult Prison and Jail Draft Standards, the Commission received over 145 submissions in response to the standards from a range of stakeholders, including professional corrections associations, state and county departments of correction, advocates, and prisoners. During the same period of time, Vera completed the Standards Implementation Needs Assessment (SINA) project, which entailed visiting nine facilities and conducting in-depth interviews with a wide variety of corrections staff and administrators. The nine facilities included three adult co-ed jails, two adult male prisons, two adult female prisons, and two juvenile facilities.

Together, the public comment period and the SINA project generated hundreds if not thousands of pages of written feedback for the Commission. In order to present this volume of information to the Commission in a succinct and coherent way, Vera created a database to manage the information and a system for coding the public comment and SINA feedback to capture the most salient points in the forms, letters, and transcripts. We reviewed the public comment submissions and SINA transcripts and coded for the following:

CATEGORIES	CODES								
	Academic	Advocate	Corrections Professional	Government	Individual	Labor Union	Professional Organization	SINA	Prisoner
Type of Comment	Concern/Disagreement	Current Practice	Question	Observation	Support/Agreement	Suggestion	Unintended Consequence		
Standard Body	Prison/Jail	Juvenile	Immigration	Lockup	Community Correction				
Standards	Each Standard	All Standards	Introduction	Compliance Guide	Glossary				
Standard Component	Standard Statement	Discussion	Checklist	N/A	All				
Actual Comment	Text from Actual Comment Submission								

We coded for **source** based on submitter information. Academics, advocates, labor unions, SINA sites, and prisoners were easily identified and coded accordingly. We used “corrections professional” for any submission received on behalf of a state, county, or federal prison system and for any submission received by individuals who worked in a state, county, or federal prison system. We reserved “government” primarily for the Federal Bureau of Prisons but also used it for any other comments received from general government agencies. We used “individual” for submitters who were simply concerned citizens or unaffiliated professionals who submitted comments.

We coded for **type of comment** based on nature and tone of the comments submitted:

- Concern/disagreement—Used for comments that expressed concerns or negative views of standards.
- Current practice—Used for statements about facility operations as they related to the standards.

- **Question**—Used for requests for information or clarification about the standards or their implementation.
- **Observation**—Used for general comments about or related to the standards.
- **Support/Agreement**—Used for comments that expressed positive views or support of the standards.
- **Suggestion**—Used for comments that proposed changes or additions to the standards.
- **Unintended Consequence**—Used for comments that expressed possible negative outcomes of implementing the standards.

For **standard body**, we simply coded for the draft on which people submitted comments. In this binder we have only included comments that were made on the Adult Prison and Jail Draft Standards.

For **standard**, we coded each comment by the standard it addressed. We coded comments on specific standards using the individual standard title. For global comments about all of the standards, we used “all.” For comments on the “Introduction,” “Compliance Guide,” and “Glossary,” we used “introduction,” “compliance guide,” and “glossary,” respectively.

For **standard component**, we coded each comment by the standard component that it addressed: “standard statement,” “discussion,” or “checklist.” In cases where the comment referred to all components, or did not specify a particular component, we used “all.” Likewise, for global comments not directly linked to a specific standard or standard component, we used “N/A.”

The **actual comment** is the text of the comment itself.

After coding the documents, we entered all of the information into a database and used the database to generate the summary reports contained in this binder. The summary reports in this binder are drawn from:

- The SINA transcripts from all of the adult prison and jail site visits
- Approximately 95% of all of the comments received during the public comment period

Please note that because of the unique nature and format of the ACA’s submission and because Jenni sent each of you an electronic copy of their full submission, we did not code or enter into the database ACA’s comment submission.

II. The Summary Reports

The reports that follow are organized by standard, and each report contains all of the comments received and coded for the given standard. We have assembled the reports to match the order in which the standards appear in the draft, and each report/standard is separated by a blue piece of paper so you can easily see all of the comments received for each standard. Additionally, we have included the global comments on the draft that the Commission received, which we have called “All” to indicate that those comments pertain to all of the standards. We have also included comments on the introduction, compliance guide, and glossary.

When you look at the reports that follow, you will see headers at the top of each page that read: Type of Comment, Standard Components, and Source. In gray, under those headers, you will see subheadings for the actual type of comment (Concern/Disagreement, Current Practice, Observation,

and so forth), standard components that were commented on (Standard Statement, Discussion, and/or Checklist), and the source of the comment (SINA, Corrections Professional, Advocate, and so on). The text of the comments appears under those subheadings.

III. Preparing for the July 28-29th Meeting

Please review these summary reports in preparation for the July 28-29th meeting. You have already received the first half of the public comment feedback via mail, and in this binder is included a CD prepared by NPREC staff with the complete set of comments received during the public comment period. We have also included the NPREC staff's log of all the comments received.

We are hopeful that all of these materials will be helpful to as you think through the issues in preparation for the meeting. We look forward to walking you through the important decisions you will be making on July 28 and 29 to ensure the success of these standards.