

62660,

The National Evaluation of the Standards and Goals Project

Concordance of Criminal Justice Standards

adopted by the States and the National Advisory Commission

Blair B. Bourque and D. Rigney Hill

Prepared for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, Department of Justice, under Contract No. J-LEAA-007-77.

December 1978



The National Evaluation of the Standards and Goals Project

Concordance of Criminal Justice Standards

adopted by the States and the National Advisory Commission

Blair B. Bourque and D. Rigney Hill

Prepared for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, Department of Justice, under Contract No. J-LEAA-007-77.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official opinions or policies of the Department of Justice.

December 1978

ACQUISITIONS
NOV 8 1979
NCJRS



Introduction

This volume is a product of the National Evaluation of LEAA's Standards and Goals (S&G) Program. The S&G program was active during the period 1974-77. The evaluation was conducted by the American Institutes for Research in 1977-78.

It was the intent of the S&G program that each state develop its own set of standards for the operation of its criminal justice institutions--law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, public defense services, courts, and the correctional system. The standards were to include topics that cut across LE/CJ institutions such as juveniles, system planning, information systems, and crime prevention. By March 1978, 45 of the states had developed standards for at least some aspect of the LE/CJ system. Most states published their standards as a separate volume explicitly designated as the product of the S&G Program. Some states simply included the standards in their comprehensive state plans. Four additional states with S&G programs had not published any standards by that date, and two states chose not to participate in the program.

The standards do not have the force of law or even of administrative regulation. They were typically produced by a commission of leading figures in the state's law enforcement and criminal justice system. Often, prominent lay persons were also included. The commission was typically supported by a research and administrative staff, functioning in much the same role as a congressional committee staff. The standards they produced can be read as an official statement of where a state wants its law enforcement and criminal justice system to be heading, and the minimum acceptable practices that the system should permit. The standards were not always adopted by the State Planning Agencies (SPAs), nor were the LE/CJ agencies in some states aware of their existence (see Table 1).

TABLE 1. State Planning Agencies (SPA) Adoption of State Standards and Goals

STATE	Status of volume	Adopted by SPA?	Publication date of volume	SECTORS COVERED BY VOLUME						FORMAT OF VOLUME			COMMENTS	
				Law enforcement: Courts	Corrections	Systems	Community crime prevention	Juvenile justice	Commentary	Implementation strategies	Priority rankings	Comparative analysis of S/Gs to implementation status		Current state practice description
ALABAMA	Final	Yes	2/76	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	1 ABA S/Gs were adopted, no separate volume published
ALASKA	Final	Yes	6/76	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
ARIZONA	Final	Yes	2/77	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
ARKANSAS	Final	Yes	6/76	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
CALIFORNIA	Draft	No	12/74	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	2. Juvenile justice S/Gs are in draft form. 3 Adopted as an advisory document to the Governor.
COLORADO	Final	Yes	6/77	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
CONNECTICUT	Final	Yes	5/76	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
DELAWARE	Draft	Yes	12/76	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
FLORIDA	Final ²	Yes ³	7/76	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	2. Juvenile justice S/Gs are in draft form. 3 Adopted as an advisory document to the Governor.
GEORGIA	Final	Yes	3/76	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
Hawaii*	S/Gs are being revised--no document produced yet.													
IDAHO	Final	No	6/75	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	4 SPA will use as a working document--no formal adoption 5 Represents only the S/Gs for the nonmetropolitan areas, two additional S/G programs, but no volumes were published at time of this report.
Illinois*	Final	No ⁴	4/77 ⁵	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
INDIANA	Final	Yes	5/78	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
IOWA	Final	Yes	1/77	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	6 Final volume will be published in July 1978
KANSAS	Final	Yes	5/77	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
Kentucky*	S/Gs included in the 1978 Plan; document not received at time of report													
LOUISIANA	Final	Yes	10/75	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	7 S/Gs included in the 1977 State Plan and Court Standards adopted 10/76.
MAINE	Fin.Draft ⁶	No	12/77	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
MARYLAND	NA ⁷	Yes	1976	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
Massachusetts*	Draft	Yes	1976	S/G volume not received by time of this writing										
MICHIGAN	Final	Yes	4/75	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	8 S/Gs included in the 1976 Comprehensive State Plan.
MINNESOTA	Final	Yes	10/75	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
MISSISSIPPI	NA ⁸	No	NA	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
MISSOURI	Final	Yes	2/76	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
MONTANA	Final	Yes	7/76	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	9 S/Gs from NAC were approved one by one; volume of collected standards will not be published.
NEBRASKA	Final	Yes	NA ⁹	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
NEVADA	Draft	Accept	2/77	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
NEW HAMPSHIRE	Fin.Draft	Yes	9/76 ¹⁰	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	10 Courts volume published 1/77.
NEW JERSEY	Final	Yes ¹¹	6/77	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
NEW MEXICO	Final	Yes	1/77	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	11. Comparison of NAC standards and state status. 12 S/Gs adopted by Governor, never formally adopted by SPA.
New York*	S/G program started as of 4/77; no document published as of 9/78.													
NORTH CAROLINA	Final	Yes	7/76	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	13. Volume will always be in draft form to permit flexibility and revision.
NORTH DAKOTA	Final	Endorsed	12/75	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
OHIO	Final	Yes	1/77	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
OKLAHOMA	Final	Yes	4/77	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
OREGON	Draft ¹³	Yes	1975	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	13. Volume will always be in draft form to permit flexibility and revision.
PENNSYLVANIA	Final	Yes	3/76	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
Rhode Island*	S/Gs are still in draft form--no document produced yet.													
SOUTH CAROLINA	Final	Yes	1977	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	14 S/Gs revised in 1977.
SOUTH DAKOTA	Final	Yes	12/76	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
TENNESSEE	Final ¹⁴	Yes	1975	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
TEXAS	Final	No	7/76	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
UTAH	Final	Yes	8/74	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	15. Not all standards were adopted.
Vermont*	No S/G program													
VIRGINIA	Final	Endorsed ¹⁵	3/77	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	16 S/Gs will not be published in a separate volume, are in Comprehensive State Plan.
WASHINGTON	Draft	Yes	NA ¹⁶	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
West Virginia*	S/Gs are in the 1976 Comprehensive State Plan; document not received by time of this writing													
WISCONSIN	Final	Yes	1/77	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	17. Juvenile Justice S/Gs were published 12/75 as a separate volume.
Wyoming*	S/Gs are still in draft form--no document produced yet.													

* States not included in concordance study.

The concordance of standards and goals that follows embraces 41 states that had completed standards development by March 1978, and for which the S&G document was publicly available. It focuses on 136 selected topics--"key elements" as we labeled them--that specified policy and practice in concrete detail. The topics were chosen from the five volumes produced by the National Advisory Commission in 1973: those dealing with police, courts, corrections, the criminal justice system, and community crime prevention. Several criteria governed the selection of standards. They were to be specific enough to entail an identifiable behavior or activity by an agency affected by the standard. Thus, broad and undefined standards such as "Every police agency should insure its operational effectiveness in dealing with other elements in the criminal justice system" were eliminated from consideration. Standards were also eliminated if they appeared to address self-evident or incontrovertible truths, or if they merely endorsed policies or practices that were settled by some other authority such as a legal statute or a court decision. Another obvious criterion was the intrinsic importance and salience of the issues the standards addressed to the criminal justice system.

Data reported on the following pages were obtained by combing the standards volumes of the 41 states and determining the stance of each state on each of the 136 key elements. In the final step, the variations on each key element were grouped into a manageable number of categories, with footnotes indicating significant deviations.

When interpreting the tables, it should be remembered that states varied in their approaches to standards development. Some states, such as South Carolina, developed standards only on a few topics of highest priority in that state; hence, South Carolina did not have standards for most of the topics in this comparison. Other states virtually copied the National Advisory Commission (NAC) standards. Still others went beyond the scope of NAC, and developed standards on topics not covered in this analysis. At each of these extremes, the impressions left by the tables could occasionally be misleading. Most states, however, used NAC as a guide, applying their own thinking to the topics we covered.

Many coding decisions were necessarily subjective. In particular, we sometimes wavered on the question of whether to code "no standard," when a remotely relevant item had been found. The rule was that the state standard must address the specific topic indicated by the key element. But there were borderline cases.

It should also be noted that states were often ambiguous about what constituted a "standard," as distinct from an "implementation strategy," or just "commentary." We took a broad interpretation of "standard," using most of the material in the volumes, regardless of its official label. Information retrieved from commentary is generally italicized in the following tables.

The results of this exercise were used as a basis for much of the analysis in the evaluation reports.* But it is our hope that the complete state-by-state breakdown will be of reference value to SPAs and other criminal justice planning agencies. Hence this concordance.

*American Institutes for Research. *The National Evaluation of the Standards and Goals Program*. 2 vols. Washington, D.C.: AIR, 1978.

Contents

I. LAW ENFORCEMENT

Organization and Planning	1
Operations	6
Specialization	15
Personnel Policies	27

II. PROSECUTION

Prosecution Process	43
Personnel	51

III. PUBLIC DEFENDER

Organization and Planning	54
Defense Function	60
Personnel	63

IV. COURTS

Court Process	70
Court Organization	82
Court Personnel	88

V. CORRECTIONS

Sentencing	91
Correctional Programs	103
Offender Rights	116
Facility Construction	124
Local Correctional Facilities	127
Training and Education	131
Organization and Planning	134



Concordance Tables

**LAW ENFORCEMENT
Organization and Planning**

**1. Establishment
of Police Goals
and Objectives**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC					
• Revise agency objectives and priorities . . . annually in conjunction with budget preparation.	•	•		•		•				•		•	•	•		•								•	•			•						•					•						20			
• Revise agency objectives and priorities periodically (no budget tie-in).							•	•	•		• a						•												•		•														•	9		
• Establish agency objectives and priorities (no mention of update or revision).					•										•	•																														3		
• No standard.		•																•	•	•	•	•			•	•																			•	9		
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	*	*		*	*	*				*		*		*		*								*	*		*		*	*				*													*	18

a. Applicable to agencies with more than 100 sworn personnel only.

**LAW ENFORCEMENT
Organization and Planning**

2. Planning Capabilities

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex-cluding NAC			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employ at least one full-time planner in agencies with at least 75 personnel. In agencies with fewer than 75 personnel, assign responsibility for planning to a designated employee. 	●	●			●							●	●	●											●			●											●					10		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have a full-time planner in large police agencies and have some planning capability in small agencies. 										●																															●				2	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish a planning capability consistent with agency size and planning tasks. 									●																			●																		3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish or improve planning capabilities. 			●			●	●				●				●		●		●														●	●											10	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No standard 		●		●				●									●		●		●	●	●	●		●	●				●	●								●	●				16	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Target date for implementation (* = immediately) 	*	*			*							*	*	*	78										*		*		*				*	*	78	*								13		

a. Refers to agencies with 50 or more personnel instead of 75.

**LAW ENFORCEMENT
Organization and Planning**

**3. Formation of
Criminal Justice
Coordinating
Councils**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC			
• Establish criminal justice coordinating councils in jurisdictions of 30,000 or more persons.										•																																				1
• Consider and where appropriate form a criminal justice coordinating council.	•	•		•	•	•			•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•			•	•		•	•	•	•			•		•		•	•	•							27
• Conduct joint planning and exchange information with other criminal justice agencies.							•	•																	•											•										4
• No standard		•																			•	•								•	•		•	•						•	•				9	
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	*	*			*	*	*						*	*	78	*		*		*	*			*	*		*			*						*	78			*					18	

**LAW ENFORCEMENT
Organization and Planning**

**4. Consolidation
of Police
Agencies**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC		
• Consolidate police agencies with fewer than 10 employees.	•	•										•	•				•																												5
• Consolidate police agencies with fewer than 20 or 24 employees.						• b													•																										2
• Consolidate police agencies if that is the most effective and efficient way to provide adequate (i.e., 24-hour) police service.							•							•						•							• c							• d						•					6
• Consider the feasibility of consolidation.				•							• e				•												•				•	•			•		•								9
• No standard		•		•				•	•	•						•	•			•	•	•	•	•	•			•		•				•		•									19
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	*	*				*	*					*	*		78												*		*																8

a. Advises combining or contracting for services, but states that the minimum number of sworn officers employed by any agency should be 10.
 b. Advocates consolidation only when there are no compelling geographic reasons to the contrary.
 c. Advocates that state funding be provided for this purpose.
 d. Adds that no arbitrary limit on agency size should be imposed and that no agency employee should lose salary or status as a result of such consolidation.
 e. Relates only to jurisdictions of less than 5,000

**LAW ENFORCEMENT
Organization and Planning**

**5. Combining
Police Services**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC					
• Consider combining or contracting for police services with other agencies	•			•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•			•		•		•																	•	30			
• Develop joint task force efforts or personnel exchange programs among police agencies		•			•																					•																				•	4	
• No standard			•																		•	•		•						•		•		•														7
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	*	*		*	*		*			*		*	*	*		*		82							*			*	*	*							*	77	*	*	*						19	

- a. Relates to counties of over 100,000 population only.
- b. Relates to jurisdictions of less than 5,000 population only.
- c. Relates to agencies unable to provide 24 hours/7 day service only.

**LAW ENFORCEMENT
Operations**

1. Geographic Policing

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total excluding NAC							
• Adopt geographic policing programs with stable officer assignments where feasible.	•	•			•					•			•	•					•	•							•																		12					
• Study the alternatives of neighborhood team policing, geographic policing, and other patrol methods, and implement those best suited to local needs.						•									•														•							•	•	•	•							7				
• Develop state-wide guidelines on the use of different types of patrol methods.											•																																			1				
• No standard		•	•	•			•	•				•				•	•	•		•		•	•			•	•			•		•	•	•	•					•	•					21				
• Target date for implementation (* - immediately)															80																															79	*			3

**LAW ENFORCEMENT
Operations**

**2. Criteria for
Allocation
of Patrol
Resources**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC		
• Allocate patrol personnel on the basis of explicit geographical and chronological criteria.	●	●		●	●	●		●	●	●		●	●	●		●	● a		●		●				●		●	●					●			●	●	●						22	
• Study or consider patrol allocation alternatives.						●																						●																	2
• Develop state-wide guidelines on the use of alternative patrol distribution plans.										●																																			1
• No standard		●													●		●		●		●	●	●		●				●	●	●		●	●	●				●	●				16	
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	*	*		*	*		77	*				*	*			*					*				*			*	*					*			*	*	*						16

a. Adds that the system may not be applicable to smaller departments.

**LAW ENFORCEMENT
Operations**

3. Use of Workload Studies to Allocate Patrol Resources

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total excluding NAC
• Conduct comprehensive workload studies at least annually, for establishing patrol activity priorities and operational objectives.	•	•			•	•		•		•			•	•			•	•		•					•								•				•	•				16	
• Conduct comprehensive workload studies for establishing patrol activity priorities and operational objectives without specifying annually.				•								•				•		•									•								•	•							8
• Maintain data from the criminal justice information system for use in making allocation decisions.									•						•																					•							3
• No standard		•					•			•									•		•	•	•		•		•		•	•				•				•	•				14
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	*	*			*	*			*			*	*		80	*									*		*	*					*		*	80	*	*					16

**LAW ENFORCEMENT
Operations**

**4. Closure of Investigations
by Patrol
Officers**

Content of Standard	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC		
• Allow patrol officers to close criminal investigations that do not require extensive followup	•	•		•		•		•		•		•	•		•			•		•					•		•																		19
• No standard			•		•		•		•		•			•		•	•		•	•		•	•	•		•	•		•			•	•	•											22
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	*	*				*															*				*		*		*																11

**LAW ENFORCEMENT
Operations**

**5. Telephone
Investigation
of Misdemeanors**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC			
• Consider the collection of misdemeanor and miscellaneous incidents by telephone where appropriate	•	•			•				•			•	•	•		•	•								•		•		•															12		
• Provide a procedure for accepting reports of criminal incidents not requiring field investigation					•		•								•																•													4		
• No standard			•	•			•		•		•							•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•		•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	25
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	*	*			*	*			*			*	*	*		*									*		*		*																11	

**LAW ENFORCEMENT
Operations**

**6. Exercise of Discretion:
Investigations**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC		
• Establish policy for the exercise of discretion in the conduct of investigations.	•	•		•		•		•		•		•	•					•	•					•	•		•	•	•	•							•	•	•	•			24		
• Establish policy for the exercise of discretion in general.							•										•																											2	
• Seek legislation or authority to permit discretion in the conduct of investigations.																																												•	1
• No standard			•		•				•		•			•						•	•	•	•			•				•		•										•		14	
• Target date for implementation (* - immediately)																																												76	1

**LAW ENFORCEMENT
Operations**

**7. Exercise of Discretion:
Arrests**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC					
• Establish policy for the exercise of discretion in using arrest alternatives.	•	•		•		•				•		•	•	•	•				•	•				•	•		•	•	•				•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	25				
• Establish policy for the exercise of discretion in general.						•										•										•																				3		
• Seek legislation or authority to permit discretion in selection of arrest alternatives.																	•																													•	2	
• No standard		•		•				•	•		•									•	•	•			•					•				•													11	
• Target date for implementation (* immediately)																																															76	1

**LAW ENFORCEMENT
Operations**

8. Use of Citations and Summons in Lieu of Arrest

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total excluding NAC		
• Implement programs or utilize existing statutes permitting use of summons or citations in lieu of physical arrest or prearraignment confinement.	•	•		•		•			•	•		•	•	•			•		•						•		•	•	•	•							•					•	22		
• Implement programs or utilize existing statutes permitting use of citations in lieu of physical arrest or prearraignment confinement.																•		•					•																						4
• Implement programs or utilize existing statutes permitting use of summons in lieu of physical arrest or prearraignment confinement.			• a																							•																			3
• Seek legislation allowing use of citations or summons in lieu of arrest.							•				•					•																													4
• No standard					•			•												•	•	•		•						•														•	9
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	*											*			78										*		*	*	*																11

a. In misdemeanor cases.

**LAW ENFORCEMENT
Operations**

9. Diversion Policies

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC					
• Divert some offenders pursuant to written policy, for some juvenile offenders, misdemeanants, and mentally ill persons.	•	•		•		•				•		•	•			•			•						•			•																	13			
• Divert some juvenile offenders and mentally ill persons pursuant to written policy.															•			•																													7	
• Divert some juvenile offenders pursuant to written policy.			•		•			•										•			•						• a																					8
• Divert some offenders pursuant to written policy.							•		•																				•																			4
• No standard											•			•								•	•	•	•																							9
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	*	*		*	*	*						*	*			*									*		*	*	*					*												77	16	

a. Also advocates the development of written policy governing all police situations.

**LAW ENFORCEMENT
Specialization**

**1. Specialized
Capabilities:
Intelligence**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC			
• Maintain a full-time intelligence capability in agencies with more than 75 personnel	•	•				•							•	•	•						•				•											•	•	•		•				13		
• Maintain a part-time or full-time intelligence capability depending on agency size and local needs									•	•		•				•		•										•	•																	7
• Study the need for intelligence specialization							•																																							1
• No standard		•	•	•				•			•						•		•	•		•	•	•		•	•			•	•	•	•	•						•			•		20	
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	*	*				*						*	*	*		*									*		*									*	77	*	*						12	

- a. With more than 200 officers
- b. Opts for a state-wide system of gathering and disseminating information.
- c. Refers to agencies with more than 50 instead of 75.
- d. Advocates the use of generalists whenever possible with specialization only after careful investigation.

**LAW ENFORCEMENT
Specialization**

**2. Specialized
Capabilities:
Vice**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC			
• Maintain full-time vice investigation capability in police agencies with more than 75 personnel.	•	•				•						•	•	•	•						• ^a				•											• ^a	•							13		
• Maintain full-time vice investigation capability depending on local needs and agency size				•				•	•						•			•																												7
• Study the need for specialized capability in vice investigation							•																																							1
• No standard		•		•			•			•							•	•		•		•	•	•						•	•	•								•	•	•				18
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	*	*				*						*	*	*							*				*			*	*	*				*			77		*						13	

a. Refers to agencies with more than 50 personnel instead of 75.

**LAW ENFORCEMENT
Specialization**

**3. Specialized Capabilities:
Drugs and Narcotics**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total excluding NAC			
• Maintain a full-time narcotic and drug investigation capability in agencies with more than 75 personnel	•	•			•	•						•	•	•	•						• ^a				•									•	• ^b	•	• ^a		•					17		
• Maintain a full-time narcotic and drug investigation capability depending on local needs and agency size				•				•	•						•			• ^c	•																		•							7		
• Study the need for specialization in drugs and narcotics							•																																						1	
• Develop regional crime squads specializing in drug and narcotic investigation							•																				•																			2
• No standard		•								•						•			•	•	•	•			•					•	•	•						•	•	•				14		
• Target date for implementation (* = inmediately)	*													*							*							*	*	*				*											8	

a. Refers to agencies with more than 50 personnel instead of 75.

b. Refers to agencies with more than 25 personnel instead of 75.

c. Advocates providing drug training to all officers and specializing only after careful investigation of the need.

**LAW ENFORCEMENT
Specialization**

**5. Specialized
Capabilities:
Evidence
Technicians**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC				
• Ensure the availability of trained evidence technicians on a 24-hour basis	●	●		●	●	●				●		●	●	●	●	●		●							●			●	●	●	●														20		
• Ensure the availability of trained evidence technicians when they are needed							●				●									●																										3	
• Ensure the availability of trained evidence technicians through a state or regional laboratory system																											●																				2
• Consider the use of trained evidence technicians																																															1
• No standard		●						●	●								●	●			●	●	●	●		●					●			●												15	
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)						*																																									1

a. Not necessarily on a 24-hour basis.

b. Refers only to those agencies with a 24-hour police capability.

c. Advocates that each county have a 24-hour capability and that counties with less than 100,000 population combine with neighboring counties to provide full-time evidence technician services.

**LAW ENFORCEMENT
Specialization**

6. Access to Crime Laboratories

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC	
• Ensure access to at least one crime laboratory (state, regional, or local) capable of efficient processing of physical evidence	●	●		●	●	●	●		●	● b	● a	●	●	●	●	●	● a	●	● a	●		●	●	●	●	●	● a	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	33
• No standard			●					●												●					●								●		●				●		●		8	
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	*																																											1

- a. Stipulates that the state should legislate or order the development and funding of crime labs.
- b. Within 24 hours travel time.
- c. Advocates using the State Bureau of Investigation's facility.

**LAW ENFORCEMENT
Specialization**

**7. Internal
Complaint
Unit**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC	
• Use a specialized unit or individual to investigate complaints against officers	•	•						•		•		•	•	•		•		•							•							• ^a	•			•	•	•					17	
• Use a specialized unit or individual to investigate serious complaints against officers																																							•	•				2
• Investigate complaints according to written policy and procedures						•									•			•									•						•											6
• Ensure that all complaints are investigated				•																																								1
• No standard		•		•	•		•		•		•						•			•	•	•	•	•		•																	•	15
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	*	*				*				*		*	*	*		*		*							*		*	*	*				*		*	77	*	*					17	

a. Advocated only when agency resources permit.

**LAW ENFORCEMENT
Specialization**

**8. Police Liaison
with the Media**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC		
• Establish regular liaison with the media through a full-time specialist officer (or unit, depending on agency size and media demands).	•	•		•	•					•	•	•	•	•			•							•	•	•		•																19	
• Assign at least a part-time officer to media liaison.									•																																				1
• Develop a policy or program with regard to the news media.							•								•							•					•	•				•		•										8	
• No standard		•		•				•								•		•	•	•	•		•							•		•												•	13
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	*	*									*	*	*										*	*			*	*				*		*	77	*	*						13		

**LAW ENFORCEMENT
Specialization**

**9. Specialized
Capabilities:
Juveniles**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC					
• Utilize a specially trained juvenile officer or unit.									•								•						•																								5	
• Utilize a specially specially trained juvenile officer of unit (for agencies with more than 15 officers).	•	•			• b	•		• d		• a		•	•		•	•			•		•	•		•	•			•	•																		• c	24
• Provide officers with specific training in juvenile delinquency topics.			•															•																														2
• No standard				•			•			•			•						•									•		•	•									•	•						10	
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	*	* 78			*					78		* *			76 *						*		*	*	*										*		*	78		*				80	17			

- a. Refers to agencies with more than 10 officers.
- b. Refers to agencies with more than 12 officers.
- c. Refers to agencies with more than 13 officers.
- d. Refers to agencies with more than 25 officers.
- e. Refers to agencies with more than 50 officers.

**LAW ENFORCEMENT
Specialization**

**10. Assignment of
of Police
Officers to
Schools**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC				
• Assign a full-time officer to each secondary school, for counseling and teaching classes (when school cooperation can be obtained).	• b												•	•									•	•					•								•	•					8				
• Assign a part-time officer to each secondary school, for counseling and teaching classes (when school cooperation can be obtained).												•																•									•								3		
• Assign a part-time officer to each secondary school if agency resources permit or if the program is believed to be beneficial.		•		•																																										2	
• Establish liaison officers to improve police-school relations.																			•							•			•																	3	
• Initiate some other type of educational program for the secondary schools.								•													•																									2	
• No standard		•		•	•	•		•	•	•	•					•	•	•	•		•		•				•								•	•	•	•	•			•	•			24	
• Target date for implementation (* - immediately)	*																																														1

a. Refers to police agencies with more than 200 employees.
b. Refers to police agencies with more than 400 employees only.

**LAW ENFORCEMENT
Specialization**

**11. Presentations
at Schools
by Police
Officers**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC		
• Ensure that classroom presentations are conducted at specified intervals by uniformed officers at all elementary schools in each jurisdiction.	•	•		•		• a						•	•	•	•	•	•							•	•			•									•	•					18		
• Same as above, without specifying frequency or regularity of presentations.								•		• c										•		•																	• a					5	
• No standard			•		•		•		•		•							•	•				•			•	•			•											•	•			18
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)		*		*								*	*		*	*	*							*	*			*		*		*		*		*	*							16	

- a. Advocates presentations only when local conditions permit.
- b. Advocates presentations at all schools in a jurisdiction.
- c. Suggests only that presentations be encouraged.

**LAW ENFORCEMENT
Specialization**

**12. Crime
Prevention
Programs**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC				
• Establish crime prevention programs that include (a) dissemination of crime prevention information, (b) volunteer neighborhood security efforts, and (c) security programs for commercial establishments.	•	•		•		•	•			•		•	•	•		•	•			•	•				•	•	•	•																	28		
• Establish crime prevention programs that include (a) dissemination of crime prevention information and (b) security programs for commercial establishments.																																															1
• Establish crime prevention programs that include (a) dissemination of crime prevention information, and (b) volunteer neighborhood security efforts.			•																		•																										3
• Increase community involvement in crime prevention.					•			•							•			•																													4
• No standard									•	•									•				•																	•		•				6	
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	*	*				77					*	*	*		*					*			*	*			*	*								*	79	*		*	*	*	*		18		

- a. Also suggests strengthening security ordinances and codes and improving environmental design.
- b. Also suggests establishing crime prevention bureaus that transcend municipal boundaries.
- c. Specifies that communities with populations of more than 10,000 should have crime prevention bureaus.
- d. Specifies that jurisdictions of 20,000 or more should have special crime prevention officers.

**LAW ENFORCEMENT
Personnel Policies**

**2. Standards for
the Selection
of Police
Officers**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC			
• Develop state standards for police officer selection through an existing commission or council										•	•		•	•						•														• ^a				•				•	9			
• Develop state standards for police officer selection through legislative action	•	•		•		•			•						•	•			•		•				•		•	•										•	•					15		
• Develop state mandatory minimum standards for police officer selection							• ^c					• ^b																																	2	
• Develop local selection standards for individual agencies																																														1
• No standard		•		•				•									•	•				•	•	•		•				•										•		•		14		
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	75					75									77	76			76									78	77															79	7	

a. Adds that by 1976, legislation should empower Commission to enforce selection standards.
 b. Advocates using P.O.S.T. standards.
 c. Advocates adhering to the State Intergovernmental Personnel Act in setting selection policy.

**LAW ENFORCEMENT
Personnel Policies**

**3. Enforcement
of Selection
Standards**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC			
• Use a state commission to inspect local agencies for compliance with selection standards	•	•		•		• c					• b	•			•					•					•	•		•				•			•	•	•							17		
• Use a state commission to enforce selection standards					•			•	•	•					•																															5
• No standard			•				•					•	•				•	•	•	•		•	•	•			•		•				•					•	•	•					19	
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	75	75	75	75	75										77	76												78	77					76			79							10		

- a. Advocates that the current practice of inspecting local agencies for compliance be continued.
- b. Adds that the State should certify agencies based on compliance to selection standards.
- c. Adds that the State should certify only those officers who have met the selection standards.

**LAW ENFORCEMENT
Personnel Policies**

4. Reserve Officer Programs

Content of Standard	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total excluding NAC			
• Establish a reserve officer program when there is a need to augment the sworn officer force.	●	●				●	●			●	● ^a	●			●	●	●							■	●		●	●		●							●	●	●		●			18		
• (Statements in the standards indicate that reserve officers are currently used.)														●																●															2	
• Consider establishing a reserve officer program.				●									●				●											●				●						●							6	
• No standard		●		●				●	●									●	●	●	●	●			●					●			●	●					●		●				15	
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	*	*				*				*	*														*		*		*										*	77	*	*				11

a. Refers to agencies with at least 10 sworn personnel only and advocates that volunteers be required to serve at least 16 hrs. per month.
 ■ State has standard on topic; content data unavailable.

**LAW ENFORCEMENT
Personnel Policies**

**5. Use of Civilians
in Police
Positions**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC			
• Use civilians in positions not requiring peace officer status.	•	•		•		•	•		•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	• ^a							•			•	•	•	•			•	•		•							•	25	
• Use civilians in positions not requiring peace officer status (for agencies with at least 10 personnel).											•																																			1
• Study or encourage the use of civilians.			•																							•											•									3
• Use civilians for property system or technical positions only.								•																																						2
• No standard					•														•	•	•	•	•	•		•								•												10
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	*	*	*	*	*						*					*									*				*																	11

a. Advocates civilianization only where it is fiscally feasible.

**LAW ENFORCEMENT
Personnel Policies**

**7. Educational
Incentives
for Police
Officers**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC		
• Adopt the following educational incentives when they do not interfere with the delivery of police services: (a) duty or shift adjustments to facilitate college attendance, (b) financial assistance for books and tuition, and (c) pay incentives for college credits.		•	•	•	•	•						•	•					•	•				•	•		•	•	•	•			•	•				•	•					19		
• Same as Item 1 above, omitting pay incentives.										•					•																		•											3	
• Same as Item 1 above, omitting duty and shift adjustments.									•																												•							2	
• Same as Item 1 above, omitting financial assistance.		•																																											1
• Same as Item 1 above, providing for pay incentives only.											•																																		1
• Same as Item 1 above, providing for duty or shift adjustments only (or leave with pay)														•																															2
• Provide adequate educational incentives.					•			•								•			•		•																								5
• No standard																	•			•			•			•															•	•			8
• Target date for implementation (* - immediately)		* 78			*				*		*	*			*				*		*						*						*		*	77	*	*						15	

a. Recommends that LEEP funds be made available.
 b. Advocates that these incentives be considered only.
 c. Limits leave with pay for education to 40 hours per year.

**LAW ENFORCEMENT
Personnel Policies**

8. Training Requirements

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total excluding NAC		
• Legislate minimum preservice training requirements for sworn police officers.	•	•				•		• b			•		•	•		•				•	• c	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•		• a		•			•		•				20		
• (Statements in the standards indicate that legislation setting minimum training requirements already exist.)											•							•		•						•																			9
• (Other standards indicate that authority for setting training standards is vested in existing board, commission, or council.)			•	•	•		•		•	•			•			•			•																										9
• No standard.																														•		•												3	
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	75	76			76	78					76	76		78	76																														12

a. States that exceptions may be made for smaller agencies.
b. Does not specify that the standards be for preservice training.
c. Adds that the training be completed within one year of service.

**LAW ENFORCEMENT
Personnel Policies**

9. In-Service Training

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex-cluding NAC			
• For sworn officers up to and including captain, provide at least 40 hours of inservice training annually.	•	•			•	•		•		•	• ^a	•			•	•			•		•	•	•	•	•		•											•					26			
• For sworn officers up to and including captain, provide at least 30-35 hours of in-service training annually.																		•																											2	
• For sworn officers up to and including captain, provide at least 40 hours of in-service training every two years.																																													1	
• Provide in-service training (no other specifications).		•	•			•		•						•												• ^b																				7
• Study, consider, or identify in-service training needs.																				•																									2	
• No standard.																	•									•																				3
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	75	75				76	77			78		75						82			76							75		77															14	

a. Applies to all officers with 2 yrs. of service.

b. Advocates legislation requiring annual training hours to be set by the Police Personnel Standards Board.

**LAW ENFORCEMENT
Personnel Policies**

**10. Criminal
Justice
Training
Centers**

Content of Standard	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC		
• Establish criminal justice training center(s) to provide training for officers without access to local facilities.	•	•		•	•	•	•		•			•	•	•	•	•	•				•			•	•	•	•	•	•								•		•				24		
• (Other standards indicate that criminal justice training centers are already in existence.)			•					•		• a													•																						8
• No standard											•							•	•	•		•								•			•												9
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	78	78		78	78			78			78										78			78	78	78		82		80														11	

a. Specifies that legislation should empower P.O.S.T. to approve institutions and facilities for training of officers and recruits.

b. Advocates one center only.

**LAW ENFORCEMENT
Personnel Policies**

**11. Rules for
Conduct and
Appearance**

	• Provide officers with written rules of conduct and appearance at the time of employment.	• No standard	• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)
NAC	●		*
Alabama	●		*
Alaska		●	
Arizona	●		*
Arkansas		●	
California	●		*
Colorado		●	
Connecticut		●	
Delaware		●	
Florida	●		*
Georgia		●	
Idaho		●	
Indiana	●		*
Iowa	●		*
Kansas	●		
Louisiana	●		*
Maine		●	
Maryland		●	
Michigan	●		
Minnesota		●	
Mississippi		●	
Missouri		●	
Montana		●	
Nebraska		●	
Nevada	●		*
New Hampshire		●	
New Jersey		●	
New Mexico	●		*
North Carolina	●		
North Dakota		●	
Ohio		●	
Oklahoma	●		
Oregon		●	
Pennsylvania	●		*
South Carolina		●	
South Dakota	●		*
Tennessee	●		77
Texas	●		
Utah	●		*
Virginia	●		*
Washington	●		
Wisconsin		●	
Total excluding NAC	20	21	14

**LAW ENFORCEMENT
Personnel Policies**

**12. Physical
Examination
Requirement**

	• Require physical examinations of officers at least annually.	• Require physical examinations of officers periodically.	• No standard	• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)
	•			75
NAC	•			
Alabama	•			
Alaska			•	
Arizona			•	
Arkansas			•	
California		•		
Colorado			•	
Connecticut			•	
Delaware		•		
Florida	•			
Georgia			•	
Idaho	•			76
Indiana	•			
Iowa	•			
Kansas		•		
Louisiana			•	
Maine			•	
Maryland			•	
Michigan			•	
Minnesota			•	
Mississippi	•			77
Missouri			•	
Montana			•	
Nebraska			•	
Nevada	•			
New Hampshire			•	
New Jersey			•	
New Mexico	•			80
North Carolina	•			
North Dakota	•			77
Ohio			•	
Oklahoma		•		
Oregon			•	
Pennsylvania	•			76
South Carolina			•	
South Dakota	•			78
Tennessee		•		
Texas	•			
Utah	•			
Virginia		•		
Washington		•		
Wisconsin			•	
Total excluding NAC	14	7	20	6

a. Requires examinations semi-annually.

**LAW ENFORCEMENT
Personnel Policies**

**13. Physical
Fitness
Facilities**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC				
• Provide physical fitness facilities for officers.	•	•				•						•	•	•	•					•					•		•		•					•			•								14		
• Provide physical fitness programs or standards for officers.				•						•						•																															5
• No standard			•		•		•	•	•		•						•	•	•	•		•	•	•		•	•		•		•	•	•							•			•			22	
• Target date for implementation (* - immediately)	75	75				75						76									77								78						77											6	

CONTINUED

1 OF 3

**LAW ENFORCEMENT
Personnel Policies**

**14. Enhancement
of the Patrol
Officer's Role**

Content of Standard	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC	
• Establish or expand multiple classification and pay grades within the patrol rank.	●	●		●		●		●		●		●	●	●	●	●			●	●	●				●		●	●	●	●		●	●			●	●	●	●	●	●	●	27	
• Establish multiple pay grades within the patrol rank.																		●																										1
• Consider establishing multiple classification and pay grades within the patrol rank.			●														●																											2
• No standard					●	●			●		●											●	●	●		●				●		●		●										11
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	*	*	*			*						*	*	*		*				*	*				*		*	*								*	77	*	*	*	*	*	16	

**LAW ENFORCEMENT
Personnel Policies**

15. Collective Bargaining

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total excluding NAC
• Allow employees to engage in collective bargaining.	•							•	•	•		•	•		•				•						•											•	•	•					12
• Continue existing practice of allowing collective negotiations.					•	•																													•								3
• No standard		•	•	•			•				•			•		•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•					•	•	•		26
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	75				*							76	78						75																	78							5

a. Advocates only that this practice be considered.

**LAW ENFORCEMENT
Personnel Policies**

**16. Prohibition
of Work
Stoppages and
Job Actions**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC			
• Prohibit police work stoppages and job actions through legislation.	•	•		•					•	•		•	•		•	•			•						•		•		•						•	•	•	•						17		
• Prohibit police work stoppages and job actions through formal written policy.																																														1
• (Other standards indicating that legislation prohibiting such actions has already been enacted.)						•								•		•																														3
• No standard			•		•		•	•		•								•		•	•	•	•	•		•	•		•		•										•	•	•			20
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	76	76										76	78			76									76			80							*		78	78	76						11	

**PROSECUTION
Prosecution Process**

**1. Approval of
Arrest
Warrants**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC			
• Obtain the formal approval of the prosecutor before issuing an arrest warrant or filing a complaint.	•				•						•	•	•	•				•		•					•	•	•	•	•															15		
• Obtain the formal approval of the prosecutor before issuing an arrest warrant.								•											•																											3
• Obtain the formal approval of the prosecutor before filing a complaint.																							•																							1
• No standard	•	•	•	X	•	•	•	•	•	•	•				•	•				•	•			•	•			•						•	•	•			•	•	•				21	
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)																																														0

a. Adds search warrant.
X Adopted ABA Standards.

**PROSECUTION
Prosecution Process**

**2. Guidelines for
Taking Persons
into Custody**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC		
• Aid the police in establishing guidelines for taking persons into custody.	•	•								• b		•		•	•	• a					•		•		•		•	•	•			•	•			•	•							17	
• Aid the police in establishing guidelines for taking juveniles into custody.																	•																												1
• Provide law enforcement agencies with legal advice regarding their functions and duties.					•																						•		•																3
• No standard	•		X		•	•	•	•	•	•		•						•	•	•	•		•		•								•	•		•			•	•	•			19	
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)																																													0

- a. Guidelines by the Police and Prosecutors should be developed separately.
 b. Advocates drawing up law enforcement guidelines only for those cases where it is contemplated that the pretrial intervention decisions will be made by the police; in other cases the prosecutor develops the guidelines.
 X Adopted ABA Standards.

**PROSECUTION
Prosecution Process**

3. Preliminary Hearings in Misdemeanor Cases

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total excluding NAC		
• Discontinue preliminary hearings for misdemeanor prosecutions.	•	•						•				•		•	•	•	•	•	•		•			•			•										•			•			14		
• (Related statements supporting the limitation of preliminary hearings for felony and serious misdemeanor cases).										•																	•																		3
• Study the possibility of eliminating preliminary hearings.						•																																							1
• No standard		•	X	•		•	•				•		•							•		•	•		•		•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•				•	•	•	•	•	•	22
• Target date for implementation (• = immediately)																																													0

X Adopted ABA Standards.

**PROSECUTION
Prosecution Process**

**4. Guidelines
for Diversion**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota ^a	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC		
• Publish guidelines governing diversion decisions.	●				●				●	●		●	●		●		●	●	●	●	●		●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●			●	●				●				24	
• Develop diversion guidelines (no stipulation that they be made public).			● ^a			●		●			●				●																					●								6	
• No standard	●		X			●								●								●	■				●													●	●			9	
• Target date for implementation (* immediately)																																												77	1

X Adopted ABA Standards.

■ State has standard on topic; content data unavailable.

a. For juveniles.

**PROSECUTION
Prosecution Process**

**5. Diversion
Criteria**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC	
• Use diversion programs for offenders when the likelihood of conviction is high but when the benefits of noncriminal diversion for the offender outweigh the potential danger to society.	•	•			•		•		• a	•		•		•	•	•	•	•	•		•			•	•		•	•		•	•						•	•			•	24		
• Use diversion programs for offenders when the benefits of noncriminal diversion for the offender outweigh the potential danger to society.							•					•														•														•			6	
• Consider using diversion when appropriate.		•			• b														•		•													•		• d			•			7		
• Support the enactment of legislation allowing and legalizing diversion.										•													•																				2	
• No standard			X																														•									1		
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)																																											77	1

a. States that court approval must be sought if the diversion agreement includes a substantial deprivation of liberty.

b. Standard sets forth criteria indicating which offenses may qualify defendants for diversion.

c. Does not advocate use of diversion but does specify some standards to use if diversion is adopted.

d. Jurisdictions may wish to consider the development and implementation of diversion programs.

X Adopted ABA Standards.

**PROSECUTION
Prosecution Process**

**6. Guidelines
for Plea
Negotiations**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC			
• Establish guidelines governing plea negotiation practices.	●	●				●		●	●	●		●	●		●	●	●		●	●	●		●		●			●	●	●						● ^a	●	●		● ^b	●	25				
• No standard			●	X	●		●				●			●				X				●		●		●	●			●									●			14				
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)															76																												77			2

- a. Adds that prosecutors may wish to consider written policies.
- b. Adds that the guidelines should be legislatively established mandatory standards.
- X Adopted ABA Standards.

**PROSECUTION
Prosecution Process**

**7. Presentation
of Plea
Negotiation
Agreements**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC		
• Present all plea negotiation agreements in court, and place in the record a full statement of the terms underlying the agreement.	•					• a			•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•			•					•		•				•	•				•	•				•		19		
• Present all plea negotiation agreements in court, and place in the record a full statement of the terms underlying the agreement, for felony cases only.																			•																									2	
• Present all plea negotiation agreements in court.		•													•					•	•																							4	
• No standard			•	X	•		•	•										•					•	•		•	•		•				•	•		•					•			15	
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)																																													0

a. Does not stipulate that the agreement be in open court, but that it must be recorded.
X Adopted ABA Standards.

**PROSECUTION
Personnel**

**1. Time
Commitment**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC			
• Employ prosecutors on a full-time basis.	●	●			●	●	●		●	●		●			●	●		●			●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●			●	●	●	●			●		26			
• Ensure access to at least one full-time prosecutor in each jurisdiction or region, but assistant prosecutors may be part-time if the jurisdiction has a small caseload.													●				●		●	●											●													6		
• Have or encourage full-time prosecutors whenever it is necessary and feasible.														●																			●							●				3		
• No standard		●	X				●				● ^a																		●											●				5		
• Target date for implementation (* - immediately)																																													77	1

a. Already a state practice.
X Adopted ABA Standards.

**PROSECUTION
Personnel**

**2. Pre-Service
Training**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC		
• Require new prosecutors to attend a prosecutor's training course prior to taking office.	•	•			•			•				•	•	•	•	•	•	•			•		•	•	•														•					18	
• Require training for prosecutors (without stipulation that it be received prior to taking office).									•	•																	•						•				•								6
• Establish training programs for new prosecutors.						•												•														•		•										5	
• No standard		•	X				•				•								•		•					•															•	•			11
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)																																													1

a. Requires a minimum of 40 hours of pre-service training.
 b. Requires a minimum of 80 hours of pre-service training.
 X Adopted ABA Standards.

**PROSECUTION
Personnel**

**3. In-Service
Training**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC			
• Require prosecutors and assistants to attend a formal training course annually.	•	•			•			•		•		•		•	•	•	•	•		•	•			•	•	•	•	•				•	•		•	•	•	•	•			•		26		
• Establish in-service training for prosecutors.						•		•		•								•								•																		•		6
• Encourage the establishment of continuing education programs for prosecutors.													•																•	•														•		4
• No standard		•	X				•															•																						•		4
• Target date for implementation (* - immediately)																																														0

X Adopted ABA Standards.

**PUBLIC DEFENDER
Organization and Planning**

**1. Provision of
Defense Services**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC		
• Provide defense services in each locality through an assigned counsel system drawing from the private bar and from a public defender organization.	•	•			•				•	•	•	•		•	•	•		• a	•	•			•	•	•		•		•									•			•	21			
• Provide defense services, with local option on the type of system (assignment of counsel or public defender).						•							•								•																								7
• Create or expand a full-time state-wide public defender organization.																						•					• b					•					•		• c		•			6	
• Provide defense services through an assigned counsel system but experiment with a hybrid system using both assigned counsel and public defenders.																	•																											1	
• No standard		•	X				•	•																																					5
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)																78																													2

- a. Assigned attorneys are advocated for unusual circumstances only.
- b. Counties with smaller populations currently use private counsel.
- c. Advocates an independent, non-profit organization under contract to the state.

X = Adopted ABA Standards.

**PUBLIC DEFENDER
Organization and Planning**

**3. Location of
Offices**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC			
• Locate public defender offices in the neighborhoods where most of the clients live.	•	•			•							•								•				•	•			•										•						10		
• Locate public defender offices in easily accessible locations.						•			•	• a							• a																													5
• Locate public defender offices in areas which will not cause the public defender to be identified excessively with the law enforcement and judicial systems.														•													•																			2
• No standard		•	X				•	•		•			•	•		•	•		•	•		•	•			•	•			•	•	•	•			•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	23	
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)																																													0	

a. Specifies that the location be accessible to the courts, rather than the clients.
X = Adopted ABA Standards.

**PUBLIC DEFENDER
Organization and Planning**

4. Use of Computers for Public Defense Management

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total excluding NAC	
• Provide the public defender with access to a computer that performs administrative functions such as case scheduling, multiple indexing, etc., in high-volume systems or where economical	•	•			•				•	•		•			•	•	•	•		•				•	•											•	•		•			16		
• Use an information system for the above functions (not necessarily computerized)							•																																					2
• No standard		•	X	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	22
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)							85																																				2	

X = Adopted ABA Standards.

**PUBLIC DEFENDER
Organization and Planning**

5. Felony Caseload Limits

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total excluding NAC		
• Limit public defender felony caseloads to 150 per year.	•							•	•		•			•						•					•																				7
• Limit public defender felony caseloads to assure proper representation (no figure specified).						•		• ^a		•				•												•							•												8
• No standard	•	•	X	•		•				•		•			•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•		•			•	•	•		•	•					•	•	•				25
• Target date for implementation (* - immediately)																																													0

a. Suggests the development of standards for felony caseload management.

X = Adopted ABA Standards.

**PUBLIC DEFENDER
Organization and Planning**

6. Provision of Services during Mass Disorders

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total excluding NAC		
• Ensure that the local public defender or bar association develops a plan for providing defense services during a mass disorder.	•	•													•										•																			4	
• Ensure that the judicial council or the courts develop a plan for court processing during a mass disorder.										•	•			•														•																	4
• Develop a comprehensive criminal justice plan for mass disorders.					•											•	•									•		•																	7
• No standard		•	X			•	•	•	•			•	•				•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•					•	•	•	•	•			•	•	•	•	•	•	25	
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)																																												0	

X = Adopted ABA Standards.

**PUBLIC DEFENDER
Defense Function**

**1. Post-Detention/
Conviction
Defense Services**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC			
• Provide public representation to (a) inmates wishing to appeal, (b) indigent inmates of detention facilities, (c) indigent parolees at parole revocation hearings, and (d) indigent probationers at proceedings affecting probationary status.	•								•			•	•		•		•	•		•				•	•				•																16	
• Same as Item 1 above, omitting indigent probationers.					•																																									1
• Provide public representation to inmates who wish to appeal, to indigent inmates of detention facilities, or in all criminal proceedings (usually limited to the first appeal).						•				•	•														•							•	•		•											7
• No standard	•	•	X	•			•							•	•	•		•		•	•							•	•						•			•	•	•					16	
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)																																														0

X = Adopted ABA Standards.

**PUBLIC DEFENDER
Defense Function**

**2. Earliest Point
of Representation**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC	
• Provide counsel to eligible defendants during investigatory stages in which the individual is a likely suspect, or upon arrest.	•	•			•				•	•		•		•	•				•		•		•		•		•								•		•						14	
• Provide counsel to eligible defendants upon arrest (or at the first stage of criminal proceedings).								• a								•		• b								•												•						7
• Provide counsel to eligible defendants no later than the first court appearance.											•																	•			•													3
• Provide prompt and reasonable defense representation that includes pretrial activities.																													•															1
• No standard		•	X			•	•						•				•		•		•		•			•							•	•		•		•	•					5
Target date for implementation (* = immediately)																		82																										1

a. Advocates the "earliest possible client representation".
b. Suggests counsel be provided within 24 hours after arrest.

X = Adopted ABA Standards.

**PUBLIC DEFENDER
Defense Function**

4. Compensation

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC	
• Require that defendants with public representation pay that portion of the cost that they are able to afford without substantial hardship to them or their families.	•	•			•	•			•	•		•		•	•				•		•			•	•			•	•	•							•	•	•				20	
• Develop a system whereby defendants pay some part of the costs of public representation.													•													• a								•					•	•				5
• No standard		•	X				•	•		•								•	•	•		•					•		•	•	•	•				•			•					15
• Target date for implementation (• = immediately)																																												0

a. Partial payment system exists (standard suggests increasing the supervision of those able to make partial payments).

X - Adopted ABA Standards.

**PUBLIC DEFENDER
Personnel**

**1. Selection of
Public Defenders**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC				
• Nominate candidates for public defender through a commission or similar body with final selection by the Governor.	•	•						•		•		•												•	• ^a				•		•												8				
• Same as Item 1 above, except with final selection by the Supreme Court.												•																																	1		
• Nominate through the appropriate district bar, with final selection by the Governor.																												•																	2		
• Nominate through local nonpartisan boards, with appointment by the county commissioners.																																													1		
• Select public defenders through public election.									•												•																								3		
• Appoint public defenders through the board of directors or trustees of the public defenders organization.																		• ^c																											2		
• Ensure independence and competence of public defenders through an appropriate selection process (no process specified).						•													•																										2		
• No standard		•	X	•	•	•	•	•	•	•			•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	20	
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)																																														79	1

a. Stipulates that final selection be by the appropriate governmental authority.
 b. Stipulates that current selection policy should be continued without specifying what the current policy is.
 c. Only the Chief Public Defender is appointed by the Board of Trustees, assistants are selected by the Chief Public Defender.

X = Adopted ABA Standards.

**PUBLIC DEFENDER
Personnel**

**2. Use of Full-Time
Public Defenders**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC			
• Employ public defenders on a full-time basis.	●	●			●	●			●	●		●		●	●			●	●		●	●	●		●		●	●	●			●			●	●								21		
• Employ public defenders on a full-time basis, where justified by the caseload.																				●													●											2		
• No standard			●	X			●	●			●		●			●	●							■			●	●			●	●				●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	16
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)																78																													1	

X = Adopted ABA Standards.

■ = State has standard on topic; content data unavailable.

**PUBLIC DEFENDER
Personnel**

**3. Public Defender
Terms**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC		
• Employ public defenders to serve terms of not less than four years.	•	•							•	•	•			•	•						•				•	•	•						•											13	
• Use a merit system in deciding whether to retain the public defender.																		•																		•									2
• Employ public defenders for terms equivalent to those of prosecutors.																																				•									1
• No standard		•	X	•	•	•	•			•		•			•	•		•	•	•	•		•	•		•	a			•	•	•		•			•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	23
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)																																													0

a. States that the terms of public defenders as stipulated in N.J.S.A., 2A:158 A-1 should be continued.
X = Adopted ABA Standards.

**PUBLIC DEFENDER
Personnel**

4. Compensation

Content of Standard	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex-cluding NAC	
• Compensate public defenders at a rate comparable to that paid by private law firms.	●								●	● a		● a							●						● a		●					● a												8
• Compensate public defenders at a rate comparable to that of prosecutor counterparts.		●			●	●								●							●							●	●	●			●	●	●	●			●					13
• Compensate public defenders in accordance with provisions established by a board or commission.																													●															2
• No standard		●	X				●	●		●		●			●	●	●	●		●		●	●	■	●											●		●	●					16
• Target date for implementation (* - immediately)																																												0

- a. Refers to salaries through the first 5 years of service only.
- b. State has standard for salary of Chief Public Defender only.
- c. Existing state law.

X = Adopted ABA Standards.

■ = State has standard on topic; content data unavailable.

**PUBLIC DEFENDER
Personnel**

5. Civil Service Status

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total excluding NAC		
● Prohibit public defenders from holding civil service status.	●	●			●	●				●		●		●	●						●			●	●			●										●						14	
● No standard			●	X			●	●	●		●		●			●	●	●	●	●		●	●			●	●		●		●	●	●	●	●				●	●	●	●	●	●	26
● Target date for implementation (* = immediately)																																												0	

a. Standard states only that public defenders be part of a non-profit corporation contracted with by the state; it is therefore assumed they do not have civil service status.

X = Adopted ABA Standards.

**PUBLIC DEFENDER
Personnel**

**6. Orientation
Training**

	● Require new public defenders to participate in an entry-level training program.	● No standard	● Target date for implementation (* = immediately)
NAC	●		
Alabama		●	
Alaska		●	
Arizona		X	
Arkansas		●	
California	●		
Colorado		●	
Connecticut		●	
Delaware	●		
Florida	●		
Georgia		●	
Idaho	●		
Indiana	●		
Iowa	●		
Kansas	●		
Louisiana	●		
Maine		●	
Maryland	●		82
Michigan	●		
Minnesota		●	
Mississippi	●		
Missouri	●		
Montana		●	
Nebraska	●		
Nevada	●		
New Hampshire		●	
New Jersey	●		
New Mexico	●		
North Carolina		●	
North Dakota		●	
Ohio		●	
Oklahoma		●	
Oregon		●	
Pennsylvania	●		
South Carolina		●	
South Dakota	●		
Tennessee	●		
Texas		●	
Utah	●		
Virginia		●	
Washington		●	
Wisconsin		●	
Total excluding NAC	20	20	1

X = Adopted ABA Standards.

COURTS
Court Process

2. Use of Private Bail Bond Agencies

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total excluding NAC			
• Eliminate private bail bond agencies from the pretrial release process.	•	•			•					•	•					•			•	•	•			•	•	•										•	•						15			
• Minimize participation of private bail bond agencies in the pretrial release process.																																														2
• Study alternatives to the private bail bond system.				•																																										2
• Retain private bail bonding with suitable reforms.						•						•	•													•																				6
• No standard				X			•	•	•					•	•		•	•			•							•		•	•											•	•			15
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)		77																																											78	2

X Adopted ABA Standards.

COURTS
Court Process

3. Time Limits on Misdemeanor Trials

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total excluding NAC			
• Set a time limit of 30 days between arrest or indictment and trial in misdemeanor cases.	•				•			•				•	•	•	•		•	• ^a	•		•			•	•			•																16		
• Same as Item 1 except that the time may be extended if pre-trial release occurs.					•				•							•									•																					5
• Same as Item 1 except time limit is 60 days.																							•															•							2	
• Set a time limit of 180 days between arrest and indictment and trial in all cases.																							•				•	•	•																	5
• Mandate the development of time limits through court ruling or statute.						•		•																																						3
• Eliminate delays in bringing cases to trial.																																														2
• No standard	•	•	X							•									•																											7
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)																																														2

a. 15 days for district court cases.
 b. From preliminary hearing to trial.
 c. For nonincarcerated defendants.
 d. Should try to attain 30 days in misdemeanor cases.
 X Adopted ABA Standards.

COURTS
Court Process

4. Time Limits on Felony Trials

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total excluding NAC				
• Set a time limit of 60 days between arrest or indictment and trial, in felony cases.	•				•							•			•		•		•		•		•					•		•		•											13				
• Set a time limit of 60 days between arrest or indictment and trial, except that the time may be extended if pre-trial release occurs.																•										•																				2	
• Set a time limit of 90 days between arrest or indictment and trial, in felony cases.					•				•	•			•	•				•							•		•																			9	
• Set a time limit of 180 days between arrest or indictment and trial in all cases																					•						•		•					•												4	
• Mandate the development of time limits through court ruling or statute.							•	•																													•								3		
• Eliminate delays in bringing cases to court.																																														2	
• No standard	•	•	X								•									•																										7	
• Target date for implementation (* - immediately)																																															2

a. Period from preliminary hearing to trial should not exceed 60 days, with a 180 days limit for non-incarcerated defendants.

X Adopted ABA Standards.

**COURTS
Court Process**

5. Grand Jury Indictments

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total excluding NAC			
• Eliminate the requirement for grand jury indictment in criminal prosecutions.	•								•			•		•	•		•	•	•					•	•	•							•											14		
• Eliminate the requirement for grand jury indictment in criminal prosecutions, except in capital cases.										•						•																														3
• Eliminate the requirement for grand jury indictment in criminal prosecutions, except in controversial or exceptional cases.			•										•														•																			3
• Continue existing grand jury indictment practices.						•																				•										•		•							5	
• No standard	•	•	X	•		•	•	•		•										•		•					•						•				•		•	•	•	•	•	•	15	
• Target date for implementation (* immediately)																																													0	

a. Eliminate indictment on all guilty pleas and where defense and prosecution agree to waive.

X Adopted ABA Standards.

**COURTS
Court Process**

6. Use of Plea Negotiations

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total excluding NAC					
• Eliminate plea negotiation practices.	●		● ^e																																												1	
• Aim for the elimination of plea negotiations, but conduct negotiations in accordance with written guidelines in the meantime.																			● ^b				● ^a																									2
• Support or permit plea negotiations when they are in the public interest.						●		●	●		●	●	●		●	●	●	●		●	●	●			●		●	●			●	●		●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	26	
• No standard	●		X	●		●			●					●										●	●				●			●														12		
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)																																														76	1	

- a. Sets a time limit after which plea negotiations will no longer be permitted.
- b. Stipulates that adequate resources be insured before plea negotiations are discontinued.
- c. Suggests that there be tighter controls on plea bargaining.
- d. Suggests the elimination of plea bargaining necessitated solely by overcrowded caseload.
- e. Existing practice in Alaska.

X Adopted ABA Standards.

COURTS
Court Process

8. Rules of Pretrial Discovery

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total excluding NAC				
• Require full reciprocal disclosure between the prosecution and the defense, within the limits of constitutionally protected rights and witness safety.	•					•			•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	25	
• Require disclosure by prosecution only.																											•																				3
• No standard	•	•	•	X	•	•	•	•														•								•			•	•	•						•	•				12	
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)																																														0	

a. Refers to plea negotiations only.

X Adopted ABA Standards.

9. Jury Size

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC		
• Use juries of fewer than 12 persons but more than 6 in criminal prosecutions for offenses not punishable by life sentences.	•				•				•	•		•			•																													5	
• Use 12-member juries in felony cases unless the parties approve a jury composed of fewer than 12.															•		•								•			•																•	6
• Use juries of fewer than 12 persons but more than 6 in non-felony cases; use 12-member juries for felonies.		•				•							•					•																											3
• Study the use of juries of fewer than 12 people.																												•																	1
• Use 12-member juries.		• a									•									•									•																4
• No standard		•	X			•	•						•			•				•	•	•			•	•			•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	21
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)																																												0	

a. Reduction to 10 permitted if a member dies or is discharged for good cause.
X Adopted ABA Standards.

11. Dispositional Hearings in Juvenile Cases

COURTS
Court Process

	● Hold dispositional hearings that are separate from adjudicatory hearings in all juvenile cases.	● No standard	● Target date for implementation (● = immediately)
NAC	●		
Alabama	●		
Alaska		●	
Arizona			X
Arkansas	●		
California	●		
Colorado		●	
Connecticut		●	
Delaware	●		
Florida		●	
Georgia		●	
Idaho	●		
Indiana		●	
Iowa		●	
Kansas	●		
Louisiana		●	
Maine		●	
Maryland		●	
Michigan	●		
Minnesota		●	
Mississippi	●		
Missouri		●	
Montana		●	
Nebraska		●	
Nevada		●	
New Hampshire		●	
New Jersey		●	
New Mexico		●	
North Carolina		●	
North Dakota		●	
Ohio	●		
Oklahoma		●	
Oregon		●	
Pennsylvania		●	
South Carolina		●	
South Dakota	●		
Tennessee	●		
Texas	●		
Utah		●	
Virginia		●	
Washington		●	
Wisconsin	●		
Total excluding NAC	13	27	0

X Adopted ABA Standards.

COURTS
Court Process

12. Jury Sentencing

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex-cluding NAC			
• Abolish jury sentencing.	•	•				•			•		•	•			•	•	•	•	•	•					•		•								•	•							16			
• Abolish jury sentencing except in capital cases.					•		•																																						2	
• (Related statements indicating that jury sentencing is permitted.)																											•									•								2		
• No standard		•	X					•	•		•			•	•							•	•	■		•		•			•	•	•	•	•			•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	19
• Target date for implementation (• immediately)																																													0	

X Adopted ABA Standards.

■ State has standard on topic; content data unavailable.

COURTS
Court Organization

1. Unification of the Court System

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex-cluding NAC		
• Unify all courts under a state-administered and financed system, supervised by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.	•	•			•				•	•		•	•	•	•	•		•	•			•	•				•	•								•	•				•	22			
• Organize all courts into a state-administered and financed system under the supervision of the state judicial council.						•																			•																				3
• Unify all state-level courts under a state-administered and financed system, maintaining local control of limited jurisdiction courts.																					•																								1
• No standard		•	X			•	•			•							•		•				•		•		•	•					•						•	•				14	
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)																			*																									78	2

X Adopted ABA Standards.
a. State constitutional law.

COURTS
Court Organization

2. Criminal Justice Coordinating Councils

- Establish state, local, and regional coordinating councils to monitor and advise on the administration of the courts.
- No standard
- Target date for implementation (* - immediately)

			●	NAC
			●	Alabama
				Alaska
		●		Arizona
		●		Arkansas
		●		California
		●		Colorado
		●		Connecticut
			●	Delaware
			●	Florida
			●	Georgia
			●	Idaho
		●		Indiana
			●	Iowa
			●	Kansas
			●	Louisiana
			●	Maine
			●	Maryland
			●	Michigan
		●		Minnesota
		●		Mississippi
		●		Missouri
			●	Montana
		●		Nebraska
			●	Nevada
		●		New Hampshire
		●		New Jersey
			●	New Mexico
			●	North Carolina
			●	North Dakota
		●		Ohio
		●		Oklahoma
			●	Oregon
		●		Pennsylvania
		●		South Carolina
			●	South Dakota
		●		Tennessee
			●	Texas
		●		Utah
		●		Virginia
			●	Washington
		●		Wisconsin
		0	20	Total excluding NAC

X Adopted ABA Standards.

COURTS
Court Organization

3. Family Court

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC		
• Establish a family court as a division of the trial court of general jurisdiction.	•	•			•				•			•							•								•	•																8	
• Establish a family court when feasible.																				•	•																								2
• Maintain a separate juvenile court.						•																																							5
• No standard		•	X				•	•		•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•						•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•												25
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)																																													1

X Adopted ABA Standards.

a. Existing state law.

COURTS
Court Organization

4. Administration of Local Trial Courts

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total excluding NAC	
• Use full-time local court administrators in trial courts with five or more judges, or in courts where justified by the caseload.	•	•			•					•	•	•	•	•	•				• ^c		•		•		•			•			•						•	• ^b					17	
• Use local trial court administrators as needed.																											•								•								2	
• Use court administrators in each judicial circuit or district.					•				•									• ^a												•														4
• No standard.		•	X			•	•	•								•			•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•				•	•	•			17	
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)																																												0

- a. Counties with sufficient workloads should also employ a county administrator.
- b. Specifies each court with 3 or more judges should employ local court administrator.
- c. Utilization contingent on statewide financing of a unified system.

X Adopted ABA Standards.

COURTS
Court Organization

5. Research and Development Functions

Content of Standard	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total excluding NAC	
• Assign responsibility for research, planning, and development to the local or regional administrator.	•	•			•	•				•		•		•	•	•			•		•		•					•	•				•			•	•	•					19	
• Assign responsibility for research, planning, and development to the central administrative office.										•		•					•																											3
• No standard		•	X				•	•	•								•		•		•		•	•	•	•			•		•		•	•				•	•	•			18	
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)																																												0

a. Regional only.

X Adopted ABA Standards.

COURTS
Court Organization

6. Management Information Systems

Content of Standard	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nabraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total excluding NAC				
• Establish court access to a computer for management functions such as case scheduling and jury selection in high-volume systems or where economical.	•	•							•	•	•	•	•			•		•	•					•	•		•	•									•	•		•			19				
• Establish a court management information system (not necessarily computerized).						•		•							•														•															•		8	
• No standard		•	X	•			•							•			•			•			•			•	•																		•		13
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)																																														0	

X Adopted ABA Standards.

CONTINUED

2 OF 3

**COURTS
Personnel**

**1. Selection
of Judges**

Content of Standard	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC			
• Nominate judges through a judicial nominating commission, with final selection by the Governor.	•	•							•	•	•	•	•	•			•	•		•				•	•		•											•						17		
• Nominate judges through a judicial nominating commission, with final selection by the Governor, and election on a non-partisan ballot after the initial term of service.																					•							•																		2
• Adopt a judicial merit selection system that includes members of the bar, bench, and public.						•												•				•			•																				4	
• Elect judges by popular vote.																•					•										•					•	•								5	
• No standard		•	X	•		•	•								•												•		•			•	•	•						•	•				12	
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)																																													76	1

X Adopted ABA Standards.

**COURTS
Personnel**

**2. Oversight of
Judicial Court**

Content of Standard	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC		
• Establish or maintain a commission authorized to investigate and take action on matters of judicial conduct.	•	•	•		•			•				•	•				•		•		•	•	•	•		•									•	•		•					19		
• Use existing provisions in the state code to discipline and remove judges.														•															•			•													3
• Establish or maintain a commission to investigate judicial conduct and make recommendations to the Supreme Court (or Court of Appeals) for action.					•				•						•		•										•							•											6
• No standard				X		•	•		•					•					•	•						•							•			•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	12
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)		77																																											1

X Adopted ABA Standards.

a. Existing state law.

**CORRECTIONS
Sentencing**

2. Maximum Sentences for Felonies

- For felonies other than murder, set the maximum sentence at 25 years.
- For felonies other than murder, set the maximum sentence at 25 years except when the prescribed penalty is life imprisonment.
- For felonies other than murder, set the maximum sentence at 25 years with extension permitted under certain circumstances (e.g., dangerous or habitual felony offenders).
- Permit life sentence without parole for repeat and violent offenders.
- No standard
- Target date for implementation (* = immediately)

NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total excluding NAC		
• For felonies other than murder, set the maximum sentence at 25 years.	•			•	•						•								•	•		•		•		•																	8	
• For felonies other than murder, set the maximum sentence at 25 years except when the prescribed penalty is life imprisonment.													•					•																										2
• For felonies other than murder, set the maximum sentence at 25 years with extension permitted under certain circumstances (e.g., dangerous or habitual felony offenders).																																								•			1	
• Permit life sentence without parole for repeat and violent offenders.																														•														1
• No standard	•	•	•			•	• a	•	•	•		X		•	•	•	•				•		•		•	•	•	•	•			•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	28
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)																																												

a. State has a general standard that advocates a comprehensive examination of sentencing practices, including their duration.
 b. Advocates maximum of 25-30 years.
 X No corrections standards available.

**CORRECTIONS
Sentencing**

**3. Specification of
of Minimum
Sentences in the
Criminal Code**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Iaaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC		
• Do not specify minimum sentences in the criminal code.	●				●			●				●		●		●		●			●				●																	●	9		
• Do not specify mandatory sentences in the criminal code.					●		●																				●																		3
• Establish a determinant sentencing system.																															●										●		2		
• No standard	●	●	●					●		●	●		X		●		●		●	●		●	●	●		●		●	●	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	26
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)																																													0

X No corrections standards available.

**CORRECTIONS
Sentencing**

5. Discretion in Specifying Maximum Time Before Parole Eligibility

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex-cluding NAC		
• Authorize courts to impose a maximum of one-third of the sentence or three years to be served before becoming eligible for parole.	•			•								•		•						•					•																			6	
• Authorize courts to impose a maximum of one-third of the sentence or three years to be served before becoming eligible for parole, in certain classes of felony cases only.																			•																									1	
• (Other statements indicating that the parole authority is responsible for establishing these guidelines.)																											•					•												2	
• Authorize courts to impose a maximum sentence to be served before becoming eligible for parole.																				•																								1	
• No standard		•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•		X		•	•	•	•				•	•	•		•			•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	30
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)																																												0	

X No corrections standards available.

**CORRECTIONS
Sentencing**

6. Discretion in Imposition of Concurrent Sentences

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total excluding NAC			
• Authorize courts to impose concurrent sentences on offenders already under sentence for prior crimes, and on those convicted of multiple offenses.	•	•		•								•		•	•			•	•						•			•																11		
• Authorize courts to impose either concurrent or consecutive sentences depending on the circumstances.						•			•	•					•																														4	
• No standard		•		•		•	•			•		X				•			•		•	•	•		•	•		•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	25
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)																																													0	

a. Stipulates only for offenders convicted of multiple offenses.

X No corrections standards available.

**CORRECTIONS
Sentencing**

**7. Credit for
Time Served
Before Trial**

Content of Standard	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex-cluding NAC	
Grant offenders credit toward their sentences for time served in jail awaiting trial or appeal.	●	●		●	●	●	●		●	●		●		●	●		●	●	●						●			●										●				●	21	
No standard			●					●		●		X			●					●		●	●	●		●	●	●		●		●	●	●		●	●						●	19
Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	75		75					75		75		75		*					*		77						*			75					*			*						10

X No corrections standards available.

**CORRECTIONS
Sentencing**

9. Specification of Reasons for Sentencing Decisions

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Iaaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex-cluding NAC		
• Specify in the record the reasons for imposing a given sentence.	•	•		•	• ^a	•	•	•			•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•		•		•		•														•	•	19		
• Consider recording the reasons for sentences that do not fall in the usual range for a given offense.							•																																						1
• No standard		•							•	•		X							•	•		•		•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	20
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	*	*	*								*	*	*	*	*	*				*			*		*		*																		9

a. Suggests recording reasons for sentences unless it would be detrimental to the defendant.
 X No corrections standards available.

**CORRECTIONS
Sentencing**

10. Appeals of Sentence

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC				
• Make sentencing decisions subject to review on appeal to a court or other appeals body.	•	•								•		•		•	•	•			•	•	•						•																•	14			
• No standard			•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•		X				•	•				•	•	•	•				•	•	•				•	•	•	•	•	•						26	
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	75	*										76			75																																6

a. Suggests that sentences be subject to review on appeal in certain instances such as the discovery of new material facts, the sentence exceeds the maximum imposed by law, etc.

X No corrections standards available.

**CORRECTIONS
Sentencing**

**11. Disclosure of
Presentence
Reports**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC		
• Make presentence reports routinely available to convicted defendants and to the prosecution, prior to sentencing.	•	•		•	•	•			•	•		•		•	•			•	•	•	•			•														•		•	•	20			
• Make presentence reports routinely available to defendants only, except under special circumstances.							•				•						•																											3	
• Make presentence reports routinely available to either the court or the prosecution.																•											•																		2
• (Related statements supporting full exchange of information relative to sentencing.)																																													1
• No standard		•						•					X									•		•		•		•		•	•			•	•	•	•	•		•					14
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	*	*	*									*	*							*	*	*		*	*		*	*																9	

a. Make available reports unless the report contains information harmful to the defendant or others if disclosed.
X No corrections standards available.

CORRECTIONS
Correctional Programs

1. Planning for Noninstitutional Alternatives

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex-cluding NAC			
• Develop a systematic plan and timetable for implementing a full range of alternatives to incarceration.	•	•	•	•	• ^a	•		•	•		•		•	•	•		•	•	•		•			•	•		•	•	•	•			•			•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	26
• Analyze the needs, resources, and gaps in service to develop a range of alternatives to incarceration.							•			•					•								•								•		•			•										7
• No standard						•							X						•		•					•	•					•					•									7
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	78 *			78	80	78				78 *				78	78			78	78		78			78			78	78					78		78	77		78							18	

a. Specifies for diversion only.

X No corrections standards available.

CORRECTIONS
Correctional Programs

**2. Encouragement
of Community-
Based Correctional
Programs**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC		
• Enact legislation authorizing the establishment of a wide variety of community-based correctional programs.	•	•			•	•				•		•													•			•	•	•				•	•									12	
• Develop community-based correctional programs through correctional agencies.							•		•		•				•	•	•	•	•		•						•			•					•	•	•				•	•			16
• No standards		•	•					•					X	•						•		•	•	•		•					•					•		•						12	
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	*	*			77	*				*		*								82	*	*			*				80	*					78	*	77		*					15	

X No corrections standards available.

CORRECTIONS
Correctional Programs

3. Classification of Inmates in Reception-Diagnostic Centers

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total excluding NAC		
• Do not use reception-diagnostic centers for inmate classification.	●																			●					●														●			●	6		
• Continue to expand the use of reception-diagnostic centers for inmate classification.									●		●				●												●		●																7
• (Other statements indicating that inmate classification is conducted at institutions rather than at separate reception-diagnostic centers.)																	●		●																										2
• No standard		●	●	●	●	●	●	●		●		X	●		●	●		●				●	●	●		●		●		●	●	●	●					●	●		●			25	
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	*								*											*				*			*								*										5

a. Discontinue use of centers as soon as the community classification teams are implemented.
 b. Inferred from a related standard that centers will still be used.
 X No corrections standards available.

CORRECTIONS
Correctional Programs

4. Conversion to a Coeducational System

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total excluding NAC		
• Convert adaptable institutions with comparable populations to coeducational facilities.	•	•							•		•			•						•				•					•															7	
• Study the feasibility of converting institutions into coeducational facilities.						•								•						•								•									•							5	
• No standard		•	•	•		•	•	•		•			X		•	•	•	•				•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	28
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	*													82																						80								3	

X No corrections standards available.

CORRECTIONS
Correctional Programs

5. Educational Programs Within State Institutions

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total excluding NAC	
• Develop or continue comprehensive educational programs within each institution.	•	•		•		•			•	•		•		•	•	•	•		•		•			•		•	•	•	•			•	•				•	•			•		24	
• (Other statements indicating the existence of educational programs.)																							•														•						2	
• Provide education to inmates either through institutional or community programs.					•		• ^a											• ^a											•	•														5
• No standard.		•						•		•			X						•	•		•			•								•							•			9	
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	*	*	*	*		*				*	*	*						*		*				*			*	*	*	*		*		*	78	*	*						17	

a. Stipulates the provision of education up to high school equivalency.
X No corrections standards available.

CORRECTIONS
Correctional Programs

6. Treatment of Addicted Offenders

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nabraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total excluding NAC				
• Develop drug treatment programs for incarcerated addicts who cannot be handled in community facilities.	•	•	•	•	•	•		•		•		•		•	•	•		•	•	•	•				•		•	•	•	•	•								•	•		•	26				
• Reexamine policies for handling addicted offenders and discourage their incarceration.																																															2
• Divert addicted offenders from correctional facilities into community treatment programs, prior to incarceration.																	•							•																						4	
• No standard							•		•		•		X											•		•																				8	
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	*	*	*						*		*	*		*			*			*	*		*		*		*																			13	

X No corrections standards available.

CORRECTIONS
Correctional Programs

7. Study-Release Programs

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex-cluding NAC				
• Adopt or expand study-release programs in institutions.	•	•		•	•				• a	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•				•		•	•	•	•									•	•					25		
• (Other statements indicating the current use of study-release programs.)			•																																												2
• No standard						•	•	•					X										•	•	•	•					•	•														13	
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	*	*		*	*					*	*			*						*					*			*	*	*				*													15

a. Specifies "release programs" in general.
X No corrections standards available.

CORRECTIONS
Correctional Programs

8. Home Furlough Programs

	• Allow home furloughs to qualified inmates.	• No standard	• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)
NAC	●		*
Alabama	●		*
Alaska		●	
Arizona		●	
Arkansas	●		*
California		●	
Colorado		●	
Connecticut		●	
Delaware		●	
Florida	●		*
Georgia		●	
Idaho	●		*
Indiana		X	
Iowa	●		*
Kansas	●		
Louisiana	●		
Maine	●		
Maryland		●	
Michigan	●		
Minnesota		●	
Mississippi	●		*
Missouri		●	
Montana		●	
Nebraska		●	
Nevada	●		*
New Hampshire		●	
New Jersey	●		
New Mexico	●		*
North Carolina	●		
North Dakota	●		*
Ohio		●	
Oklahoma		●	
Oregon		●	
Pennsylvania		●	
South Carolina		●	
South Dakota		●	
Tennessee	●		77
Texas		●	
Utah	●		
Virginia		●	
Washington		●	
Wisconsin	●		
Total excluding NAC	18	22	10

X No corrections standards available.

**CORRECTIONS
Correctional Programs**

9. Community-Based Partial Release Programs

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total excluding NAC		
• Develop residential or other partial release alternatives.	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•		•	•		•	•	•					•	•	•	•	•	•									•	•	•	•	•	31		
• Study the need for community release programs.																•																													1
• (Other statements indicating that partial release programs are already being utilized.)																						•																							1
• No standard			•								•		X								•	•		•							•							•						7	
Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	*	*			77	*				*	*			*	*									*	*				*							*	77			*				13	

X No corrections standards available.

CORRECTIONS
Correctional Programs

10. Vocational Programs Within State Institutions

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total excluding NAC			
• Develop or continue vocational training programs within each institution.	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•		•		•	•	•	•	•	•		•				•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•				•	•	•			•	29			
• (Other statements indicating the existence of vocational training programs.)																																														1
• Develop and test in selected settings vocational training concepts related to state employment needs.							•																																							1
• No standard										•		X							•		•	•	•					•					•	•						•					9	
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	*	*		*	*	*			*				*					*		*				*				*				*					78		*	*					14	

X No corrections standards available.

CORRECTIONS
Correctional Programs

11. Private Industry and Vocational Training

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total excluding NAC
• Encourage private industry to establish institutional training programs and to reserve jobs for graduates of these programs.	●	●		●		●				●		●		●		●		● ^a	●		●				●		●	●	●				●		●			●	●				19
• No standard			●		●		●	●	●		●		X		●		●			●		●	●	●		●				●	●	●		●	●				●	●			21
• Target date for implementation (* - Immediately)	*	*		*		*				*		*		*				*			*				*		*	*	*				*		*		*	*					15

a. Stipulates only that effective working relationships with employment resources be developed (not necessarily training programs and job commitments).

X No corrections standards available.

CORRECTIONS
Correctional Programs

12. Rates of Compensation in Prison Industries

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total excluding NAC					
• Compensate inmates at the rate prevailing outside the correctional facility.	•	•							•											•									•																4			
• Compensate inmates at a reasonable level, or as an incentive to participate.				• ^a					• ^c						•	•	•											•																		6		
• Compensate inmates at the Federal minimum wage.																																													•	1		
• Compensate inmates (no level specified).												•																																		1		
• Compensate inmates for their work, but require payment for services provided by the state (food, clothing, medical).		•				•														•							•	•																		•	•	7
• No standard					•	•	•		•				X	•				•	•			•	•	•	•	•	•			•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•		•	•				21			
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	78																			* 78								80	78																•	5		

a. Advocates that pay be based on a sliding scale directly related to the prevailing economic situation and the economic price index.
 b. Advocates studying the feasibility of compensation and service deductions.
 c. Remuneration should be graduated according to job difficulty, responsibility and seniority and used as an incentive.
 X No corrections standards available.

CORRECTIONS
Correctional Programs

13. Work-Release Programs

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC				
• Adopt, expand, or continue work-release programs in each institution.	•	•	•	•	•	•			•	•		•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•				•		•	•	•	•				•	•										29		
• Establish transitional centers for selected work-release inmates rather than developing work-release programs in each institution.																										•																					1
• (Other statements indicating the current use of work-release programs.)											•																																			1	
• No standard							•	• b					X										•	•	•					•							•				•	•				9	
• Target date for implementation (* - Immediately)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	17	

- a. Advocated only where job training needs cannot be met within the institution.
- b. Advocates institutional vocational programs with a period of institutional "decompression".
- c. Advocates only the consideration of work-release.
- X No corrections standards available.

**CORRECTIONS
Offender Rights**

**1. Grievance
Procedures in
Institutions**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nabraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC		
• Establish a formal system to hear inmate grievances, using an ombudsman or other independent entity.	•	•		•	•	•		•	•	•		•		•	•				•						•			•										•	•					19	
• Establish formal, written grievance procedures.											•							•														•												4	
• No standard			•				•						X			•	•			•	•	•		•		•	•			•								•			•	•		17	
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	*	*		*	*					*		*		*			*										*		*		*														14

X No corrections standards available.

**CORRECTIONS
Offender Rights**

**2. Inmates' Rights
to Legal Counsel
During
Disciplinary
Hearings**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC				
• Implement policies that satisfy a prisoner's right to legal counsel during disciplinary hearings.	•	•		•				•				•		•	•	•			•	•			•		•											•						•	14				
• Afford access to at least a counsel substitute (law student, correctional staff member, inmate paraprofessional, paralegal) during disciplinary hearings.										•								•										•	•										•	•					7		
• Afford access to legal counsel (disciplinary hearings not specified).					•	•										•																	•												4		
• Afford access to counsel or a counsel substitute in preparation for disciplinary hearings.							•																													•									2		
• No standard		•						•			•	X								•	•		•			•	•				•	•		•	•						•				13		
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)																																														77	1

X No corrections standards available.

**CORRECTIONS
Offender Rights**

**3. Provision of
Legal Counsel
for Disciplinary
Hearings**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC		
• Provide counsel for prisoners unable to afford a private attorney, for major disciplinary hearings.	•			•					•			•			•	•			•	•	•				•														•				11		
• Provide staff assistance for prisoners in proceedings related to disciplinary hearings.										•				•														•																	3
• Provide legal services to prisoners in accordance with existing legislation, court decisions, or administrative policies.							•																										•										•	3	
• Facilitate prisoner access to legal services (no public funds to be used for attorneys' fees).				•														•										•																	3
• No standard		•	•			•		•			•		X				•						•	•	•		•	•				•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	20
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	*			*	*				*		*							*	*		*				*		*												*					10	

X No corrections standards available.

**CORRECTIONS
Offender Rights**

4. Limits on Solitary Confinement

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total excluding NAC				
• Prohibit solitary confinement extending beyond 7 days.																		•																										1			
• Prohibit solitary confinement extending beyond 10 days.	•				•									•				•				•							•							•	•									7	
• Require administrative review of confinement after a specified time.									• a		• a																• a															• b					4
• Require administrative review of confinement after 15 days.				•																				•				•												•						4	
• Set policy limits and procedural safeguards for solitary confinement.	•																		•																											2	
• Prohibit solitary confinement except as a last resort.						•									•																															2	
• No standard		•		•			•	•	•	•		X			•	•				•	•	•	•	•		•	•			•	•	•	•	•		•	•		•						20		
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	*	*	*						*	*								*	*			*					*									*	77		*						11		

a. Hearing after 10 days of solitary confinement.

b. Hearing to take place within 3 days and the upper limit of solitary confinement shall not exceed 90 days.

X No corrections standards available.

**CORRECTIONS
Offender Rights**

5. Conditions of Participation in Rehabilitation Programs

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex-cluding NAC				
• Assure that participation in rehabilitation or treatment programs be voluntary.	•	•	•	•	•	•			•	•				•	•					•	•				•		•	•										•				•			18		
• Require participation in rehabilitation programs for adults.																		•																													1
• Provide incentives for participation in rehabilitation programs.																																															1
• No standard	•	•		•			•			•	•	•	X		•			•				•	•	•		•		•		•		•	•	•	•		•	•		•						20	
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	*	*	*						*					*							*				*		*		*								78			*			*			11	

X No corrections standards available.

**CORRECTIONS
Offender Rights**

**6. Cell
Occupancy**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC				
• Within a reasonable time, close all facilities in which prisoners are not provided with individual cells.	•									•				•	•			•																												5	
• Require individual cells in new construction.																			•																												2
• Provide prisoners with individual cells (no stipulation that substandard facilities be closed).			•								•																	• ^a		•		•									•						6
• Provide prisoners with adequate space.				•		•														•			•																	•						5	
• No standard	•	•			•	•	•	•	•			•	X			•	•				•	•		•	•	•		•				•	•	•	•	•				•	•					22	
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)															76						*																									4	

a. Refers to regional facilities only.
X No corrections standards available.

**CORRECTIONS
Offender Rights**

**7. Restoration of
Civil Rights
Following
Release**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- cluding NAC
• Assist inmates in the restoration of civil rights by providing related agency services.	•			•					•	•	•		•			•						•		•			•		•							•	•					11	
• Enact legislation providing for the restoration of all civil rights (no services.)								•							•	•					•	•									•	•											9
• (Other statements in the standards supporting the restoration of civil rights of prisoners following release.)		•									•																		•								•		•			5	
• No standard			•		•	•	•	•					X					•	•	•				•			•	•					•	•					•			15	
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	*			*					*		*		*											*			*		*									*	77	*			10

X No corrections standards available.

**CORRECTIONS
Offender Rights**

**8. Employment
of Ex-Offenders**

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex- ceeding NAC					
• Repeal all statutory provisions prohibiting the employment of ex-offenders in state and local government agencies.	•											•		•	•		•					•					•	•															•	11				
• Enact legislation protecting ex-offenders from unreasonable discrimination in employment (government agencies not specified).									•							•		•																												•	4	
• Enact legislation protecting ex-offender's civil rights and other attributes of citizenship (employment barriers not specified).	•		•						•												•										•																	5
• Utilize existing laws to restore ex-offenders' rights (including the right to employment) not directly related to the offense committed.												•																																				1
• Legislate collateral consequences of a criminal conviction, including the denial or revocation of a license or governmental privilege.						•																																									1	
• No standard		•		•		•	•						X					•		•			•	•		•		•				•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	18		
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	75								*			77			75						*							80	75																	7		

X No corrections standards available.

**CORRECTIONS
Facility Construction**

1. Construction of New Adult Institutions

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total excluding NAC			
• Prohibit construction of major new adult institutions unless an analysis indicates that no alternative exists (replacement allowed).	•	•		•					•	•		•		•	•				•	•	•		•	•	•		•											•	•	•			20			
• Postpone construction of new adult institutions until inmates are classified and grouped into homogeneous populations as specified in a master plan.																	•																												1	
• Permit construction of new adult facilities provided that construction conforms to total system needs or to state-wide policy.						•																						•		•																3
• Permit construction of new facilities.																										• a											• b									2
• No standard		•		•		•	•			•		X			•		•				•				•							•			•	•				•	•				14	
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	*	*	*					*	*	*	*	*	*						*	*	*			*				*					*				*								13	

a. Promote the construction of regional facilities for housing offenders sentenced to more than 6 months.
b. The maximum inmate population in new facilities must be 400.
X No corrections standards available.

**CORRECTIONS
Facility Construction**

2. Construction of New Juvenile Institutions

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total excluding NAC		
• Prohibit construction of major new juvenile institutions under all circumstances (replacement allowed).	•			•					•											•	•	•											•			•							10		
• Prohibit construction of major new juvenile institutions unless an analysis shows that no other alternative exists.												•					•			•							•	•									•							6	
• Permit construction of new juvenile institutions provided that projects are undertaken in accordance with a system-wide plan.						•				•					•																	•												4	
• No standard	•	•		•		•	•	•	•			X	•		•	•	•	•	•	•		•				•		•	•				•	•				•	•	•					20
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	*			*								*								*	*				*			*								77								7	

a. Construction prohibited until community resources have been developed that would deinstitutionalize status offenders.

X No corrections standards available.

**CORRECTIONS
Facility Construction**

3. Size Restrictions on Juvenile Detention Facilities

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total excluding NAC					
• Restrict the population of newly constructed juvenile detention facilities to 20 persons.					•																					•																•	3					
• Restrict the population of newly constructed juvenile detention facilities to 30 persons.	•	• a										•							•						•			•																		•	8	
• Develop standards for juvenile detention facilities.																																	•													1		
• No standard		•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•			X	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•		•	•	•	•																28	
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)																																															78	1

a. Stipulates only where it is feasible.

X No corrections standards available.

CORRECTIONS
Local Correctional Facilities

1. Planning for Local Correctional Facilities

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total excluding NAC		
• Develop local correctional facilities in accordance with a state-wide master plan.	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•		•		•		•						•		•	•		•	•	•		•	•					•	•	•				23		
• No standard							•				•	X		•		•	•	•	•	•			•			•	•			•			•	•											17
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	*	*	77	78			77		*	*	*												*			*	*									*		*						12	

a. Refers to planning for construction of local facilities only.
X No corrections standards available.

CORRECTIONS
Local Correctional Facilities

2. State Control of Local Correctional Facilities

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total excluding NAC	
• Incorporate jails into the state system (state control).	●			●				● ^c						●	●						●						● ^c	●									●						9	
• Study the feasibility of incorporating jails into a state or regional system; in the interim, develop and enforce jail standards.										● ^a		●										● ^b																		●				4
• Develop and enforce state-wide jail standards, but retain local administrative control.		●				●		●		●							●		●				●	●	●				●			●					●						14	
• Develop and enforce jail standards (no mention of control).			● ^d												●										●										●								4	
• Continue complete local control of jails.																				●																							1	
• No standard					●	●						X						●											●		●	●	●							●			8	
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	82	*	*		80					77				*	78						*		82	*			80	*							*	77		82	*				15	

- a. Florida leaves choice of state/local operation to counties, but counties which do not maintain local facilities in accordance with state standards forfeit their right to choose and are incorporated.
 b. Applies to selected local institutions only.
 c. Applies only to all local correctional facilities housing offenders sentenced to more than 6 months.
 d. Already accomplished in state.
 X No corrections standards available.

CORRECTIONS
Local Correctional Facilities

3. Segregation of Pretrial and Post-Trial Detainees

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total excluding NAC	
• Segregate pretrial and post-trial detainees where possible, in local correctional facilities.	•	•		•		•				•		•		•														•											•	•				13
• Segregate diverse categories of inmates in local facilities.									•						•	•			•								•									•		•						7
• No standard			•		•		•	•			•		X				•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•				•	•										•	•			20
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	*	*		*						*		*		*														*		*														11

- a. Advocates segregation in all cases, instead of "where possible".
 b. Suggests separation of those requiring maximum security confinement from those who need less supervision.
 X No corrections standards available.

CORRECTIONS
Local Correctional Facilities

4. Programming in Local Correctional Facilities

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total excluding NAC	
• Develop educational, vocational, job placement and recreational programs in local correctional facilities.	•	•		•		•				•		•		•	•	•	•	•	•		•				•			•	•										•	•	•		21	
• Examine programming or develop standards to ensure that recreational, educational skills and social needs of offenders are being met in local correctional facilities.											•											•								•														3
• No standard			•		•		•	•	•				X							•				•	•		•						•	•						•				16
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	*	*	*							*	*			*	77	*				*	*							*	*	*									*	*				14

a. Programs should be available "when practicable".

X No corrections standards available.

CORRECTIONS
Training and Education

1. Provision of In-Service Training for Correctional Employees

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total ex-cluding NAC			
• Provide at least 80 hours of in-service training annually for all correctional staff.															•																													1		
• Provide at least 60 hours of in-service training. . .																		•																												1
• Provide at least 40 hours of in-service training. . .	•	• ^a	•	•	•	•		•	•				•		•	•	•	•	•	•				•			•							•	• ^a	• ^b	•	•	•	•					20	
• Provide at least 20 hours of in-service training...								• ^a																				•												•					3	
• Provide formal in-service training (no hours specified).	•										•								•					•			•		•				•	•								•				8
• Create a commission to advise on correctional and other criminal justice agency training needs, and to develop standards thereto.						•					•									•																										3
• No standard													X									•		•		•							•												4	
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	*	* 77	*	*	*				* *	76	*		*	*		*		82	*	*				*			*	77	*	*																24

a. Provide 80 hrs. for first year employees, provide 40 hrs. for all others.
 b. Standard relates only to correctional systems in counties of at least 150,000 population and the State
 X No corrections standards available.

CORRECTIONS
Training and Education

2. In-Service Education of Correctional Employees

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total excluding NAC	
• Provide salary increases and new work assignments as incentives for correctional employees to improve their education.	•	•		•	•	•				•		•		•				•		•					•			•	•	•						•	•	•			•	19		
• Provide salary increases as incentives (not new work assignments).											•																																	1
• Provide incentives to improve education (unspecified).								•	•						•	•			•																									5
• Provide incentives for participation in in-house training programs.																	•																											1
• No standard		•				•						X							•		•	•	•			•	•			•	•		•	•						•			14	
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)															78						77																						2	

a. Specifies incentives for probation officers only.

X No corrections standards available.

CORRECTIONS
Training and Education

3. Work Stoppages by Correctional Employees

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total excluding NAC								
• Enact legislation prohibiting work stoppages by correctional employees.	•			•		•			•			•		•	•	•					•							•	•																	12					
• Establish formal policy prohibiting work stoppage (legislation already exists).										•																														•					2						
• Discourage work stoppages and make plans to deal with them.		•						•											•				•																•						5						
• No standard			•		•		•				•		X				•	•		•		•		•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•				•	•				21						
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	78	*				*			78	*		78		78		78					78							80																		78		*	*		12

X No corrections standards available.

CORRECTIONS
Organization and Planning

1. Program Evaluations

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total excluding NAC		
• Evaluate correctional performance on the basis of recidivism rates reported at six-months intervals.	•	•		•	•	•				•		•		•		•									•		•	•	•									•	•				14		
• Conduct agency evaluations periodically.							•										•														•													3	
• Conduct overall reviews of the state correctional system on the basis of recidivism measures.								•	•														•																		• ^a				4
• No standard		•								•		X		•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•			•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	19
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	*	*	*	*	*				*	*	*	*		*			*							*		*												*	*					12	

a. Evaluation not required but the information by which they may be evaluated must be available.

X No corrections standards available.

CORRECTIONS
Organization and Planning

2. Jurisdiction Over Juvenile Status Offenders

	NAC	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Total excluding NAC					
• Limit the jurisdiction of the court to juveniles charged with nonstatus offenses.	•	•										•								•					•		•	•															•	8				
• Maintain the court's jurisdiction over status offenders, but prevent their incarceration.					•	•		•								•		•				•							•																	•	10	
• No standard		•	•				•		•	•	•		X	•	•		•		•			•	•						•	•	•															•	22	
• Target date for implementation (* = immediately)	75	75										77				80																																4

X No corrections standards available.

END