

1979 annual report

69171



NCJRS

JUL 10 1980

ACCREDITATIONS

1979

annual report

contents

Annual Report	1
Board of Commissioners and Commission Staff	7
American Correctional Association Committee on Standards	7
Accredited Agencies	8
Agencies Participating in Accreditation by Category and Jurisdiction	10
Statement of Principles	12
Available Materials	14

COMMISSION ON ACCREDITATION FOR CORRECTIONS
6110 Executive Blvd., Suite 750, Rockville, Maryland 20852

The Commission on Accreditation for Corrections is principally funded by the Standards Program Management Team, Criminal Justice Programs, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, United States Department of Justice.

The views and opinions in this document are those of the Commission and do not represent the policies or positions of the U.S. Department of Justice.

May 1980

An accreditation system for corrections has been given considerable attention in recent years. Accreditation would be used as a means to recognize and maintain standards of service, programs, and institutions, and eventually bring about higher levels of quality.

National Advisory Commission
on Criminal Justice Standards
and Goals, 1978

The Commission on Accreditation for Corrections represents the culmination of many years of effort by corrections professionals to design a blueprint for systematic improvement of the field. Although the original movement to upgrade correctional practice began a century ago, it has been the actions of both corrections and the courts during the last thirty years that produced the momentum for change which created the Commission.

After five years of operation, the Commission has achieved its original program objectives to provide corrections with measurable standards of operation and to develop an objective method for evaluating performance relative to those standards. The Commission reached two significant milestones in 1979. It completed the series of standards for adult and juvenile corrections, in cooperation with the American Correctional Association Committee on Standards. And, it implemented the second half of its national accreditation program by initiating juvenile activities.

By publishing the tenth and final volume of standards in the series—the *Manual of Standards for the Administration of Correctional Agencies*—the Commission came full-circle in providing corrections with operational standards for individual facilities as well as for the administration of an entire system, and moved the field closer to its final goal, as set forth in the Commission's *Statement of Principles*: "The accreditation of individual correctional agencies within a given major jurisdiction is but a step toward the ultimate goal of realizing accreditation of the total system of correctional services within that jurisdiction."

Commission Organization

The Commission, a private, nonprofit, independent organization, was originally established in 1974 through a grant from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration to the American Correctional Association. As originally planned, the Commission became fiscally and administratively independent of the ACA on April 1, 1979. However, as partners in correctional progress, the Commission maintains a cooperative working relationship with ACA. Both organizations continue to share the joint responsibility of approving the standards and all subsequent revisions thereof.

The Commission *By-Laws* provide that membership on the Commission will be in accordance with the following categories:

Community-Based Services	Institutions
Adult	Adult
Juvenile	Juvenile
Correctional Systems	Parole
Adult	Adult
Juvenile	Juvenile
Detention Facilities	Probation
Adult	Adult
Juvenile	Juvenile
Criminal Court Judiciary	
Juvenile Court Judiciary	
Ex-Offender	

Members of the Board of Commissioners are elected to serve in these categories by the membership of the American Correctional Association. Both the nomination and election of the Commission members follow regular Association procedures, with the additional provisions that Commission members serve five-year terms and are ineligible to succeed themselves for a period of five years.

In addition, there are five members of the Commission who are appointed to serve five-year terms as the official representatives of the following organizations: American Bar Association, American Institute of Architects, American Medical Association, and the National Sheriffs' Association.

The Commission meets six times annually to consider and decide accreditation awards, review and approve standards revisions, and establish accreditation policy and procedure. Under the direction of the Executive Director, the Commission's staff

carries out the daily operations of the national accreditation program.

Standards Development and Revision

Beginning with the publication of the first volume of standards in July 1976, the Commission has issued the following ten manuals:

- Manual of Standards for Adult Parole Authorities (July 1976)*
- Manual of Standards for Adult Community Residential Services (April 1977)*
- Manual of Standards for Adult Probation and Parole Field Services (July 1977)*
- Manual of Standards for Adult Correctional Institutions (August 1977)*
- Manual of Standards for Adult Local Detention Facilities (December 1977)*
- Manual of Standards for Juvenile Community Residential Services (April 1978)*
- Manual of Standards for Juvenile Probation and Aftercare Services (July 1978)*
- Manual of Standards for Juvenile Detention Facilities and Services (February 1979)*
- Manual of Standards for Juvenile Training Schools and Services (March 1979)*
- Manual of Standards for the Administration of Correctional Agencies (June 1979)*

These standards are the first and only set of comprehensive, operational criteria developed for corrections. As such, they serve as the cornerstone of the Commission's national, voluntary accreditation program.

In order to continue to reflect the consensus of professional corrections in the future, as they do now, the standards will be revised consistent with new knowledge and experience. As stated in the Commission's *Principles*, "no standard is fixed for all time, nor should any standard constrain efforts toward innovation and the development of more effective methods of achieving the goals of the field."

Unlike the development of the original standards, the primary responsibility and staff support for the revision of the adult manuals of standards is with the American Correctional Association, not the Commission. However, the Commission is cooperating with ACA throughout the standards revision process. Information

relative to the standards which is gained through accreditation activities is forwarded to ACA by the Commission. And once the standards are revised and approved by the ACA Committee on Standards, the Commission reviews and approves the revisions. As with the initial series of standards, second edition manuals are published only after both ACA and the Commission have approved them.

The Commission and ACA continue to support the premise used in the development of the original standards—as many correctional agencies, individual practitioners, and national organizations as possible should be given the opportunity to review and respond to the proposed standards revisions. It is this participation by the field that validates the standards and encourages continued support for them.

Accreditation Activities

By the end of 1979, twenty-seven months after the initiation of national accreditation activities, 400 correctional facilities were formally involved in the process. Initially, community correctional facilities, both public and private, represented the largest component within corrections to seek accreditation. This is illustrated by the fact that 27 of the 34 agencies which were accredited as of December 1979 were adult community residential facilities. However, approximately twenty-five percent of all adult correctional institutions were pursuing accreditation by the end of the year, thereby becoming proportionately the largest component in corrections represented in the process.

During 1979, the Commission's accreditation efforts not only expanded in this country, but also became established in the international corrections community. The Correctional Service of Canada completed a pilot project of accreditation activities, resulting in the accreditation of one adult correctional institution, two community residential facilities, and three offices of its national parole service. Correctional administrators in Australia began staff dialogue with the Commission, and Japanese corrections officials requested permission to translate the standards for study purposes.

In this country, the Federal Prison System initiated its multi-phase accreditation effort by bringing eight community treatment centers and five institutions into the process. According to the FPS accreditation program design, additional institutions are sched-

uled to enter the process until all federal facilities have been accredited.

Eleven state corrections systems—Arizona, Colorado, Connecticut, Iowa, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Jersey and Vermont—are involved in accreditation activities as participants in the LEAA-sponsored Correctional Standards Accreditation Program. LEAA has provided the funds for these agencies to pursue accreditation in order to demonstrate and evaluate accreditation as a method for implementing national correctional standards.

In addition, eight state corrections systems and numerous individual correctional agencies have begun accreditation activities without special federal funds. Florida was the first state to enter all of its adult correctional institutions into accreditation. Illinois was the first state to have a correctional institution accredited. And, Nebraska became the only state to begin accreditation activities in all of its adult and juvenile correctional facilities simultaneously.

Accreditation requires considerable organizational and fiscal resources, as well as a strong commitment from the leadership and personnel of any agency or facility which begins the process. The time required to complete accreditation is from six to eighteen months, and the award of accreditation is for a three-year period. Annual reports and on-site inspections are required to monitor accredited agencies' continued compliance with the standards.

The central focus of the accreditation process is the agency's internal self-evaluation—a systematic assessment of its compliance with each standard in the applicable manual of standards. Using the agency's own self-evaluation report, a team of Commission consultants conducts an on-site audit to verify standards compliance and assess the plans of action which the agency has developed to correct all deficiencies. Written documentation is required to illustrate that policies and procedures exist and are used in the daily operation of the agency.

The benefits of accreditation are many—ranging from accountability to both public and offender populations, budgetary justification for improvements based on national norms and adherence to constitutional requirements, to the establishment of appropriate working conditions for staff, long-range economies resulting from efficient management, and the coordination of corrections administration with other components of the criminal justice sys-

tem. The effort of self-evaluation is rewarded by the development and refinement of written policies and procedures which comprehensively address the daily operation of correctional facilities. "Oral tradition" is thereby replaced by contemporary management practices.

Accreditation offers the mechanism by which to upgrade corrections systematically. In addition, it also offers the method for independently verifying good correctional practice as it exists throughout the country. Those correctional systems, whether federal, state or local, which operate according to sound management and humane treatment models should be recognized and applauded as such.

Correctional Improvement: A Contemporary Mandate

The momentum for change which created the Commission was, in part, a response from the field to increased judicial activity. Within recent years, a significant number of correctional systems and individual facilities have become the subjects of court orders. An even greater number of correctional agencies have worked to avoid court action. Consequently, the need for standards of operation and a mechanism to measure compliance with those standards was recognized and required immediate action. The field of corrections had to enforce the precepts of professionalism, humaneness and constitutionality.

Pursuant to its mandate, the Commission developed comprehensive standards for all areas of adult and juvenile corrections. In so doing, the Commission has addressed itself to the establishment of certain life, health and safety minima which must be met at all times by corrections. Adherence to these life, health and safety standards becomes the hallmark of exemplary correctional administrations. Any deficiency in these areas can become the foundation for human tragedy.

The standards require and accreditation enforces sound correctional practice which insures the safety and well-being of both corrections personnel and offenders. Life, health and safety hazards cannot be tolerated in correctional facilities, and accreditation provides the mechanism to monitor these critical areas.

Corrections has recognized the need for change. The Commission provides the course for improvement.

COMMISSION ON ACCREDITATION
FOR CORRECTIONS
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

Executive Committee

Robert J. Watson, Chairman
Oregon
William Lucas, Vice Chairman
Michigan

J. Robert Weber, Treasurer
North Carolina
Edna L. Goodrich, Washington
H. G. Moeller, North Carolina

Gary R. Blake, Maryland
Paul J. Charters, Florida
Alfred B. Coate, Montana
Albert Elias, New Jersey
B. James George, Jr., Texas
Leslie R. Green, Minnesota
Robert P. Heyne, Indiana
Ralph A. Jefferson, Wisconsin
John W. McGough, Washington

Thomas H. Morrissey, North
Carolina
Donald Omodt, Minnesota
Wayne K. Patterson, Colorado
Marcella C. Rapp, Colorado
Amos E. Reed, North Carolina
Irvin M. Riedman, North Dakota
Felix Rodriguez, New Mexico
Joseph R. Rowan, Illinois
J. Steven Tremont, Louisiana

Staff

Robert H. Fosen
Executive Director
Jane A. O'Shaughnessy
Deputy Director
Sharon L. Johnson
Assistant Director

Charles R. Reusing
Assistant Director
Lloyd W. Heflin
Business Manager
Susan S. Miller
Counsel

AMERICAN CORRECTIONAL ASSOCIATION
COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS

Samuel Sublett, Jr., Chairman
Illinois
John W. Braithwaite, Canada
Norman F. Chamberlain,
Washington
Grady A. Decell, South Carolina
W. J. Estelle, Jr., Texas
J. J. Enomoto, California
Gerald Farkas, Washington, D.C.
John R. Gagnon, Wisconsin
Rudy F. Guillen, Virginia

Gary Hill, Nebraska
Vernon G. Housewright, Arkansas
Ronald G. Jackson, Texas
Jacqueline Jones, Colorado
Charles Kehoe, Michigan
Joann B. Morton, South Carolina
Ruth M. Pappert, Indiana
Donald W. Pointer, Maryland
Julian Pugh, Virginia
William B. Robinson, Pennsylvania
Paul I. Weldon, South Carolina

ACCREDITED AGENCIES

Adult Parole Authorities

New Jersey State Parole Board

Adult Probation and Parole Field Services

Correctional Service of Canada
National Parole Service
(Atlantic Region—3 district offices)

Adult Probation and Parole Services
Utah Division of Corrections
(19 field offices)

Division of Adult Field Services
Vermont Department of Corrections
(4 field offices)

Adult Community Residential Services

Alvis House
Columbus, Ohio
(3 residential facilities)

Magdala Foundation
St. Louis, Missouri
(4 residential facilities)

Bureau of Rehabilitation of the
National Capital Area
Washington, D.C.
(4 residential facilities)

Mahoning County Residential
Treatment Center
Youngstown, Ohio

California Department of
Corrections
Sacramento, California
(1 residential facility)

Montana Bureau of Community
Services
Helena, Montana
(2 residential facilities)

Correctional Service of Canada
Ottawa, Canada
(2 residential facilities)

Pioneer Cooperative Affiliation
Seattle, Washington
(3 residential facilities)

Dismas House of St. Louis
St. Louis, Missouri

Rube, Incorporated
Pomona, California
(2 residential facilities)

Federal Prison System
Washington, D.C.
(4 residential facilities)

Span, Incorporated
Pomona, California
(3 residential facilities)

Talbert House
Cincinnati, Ohio
(4 residential facilities)

Utah Division of Corrections
Salt Lake City, Utah
(6 residential facilities)

Adult Correctional Institutions

Colorado Department of
Corrections
Buena Vista Correctional
Facility
Buena Vista, Colorado

Federal Correctional
Institution
Texarkana, Texas

Correctional Service of Canada
Dorchester Penitentiary
Dorchester, New Brunswick

Illinois Department of
Corrections
Logan Correctional Center
Logan, Illinois

Springhill Institution
Springhill, Nova Scotia

Menard Correctional Center
Menard, Illinois

Federal Prison System
Federal Correctional
Institution
Lompoc, California

Menard Psychiatric Center
Menard, Illinois

United States Penitentiary
Terre Haute, Indiana

Vandalia Correctional Center
Vandalia, Illinois

Federal Prison Camp—
Allenwood
Montgomery, Pennsylvania

Minnesota Department of
Corrections
Minnesota Correctional
Facility
St. Cloud, Minnesota

Federal Correctional
Institution
Memphis, Tennessee

Adult Local Detention Facilities

Denver Department of Safety
Denver County Jail
Denver, Colorado

Connecticut Department of
Corrections
Community Correctional
Center
New Haven, Connecticut

Pre-Arrestment
Detention Facility
Denver, Colorado

*Accredited agencies as of May 1980.

AGENCIES PARTICIPATING IN ACCREDITATION BY CATEGORY AND JURISDICTION

(Figures as of May 1980)

Adult Parole Authorities (APA)	7
Adult Community Residential Services (ACRS)	121
Adult Probation and Parole Field Services (APFSS)	205
Adult Correctional Institutions (ACI)	144
Adult Local Detention Facilities (ALDF)	12
Juvenile Community Residential Services (JCRS)	2
Juvenile Probation and Aftercare Services (JPAS)	3
Juvenile Detention Facilities and Services (JDFS)	3
Juvenile Training Schools and Services (JTSS)	<u>3</u>
Total	500

STATE	APA	ACRS ¹	APFSS ²	ACI	ALDF	JCRS	JPAS	JDFS	JTSS	Private ³ Comm. Resid. Services
Alaska										1
Arizona		4*	14*	6*						2
California		1	46	12						8
Colorado		2*	5*	8*	2					1
Connecticut			3*	4*	6*					1
District of Columbia										4
Florida				24						1
Idaho										1
Illinois		4		7				1		
Iowa		6*	3*	7*						
Kentucky		1								
Louisiana		1*	14*	5*						2
Maine			5*	2*						1
Maryland		2*	9*	46*	8*	1				2
Massachusetts			7*	11*						1
Michigan							1	1	1	
Minnesota		1*		5*	3					1
Missouri				5						6
Montana			2							
Nebraska		1	4	2	4		1	2	2	
Nevada										1
New Jersey		1	1*	9*	8*					2
Ohio										11

STATE	APA	ACRS ¹	APPFS ²	ACI	ALDF	JCRS	JPAS	JDFS	ITSS	Private ³ Comm. Resid. Services
Oklahoma		10	6	8						
Pennsylvania	1		26							1
Rhode Island								1	1	
Texas										1
Utah	1	6	19	1						
Vermont			4*	6*						
Virginia										2
Washington										3

Subtotal	7	58	202	131	12	2	2	3	3	53
Federal Prison System		8		10						
Correctional Service of Canada		2	3	2						
TOTAL ⁴	7	68	205	144	12	2	3	3	3	53

*Indicates state facilities which are participating in the LEAA-funded Correctional Standards Accreditation Program.

¹The figures in this category represent public community residential facilities participating in accreditation.

²The figures indicated are the number of field offices operated by the probation/parole agency.

³These figures are public nonprofit and for-profit community residential facilities participating in accreditation.

⁴All of the figures in the chart include agencies which have been accredited.

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

Preamble—The Commission on Accreditation for Corrections, in order to develop and implement most effectively an accreditation program within and for the field of corrections, at both the juvenile and adult levels, and within the United States of America and such other Countries as may be appropriate and feasible, therefore adopts this Statement of Principles

Principle I—The goals of the correctional field are (1) protection of the public, (2) assistance to the courts regarding offender dispositions, (3) assistance to juvenile and adult offenders to promote law-abiding behavior, (4) provision of just and humane care in the management of offenders, (5) encouragement of and participation in research regarding the causes of delinquency and crime and the effectiveness of correctional methods, (6) provision of efficiency and economy in correctional operations, (7) promotion of and participation in coordinated planning and administration of diversified programs, activities and services of criminal justice agencies, and (8) motivation of improved employee performance through promotion of education and training opportunities. These goals will be met more effectively and efficiently through the development within major jurisdictions or coordinated systems of services characterized by joint problem identification, joint planning, coordination of operations and joint evaluation of results.

Principle II—The correctional field and services it provides are, fundamentally, (1) community services, including probation and parole, (2) institutional/residential services, and (3) community residential/transitional services, such as halfway houses and other forms of community programming. These services, when operated effectively and efficiently as interdependent and coordinated components of a total system of services, provide the basis for achievement of the goals of the field.

Principle III—To achieve maximum progress toward the realization of specified goals, it has been and will continue to be necessary for the field of corrections to articulate and adhere to the highest professional standards, which are viewed as required levels of performance in the public interest.

Principle IV—Standards for the correctional field should be expected to undergo continuous review and growth consistent with the experience of new knowledge, skills and methods. Thus, no standard is fixed for all time, nor should any standard constrain efforts toward innovation and the development of more effective methods of achieving the goals of the field.

Principle V—Pursuant to accepted standards, voluntary self-evaluation by correctional agencies within the context of a total system of correctional services is recognized as a sound and productive process for the continuous improvement of both standards and performance.

Principle VI—The development and definition of standards, and the application of standards through rigorous self-evaluation are serious social and professional responsibilities of each individual working in the field of corrections.

Principle VII—Accreditation will be awarded to governmental jurisdictions and to individual agencies and services thereof demonstrating adherence to standards approved and accepted by both the American Correctional Association and the Commission on Accreditation for Correction. The accreditation of individual correctional agencies within a given major jurisdiction is but a step toward the ultimate goal of realizing accreditation of the total system of correctional services within that jurisdiction.

Principle VIII—Among all employees of the correctional field, accreditation will provide recognition of effective leadership and achievement of the highest standards of employee performance. In addition, accreditation can be expected to contribute significantly to the improvement of staff development, teamwork and morale.

Principle IX—Accreditation can be expected to facilitate the identification of strengths and needs at both the correctional agency level, and at the level of the total system of services within major jurisdiction. Short and long range planning will be facilitated at both the agency and total system levels.

Principle X—Among correctional agencies and total correctional systems, accreditation will contribute to the presentation of understandable and persuasive budget requests to both cognizant officials/executives and to the legislative bodies of the respective jurisdictions. The accreditation status indicates that budgeted funds are being used appropriately. Accordingly, it is vital that the courts and all concerned officials, executives, and legislators understand and believe in the integrity of the nationally-recognized standards as applied in the accreditation process.

Principle XI—With the further development of public participation and understanding, the Commission seeks to encourage among all correctional agencies and systems the adoption of new approaches to crime reduction and prevention. The reduction and prevention of crime can be expected to progress with the continuous articulation of standards and the continuous measurement of adherence to standards within the context of coordinated systems of correctional services. Official recognition of correctional effectiveness will follow. In addition, accreditation will provide to interested citizens the opportunity to view their correctional agencies and systems within the framework of nationally-recognized standards.

Principle XII—Adherence to the foregoing principles in the accreditation of correctional services can be expected to result in better utilization of personnel and resources, with maximum benefits to the criminal offender, to the correctional field and to the public.

Available Materials

Publications

Accreditation: Blueprint for Corrections
Agency Manual of Accreditation Policy and Procedure:
 Adult Parole Authorities
 Adult Community Residential Services
 Adult Probation and Parole Field Services
 Adult Correctional Institutions
 Adult Local Detention Facilities
 Juvenile Community Residential Services
 Juvenile Probation and Aftercare Services
 Juvenile Detention Facilities and Services
 Juvenile Training Schools and Services
Annual Report
Manual of Standards for Adult Parole Authorities
Manual of Standards for Adult Community Residential Services
Manual of Standards for Adult Probation and Parole Field Services
Manual of Standards for Adult Correctional Institutions
Manual of Standards for Adult Local Detention Facilities
Manual of Standards for Juvenile Community Residential Services
Manual of Standards for Juvenile Probation and Aftercare Services
Manual of Standards for Juvenile Detention Facilities and Services
Manual of Standards for Juvenile Training Schools and Services
Manual of Standards for the Administration of Correctional Agencies

Audio-Visuals

The Way to Accreditation:
 Adult Parole Authorities
 Adult Community Residential Services
 Adult Probation and Parole Field Services
 Adult Correctional Institutions
 Adult Local Detention Facilities
 Juvenile Community Residential Services
 Juvenile Probation and Aftercare Services
 Juvenile Detention Facilities and Services
 Juvenile Training Schools and Services

Direct requests or inquiries to:

Commission on Accreditation for Corrections
6110 Executive Boulevard, Suite 750
Rockville, Maryland 20852
Phone: (301) 770-3097

**COMMISSION ON ACCREDITATION
FOR CORRECTIONS**

**6110 Executive Blvd., Suite 750
Rockville, Maryland 20852**

END