

70081

LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE  
ADMINISTRATION  
OFFICE OF LAW ENFORCEMENT  
PROGRAMS

DISCRETIONARY GRANT  
PROGRESS REPORT

1. Grantee: Division of Justice and Crime Prevention, Commonwealth of Virginia	4. Grant No. 71-DF-1095 1096	5. Date of / / April Report: / / October 12/14/73 /x/ Other
2. Implementing Subgrantee: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges	6. Grant Amt. \$73,460	7. Character / / Interim of Report: x/ Final
3. Title or Character of Project: Junior College Attainment Program for Line Correctional Personnel	8. Covering Period: January 3, 1972 to August 31, 1973	

To: ☒ Cognizant Regional Office  
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration

☒ State Planning Agency, State of Virginia

Submitted herewith is the grantee's progress report for the period  
shown above:

Andrew S. Korim  
Project Director (signature)

Andrew S. Korim, Project Director  
(Typed Name and Title)

[Commence report below and add continuation pages as required.]

(Report begins on next page.)

NCJRS

JUL 31 1980

ACQUISITIONS

Instructions Appear on Reverse Side

## PROGRESS REPORTS--INSTRUCTIONS FOR LEAA DISCRETIONARY GRANTS

Grantees are required to submit Semi-Annual Progress Reports on project activities and accomplishments. No fixed requirements as to format, length, or detail have been established, although some general guidelines appear below. It is expected that reports will include data appropriate to the stage of project development and in sufficient detail to provide a clear idea and summary of LEAA and accomplishments to date. The following should be observed in preparation and submission of progress reports.

- a. Reporting Party. The party responsible for preparing the report will be the agency, whether grantee or subgrantee, actually implementing the project. Thus where a State planning agency is the grantee but has delegated funds to a particular unit or agency to carry on the project, the report should be prepared by the subgrantee.
- b. Due Date. Semi-annual reports are due by April 1 and October 1 each year for all active discretionary grant projects. The first progress report should cover the period from commencement of the project until the applicable April 1 or October 1 reporting date. However, no report is required if the grant award date is less than 30 days prior to the reporting date. Where the project has been completed at the time of the applicable reporting date, the progress report will serve as the final narrative report and Item 7 should so indicate.
- c. Form and Execution. Three copies of each report should be submitted, using Form LEAA-OLEP-159 as a face sheet. (Where the grantee wishes to submit the same report to several agencies and thus does not desire to start the text on the face sheet, it may, as an alternative, complete the Form 159 fill in items and attach the progress report to it.) It should be noted that the report is to be signed by the person designated as project director on the grant application or any duly designated successor.
- d. Content. Reports should be cumulative, i.e., describe progress from the beginning of the project to the report date. They should describe activities and accomplishments during the report period with specific attention to project phases or stages completed (e.g., initial planning stage, completion of preliminary survey effort, purchase of required equipment, staging of pilot training programs, etc.). Reports should be concrete and specific concerning accomplishments, e.g., number of people trained, volume of correctional services provided, content of equipment used, etc. Special reports, evaluation studies, publications or articles issued during the period should be attached, and major administrative or design developments should be covered (e.g., changes in personnel, changes in project design, improvements or new methods introduced). Budget changes should be touched upon. Problem areas and critical observations should be mentioned and frankly discussed, as well as project successes.
- e. Dissemination. Progress reports should be furnished both to the State planning agency (1 copy) and the law-enforcement regional office (2 copies) which will route reports to all interested LEAA units. Copies should also be provided to agencies cooperating in or providing services to the project.
- f. Special Requirements. Special reporting requirements or instructions may be prescribed for discretionary projects in certain program or experimental areas to better assess impact and comparative effectiveness of the overall discretionary program. These will be communicated to affected grantees by the LEAA Office of Law Enforcement Programs or other supervising LEAA unit.

### Note re State Planning Agency Progress Reporting Systems

Many States have regular progress reporting requirements for subgrantees to State and local units or agencies under their annual "block grant" allocations. Often, these systems require quarterly rather than semi-annual reports. Where a State planning agency is the recipient of a discretionary grant and wishes to apply these regular requirements to the State or local subgrantee which will be implementing the discretionary project, this is appropriate and the resulting reports may be used to satisfy the LEAA semi-annual progress report requirement if:

- (1) the LEAA progress report is reasonably current up to the LEAA report dates, i.e., April 1 or October 1. (A progress report current to within 90 days of these dates, i.e., January 1 for the April 1 deadline would be considered as acceptable but not anything earlier.)
- (2) the progress report substantially covers the "Content" requirement set forth in Instruction (d) above.

Where the State system is used, all the subgrantee need do is fill out the LEAA Form 159 face sheet and attach its most current 5th progress report in satisfaction of its LEAA discretionary grant obligations.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC--previously American Association of Junior Colleges) was funded under a subgrant from the Division of Justice and Crime Prevention, Commonwealth of Virginia, LEAA Grant No. 71-DF-1096, to undertake an intensive effort to improve the quality of line personnel working in penal institutions (adult and juvenile facilities). The period of the grant was January 3, 1972 to August 31, 1973 (including extensions).

Specifically the project had as its goals: increasing the number of correctional officers present and prospective undertaking and completing educational programs consisting of certificate and associate degree programs in community and junior colleges throughout the nation; increasing the number of two-year community colleges, junior colleges, and technical institutes offering educational opportunities to persons interested in careers in corrections and to line personnel already employed in the field of corrections; and facilitating innovative approaches to improve education and training programs for line workers in corrections. The project became known as the Correctional Officers Educational Program (COEP).

The Commission on Correctional Facilities and Services of the American Bar Association (CCFS-ABA) served as a subcontractor in this project. The Assistant Director of the project was a full-time member of the professional staff of the Commission. The Commission's efforts in attempting to bring reform to correctional processes have served as an important ingredient in improving the quality of personnel working in corrections. The resources of the Commission reinforced those of AACJC giving the project considerable depth beyond the capability of the grant. Furthermore, the linkages of the Commission with the practising lawyers throughout the states provided a valuable resource to the project.

The cooperation of the American Correctional Association (ACA) and a number of other interested organizations was acquired in this effort. Staff of ACA and its affiliates were important in providing valuable services at conferences, gave support through promotion of the objectives and activities of the project, and provided technical advice regarding the structure and operation of the various correctional systems in the nation.

## II. ACTIVITIES UNDER THE PROJECT

The activities conducted under the project consisted primarily of field visitations, surveys, conferences, consultation and technical assistance services, and preparation and dissemination of materials on project activities.

A. Meetings with Officials in Selected States. In an effort to identify the issues and concerns pertinent to improving the quality of correctional officers, meetings were held with officials in six states: New York, Minnesota, California, North Carolina, Illinois, and Pennsylvania. Although the composition of participants at the meetings varied, the mix usually consisted of the state commissioner of corrections, training officers from correctional institutions, both local and state, representatives from the state community college agency, and community college presidents and staff members.

Although many of the issues varied from state to state, certain ones dominated discussions. The following are the primary issues that surfaced in all states:

- What will be the characteristics of the profile of the future correctional officer?
- What changes in education and training will be necessary to develop these characteristics in the future correctional officer?
- What alternative forms of education and training are available to do the job?
- How can existing correctional officers be motivated to participate in training and education programs?
- How can new personnel be attracted to corrections?
- How can the resources of community and junior colleges be mobilized?
- How can state planning for education and training of correctional officers be improved?
- What are the alternative sources of funds to finance corrections education?
- How can legislation pertaining to the education and training of correctional officers be improved?

B. Inter-regional Conferences. The above listed issues and concerns were addressed in workshops conducted at four inter-regional conferences. The respective conferences were held as follows: Western States Conference, Salt Lake City, Utah, August 28 and 29, 1972; Central States Conference, St. Louis, Missouri, October 30 and 31, 1972; Eastern States Conference, Hartford, Connecticut, November 9 and 10, 1972; Southern States Conference, Mobile, Alabama, December 14 and 15, 1972.

The conferences were attended by one hundred and eighty-five persons from forty-four states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and Canada.

Representation at the conferences consisted of:

- state and local corrections administrators, training officers, and correctional officers (including jail personnel)
- state criminal justice planning agency officials
- state community college officials
- state vocational education officials
- presidents, administrators, and faculty from community and junior colleges, technical institutes, and universities
- representatives from federal agencies: Law Enforcement Assistance Administration; U. S. Bureau of Prisons; and Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

C. Consultation and Technical Assistance. An important component of the activities under the project consisted of consultation and technical assistance services to individual community colleges, junior colleges, and technical institutes regarding such matters as needs assessment, curriculum design, program improvement, student recruitment, faculty selection, and funding. Additionally, services were provided to state community and junior college agencies, state and local corrections agencies, and state criminal justice planning agencies regarding plans to mobilize the resources of community colleges to provide educational services to the field of corrections. Assistance was made available to the agencies, professional organizations, and individual colleges developing strategies to initiate and strengthen linkages among the respective principals in correctional officer education and training.

D. Surveys and Studies. During the term of the project, research was conducted by administering questionnaires at project conferences, mail questionnaires, review of state plans and reports, and literature studies. Among the topics included in this research were:

- Inventory of Educational Programs in Community and Junior Colleges.
- Survey of Line Officer Educational Needs.
- Analysis of State Law Enforcement Improvement Plans Regarding Role of Two-Year Colleges in Correctional Staff Development.

--Survey of Legislation, Regulations, and Policies  
Supportive of Correctional Officer Education.

--Graduate Schools of Criminal Justice as a Source  
of Faculty for Corrections Programs at Two-Year  
Colleges.

Staff papers were prepared on each of these topics and distributed widely.

E. Information Clearinghouse Services. Inquiries concerning careers in corrections, curriculum matters, instructional materials, availability of faculty, structure of correctional systems in various states, possible sources of funds, and legislation, among others, were commonplace. To service these inquiries, an information clearinghouse and referral operation was established as a part of the project. Various organizations such as the American Correctional Association cooperated with the project staff supplying information and processing inquiries.

F. Publications. Findings from proceedings at conferences, surveys, field visitations, workshops, and meetings served as a basis for publications under the project. These documents are reviewed briefly.

1. Improving Corrections Personnel Through Community Colleges. This report reflects the issues and concerns identified in the state-level meetings and the views expressed by the participants in the workshops of the inter-regional conferences. The findings of the research conducted under the project serve as reference points throughout the report. A discussion of the correctional officer (his characteristics, duties performed and competencies needed) serves as the base point from which implications for educational programs are identified.

Conditions influencing corrections education are reviewed: the probable impact of permissive and limiting factors such as the posture of correctional agencies, the sensitivity of state criminal justice planners, priorities of funding sources, the profile of the existing correctional officer, and the internal makeup of the college. In a chapter on approaches to corrections education, several existing alternatives are analyzed. The alternatives are many and reflect the limiting and permissive factors mentioned above. Improvements, as discussed at the conferences, are suggested.

One of the most frequent concerns that ran throughout all meetings and workshops was that of standards for improving educational programs to prepare and upgrade correctional officers. A chapter is devoted to suggested standards. The standards, by the very nature of the complexities of improvements in corrections education, address state planning, the career structure, incentives to line officers, curriculum

matters, and legislation. The suggested standards are intended to weld together all principals essential to improved corrections education (and in turn to an improved correctional process) into a unified coalition.

Three thousand copies of this publication were printed. Copies were distributed to all participants at conferences and workshops conducted under the project, approximately 1,100 community and junior colleges, state community college agencies, state corrections agencies, state criminal justice planning agencies, federal agencies, and to individuals upon request.

## 2. Legislating for Correctional Line Officer Education and Training.

This publication is based on proceedings at a workshop conducted as part of the conferences held under this project. Further, it reflects research into legislative approaches in support of education, career reform, and manpower development in corrections in several states.

The document is intended to serve as a guidance tool for community colleges and correctional administrators, legislators, state and local government officials, bar associations, law reform organizations, and civic and business associations interested in strengthening correctional systems.

The American Bar Association Resource Center on Correctional Law and Legal Services joined together with AACJC to publish the pamphlet. Copies were distributed to the participants in conferences, state corrections officials, state criminal justice planning agencies, community college and other education officials, and selected legislators.

3. Staff Papers. Several staff papers were prepared on the basis of surveys and research conducted during the project and distributed widely.

Highlights of these staff papers are summarized below.

- a. Competencies Needed. Corrections administrators and educators from 44 states, who attended conferences under the project, were queried on line officer educational needs. In assessing the importance of certain skills and areas of knowledge for the line officer, respondents most frequently ranked as "very important" understanding of deviant behavior, security procedures, inmates rights, counseling skills, and philosophy of corrections.

Educators considered the following more frequently to be "very important" than did correctional



respondents: theories of social work, education and training opportunities for inmates, parole procedures, interview procedures, and juvenile delinquency. Skill and knowledge areas that received a relatively low rating by both groups were: history of penology, information on recreational rehabilitation, teaching methodology, data on social agencies, and statistical information on corrections.

- b. Educational Programs. Community and junior colleges offering single courses, certificate and/or associate degree programs, non-credit courses, and seminars or institutes in corrections at the end of 1972 totaled 110. This activity was distributed across 31 states. Four other institutions reported offering related programs. Another 37 institutions indicated they planned to implement courses and/or an associate degree program by the start of the academic year 1973-74. Additionally, 32 institutions expressed interest in developing courses or programs but gave no starting dates.

Progressive program approaches were identified in a number of instances. In Minnesota, corrections academy training and the associate degree program at Lakewood State Junior College are integrated. An option in a criminal justice curriculum is being advanced in California community colleges. At College of Dupage (Illinois) a human services emphasis underlies the corrections program. Northern Virginia Community College and George Mason University have developed a division of responsibility, with the former providing basic competencies needed for line performance and the latter providing general education concepts.

- c. Assistance to Line Officer. Eighteen states reported some kind of state assistance to correctional officers enrolled in two-year colleges (other than assistance under the Law Enforcement Education Program). Among the forms of assistance reported by the states were: tuition reimbursement or rebates--10 states; released time for attendance--8 states; educational leave--7 states; shift changes or working hour adjustments--3 states; use of state vehicle for

transportation--1 state. Some of the states utilized a package of assistance devices in support of line officer education.

- d. Criminal Justice Planning. A review of state plans for the improvement of criminal justice, as required of the states under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, showed that a limited number of state planning agencies have made grants to community and junior colleges and technical institutes to develop curricula, offer educational programs, and operate training academies with corrections programming.

Thirty-four of the state plans gave no indication that two-year community and junior colleges were being utilized or had been identified as a resource for upgrading existing correctional employees or for preparing a new flow of correctional manpower. With community and junior colleges in thirty-one states reporting courses and programs in corrections, state planning agencies either are unaware of the existence of community and junior college efforts or do not consider the resource to be sufficiently significant to recognize this in the state plans.

- e. Legislation, Rules, Policies. Despite increasing availability of community and junior college programs for line officers in corrections, there continues to be little recognition of associate degree or certificate attainment in line officer hiring qualifications as well as in advancement opportunities for line personnel. In a number of states no formal educational requirements for line personnel exist.

In Michigan, attainment of an associate or higher degree results in a review for promotion. Similarly, in the District of Columbia promotion points are gained by enrollment in college courses. These were findings in a study of legislation, regulations, and policies supportive of correctional officer education.

Additionally, 38 states reported the existence of

established career ladders for line officers. In some states, legislation has mandated standards, training and qualifications for correctional line officers. Massachusetts, Illinois, Maryland, California, and Minnesota serve as examples of states with related legislation.

### III. IMPACT OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES

Through the project, linkages between community colleges and corrections agencies were established for the first time in several cases. Communication channels have been opened in several states where prior collaboration was minimal. This accomplishment was evident at workshops and conferences conducted under the project. Several states have conducted follow-up workshops based on the project activities resulting in an acceleration in the use of community and junior college resources for educational programs for correctional officers.

More specifically, whereas slightly more than 40 certificate and/or associate degree programs in corrections existed in 1971, AACJC estimates that about 115 community colleges offer such programs currently. Although the project cannot claim that this increase in the numbers of programs is solely due to its activities, as noted above, the project contributed to the conditions that helped make the increase possible.

Concurrently, enrollments in corrections education programs at the certificate and associate degree levels have increased. At the beginning of the project, LEAA reports indicated that approximately 6,000 persons were enrolled in corrections education programs. Today, these reports indicate roughly 15,000 persons are participating in educational programs geared to meet the manpower needs of corrections.

Furthermore, increased interest in the participation of community and junior colleges in state criminal justice manpower planning, in the integration of programs in training academies with associate degree programs in community colleges, in curriculum approaches reflecting the needs of correctional officers, and in the division of responsibility between community colleges and university programs indicates that conditions in corrections education are improving.

Unfortunately, standards for the improvement of education of line officers in corrections, as suggested in the project report Improving Corrections Personnel Through Community Colleges, require the combined efforts of many interested agencies, institutions, professional groups, and legislators. Consequently, the process by which

corrections education may be improved is a time-consuming one requiring concurrence of these several elements.

On the other hand, collaboration among the American Bar Association Commission on Correctional Facilities and Services, the American Correctional Association, the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (and the more than 1,100 community and junior colleges with which it works), and the various state and federal agencies with interests in an improved correctional process is necessary to the overall improvement of the quality of line personnel working in corrections. Under this project progress was made in setting into motion the factors necessary to improve the quality of line personnel, but the full impact of the project is not likely to be realized for at least three to five years.

#### IV. PERSISTENT CONCERNS

In addition to the problems reviewed in Improving Corrections through Community Colleges, specific areas of concern may be appropriate for LEAA to address directly. Among these are:

- A national data bank on manpower in corrections is necessary as a planning tool to agencies and community colleges. Up-to-date data on budgeted vacancies, salary levels for line personnel, enrollments (both in-service and pre-employment) in educational programs, number of graduates, and community colleges offering programs are needed in planning effective approaches to manpower development for corrections. Such data are generally unavailable or of questionable accuracy if available.
- Curriculum design efforts by community colleges and other educational institutions rarely reflect the tasks performed by line personnel. The effect of traditional courses such as psychology and sociology upon the performance of line personnel is assumed to be positive, but no scientific basis exists to show the specific effect of such courses in improving the performance of line personnel. Curriculum design efforts could be improved if the relationship between courses and performance in rehabilitating offenders were taken into consideration. A national effort to improve curriculum development practices seems desirable.
- The supply of well-prepared faculty members for corrections education programs in community colleges is extremely short. Efforts to improve the quality of faculty both from the standpoint of their knowledge of corrections and the understanding of the philosophy and role of community colleges would contribute significantly to improved instructional programs in community colleges. The upgrading of existing faculty is essential to improved corrections education.

--Because of the diversity that exists among the states regarding current education and training practices in corrections, national standards for corrections education in community colleges, such as those suggested in Improving Corrections through Community Colleges, are difficult to achieve. The process of moving toward such standards would likely be enhanced through a national effort to establish selected community colleges in selected states as centers for the improvement of certificate and associate degree programs for corrections personnel.

--Under this project, AACJC has provided clearinghouse services to corrections agencies, individuals interested in line officer careers, community colleges, and private organizations, among others. The need for information services regarding curriculum, availability of programs, and career guidance information is likely to continue. A national clearinghouse to address these needs would contribute to improved manpower development efforts for corrections.

With the close of this project, these areas of concern constitute suggested priorities for continued efforts by LEAA in the realm pertaining to community and junior colleges.

**END**