

CORRECTIONS 2000

Policies for the Future

by

The California Corrections Policy Development Project

Project Director

Susan Cohen

**California Probation, Parole and Correctional
Association**

MAY 1992

This project was supported by grant number 90P01GHK3 from the National Institute of Corrections. U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view expressed in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Planning and Scope Committee and Staff	ii
Call to Action	iii
Mission and Policy Statements: Summary	iv
Implications for the Future: Recommendations	vi
Mission Statement for California Corrections	1
Policy Statement on Creating a Better Integrated System	3
Policy Statement on Balanced Funding	5
Policy Statement on Sentencing	7
Policy Statement on Punishment Options	9
Policy Statement on Substance Abuse	11
Policy Statement on Prevention	13
Policy Statement on Victims	15
Policy Statement on Staffing	17
Policy Statement on Demographic Changes	19
Policy Statement on Educating the Public	21
Attributes of an Effective Correctional System: Conclusions	23
Appendices	
Current State of Corrections in California	
Significant Contributing Factors	
Purpose and Approach of the Policy Project	
Project Advisory Group	
Initial Focus Group	

CALIFORNIA CORRECTIONS POLICY DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

Planning and Scope Committee

Sue Cullen, Chair

Susan Blackwell

Jim Embree

Robert Franklin

Thomas Gitchoff, Ph.D.

Don Hallstrom

P. Joseph Lenz

George McKinney

Barbara Morandi

Paul Muntz, Past Chair

Barry Nidorf

Raymond Ojeda

Kathy Richard

Cecil Steppe

Margaret Stricklin

Ed Veit

Arlyn Webster

Staff

Susan B. Cohen, Project Director

Robert M. Brown, Jr., Project Consultant

Caroline S. Oldham, Consultant

Sterling W. O'Ran III, Consultant

Kelly Heikila, Staff Support

Kristina Houchins, Staff Support

Cassandra Kearney, Staff Support

Patrick K. Moran, Staff Support

Thanks to the California Department of Corrections for the extensive assistance it has provided to the Corrections Policy Development Project.

CALL TO ACTION

The guiding premise of the California Corrections Policy Development Project is that corrections can function more effectively than it does now. What has emerged as the common thread is that, if corrections is to be more effective, it must become a more integrated system. Especially given the limited resources but seemingly limitless demands facing correctional entities, corrections must become more balanced, more cooperative and more collaborative than it is today.

The concepts which comprise *CORRECTIONS 2000: POLICIES FOR THE FUTURE* describe what those concerned about corrections agree are the primary principles of a true correctional system. Corrections in California does not now embody these principles. Instead it is internally competitive, divided, duplicative, resistant to cooperation, out of balance. Practitioners know that; so do legislators and taxpayers and offenders; the problem has been studied and defined and discussed for years.

Now it is time to do something about it. Creating a correctional system will require the combined efforts of every correctional agency, every administrator, manager, supervisor and staff person in every part of the corrections community, as well as the support of people in a host of disciplines related to corrections. The task is daunting, but it must be undertaken.

CORRECTIONS 2000: POLICIES FOR THE FUTURE is a call to action! *CORRECTIONS 2000* provides the framework. Now agencies and individuals around the state must take up the challenge and turn these policies into action. No one can mandate or legislate a correctional system into being; it has to be made, step by step and piece by piece. And it is individuals in and around correctional agencies who must exert the leadership to begin.

SUMMARY

MISSION AND POLICY STATEMENTS

MISSION

THE MISSION OF CALIFORNIA CORRECTIONS IS TO PROTECT THE COMMUNITY; SUPPORT THE RIGHTS OF VICTIMS; ENFORCE COURT ORDERED SANCTIONS; AND ASSIST OFFENDERS TO CHANGE.

CREATING A BETTER INTEGRATED SYSTEM

THE EFFECTIVE PROVISION OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES REQUIRES AN INTEGRATED, BALANCED SYSTEM OF ADULT AND JUVENILE, STATE AND LOCAL ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMS WITH A COMMON MISSION, SHARED VISION AND VALUES, AND MUTUALLY UNDERSTOOD ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES.

BALANCED FUNDING

ADEQUATE FISCAL RESOURCES ARE ESSENTIAL FOR AN EFFECTIVE CORRECTIONAL SYSTEM. RESOURCES FOR CORRECTIONAL PROGRAMS AND SERVICES SHALL BE ALLOCATED IN A MANNER WHICH IS COST-EFFECTIVE WHILE CONSIDERING BOTH PUBLIC SAFETY AND OFFENDER NEEDS.

SENTENCING

CALIFORNIA SENTENCING LAWS MUST BE CONSISTENT, UNDERSTANDABLE AND APPROPRIATE TO THE CRIME AND THE OFFENDER.

PUNISHMENT OPTIONS

PUBLIC SAFETY SHALL BE ENHANCED, AND GREATER COST EFFECTIVENESS ACHIEVED, THROUGH USE OF A FULL RANGE OF TIMELY AND APPROPRIATE PUNISHMENT OPTIONS WHICH HOLD OFFENDERS ACCOUNTABLE.

SUBSTANCE ABUSE

CORRECTIONS MUST BE AN ACTIVE PARTNER AND A STRONG ADVOCATE IN THE COORDINATING, FUNDING, PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTING OF SUBSTANCE ABUSE SERVICES.

PREVENTION

THE PREVENTION OF CRIME AND DELINQUENCY IS AN APPROPRIATE CONCERN OF CORRECTIONS. CORRECTIONS MUST BE A PARTNER WITH OTHER PUBLIC AND PRIVATE AGENCIES IN THE CREATION, DELIVERY AND/OR SUPPORT OF PREVENTION PROGRAMS AND SERVICES.

VICTIMS

CORRECTIONS STRONGLY SUPPORTS THE RIGHTS OF CRIME VICTIMS, THE DEVELOPMENT OF VICTIMS SERVICES AND THE PROVISION OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR VICTIMS TO ACTIVELY PARTICIPATE IN CORRECTIONAL PROCESSES.

STAFFING

THE SUCCESSFUL DELIVERY OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES IN CALIFORNIA DEPENDS ON THE HIRING AND RETENTION OF A DEDICATED, EDUCATED, TRAINED AND CAPABLE WORE FORCE.

DEMOGRAPHIC CHANGES

THE EFFECTIVE OPERATION OF CORRECTIONS REQUIRES AN AWARENESS AND UNDERSTANDING OF, AND RESPONSIVENESS TO, THE DEMOGRAPHICS OF CALIFORNIA'S EVOLVING GENERAL AND OFFENDER POPULATIONS.

EDUCATING THE PUBLIC

EVERY CORRECTIONS AGENCY IN CALIFORNIA MUST DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT STRATEGIES TO EDUCATE THE PUBLIC ABOUT CORRECTIONAL ISSUES.

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE FUTURE: RECOMMENDATIONS

In order to implement these policies and work toward an effective correctional system, the Policy Project recommends that correctional agencies and decision makers begin at once to initiate the following activities.

I. Create a Corrections Coordinating Council:

The Policy Project recommends the establishment of an entity, described as a corrections coordinating council, to which all correctional agencies can look for information and assistance. Such a body should have as its focus maximizing correctional resources while helping to streamline service delivery, reduce duplication, eliminate overlap and enhance cooperative interactions. It must be a supportive and consensus based entity, not a regulatory or oversight agency, and it must provide active political leadership in setting correctional policy. In light of the inter-relatedness of state and local corrections and the overlap of offender populations, the council must develop strategies for inmate population management, facility construction and funding and continuity of program efforts. The existing California Corrections Executives Council (CCEC) or the Board of Corrections could serve as the coordinating council; it is less important that a new entity be created than that the coordinating and communications functions occur.

II. Study Correctional Services Delivery Systems:

California has a need to fully study corrections service delivery systems other than the current one in which both state and local jurisdictions have responsibility for operating adult and juvenile institutions and field services. In order to ensure that we are operating under the most efficient and cost effective model possible, California must undertake a comprehensive study of the merits of a variety of system structures and/or designs, including but not limited to:

- * counties having sole responsibility for all of corrections;
- * the state having sole responsibility for all of corrections;

- * the state being responsible for institutions (prisons, jails and juvenile facilities) and counties having responsibility for field services and supervision (probation and parole) or vice versa;
- * other combinations or variations which might emerge as possibilities.

Criteria by which service delivery systems should be evaluated include interjurisdictional relationships, cost efficiency, ease of implementation, lack of redundancy, ability to interface with other service providers (i.e. substance abuse, mental health, education, etc.) and ability to cover a full range of punishment options and address policy issues described in this document.

The necessary study must be conducted by an objective, nonpartisan body and must be premised on systemwide benefit, not on the aggrandizement of one part of the corrections continuum at the expense of other parts. Community based service providers and entities which support corrections such as substance abuse treatment providers, the education community, health and mental health agencies, must be considered in the construct.

III. Seek Balanced Funding:

Corrections cannot function without dollars and will not be a real system without balanced, stable funding for all its elements. In order for limited resources to be used most effectively, the corrections community must find ways to achieve better balance between state and local correctional allocations and expenditures. The coordinating council, CCC or the Board of Corrections must have ongoing responsibility for facilitating comprehensive, unified planning for more balanced use of existing and/or potential resources.

IV. Study Adult and Juvenile Sentencing Structures:

California's sentencing laws are complex, confusing, cumbersome and unwieldy. While they have been the subject of much debate, they haven't been thoroughly examined in decades. An objective body must conduct a comprehensive study of California's adult and juvenile sentencing laws and determine whether a less complex, more workable system might exist. Such a study must consider sentencing grids, sentencing guidelines, sentencing commissions and other sentencing structures which have been used elsewhere to see if any one or a combination of these might prove viable in California.

V. Initiate Coordinated Substance Abuse Strategy:

It will take a major, progressive, coordinated initiative to overcome substance abuse and thereby the crime and correctional overloading which is attendant on the use of illegal substances. Correctional agencies must be partners in such an effort. At the very least, all correctional administrators must take part in the current Substance Abuse Master Plan to ensure that the plan fully incorporates the concerns of corrections, education and other important program elements. counties' and the State's master plans must address the service populations of adult and juvenile probationers, parolees and offenders in institutions. There will be no money for substance abuse programs for agencies which have not participated in the master planning process; clearly correctional administrators must ensure that corrections' huge and needy 'captive' substance abusing populations are considered in the Substance Abuse Master Plan as well as in the resulting allocation of resources. Additionally, corrections agencies must address substance abuse detection, treatment, education and prevention in their internal planning, program design and resource allocation as well.

VI. Develop Political Leadership Through Public Education:

Corrections is the people's business; corrections is political. Implementing sound correctional policy requires political leadership. In the absence of political leadership, nothing meaningful will change. To foster a political environment conducive to sound correctional policy, there must be an informed public. The directions contained in these policies will not be actualized--nor will any of the other good ideas people have about how better to provide correctional services--unless there is a political context for reasonable risk taking and real change.

The impetus has to come from correctional practitioners themselves, from the people who know the problems, know the solutions, do the real work. Before we can expect a groundswell of informed public or political support for change in corrections, those in corrections must carry the message that change is needed; they must tell what corrections can and can't do and what it could do better under what circumstances. Public policy requires public involvement and realistic correctional policy requires correctional personnel at all levels to take responsibility for creating a more informed public, supportive of positive change. Each person who works in corrections must consider public education an essential part of the job and undertake public education as aggressively and professionally as every other aspect of the work.

MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of California corrections is to protect the community; support the rights of victims; enforce court ordered sanctions; and assist offenders to change.

This mission statement, developed in the consensus-building process central to the California Corrections Policy Development Project, articulates values and principles necessary to guide correctional practice. The mission statement provides focus and direction for the many elements and agencies in California's complex correctional system, is inclusive of all those elements and is practical as well as visionary.

The mission statement underscores corrections' commitment to positive change. Corrections seeks to enhance public safety, not only by punishing, but also by encouraging offenders to become responsible, law abiding members of the community, accountable for their behavior. Additionally the corrections community strives to enhance its own effectiveness and accountability by improving service delivery, brokering services, encouraging research, developing partnerships, designing models and initiating innovative strategies for fulfilling the many parts of its comprehensive mandate.

Corrections is a collaborative effort encompassing stakeholders in both the public and private sectors. Corrections involves the business, education, religious, health, mental health and social service communities as well as the courts, police and sheriffs, probation, parole, detention and program services. This mission statement relates to and is reflective of all those who are a part of corrections. It incorporates the crime prevention, early intervention, screening, classification, detention, incarceration, supervision, treatment and programing afforded by all those who serve the court and undertake the supervision of adult and juvenile offenders in institutions and in the community.

This mission statement and the policies which follow are exemplary of the corrections community's energy, creativity and commitment. They are a pioneering effort to help design a realistic, collaborative future for corrections in California.

POLICY STATEMENT ON CREATING A BETTER INTEGRATED SYSTEM



The effective provision of correctional services requires an integrated, balanced system of adult and juvenile, state and local activities and programs with a common mission, shared vision and values, and mutually understood roles and responsibilities.

Although progress has been made toward effectively creating a continuum of correctional services, state and local corrections agencies need still better coordination in terms of most efficiently using available juvenile institution, prison and jail space and programs. Similarly, more standardized and integrated policies and practices will help avoid adverse effects of one part of the system upon another. State and local corrections must act, and be able to be viewed, as a system in providing for the public safety.

Given the inmate, ward and offender population increases state and local corrections agencies are experiencing, available beds and programs must be used for the most appropriate offenders. Better coordination, problem analysis and resource utilization will help to maximize overall correctional capacity. Facing unprecedented fiscal and budgetary crises, the California corrections community needs a systemwide resource management strategy, as well as integrated plans for managing probation, juvenile institutions, jail, prison and parole populations.

Corrections practitioners must continue to work toward a consensus definition of community corrections and commonly agreed upon goals, objectives, funding and outcomes for a statewide community corrections strategy. A comprehensive community corrections approach will go a long way towards establishing more balanced funding and service delivery and is necessary for a real correctional system to evolve.

Further, there are a number of areas in which corrections' interests and those of the education, health, mental health, treatment and religious communities overlap. Corrections agencies must strengthen relationships with these communities so that everyone is working together and efforts expended in areas of mutual interest are supportive rather than competitive or

duplicative. Given the desperate fiscal limitations agencies will have to deal with for the foreseeable future, it is crucial that service providers develop mutually beneficial partnerships wherever possible and make use of whatever resources, programs and service are available to augment their own.

For these reasons, and because cooperative interaction is the strategy most likely to be successful, The Policy Project recommends the establishment of a corrections coordinating council to which all correctional agencies can look for information and assistance. Such a body should have as its focus maximizing correctional resources while helping' to streamline service delivery, reduce duplication, eliminate overlap and enhance cooperative interactions. It must be a supportive and consensus based entity, not a regulatory or oversight agency, and it must provide active political leadership in setting correctional policy. The existing California Corrections Executive Council (CCEC) or the Board of Corrections could well be charged with this responsibility.

POLICY STATEMENT ON BALANCED FUNDING



Adequate fiscal resources are essential for an effective correctional system. Resources for correctional programs and services shall be allocated in a manner which is cost-effective while considering both public safety and offender needs.

Most crucial to the continued success and expansion of California corrections is adequate funding. Without adequate revenue, edicts for increased penalties and expanded sanctions are simply rhetoric.

Local corrections agencies have suffered from post-Proposition 13 limitations on counties' ability to generate revenue. County general purpose revenues grew only 58 percent between FY 1984-85 and FY 1989-90 while public protection expenditures for corrections and detention rose by 67 percent. Populations have increased dramatically and new adult and juvenile correctional facilities have had to be constructed to meet the demands of that growth.

Probation, the most utilized form of corrections, has suffered the greatest reductions and/or the most minimal increases of all elements of the criminal justice and corrections communities. While the offender population has grown astronomically in the last decade, and sheriffs@ departments, the California Department of Corrections and the Department of the Youth Authority have grown in an effort to meet the demand for their services, probation has experienced zero growth in staff. Dealing with fully two-thirds of the sentenced offender population, probation operates with less than one-fifth of the total amount of correctional funding. While the number of sentences of probation or probation with jail account for over 74 percent of all felony dispositions statewide, the operating costs for probation in 1990 were roughly \$353 million out of total local corrections expenditures of over \$1.5 billion.

In order for corrections to function as a system, adequate funding must accompany all mandates for increased accountability through correctional measures. Any future funding for jail or prison construction or enhancing law enforcement efforts must identify the systemwide costs such actions generate, including probation and parole costs. Funding must be allocated to all parts of the criminal justice system affected by increases to any one part.

Funding must be directly linked to new or expanded efforts in the areas of prevention, substance abuse intervention, supervision, community corrections and construction, and funding must be provided for the implementation of well-founded pilot programs. Corrections practitioners have an obligation to help policy makers and the public understand the need to allocate sufficient dollars to both state and local corrections and to explore additional methods of raising funds to support correctional activities. Special taxes, dedicated taxes, fees for service and aggressive collection of realistic criminal fines are among revenue generating approaches which might be expanded.

POLICY STATEMENT ON SENTENCING



California sentencing laws must be consistent, understandable and appropriate to the crime and the offender.

California's sentencing structure is the result of a proliferation of sentencing laws in response to a public demand for stiffer penalties for crime. Current sentencing laws have a piecemeal quality. Changes and amendments over the years have left the statutes complex, confusing and difficult to manage. Although the sentencing structure is comparatively inflexible, there are still significant differences between adult and juvenile sentences and in sentencing practices from one county to the next.

While sentencing per se is not a corrections issue, the impact of sentencing significantly affects corrections. Sentencing is a key factor driving corrections populations.

Sentencing delays have become an issue. The length of time between the commission of a crime and delivery of the sentence for that crime has become so long that the nexus between the crime and its punishment is lost on the offender.

Even with juveniles the connection between a crime and its punishment is shaky. The court process is lengthy and, given the current crowding of juvenile halls, departments are less likely to be able to provide programming for young offenders while they wait for disposition, thus an opportunity for early, positive intervention is lost.

California's sentencing laws have not been comprehensively studied in decades, if ever. An objective body must thoroughly examine sentencing laws for adults and juveniles and compare California's approach with structures and practices in other states and in the federal system. If there is a less complex, more workable sentencing design which might be implemented in the state, it is incumbent on corrections professionals to encourage finding it.

This analysis of sentencing structures must include review of the comparative benefits of determinate, indeterminate and presumptive sentencing as well as of sentencing commissions, sentencing grids

and sentencing guidelines. It must also consider whether a sentencing design appropriate for adult offenders is suitable for the juvenile court as well or if a separate, different sentencing structure continues to be necessary for juveniles.

POLICY STATEMENT ON PUNISHMENT OPTIONS



Public safety shall be enhanced, and greater cost effectiveness achieved, through use of a full range of timely and appropriate punishment options which hold offenders accountable.

A full range of punishment options needs to be used to hold adult and juvenile offenders accountable while protecting public safety. It is clear that California cannot construct enough juvenile facilities, jails and prisons fast enough to meet the projected needs should the system continue to rely heavily on incarceration. Use of a full range of appropriate punishment options will help reduce institutional overcrowding as it provides balance within the system and enhances cost effective public safety.

In addition to crime and arrest rates, which affect the size of the incarcerated population, there are policy and legislative factors which also have a direct impact on the number of individuals under correctional control. Among these is the 'get tough' attitude legislators, judges, law enforcement personnel and others exhibit individually and collectively toward crime and its perpetrators. This attitude and the actions resulting from it have contributed to, among other things: tougher laws; more probation and parole violators going to prison; mandatory jail and prison sentences for offenses formerly under the judiciary's discretion; increased remanding of youthful offenders to adult court; and approval of funds for the construction and operation of prisons, jails and juvenile facilities.

However, 'getting tough' has also meant that not enough energy has gone toward, or enough attention has been paid to, fully using a wide range of potential punishment options. If corrections is to really be tough it will increase its arsenal of sanctions to include those designed not only to punish but also to fundamentally challenge the offender toward positive, law abiding behavior.

Intermediate sanctions--punishment options between incarceration and traditional probation--are often aggressive, coercive interventions more punitive than the comfortable routine of institution life or the relative ease of infrequent field supervision. Electronic monitoring, work programs, home detention,

community service and other intermediate sanctions impose significant limitations on the offender's liberty while simultaneously demonstrating the values of socially acceptable behavior. If adequately funded to provide both the supervision and treatment necessary to modify offending behavior, intermediate sanctions have been shown to be very effective in promoting public safety in both the short and the long run.

More fully using a range of punishment options will help to restore balance to California's correctional response. Many intermediate sanctions and/or punishment options, including intensive supervision with and without electronic monitoring, community service, work furlough, other work programs, restitution centers and more are currently in place and can be replicated relatively easily. Correctional agencies need to communicate with one another about these programs, evaluate various efforts' strengths and weaknesses and suggest ways to implement the right program for the right offender populations. Tailoring punishments to fit the offender as well as the crime is another feature of balance and has the further value of supporting both public safety and cost effectiveness.

In addition to what are currently thought of as punishment options, corrections practitioners might also consider additional possibilities such as preadjudicatory diversion, sentencing alternatives, custodial and programming options for special needs populations (e.g., the mentally ill, older offenders, etc.), various kinds of institutionally based programs and probation and parole case management options. By bringing a host of possibilities to the table for discussion, practitioners will find viable and creative ways to manage correctional populations and protect California's communities.

POLICY STATEMENT ON SUBSTANCE ABUSE



Corrections must be an active partner and a strong advocate in the coordinating, funding, planning and implementing of substance abuse services.

Substance abuse is so compelling and so pervasive a problem that it is mentioned in every survey, every forum, every article related to correctional issues. Inclusion of this policy on substance abuse does not discount the influence on and importance to corrections of gang activity, domestic violence, child and sexual abuse and other social problems. Indeed the corrections community is and must continue to be actively involved in responding to these problems as well as to substance abuse.

However, substance abuse maintains a unique position among correctional concerns. Adult and juvenile offenders who abuse drugs and alcohol comprise at least 80 percent of those in correctional institutions and/or under correctional supervision. Alcohol and drugs have filled our jails and prisons. Studies show that the vast majority of both adults and juveniles arrested for any crime, whether alcohol/drug related or not, test positive for illegal substances at the time of their arrest.

Although drug and alcohol abusers are the single largest drain on correctional resources statewide, they are also a seriously underserved population. They have disproportionate health and mental health needs and present an unparalleled challenge in terms of reentry programming and supervision in the community. With these facts in evidence, corrections must respond aggressively to the problem of substance abuse.

State and local, youth and adult correctional agencies must join with other entities involved in substance abuse treatment and prevention to help reduce drug and alcohol abuse. Cooperation and coordination among all elements of the law enforcement, criminal justice, corrections, education, drug treatment and mental health communities will be effective in establishing strategies to diminish the frequency of substance abuse and related criminality. Because education is key in the reduction of substance abuse, corrections must initiate educational programs, use court and

public school programs and enter into other partnerships to teach offenders not only the dangers of substance abuse but also the skills necessary to achieve and maintain lifestyles free of drugs and alcohol.

Current research shows coercive or enforced treatment programs, as distinguished from those which an offender might chose to enter, can also be effective in changing substance abusing behavior. Corrections agencies need no longer be bound by the concept that treatment works only when an individual elects to be treated. There is considerable evidence that treatment programs required as part of the institutional or supervision regimen are effective in reducing drug and alcohol use and abuse even after release.

POLICY STATEMENT ON PREVENTION



The prevention of crime and delinquency is an appropriate concern of corrections. Corrections must be a partner with other public and private agencies in the creation, delivery and/or support of prevention programs and services.

Prevention, defined as the reduction or elimination of the inclination to commit crime, may provide the greatest hope for stemming the growing tide of crime in California. Most offenders come before the criminal justice system deficient in education, vocational skills, emotional and physical health or other areas of personal development. They are often unwilling or unable to assume personal responsibility for their actions. Family violence, child abuse and spousal abuse continue to wear thin the fundamental foundations of family values that often serve to assist children in developing self esteem. Substance abuse and dependence, affiliation with gangs and hopelessness continue to play major roles in contributing to criminal behavior. Particular attention must be paid to offering viable alternatives to drug and alcohol abuse, gang activity, domestic violence and dysfunctional environments. Prevention efforts remain the primary resource to positively impact individuals who might otherwise become involved, or more deeply involved, in the criminal justice system.

Prevention efforts presently in existence are administered through private organizations as well as through state and county and city agencies. Without these prevention efforts, the criminal justice system would surely suffer even greater caseloads and volumes of work than it has now. However, even though there is general, longstanding acknowledgement of the need for and effectiveness of prevention, funding of prevention programs has been notoriously inadequate. The California Youth Authority and probation departments, by way of example, have legislative mandates expressed in the Welfare and Institutions Code to provide prevention programming. Lack of funding and the proliferation of other mandates have kept these agencies from fully pursuing their prevention responsibilities, just as insufficient resources have kept other programs from realizing their potential to prevent crime

and delinquency. The lack of funding for prevention may be directly tied to increases in the offender population.

Helping individuals achieve positive personal values, feelings of self worth and self esteem and a social support system is crucial to preventing crime. Often programs need to regenerate or replace old fashioned family values, because there is no other source for those values in an individual's experience. Communities across California must stress early intervention through juvenile justice and delinquency prevention programs in neighborhoods and in schools; such programs have to be able to reach more youth much faster and much sooner. Comprehensive prevention efforts, including at a minimum educational instruction, physical and mental health care, vocational training, parenting skills, values clarification, substance abuse treatment and esteem building, must be available in every part of our state to every person who might need them.

Public and private agencies must infuse funding and support into prevention efforts. When funds are effectively spent on prevention of crime, public safety is enhanced and prison, jail, juvenile facility and probation populations are reduced. California communities must unite in efforts to develop comprehensive prevention initiatives and to generate adequate funding for prevention. Corrections practitioners, who work with offenders and know the price communities pay for not preventing crime before it happens, can provide leadership in this regard in the neighborhoods and communities in which they live and work.

POLICY STATEMENT ON VICTIMS



Corrections strongly supports the rights of crime victims, the development of victims services and the provision of opportunities for victims to actively participate in correctional processes.

Corrections practitioners subscribe to the principles that victims of crime have the right to be treated with respect and compassion, to be informed about and involved in the criminal justice process as it affects their lives, to be protected from harm and intimidation and to be provided necessary financial and support services that attempt to restore them to their positions before the crimes were committed. The corrections community shares with many other agencies the responsibility for providing services to victims of crime.

Corrections supports programs in which offenders provide restitution to victims and compensation and service to the community, not only because such programs give tangible help to victims, but also because they help to hold offenders accountable for their crimes. Some correctional entities operate victim assistance programs and all need to be receptive to program ideas for victim assistance and willing to develop as well as participate in such programs.

Correctional agencies must seek, as much as possible, to include victims in correctional processes such as parole hearings, release hearings, dispositional hearings and the like. In addition to helping victims deal with the effects of their victimization, such involvement may also help victims better understand, and have more realistic expectations for, corrections. Everyone stands to gain if crime victims and victims service providers outside corrections get basic information about how the system works and how decisions involving offenders are made.

Working in a correctional agency does not make staff immune to fear, trauma and damage resulting from on-the-job incidents. Correctional agencies have a responsibility to encourage staff to participate in programs and services designed to deal with victimization when they have been exposed to traumatic incidents, on or off the job.

POLICY STATEMENT ON STAFFING



The successful delivery of correctional services in California depends on the hiring and retention of a dedicated, educated, trained and capable work force.

Many issues influence corrections agencies' ability to recruit, hire, train and retain qualified staff. Principal among these is a shrinking qualified labor and applicant pool. In the past, public service employment offered stability, security and the certainty of a retirement program. These are no longer safe assumptions and, for these and a variety of other reasons, some corrections agencies are experiencing increasing difficulty recruiting and retaining qualified staff.

Problems with staff retention are particularly acute for county agencies which lose staff to state and federal agencies offering higher pay and better benefits. Historically there has been an effort to maintain parity between state and county pay schedules for equivalent jobs; however, in the past 15 years this parity has eroded, with state employees now earning significantly more than their counterparts at the local level.

The result is that trained and experienced staff leave local departments just as they are becoming productive. This means that local departments are constantly in a training mode, never able to catch up with their needs. Meanwhile the receiving agencies reap the benefits of the experience and training the employee accomplished at the expense of the county. This tends to further exacerbate recruiting problems at the local level and heighten imbalance in the system.

It may prove beneficial for corrections to consider designing processes which allow staff to move more easily from one agency to another. Cross training, progressive employment opportunities, certification as corrections professionals might all be considered.

corrections agencies must ensure that they continue to recruit and train competent and culturally diverse staff. Corrections agencies must maintain high standards for their employees by, among other things, administering written tests, completing background

investigations, performing psychological evaluations and assuring that candidates possess the physical abilities to safely perform the validated functions of their jobs. Additionally, agencies will have to devise ways to adequately compensate people, financially and/or with other benefits, if they are to retain the staff they so carefully select and train for the specialized and demanding work of corrections.

Corrections as a profession must support the enhancement of college level correctional education. Professionalism is directly related to higher education; doctors are required to have medical degrees, lawyers are required to have law degrees. In order for corrections to be an acknowledged profession, it too must define a course of study and require an advanced degree. While this may be a long range objective, in the more immediate future corrections must both recruit the educated and educate the recruited. Doing so will not only improve corrections practice, it will also encourage more college graduates to enter public service/corrections work.

In addition to and separate from education, correctional agencies must continue to provide, require and support training of staff. Training must continue to be a priority emphasis and it must continue to be fully and adequately funded. Because counties and the state are experiencing devastating financial shortfalls, they are proposing reducing services in a host of areas, including training of correctional personnel. Corrections agencies must not allow this to occur as the short term savings will be more than eradicated by the litigation costs and resulting judgments based on failure to train. Correctional agencies and training providers may need to devise ways to train smarter or more cost effectively, but they must diligently guard against reducing or eliminating training for correctional staff.

In this and every other way, corrections agencies must continue to strive for and maintain optimum working conditions. Corrections must ensure that it treats its personnel with dignity and respect and that it meets the highest standards of safety for corrections staff in institutions and in the field.

POLICY STATEMENT ON DEMOGRAPHIC CHANGES



The effective operation of corrections requires an awareness and understanding of, and responsiveness to, the demographics of California's evolving general and offender populations.

California's population has been experiencing a shift in ethnic composition over the past ten years and correctional agencies have seen an even greater change in the ethnic composition of the offender population. The general population has a decreasing proportion of Whites and a steadily increasing proportion of Hispanics and Asians. Correspondingly the proportion of Hispanics and Asians under some form of correctional supervision continues to increase. The ratio of African Americans under correctional supervision has remained disproportionate, although steady, for a decade.

New ethnic and cultural groups in California's population bring with them unique backgrounds, languages and traditions. Corrections must expect, and prepare, to operate in the midst of increasing cultural diversity. Issues of gender, race, age, physical ability and sexual preference will be important for years to come; they too must be accommodated. Facility and program design, interventions and service delivery--all are likely to be subject to modification to maintain corrections' ability to provide public safety in a rapidly changing environment. Corrections will be continually challenged to respond to the evolving cultural, racial, age related and gender specific needs of California's offender population and must ensure that its policies and practices respond to diversity with appropriate adaptations.

Corrections will have to ensure too that its staff selection and training processes encompass cultural diversity. Corrections must maintain aggressive policies to attract a culturally diverse labor force and to hire applicants who are culturally competent and able to provide equitable treatment for all individuals through respect for differences. Corrections agencies will have to provide training which promotes a thorough understanding of, and sensitivity to, cultural diversity and prepares correctional personnel to be responsive to the rapidly changing demographics of California.

POLICY STATEMENT ON EDUCATING THE PUBLIC



Every corrections agency in California must develop and implement strategies to educate the public about correctional issues.

In order to create an informed constituency and thereby the political will for sound correctional policy, corrections practitioners must take the initiative to familiarize the public and policy makers with the abilities, functions and importance of corrections. Correctional policy is public policy; nonetheless the day to day operations of adult and juvenile corrections agencies and their vital roles in protecting and maintaining public safety are not well understood by the public. Corrections has the responsibility to energize informed judgment about what corrections is, what it does and what it can do if adequately supported.

A far reaching public education campaign of this sort does not necessarily require hiring public relations consultants or spending large sums of money. If each of California's 60,000 corrections practitioners were to tell a few friends something about the work he or she does and the value of it, the campaign will be under way. Corrections agencies across the state are rich in multi-talented staff people who can help create positive press, speakers' bureaus, public forums, open houses, educational seminars, public service announcements, editorial campaigns and similar methods of public exposure. Opportunities for explaining the difference between probation and parole, prison and jail present themselves almost daily; gatherings of all kinds lend themselves to discussion of the 'good news' in corrections, the success stories and viable programs and lives changed for the better.

By educating the public and marketing what corrections is and does, the corrections community can encourage informed judgment, a climate for positive change and with it public support. An informed, supportive public will help decision makers at all levels to enact an aggressive, progressive correctional agenda. Public support is the key ingredient in the creation of political will for positive change and public education is the touchstone of public support.

ATTRIBUTES OF AN EFFECTIVE CORRECTIONAL SYSTEM

An effective correctional system is integrated, collaborative and coordinated.

An effective correctional system provides balanced funding, i.e., where there is responsibility, there are resources to go with it.

An effective correctional system responds to clear, consistent sentencing laws which reflect the crime, the offender and available resources and uses a full range of appropriate punishment options.

An effective correctional system identifies substance abusers and, either directly or in collaboration with others, provides treatment and training to address substance abusing behaviors.

An effective correctional system prizes public education, and understands the need to maintain public and political support for responsible risk taking and positive change.

Moreover, an effective correctional system:

- * recognizes its responsibility to participate in preventing crime and delinquency;
- * considers the rights and needs of victims;
- * recognizes the vital importance of its personnel in every job classification;
- * responds to demographic changes in ways which maintain culturally competent staff and provide appropriate interventions for offenders; and
- * emphasizes research and outcome evaluation to measure success and maintain accountability.

APPENDICES

- * CURRENT STATE OF CORRECTIONS IN CALIFORNIA

- * SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTING FACTORS

- * PURPOSE AND APPROACH OF THE POLICY PROJECT

- * PROJECT ADVISORY GROUP

- * INITIAL FOCUS GROUP

CURRENT STATE OF' CORRECTIONS IN CALIFORNIA

* Prison, jail and juvenile facility crowding coupled with diminishing resources and drastic budget shortfalls are among the most critical problems facing corrections in California in the 1990s. Urgent though they are, these are not the only problems with which corrections has to deal. Also enormously pressing are the ongoing drug epidemic, continued violent crime, a proliferation of youth and adult gang activity, the public's fear of crime and growing pressure for less expensive but equally safe sentencing options as well as provision of jail, juvenile facility and prison beds for the most serious offenders.

* Correctional institutions' populations have skyrocketed in the last decade.

The state prison population has more than tripled. The prison system has grown from 22,500 prisoners in 1980 to 102,000 today. Projections are that there will be 120,000 people in state prison by 1996.

The number of people in county jails has risen from 25,000 in 1980 to 68,700 today. It is projected that there will be 102,000 people in jails by 1996.

The California Youth Authority has over 8,300 juvenile offenders in custody, up from 5,800 at the beginning of the decade, and it is anticipated that CYA will have 9,800 offenders in custody by 1996.

Local juvenile halls, camps and ranches hold more than 9,400 young offenders at present, up from about 7,500 in 1980. It is projected that there will be 10,200 juveniles in local facilities by 1996.

* Probation and parole populations have escalated at least as dramatically.

The California Department of Corrections, which had 12,000 parolees at the start of the '80s, now supervises more than 83,000 parolees and expects over 101,000 by 1996.

The Department of the Youth Authority supervised 6,650 parolees in 1980; today it has 5,830 young offenders under parole supervision and by 1996 it anticipates 7,200.

County probation departments have experienced an increase from 151,000 adults and 57,900 juveniles under probation supervision in 1980 to 290,000 adults and 68,000 juveniles today.

- * Probation and parole violations are major factors increasing prison populations. A larger percentage of new prison admissions are in prison on probation and parole violations than are committed for new crimes. In 1978 there were 1,011 adult parole violators returned to prison; by 1991 that number had increased to over 41,573. Additionally, it is estimated that today probation violators comprise about 16 percent of felony new admissions to state prison.
- * It costs California taxpayers about \$5 billion a year (excluding construction costs) to operate state and local corrections. The Department of Corrections' budget for FY 1991-2 was \$2.5 billion; the Department of the Youth Authority was budgeted at \$342 million and county corrections, sheriffs' and probation departments were expected to spend approximately \$1.5 billion.
- * After comprehensive review of corrections in California, the recent Blue Ribbon Commission on Inmate Population Management found that "state and local corrections must be viewed as a system in developing corrections policy. Prison overcrowding is increased by probation underfunding and jail overcrowding and underfunding. The corrections system is presently lacking sufficient integrated strategies to manage probation, jail and prison populations."
- * The Blue Ribbon Commission's predominant conclusion was that the criminal justice system is out of balance and will remain so unless the entire state and local criminal justice system is addressed from prevention through discharge of jurisdiction.

SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTING FACTORS

A broad array of forces interact in complex ways in California as we approach the year 2000. The diversity of these forces and the speed with which they can affect one another challenge corrections to be flexible and creative yet pragmatic. In its efforts to ensure the public safety, California has developed a complex system of laws, agencies, processes and functions which collectively comprise California corrections. Fueled by growth in the size and diversity of the state's population, corrections is becoming more sophisticated; however it must also become more integrated. It must have a solid base of informed public and political support and must be prepared to deal, on a systemwide basis, with the rapidly changing environment in which it exists.

Particularly relevant factors affecting corrections include the following:

- * California's population continues to grow and is increasingly culturally diverse. The Department of Finance projects that California will be home to nearly 40 million people by the year 2005.
- * Over the past decade, the public has sent a strong message to lawmakers to maintain law and order through passage and enforcement of laws which mandate tougher criminal penalties and provide recourse for victims of crime.
- * Improved methods of identification, investigation, arrest and prosecution have resulted in increasing numbers of offenders being placed under some form of correctional supervision.
- * Changes in sentencing laws have made state prison mandatory for offenses which were once jail or probation sentences. Since the adoption of the Determinate Sentencing Law in 1977, there have also been continuing increases in the length of sentences for specified crimes. The results have been unprecedented increases in prison and jail populations and prison, jail and juvenile facility overcrowding.
- * Institutional crowding has been exacerbated by the persistent underfunding of probation which has led not only to reduced supervision of both adult and juvenile probationers, but also to delays in providing reports to the court. This in turn results in prisoners spending weeks longer in jail pending sentencing than would otherwise be the case.

- * Substance abuse, particularly the abuse of alcohol, cocaine and crack, is a major factor contributing to increases in the offender 'population.
- * Corrections is not able to respond quickly, let alone immediately, to criminal behavior. court delays, structural safeguards, limited resources--these and other factors contribute to corrections' inability to impact offenders' behavior early in their criminal careers. By the time most offenders get into the correctional process their behavior is hard to change.
- * Corrections' inability to consistently hold offenders accountable for their behavior contributes to the revolving door of crime, arrest, incarceration, release and subsequent return to criminal activity.
- * The attention placed on crime and delinquency prevention is sporadic and mostly ineffectual. Prevention efforts are underfunded and underutilized in maintaining public safety.

The forces with which modern corrections is confronted, of which this is only a partial listing, have evolved during a period in which resources have become increasingly scarce. In order to continue to function effectively, corrections must find ways to maximize the resources available to it. Creating an integrated, balanced and coordinated correctional system is the most promising strategy to accomplish that end. The mission and policy statements which follow present a consensus foundation for just such an effort.

PURPOSE AND APPROACH OF THE POLICY PROJECT

PURPOSE

The California Corrections Policy Development Project arose out of an identified need for a clear sense of direction for state and local, adult and juvenile corrections in California. Flowing from the recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Commission on Inmate Population Management (1990), the Policy Development Project has built consensus on a conceptual framework within which the diverse parts of the corrections community can function effectively together.

The California corrections community is comprised of many elements including the Youth and Adult Correctional Agency (YACA), the Department of Corrections, the Department of the Youth Authority, the Board of Prison Terms, the Youthful Offender Parole Board, the Board of Corrections, 59 county probation departments, 58 county sheriff's departments and three county departments of corrections. Other agencies in the criminal justice system, for example the Department of Justice and the Office of Criminal Justice Planning, also have an impact on corrections' operations.

While this diversity of components provides breadth and richness to correctional services, it also fosters duplication, overlap and confusion. Moreover, given the structure of governmental agencies and the variety of correctional interests in the state, there is no single entity or mechanism authorized or staffed to formulate statewide, integrated policies for corrections. The Corrections Policy Development Project has been a way for practitioners to fill that gap, to begin to create a body of correctional policy within which they can work.

APPROACH

The mission and policy statements contained in this document are the products of a carefully designed process. In a widely distributed survey, hundreds of criminal justice and correctional practitioners were asked to identify "the three most critical issues facing California corrections for the next five years." More than 50 issues were raised.

These were discussed, analyzed and processed during a two-day focus group meeting in which practitioners from all aspects of corrections, as well as representatives of city, county and state government, education and the courts worked to reach consensus on the eight to ten priority areas for development of policy statements.

The statements which comprise the heart of this document are the results of that process. They represent the contemporary view of leading practitioners and have immediate relevance to the challenges which confront California corrections at this critical time. While a large number of issues face corrections, these emerge as the ones on which professionals have reached consensus.

Through the dissemination of these mission and policy statements, the Corrections Policy Development Project hopes to foster a climate for discussion and positive change and to help create an environment in which community, political and professional leaders will join in working toward a coordinated, proactive correctional system. The mission and policy statements emphasize ongoing communication, cooperative action and public education as ways to constructively influence the political process and generate support for system change. Finally, the project offers the mission and policy statements to the Governor, the Legislature and related interest groups as valuable tools to use in making decisions affecting the future of corrections.

CALIFORNIA CORRECTIONS POLICY DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

Advisory Group

Francisco J. Alarcon, Chief Deputy Director
Department of the Youth Authority

The Honorable Rafael A. Arreola
Municipal Court, San Diego County

The Honorable Leonard Edwards
Juvenile Court, Santa Clara County

Gregory W. Harding, Deputy Director
California Department of Corrections

Don Hogner, Chief Probation Officer
Alameda County Probation Department

John Kenney, Ph.D., President
August Vollmer University

Norma P. Lammers, Director of Corporate Affairs
California State Association of Counties

Joan Petersilia, Ph.D., Director
Criminal Justice Program, RAND Corporation

Wendell Phillips, President
Sacramento County Deputy Sheriffs Association

The Honorable Robert Presley, Member
California State Senate

Richard K. Rainey, Sheriff-Coroner
Contra Costa County

Anna Z. Thompson, Correctional Program Specialist
National Institute of Corrections

CALIFORNIA CORRECTIONS POLICY DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

Initial Focus Group

Francisco J. Alarcon,
Chief Deputy Director
Department of the Youth Authority

Honorable Jim Ardaiz
Fifth District
Court of Appeals

Midge Carroll
then Deputy Director
Parole and Community Service Division
California Department of Corrections

Michael Corbett
Legislative Advocate
California State Assn. of Counties

Craig Cornett
Director
Criminal Justice Section
Legislative Analyst's Office

Honorable John A. Flaherty
Superior Court
Santa Clara County

David Flores
Area Administrator
Los Angeles Office of Education

Robert Pash
Commander, Custody Division
Los Angeles County Sheriff's Dept.

James A. Gomez
then Assistant County Executive
Santa Clara County

Gregory Harding
Deputy Director
Evaluation and Compliance Branch
California Dept. of Corrections

Jim Hankla
City-Manager
City of Long Beach

Don Hogner
Chief Probation Officer
Alameda County

Norma Lammers
then Executive Officer
Board of Corrections

Geoff Long
Consultant
Assembly Ways and Means
Committee

George McKinney
Deputy Director
Parole Services Branch
Dept. of the Youth Authority

Barry Nidorf
Chief Probation Officer
Los Angeles County

Harvey Nyland
Sheriff
San Benito County

Richard Probster
Chief of Police
City of Gardena

Richard Rainey
Sheriff-Coroner
Contra Costa County

Jim Rasmussen
then Director, Bureau
of Criminal Statistics

Honorable Wilmont Sweeney
Presiding Judge
Alameda County Juvenile Court

Grover Trask
District Attorney
Riverside County

