

 <p align="center">U. S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION</p>		<p align="center">DISCRETIONARY GRANT PROGRESS REPORT</p>		
GRANTEE		LEAA GRANT NO.	DATE OF REPORT	REPORT NO.
Tennessee Law Enforcement Planning Agency		74-DF-04-0006 74-ED-04-0011	9-15-76	5
IMPLEMENTING SUBGRANTEE		TYPE OF REPORT		
Tennessee Law Enforcement Planning Agency		<input type="checkbox"/> REGULAR QUARTERLY <input type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL REQUEST <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FINAL REPORT		
SHORT TITLE OF PROJECT		GRANT AMOUNT		
Development of Tenn. Standards & Goals		\$200,000 (C) \$53,080 (E)		
REPORT IS SUBMITTED FOR THE PERIOD		THROUGH		
November, 1974		July, 1976		
SIGNATURE OF PROJECT DIRECTOR		TYPED NAME & TITLE OF PROJECT DIRECTOR		
<i>Paula W. Harvey</i>		Paula Harvey Chief of Planning & Program Development		
COMMENCE REPORT HERE (Add continuation pages as required.)				
<p>The job of developing comprehensive standards for the Tennessee criminal justice system was done by Midwest Research Institute (MRI) of Kansas City, Missouri. The Tennessee Law Enforcement Planning Commission decided to hire outside staff because the existing demands on the personnel in the Tennessee Law Enforcement Planning Agency and the statewide hiring freeze in existence at the time the project was initiated made it impossible for the TLEPA staff to execute the standards and goals project. After a process of competitive bidding, the contract for the needed services was awarded to MRI. MRI opened an on-site project office in Nashville staffed by three people. The project staff worked closely with TLEPA staff and particularly with Assistant Director Doyle Wood. Mr. Wood left TLEPA shortly before the completion of the project and TLEPA responsibility for standards and goals was then assumed by the new Assistant Director, Paula Harvey.</p> <p>The Standards and Goals Project resulted in nine reports, eight of which are to be published and distributed to criminal justice agencies and concerned citizens throughout Tennessee. Attached is a copy of the report entitled TLEPA report which serves as a summary of the entire project and will be utilized here as the Final Progress Report of this discretionary grant.</p> <p>Attachment: Final Standards and Goals for Tennessee.</p>				
RECEIVED BY GRANTEE STATE PLANNING AGENCY (Official)		DATE		

36753 C-3

NCJRS

OCT 4 1976

ACQUISITIONS

Tennessee Criminal Justice Standards and Goals Project

TLEPA REPORT

Tennessee Law Enforcement Planning Commission, 1975

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction	1
Description of the Project	1
Continuation of the Standards and Goals Project.	7
Explanation of Priority One.	7
Materials Available to the TLEPA Staff	10
TLEPA Follow-up Activities	10
Provide Information to Affected Agencies.	10
Monitor Implementation of Standards and Goals	12
Plan and Carry Out Evaluation of Standards and Goals.	15
Prepare Needed Legislation.	16
Annually Review and Update Standards and Goals.	18
Appendix	
A. How to Use the Profile Report	20
B. Objectives Rejected by the Commission During Initial Prioritization.	25
C. Cross Reference of Objectives and TLEPA Planning and Grant Award Categories.	31

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to provide guidance to TLEPA personnel concerning follow-up activities that will be needed to complete the standards and goals process. Now that standards and goals have been adopted by the TLEPC, the Agency must guide, monitor, measure and evaluate the implementation of the standards and goals.

In order to provide needed background information to agency personnel who have not been closely involved in the standards and goals project, as well as to those who join the staff in the future, this report begins with a short description of the project. It is largely the same description of the project as presented in the "Executive Summary," a document for general distribution, but with some added information.^{1/} Following the description of the project and its results are suggestions for future TLEPA activity. It should be noted that a legislative report has also been prepared outlining legislation that will have to be adopted in order to carry out certain standards and goals. That report serves as a supplement to this one.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

The staff work on this project was done by Midwest Research Institute (MRI) of Kansas City, Missouri. The TLEPC decided to hire outside staff because the existing demands on the personnel in TLEPA and the statewide hiring freeze in existence at the time the project was initiated made it impossible for the TLEPA staff to execute the standards and goals project. After a process of competitive bidding, the contract for the needed services was awarded to MRI. MRI opened an on-site project office in Nashville staffed by three people. The project staff worked closely with TLEPA staff and particularly with Assistant Director Doyle Wood. Mr. Wood left TLEPA shortly before the completion of the project and TLEPA responsibility for standards and goals was then assumed by the new Assistant Director, Paula Harvey.

^{1/} For a description of the historical background and purposes of the standards and goals process in the country as a whole, see the background section in the "Executive Summary."

For a detailed, month-by-month description of project activities and procedures, see the monthly progress reports submitted to TLEPA during the course of the project.

The major purpose of the Tennessee Criminal Justice Standards and Goals Project was to establish general goals and specific objectives for the criminal justice system in the state as a part of an overall effort to reduce crime. The project was divided into three primary phases.

The first phase involved a review of the recommendations of the LEAA appointed National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals along with the recommendations of a large number of other national groups such as the American Bar Association, American Wardens Association, American Correctional Association, etc. The national recommendations were divided into 20 groups of related proposals dealing with particular aspects of the criminal justice system. Each group was referred to as a "package." Each package was organized around a set of long range goals, specific objectives leading towards the accomplishment of a particular goal, and various strategies that could be used to reach an objective. Each of the 20 packages was identified by a general goal statement summarizing the intent of the proposals included in the package. The 20 packages are listed below.

1. Alleviate Social and Economic Factors Promoting Crime
2. Improve Crime Detection and Apprehension
3. Improve Procedures for Pretrial Detention
4. Improve Procedures for Screening, Diversion and Classification
5. Improve Community Services to Youth
6. Reduce Alcohol and Drug Abuse
7. Safeguard the Rights of the Accused by Imposing Controls on Plea Bargaining
8. Obtain Significant Reduction of Delays in Criminal Proceedings
9. Promote the Fairness and Equality of Sentencing
10. Provide Full and Fair Review of Criminal Cases
11. Reduce Juvenile Delinquency by Minimizing Extent of Involvement of Juvenile Offenders with the Criminal Justice System and by Proper Processing of Juvenile Offenders
12. Insure the Rights of Defendants Before and After Trial
13. Improve Conditions of Confinement

14. Legislate Action to Modernize Criminal Codes and Reduce Opportunities for Corruption
15. Streamline the Administrative Structure of the Criminal Justice System
16. Develop Capabilities for Long Range Planning in the Criminal Justice System and Improve Community Relations
17. Be Prepared at All Times for Mass Disorders and Natural Disasters
18. Establish a Network of Computerized Information Systems Linking all Components of the Criminal Justice System
19. Improve Criminal Justice Equipment and Facilities
20. Upgrade Personnel Working in the Tennessee Criminal Justice System

The next step in phase one was the recruitment of over 500 criminal justice professionals and other citizens from throughout the state to form the Tennessee Criminal Justice Standards and Goals Advisory Panel. The regional law enforcement planners were asked to suggest people from their district for membership on the panel. Each planner was given a list showing the number of people needed from his district, determined by the population of the district, and a desired breakdown in terms of their areas of experience and expertise. An attempt was also made to have the racial composition of the panel members reflect that found in the general population. Prospective panel members were sent letters requesting their service on the panel. They were asked to return a personal information questionnaire if they were willing to serve. When returns from a development district were insufficient, the planners were asked to supply additional names.

After the panel was recruited, they were sent questionnaires asking them to evaluate the goals, objectives, and strategies in three of the packages. Assignment to particular packages was based on the background of the individual and on the interests and knowledge of the criminal justice system that had been reported in the personal questionnaire. In choosing the group of individuals to whom a particular package would be sent, the aim was to obtain a balanced response in which a large proportion of the respondents would be expert in that particular area of criminal justice but in which there would also be a substantial representation of opinions from people working in other areas of the system as well as from a cross section of citizens. Each panel member was assigned three packages. When the first questionnaire was returned, the second was sent and when that was returned the third was sent. Those who returned three were given the opportunity to request additional packages. In addition to evaluating the recommendations contained in the packages, the panelists were asked to suggest new ideas and to make additional recommendations for any problems they believed were not addressed in the national proposals.

A total of over 800 questionnaires were answered by the members of the panel. Their answers were collected and computer analyzed, and their written comments were read, recorded and filed for further use in later stages of the project.^{1/}

At the same time that the survey of the panelists was being conducted, the project staff engaged in research on various problems relevant to the proposed standards and goals, including: (1) an overview of state crime problems and trends and a projection of crime rates to 1980; (2) an analysis of fiscal and manpower resources allocated to various segments of the state criminal justice system; (3) structural, staffing, workload and similar characteristics of the current system; (4) anticipated effects of projected crime trends on future workloads and resource requirements; (4) collection and analysis of data relevant to specific standards and goals; and (5) legal research to determine the status under Tennessee law of the various proposals being reviewed.

The result of the first phase of the project was a tentative program of goals and objectives for Tennessee based on the evaluation of the national proposals by the 500-member panel, additions to or modifications of those proposals suggested by panel members, and relevant information from the background research.

The second phase of the project centered on a series of task force meetings held in each of Tennessee's nine development districts. A total of 23 meetings was held, each one focusing on a particular part of the criminal justice system. Small groups consisting of criminal justice system professionals, representatives of related public organizations and concerned citizens--each with a background applicable to the particular problems under consideration--participated in each meeting. Participants were selected initially from the panelists. Others were added in order that each task group might have the expertise and experience needed.

The task groups reviewed, evaluated and further modified the key proposals that were produced in the first phase of the project. By holding a large number of meetings throughout the state, it was possible to obtain, not only a general review of the proposals, but an evaluation of their applicability to the particular problems and needs of each geographical area of the state, of metropolitan areas, and of rural areas.

The result of the second phase of the project was a more refined set of proposed goals and objectives.

^{1/} Information on how to read the results of the computer analysis of the survey is provided in the Appendix of this report.

The third and final phase of the project was the prioritization of the recommended goals and objectives by the TLEPC and the preparation of the project reports. The purpose of the prioritization process was to establish a clear, long-range direction for criminal justice planning in the state and to set certain minimum standards for each area of the criminal justice system. In reviewing the proposals and adopting priorities, specific definitions were given by the Commission to certain terms and priority levels. Those definitions are listed below.

Definition of Terms

Goal A statement indicating a general direction or trend that is desired.

Objective A specific program and a date by which that program is to be at least partially in effect.

Priorities:

1 Must This is an objective that must be met by agencies seeking funds from the Commission. Each agency must meet all of the number one priorities applicable to it at any given time before it will be granted funds for objectives having lower priorities. The agency is expected to achieve the objective by the year indicated. In that year it will not receive any funds for programs with a priority of less than one unless it has met all of the number one priorities for that and previous years. Agencies will not be penalized for failing to meet a priority one objective: (1) if that failure was due to a failure by the General Assembly or the Tennessee Supreme Court to take action required to carry out the program; (2) if the agency applied for funds to assist it in meeting the priority but did not receive a grant because the Commission was financially unable to fund the request. In the body of the report, the word "must" is used in stating each objective that was given a priority of one.

With respect to proposals for legislation or for action by agencies that do not seek Commission funding, a priority of one means "very strongly recommended."

- 2 Should Strongly recommended--not a "must" but will be considered for funding ahead of objectives with lower priorities. In the body of the report the work "should" is used in stating objectives with a priority of two.
- 3 Should Consider Recommended for consideration - included as an objective which has merit under specific circumstances. In the body of the report, the words "should consider" denote a priority of 3. EXCEPTION: A priority of 3 for objectives relating to correctional agencies denotes a need for research to be at least partially completed by the date indicated.
- 4 May Consider For consideration--included for information purposes only. Indicated by the words "may consider" in stating the objective.
- 5 Eliminate Rejected.

After the prioritization by the Commission, several final reports were prepared in addition to this report and the accompanying Legislative Report. Those objectives which were rated 1 through 4 by the Commission were incorporated into implementation reports. Six reports were prepared: rural law enforcement, urban law enforcement, courts, juvenile justice, corrections, and criminal justice information and statistics systems.

The proposals in each report are presented in the form of a workbook designed to facilitate revision and updating of the proposals in future years. At the beginning of the report there is an action list that serves two purposes. It serves as a table of contents for the main body of the report and also shows at a glance the key proposals, the agency responsible for implementing them, and the priorities assigned to them by the Law Enforcement Planning Commission. Following the action list is the main body of the report. It is organized in the same order as the goals and objectives in the action list. Most objectives have attached to them a list of "strategies" which are various ways in which the objectives might be achieved and which should be considered by the agencies concerned. It is important to emphasize that only the objectives, not the strategies, were reviewed and prioritized by the Commission. Therefore, even when an objective is given a priority of one, meaning that it must be achieved by the responsible agency, that does not mean that any specific strategy is a "must." In some cases, the listed strategies may be the only feasible way to reach a particular objective and, therefore, for all practical purposes may be considered to be "musts." The Commission wished it to be made very clear, however, that it is only the objectives themselves that have official priorities, and no agency is formally bound to any specific strategy.

The goals, objectives and strategies are further explained and discussed through introductions to each goal and commentaries on each objective or set of objectives. Most of the objectives or sets of objectives also have a "source" indicated. The source is the original written proposal from which the objective was taken. The objective may be in a form identical to the original source or may have been modified to meet the needs and conditions of Tennessee. In some cases, no source will be listed because the objective was developed in a task group meeting or by the Commission itself and does not have an original written source. Also included are lists of references which can be used to obtain more information about the problems and issues addressed by particular objectives. References to relevant sections of the Tennessee Code Annotated are also included.

CONTINUATION OF THE STANDARDS AND GOALS PROJECT

In order to assure that the ultimate result of the standards and goals project will be the attainment by the responsible agencies of the objectives specified by the TLEPC, certain follow-up activities will be required on the part of both the TLEPC and TLEPA. The following sections of this report describe those actions that the MRI project staff believe should be undertaken in continuing the standards and goals project. Since the objectives that were given a priority of one will affect the funding of future grant applications by TLEPC, it is very important for TLEPA personnel to have a clear understanding of the meaning of that priority and to be able to explain it to agencies applying for funds. Therefore, before describing the various follow-up activities that are recommended, a more detailed explanation is given of the effects of assigning a priority of one to certain objectives.

Explanation of Priority One

At the December 16, 1975, meeting at which it adopted the standards and goals priorities, the TLEPC also adopted a resolution defining the meaning of priority one. This resolution followed considerable discussion by the Commission of possible ways to define and apply that priority level. Three basic ones were considered.

The first and most stringent was that the responsible level of local government, e.g., county or municipality in most cases, must achieve all of the number one priorities for all of the criminal justice agencies within its jurisdiction before it could receive funds for any other activities. The practical meaning of such a definition would be that

the failure on the part of one agency to meet the priority one objectives relevant to it would prevent the provision of TLEPC funds to all other agencies that were part of the same local jurisdiction. If the sheriff, for instance, failed to meet a requirement for law enforcement agencies, the county could not apply for funds for a program to be carried out by the General Sessions Court.

The second possible interpretation of priority one was that each implementing agency had to meet all of the objectives applicable to it, but failure by one agency within the jurisdiction to meet the objectives set for it would not preclude funding for another agency that had met its objectives. Thus, in the example given above, the sheriff's failure would not prevent funding for a court program.

The third and least restrictive interpretation was that an implementing agency could obtain funds in one functional area (i.e., courts, juvenile justice, corrections, law enforcement) if it had met the priority one objectives in that area even if it did not meet the priority one objectives in a second functional area for which it was responsible. Under this interpretation, a sheriff could continue to receive law enforcement funds if he had met all of the priority one law enforcement objectives even if he had not complied with the priority one objectives in the field of local corrections which is also his responsibility.

The Commission chose the second alternative and adopted the following resolutions concerning the meanings of standards and goals priorities:

All number one priorities in each functional area (courts, corrections, juvenile justice and law enforcement) for an implementing agency shall be met before lesser priorities shall be financed unless an agency is precluded due to the requirement for action by the state legislature and/or Supreme Court ruling or a lack of funds.

In the resolution itself, the meaning of "a lack of funds" as a ground for exemption from compliance with the required objective is somewhat ambiguous. However, it was understood by the committee that drafted the resolution and by the Commission that the meaning of that phrase is that if TLEPA has a grant award category under which funds could be obtained in order to meet the objective, and an agency applied for such funds but did not receive them because TLEPA did not have enough money to meet all requests, the agency would not be penalized for not having achieved that priority by the designated date. The reference to "a lack of funds" was not understood to mean that a sheriff's department, for instance, that did not comply with the requirement to supply its men with their uniforms could plead that there was no money in its budget to supply uniforms. In such a case, the county court would have to recognize that

if it did not provide the sheriff with a budget that included funds for uniforms, the sheriff would not be able to receive TLEPA funds for other activities. A further understanding by the Commission was that if a local agency had not met all of its priority one objectives, that would not mean that it could not receive any funds from TLEPC but that it could receive funds only to help it meet those priority one objectives.

The reference in the resolution to a failure by the legislature or the Supreme Court to act was a recognition that certain objectives would require either authorization by the legislature or, in the case of the courts, rulings by the Supreme Court. No agency will, of course, be penalized if it has not met an objective because either the legislature or the Supreme Court has failed to take actions that must precede those of the local agency.

An additional understanding concerning objectives requiring Supreme Court action should be made clear. There are a number of cases, particularly among the objectives for courts, in which the Commission has given a one ranking to an objective that requires the Supreme Court to take an action, such as to adopt a certain rule of criminal procedure or to issue an order to trial courts concerning a particular matter. As was explained in the earlier description of the project, a priority of one, when applied to an objective that depends for its achievement on an agency that does not seek funds from TLEPC, means "very strongly recommended." In the case of the General Assembly, this meaning is clear and unambiguous. In the case of the Supreme Court, there is an element of ambiguity because although the court, in the sense of the five justices, does not seek funds from TLEPA, the Executive Secretary of the Supreme Court does obtain funds for court administrative and educational projects. The Judicial Committee of the Commission, when they reviewed and set the priorities for the court-related objectives, agreed that it would be improper for the TLEPC to take the position that the Executive Secretary of the Supreme Court could not receive funds unless the justices, exercising their judicial function, adopted those procedures and rules which the Commission recommended. The Supreme Court should be viewed, they felt, in the same way as the legislature, with objectives requiring Supreme Court action being recommended rather than required. Thus, for the purposes of the standards and goals project, the Executive Secretary of the Supreme Court is viewed as an agency separate from the Supreme Court itself and applications for funds by that office will not be affected by whether the justices have taken actions recommended by the TLEPC.

MATERIALS AVAILABLE TO THE TLEPA STAFF

There are several sets of project materials that TLEPA staff should have available to them in carrying out further standards and goals activities. First are the specialized implementation reports in rural and urban law enforcement, juvenile justice, courts, corrections and CJIS. Second is the Legislative Report which brings together from the various implementation reports those objectives that require legislative action. The legislative report will show for each year the types of legislation that TLEPA staff need to draft for consideration by the General Assembly if the objectives prioritized by the Commission are to be carried out on schedule. Third is the Profile Report which was completed and submitted to TLEPA during the summer of 1975. The first part of the report presents an overview of the Tennessee criminal justice system. The second part presents both the survey results and other data relevant to the specific objectives and strategies that were reviewed by the panel. The Appendix of the TLEPA Report provides information on how to use and interpret the data contained in the second part of the Profile Report. Included in the Appendix is a cross reference of TLEPA planning and grant award categories with the objectives adopted by the Commission. Where those objectives were among the ones reviewed by the panel, rather than having been added by the task forces or the Commission itself, the original identification number, known as the GOS (goals, objectives, strategies) number of the objective is shown. With that number, it is possible to find the objective in part two of the Profile Report and determine the survey response to it. The Appendix to also provides information on how to read the survey response as it is recorded in the Profile Report.

TLEPA FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES

There are several types of follow-up activities that TLEPA will have to undertake to carry through the standards and goals project. Those activities are listed and discussed below. In order to show clearly the specific things that must be done, each basic action is numbered.

Provide Information to Affected Agencies

One of the major responsibilities of TLEPA will be informing affected agencies of the existence of Tennessee standards and goals, in the form of the objectives prioritized by the Commission, and explaining to those agencies the implications of those objectives for them and the actions they must take. In most cases the affected agencies will be criminal justice agencies that seek TLEPC funds. Not all relevant agencies will be in that category, however, and they too will need to be informed of the results of the Commission's work if it is to have maximum impact.

1. Develop Distribution List for Project Implementation Reports

TLEPA personnel should draw up a list of all of the agencies to which each specialized report should be distributed. In drawing up this list, it will be important to remember that: (1) sheriffs will need to receive the law enforcement, corrections, and juvenile justice reports; (2) all criminal justice agencies should receive the CJIS report since all will eventually have to comply with Tennessee CJIS requirements; (3) in each jurisdiction, the agency responsible for local government finances should receive copies of all reports since they have implications for the expenditure of local funds; (4) reports asking for action by noncriminal justice agencies should be sent to those agencies; (5) the Executive Summary serves as an introduction to each report and should be placed at the front of each report that is distributed; (6) the Executive Summary alone should be distributed to groups and agencies that would benefit from obtaining an overview of the standards and goals project but have no need for one of the specialized implementation reports.

2. Draft Letters to Precede and Accompany Reports

Although the reports are largely self-explanatory, both with regard to the background and purpose of standards and goals and the implications for the agencies, busy officials who receive a report may just glance at it and lay it aside without realizing its importance to them. Even a letter enclosed with the report may not be carefully read. It is suggested that a week before the reports are due to be mailed, a letter be sent to the agencies that will receive them explaining that they will receive a report or reports and briefly pointing out the necessity to study the reports carefully. The fact that future eligibility for TLEPC funding will be determined in large measure by whether an agency complies with certain requirements contained in the reports should be made clear. A briefer letter can then be sent with the reports reiterating their importance to the agency. A different letter should be drafted to be sent to agencies that do not receive TLEPC funds.

3. Hold a Briefing Session for Regional Planners

Before any letters or reports are mailed to local agencies, TLEPA should hold an in-depth session for the regional law enforcement planners. The purpose of the session should be to explain in detail to the planners the nature of the reports, the priority objectives that will demand immediate attention from local agencies, the ways in which compliance with objectives will be measured, the implications of priorities for funding and any other matters about which the planners will have to be informed in order to assist the local agencies. A good briefing for the

planners should save much TLEPA staff time by permitting the planners to handle many of the questions that will inevitably arise among local agencies upon first receipt of the reports.

4. Send Annual Letters to Agencies

Each year at the appropriate time in the planning cycle, a letter should be sent to all agencies that might apply for funds reminding them that they must review the standards and goals report to determine whether any additional priority one objectives will become applicable to them that year. After the first year of using the reports, agencies should be relatively well acquainted with them and a simple reminder letter should be enough. The best procedure would be to draft a separate letter to each type of agency and inform the agency in that letter of any new number one priorities coming into effect that year.

Monitor Implementation of Standards and Goals

TLEPA will have to establish methods and procedures to determine whether agencies are in fact complying with the objectives for which they have responsibility. In addition, the agencies will have to be clearly informed of the type of evidence they will be expected to produce to show that they have complied.

5. Determine How to Ascertain Compliance with Each Objective

It will be necessary for TLEPA personnel to review each prioritized objective and determine the type of evidence that will be considered necessary and sufficient to show compliance with that objective. Since the attention of both the local agencies and of TLEPA will necessarily be focused largely on objectives with a priority of one, it is suggested that compliance criteria first be established for all number one priorities that are to be applicable in 1976 and 1977. As a practical matter, it is unlikely that objectives with a current priority below two will have any effect on funding.^{1/} Compliance criteria should be developed, therefore, for objectives with priorities one and two with attention being given to other objectives only if it seems likely that the Commission will raise their priority level in the course of its annual review of standards and goals. (The need for annual review is discussed later.)

^{1/} Although priority two objectives are not directly tied to funding, the Commission might give priority in some planning and grant award categories to agencies that had complied with all of the priority one objectives and were also complying with or trying to comply with priority two objectives. In those cases, it would be necessary to have a means to determine whether priority two objectives were being met.

In some cases, it will be very easy to determine compliance criteria. In others it will be quite difficult. In order to provide some suggestions and guidance to TLEPA staff, three types of objectives and means for measuring them are discussed below.

A. Cases in which both the action required by the objective and the appropriate compliance criteria are clear from the statement of the objective itself. There are, for instance, many objectives that call for the development of written policies and procedures about some matter that falls within the authority of a particular agency. In the case of those objectives, it is clear that what the agency must do to develop the written documents and the obvious way to show that the objective has been complied with is to send TLEPA a copy of the document.

B. Cases in which the action required is clear but a decision has to be made concerning the appropriate compliance criteria. An example is Rural Law Enforcement Objective 10.2 which requires that in 1976 every police agency "provide full-time sworn employees during the first year of employment with additional formal training, coached field training and supervised field experience." The statement of the objective is clear and if an individual agency is unsure of what is meant, for instance, by "coached field training" reading the strategies should clear up any uncertainty. How is an agency to show that it has complied, however? The best way would be to have the agency maintain certain written records that would clearly support its contention that such additional training and experience was supplied to its new officers. The records should include, for instance, the names of all new full-time sworn employees entering the department during the relevant year and, for each new officer, a description of the additional training received, dates on which it was received, and the name of the person who provided the training or coached field experience. For each objective of this type, it will be necessary for TLEPA personnel to determine precisely what records must be kept to show compliance. It is important not to overburden local agencies with recordkeeping, and no more should be required than is really necessary to prove compliance. At the same time it should be made clear to the agencies that they must provide adequate documentation for their claims of compliance. In many cases it would be helpful for TLEPA to draw up and distribute forms which personnel in the implementing agency could routinely fill out to develop the necessary written record. The use of such forms would help the local agency by making it easy for them to record the information and help TLEPA personnel by providing an easily reviewed, uniform system of records.

C. Cases in which both the action required and the appropriate compliance criteria are unclear. A good example is Rural Law Enforcement Objective 4.2 which says that by 1977, "Every police chief executive must seek to continually enhance the role of the patrol officer." The strategies attached to that objective list a large number of actions

that could be taken to enhance the rôle of the patrol officer. As was explained earlier, however, only the objectives, not the strategies, were prioritized. Therefore no strategy has to be followed by any agency. In the case of this objective, TLEPA staff will have to determine what kinds of activities a police chief executive is expected to engage in in order to accomplish this objective and the proof of compliance that must be submitted. There are relatively few objectives of this type among those given a priority of one. However, in some cases it may be necessary to consult with the appropriate committee of the Commission or with the Commission as a whole in deciding how to interpret a priority one objective of this type. There are a number of priority two objectives of this sort.

6. Inform Implementing Agencies of Criteria Used to Determine Compliance

Once TLEPA personnel have determined the criteria to be used in determining compliance with each priority one or two objective, it will be necessary to communicate that information to the responsible agencies so that they will know what proof they have to supply. They should be supplied with that information well enough ahead of time so that they will be able to develop the necessary records or other documentation required. A briefing for the regional law enforcement planners so that they will understand the compliance criteria would be very helpful due to their frequent contact with local agencies.

7. Assure Continued Compliance with Required Objectives

A procedure must be developed so that the compliance of agencies with all current number one priorities, not only those newly in force in a given year, is checked. It would be easy for the attention of the staff regarding standards and goals compliance to become entirely focused on the new objectives requiring compliance in that year. In such a situation, local agencies that did not like having to comply with some earlier objective might find it relatively easy to stop complying without TLEPA's becoming aware of it. Therefore, supplying proof of compliance with priority one objectives should be a cumulative process, with compliance for additional objectives being checked each year, not a process in which only the new requirements are checked. However, over the years, as the number of required objectives increases, it might not be feasible to check compliance by all local agencies with all priority one objectives. In such a situation, a process of random spot checking with closer attention being paid to less cooperative agencies could be introduced.

Plan and Carry Out Evaluation of Standards and Goals

In order eventually to evaluate accurately the impact of the adopted objectives on the criminal justice system in Tennessee, it is necessary to begin planning for evaluation before actual implementation begins. Evaluation of many of the objectives will probably center largely on a comparison of the situations before and after the implementation of a particular objective. That means that data necessary for the evaluation will begin to be lost as soon as a local agency starts to put into practice one of the objectives. Evaluation must, therefore, be anticipated and coordinated with implementation of the objectives.

8. Develop a Systematic Plan for Evaluating the Effects of the Adopted Standards and Goals

TLEPA staff should begin now to develop a plan for evaluating the effects of the standards and goals. Several specific steps should be taken in developing an evaluation plan:

- a. Consult with LEAA to determine what their requirements will be in the evaluation phase of standards and goals, and on the availability of funds specifically earmarked for evaluation studies.
- b. Given the possible inability of TLEPA to engage in a systematic evaluation of all of the objectives, determine the criteria that will be used in selecting objectives for evaluation. Among criteria that should be considered are: relative cost of implementing the objective; extent of changes in the system anticipated from the implementation of the objective; current state of knowledge and current evaluation efforts in the particular program area affected by the objective; usefulness of evaluating that objective in order to help the Commission to determine whether to change the priorities assigned to similar or related objectives; and assuring that there will be some evaluation in each specialized functional area.
- c. Review existing evaluation programs while drawing up evaluation plans for standards and goals so that total TLEPA resources available for evaluation research will be used in the most efficient manner possible.
- d. For each objective chosen for evaluation, determine the data that will be needed for the evaluation process. If data must be recorded or collected at the local agency level, draw up forms that will make recordkeeping easier and more accurate and notify agencies of the records they are expected to keep--presumably as a condition of funding.

- e. Establish an annual review process to determine which new objectives will be evaluated, which old ones will continue to be evaluated, any need to refine evaluation techniques, etc.
- f. Where "before and after" data are needed for evaluation, make that clear to local agencies and obtain their cooperation in collecting the "before" data prior to the implementation of the objective that will be evaluated.

9. Take Steps to Obtain Active Cooperation of Local Agencies in the Evaluation Process

It will probably be necessary to give special attention to obtaining the cooperation of local agencies in collecting data for the evaluation process. When agencies are asked to collect data for the evaluation of a project for which they have sought and received a grant, cooperation can reasonably be expected. In the case of standards and goals, some lack of cooperation probably has to be anticipated, however. From the point of view of many local agencies, they are being required to take certain actions that they may not wish to take. Thus, they may have a negative attitude towards anything connected with standards and goals. In addition, most will view a request to keep any additional records as a burden. In that case, TLEPA will have to take pains to obtain local cooperation in the evaluation process. When local agencies are asked to collect certain types of data, the need for the data and the importance of the evaluation process should be carefully explained. It would be advisable to brief the regional law enforcement planners so that they clearly understand what the local agencies are being asked to do and the reasons for it.

Prepare Needed Legislation

The execution of some of the adopted objectives will depend on legislative action. The Legislative Report of this project shows which objectives require legislation and the nature of the legislation needed. The legislative report does not, however, contain any actual draft legislation.

10. Develop a Plan to Assure that Needed Legislation is Prepared

Well before the legislative session begins, TLEPA staff should determine what pieces of legislation need to be passed in that session in order to keep the implementation of the standards and goals project on schedule. Given the delays that often accompany legislative action,

it would be ideal if legislation were initially sought in the year before that designated by the TLEPC as the year they would like to have the legislation adopted. Agency staff should draft the needed legislation or obtain the services of the staff of the Legislative Council through the assistance of an interested member of the legislature. Any drafted legislation should be carefully reviewed with the relevant committee of the TLEPC. Many of the objectives in the Courts section of this project will depend on legislative action, and in prioritizing those objectives, the Judicial Committee of the Commission made it very clear that they were accepting only the general statement of the objective and would want to be consulted about any specific legislation that was drafted. It would be wise to obtain the concurrence of the Commission as a whole for any major pieces of draft legislation.

11. Assure that Needed Legislation is Introduced into the General Assembly

Once drafts of the needed legislation are developed, TLEPA staff will have to obtain the assistance of at least one legislator in order to have the bill introduced. TLEPA staff will have to assess the situation in order to determine the best way to obtain legislative cooperation. The chairman of the TLEPC may be able to play a significant role in contacting legislators on behalf of the Governor and asking them to sponsor a bill.

12. Inform Local Agencies of Legislation Being Introduced

A program of informing local agencies when legislation related to standards and goals has been introduced is probably advisable. Where the particular piece of legislation is likely to be popular with most local agencies, they can be urged to contact their Senators and Representatives and to engage in lobbying efforts for the bill through their various professional associations such as the Tennessee Sheriffs' Association, District Attorneys General Conference, etc. There is always the danger, of course, that a particular bill will be unpopular and that local agencies will work against it. That is a danger that has to be run, however. TLEPA would lose its credibility if it informed local agencies only of those bills it thought them likely to support. A process of not informing local agencies could also backfire if it became evident in legislative hearings that the TLEPC was asking for legislation that would affect local agencies but the local agencies were unaware of the legislation. Through their professional associations and newsletters and contacts with their representatives, local agencies are likely to be aware of potential legislation that would affect them in any event. The advantage in TLEPA's taking an active role in informing the agencies is that

such action might increase TLEPA credibility among the agencies and provide an opportunity to explain the need for particular pieces of legislation and to marshal support for them.

Annually Review and Update Tennessee Standards and Goals

The publication of the standards and goals reports is not the end of the standards and goals project but marks the beginning of a new phase. If the standards and goals adopted by the Commission in the fall of 1975 are to remain relevant to the needs of Tennessee, they must be reviewed and updated in future years. The publication of the reports in a loose-leaf form was specifically intended to make it easy to add to or change the reports in future years.

13. Develop an Annual Standards and Goals Review Process

Each year the Commission should review the existing standards and goals. Special attention should be given to those objectives that are scheduled for the following year. The priorities assigned to those objectives should be reviewed in the light of changes that have taken place in the criminal justice system in the state, available resources, the observed effects of those objectives implemented in earlier years, etc. Before the Commission meeting, TLEPA staff should meet with the committees of the Commission to review in detail the objectives that fall within the sphere of each committee. Where TLEPA staff believes that the priority or year assigned to an objective should be changed, that suggestion and supporting material should be introduced at the committee meeting. The committees should also review objectives that were given priorities of five, i.e., were rejected, during the first prioritization process. Changed conditions or attitudes might warrant reconsidering those objectives. TLEPA staff should determine before meeting with the committees whether any priority five objectives are particularly worthy of reconsideration. (The Appendix to this report lists those objectives that were rated five in the initial prioritization process.) In the process of doing that, the staff may wish to review the relevant data collected in the survey and project research. That data are found in part two of the project Profile Report.

APPENDIX

A. HOW TO USE THE PROFILE REPORT

As was indicated earlier in the description of the standards and goals project, the Profile Report was delivered to TLEPA in the summer of 1975. The first part of the report is an overview of various aspects of the criminal justice system in Tennessee. The second part contains information specifically relevant to the originally proposed standards and goals. In particular, for each goal, objective and strategy, there is information concerning the status of the proposal under current Tennessee law, current practices of Tennessee criminal justice agencies relevant to the proposal, and the reaction of the panelists who answered the questionnaire that included that proposal. TLEPA personnel may wish, at some future time, to check the information presented in the second part of the profile. For instance, in annually updating the standards and goals and considering whether objectives rejected in the initial prioritization should be reconsidered, agency staff may wish to check on the evaluation of an objective by the panel or the information that was obtained concerning current practices or relevant law. In order to use the data in the profile, it is necessary to understand two things: the use of the GOS numbers and the proper way to interpret the computer printout of the results of the survey.^{1/}

^{1/} The GOS numbers of the objectives that were rejected by the Commission during initial prioritization are shown in Appendix B of this report. The cross reference of adopted objectives with TLEPA planning and grant-award categories (Appendix C) also shows the GOS number. Thus, it is possible to find in the profile relevant information about all objectives considered by the Commission. To avoid confusion, it should also be noted that in the final reports of the project, all proposals that were adopted by the Commission are referred to as "objectives." In most cases, they were also designated as "objectives" in the survey material. In some instances, however, what had been a strategy or set of strategies in the survey material was prioritized by the Commission and given a date. Those prioritized strategies then became objectives in the final report, but in the survey material in part two of the profile, they are listed as strategies.

A GOS (goals, objectives, strategies) number was assigned to each statement in the survey material. The material was divided into 20 "packages." The first number in the GOS sequence indicates the package in which that proposal was contained.^{1/} Thus, all proposals that were sent out in survey package three, for instance, begin with a number 3. The material in each package was divided into a goal or goals, objectives associated with a specific goal, and strategies associated with a particular objective. If there is only one general goal for the package as a whole, the first number in the GOS sequence is both the package and the goal number. If there is more than one goal in a package, then the goal number is the second one in the sequence and is separated from the package number by a period. Package three, for instance, has more than one goal. The first goal is designated 3.1. The second goal is 3.2 and so forth. The first objective under goal 3.1 is numbered 1 and separated from the goal number with a period--so that it is 3.1.1. The second objective under that goal is 3.1.2. Strategies under an objective are designated by numbers starting with 1 and separated from the objective number by a comma. Thus, 3.1.1,1 is the first strategy under Objective 3.1.1 which is the first objective under goal 3.1 which is the first goal in package 3. The numbering sequence in a package would produce the following outline, for example:

3.1 Goal

3.1.1 Objective

3.1.1,1 Strategy

3.1.1,2 Strategy

3.1.1,3 Strategy

3.1.2 Objective

3.1.2,1 Strategy

3.1.2,2 Strategy

3.1.2,3 Strategy

3.1.3 Objective

3.1.3,1 Strategy

^{1/} For clarity, it should be noted that the numbers of the package that were sent out in the survey and that are used in this report are not precisely the same as the numbers given in the list of packages at the beginning of this report. Because of the way the project evolved, there was no package with a number of 16. The packages listed earlier as 16 through 20 actually have the numbers of 17 through 21 although there is a total of only 20 packages.

3.1.3,2 Strategy

3.2 Goal

3.2.1 Objective

3.2.1,1 Strategy

3.2.2,2 Strategy, etc.

The table of contents of part two of the profile shows the location of each package. In some cases a package does not appear as a whole but various parts of it appear in different sections of the report. By checking the table of contents, however, it is possible to find the location of any proposal.

In part two of the profile, the left hand page gives the statement of the goal, objective or strategy. The related information is on the right hand page directly across from the goal, objective or strategy. The right hand page has two columns. In the left hand column is a summary of the legal research relevant to the particular statement and a summary of current practices in Tennessee agencies. The right hand column contains the results of the survey. The information on law and practice is self-explanatory. The interpretation of the survey results is discussed below.

Given below is an example of the survey results as contained in the profile. On the first line is the GOS number (17.1.1,1), the date the computer analysis was done (08/14/75), and the number of people who replied to that package (30). The data below that are organized into seven columns that contain information about each of the seven questions that were asked of the panelists. The letters on the last line of each column, C, P, A, etc., are abbreviations for the questions that were asked. In order to understand the survey date, it is important to understand the questions the panelists were answering.

17.1.1,1							08/14/75.		30
4.71	2.13	4.23	4.19	4.21	3.95	3.50			
28.	24.	30.	27.	28.	21.	26.			
93.	21.	83.	81.	79.	71.	50.			
0.	63.	7.	4.	7.	5.	15.			
G	P	A	R	B	C	L			

Explanation of Survey Questions

Code: Panelists were asked to use numbers to indicate their response. The meaning assigned to the numbers was as follows:

- 5 Very high
- 4 High
- 3 Medium
- 2 Low
- 1 Very low
- 0 No opinion

Questions: Each panelist was asked to answer seven questions for each rated item. The list below shows the abbreviation that designates the question on the computer printout, the one word term that was used to designate that question on the questionnaire, and the explanation of the question that was given to the panelists in the instruction booklet.

- C = Clarity: Do you personally understand the Goal, Objective or Strategy. Write in 5 if it is very clear, 1 if you do not understand it at all. Use the numbers 2, 3, or 4 for degrees of understanding. If you answer 1, you need not rate practice, acceptance, related, benefit, cost or likelihood.
- P = Practice: Is this Goal, Objective, or Strategy currently in practice in your agency and/or community? Write in 5 if it is exactly practiced as written. Use a 4 for almost, 3 for somewhat, 2 for a little, and 1 for no practice. If you do not know place an X in the appropriate space.
- A = Acceptance: Is the Goal, Objective or Strategy personally acceptable to you: Are you in favor of it? Use a 1 to indicate a strong no and 5 to indicate a strong yes. Use 2, 3, and 4 to indicate degrees between the two.
- R = Related: Is the Goal, Objective or Strategy related to a problem or a need in your agency and/or community. Please be careful and indicate if it is related to a need even if you are personally against it.

- B = Benefit: How greatly will the proposed Goal, Objective, or Strategy help your agency or community if put into practice? If it is already in practice, how is it helping now?
- C = Cost: In your opinion, what will be the costs, in money and people's time, of putting this program into practice?
- L = Likelihood: How likely do you think this program is to be put into practice in Tennessee?

Year: Each objective has a year attached to it. Under the computer printout of the survey results for objectives is added the average year for implementation suggested by the panelists. The instructions they were given concerning the year were as follows:

Each of the Objectives has a year stated. If you disagree with the year stated put in the year that you realistically would like to see the Objective reached...If you disagree with the Objective write in N for "NEVER."

Returning to the computer printout of the answers to 17.1.1.1, we see that the analysis of the answers to each question is found in the column above the abbreviation for that question. The first line in the column shows the mean of the answers to that question. In our example, for instance, the mean answer to the question of clarity was 4.71, indicating that the proposal was very clear. The mean answer to the question of acceptance was 4.23 indicating that the proposal was also highly acceptable to the panelists. The second line in the column shows the number of people who answered that specific question. Not everyone who answered a questionnaire as a whole necessarily answered each question. In our example, of the 30 persons who replied to package 17, 28 rated the clarity of this particular proposal while 30 rated its acceptability. The third line shows the percentage of answers to each question that were either a 4 or 5, that is answers that were either "very high" or "high." Ninety-three percent rated the clarity high or very high and 83 percent rated the acceptability as high or very high. The fourth line is the percentage of answers to that question that were either 1 or 2, that is, "very low" or "low."

B. OBJECTIVES REJECTED BY THE COMMISSION DURING INITIAL PRIORITIZATION

Introduction

Listed below are the objectives to which the TLEPC gave a priority rating of 5 (reject) during the prioritization meeting held in December, 1975. They are listed here so that if circumstances warrant at some time in the future, they can be presented to the Commission again for consideration. They are grouped by subject area: law enforcement, corrections, juvenile justice and courts. Preceding each objective is its original GOS number--unless it was a proposal developed in the task group meetings in which case that is indicated. If TLEPA personnel wish to look up the survey data in part two of the Profile Report, they can use the GOS number to locate the proposal. The table of contents to that portion of the profile lists the location of the various proposals by their GOS number. In some cases the statement of the objective as presented to the Commission varies somewhat from the one included in the survey because it was amended by the task groups.

Law Enforcement

- 21.1.2,5 Every police agency employee should be allowed by legislation to engage in collective negotiations in arriving at terms and conditions for employment.

Corrections

- 20.2.2,2 All courthouses should have pretrial detention facilities located near the courthouse.
- 9.7,6 Every jurisdiction should have a method by which collateral effects of a criminal record can be avoided or mitigated following a term of probation.
- 21.2.4,9 There should be no distinction between misdemeanor and felony probation organization, manpower or services.
- 15.8,16 Regional administration of the parole system should be established.
- 21.1.2,16 Legislation should be enacted prohibiting correctional employees from participating in any concerted work stoppage or job action.

21.2.4 Legislation should be enacted entrusting operation of correctional programs to professionally trained individuals and to protect the positions from political pressure.

Task Group A Correction Commission should be established by the legislature. The purpose of this Commission will be to select a Commissioner of Correction who shall be responsible for the administration of the Department of Correction, including the selection of institutional managers. This Correction Commission will consist of 7 persons, each to be appointed to staggered terms by a bi-partisan legislative committee.

21.2.4,4 Correctional agencies should develop policies to abandon the image of corrections as military agencies by abolishing military terms and titles, discontinuing use of uniforms, etc.

15.5,5 Police agencies should turn over all detention and correctional facilities to appropriate county, regional or state agencies.

1.2.1,6 Legislation should provide for state funds similar to unemployment benefits to be made available to offenders and exoffenders until they find a job.

17.2.4,8 Community action agencies should develop programs to provide job opportunities for offenders and exoffenders.

13.2.2,7 In locating work release programs, high priority should be given to the proximity of job opportunities.

Juvenile Justice and Programs

11.2.1,1 Legislation should be passed placing the jurisdiction presently vested in juvenile courts in a family court.

Courts

4.1.1,4 District Attorneys should assist police in developing guidelines for screening when taking persons into custody.

7.1 Legislation and court procedures should be adopted to abolish plea bargaining.

- 7.2 The Supreme Court or the General Assembly should adopt rules of procedure and policies so that the courts' discretion will be exercised to control plea bargaining and provide for equal treatment of defendants and proper disposition of cases.
- 8.1,8 Adopt legislation authorizing temporary reassignment of DA's, defense counsel, and others essential to trial of a criminal case.
- 8.1,9- Adopt legislation embodying ABA recommendations for guaranteeing speedy trial to those already imprisoned.
8.1,14
- 8.2,19- The Supreme Court or legislature should adopt rules governing the behavior of the prosecutor in dealing with grand juries and when charging by information.
8.2,22
- Task Group Change Tennessee law so that immunity will no longer be granted automatically to witnesses compelled to testify before a grand jury.
- 3.2.1 Courts and law enforcement agencies should adopt policies and procedures to assure that arrested persons are given prompt access to a judicial officer and are considered for pretrial release. (No action taken, present policies and procedures considered sufficient.)
- 3.2.1,9 Legislation should establish procedures to dismiss charges against accused persons found to be mentally incompetent and unlikely to regain competence. (Present procedures considered sufficient.)
- 12.1.1,13 Adopt legislation defining rights of persons detained while awaiting trial and authorizing class action suits to challenge nature of detention and alleged violation of rights.
12.1.1,14
- 8.2 Adopt legislation eliminating preliminary hearings in misdemeanor cases and in cases in which a grand jury has issued an indictment. (No action pending issuing of suggested new rules of criminal procedures by the Supreme Court.)
8.2,4
8.2,18
- 8.11 and Either through legislation or rules established by the all strategies Supreme Court, provide rules for pretrial discovery, including:

1. Disclosures that must be made by the prosecution
 2. Disclosures that must be made by the defense
 3. Materials exempted from disclosure
 4. Penalties for failing to comply with disclosures that must be made by the defense
(No action pending issuing by Supreme Court of suggested new rules of criminal procedures.)
- 8.5,2 Legislation should permit joinder of the cases of two
8.5,3 defendants or joinder of two or more offenses charged
 to one defendant.
- 8.5,4 Legislation should provide that when two or more offenses
 have been joined for trial, the court should grant severance
 upon request of either prosecution or defense when necessary
 for fair determination of guilt or innocence.
- 8.5,8 Legislation should give the court the authority to join
 or sever offenses or defendants on its own initiative.
- Task Group Guidelines governing joinder and severance should be
 established by the Supreme Court and administered by
 local courts.
- 8.10,1 to Legislation and court rules should be adopted specifying
8.10,4 circumstances in which (1) a jury trial is not required;
 (2) juries may be smaller than 12; (3) situations requiring
 less than a unanimous verdict.
- 8.9,5 The constitution should be amended to permit judges to
 comment to the jury on the evidence and to summarize
 it.
- 8.7,8 Supreme Court rules or legislation should permit a judge
 to instruct the jury on principles of law or the applica-
 bility of evidence to the issues.
- 8.3,1 Legislation should be passed providing that if a judge
 is unable to continue, another judge may proceed and
 finish the trial.
- 9.1,1 Legislation should classify all crimes into not more
9.1,2 than 10 categories and provide maximum sentences of not
9.1,3 more than 5 years except for specified crimes and for
 dangerous and persistent offenders who may be sentenced
 for terms up to 25 years.

- 9.1,5 Adopt legislation to provide that except for the crime
9.1,6 of murder, there should be no mandatory sentences or
ineligibility for dispositions other than incarceration.
- 9.1,8 Legislation should provide the court with wide discretion
in determining penalties and choosing dispositions other
than incarceration.
- 9.1,18 Adopt legislation to provide that sentencing courts should
9.1,19 have continuing jurisdiction over offenders, and be authorized
9.1,20 to reduce a sentence or modify its terms. The correctional
agency or the offender should be able to ask the court
to consider modifying the sentence.
- 9.2,1 Legislation should establish specific criteria governing
the sentencing of offenders to extended terms, including
minimum sentences before eligibility for parole, latitude
of the parole board in waiving the minimum sentence,
and use of psychiatric examinations in sentencing dangerous
offenders.
- 9.3,1 Adopt legislation specifying criteria to be used in sen-
9.3,2 tencing offenders convicted of multiple offenses.
9.3,3
- 9.5 Adopt legislation specifying situations in which a pre-
sentence report should be required.
- 9.7 Legislation should provide probation as an alternative
9.7,1 for all offenders.
- Task Group Legislation should provide probation as an alternative
for all offenders where the maximum penalty provided
by law is not more than 15 years.
- 10.1 Direct appeal and post conviction remedies should be
10.1,2 unified so that appeal will be limited to one full review
10.1,3 of conviction and sentence extending to the entire case.
10.1,1 (a) If appeal and postconviction remedies are not unified,
the defendant should be entitled to only one direct appeal
and one postconviction appeal.
- 10.1,17 Transcripts should be supplied at public expense. (Already
supplied in indigent cases.)
- 12.2.1 Legislation should provide for judicial review of the
12.12.,1 actions of correctional agencies alleged to have infringed
12.2.2 on the rights of offenders and for judicial remedies
12.2.2,20 when an offender's rights have been abridged.

- 21.2.5,1 The method of selecting judges in Tennessee should be
 21.1.4,3 changed from election to selection process based on the
 21.1.4,4 Missouri plan.
- 21.1.4,3 Require a mandatory retirement age of 65 for judges unless
 asked to sit for limited periods when services of retired
 judges are needed.
- Task Group Require an absolute retirement deadlines of 75 for judges
 unless asked to sit for limited periods when services
 of retired judges are needed.
- Task Group Provide that a judge cannot run for re-election subsequent
 to reaching age 65 but may finish the balance of his
 term after reaching 65 and continue provision permitting
 Supreme Court to ask retired judges to sit temporarily.
- 21.1.4,7 Create a judicial conduct commission with the power to
 remove judges found to be incompetent or guilty of mis-
 conduct--without having to resort to impeachment process.
- 15.5,1 Unify all trial level courts into a single court with
 general jurisdiction.
- 15.5,39 The state should finance all expenses of the state court
 system except for courtrooms and other space which should
 be provided by local governments.
- 8.12 Legislation should be enacted to make all traffic violations
 subject to administrative disposition except for specified
 serious offenses.
- 17.1.2,1 Establish in each judicial district and for the state
 17.1.2,2 court system as a whole a coordinating council with rep-
 17.1.2,3 resentatives from all areas of the criminal justice system
 17.1.2,4 and from the public, to improve the working of the court
 17.1.2,6 system, its coordination with other criminal justice
 agencies and the understanding of the courts by the public.

C. CROSS REFERENCE OF OBJECTIVES WITH TLEPA PLANNING AND
GRANT AWARD CATEGORIES

Introduction

This appendix will assist TLEPA staff by showing the relationship of the prioritized objectives to TLEPA planning and grant award categories. The objectives related to each category are listed under that category. The numbers attached to the objectives are the same numbers that they have in the implementation reports. Also shown are the year and priority assigned by the Commission and the original GOS number. The GOS number can be used to find the survey information related to that objective that is located in part two of the Profile Report. The use of the GOS numbers and the profile is explained in Appendix A of this report.

Key

The letters preceding the number for each objective indicates the implementation report in which that objective can be found. The meaning of the letters is as follows:

LE - Law Enforcement

CT - Courts

C - Corrections

J - Juvenile Justice

IS - Criminal Justice Information System

STANDARDS AND GOALS ACTION LIST - PRIORITIZED OBJECTIVES

A-1 Local and Regional Planning

None

A-2 State Agency Planning

None

A-3 Evaluation

- | | | | | |
|--------|--|------|---|----------|
| LE 6.8 | Every police agency, which has established specialties <u>should consider</u> an annual, formal review of each specialty to determine its effectiveness in helping to achieve agency goals and objectives. | 1977 | 3 | 21.1.6,6 |
| J 10.4 | Consideration should be given to evaluating each youth services bureau in terms of its effectiveness. | 1981 | 3 | 5.4 |

A-4 Research

None

A-5 Technical Assistance

- | | | | | |
|--------|--|------|---|----------|
| LE 7.1 | Every police agency <u>should</u> establish liaison with professionals outside the police service who have expertise that can contribute to effective and efficient performance beyond the capabilities of agency employees. | 1978 | 2 | 21.1.5,8 |
|--------|--|------|---|----------|

B-1 Criminal Justice Information System

- | | | | | |
|--------|---|------|---|--------|
| LE 7.3 | Every police agency <u>should</u> establish a standardized system for secure and efficient storage, classification, retrieval and disposition of items of evidentiary or other value. | 1977 | 2 | 2.6,4 |
| IS 1.1 | TLEPC <u>very strongly</u> recommends that statutory authority be established for the development and operation of the state level information and statistical system. | 1976 | 1 | 19.1,4 |
| IS 1.2 | The state <u>must</u> establish a plan for the development of information and statistical systems and advise local levels to assure coordination with the state system. | 1976 | 1 | 19.1,7 |

IS 1.3	The Tennessee Information and Enforcement System (TIES) <u>must</u> establish user groups that include state, regional and local representatives of law enforcement, courts and correction. User groups shall serve in an advisory capacity to the Commissioner of Safety only.	1976	1	19.1,2
IS 1.4	Every locality <u>should</u> be serviced by a local criminal justice information system (LCJIS) which supports the needs of criminal justice agencies.	1980	2	19.2
IS 1.5	Every component agency of the criminal justice system should be served by an information system which supports its intra-agency needs.	1980	2	19.3
IS 1.6	If not economically feasible to establish local information support functions, these services <u>must</u> be provided through consolidation of adjacent units at the same organizational level or by the establishment of a "surrogate" at the next higher organizational level.	1976	1	19.2,2
IS 1.7	TLEPC <u>must</u> prepare for approval by the Governor, regulations to strictly limit system access to agencies demonstrating a need and a right to know, subject to the Tennessee Administrative Procedures Act.	1976	1	19.4,3
IS 1.8	Each event involving an arrested individual <u>must</u> be recorded by the appropriate agency shortly after the event's occurrence. The file <u>must</u> originate in the arresting agency.	1977	1	19.1,11
IS 1.9	All criminal offender record information <u>must</u> be stored in a computer dedicated solely to and controlled by criminal justice agencies.	1977	1	19.5,8
IS 1.10	The collection of data to satisfy both the Offender-Based Transaction Statistic (OBTS) and the Computerized Criminal History (CCH) systems <u>should</u> be gathered from operating criminal justice agencies in a single collection.	1977	2	19.5,4

IS 1.11	Files created as data bases for OBTS and CCH systems, should be developed simultaneously and maintained as much as possible within a single activity.	1977	2	19.5,5
IS 1.12	Data for the Uniform Crime Reports <u>should</u> be expanded to include data from OBTS to facilitate crime oriented research.	1977	2	19.1,13
IS 1.13	With the exception of intelligence files collection of criminal justice information concerning individuals should be triggered only by a formal event in the criminal justice process and contain only verifiable data.	1977	2	19.5,6
IS 1.14	Every police agency should have a well-defined functioning information system.	Byd 1980	2	19.3,1
IS 1.15	Court information systems, serving the judge, prosecutor, defense attorney and probation officer <u>should</u> include necessary data.	Byd 1980	2	19.3,6
IS 1.16	Corrections information system <u>should</u> include necessary data.	Byd 1980	2	19.3,7
IS 1.17	The corrections system <u>should</u> collect, store, analyze and display information for planning, operational control, offender tracking and program review for all state and county correctional programs and agencies.	Byd 1980	2	19.3,8
IS 1.18	All but the largest components of the correction system <u>should</u> have a small information and statistics section capable of producing periodic reports and analyzing and interpreting policy and decision-making.	Byd 1980	2	19.3,11
IS 1.19	The performance of the correction <u>should</u> be evaluated on two levels.	Byd 1980	2	19.3,13

B-2 Law Enforcement Communication System

LE 4.1	Twenty-four hour a day police services <u>must</u> be provided for all parts of the state.	1978	1	15.1
LE 4.5	Every police agency <u>should</u> assign civilian personnel to those positions that do not require exercise of police authority or the special knowledge, skills and aptitude of the professional police officer.	1977	2	21.1.6,7
LE 4.7	Response time on emergency calls--from receipt of call to message radio transmission-- <u>should</u> not exceed 2 minutes (1 minute by 1978) nor 6 minutes (4 minutes by 1978)	1978	2	19.6,6
LE 4.8	Police communications systems <u>must</u> be developed that will provide rapid means for reporting crimes and dispatching and coordinating police units.	1977	1	19.6
LE 4.9	All phone calls to police communication centers <u>must</u> be recorded.	1978	1	19.6,3

C-1 Improvement of Community Relations

LE 3.1	Each police agency <u>should</u> establish joint police-community crime prevention programs.	1979	2	17.2.3 2.3
J 4.2	It is strongly recommended that police agencies establish programs and use police agency employees to inform the public of the police's defined police role.	1979	2	17.2.2,1A
J 4.3	Police agencies should consider obtaining the active involvement of parents, teachers and professional organizations in educating the youth as to the ill effects of drugs and providing alternatives to drugs.	1979	3	17.2.3,6

D-1 Administrative Assistance

LE 1.1	Each police agency <u>must</u> develop written policies, objectives, priorities and procedures covering the various functions of the agency and its component parts.	1977	1	15.2
--------	--	------	---	------

LE 1.2	Each police agency <u>should</u> develop written policy statements that publicly establish the limits of police discretion, provide guidelines for its exercise within those limits, and eliminate discriminatory enforcement of the law.	1976	2	15.2,19
LE 1.3	Each police chief executive <u>should consider</u> adopting a written policy statement acknowledging the role of the news media and establish liaison between the agency and the media.	1977	3	17.2.2,4
LE 2.4	Each police agency <u>should</u> establish a cost accounting system which records costs of agency programs.	1978	2	17.1.4,6
LE 4.4	Every police chief executive <u>must</u> develop written policy governing agency action in juvenile matters, including detection, deterrence and prevention of delinquent behavior and juvenile crime.	1978	1	11.1.1,1
LE 5.2	If the General Assembly authorizes citations and summons in lieu of arrest, as is recommended in Objective 5.1, then by <u>1978</u> , each local police agency should formulate in writing procedures for the use of summonses, citations and arrest warrants.	1978	2	3.1.1
LE 9.3	The General Assembly and local governments <u>should consider</u> establishing a formal salary structure based on a systematic classification of all law enforcement positions.	1978	3	21.4.1
LE 9.4	Local governments <u>must</u> expand classification and pay systems to provide greater advancement opportunities within the patrol ranks.	1977	1	15.2,13
LE 9.6	Every police chief executive <u>must</u> assume administrative control of the promotion and advancement system to insure that only the best qualified personnel are promoted or advanced.	1980	1	21.3.7,15

- | | | | | |
|---------|--|------|---|-----------|
| LE 13.1 | Every police chief executive <u>should</u> implement positive programs and techniques to prevent employee misconduct and to encourage self-discipline. | 1977 | 2 | 21.1.3 |
| LE 13.2 | Every police agency <u>should</u> designate personnel to conduct investigations of complaints. Personnel should be responsible to the police chief executive. | 1977 | 2 | 21.1.3,10 |
| LE 14.1 | Every police agency <u>should consider</u> establishment of uniform procedures that govern employee organizations and interpersonal relations. | 1978 | 3 | 21.1.2 |
| J 1.3 | Law enforcement chief executives must develop written policy governing agency action in juvenile matters, including detection, deterrence, and prevention of delinquent behavior and juvenile crime. | 1978 | 3 | 11.1.1,1 |

D-2 Patrol Deployment Plans

None

D-3 Contracting and Consolidating Law Enforcement Services

- | | | | | |
|--------|--|------|---|----------|
| LE 2.1 | Each police agency <u>should</u> participate in cooperative planning with all other governmental subdivisions of the jurisdiction when such planning can have an effect on crime, public safety, or efficient police operations. | 1978 | 2 | 17.1.1,7 |
|--------|--|------|---|----------|

E-1 Drug Abuse Enforcement

- | | | | | |
|--------|--|------|---|----|
| LE 6.4 | Every police agency <u>should</u> acknowledge the direct relationship between narcotic and drug offenses and other criminal activity, and <u>should</u> have available a narcotic and drug investigation capability based on that acknowledgement. | 1977 | 2 | TF |
|--------|--|------|---|----|

E-2 Organized Crime Control

None

E-3 Reduction of Part I Offenses

None

E-4 Crime Laboratory Services

None

E-5 Improvement of Investigative Techniques

LE 6.1	Each police agency <u>should</u> have the capacity to conduct thorough criminal investigations.	1977	2	2.4 2.4,11
LE 6.2	Each police agency <u>should</u> insure its capability to conduct effective vice operations. These operations should be capable of reducing the incidence of vice crimes and related criminal activity.	1977	2	2.4,9 2.4,11
LE 6.3	Each police agency <u>should</u> establish and maintain the capability to gather and evaluate information and to disseminate intelligence in a manner which protects every individual's right to privacy while it curtails organized crime and public disorder.	1977	2	2.4,9 2.4,11
LE 6.6	Every police agency with more than 15 sworn personnel <u>should</u> develop juvenile investigation capabilities.	1978	2	11.1.1,4
LE 7.3	Every police agency <u>should</u> establish a standardized system for secure and efficient storage, classification, retrieval and disposition of items of evidentiary or other value.	1977	2	2.6,4
J 1.4	It is strongly recommended that law enforcement agencies in which more than 15 persons are employed develop juvenile investigation capabilities.	1978	2	11.1.1,2
J 1.5	It is strongly recommended that law enforcement agencies in which more than 75 persons are employed establish juvenile units.	1978	2	11.1.1,3

F-1 Pretrial Release

CT 4.1	Increase alternatives to release on bond but permit imposition of specific conditions during release period.	1978	3	3.2.1,2-5
CT 4.2	Eliminate private bail bond agencies from the pretrial release process.	1978	1	3.2.1,8
CT 4.4	Coordinate investigative services for pretrial release, diversion and referral programs.	1977	2	3.3.1
CT 4.6	Further define the procedures and conditions for pretrial release of persons alleged or adjudged incompetent to stand trial.	1978	3	3.2.1,9
C 2.4	Each community of more than 100,000 must develop staff and procedures to investigate arrested adult defendants for possible release on recognizance while awaiting trial.	1977	1	3.3.1,4

F-2 Pretrial (Drug Abuse) Diversion

CT 1.1	Appropriate sufficient funds to implement diversion programs.	1977	1	TLEPC
CT 1.2	Implement authorized diversion programs.	1977	4	4.2,1
CT 4.4	Coordinate investigative services for pretrial release, diversion and referral program.	1978	1	3.2.1,8
C 6.1	Commitment of drug addicts should be to mental health facilities for treatment prior to confinement.	1977	2	13.3.1,1

F-3 Pretrial (General Criminal) Diversion

CT 1.1	Appropriate sufficient funds to implement authorized diversion programs.	1977	1	TLEPC
CT 1.2	Implement authorized diversion programs.	1977	4	4.2.1

CT 4.4	Coordinate investigative services for pre-trial release, diversion and referral program.	1978	1	3.2.1,8
C 6.2	Psychotic offenders should be transferred to mental health facilities.	1972	2	13.3.1,5

G-1 Indigent Defense

CT 2.2	Adopt and enforce ABA recommended standards for defense counsel in conducting plea negotiations.	1976	4	7.5
CT 13.3	Develop procedures to provide witnesses with needed information and to reduce time witnesses have to spend in court.	1977	1	17.2.2,7 8.6,3
CT 15.1	Establish a state supported, full time public defender organization in all judicial districts, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. election of public defenders on a nonpartisan basis b. provision of adequate staff, supportive services and funding c. adequate compensation for defenders and their assistants. 	1979	1	12.1.2 12.1.1,1-2 21.2.5,6 21.1.5,7 21.4.1,10-11

G-2 Educational Research Assistance for Prosecutors

IS 1.15	Court information systems, serving the judge, prosecutor, defense attorney and probation officer <u>should</u> include necessary data.	Byd 1980	2	19.3,6
---------	--	-------------	---	--------

G-3 Records Keeping for Prosecutors

CT 14.3	Develop a detailed statement of office practices and policies.	1977	1	15.4 15.4,1-2
---------	--	------	---	------------------

G-4 Administrative Support for Prosecutors

CT 2.1	Develop written policies and procedures governing plea negotiations.	1976	4	7.3 7.4
CT 5.6	Develop written policies and procedures to establish clear priorities for the hearing of cases.	1976	4	8.2,1-3

CT 5.7	In taking cases to grand jury, give priority to cases of persons held in jail pending indictment.	1976	2	TLEPC
CT 13.3	Develop procedures to provide witnesses with needed information and to reduce time witnesses have to spend in court.	1977	1	17.2,2,7 8.6,3
CT 14.1	Provide for all Assistant DA's to be full time and prohibited from engaging in outside law practice.	1977	1	21.2.5,5
CT 14.2	Assure sufficient compensation, facilities for and training of District Attorneys and their assistant.	1976	1	21.4.1,10-11 21.1.5,4
CT 14.3	Develop a detailed statement of office practices and policies.	1977	1	15.4 15.4,1-2
CT 14.4	Establish active cooperation with other criminal justice agencies and with the public.	1977	2	17.2.1,2-7
IS 1.15	Court information systems, serving the judge, prosecutor, defense attorney and probation officer <u>should</u> include necessary data.	Byd 1980	2	19.3,6

G-5 Citizen Dispute Services

None

G-6 Administrative Services to Effect Judicial Changes

CT 5.1	Specify maximum allowable delays for felony and misdemeanor trials and for retrials.	1978	2	8.1 8.1.1-7
CT 5.2	Redistrict judicial circuits to equalize caseloads.	1976	1	8.1,8
CT 5.3	Establish time limits for the holding of preliminary hearings and for the waiver by a defendant of his right to a preliminary hearing.	1978	3	8.2,5-6

CT 5.4	Adopt rules for misdemeanor cases that would require submission of motions for a nonjury trial within a specified time before trial and would establish procedures to expedite hearings on motions.	1976	1	8.2,9-10
CT 5.5	Adopt rules for felony cases setting time limits for filing, hearing and ruling on pretrial motions.	1976	1	8.2,11-13
CT 5.6	Develop written policies and procedures to establish clear priorities for the hearing of cases.	1976	4	8.2,1-3
CT 5.8	Provide through a written rule of court for continuances to be granted only when good cause is shown in a written motion.	1977	1	8.2,26
CT 6.2	Adopt standards for jury trial relating to use of court time, judge's role in providing guidance to jury, taking of notes by jury, review of testimony and examination of evidence by jury.	1977	1	8.9
CT 6.3	Adopt rules forbidding appearance of defendants or witnesses in prison attire and defining conditions requiring physical restraint or removal of defendant from courtroom.	1977	2	8.7,6 8.7,19
CT 6.4	Study use of exclusionary rule.	1978	3	8.14
CT 7.1	Establish system of bifurcated trials with separate disposition hearing before same jury that found the defendant guilty.	1977	3	9.6
CT 8.1	Establish time limits for filing motions for a new trial and amendments thereto and for hearing and disposing of such motions.	1977	1	10.1,5-7
CT 8.3	Provide Supreme Court with jurisdiction to review Court of Criminal Appeals decisions upon certification by that court that a case should be decided by the Supreme Court.	1976	1	10.2,6

CT 8.4	Remove original appellate jurisdiction in workmen's compensation cases from the Supreme Court.	1976	1	10.2,6
CT 10.1	Reorganize general sessions and juvenile courts into a circuit general sessions court that is state funded, has lawyer judges and is a court not of record.	1978	3	TF
CT 11.1	Provide for local administrative authority in each trial jurisdiction to be vested in a presiding judge and for full time trial court administrators in large circuits.	1977	3	15.5,5-7
CT 13.1	Assure adequate facilities and procedures for providing information about the courts to the public and for receiving complaints and suggestions from the public.	1978	3	17.2.2 17.2.2,5 17.2.2,6 17.2.2,11
CT 13.2	Adopt rules prohibiting court personnel from unauthorized disclosure of information about a pending case.	1977	4	12.1.1,23 12.1.1,24
CT 13.3	Develop procedures to provide witnesses with needed information and to reduce time witnesses have to spend in court.	1977	1	17.2.2,7 8.6,3

G-7 Administrative Personnel Support

None

G-8 Judicial Services Administrative Support

CT 8.2	Adopt rules and procedures to make trial transcripts available quickly and to avoid unnecessary transcribing and reproduction of trial records.	1977	1	10.1,8 10.1,11 10.1,13
--------	---	------	---	------------------------------

G-9 Improved Procedures for Judicial Services

None

H-1 Regional Correctional Centers

None

H-2 Diagnostic Services

- | | | | | | |
|---|-----|---|------|---|----------|
| C | 2.1 | The Uniform Correction Guidelines should include policies and procedures governing adult intake services. | 1977 | 2 | 3.3.1 |
| C | 2.2 | Counties with 50,000 and up population should establish centrally coordinated and directed adult intake services. | 1977 | 2 | 3.3.1 |
| C | 4.1 | The Uniform Correction Guidelines should include a standardized classification system. | 1978 | 2 | TF |
| C | 4.2 | Each correctional agency, whether community-based or institutional, should immediately reexamine its classification system and reorganize it. | 1978 | 2 | 4.3.1 |
| C | 4.3 | The classification system must be in written form specifying its objectives, major factors in classifying each individual means for classifying and structure. | 1978 | 1 | 4.3.1,1 |
| C | 4.4 | Comprehensive treatment programs should implement the recommendations of the Tennessee Classification and Diagnostic Center. | 1978 | 2 | 13.2.5,4 |
| C | 4.5 | Planning and operation of community classification teams should involve state and local correctional personnel, personnel of specific community based programs, police, court and public representatives. | 1977 | 2 | 4.3.3,1 |
| C | 7.3 | Counties with population of 50,000 and over must establish a system of classification to form a basis for residential assignment and program planning for individuals. | 1977 | 1 | 13.1.1,1 |

H-3 Treatment Services

- | | | | | | |
|---|-----|---|------|---|---------|
| C | 2.3 | Counties with 50,000 and up population should arrange for specialized services to be purchased in the community on a contractual basis. | 1977 | 2 | 3.3.1,3 |
|---|-----|---|------|---|---------|

C 2.5	The Uniform Correction Guidelines should include strategies for implementation of a range of alternatives to institutionalization, to include diversion, supervisory and prerelease programs.	1977	2	17.2.4
C 2.6	All community correctional planning should give priority to diversion and utilization of existing community resources.	1979	2	17.2.4,3
C 4.4	Comprehensive treatment programs should implement the recommendations of the Tennessee Classification and Diagnostic Center.	1978	2	13.2.5,4
C 6.5	Each correctional agency must adopt policies enabling inmates to maintain community and family ties.	1977	1	13.1.4
C 7.1	Each correctional agency must develop policies that give offenders the opportunity to participate in programs designed to bring about positive behavior change. These policies must include work-release programs.	1978	1	12.2.8
C 7.2	Correctional agencies should develop release programs drawing community leadership, social agencies, and business interests into the criminal justice system.	1977	2	13.2.2
C 7.5	Research should be conducted as to the possibility and feasibility of broadening the operation of prison industries. Simultaneous research should be conducted on the:	1977	3	13.2.3 13.2.2,3 13.2.3,7
	1. Sale of products of prison industries on the open market.			
	2. Payment of full market wages to offenders working in prison industries-- they, in turn, paying for their daily upkeep.			
C 10.4	A study should be conducted on the feasibility of adopting participatory management programs in which managers, staff and offenders share.	1977	3	21.1.1,5

H-4 Administrative Services

- | | | | | |
|---------|---|-------------|---|-----------|
| C 7.4 | A decisionmaking body should be established to follow and direct the inmate's progress through the correctional system. | 1978 | 2 | 13.1.3,7 |
| C 10.8 | Each correctional system in counties with population over 50,000 should have a functioning ombudsman. | 1978 | 2 | 21.1.2,19 |
| IS 1.16 | Corrections information system <u>should</u> include necessary data. | Byd
1980 | 2 | 19.3,7 |
| IS 1.17 | The corrections system <u>should</u> collect, store, analyze and display information for planning, operational control, offender tracking and program review for all state and county correctional programs and agencies. | Byd
1980 | 2 | 19.3,8 |
| IS 1.18 | All but the largest components of the correction system <u>should</u> have a small information and statistics section capable of producing periodic reports and analyzing and interpreting policy and decisionmaking. | Byd
1980 | 2 | 19.3,11 |
| IS 1.19 | The performance of the correction system <u>should</u> be evaluated on two levels. | Byd
1980 | 2 | 19.3,13 |

H-5 Jail Inspection Team

- | | | | | |
|------|--|------|---|------|
| C 1. | Uniform Correction Guidelines for all correctional facilities, programs and services, should be developed by the Tennessee Department of Correction in cooperation with local systems. | 1977 | 2 | 15.6 |
|------|--|------|---|------|

- C 1.A For the purpose of identifying program applicability, the Uniform Correction Guidelines must consider the following population classifications: 1977 1 TLEPC

<u>County Code</u>	<u>Population Range</u>
A	150,000 and up
B	50,000 - 150,000
C	24,500 - 50,000
D	24,500 and under

- C 1.2 Beginning with the 1977 budget and each year thereafter, Commissioner of Correction must apprise the legislature of those local facilities most in need of upgrading to comply with the Minimum Standards for Local Correctional Facilities, the intent being legislative allocations to those priority localities. 1977 1 13.1.1
- C 3.1 The Uniform Correction Guidelines should include procedures governing the pretrial detention admission process. 1977 2 3.4.2
- C 3.2 Except in cases of mass arrests, detention center admission staffing must be sufficient to avoid use of holding rooms for periods longer than 2 hours. 1978 1 3.4.1
- C 3.3 The Uniform Corrections Guidelines should include policies and procedures to insure that the rights of persons detained while awaiting trial are observed. 1977 2 3.2.10
- C 5.6 The Uniform Correction Guidelines should include policies and procedures that fulfill the right of offenders to be free from personal abuse by correctional staff or other offenders. 1977 2 12.2.4
- C 5.7 The Uniform Correction Guidelines should include policies governing searches of persons under correction authority. 1977 2 12.2.6

C 6.3	All state institutions, jails, workhouses, penal farms and temporary holding and lock-up facilities must adhere to Section 5.057 of the <u>Minimum Standards for Local Correctional Facilities</u> regulating offenders assigned as trustees.	1977	1	TF
C 6.4	The Uniform Correction Guidelines should include suggestions for offender participation in a wide variety of community based programs.	1977	2	17.2.4,3
C 10.1	TLEPC strongly recommends that the General Assembly enact comprehensive correctional codes governing institutional and community-based programs.	1980	2	14.1.1,1
C 11.1	Planning for new facilities must start from the basis that no more than 400 inmates can be housed in a single institution. New planning must also minimize the negative effects of excessive regimentation.	1977	1	20.3.2,10i 20.3.2,10j

H-6 Implementation of Improvement Recommendations Made by Jail Inspection Team

C 3.4	Pretrial and posttrial inmates must be separated.	1977	1	13.1.1,2g
C 5.1	All correctional institutions must have written rules of conduct for offenders.	1977	1	12.2.2
C 5.2	Justification for limiting offenders' rights must include rules and regulations to maintain order and protect others.	1977	1	12.2.9,2
C 5.3	All correctional institutions must have written disciplinary procedures for offenders. These procedures must emphasize good behavior rather than punishment.	1977	1	12.2.2 13.1.1,16
C 5.4	Rules and Regulations must be written prescribing nondisciplinary procedures for determining and changing offender status.	1977	1	12.2.2,13
C 5.5	Each correctional agency must establish a grievance procedure.	1977	1	12.2.2,21

H-7 Community Based Reintegration

C 2.5	The Uniform Correction Guidelines should include strategies for implementation of a range of alternatives to institutionalization, to include diversion, supervisory and prerelease programs.	1977	2	17.2.4
C 2.6	All community correctional planning should give priority to diversion and utilization of existing community resources.	1979	2	17.2.4,3
C 6.5	Each correctional agency must adopt policies enabling inmates to maintain community and family ties.	1977	1	13.1.4
C 7.1	Each correctional agency must develop policies that give offenders the opportunity to participate in programs designed to bring about positive behavior change. These policies must include work-release programs.	1978	1	12.2.8
C 7.2	Correctional agencies should develop release programs drawing community leadership, social agencies, and business interests into the criminal justice system.	1977	2	13.2.2
C 8.1	The Uniform Correction Guidelines should include the planning and development of a goal-oriented probation service delivery system.	1977	2	15.7
C 8.2	A study should be conducted to determine the feasibility of placing the probation system in the executive branch of the state government.	1977	3	15.6,1
C 8.3	If the study determines the probation system should be placed in the executive branch of state government, it must be placed under the control of the Department of Correction.	1977	1	15.6,7
C 9.1	The parole system should develop goal-oriented service delivery system.	1978	2	15.8

C	9.2	A study should be conducted to determine the feasibility of developing citizen committees (to include exoffenders) to advise on policy development.	1978	3	15.8,4
C	9.3	Parole officers must begin work with parolees during the furlough phase and prior to release, to facilitate easier transition and adjustment.	1977	1	15.8,19
C	9.4	Funds should be made available to parole staffs to purchase needed community resources for parolees.	1977	2	17.2.4,11
C	10.2	The Tennessee Department of Correction should establish an administrative unit responsible for securing citizen involvement, including advisory and service roles.	1978	2	17.2.2,18
C	10.3	The Administrative Unit responsible for securing citizen involvement should study the feasibility of recruiting and training volunteers to assist in the correctional agencies.	1980	3	17.2.2,18

I-1 Recruitment

LE	9.2	Every police agency not having enough qualified applicants with appropriate college backgrounds <u>should</u> develop a recruitment program to fill that need.	1980	2	21.2.3,9
C	10.5	The Uniform Correction Guidelines should include systemwide standards for recruitment and selection of personnel.	1977	2	21.2.1

I-2 Student Financial Assistance

None

I-3 Criminal Justice Education

None

I-4 Faculty Internship

None

I-5 Law Enforcement Basic Training .

- | | | | | |
|---------|--|------|---|-----------|
| LE 10.1 | The TLEPC <u>strongly recommends</u> the legislation mandating minimum basic training for every sworn employee within 2 years of employment. | 1977 | 2 | 21.3.2,4 |
| LE 10.4 | Every police agency <u>should consider</u> the affiliation of police training programs with academic institutions. All training courses for college credit should be academically equivalent to courses that are part of the regular college curriculum. | 1976 | 3 | 21.3.2,15 |

I-6 Law Enforcement In-Service Training

- | | | | | |
|---------|--|------|---|-----------|
| LE 2.2 | Each police chief <u>should</u> familiarize himself with all means by which the agency can derive all possible benefits from local funding, city-state-federal revenue sharing, grants and the use of bonds. | 1978 | 2 | 17.1.4,5c |
| LE 8.2 | Every police chief executive <u>should</u> establish formal training programs to deal with unusual occurrences. | 1980 | 2 | 21.3.5 |
| LE 10.2 | Every police agency <u>must</u> provide full-time sworn employees during the first year of employment, with additional formal training, coached field training and supervised field experience. | 1976 | 1 | 21.3.2,11 |
| LE 10.3 | Every police agency <u>should consider</u> allowing all sworn personnel to participate voluntarily in at least 40 consecutive hours annually of formal personnel development activity, while on duty and at full pay. | 1977 | 3 | 21.3.7.9 |
| LE 10.4 | Every police agency <u>should consider</u> the affiliation of police training programs with academic institutions. All training courses for college credit should be academically equivalent to courses that are part of the regular college curriculum. | 1976 | 3 | 21.3.2,15 |

J 1.6	It is strongly recommended that all juvenile officers be provided with specific training in preventing delinquent behavior and juvenile crime.	1978	2	11.1.1,4
-------	--	------	---	----------

I-7 Judicial Training and Continuing Education

CT 9.3	Establish a state judicial education committee to develop standards and take other steps to assure adequate judicial training.	1977	1	21.3.3,1-2,4
CT 14.2	Assure sufficient compensation, facilities for and training of District Attorneys and their assistants.	1976	1	21.4.1,10-11 21.1.5,4
J 3.1	It is very strongly recommended that the juvenile court be uniform within the state judicial system of Tennessee.	1982	1	11.2.1,1
J 3.2	Specialized training must be provided all persons participating in the processing of juvenile court cases.	1979	1	11.2.1,4

I-8 Correctional Training

LE 9.5	Formal career development programs <u>should</u> be established in all law enforcement agencies.	1979	2	21.3.7
C 10.7	The Tennessee Department of Correction and correction systems in counties with populations of 150,000 and over must plan for and provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Forty hours a year of executive development training to correctional managers on operations of police courts, prosecution and defense attorneys. 2. New correctional staff with 40 hours orientation training during first week and 60 additional hours during first year. 3. Forty hours additional training, after first year, to all correctional staff. 	1977	1	21.3.4
C 10.6	The Uniform Corrections Guidelines should include standards for the training and education of corrections personnel.	1977	2	21.3.1

J-1 Prevention

- | | | | | |
|--------|---|------|---|----------|
| LE 6.8 | Every police agency <u>should</u> provide all juvenile officers with specific training in preventing delinquent behavior and juvenile crime. | 1978 | 2 | 11.1.1,4 |
| J 1.1 | Policies must be established and it is very strongly recommended that, in addition, legislation be enacted to insure uniform and appropriate action to divert juveniles from the criminal justice system. | 1977 | 1 | 11.1.1 |

J-2 Residential Treatment for Status Offenders and Delinquents

- | | | | | |
|--------|--|------|---|----------|
| J 2.2 | It is very strongly recommended that the detention of juveniles in facilities housing adults accused or convicted of crime be prohibited. | 1980 | 1 | 11.1.2,1 |
| C 11.3 | The Tennessee Department of Correction must adopt the policy of not building new institutions for juveniles until community resources have been developed deinstitutionalizing status offenders. | 1977 | 1 | 20.3.4,2 |
| C 11.4 | The Tennessee Department of Corrections must phase out juvenile institutions, where possible, in favor of community programs and facilities. | 1980 | 1 | 13.1.5 |
| J 8.1 | It is strongly recommended that each juvenile correctional agency implement policies and procedures to improve treatment for problem offenders, such as drug addicts, mentally ill, emotionally disturbed and psychotic. | 1978 | 2 | 13.3.1 |
| J 10.1 | Consideration should be given to the establishment of community-based youth services bureaus throughout the state to focus on the special problems of youth. | 1980 | 3 | 5.1 |
| J 11.2 | It is very strongly recommended that after school and summer employment programs be broadened for youth, including 14 and 15 year olds. | 1979 | 1 | 1.1.1,5 |

- J 12.5 It is very strongly recommended that educational authorities propose and adopt experimental and pilot projects to:
1. Train parents to instruct children at home.
 2. Develop techniques and methods for using the home as a learning environment.
 3. Provide instructional materials for home use.
 4. Expand programs to train and use parents as aides, assistants and tutors in regular school classrooms.
 5. Train teachers to effectively instruct disruptive children in the classroom.
 6. Develop innovative methods and programs to prevent and reduce delinquency by children who are recognized by teachers and others who work with young children as potential behavior problems.
- 1980 1 1.3.1,8
- J 14.1 Consideration should be given to develop ways in which the religious community may actively participate in the process of crime prevention.
- 1980 3 1.1.5

J-3 Development of Community Resources

- J 8.1 It is strongly recommended that each juvenile correctional agency implement policies and procedures to improve treatment for problem offenders, such as drug addicts, mentally ill, emotionally disturbed and psychotic.
- 1978 2 13.3.1
- J 10.1 Consideration should be given to the establishment of community-based youth services bureaus throughout the state to focus on the special problems of youth.
- 1980 3 5.1
- J 10.2 Consideration should be given to the employment by youth services bureaus of sufficient full-time staff to meet the needs of youth.
- 1980 3 5.2

- | | | | | |
|--------|--|------|---|---------|
| J 11.2 | It is very strongly recommended that after school and summer employment programs be broadened for youth, including 14 and 15 year olds. | 1979 | 1 | 1.2.1,5 |
| J 12.5 | It is very strongly recommended that educational authorities propose and adopt experimental and pilot projects to: | 1980 | 1 | 1.3.1,8 |
| | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Train parents to instruct children at home. 2. Develop techniques and methods for using the home as a learning environment. 3. Provide instructional materials for home use. 4. Expand programs to train and use parents as aides, assistants and tutors in regular school classrooms. 5. Train teachers to effectively instruct disruptive children in the classroom. 6. Develop innovative methods and programs to prevent and reduce delinquency by children who are recognized by teachers and others who work with young children as potential behavior problems. | | | |

J-4 Juvenile Court Services

- | | | | | |
|--------|--|------|---|-----------|
| J 1.2 | Each local jurisdiction, in cooperation with related state agencies, must develop and implement formally organized programs of diversion that can be applied to juveniles in the criminal justice process from the time an illegal act occurs to adjudication. | 1978 | 1 | 4.2.1 |
| J 3.3 | An inmate procedure must be established for each juvenile court. | 1976 | 1 | 11.2.1,11 |
| J 10.3 | All law enforcement and court intake personnel should consider, through policy changes and ultimately through legal changes, making full use of the youth service bureau in lieu of court processing for every juvenile who: | 1980 | 3 | 5.3 |
| | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is not an immediate threat to public safety. 2. Voluntarily accepts the referral to the youth services bureau. | | | |

J-5 Institutional Reintegration

- | | | | | |
|-------|---|------|---|-----------|
| J 5.1 | The Department of Correction must fulfill the right of each juvenile in a correctional institution's custody to:
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. A healthful place in which to live.2. Recreation opportunities.3. Healthful surroundings--including independent safety and sanitation inspections. | 1978 | 1 | 12.2.5 |
| J 6.1 | It is very strongly recommended that necessary legislation and procedures be enacted to assure certain minimum requirements are adhered to in all juvenile correctional institutions and programs. These programs should assure:
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Adequacy of facilities.2. Adequacy of services.3. Adequacy of security.4. Adequacy of regulations and procedures. | 1978 | 1 | 13.1.1 |
| J 6.2 | Each correctional agency operating juvenile institutions must:
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Provide an organizational structure that permits open communication between the inmates, staff members and the administration, and allows input in the decision making process.2. Make explicit its correctional goals and program thrust.3. Adopt policies and procedures that will preserve the individual identity of the inmate. | 1978 | 1 | 13.1.3 |
| J 6.3 | Each institution for juveniles should consider adopting policies and procedures and provide facilities that will enable inmates to maintain healthy ties to their families and communities. | 1978 | 3 | 13.1.4 |
| J 6.5 | Prerelease guidance centers for committed juveniles must be established. | 1980 | 1 | 13.1.6,8b |

- | | | | | |
|-------|--|------|---|--------|
| J 7.1 | It is strongly recommended that each institution for juveniles reexamine education and vocational training programs to ensure that they provide programs to individualize education and training. | 1978 | 2 | 13.2.1 |
| J 8.1 | It is strongly recommended that each juvenile correctional agency implement policies and procedures to improve treatment for problem offenders, such as drug addicts, mentally ill, emotionally disturbed and psychotic. | 1978 | 2 | 13.3.1 |
| J 8.2 | Consideration should be given for each correctional institution for juveniles to actively develop the maximum possible interaction between the institution and the community. | 1978 | 3 | 3.33 |
| J 9.1 | It is strongly recommended that guidelines be developed for planning the construction or renovation of juvenile detention facilities. | 1978 | 2 | 20.3.3 |

PSD '76

- | | | | | |
|-------|--|------|---|--------|
| J 4.1 | Specific programs must be established to inform the public of the problems, needs and activities of the criminal justice system and its component parts. | 1979 | 1 | 17.2.2 |
|-------|--|------|---|--------|

END

7. 10/10/11/11