

ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT
John J. Galvin, Administrator *

The Corrections Division, Oregon State Board of Control, was created by the 1965 Legislature. As provided in ORS 423.020, the Corrections Division has the responsibility to supervise the management and administration of the penal and correctional institutions, the juvenile training schools, and other functions related to State programs for corrections as provided in ORS chapters 179, 420, and 421.

In addition to the responsibility of managing and administering the various institutional programs, legislation passed during the 1965 and 1967 legislative sessions gave the Corrections Division the authority to establish and carry out an increasing number of institutional and community based programs. These programs are:

1. Work Release (including educational release)
2. Reception and Planning Center
3. Community Consultation
4. Youth Care Centers
5. Services for Local Misdemeanants
6. Staff Development and Training
7. Family Court Act
8. Crime Control Coordinating Council

The purpose of these programs is to involve the Corrections Division in planning, improving, or establishing programs on the community level as part of a strong thrust to develop a continuum of rehabilitative services complementary to institutional services. Such programs have been recommended by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency in a report on Oregon's correctional programs in 1966 and the more recent report of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. It is clear from these reports, and the intent of the Board of Control, that maximum rehabilitative programs with strong community links must continue to be developed on the institutional, pre-commitment, and pre-release levels in both the adult and juvenile areas. The underlying philosophy of this correctional effort is to develop and relate all correctional programs into an integrated continuum of services.

Thus, it can be unequivocally stated that the objective of the Corrections Division is to carry out the intent of Section XV, Article 1, of the Oregon Constitution, which states, "Laws for the punishment of crime shall be founded on the principle of reformation, and not vindictive justice." Under this constitutional provision, the Corrections Division

* Appointed November, 12, 1968

reaffirms the common principles of the rights, dignity, and responsibility of each individual in a democratic society and sets forth its commitment that law offenders are members of the community and should have the opportunity to develop their potential for living within the law.

Further, this philosophy is based upon the concept that all correctional programs--institutional and community--are part of total community resources which can be brought to bear on the problems of adult and juvenile offenders. The aim of this concept is to break down the public attitude that adult and youthful offenders should be totally "separated," or "isolated" or "removed" from the community for "rehabilitation." Rather, the new concept emphasizes that correctional programs are specialized community services which are necessary in order to assist offenders to attain an improved level of functioning in the community.

It is the Corrections Division's contention that for too long correctional programs have been identified in the public mind with the isolation of institutions where correctional efforts have been secondary to the importance of public safety. The Division holds that the best protection of society is achieved when adult and juvenile offenders are helped to become law abiders within the community. Thus, the Corrections Division has, by law and philosophy, a specific mandate to assist the individual and the community in controlling, changing the behavior of, and integrating adult and juvenile offenders in the community as law-abiding citizens.

It is clear, too, from both statutory authority and legislative intent, that the purpose of the various institutional and community programs is to broaden and strengthen the scope of Corrections Division programs in order that the constitutional provision of reformation of offenders shall become a reality in the State of Oregon.

Over the last two years, the Corrections Division has been given strong support by the actions of the Board of Control and the Oregon State Legislature in improving adult and juvenile institutional programs, and in launching a number of complementary programs which relate institutional rehabilitation efforts much closer to the community. Corrections Division staff at all levels is aware that the progress achieved to this point would not have been possible without this visible support, and Division staff is equally aware that future advances cannot be made without the continuing support of public officials and citizens at large. Corrections Division staff is convinced that its newly developed "community philosophy" is a giant step toward providing simultaneously for the public safety and the rehabilitation of adult and juvenile offenders. The Corrections Division will continue to need the support of public officials and citizens to translate its philosophy and goals into tangible programs.

Corrections Division
Administration

Correctional progress during the past two years has been rather dramatic, in that a number of important program advances were initiated as a result of action by the 1967 Legislature. These programs included the following:

1. Expansion of the work release concept to include educational leave for inmates who can benefit by academic or vocational training on a community level.
2. The expansion of the Youth Care Center program to six facilities, with a potential of at least six more during the 1967-69 biennium .
3. Introduction of an intensive staff training program through the employment of a staff training director and the procurement of a Federal grant through the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance.
4. More intensive contact with local communities on a consultation basis, including studies and surveys as time and personnel have allowed.

The past two years also have been featured by the unprecedented inmate riot at the Oregon State Penitentiary on March 9, 1968. The total impact of the prison riot in terms of dollars and program has yet to be accurately determined. As part of the riot and its aftershock, however, a new Warden was appointed at the Oregon State Penitentiary. Subsequently, the Administrator of the Corrections Division since its inception in 1965 resigned to take a position in the East.

The complete story of the March 9 riot is yet to be written, but its impact has been felt throughout the Corrections Division, as well as the State at large. It is a tribute to all concerned, at the staff, Board of Control, and legislative levels, that the March 9 riot has been seen in a realistic perspective. A concerted effort has been made by all concerned to take the necessary action to reconstruct the damaged facilities, reinstitute Penitentiary programs, and begin to plan for new and improved programs. The entire emphasis has been on viewing constructively the riot experience as a basis for improved programs in every area.

The Correctional situation in Oregon at the present time would seem to call for solidifying the gains that have been made during the past two years and building up experience in the various program areas. Changes will continue to be part of the correctional scene in the years ahead, but emphasis for the present will be to unify the total Divisional operation in order to maximize the advantages gained through the major changes and happenings of the past biennium.

More specifically, the short-range and long-range objectives of the Corrections Division's future program aims are summarized as follows:

1. Administrative reorganization at the Corrections Division level to allow the Corrections Division to carry out more efficiently and effectively its primary mandate to manage and administer its various programs.
2. Continued improvement of institutional programs by enrichment of academic, vocational, variable treatment, and work components which are essential to basic attitudinal change and development of skills on the part of inmates.
3. Expansion and improvement of the reception and planning process at the Corrections Division level. Improvement in this area will depend in large part on the appropriation of additional funds and the employment of additional staff to develop the intensive diagnostic process that was contemplated in the original legislation.
4. Continued emphasis on staff training on both the in-service and community level, including extension of the Division's training program to local juvenile courts as provided in the Family Court Act .
5. Continued expansion of the Youth Care Center program to approximately twenty centers during 1969-71 biennium in cooperation with the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation.
6. Maximum development of the work release concept, to include educational leave and the opportunity for an increased number of inmates to participate in academic and vocational schooling on the community level.
7. Development of residential correctional centers (halfway houses) in Portland and other communities, and the extension of counseling services to residents of these centers through cooperative programs with the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation.
8. Development of a jail and detention inspection service and the establishment of standards for jail and detention care.
9. Extension of consultation services to juvenile courts, private agencies and groups, and other organizations concerned with the problems of crime and delinquency.

WORK RELEASE

History

The Work Release program was authorized by the legislature in 1965. Operations began March 1, 1966, with a staff of a Work Release Supervisor and an Institution Employment Officer 2. During the ensuing months, four Institution Employment Officer 1 positions were filled, bringing the staff to its present level. Present clerical staff includes one secretary, one file clerk, one clerk-typist, and one accounting clerk.

Department of Vocational Rehabilitation

In the current biennium, significant changes have occurred which have affected the mission, functions, and goals of the program. The 1967 Legislature amended the law to permit the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation to serve work release enrollees. In the period July 1, 1967, through December 31, 1967, Work Release continued to do employment placement while the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation assumed responsibility for employment placement. At this time, Work Release assumed greater responsibility for a more intensive program of counseling, control, and supervision in the field. Work Release also found increasing responsibilities in the administration of the program and in coordinating the activities of the many governmental agencies involved.

Board of Parole and Probation

In January of 1967, a cooperative agreement was reached with the Board of Parole and Probation whereby parole officers in the field would provide a monitoring service for enrollees in the outlying areas of the State. Experience has shown great cooperation on the part of parole officers. Their reports have called our attention to certain unacceptable conditions involving enrollees. When these conditions become known, it becomes necessary for work release representatives to travel to the area, make investigations, arrive at decisions, and take action needed to correct the situations.

Work Release Advisory Committee

As a result of numerous contacts and conversations with representatives of law enforcement agencies, areas of misunderstanding of the goals, procedures, and policies of Work Release became known. Some of these questions were resolved by revision or development of new statements of policies, procedures, and directives, which were then communicated to law enforcement officials. To develop greater understanding and positive interest in the program at the local level, representatives of enforcement agencies, Work Release, the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation, and the institutions have been invited to participate as members of a Work Release Advisory Committee. This committee meets monthly to iron out problems, to constructively criticize the program, and to develop positive approaches to Work Release. Great benefit to the program and to corrections in general is expected from the work of this committee.

Loan Fund

In July of 1968, the Board of Control approved a loan fund and the procedures for use of this fund. This program answers the long-standing problem of how to finance an enrollee for his incidental expenses until he

reaches his first payday. However, the time-lag involved in clearing a loan makes it necessary to issue advances from the work release account prior to the enrollee actually receiving the money. Efforts are now being made to establish a revolving fund for the purpose of meeting the immediate monetary needs of enrollees pending receipt of money from employment or as authorized for expenditure by the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Leave for Enrollees

During 1968, the Board of Control approved the policies and procedures implementing the law relating to leaves of absence from custody to participate, without direct supervision, in a number of approved activities. The Work Release Supervisor is also authorized to approve leave for enrollees to a maximum of six hours. This authority will allow Work Release to approve enrollee participation in constructive personnel activities at appropriate times.

Relationships

Work Release is a cooperative venture involving such governmental agencies as the Penitentiary, Correctional Institution, Department of Vocational Rehabilitation, Upward Bound, Board of Parole and Probation, city and county law enforcement agencies, employers, and educators. Work Release must maintain good working relations with these diverse groups. Problems are resolved through frequent consultations by staff and have resulted in revision of existing policy and procedure statements and the development of new operating guidelines and directives. Work Release is grateful to the many public officials who assume responsibilities toward enrollees in furthering the success of the program.

Program Goals

It is the long-range goal of Work Release to make the benefits of the program available to inmates who appear to have need for the program and who have likely prospects for successful rehabilitation. It is hoped that concentrated treatment programs can be brought to these men to aid them in solving some of their problems. Referrals are made to such programs as alcohol therapy, budget and financial counseling, narcotics therapy, social adjustment, and religious counseling. Available community resources are utilized in most instances.

It appears that the present level of one hundred enrollees in the program approaches the maximum possible with the bed space available in county and city confinement facilities. Though local authorities are encouraged to develop minimum custody areas within their facilities, the Corrections Division is unable to offer financial or equipment assistance to them.

Most jails are overcrowded and have no space available for conversion. Some of the available bed spaces are in areas which offer little or limited employment opportunity. The jails have neither the trained personnel nor adequate staff to permit them to provide needed supervision, controls, or counseling. This places a heavy burden on the small staff of work release representatives who provide this service.

Note should be taken that the room and board charges paid by inmates do not cover the actual cost of maintaining the enrollee. It is not realistic to expect enrollees to pay these costs in full. County governments, in effect, subsidize a portion of the cost of work release enrollees.

Ultimately, work release expansion will depend on the development of halfway houses (or correctional centers) in various communities. A recent opinion by the Attorney General has described halfway houses as "institutions" and thus need to be confined to Marion County by constitutional provisions. Steps necessary now to develop halfway house facilities will depend upon legislative action to provide for a referendum to the electorate to approve establishment of halfway houses in other counties, and legislative provision to allow the Corrections Division to contract with non-governmental agencies to establish such facilities.

Work release has proven to be a very worthwhile part of the treatment process for certain offenders. It can continue to assist an increasing number of offenders with certain procedural modifications and expansion of community-based living quarters.

RECEPTION AND PLANNING

Planning commenced on January 2, 1968, to establish a Reception and Planning Center at the Oregon State Penitentiary as provided in Chapter 585, Oregon Laws 1967. Inauguration of the Reception and Planning Center was delayed until this time because of necessary readjustments related to drastic budget cuts by the special session of the Legislature in the fall of 1967.

As originally conceived, the Reception and Planning Center was intended to be a fully developed diagnostic center capable of producing rather comprehensive evaluation on each inmate committed to the Corrections Division. The original budget appropriated for this purpose was \$253,277 and included 17 positions. The special legislative session reduced this amount to \$131,834, or sufficient funds for eight positions. In addition, the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation, through a special Federal program, is committing case services funds in the form of specialized staff services. The participation of DVR in the Reception and Planning Center adds considerably to the scope of the total program.

However, because of the serious budgetary reduction, the Reception and Planning Center has focused its initial efforts on planning for only those offenders destined for the Oregon State Penitentiary. Ultimately, with additional funds and staff, the reception and planning process will be extended to inmates now being referred directly to the Oregon State Correctional Institution.

The purpose of the Reception and Planning Center is to utilize every resource to develop a comprehensive evaluation of each adult offender committed to the care and custody of the Corrections Division. This process will be accomplished through the involvement of professional personnel and methods representing the fields of psychiatry, psychology, sociology, social work, vocational rehabilitation, and related helping professions. Insofar as possible, a research component will be built into the total diagnostic process to gain an accurate perspective on the relationship between assessment, treatment, and later community adjustment.

The importance of a reception and planning process has already been demonstrated in a number of states. Such a procedure has many implications for the total State correctional program in that the diagnostic plan formulated during the reception period, if it is to be successful, must be related to specific program components on the institutional and community levels. The reception and planning process conceived here is one that calls for a built-in research component which will provide for experimental and control groups, and thus a careful assessment of the relationship between diagnosis and treatment. The unique contribution of Oregon to the reception-planning process would come with the implementation of a well-conceived research component as part of the total diagnostic-treatment program.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Reception and Planning Center staffing be increased during the next biennium by restoring the program to the level authorized prior to the reductions made by the special session of the legislature. Restoration of these reductions will permit the development of a reception and planning program to cope with the anticipated intake of our adult correctional programs.

COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

As provided by ORS 423.020, the Corrections Division has the responsibility to (a) Institute and sponsor, in cooperation with public and private agencies, the development of community programs designed to reduce the cause of juvenile delinquency and to aid in the rehabilitation of juvenile delinquents; and (b) Provide consultation services related to the prevention, control and treatment of crime and delinquency to local or state-wide public or private agencies, groups, and individuals, or initiate such consultation services, including studies and surveys and various types of educational programs.

During the past biennium, the Corrections Division completed jail surveys in Benton and Multnomah counties, and representatives of the Division have participated in a number of State, regional, and local conferences and programs dealing with the subject of crime and delinquency. Both the Benton and Multnomah county jail studies were carried out in cooperation with lend-lease staff from the Board of Control office, the Oregon State Penitentiary, and Oregon State Correctional Institution.

Consultation services of various types become increasingly important as the Corrections Division projects its programs into the community. The demand for services is much greater than available staff to meet the requests of local communities and groups. Priority should be given to the expansion of this phase of the Division's responsibility during the next biennium, including the addition of staff to help meet the demands of the program.

Recommendations

It is recommended that Divisional consultation services be extended during the next biennium to include an inspection service for adult and juvenile detention facilities. This service will require the addition of one position and legislation to permit the Corrections Division to engage in inspection and trend-setting.

YOUTH CARE CENTERS

Since July, 1967, Oregon law has provided for the establishment of agency-operated group homes for eight to 15 children on the local level under the direction of private and public agencies. Provision was made in the law for an initial appropriation of \$125,000 to provide for State subsidies on a 50-50 matching basis, or up to \$125 per month per child, whichever is lesser. The purpose of this program is to provide an alternate treatment resource for juveniles on the local community level in lieu of commitment of juveniles to State juvenile institutions. The Corrections Division is responsible for the review of youth care center proposals and final certification of these programs.

Since the inauguration of the Youth Care Center program one year ago, six programs have been certified and are now operating. These programs are as follows:

1. Lane County No. 1 (for boys) In cooperation with the
Department of Vocational
Rehabilitation
2. Lane County No. 2 (for girls) In cooperation with the
Department of Vocational
Rehabilitation
3. Youth Adventures, Inc. In cooperation with the
Multnomah County
Juvenile Court
4. Multnomah County Youth Care Center
5. Hawthorne Manor Operated in Corvallis under
the Children's Farm Home in
cooperation with Linn, Benton,
and Lincoln counties
6. Pitchford Boys Ranch Douglas County

On June 14, 1968, the Emergency Board agreed to reserve an additional \$50,000 for the expansion of the Youth Care Center program during the remainder of the 1967-69 biennium. This action will enable the Corrections Division to give immediate attention to youth care center applications currently pending from Umatilla, Coos, Washington, Deschutes, and Clackamas Counties. A third youth care center in Lane County is also a possibility if additional financing can be obtained.

Corrections Division
Administration

The growth of the Youth Care Center program represents a significant stride in Oregon in providing for boys and girls who do not need the stronger control and structured program of MacLaren or Hillcrest. The program has also been strengthened through the present participation of the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation in Lane County and their potential participation in a number of existing and new programs. In a three-part arrangement with the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation, 75 percent funding comes from the Federal level, and the State and local agency share the remaining 25 percent on an equal basis.

Recommendations

1. At the present time, only Lane County has developed a youth care center for girls. There is a strong likelihood that the legislature will have to provide additional financial incentive to encourage development of youth care centers for girls. The picture at the present time is that the Youth Care Center program will expand to 15 or more facilities in the next biennium, all for boys. The reason for this is related to the sheer volume of delinquency among boys and the limited resources of local counties to go beyond the development of a single youth care center.

It is recommended that consideration be given to a special effort to establish at least four youth care centers for girls on a regional basis, possibly providing up to 75 percent of operating costs. An alternative is for the State to establish regional youth care centers under the Corrections Division with the participating counties to pay a per diem rate for girls committed to such facilities.

2. The present Youth Care Center Law states that commitment to such a facility is to be in lieu of commitment to MacLaren or Hillcrest. It is recommended that ultimately this language be expanded to permit commitment of youngsters who are not so near the point of institutional commitment. A new commitment criterion would have to be established, probably related to type and number of delinquencies, and the Legislature would have to be convinced that the Youth Care Center program has prevention potential for youngsters who are not yet ready for commitment to our State schools.
3. With the idea of supporting continued improvements in the quality of treatment programs in the youth care centers, and based upon the present status of Youth Care Center programs, it is recommended that an improvement to \$150 per month per child (over the present rate of \$125 per month per child) be considered.

SERVICES FOR LOCAL MISDEMEANANTS

As provided by House Bill 1792, passed by the 1967 Legislature, the Corrections Division is authorized to initiate a program with counties and cities to provide care and supervision to misdemeanants sentenced to local jails. The forest work camp, operated by the Oregon State Penitentiary in cooperation with the Forestry Department, was designated as the location for this new program.

Under provision of the law, local jurisdictions can apply to the Corrections Division for transfer of sentenced misdemeanants to the forest work camp. The staff of the Oregon State Penitentiary continues to have custodial and operational responsibility for all inmates in the camp, while the Forestry Department has responsibility for all aspects of the work program. While employed at the forest camp, the local inmate is within the custody of the Administrator of the Corrections Division and is subject to the rules established by his office governing custody and employment. However, legal jurisdiction of each inmate remains with the local county or city. A cost of two dollars per day per inmate has been established as the cost of care to the local jurisdiction.

As of June, 1968, two counties (Josephine and Tillamook) had signed agreements with the Corrections Division and had transferred a number of misdemeanants into the forest work camp program. Efforts are continuing to increase the interest on the part of other counties, and the Division anticipates that the forest work camp program for misdemeanants will gain momentum during the next biennium.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING

Considerable attention and support have been given to training as a means of upgrading correctional services at the national level, as well as in the State of Oregon. A full-time training director position and a central training budget were created in the Corrections Division during the biennium. These steps were a strong indication of the administrative and legislative support for correctional training in Oregon.

The major task of the new correctional training program was to assist the juvenile and adult institutions in the development, coordination, and integration of training programs to enhance the quality of services to correctional clients.

Corrections Division
Administration

Created July 1, 1967, the new training position in the Corrections Division was not filled until January 1, 1968. However, in September of 1967, Mr. D.R. Rinehart was hired by the Division of Continuing Education to administer a training grant, provided through the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance, for the adult correctional institutions and the Board of Parole and Probation. Mr. Rinehart did an intensive study of the personnel filling correctional positions, their qualifications and background, what they perceived to be their major job related problems, and how training could help to solve these problems. The results of this study provided the basis for developing a master training plan.

Mr. Rinehart and the new training director worked very closely between January and July of 1968. A "resource committee," with representatives from the Board of Parole and Probation, the Corrections Division, and higher education institutions, was created and served as a valuable advisory resource on training. Training committees were also developed in each of the four correctional institutions. These committees were comprised of "grass-roots personnel" who worked closely with staff in interpreting the data obtained from the training studies and in formulating training recommendations.

A wide variety of training activities in terms of study, planning, and program implementation took place between January and July of 1968. Some of the major developments during this period were:

1. Development of a tuition reimbursement program to provide extended training for correctional personnel through the auspices of regular college and community college courses;
2. Placement of a number of staff in State civil service training courses such as "Supervision in State Government";
3. Coordination and collaboration with higher education in designing contractual courses which would serve as extensions of in-service training and be offered on the campuses of the four institutions (such courses were held at MacLaren, Hillcrest, and the Oregon State Correctional Institution);
4. Procurement of specialized training materials to establish an instructional materials center for the Corrections Division institutions; and
5. Development of a comprehensive master training program to serve the institutions of the Corrections Division and the Board of Probation and Parole. (This program will be jointly financed through the Office of Law Enforcement and Corrections Division fund.)

The training responsibilities of the Corrections Division were significantly expanded with the activation of the Family Court Act (July 1, 1968), passed by the 1967 Legislature. Section 7 of ORS 423.310 requires the Corrections Division to assist counties and courts in developing plans and programs relating to court services, and to promote and assist in the development of academic and in-service training programs in public and private agencies, including the Division.

A Family Court Act workshop, sponsored by the Corrections Division, was held on May 9, 1968, for juvenile court judges and personnel. The purpose of the workshop was to clarify issues and problems in implementing the Act on July 1, 1968. Juvenile court personnel were very desirous of receiving training, planning, and financial assistance from the Corrections Division. It became readily apparent, however, that the kind and amount of assistance to courts and communities would be quite limited because neither funds nor personnel were provided to implement the Family Court Act. Proceedings of the workshop were published by the Corrections Division for distribution to all juvenile courts.

Many challenges and opportunities for meaningful and innovative correctional training face the Corrections Division. An administrative workshop, to include key administrative personnel from all the major program settings within the Corrections Division is scheduled for the end of July 1968. The purpose of the workshop will be to discuss management's program objectives and priorities and the relationship of training to achieving these goals on a short-term and a long-term basis. Improvement of services to correctional clients is, however, the ultimate goal of all management and training efforts within the Corrections Division.

In summary, the Corrections Division recognizes the importance of training as the critical factor in program implementation. The Division is indeed fortunate to have a strong training staff to develop and carry out a comprehensive training program tailored to the needs of all staff levels

FAMILY COURT ACT

Chapter 534, Oregon Laws 1967, usually referred to as the "Family Court Act," imposed special responsibilities upon the Corrections Division. In administering court services under this new law, the Corrections Division of the Oregon State Board of Control has the following responsibilities:

Corrections Division
Administration

1. Assist and maintain liaison with counties and circuit courts in developing plans and programs relating to court services;
2. Promote and assist in the development of academic and in-service training programs in public and private agencies, including the Division; and
3. Assist in locating qualified applicants and in making their names available to persons responsible for administering court services in the counties.

Attached to House Bill 1038, the original family court bill, was a substantial appropriation to provide State assistance to local courts. The purpose of this assistance was to aid local jurisdictions, to plan, to expand, and to encourage services to children and families. While the substance of the legislation was passed and has become law, the original appropriation was completely deleted from the bill.

Recommendation

It becomes increasingly obvious that the State of Oregon must take a more realistic interest in the quality and quantity of local court services. A State subsidies program based upon an equitable formula, is clearly indicated as a step the State of Oregon should take sooner rather than later in order to provide adequate court services on the local community level.

OREGON CRIME CONTROL COORDINATING COUNCIL

A significant step toward prevention of crime and delinquency was taken by the 1967 Oregon Legislature in establishing the Oregon Crime Control Coordinating Council.

The Council is to assist the Governor in developing, planning, and carrying out long-range, state-wide crime and delinquency programs. To achieve this goal, the Council is authorized to coordinate the activities of all State agencies in this field. The Council is also to advise and assist local communities and citizen groups with local crime prevention programs.

Organization of the Council took place in November, 1967 with the Governor as chairman and the Attorney General as vice chairman. The Council includes the administrators of the Corrections Division, State Police, State Hospital, and the State correctional institutions; the chairman of

the Board of Parole and Probation; and the executive secretary of the Governor's Committee on Children and Youth. In addition, representatives of the Legislature, judiciary, and law enforcement agencies complete the Council.

In June, 1968, the Council employed an executive director and assistant director. Policy-wise, the executive director will be responsible to the Crime Control Coordinating Council. Functionally, the executive director responds to the direction of the Corrections Division Administrator.

Initially, the Crime Control Coordinating Council will focus on specific planning efforts which will result in a framework for future action efforts. It is anticipated that a large part of the Council's planning in the near future will emanate from the direction and funding provided by the recent passage of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act. On the basis of this Federal legislation, the Council will be responsible for developing a comprehensive plan to improve and enlarge upon the present functions of law enforcement agencies throughout the State. In addition, the Council will have the responsibility to evaluate specific proposals for funding submitted to it from the various law enforcement agencies.

While the major thrust of the Oregon Crime Control Coordinating Council will focus on implementation of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, the Council will continue to concern itself with related areas of crime and delinquency programs and the initiation of specific action efforts in these areas.

CORRECTIONS DIVISION ADVISORY BOARD

The purpose of the Corrections Division Advisory Board is to function in an advisory capacity to the State Board of Control in the operation of the Corrections Division. Its duties and responsibilities are as follows:

1. Study the policies and administration of all the programs administered through the Corrections Division;
2. Develop suggestions and recommendations for consideration by the Board of Control for achieving an integrated and effective corrections program for the State of Oregon;
3. Serve as a source of public information and education regarding corrections; and
4. Undertake such other advisory duties relating to the field of corrections as may be assigned by the Board of Control.

Corrections Division
Administration

During the past year, the Advisory Board has been involved in a number of specific projects which have had positive implications for both administration and program on the Divisional and institutional levels. Specifically, a committee of the Advisory Board concentrated on the various facets of the Hillcrest School program, and following detailed evaluation made recommendations for certain improvements. At the same time, the committee was very supportive of those program efforts which were recognized as making a positive contribution to the welfare of the children.

Growing out of the Corrections Division Advisory Board's interest in the programs at the Oregon State Penitentiary and the Oregon Correctional Institution, Mr. J. N. Peet, Advisory Board member, organized a detailed study of the quality and quantity of vocational programs now in operation at the two adult institutions. For the most part, outside technicians participated on an ad hoc basis in the evaluation of the vocational education programs. The final report presented a rather thorough evaluation of existing programs, together with strong recommendations for improvement of the vocational training programs.

Members of the Corrections Division Advisory Board as of June 30, 1968, were:

Mrs. Claire Argow
Professor of Sociology
Pacific University
Forest Grove, Oregon

Mrs. L. A. Baumhover
5004 S.W. Lowell
Portland, Oregon

Mr. Edgar W. Brewer
Associate Professor
School of Community Services
and Public Affairs
University of Oregon, Eugene

Rev. Leslie Dunton
Good Samaritan Episcopal Church
Corvallis, Oregon

Mr. R. L. Gillmouthe
Hood River County Sheriff
Hood River, Oregon

Dr. Norman M. Janzer, Psychiatrist
Medical Dental Building
Portland, Oregon

Dr. Harold Kleiner
Assistant Superintendent
Portland Public Schools
Portland, Oregon

Mr. John J. Mathews
7345 S. W. Northvale Way
Portland, Oregon

Mr. David S. Moffitt
County Commissioner
Lincoln County Courthouse
Newport, Oregon

Mr. William J. Moshofsky
Chairman, Oregon Council on
Crime and Delinquency
Portland, Oregon

Corrections Division
Administration

Mr. R. S. Glover
General Secretary
Salem YMCA
Salem, Oregon

Mr. J. N. Peet,
Commissioner
Department of Employment
Salem, Oregon

Mr. James O. Goodwin
Attorney
Oregon City, Oregon

Hon. Charles W. Redding
Judge of the Circuit Court
Multnomah County Courthouse
Portland, Oregon

Dr. Gordon Hearn
School of Social Work
Portland State College
Portland, Oregon

Hon. George Van Hoomissen
Multnomah County District Attorney
Portland, Oregon

A corrections advisory board has great value to a correctional system. It is very important that a corrections system, which can very easily become isolated, have an official tie with a group which represents the community at large. Every effort should be made in the future to involve the Corrections Division Advisory Board in relation to the Division's total program responsibilities.

Corrections Division
Administration

CONSOLIDATED SUMMARY OF EXPENDITURES
JULY 1, 1966 - JUNE 30, 1968

<u>Program</u>	<u>1966-67 Expenditures</u>	<u>1967-68 Expenditures</u>	<u>1966-68 Totals</u>
Corrections Division Administration and Central Programs	\$ 126,950	\$ 304,553	\$ 431,503
Adult Institutions			
Oregon State Penitentiary	\$3,175,065	\$ 3,969,644	\$ 7,144,709
Women's Correctional Center	(97,811)	(111,088)	(208,899)
Oregon State Correctional Institution	<u>\$1,909,611</u>	<u>\$ 2,076,424</u>	<u>\$ 3,986,035</u>
Total Adult Institutions	\$5,084,676	\$ 6,046,068	\$11,130,744
Juvenile Schools			
MacLaren School for Boys	\$2,653,333	\$ 2,853,345	\$ 5,506,678
Hillcrest School of Oregon	<u>\$1,054,443</u>	<u>\$ 1,197,989</u>	<u>\$ 2,252,432</u>
Total Juvenile Schools	<u>\$3,707,776</u>	<u>\$ 4,051,334</u>	<u>\$ 7,759,110</u>
Total All Programs	<u>\$8,919,402</u>	<u>\$10,401,955</u>	<u>\$19,321,357</u>
 <u>Fund</u>			
General Fund	\$8,070,767	\$ 9,575,134	\$17,645,901
Miscellaneous Receipts	<u>\$ 848,635</u>	<u>\$ 826,821</u>	<u>\$ 1,675,456</u>
Totals	<u>\$8,919,402</u>	<u>\$10,401,955</u>	<u>\$19,321,357</u>

	<u>June 30, 1966</u>	<u>June 30, 1968</u>
Total Number of Employees (Positions filled)	963	991
Total Assessed Valuation, Physical Plant	\$25,804,689	\$27,800,393
Total Land Acreage	2,840	2,832