

* Happenings

Minnesota Community Corrections Association

MCCA Reacts to Corrections Act Evaluation

As you are aware, the Minnesota Community Corrections Act general report was released on October 31, 1980. Although it is only in draft form it already has caused quite a commotion within and outside the field of Corrections. General media responses have been fairly negative and question the cost effectiveness and goals of the Act based on the report conclusion. Of even greater concern is unwarranted early conclusions based on conjecture of the failure of Community Corrections programs, even though the evaluation specifically stated that the report does not evaluate or research the community-based program's effectiveness.

The Department of Corrections research staff responsible for conducting the research and producing the final evaluation had a most difficult responsibility. The study was not designed for ongoing research with previous established control and experimental groups, but a retroactive research response. In effect, it is an ex-post-facto research that is considered questionable by some. Important research variables that could not be controlled for may bias the results.

We cannot fully address within this article all the issues raised about the report. As providers we should be aware of the possible consequences of the report, data collection methods and the conclusions being drawn from the report by legislators, professionals in Corrections, news media and the community.

The research design of the study is viewed by some as faulty, although extensive. Problems in the research methodology, conceptual framework and criteria selections utilized were only too briefly addressed within the report. Fur-

ther clarification of these problems need to be illuminated and evaluated in terms of the research conclusions drawn. Such questions as the face, construct and concurrent validity of the study must be carefully addressed as well as the emphasis being drawn from the report.

The report, as presently interpreted by many, is an indictment against the Community Corrections-based approach in Corrections. Such an indictment is challenged by the service providers of community-based programs and many other Correctional personnel.

If left unchallenged, the consequence of the report can be most serious. The report is sure to have an impact on public and private funding. The State already is attempting to reduce its expenditures so it is sure to take note of the report's conclusions. Private funding through grants may also be severely jeopardized since many companies may not wish to contribute their limited financial resources to programs viewed as contributing to an ineffective Community Corrections approach. Such an indictment against community-based Corrections programs is

not warranted and is being based solely on conjecture and inference based on inadequate data. Another possible effect is the reduction of referrals to community-based programs for fear of financial resources evaporating as the result of conclusions drawn from the report, such as questioning of program effectiveness, potential new priorities as the emphasis of Correction intervention changes.

The attitude of "why not incarcerate if cheaper" is beginning to surface through this period of turmoil, losing sight of the previous accomplishments and changes that Corrections within the State of Minnesota has made over the past few years.

Minnesota Community Corrections Association Board is responding to the draft report and will closely monitor the report's progress. A committee is being established to review the report released in draft form and to review the data base on which the report was founded. Programs and all interested parties are encouraged to obtain copies of the report from the Department of Corrections and respond to its content to the Department of Corrections and other appropriate parties.

Others React to Evaluation

By Dale Fisher

On November 8, Minnesota corrections workers were informed that an extensive study of the Community Corrections Act revealed it "isn't working." The report was discussed at the Minnesota Corrections Associations conference. To those not in attendance and the rest of the state's populace the report was announced under the newspaper headlines such

as that of the Minneapolis Star: "Community penal plan failing, study finds," and the lead paragraph stating that the "attempt to move Minnesota's corrections system out of the prisons and into the communities has been an expensive flop." We personally heard of several community programs who were threatened with

continue to page 4

LETTERS

A Compliment

Dear Editor:

I have belonged to many organizations and have received numerous communications published by them. However, I think "Happenings" is one of the most useful because it contains so much relevant news. It is also a nice format. You and your staff are to be congratulated! Keep up the good work!

Cordially,
Marilyn R. Sanchez,
Probation Officer
Hennepin County Court Services

Committee Happenings

FUNDRAISING

The Fundraising Committee has developed a plan that includes short-term and long-term goals.

The short-term goals include: 1981 general operations and costs, the Industry program, training and a communication network.

MCCA's long-term goal is to become financially stable by sponsoring activities that bring a monetary return to the association.

NEWSLETTER

The next newsletter committee meeting is scheduled for January 7 at 1 p.m. in the MCCA office. All interested persons are welcome. We'll be deciding what the January/February issue will include.

Give Us Your Opinion

Dear Community Corrections worker;

Sentencing guidelines is an issue of a far reaching significance to those of us working in Minnesota Corrections. The Minnesota Community Corrections Association (MCCA), by way of a committee on sentencing guidelines, is studying the impact of the guidelines as experienced directly by practitioners in corrections. We intend to give feedback in pertinent situations and to appropriate people reflecting the views of professional practitioners. The results of this study would also be important in the event the Sentencing Guideline Commission chooses to recommend guidelines for probation.

SENTENCING GUIDELINES

The committee met December 2 and discussed the "Musings on Sentencing Guidelines for Probationary Cases." Each committee member will be put on the mailing list for the Sentencing Guidelines Commission.

As a member of the MCCA Committee, I am contacting out-of-state areas for input. I urge you to talk to your co-workers, take some time and respond to me either by phone (612/348-4065) or letter relaying your experiences with the guidelines. The intention of this committee is to give a voice to those directly involved; we can't do it and we can't be effective without your input.

The opinions expressed in the Happenings are those of the contributing writers. Readers are encouraged to respond to the contents of this newsletter and to write on topics of interest to its readers. The staff reserves the right to edit submitted articles. Copy deadline is the 25th of odd-numbered months.

Members of the newsletter committee are:
Dale Fisher--publishing editor
Maggie Kaeter--editor
Gene Glass
Karen Koch
Dale Morris
Mark Olson
Herb Pernam
Ed Richter
Simeon Wagner
Karole Williams--Board of Directors liaison

Following are some questions you may wish to address.

- What is your experience as an agent or supervisor?
- Are there problems with the guidelines? If so, what?
- Are there benefits from the guidelines? If so, what?
- How many judges in your area use the guidelines?
- How many do not? Why?

If they use them, do they deviate and thereby submit written rationale for aggravation or mitigation?

What, if any, is the change in plea bargaining as a result of sentencing guidelines?

What effect does any change have on your job, the courts, service to the community?

What, if any, is the change in use of treatment programs as a result of the guidelines?

Please feel free to cite pertinent, specific cases and statistics that are seemingly a direct result of sentencing guidelines.

Thank you for whatever assistance you choose to provide.

Sincerely,
Carol Sturm
Parole Probation Officer
1800 Chicago
Minneapolis, MN 55404

James Brown - Chairperson
BREMER HOUSE
 855 West 7th Street
 St. Paul, MN
 222-4472 (office)

Farris Bell - Secretary
WOMEN HELPING OFFENDERS
 1422 West Lake Street
 Suite 204
 Minneapolis, MN 55408
 824-0741 (office)

Dan Cain
EDEN HOUSE
 1025 Portland Avenue
 Minneapolis, MN 55404
 338-0723 (office)

Gail Johnson - Vice-chair
FREEDOM HOUSE
 3020 Lyndale Avenue
 Minneapolis, MN 55408
 823-6610 (office)

Harry Kramer
RAMSEY CTY. COMM. CORR.
 945 Courthouse
 St. Paul, MN
 296-7019

Tom Lawson
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
 430 Metro Square Building
 St. Paul, MN 55102
 296-7019 (office)

Julie Shaw
GENESIS II
 1035 East Franklin Avenue
 Minneapolis, MN 55404
 348-2762 (office)

Matt Smrekar - Treasurer
HENN. CTY. PAROLE SERVICES
 1800 Chicago Avenue
 Minneapolis, MN 55404
 348-4039 (office)

Karole Williams
OPERATION DENOVO
 321 South Third Street
 Minneapolis, MN 55415
 336-1731 (office)

Dick Williams
REENTRY SERVICES
 532 Ashland
 St. Paul, MN 55102
 292-1466 (office)

We Want You To Know...

Annual Meeting Planned

Dear Director:

The Minnesota Community Corrections Association has scheduled January 28, Wednesday, for the 1981 annual membership meeting. The Board of Directors has five vacancies that are two-year positions.

The directors whose terms are continuing through 1981 are:

Dan Cain--Eden House
 Harry Karmer-- Ramsey County Community Corrections
 Gail Johnson-- Freedom House
 Matt Smrekar--Hennepin County Parole Services
 Karole Williams -- Operation de Novo
 Dick Williams --Re-entry Services

MCCA is now accepting nominations for the five vacancies. Please consider nominating someone you feel would be interested in serving on the Board of Directors.

There are monthly board meetings and monthly meetings of committees and all board members serve as liaisons to one active MCCA committee.

Please consider nominating yourself or a staff person from your program.

This meeting will consist of a business meeting and then a panel to discuss the "Community Corrections Act Evaluation," now this evaluation has impacted programs and the Community Corrections Field.

I hope you and your staff will attend. Please call if you have any questions.

Sincerely

Myrie Mackenzie
 MCCA Business Manager-Administrator

MCCA Membership Application

NAME _____ HOME PHONE _____
 PROGRAM/AGENCY _____ WORK PHONE _____
 ADDRESS _____ ZIP CODE _____
 WORK ROLE _____
 VOTING MEMBER (Working in Community Corrections) \$15 _____
 Sustaining Member \$25 _____
 Patron Membership \$50 or more _____
 Program Membership \$100 per year _____
 Sponsoring Membership \$300 per year _____
 1980 Membership Renewal \$15 _____

Make checks payable to MCCA

**Remember... We're at 2344 Nicollet
 Mpls. MN 55404**

871-9410

cont. from p.1

loss of support by those who heard the news and were apparently not informed that the report was stamped "Draft Only. Not Official." Nor was it noted that the report began by stressing that "this evaluation addresses the effectiveness of a particular piece of community corrections legislation" and "does not address the utility of a community corrections approach nor of individual community corrections programs."

Not surprisingly, reactions to the study of those participating in and supported by the Community Corrections Act have been quick and painted.

Notable among the responses received by the Happenings was that of the Minnesota Association of Community Corrections Act Counties (MACCAC), Ramsey county and other counties. The association raised questions regarding the accuracy of the information used and the methodology of the study. Its response pointed out that the study used a quantitative rather than qualitative design to gather data. Such a design requires an unchanging program with clear goals. The Community Corrections Act is not stable because the program is growing and changing. In considering the "original" goals of the CCA, the study disregarded the changes in some of the goals. The use of non-CCA counties as a comparison was contaminated by the fact that the entire state was aware of and headed toward the philosophy of community corrections.

Another problem with the data collection was the low return rate of questionnaires. Jay Klein of Rock-Nobles counties also told us that the extensive research forms were frustrating to complete, they seemed to assume that everyone involved in community corrections knew everything about it, despite the fact that some advisory board members had specialized areas of interest. Another rural administrator also indicated that most potential respondents in his area refused to complete the thirty-page questionnaires because they were too complex.

The MACCAC response also criticized the study for emphasizing quantity of local programming, giving little credit to quality or to pre-CCA programming. In the response from Ramsey county, Gene Burns argues that the CCA has produced more benefits than the

study reflects, benefits of education, employment and stability for the offender, resulting in long-term benefits for society.

The study concluded that there has been very little improvement in the proportion of offenders kept in the community. However, the study did not consider changes in sentencing patterns, which the CCA cannot control. As Gene Burns also reported, Ramsey county Corrections workers have seen an increasing sophistication in offenders, with new clients being more street-wise, disturbed, and resistant to treatment. Other counties also objected to this finding, saying they had reduced commitments as that their commitment rate was so low it would be hard to lower it further.

The study also found that the CCA did not change the degree of public protection. The MACCAC response pointed out that the study failed to consider the in-

creased use of local jail time and tougher community sanctions. The response also argued that retaining offenders in the local community without a decrease in public protection (defined by the study as lowered recidivism) should be a plus because we are retaining property offenders who have proven to be higher recidivists. Also, many other agencies such as law enforcement and the courts are responsible for public protection, perhaps more so than corrections.

MACCAC argued that the study's finding that CCA is less economical and efficient resulted from numerous flaws in research design and inaccurate case data. The response from Ramsey county argued that the study defined "efficiency" on the basis of profit-making cost-effectiveness and questioned such an application to the non-profit world of human services.

A History of the Act

By Karen Koch

To understand how the Minnesota Community Corrections Act came into being, we would have to trace the history of community corrections programs in Minnesota back to 1967. During that year in Rochester, Minnesota, a group of citizens, Judge Russell Olson, and a doctor from the Mayo Clinic, formed a committee. Their purpose was to study the possibilities of starting a program in Olmstead County that would keep local offenders in the county and out of state prisons. This soon became reality and was to be called a PORT Program (Probation Offender Rehabilitation Training). It was a residential community corrections program for the adjoining counties of Dodge, Fillmore, and Olmstead County.

In 1972, David Fogel, the Commissioner of Corrections, appointed Kenneth Schoen as the assistant commissioner of corrections. They studied what California had been doing in community corrections, and they also set up a committee concerning what Minnesota could do in the field of community corrections. Thomas Christian, founder and former director of MCCA, was also involved in studying the possibilities of community corrections, and how the need for such a program could be presented to the state legislature. That came to be, and in 1973 the state legislature passed the Minnesota Community Corrections Act, which

was implemented in 1974.

The purpose of the Act is to effectively protect society, reduce costs and duplication of services, and to provide alternatives for non-dangerous offenders. Counties can sign up with the program if they have 30,000 or more people. If an interested county does not have the required population, it can group with an adjoining county or counties. For counties who decide to become a Community Corrections Act county, there are benefits in keeping a non-dangerous offender in the county. The county receives a subsidy for the offenders they keep within the community. However, if that county sends an offender with a maximum sentence of less than five years to a state institution, that sentencing county will be financially responsible for the costs of incarcerating that offender. For offenders sentenced to a state institution with a five year or more sentence, the state would automatically pay all costs.

So, a county receives a subsidy because it keeps a 0 - 5 year offender in the same county. This subsidy was different for every county, as it was based upon: per capita income; per capita tax value; per capita expenditure per 1,000 in population; and, the percent of the population between the ages of 6 and 30, assuming that the people between those ages com-

A Summary of the Community Corrections Act Evaluation

By Gene Glass

The Minnesota Community Corrections Act Evaluation, dated October 31, 1980, hit the Minneapolis Star and Tribune with a resounding "thud." The most evident thing about this document when one reads it is that it is a "Draft Only, Not Official," as is printed on the title page of the 81-page study. This draft was circulated prior to the official study to be completed in January of 1981 to receive some feedback from the field personnel. Hopefully, the Star and Tribune's stories will contribute to the feedback sent.

The study states, "An important point to stress at the outset is that this evaluation addresses the effectiveness of a particular piece of community corrections legislation. The evaluation does not address the utility of a community corrections approach nor of individual community corrections programs. Rather, the evaluation investigates the effectiveness of the Minnesota Community Corrections Act in achieving its intended objectives and goals. The results of the study do not necessarily reflect upon the effectiveness of individual programs nor on the effectiveness of community corrections as a general correctional policy."

The study is an attempt by the Informations Systems division of the Minnesota Department of Corrections to consolidate findings of the effectiveness of the seven-year-old policy. Twenty-seven out of eighty counties in Minnesota have joined the Act and were asked to provide data for the study. The researchers identified four objectives (planning and administration, local correctional programming, retaining offenders in the community and appropriateness of sanctions) and four goals (public protection, social justice, economy and efficiency) that seemed to be pertinent to determine whether or not the Act is effective. There were no specific areas identified at the time the Act was implemented to be studied and the researchers drew these goals and objectives out of the natural consequences of the Act. The supposition was that if the objectives were being met the goals had the likelihood of being achieved.

The study proceeds to explain the terminology and methodology used to examine each issue, gives the results for each issue,

then summarizes and points out some problems and makes suggestions for resolutions of the problems. The first objective of planning and administration was researched through sending mail surveys out, conducting one-to-one and telephone interviews with CCA administrators to clarify problems and issues and to "derive a consensus about the acceptability of suggestions for resolutions of problems and issues." Administration for purposes of this study refers to "the set of coordinated and collaborative actions, centralized at the local level that yields the effective and efficient implementation of the CCA." The results of the study draws the conclusion "that organizations have achieved levels of cooperation and collaboration among individuals which are superior to those which existed prior to implementation of the Community Corrections Act." There were several problems and issues raised up by the researchers which will not be discussed here.

The second objective is that of local corrections programming which the study examines in depth for each county grouping. The study reports that "In ten of eleven CCA areas analyzed, the CCA objective of improving local programming was realized. Therefore, the Community Corrections Act can result in the realization of this objective." Only in Hennepin county is there no increase of programs prior to CCA. In all cases, the researchers statistically adjusted the finding to account for program changes that would have happened even if CCA was not implemented and still came the positive findings.

The third objective of retaining offenders in the community was researched with two questions in mind: 1) "Can the CCA increase the proportion of offenders (juveniles) retained in the community?" and 2) "Has the CCA increased the proportion of offenders (juveniles) retained in the community?" For both juveniles and adults, the answer to the first question was found to be "clearly positive! It...has increased the number of adult offenders retained..." but that "the actual numbers retained are relatively small."

The fourth objective of appropriateness of sanctions the conclusion "is that the CCA maintains but does not improve appropriateness of sanctions for most CCA

areas." In general, there is a decrease in use (regular) of probation with condition of jail" so that one can be sent to a halfway house, etc. One may conclude that CCA has increased severity of community sanctions for adults.

The first recognized goal to be achieved through CCA was identified as public protection. For purposes of this article, only findings on adult offenders will be reviewed. The study divides the reference periods into short-term (time that a person would have been incarcerated had they been committed) and long-term (twelve months following the short-term period). The conclusion is that "overall, public protection is maintained but not improved."

The second goal of social justice is defined as that concept that emits a balance between the goals of public protection and appropriateness of sanctions. The results indicate that for eight of the ten CCA areas included "...no change in social justice..." social justice overall is concluded as being maintained but not improved.

The third goal of economy looks at the all important questions of whether CCA is a less expensive policy than continuation of the system it replaced. Overall, CCA costs more money although the amount varies among target areas. The study states most prophetically "providing more programming at the local level increases costs." It is also stated in the report that the communities simply added this CCA system to these existing systems because of lack of guidance by the administering agency.

The fourth and final goal examined is efficiency. Public safety is the outcome to be reached with minimum resource use. "In every area, the higher cost per success and CCA indicates efficiency is decreased under CCA."

Although the study indicates that the objectives of the CCA are generally achieved, the achievement of the goals leave something to be desired. Overall, the study indicates that the Community Corrections Act is not doing what it has intended to do. This report is intended to be used by Minnesota policy-makers such as state legislators, the Governor, the Commissioner of Corrections and the Crime Control Planning Board for policy decisions.

Reactions to Community Corrections Act Vary

By Dale Fisher
and Maggie Kaeter

The Community Corrections Act has met with a wide variety of reactions from corrections workers around the state. These reactions vary from "it's a waste of money," to full support as a result of greatly enhanced resources and community involvement.

The Happenings staff recently contacted probation and parole officers, program staff, administrators and judges in counties participating in the Community Corrections Act (CCA). We asked for opinions about the impact of the act.

Responses generally were split between the urban counties which had developed community programs prior to the act and rural counties for whom the act has provided the funds needed to establish alternatives. As pointed out by Dennis Avery, Hennepin County Parole Services, the bigger counties have had the larger tax base, community interest, greater professional manpower and less geographic distance which enabled the creation of community programs.

This urban/rural split was reflected in the comments of nearly all those we talked to. Probation and parole officers, administrators and judges in Hennepin, Ramsey and Anoka counties said there has been no real change in programming since they joined the CCA; they were involved in such efforts before.

Administrators in central Minnesota rural counties reported greater satisfaction with the impact of the act. Since joining the Act in 1976, Red Lake/Polk/Norman counties have been able to build the Northwest Regional Corrections Center with programming that has won, along with the centers in Duluth and Rochester, the title, "National Model." Todd/Wadena counties have developed a very successful youth program showing a recidivism rate of only seven percent. Dick Fritzko, Anoka County, told us that the coordination of probation and parole services under the CCA has been an advantage in providing an improved continuum of service. A Ramsey County worker, however, expressed increased confusion over that county's integration which requires an agent to serve municipal and district courts and the parole board.

According to reactions we received, other local staff are generally not opposed to the CCA. Harley Nelson in Crookston reported that staff initially feared the potential loss of their relationships with judges, and judges feared losing their authority. Neither fear was realized. Two Hennepin County judges expressed concern about a "pirhana effect." Over the past ten years the authority of the Court has been gradually nibbled away by the Executive branch, Legislature, Court Administration, higher courts and nearly every other branch of government." They are afraid the CCA is another "nibble," enabling the legislature to enter areas that have been the domain of the judges.

Nelson told us that the jobs of the agents have not really changed, but they have more resources to work with. Todd/Wadena counties reported satisfaction with the fact that they now have the full service of a probation officer and will be adding another, whereas before CCA they were served by an officer from a greater distance.

Hennepin County probation officers reported no change in their job or resources as a result of joining CCA in 1978. The parole officers, however, were pleased with the improved communication, especially with other parole officers since they moved to one location.

Reactions to the administrative effects of the CCA were even more diverse. The two rural areas we talked to agreed that the Act has received much support from the community. Through advisory boards, local people now have more involvement and input into the operation and policies of the corrections system. Anoka's Dick Fritzko said that before implementation of the Act, there was concern whether it was financially feasible or whether there would be too much state control. He has found the new system to be feasible and state control to be minimal.

Gene Burns, Ramsey County administrator reported that the system is basically sound, that the local area should be responsible for service delivery. However, under the current budgeting process, it is hard to know how much money they will have for the coming year.

Finances also are a concern in other areas. One of the rural administrators feels money is wasted through the computerized infor-

mation system and could be more efficient on a state-wide basis. A Ramsey county parole officer, who disclaimed representation of other workers, feels the CCA has not improved the system, that a lot of money went into creating a big bureaucracy with unnecessary positions that overlap what was being done before. The Hennepin County Parole Services worker, who formerly worked for the Department of Corrections, feels the county bureaucracy is smaller and more flexible and easier to work with, especially at budget time.

The one area in which we received general agreement was the lack of effect on the number of offenders sent to prison. None of the people, parole officers, administrators or judges, feel the per diem chargeback has reduced the number of commitments.

Outstate programs were more pleased and saw more differences in the before and after effects of the act than metro-area programs. Ron Amdahl, Port Corrections Center Director in Rochester, exhibited this feeling. "The idea of the community being involved in corrections is one of the best things that's happened to corrections," he said. "I think delivery of services are usually enhanced when you bring it to the local level. It makes it a little more rational planning process because the community is resolving their own problem. You become a legitimate part of the community as you deal with the business world."

Amdahl did see problems though. "Having community corrections and the local control has become vastly more complex," he said.

Metro-area program directors agreed the act was good and emphasized that there would probably be drastic cutbacks if the act were rescinded. "We've been satisfied with how the act is functioning with us personally as a program," said Norb Gernes, former director of Portland House in Minneapolis. "If they rescinded the act it would definitely mean a loss for some programs but another way probably would be found to continue some of the programming." Gail Johnson, Freedom House administrator, agreed. "If they abolish it, a lot of programs will fail. If programs fail, the necessary range of services won't be available."

Faulconer Leaves Project De Novo

By Karole Williams

Henrietta Adams Faulconer, Executive director of Operation de Novo, is leaving after 10 years. Faulconer has been employed by the program, almost since its inception. She first became interested in the program and its concept while serving as a member of the Law and Justice Task force. And she was a member of the oral testing board that selected de Novo's first director.

She began her employment with the program in February 1971 in the position of Municipal Court Screener. After working in this position for one year Faulconer was promoted to the position of intake supervisor for the Court Unit. She worked in this capacity for two years and followed that with three years as Assistant to the Director. In May 1977, after showing her skill and expertise in dealing with the courts and various areas of program management, she was selected as Executive Director.

Faulconer said she strongly believes in the concept of pre-trial diversion and she said she has enjoyed working with and helping to implement a program which offers such diverse services to such a diverse clientele.

Faulconer has proved it is possible for a person without formal training to gather the skill and expertise necessary to move up through the ranks. She originally became involved with legal services as a volunteer probation worker 13 years ago. Later, while working as a secretary and community worker for the Way community center, she began acting as a juvenile court liaison for the community center. Her experience also includes working as a para-legal assistant for the Legal Aid Society where she acted as a dispositional advisor

Program Happenings

with the juvenile court unit. She also was the first court/community liaison at the Legal Rights Center where where she was employed from January 1970 to February 1971, before coming to Operation de Novo.

She says it was their concern then and has remained an important concern of hers that "there be aggressive and quality legal representation of the poor."

When asked who or what has been most instrumental in where she has come to date, she said that while there have been many people who have shared their expertise and offered their support, she felt that Judge Lindsay Arthur was most instrumental in giving her the opportunity to demonstrate that the non-degreed person can successfully work with trained professionals in a joint effort to provide quality services to those in need and to speak for those who cannot speak for themselves.

New De Novo Director Named

Norbert Gernes, Director of Portland House since 1976, has been named to succeed Henrietta Adams as director of Operation de Novo. Norb joined the Portland House staff as treatment director in 1974, shortly after the program's inception. Previously, Norb worked at the corrections center at Lino Lakes, working with academic impaired juveniles. Before that, Norb served for ten years as a Catholic priest in the Rochester and Owatonna areas.

Gernes spoke with satisfaction of the growth of the Portland House program to a respected, effective treatment modality. The program has kept much of its original Positive Peer Culture approach but has modified it to include more structure in its rules and decision-making and has gained greater effectiveness in working with chemically dependent clients.

Gernes has gained an interest in the effect of diet on behavior and has installed a controlled diet program at Portland House. Although he does not see a controlled diet as a substitute for therapy, he claims it can relieve stress and tension.

Gernes has been an active member of the MCCA as a member of the Board of Directors and currently as chairperson of the legislative committee.

National Models Named

The National Institute of Corrections has awarded the title "National Model" to the Northwest Regional Corrections Center of Polk, Norman and Red Lake counties. Also named were the Northeast Corrections Center in Duluth, Olmstead County Jail in Rochester, the Crime Control Planning Board and the Department of Corrections Jail Training and

Technical Assistance Unit.

A grant totaling \$65,000 will be awarded to the five agencies to initiate an Area Resource Center Program providing technical assistance to other jails throughout the nation. Each of the jails selected excels in a variety of operations, services and programs and will lend expertise in those areas to others.

History of the Community Corrections Act continued

mit the most crimes.

A county (or group of counties) interested in becoming involved in the Act would first have to complete a community study. Thereafter, the County Commissioners

responsible to appoint an advisory Board, which consists of representatives from the areas of corrections, the courts, education, welfare, law enforcement, the medical profession, plus one ex-offender and at least four citi-

zens, two of whom had to be members of an ethnic minority group.

The Advisory Board is responsible for developing a plan involving the following: prevention; diversion, probation and parole; community corrections centers; and, programs for confined or detained offenders. The plan would be submitted to the State Department of Corrections for approval and possible funding, which would lead to its implementation. A

county can then withdraw from the Act if it chooses to do so.

Community Corrections Act counties are expected to administer and provide local services, maintain a county corrections spending level, comply with Department of Corrections standards, and pay costs for county commitments to state institutions. In 1979, 27 of Minnesota's 87 counties were involved in the Community Corrections Act.

Thank You MCCA Contributors

PROGRAM MEMBERS

Minnesota Institute on Black Chemical Abuse
Minnesota Coalition for Battered Women
American Indian Chemical Dependency Diversionary
Project
Christopher Street
Blaisdell Place
Education and Training Consortium
The Bakery
Genesis II
Women Helping Offenders
Profigal House
Midwest Challenge
Damascus Way
Alpha House
180 Degrees
Re-Entry Services
Nexus
Bremer House
Domestic Abuse Project
American Indian Services
Operation De Novo
H.I.R.E.D.
Winaki House

FUNDING SOURCES, GRANTS AND CONTRIBUTORS

Dayton-Hudson Foundation
Daytons
J.B. Hudson
Target stores
B. Dalton Bookseller
Minneapolis Foundation
Northwest Area Foundation
St. Paul Companies, Inc.
McKnight Foundation
St. Paul Foundation
Minnesota Department of Public Welfare
Chemical Dependency Division
Minnesota Department of Corrections
Hennepin County

SPONSORING MEMBERS

Portland House
Hennepin County Court Services

PATRON MEMBERSHIPS

Ella Gross -- Afro Womens Resource
John Nickols

SUSTAINING MEMBERSHIPS

Dr. Tom Christian
Harry Kramer
Beverly Taliman

Minnesota Community Corrections Association
2344 Nicollet Avenue
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55404

NON-PROFIT ORG.
U.S. POSTAGE
PERMIT NO. 1994
MPLS MN

