

**REPORT OF THE
VIRGINIA STATE CRIME COMMISSION
TO
THE GOVERNOR
AND
THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF VIRGINIA
STUDY OF THE
VIRGINIA CORRECTIONAL SYSTEM**



SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 31

**COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
Department of Purchases and Supply
Richmond
1975**

REPORT OF THE
VIRGINIA STATE CRIME COMMISSION
TO
THE GOVERNOR
AND
THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF VIRGINIA
STUDY OF THE
VIRGINIA CORRECTIONAL SYSTEM

Senate Document No. 31

Commonwealth of Virginia
Department of Purchases and Supply
Richmond
1975

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA



Lewis W. Hurst
Executive Director

Laurence Leonard
Assistant Director

VIRGINIA STATE CRIME COMMISSION
SUITE 905, 701 EAST FRANKLIN STREET
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23219

TELEPHONE
(804) 770-4891

TO: THE HONORABLE MILLS E. GODWIN, JR.

GOVERNOR OF VIRGINIA

AND

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

MEMBERS

From the Senate of Virginia
Stanley C. Walker, *Chairman*
George S. Aldhizer, II
George M. Warren, Jr.

From the House of Delegates
Claude W. Anderson
L. Ray Ashworth
Arthur R. Giesen, Jr.
John L. Melnick
Theodore V. Morrison, Jr.
A. L. Philpott

Attorney General of Virginia
Andrew P. Miller


Appointments by the Governor
Erwin S. Solomon, *Vice Chairman*
William N. Paxton, Jr.
George F. Ricketts

The Virginia State Crime Commission was directed by legislative mandate to study all areas of public safety including the causes of crimes, ways to reduce and prevent it, and the examination of methods of rehabilitation for convicted criminals.

A comprehensive study of the Virginia correctional system was therefore begun in 1973 and has continued over the past two years. Three major reports detailing the prevailing conditions at the Virginia State Penitentiary, Bland Correctional Farm, and selected field units have been published along with an in-depth study of capital outlay needs for the Department of Corrections. Numerous recommendations for the improvement of the penal system have been included in each of the Commission's reports.

This report is also included with other information as a part of the Annual Report of the State Crime Commission.

Respectfully submitted,


Stanley C. Walker,
Chairman

MEMBERS OF COMMISSION

Stanley C. Walker, CHAIRMAN

Erwin S. Solomon, VICE CHAIRMAN

George S. Aldhzier, II

Claude W. Anderson

L. Ray Ashworth

Andrew P. Miller

Theodore V. Morrison, Jr.

William N. Paxton, Jr.

A. L. Philpott

George F. Ricketts

George M. Warren, Jr.

STAFF

Lewis W. Hurst, Executive Director

STUDY GROUP

John Adams	David Lutkoff
O. Oliver Atkins	Oliver McBride
James P. Baber	Arthur J. McGinty
Raymond H. Boone (Mrs.)	Philip B. Morris
J. deKoven Bowen	John R. Newhart
Edward L. Brown, Sr.	James Olin
Paul B. Ebert	B. David Peck
Walt Grazer	Edgar Allen Prichard
Ellen Gale	Jan Reed
James W. Gilkeson	Arlin F. Ruby
S. Tucker Grigg, Jr.	Wayne Shannon
Thomas M. Grizzard, Jr.	Arthur W. Sinclair
Lloyd H. Hansen	John R. Snody, Jr.
Robert F. Horan, Jr.	Charles Swift
Reuben S. Horlick	George Taylor
Joseph A. Leafe	William F. Watkins, Jr.
Frances Lewis	Jerry Welch
Andrew J. Winston	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Report	Page 4
Recommendations	Page 7
Recommendations (for Penitentiary)	Page 8
Recommendations	Page 11
Overview	Page 16

CORRECTIONS STUDY

When the Crime Commission held its organizational meeting as a permanent body in July, 1972, six years after its creation, an urgent need was identified for becoming better informed on the state of the corrections system in Virginia.

Therefore, an in-depth examination and review of the present system was initiated in the spring of 1973. Responsibility for studying the system was assigned to a subcommittee chaired by Commission vice-chairman Erwin S. Solomon. In September, 1973, the scope of the study was expanded and Commission Chairman Senator Stanley C. Walker enlarged the subcommittee to include all 13 members of the Commission.

Joining the Commission in the study was a distinguished group of legislators appointed from the Senate Rehabilitation and Social Services Committee, the House Health, Welfare and Institutions Committee and three representatives from the State Board of Welfare and Institutions. Members of the 1973 Specially Appointed Corrections Study Unit were Senators Leroy S. Bendheim, Alexandria; Frederick T. Gray, Chesterfield; A. Joe Canada, Jr., of Virginia Beach; Delegates John S. Gray, Hampton; J. Samuel Glasscock, Suffolk; the late Victor J. Ashe, Norfolk; Mrs. John J. DeHart, Jr., Richmond; Clarence P. Penn, Jr., Farmville. Senator Edward E. Willey of Richmond, President pro tempore and speaker of the House John Warren Cooke, of Mathews, serve as ex-officio members.

The Crime Commission also formed a committee of 35 private citizens from around the state who were interested and involved in the criminal justice system. Known as the Corrections Advisory Group, these citizens gave generously of their time and effort toward finding workable solutions to the problems confronting the corrections system.

The Corrections Advisory Group identified seven major areas of concern to the correctional system and formed subcommittees to look into the problems confronting each area including custodial care, education and rehabilitation,

probation and parole, recidivism, pre-release and community based programs, reception and classification and sex offenders. The Advisory Group's recommendations were presented to the Commission in December, 1974.

Members include John Adams, Richmond; Chief O. Oliver Atkins, (Pumunkey Reservation) Providence Forge; James P. Babeř, commonwealth's attorney, Cumberland; Mrs. Raymond H. Boone, management consultant, Richmond; Chief of Police J. deKoven Bowen, Charlottesville; Edward L. Brown, Sr., president, International Longshoreman's Association No. 1248, Norfolk; Paul B. Ebert, commonwealth's attorney, Manassas; Walt Grazer, associate director, Social Ministry, Catholic Diocese of Virginia, Richmond; Mrs. Ellen Gale, League of Women Voters, Annandale; James W. Gilkerson, Harrisonburg; Mrs. Tucker Grigg, Jr., Richmond; Thomas M. Grizzard, Richmond; Lloyd H. Hansen, commonwealth's attorney, Hampton; Dr. Fmory L. Hodges, Medical Society of Virginia, Alexandria; Robert F. Horan, Jr., commonwealth's attorney, Fairfax; Dr. Reuben S. Horlick, psychologist, Arlington; the late Miss Virginia Keyser, former director, Development and Alumnae Affairs, Madeira School, Greenway; Dr. Mae Johnson, Virginia State College, Petersburg; Delegate Joseph A. Leafe, Norfolk; Mrs. Frances Lewis, executive vice-president, Best and Company, Richmond; Mrs. David Lutkoff, Richmond; Delegate Phillip B. Morris, Richmond; Sheriff John R. Newhart, Chesapeake; Mrs. James Olin, school psychologist for TAAP (Total Action Against Poverty), Roanoke; B. David Peck, vice-president, Peck Metal Company, Richmond; Edgar Allen Pritchard, attorney, Fairfax; Jan Reed, chief probation officer, Martinsville; Arlin L. Ruby, assistant commonwealth's attorney, Richmond; Mrs. Walter Skallerup, McLean; Wayne Shannon, manager of Human Resources Community Relations, Arrow Hart, Inc., Earleysville; Judge Arthur W. Sinclair, Circuit Court of Fairfax County, Fairfax; John R. Snoodly, Jr., commonwealth's attorney, Buckingham;

Charles Swift, Norfolk; George Taylor, Portsmouth; William F. Watkins, Jr., commonwealth's attorney, Prince Edward County; Reverend Jerry Welch, Wise; City Sergeant Andrew J. Winston, Richmond; and Edward O. Wells, executive director, National Council to Control Handguns, Washington, D. C.

Tours of state institutions were made and the Commission invited several state correctional administrators and custodial personnel to attend a number of meetings, describing conditions and identifying problems at the institutions. As another means of becoming better informed of problems in the corrections field, the Commission, in cooperation with the National Society of State Legislators, held a special seminar on corrections, with a diversified group of panelists, in October, 1972. Panelists were Senator John R. Dunne, chairman, New York Senate Committee on Crime In Corrections; Mrs. Jeanette Spencer, vice-president, and Danny Keane, both of whom represented the Fortune Society, an organization of ex-inmates in New York state; James F. Howard, then superintendent of the Bureau of Correctional Field Units in Virginia; Major John Case, U. S. M. C., retired, director, Department of Corrections, Bucks County, Pennsylvania; Charles B. Lankford, director of Offender Aid and Restoration, Fairfax County; and Richard J. Hughes, former Governor of New Jersey and chairman of the American Bar Association's Commission on Correctional Facilities and Services. An important objective of this effort was to demonstrate to our legislators, public officials and the general public the urgent needs of the corrections system.

The Crime Commission's first phase report known as the "Penitentiary Report," on Corrections was presented on January 7, 1974, to the Governor, General Assembly members, interested state officials and the general public. The report was the result of six months detailed study of the prevailing conditions at the penitentiary in Richmond.

The penitentiary was described by the Commission as "a bankrupt institution -- a momento to the obvious futility of a system virtually barren of any rehabilitation programs."

The Commission further stated that the penitentiary "while reputed by the Division of Corrections to be a maximum security correctional institution, in reality, gave little security, nor did it correct. What few social and behavioral disciplines the staff members did bring to this institution were designed to make the inmate adjust to prison life, not to the life of a free society to which some 95 per cent of the inmates will return."

The Commission found "medical procedures resembling those of the 19th century. Illicit drugs circulated almost openly, homosexual rapes were commonplace, and weaker inmates lived in fear of their lives at the hands of stronger inmates, who ran internal prison affairs almost at will."

The report pointed out other conditions that existed at the penitentiary, notably the overcrowded cell blocks, inadequate ineffective reception and classification and untrained personnel.

In the early stages of its penitentiary study, the Commission felt that these conditions greatly inhibited the possibilities of effective programs. Therefore, on September 25, 1973, the Commission urged then Governor Linwood Holton to appropriate \$450,000 for better lighting, division of cell blocks, and closed circuit television for surveillance of cell blocks in the penitentiary. The Governor agreed to the request. Conditions were so adverse the Commission made this proposal several months before the report was completed.

The Commission made the following legislative and administrative recommendations based on the information gathered during the study:

1. The Virginia State Crime Commission recommends that the Department of Welfare and Institutions should be divided into two

departments. The proposed Department of Corrections should have the authority and direction over all adult, youthful and juvenile offenders, as well as the provision of probation and parole services.

2. The function of the Probation and Parole Board should be adjudicatory; consideration should be given to assigning responsibility for the administration of probation and parole services to a division of the proposed Department of Corrections.
3. A school should be established for the proper training of correctional officers. This school should begin to function three months after enactment of the legislation.
4. Personnel who are not performing satisfactorily should not be retained in the system. Sufficient funds should be available to hire outstanding administrators. The Virginia State Crime Commission recommends that the Commonwealth hire the best available people for the top administrative positions and offer salaries that will attract individuals of this caliber. It is false economy to hire high echelon personnel at a low salary.
5. Medium security institutions should be planned to offer true vocational and academic training, behavioral modification, and rehabilitation. The program of the Fox Lake Institute of Wisconsin should be the model. This should be one facet of an overall plan.

Recommendations for the Virginia State Penitentiary

1. Close the penitentiary at the earliest feasible date.
2. The Reception and Classification Section housed in the penitentiary should be moved as soon as possible to Pocahontas Correctional Field Unit in Chesterfield County or to a better facility now standing.
3. Proper classification procedures should be adopted. Teams made up of psychologists, counselors, members of corrections staff, and arbitrators should be utilized to classify the inmates. The system used in the State of Florida for classification should be adopted with necessary modifications as a model.
4. Institute meaningful vocational programs and eliminate vocational programs that are outmoded.
5. Basic educational programs should be implemented under the direction of the Virginia Departments of Education and Vocational Rehabilitation.
6. Transfer the State Penitentiary hospital to the Medical College of Virginia, retaining the infirmary at the penitentiary for minor illness.

The Crime Commission chairman, vice-chairman and other legislative members appeared before the Senate Rehabilitation and Social Services Committee and the House Appropriations Committee to review the recommendations contained in the Penitentiary Report. The Commission and committee members also discussed the planned maximum security institution at Mecklenburg and reception and diagnostic center in Louisa County. Concern over the two facilities had been expressed due to their locations, and the unspecified number and types of rehabilitative programs that were to be implemented.

Uppermost of all legislation passed during the 1974 Session in regard to the correctional system and the Commission's recommendations was a bill separating the Department of Welfare and Institutions into two distinct departments: the Department of Welfare and the Department of Corrections. The law, which became effective July 1, 1974, placed all adult, youthful and juvenile functions throughout the Commonwealth under a single department under the governance of a State Board of Corrections and a director.

Funds were appropriated for the employment of approximately 100 new probation officer positions for the Department of Probation and Parole over a two-year period.

Another major piece of legislation was passed creating the Rehabilitative School Authority to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a system of free schools for persons housed in state correctional facilities.

During the Commission's study of corrections, shortcomings had been found in the quality of educational and vocational training programs in both juvenile and adult correctional facilities. In some cases adequate staffing, equipment, and classroom space were lacking; schools were not running on schedule and were not integrated into the overall program of the institution.

The new Rehabilitative School Authority operates under the direction of a seven member board. It should function integrally with the Department of Corrections

in the management of all elementary, secondary, post-secondary, vocational, technical and special education courses offered in correctional facilities.

On March 5, 1974, the Crime Commission forwarded to members of the General Assembly and the Administration, copies of the John Howard Association's report entitled Comprehensive Long Range Master Plan for Juvenile and Youthful Offender Justice Systems in the Commonwealth. The Crime Commission in October, 1973, had joined with the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council's Commission on Services to Youthful Offenders in obtaining a grant from the Council on Criminal Justice to finance a major study of juvenile and youthful offender justice systems in Virginia. The John Howard Association of Chicago, a consultant firm in the crime and delinquency field, was contracted to complete the study.

The report contained an analysis of services presently provided youthful offenders in the state and general program and legislative recommendations for suggested implementation.

The original contract agreement with the John Howard Association was broadened in December, 1973, to include a report of present correctional services for adults. This report entitled Comprehensive Long Range Master Plan For The Adult Criminal Justice System In The Commonwealth was received in April.

The Association concurred to a large degree, with the recommendations made in the Commission's "Penitentiary Report" on corrections. The John Howard report repeated the Commission's proposals for the improvement of areas including institutional programs, data collection and research, classification, medical care, educational programs and post-trial institutional diversion programs, many of which have been implemented.

The Crime Commission's study of corrections continued throughout the year. A detailed report on "Bland Correctional Farm and 13 Correctional Field Units"

was completed, resulting in the May, 1974, publication of the second phase report on corrections.

The report of the correctional field units of the then Division of Corrections revealed a system that was uniformly poor. Rapists and murderers were incarcerated with prisoners who were serving short sentences for non-support, drunk in public, driving on revoked licenses and various misdemeanors. The Commission found that all of the 13 field units studied from January 15 to May 30, 1974, had maximum security prisoners who had been placed in minimum security field units. Inmates convicted of heinous crimes were found in camps where there were no true security provisions. The Commission found few rehabilitative programs and limited recreational programs.

The following recommendations were made in the second phase report on the corrections system in Virginia and are repeated here:

1. The Department of Corrections should cease immediately sending maximum security personnel or so-called incorrigible prisoners to minimum security field units. The protection of citizens in the areas surrounding the field units is now being jeopardized by this practice.
2. As had been recommended by the State Crime Commission's first report on Corrections, prisoners must be classified as to security, education, rehabilitation, treatment and programs before they are assigned to the appropriate installation. The Crime Commission finds that prisoners are still being assigned to camps on the basis of the availability of a bed.
3. Field units not suitable for human habitation should be closed. The Crime Commission is specifically referring to "stick camps".
4. Misdemeanants and felons shall not be incarcerated in the same installation. Non-support, trespassing, drunk in public, and other minor offenders are now being placed with murderers, rapists and thieves.
5. Administrative field unit personnel should be replaced forthwith if they cannot perform their job functions properly.
6. The Department of Corrections must begin to give administrative personnel proper tools with which to perform their jobs satisfactorily.

7. Security officers should be trained immediately in meaningful educational courses. Most guards in the field unit system do not qualify under the Minimum Standards Training Act.
8. Effective treatment programs for rehabilitation should be instituted in the field units.
9. Persons who have been charged with misdemeanors but not convicted of a crime are now placed in penal institutions with convicted felons. This practice should cease immediately.
10. Persons charged with misdemeanors of a minor nature should not be sent to penal institutions, but should be treated in their communities whenever possible.
11. Eighteen to twenty-five year old inmates serving sentences for the first time should not be incarcerated with hardened criminals who are older.
12. Inmates who are psychotic or suffer from other mental diseases should be taken out of the penal system and incarcerated in a mental hospital. Beds are now available in these hospitals.
13. Vocational training for the inmate should be correlated with the job demands and skills needed in the local community at or near where the field unit is located.
14. Mutual agreement programs should be instituted. The definition of a mutual agreement program is a contract between the inmate and the Commonwealth, the terms of which the Commonwealth sets. If the inmate fulfills the educational and sociological terms of the contract he is released in a designated period of time.
15. Staff recruitment should be upgraded with better pay scales as an inducement, and ongoing training programs should be developed for existing correctional staffs. Additionally, standards relating to work loads and inmate staff should be adopted and implemented. Job descriptions with proper classification are necessary. Perimeter fencing as well as other safeguards are needed at all units where maximum security prisoners are assigned.
16. All correctional facilities and programs should be required to maintain uniformly thorough offender records and copies of such records should be dispatched daily to the division and field unit superintendents so that each headquarters has necessary daily figures as to head count of personnel - those available for duty, those on furlough, those on work assignments, those on study assignments or any other status or change of status at all times. This study has revealed inept record keeping, especially with regard to escapes. An "unknown" status regarding any escape is a red flag. At Camp 16, New Kent, for instance, there were 31 escapes with a population of 71 in a 17 month period. Ten remain at large (May, 1974).

17. Adequate medical, dental and mental health services should be provided to all offenders in the correctional system along with chaplain and counseling services and opportunities for recreation properly directed. Professional personnel at the division level should be responsible for employment of those professionally qualified to give such service instead of unit superintendents employing them.
18. Tables of organization are essential for each unit and should be established on the basis of the maximum effective population and the type unit. As an example, a maximum facility needs more guards and better trained guards than does a small minimum security unit. Recent change of inmate security classification at Pocahontas Unit is an example of this. The unit superintendent had three days notice the camp was being changed from work release inmates to C-status personnel. He received 156 new inmates in three weeks. Personnel were obviously lacking in training, experience and numbers to cope with the lightning-like changes, and as a result nine prisoners escaped. Virtually the same situation now exists at St. Brides.
19. Inmate grievance forms should be made available at all units and guidelines covering the follow-up procedures should be rigidly followed.
20. Community resources, both recreational and social, should be an integral part of the correctional process wherever possible.

The second phase report, as in the case of all Commission publications, was distributed to the Governor, General Assembly members and the general public.

The Commission's study of corrections has been geared toward the identification of methods to better protect citizens against crime and toward rehabilitation of the offenders so that they may become productive and economically self-sufficient members of the community.

To become more aware of corrections systems in these areas material has been gathered on programs in use around the country.

In late June, members of the Crime Commission and staff were accompanied by members of the 1974 Specially Appointed Corrections Study Unit on a visit to Wisconsin. The Department of Corrections in Wisconsin enjoys a national reputation for its management efficiency and vocational and rehabilitational

programs.

The purpose of the trip was to familiarize the legislative members and the Crime Commission with the operation of the Wisconsin Department of Corrections and state penal institutions. Of particular interest was the maximum security State Prison at Waupun and the medium security Fox Lake Institute near Beaver Dam. A report of this inspection study was made public following the beneficial visit.

Legislative members of the 1974 Specially Appointed Corrections Study Unit include Senator Leroy S. Bendheim, Alexandria, Chairman, Senate Rehabilitation and Social Services Committee; Senators Frederick T. Gray, Chesterfield; James T. Edmunds, Kenbridge; David F. Thornton, Salem; Delegate Donald G. Pendleton, Amherst, Chairman, House Health, Welfare and Institutions Committee; and six committee members--Delegates Ralph T. Axselle, Jr., Richmond; J. Samuel Glasscock, Suffolk; John D. Gray, Hampton; Owen B. Pickett, Virginia Beach; Norman Sisisky, Petersburg; C. Jefferson Stafford, Pearisburg. Senator Edward E. Willey of Richmond, President pro tempore, and House Speaker John Warren Cooke of Mathews serve as ex officio members.

The upgrading of the inmate classification process had been pointed out in the Commission's previous reports as the first and most important step in improving the Commonwealth's corrections program.

This was reemphasized in the third phase interim report on corrections. The report, published August 26, 1974, called for the establishment of a viable reception and classification program as soon as was considered possible.

The Commission felt that the major advantage in establishing such a center was that there should be the opportunity to inform, motivate and thoroughly evaluate the offender at the beginning of his incarceration.

The Reception and Classification Center at the State Penitentiary had been characterized as the most dangerous section within the entire institution. Short-termers and long-termers, recidivists and first offenders, and young men and geriatrics lived together in communal cells in the large dormitory that could house more than 60 inmates.

In the State Penitentiary report, the Commission had recommended that "the Reception and Classification Center should be moved as soon as possible".

The Commission further recommended that "proper classification procedures be adopted. Teams made up of psychologists, counselors, members of the Corrections staff, and arbitrators should be utilized to classify the inmates".

The Phase III report noted that part of the Reception and Classification Center has been transferred from the penitentiary to the Powhatan Correctional Center in Powhatan County. The Commission felt that while this may have alleviated some of the immediate problems, the State Farm, as with most of the institutions in the system, was already overcrowded. The inmate population was 967 at the time of the report in May. Inmates continued to be confined in one cell and have no outdoor recreation whatsoever. Population at Powhatan has since been greatly reduced.

On June 13, 1974, plans to halt construction on the proposed Reception and Diagnostic Center at Green Springs were announced by Governor Mills E. Godwin, Jr. This decision followed several meetings with both proponents and opponents of the correctional facility site which had been declared both a Virginia and a national historic landmark.

While other sites have been examined for the center, the Commission believes that the establishment of a Reception and Classification Center can be accomplished quicker and at a tremendous savings to the Commonwealth if placed at an existing

facility. Adequate space is essential, as is the employment of qualified personnel to develop and implement a far-reaching program of thorough inmate assessment and evaluation.

The Commission believes that the first benefit of a viable reception and classification program will be the assignment of inmates to the type of institution deemed best for their custody status and treatment, thus providing better protection for the community and a better atmosphere for rehabilitation of the offender.

OVERVIEW

This report covers the period immediately preceding the separation of the Department of Welfare and Institutions, the transitory period into the new Department of Corrections, and the early months of the new administration during which there have been a number of departmental changes.

Escapes and institutional occurrences, specifically murders, attempted murders, rapes and assaults continue at an alarming rate. From January 1 to June 30, 1974, there were 150 escapes from correctional facilities throughout the state. An additional 125 escapes took place from July 1 to December 15, 1974. The Records Section reports approximately 400 escapes for the 12-month period ending December 31, 1974. There are approximately 275 at large.

Institutional violence continues to plague the system due to an inadequate number of trained personnel, the environment created by dormitory-styled housing, and because there are not enough programs to keep the inmates occupied with meaningful activity.

As the Commission's reports have pointed out, the quality of correctional personnel has been below the desired level. Efforts have been made to upgrade training and improve the salaries of personnel from superintendents to line

officers. A five percent pay increase was announced on June 22, 1974, by Director Jack F. Davis. The starting salary of untrained correctional officers was raised from \$6,720 to \$7,344 with top pay at \$9,600. After completing the initial training, which can be done in about two months, an officer will be paid about \$7,680 annually.

The Commission has emphasized the need for a viable system of reception and classification in each corrections report printed. The lack of such a proper system has been reflected in a recent tragic incident in Chesapeake where a work release inmate killed a police officer and has been linked with the slaying of a 23-year old Portsmouth citizen. The Commission subsequently called for a full investigation of the work release program in Virginia and asked that a special classification committee be formed to reevaluate each work release participant according to their eligibility, suitability and acceptability on the program. This was underway December, 1974, and early January, 1975.

The Commission believes that properly selected and trained administrators and line personnel, a viable classification system, and facilities equipped to carry out the necessary programs, continue to be the major factors in providing a safe, secure, and effective corrections system for citizens and inmates alike.

The Department of Corrections formally began its operation on July 1, 1974. Seven distinguished citizens were appointed to serve on the State Board of Corrections. They are Bishop John A. Baden, Alexandria; Mrs. Claudette Black McDaniel, Richmond; William M. Dudley, Lynchburg; Walther B. Fidler, Sharps; William S. Teach, Middleburg; Bernard Levin, Norfolk; and the Reverend Grady W. Powell, Petersburg. Walther B. Fidler, former delegate of the Virginia General Assembly, was elected chairman of the board.

The Commission has discussed with the new Director of Corrections, Jack F. Davis, a number of planned improvements to increase the efficiency and

productivity of the entire department. The Commission had worked with Davis prior to his appointment as director of the Department of Corrections in his capacity as Senior Executive Assistant to Governor Godwin.

Under its legislative mandate the Crime Commission keeps the Administration informed of developments and its activities. Consequently, the Commission had enjoyed considerable contact with Davis and recognized his administrative abilities.

Since assuming the directorship, the Crime Commission has continued to work with him. This is especially true in the capital outlay study, established to consider the immediate needs and priorities within the Department of Corrections. The study was accomplished by the capital outlay subcommittee of the Crime Commission with the close cooperation of the capital outlay subcommittee of the Board of Corrections. The joint committees engaged the services of four nationally recognized consultants who are specialists in correctional programs and architecture. The capital outlay report was made public in December.

The Commission has reviewed with interest the progress made in the implementation of the Rehabilitative School Authority. The Crime Commission introduced the legislation creating the authority because of the previously mentioned shortcomings that had been found in correctional institutions and because of a belief that a sound educational program is essential to a well-integrated approach toward rehabilitation of the offender.

The Board of the Rehabilitative School Authority was appointed on June 12, 1974. Branch K. Rives, Fieldale, was elected chairman and Elgin M. Lowe, Suffolk, vice-chairman. Also serving on the board from Richmond are Ernest R. Outter; Carroll Proctor, acting director of the Division of Adult Services,

Department of Corrections; George Orr, director of Vocational Education, Department of Education; Pleasant Shields, chairman, Probation and Parole Board, and William E. Weddington, director of the Division of Youth Services, Department of Corrections.

The new superintendent, Charles R. Price, was appointed November 1, 1974. Since that time the authority has been involved with the scheduling of classes for the school year in all facilities, with the establishment of a vocational and academic program at St. Brides Correctional Center in Chesapeake, with the development of a five-year plan to be submitted to the Department of Education and with upgrading and improving educational offerings in the field units.

The educational program being established at St. Bride's will be the first since the facility began operation.

A buildings trade cluster consisting of four vocational programs in carpentry, brickmasonry, plumbing and electricity is planned along with an academic learning center program offering among other courses remedial reading and mathematics.

A reorganization plan to streamline the operation of the Division of Adult Services became effective on December 1, 1974. Under the new plan, the division medical officer and administrative officer will report directly to the director of adult services. The deputy director will have responsibility over the associate director of major institutions, the assistant director of community services, the assistant director of enterprises, the assistant director for institutional services and the associate director for the correctional field units.

The Commission is hopeful that the new procedures for maximum efficiency of the department will be implemented as soon as possible and that more far-reaching objectives can be established by the director and members of the State Board of Corrections.

