

**Title: CAPRA Standards Input Session**

**1:42 Danielle Price:**

Good Afternoon! We are excited that you are all joining us for today's live chat regarding the 2014 CAPRA Standards. The CAPRA Commission values your input. We recently collected public feedback through an online survey which helped guide the Commission on further revisions and will help to direct them in the formation of a focus group chat. During this chat, we will be eliciting feedback on those standards that generate significant comments and questions from the survey and answering your questions. We will begin promptly at 2:00pm.

**1:58 Danielle Price:**

With me today are two of the CAPRA Commissioners, Dirk Richwine and John Henderson.

Dirk Richwine recently retired from the City of Henderson where he worked for the last 15 years including nine years as Assistant Director. During this time Henderson won the National Gold Medal Award and was CAPRA Accredited 2001 and was reaccredited in 2006 and 2011. Dirk led Henderson's CAPRA efforts. He also spent time working with the Police Department on their CALEA accreditation. Dirk has been active in the NRPA CAPRA program for several years serving as a visitor, lead visitor and currently on the CAPRA Board. Dirk is a Certified Parks and Recreation Executive. He has a Bachelor's degrees in Recreation from Arizona State University and a Master's in Public Administration from Golden Gate University.

John Henderson, is a Certified Park and Recreation Executive with over 24 years of experience in parks and recreation, including twelve years with the Chicago Park District and twelve with The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission where he currently serves as Research and Evaluation Manager in the Department of Parks and Recreation. John holds a Juris Doctor degree from The John Marshall Law School, Bachelors in Community Planning from the University of Cincinnati and a Certificate in Public Performance Measurement from Rutgers University. John has represented NRPA on the CAPRA Board since 2011.

**1:59**

**Danielle Price:**

Your chat questions will not appear in the chat feed automatically. Between the three of us we will work on providing a response to each question. Once the response has been created both the question and the response will be posted for everyone to see. This ensures a smooth and coherent chat. If for some reason we do not get to all of your questions during the live chat today, we will be sure to send you an individual emailed response.

Please begin chatting your questions now.

**2:00**

**Comment From Peggy Riggs**

What is the current timeline for finalizing the revised standards?

**2:01**

**Danielle Price:**

Hi Peggy, We anticipate releasing the finalized standards in April after the full Commission approves them.

**2:02**

**Comment From Bob Bierscheid**

First, a comment. I do like several of the changes including the preambles. I also like standard 1.2

**2:02**

**Dirk Richwine:**

Thanks Bob We appreciate that

- 2:03 Comment From Guest**  
When would such changes be effective, particularly for re-accreditation?
- 2:03 Danielle Price:**  
The Commission anticipates making them effective starting in 2015. They have a commission meeting at the end of March to discuss.
- 2:03 Comment From Bill Tschirhart**  
We are up for re-accreditation in 2016, will we be using the new standards?
- 2:04 Danielle Price:**  
Hi Bill, Yes, you will be required to use the new standards.
- 2:04 Comment From Guest**  
Regarding NPRA connect.. Will the documents on NPRA Connect be removed or moved to their appropriate standards since they currently pertain to the 2009 standards
- 2:04 Danielle Price:**  
Once the new standards have been finalized, the documents will all be updated on the website and on NRPA Connect.

**2:05 Comment From Barb Burkholder**

How many Fundamental standards are being changed vs the other standards?

**2:05 Danielle Price:**

Hi Barb, You can find the draft version of the standards online here to see the

changes:[http://www.nrpa.org/uploadedFiles/nrpa.org/Professional\\_Development/Accreditation/CAPRA/CAPRA%202014%20Standards\\_DR11-14.pdf](http://www.nrpa.org/uploadedFiles/nrpa.org/Professional_Development/Accreditation/CAPRA/CAPRA%202014%20Standards_DR11-14.pdf)

**2:05 Comment From Jeanette Williams**

Was there any consideration to combine fundamentals 1.4 Mission and 1.5 Vision? While important as guiding an agency, do they really warrant being two separate standards let alone both fundamentals?

**2:05 Dirk Richwine:**

There was a lot of discussion about 1.4 and 1.5. we felt that they were really two different topics and two key different items that they needed to stand alone

**2:06 Comment From Greg Mack**

I have an overall concern about the new standards being too prescriptive, suggesting that all agencies are created equally.

**2:06 John Henderson:**

Hi Greg -- In our effort to make the standard less subjective, we moved material that was previously in the commentary to the evidence of compliance to provide context. This should help the visitors and the agency knows more clearly what is expected. We have received numerous comments that the new standards are too prescriptive.

**2:06 Comment From Guest**

We are up for re-accreditation next spring 2015... so which standards are we to meet?

**2:06 Danielle Price:**

The Commission anticipates making them effective starting in 2015. They have a commission meeting at the end of March to discuss.

**2:07 Comment From Guest**

Independent Audit. Our local government has centralized all business services in an Office of Management and Budget. This new department is not under the control of Parks and Recreation Department. (Rather the reverse is true.) Will this fundamental standard apply to our situation?

**2:07 Dirk Richwine:**

That fact the entire agency has an independent audit is acceptable. There does not need to be a separate audit for the parks and recreation department.

- 2:07 Comment From Guest**  
So if we are up for re-accreditation in 2016 we will have four years of old standards and one year of new standards?
- 2:07 Danielle Price:**  
No, you will be required to be compliant with the new standards.
- 2:07 Comment From Guest**  
Is there any current discussion that may affect the language in the draft standards
- 2:08 Danielle Price:**  
This live chat today is the last period of public feedback before the final version is approved by the full Commission.
- 2:08 Comment From Guest**  
Hi Debbie Hurtt here from The Villages (Hi Bob!). We are already working on our re-accreditation slated for 2016 using a draft of the new standards. Do you anticipate significant changes in them between now and April?

- 2:09 Dirk Richwine:**  
Hopefully, we do not anticipate any more significant changes between now and final adoption.
- 2:09 Comment From Michelle**  
I'm commenting but it's not showing up.
- 2:10 Danielle Price:**  
Your chat questions will not appear in the chat feed automatically. Between the three of us we will work on providing a response to each question. Once the response has been created both the question and the response will be posted for everyone to see. This ensures a smooth and coherent chat. If for some reason we do not get to all of your questions during the live chat today, we will be sure to send you an individual emailed response.
- 2:11 Comment From Barb Burko**  
Without seeing a summary of all the feedback you received, are there any of the new proposed standards that raised a lot of concern?
- 2:11 John Henderson:**  
The standards that have raised the most concern have dealt with ADA and PRORAGIS. The sense of the comments re ADA is that we are dealing with something already mandated by law. Re PRORAGIS, there was resistance to mandating this NRPA sponsored program. The commissioners believe the effort to create a national database is of such significance to the profession that it should be supported.

**2:11 Comment From Gina Rivera**

Was there any consideration given toward combining 1.4.1., 3.2., and 4.1. (Administrative Policy & Procedures Manual)?

**2:11 Dirk Richwine:**

Yes there was a lot of discussion about combining policy and procedures and Human Resources policies. It was felt that the HR policies are significantly independent from the department regular policies

**2:12 Comment From Bo Hutchens**

Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay, We are scheduled for our visit in July of 2014, What standards should we be utilizing?? 2012?

**2:12 Danielle Price:**

Hi Bo, You will be held to the 2009 Standards.

**2:12 Comment From Bobbi**

Will the list of standards covered as part of the co-op with the Illinois accreditation program also be updated when the standards are posted this spring? Several of the new standards are part of the current Illinois accreditation program?



**2:13 Danielle Price:**

Hi Bobbi, Once the new standards have been released we will have a subcommittee on the Commission working on updating the comparison with the IL Distinguished Agency standards.

**2:13 Comment From Joyce Manwaring**

I like the changes made to the standards. The new standards clarify terminology and are organized in a way that makes sense in terms of the way our department operates.

**2:13 Danielle Price:**

Thank you Joyce.

**2:14 Comment From Guest**

I appreciate you moving what was previously in the commentary to the evidence of compliance given that we found we were being required to meet some of the evidence in the commentary. It makes it much clearer.

**2:14 Comment From Michelle**

Will the panel look at a grace period? i.e. if the standards are just being adopted this year for 2015 and the agency is up for re-accreditation in 2015, could they choose to go by the 2009 standards? It could be difficult to meet new standards put into place only 9 months before re-accreditation.

- 2:14 Danielle Price:**  
The Commission anticipates making them effective starting in 2015. They have a commission meeting at the end of March to discuss.
- 2:15 Comment From Melida McKee**  
Has a document been created that summarizes just the deletions/additions/changes to the standards? If so, where is it available?
- 2:15 Danielle Price:**  
Hi Melida, There was one that was published during the public comment period this past fall. We will update it with the final version and publish it with the new standards.
- 2:15 Comment From Guest**  
I am among those that think PRORAGIS should not be part of agency standards. NRPA also may change its software/database and that affects the standards. These standards are getting harder and harder for small agencies with small staffs and budgets to meet.
- 2:16 Comment From Guest**  
Please clarify standard 10.5.3. What is considered the PROFILE. We started entering info into Proragis a couple of years ago, but do to lack of man power, this has been put on the back burner. I revisited Proragis and could not find that a section called AGENCY PROFILE

**2:16 Dirk Richwine:**

Having all accredited agencies have PROGASIS will help build a very valuable data base for all agencies participating in the accreditation program. It is also the only data base that we can develop, manage and cross reference.

**2:16 Comment From Barb Burkholder**

Are there many changes to Standard 4? I have a meeting with our HR Dept. today at 4 p.m. It would be helpful to know which ones are being changed.

**2:16 John Henderson:**

Barb --There are two new standards. 4.1.1.2 deals with Staff Acceptance of Gifts and Gratuities. 4.4.1 deals with leadership succession -- making sure leadership is always available. Revision was made to the qualifications for chief administrator (4.4) The current standard on physical exams was eliminated.

**2:17 Comment From Barb Burko**

How do we know how the feedback was used to change/modify the first version?

**2:17 Danielle Price:**

Hi Barb, There has been a subcommittee of the Commission working on the standards revision for over a year. We have been meeting at least every month to make the revisions and have several conference calls, emails, and phone calls to discuss and implement changes based on the public feedback.

**2:19 Comment From Guest**

I notice a number of new proposed standards related to the ADA. The standard 2.10 ADA Transition Plan is generally above the department's authority. What if the jurisdiction declines to adopt a plan, then what?

**2:19 Comment From Bob Bierscheid**

I do have some concerns on 2.10 ADA I think it is too prescriptive. I believe it could put CAPRA and agencies in some liability.

**2:19 Dirk Richwine:**

With regards to ADA. We contacted specialists in the field and their comments were incorporated into the standards.

We understand that some agencies may have ADA management in other department and that is fine.

It does not need to be department specific and can be agency wide.

There are several other standards that require interaction action with other departments or agencies.

**2:20 Comment From Guest**

What does the annual report entail? Will it need to be modified in 2014 or 2015?

**Danielle Price:**

Please email me at [CAPRA@nrpa.org](mailto:CAPRA@nrpa.org) and I can send you a PDF copy of the Annual Report. It most likely will not be changed next year.

**2:20 Comment From Linda Smith**

Are there going to be any additional efforts to reduce some of the duplication?

**2:21 Danielle Price:**

Hi Linda, The subcommittee has worked hard to reduce any duplication they felt that could be eliminated. If you have specific instances that you would like for us to look at, please let us know which standards those are.

**2:21 Comment From Jeanette Williams**

7.9.1 asks that we now "provide statistics on the amounts of materials recycled or the percent of total waste recycled for the most current period". Many Parks & Recreation agencies have their waste controlled by the city/county, etc. Will we no longer meet that standard if we can't provide the statistics on amount recycled (even if we do have a recycling plan implemented)?

**2:21 Dirk Richwine:**

Any type of general standard can be acceptable. This include tipping fees or number of pickups, number of containers, etc.

2:21

**Comment From Guest**

We have concern about standard 2.5 where it talks about the strategic plan supporting the Parks and Rec Master Plan. The Master Plan in our county is the County's Comprehensive Plan owned by Planning and Zoning. Our Strategic Plan is the over-arching document for our agency.

2:21

**John Henderson:**

2.3.1 is the new standard for a community comprehensive plan with a parks and recreation element. 2.4 requires the park and recreation agency to have a system master plan. 2.5 requires a strategic plan. Depending on how the system master plan is written, it can also serve as a strategic plan. The strategic plan requires detailed action steps and add isn't meant on how objectives are being achieved.

2:21

**Comment From Guest**

We agree with Gina Rivera's comment on combining some of the policy and procedure questions.

2:22

**Comment From Tracy Novak**

Hello All! (especially Dirk). A question was raised earlier about Proragis. Can you talk more about what this requirement is, the section it belongs to, and what is expected? Tracy Novak in El Paso Texas

2:22

**Danielle Price:**

Hi Tracy, Was your question answered by Dirk earlier in the chat?

**2:22 Comment From Barb Burko**

What if a new standard is just not applicable to what our agency does. Example. 6.5. We do not have programs that are spectator sports, nor coaches.

**2:23 Danielle Price:**

Hi Barb, There may be some standards in which some agencies are unable to meet. The ones the Commission expects all agencies to meet are the fundamental standards.

**2:23 Comment From Bill Tschirhart**

Regarding 2.4, the standards calls for a master plan and the narrative references a comprehensive plan. What is the standard asking for? Additionally, 6.1 rec program plan seems to overlap with 2.4.

**2:23 Dirk Richwine:**

We tried to create a distinction between a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (2.3.1) and Parks and Recreation Master Plan. They are two separate documents.

**2:25 Comment From Vickie**

I appreciate that you have found and referenced the pages from the Management of Park and Recreation Agencies Book to help us in defining the standards.

**2:26 Comment From Guest**

Regarding 3.3 Internal Communication, and specifically the fact that a matrix is required. Is there value in providing the information in a matrix format? I tend to think that most organizations would not use a tool like this. Is the matrix format a tool to make it easier for the reviewers?

**2:26 John Henderson:**

Thanks for your comment on 3.3. I believe the "matrix" is a holdover requirement. It is intended to organize the material in a convenient format for the visitors to review. We can review this to see if it is really necessary. We do not want to avoid imposing requirements that have no practical value beyond CAPRA.

**2:26 Comment From Bill Tschirhart**

Regarding 4.1.5 - background investigation, what type of information are you expecting to see in a national background check?

**2:26 Dirk Richwine:**

We expect to see an approved policy regarding background investigations and some sort of summary that investigations were conducted, not about the type of incidents were found but just that the backgrounds were conducted on what type of staff, full time part time, volunteers coaches, etc.



**2:28 Comment From Joyce Manwaring**

We are confused on the 3.4.1.1 Public Information and Community Relations Responsibility in the new standards with the note "3.4.1 requires policy and procedure instead of statement." Is there no longer a 3.4.1 which was entitled Public Information in the 2009 standards?

**2:28 Dirk Richwine:**

yes that is correct. We are looking for more process with regards to policies and procedures than just a statement.

**2:29 Comment From Linda Smith**

The policy and procedure areas are where I see the most duplication. All policies are asked for in section 1, and then asked for again for specific standards later, some policies are required in more than one standard.

**2:29 Danielle Price:**

Thank you. We will take a look at that during our next review after this chat.

**2:29 Comment From Barb Burko**

Is there anywhere we can see the revisions as they stand now before they are voted on? Were any of new proposed standard changed significantly from what we received?

2:30

**Danielle Price:**

Hi Barb, You can view the current draft online

at:[http://www.nrpa.org/uploadedFiles/nrpa.org/Professional\\_Development/Accreditation/CAPRA/CAPRA%202014%20Standards\\_DRAFT\\_11-14.pdf](http://www.nrpa.org/uploadedFiles/nrpa.org/Professional_Development/Accreditation/CAPRA/CAPRA%202014%20Standards_DRAFT_11-14.pdf)

Additional changes may be added after this chat.

2:30

**Comment From Guest**

I have always struggled with the difference between General Security Plan and the Emergency Mgmt Plan. The Emergency Mgmt Plan is actually one piece of a Security Plan, in addition to other things, i.e. prevention and safety. Also, I would like clarification on how 8.6.2 Emerg Risk Commun Plan and 8.6.3 Care & shelter procedures could be components of an emergency mgmt plan.

2:31

**Danielle Price:**

The General Security is different from the Emergency Management plan. The GSP will address security and procedures for locking the facilities, keys and incident issues.

The Emergency Management plan will address more incidents related to the Incident Command system and FEMA. These plans are related but they are very different.

2:31

**Comment From Greg Mack**

I want to go back to the prescriptive nature of the standards and EOC. Being too prescriptive will create barriers for agencies that operate under a general purpose government structure. These agencies cannot dictate what are in policy and planning documents of the governmental unit.

**2:31 John Henderson:**  
Greg -- We agree. We have responded to many comments regarding the prescriptive nature of the new standards. We have made many changes in response. Please let us know if you have specific examples for us to review. The concept is to provide context, e.g. what needs to be in a recreation program plan. Current standards provide little guidance. We have given credit to many weak plans because context has not been part of the EOC.

**2:31 Danielle Price:**  
I am going to post all of the current questions regarding PRORAGIS and Dirk will work on the response:

**2:31 Comment From Guest**  
I saw my question go by unanswered: Please clarify standard 10.5.3. What is considered the PROFILE. We started entering info into Proragis a couple of years ago, but do to lack of man power, this has been put on the back burner. I revisited Proragis and could not find that a section called AGENCY PROFILE

**2:31 Comment From Tracy Novak**  
No it wasn't. I wanted to understand better what the Proragis requirement is.

**2:31 Comment From Guest**  
Danielle, neither Tracy's question or mine was answered

**2:31 Comment From Guest**

I also contend that PRORAGIS should not be part of agency standards. But if we must do it, (and I highly suspect it's not really up for discussion); do we have to fill in the data from the last 5 year period of just from the 2015 on.

**2:32 Comment From Guest**

Please provide clarification on 10.5.3 Do we need to complete the entire PRORAGIS or a particular section

**2:32 Comment From Guest**

Will a transcript of this chat be available?

**Danielle Price:**

Yes, it will be posted online.

**2:32 Comment From Guest**

I'm finding this chat to be illuminating. Will the comments and responses be available later for study?

**Danielle Price:**

Yes, the transcript will be posted.

**2:33 Comment From Karen Hesser**

Will this summary of Q & A be available for reference relative to explanations of the various changes going forward?

**Danielle Price:**

Yes, the transcript will be posted.

**2:35 Comment From Guest**

Is the Commission looking at its cycle of reviewing standards so they do not always impact the same agencies in their 5 year re-accreditation cycle being the "newbies" with the new standards.

**2:35 Danielle Price:**

The Commission is committed to reviewing the standards every five years to ensure they remain relevant and current. This does not mean that major changes will always occur every 5 years.

**2:35 Comment From Guest**

I have a concern. It seems our agency and many other are on the swing year. I assume the next cycle of review will be in 2020 and those of us that will be up in 2020 will only have a few months to adopt any changes. Agency up for reaccreditation in spring of 2015 do not have as much time to adjust as agency up for re -accreditation later in the year or 2016

- 2:35 Danielle Price:**  
The Commission is committed to reviewing the standards every five years to ensure they remain relevant and current. This does not mean that major changes will always occur every 5 years. The Commission is meeting at the end of next month and will be discussing the implementation period of these new standards.
- 2:36 Comment From Guest**  
Will there be time for 2015 re-accredited agencies to catch up with the new revised standards?
- 2:36 Danielle Price:**  
The Commission is meeting at the end of next month and will be discussing the implementation period of these new standards.
- 2:36 Comment From Mike Phillips**  
Just to clarify, all the new standards being evaluated by visitors in 2015 will be looking for evidence of compliance on that new standard over the past five years?
- 2:36 Danielle Price:**  
That is correct.

**2:36 Comment From Tracy Novak**

Will there be an update to the Management of Park and Recreation Agencies book as a result of the changes made to these standards?

**2:36 Danielle Price:**

Hi Tracy, There have not been any discussions in the office regarding updating the textbook at this time.

**2:37 Comment From Guest**

Appreciate that many of the standards are clearer with evidence of compliance.

**2:38 Dirk Richwine:**

Similar to the Gold Medal Program, the link for PROGAGIS to connect to CAPRA will produce some significant dividends for the program.

First, it will link to the NRPA Strategic Plan.

More importantly, it will enable all of us to produce different reports regarding Accredited agencies that are available to the different agencies. This is one of the most valuable tools that accredited agencies can use to. Each agency will be available to retrieve benchmark information.

Finally, because it is in house, we will be able to provide input into what information is being requested. We hope this make it easier for agencies to input their information and be able to modify it from time to time.

**2:39 Comment From Guest**

Agree that these proposed standards take more than a few months to meet, while continuing to meet "old" standards for annual reports. How much emphasis will be placed on old standards i.e. 4 yrs old + 1 yr new at a reaccred visit?

**2:40 Danielle Price:**

If the Commission decides at their next meeting (at the end of March) to require all agencies with 2015 visits or later to comply with the new 2014 Standards, those agencies will be held to the new standards completely - there is no partial with 2009 and partial with 2014.

**2:40 Comment From Guest**

If your Director is leaving by Spring of 2014 and you are being up for re-accreditation in 2015, will we be given some additional time for the new Director to get their feet wet?

**2:40 Danielle Price:**

Are you asking about requesting an extension to your visitation time frame?

**2:40 Comment From Bob Bierscheid**

Can the Master Plan be a section of the Land Use Plan?



- 2:40 Dirk Richwine:**  
It depends, the Land Use Plan is usually the Zoning map of a Comprehensive Plan. The Parks and Recreation Master Plan is usually a different chapter.
- 2:41 Comment From Guest**  
I think 10.6.1 Quality Assurance is duplicative of items covered in 10.1 systematic evaluation program, and 10.3 performance measurement, even 10.1 & 10.3 are similar. Need clarification
- 2:41 John Henderson:**  
Thanks for your comments on the 10.0 series. The new standards are 10.2 on Outcomes Assessment, 10.3 on Performance Measurement and 10.3.1 on Level of Service. 10.6 on Quality Assurance is a current standard. The effort in this area is typically a source of data for performance measures. 10.1 is to assure that all of the pieces of data collection, analysis and assessment create a holistic process of evaluation and assessment.
- 2:42 Comment From Gina Morais**  
Standard 6.4 now includes plan in the title, but the standard refers to a process. Should it be a plan or a process?
- 2:43 Danielle Price:**  
Hi Gina, Thank you. We will certainly take a look at that to ensure consistent language.

**2:43 Comment From Gina Rivera**

Could 1.4.1 (Policy Manual) be combined with 3.2 (Admin Policies & Procedures) and located in either of the two sections?

**2:43 Dirk Richwine:**

Yes these are combined. The policies and procedures of 3.2 were incorporated into 1.4.1

**2:44 Comment From Joyce Manwaring**

So the number 3.4.1 is no longer associated with a standard?

**2:44 Danielle Price:**

Hi Joyce, According to the current draft, 3.4.1 is:

3.4.1 - Public Information and Community Relations Responsibility

Standard: A specific position in the agency shall be designated to direct the public information

and community relations functions. The position serves as a point of control for information dissemination to the community and the media. The intent of the standard is to establish the authority and responsibility for developing and coordinating the agency's community relations function in an identifiable position. [Chapter 15; Pages 375-377]

Suggested Evidence of Compliance: Provide the position description that reflects responsibilities for public information and community relations functions.

**2:44 Comment From Guest**

Thank you for clarifying the components required in the Recreation Programming Plan. Is it possible to provide requirements for content in all of the plans? Thanks.

**2:45 Danielle Price:**

We can certainly take a look at this during our next call. Thank you.

**2:46 Comment From Guest**

Yes, I guess that I am asking if that is a possibility if our Director leaves. Who would we contact for an extension? We are in limbo currently.

**Danielle Price:**

Send me an email at [CAPRA@nrpa.org](mailto:CAPRA@nrpa.org) and I can walk you through the process of an extension. I would also recommend you read the handbook regarding extensions.

**2:46 Comment From Guest**

Are there plans to offer training sessions targeted to those agencies up for re-accreditation to help us work through the impact of the new or changed standards?

**Danielle Price:**

Yes, we will be offering training on the new standards via webinar format starting this summer.

**2:46 Comment From Gina Rivera**  
Thank you for combining 1.4.1 and 3.2 :)

**2:47 Comment From Guest**  
When the final updates are approved we would like to see the final document laid out as the comparison chart was set up. Very helpful with 2009, proposed, notes. Thank you.

**Danielle Price:**  
Yes, we will be sure to provide that.

**2:48 Danielle Price:**  
We have a lot of great questions here and are trying to respond to them as quickly as we can. Please keep them coming - and if we don't get to them during the live chat, we will send email responses and add the answers to this transcript.

**2:48 Comment From Guest**  
Will agency's up for re-accreditation in Spring 2015 ask for an extension??

**Danielle Price:**  
I'm not sure I understand your question.

**2:48 Comment From Greg Mack**

To Dirk's comment about Comp plans and master plans, you are imposing your definitions, which may or may not be consistent with other organizations. Agencies need to follow the lead of their parent organizations.

**2:48 Dirk Richwine:**

There has been a significant amount of confusion about these terms and many agencies were using them interchangeably which created confusion during many visits.

The terms Comprehensive Plan or General Plan are terms found in most state statutes regarding the land use and development plans of each agency. They are generally associated with planning or community development.

Parks and Recreation Master plans may be an implement of the Comprehensive plan but is different than a comprehensive plan. They usually help drive the parks and recreation elements, and sometimes open space, elements of the Comprehensive Plan.

**2:50 Comment From Guest**

How do we get an email response if my questions are being entered as a Guest?

**Danielle Price:**

If we don't get to your response and you still have a question, please feel free to email it to [CAPRA@nrpa.org](mailto:CAPRA@nrpa.org).

**2:51 Comment From Linda Smith**

9.1 asks for a Policy on risk management and then 9.1.1 asks for the risk management plan and procedures. Seems like that could all be covered in one standard.

**2:51 John Henderson:**

Hi Linda -- the distinction between 9.1 and 9.1.1 reflects the difference between the policy-making/ policy directive by the policy-making authority. The plan and procedure are the work of staff within the policy authorization. Quite often the policy is included/referenced in the plan and the EOC will be similar. 9.1. requires providing the adopted policy and 9.1.1 requires providing a plan approved by the proper authority. In some agencies the policy-making authority and the plan approval authority could be different.

**2:51 Comment From Guest**

Do you foresee accreditation being a requirement for the Gold Medal.

**Danielle Price:**

I am unable to answer that, as I am not involved with the Gold Medal requirements. It would be a question you can send to Brenda Beales at [bbeales@nrpa.org](mailto:bbeales@nrpa.org).

**2:51 Comment From Guest**

Regarding the matrix discussion. Although we didn't believe the matrix would benefit us (Beyond CAPRA), it actually was another way of analyzing our data that we hadn't looked at before. It was time consuming to add all programs into it, but I believe it was useful (and not something we would have done before CAPRA).

**2:52 Comment From Guest**

I hope that the Commission will take into account that some agencies only have one person devoted to CAPRA Accreditation. To get all of the changes for 2015 will be a challenge for many who have more than just accreditation in their job functions.

**2:52 Comment From Bill Tschirhart**

Regarding standard 1.2 - periodic timetable for review of documents, not all documents that require review are listed. What is the timetable for their review? I'm referring specifically to standard 4.1. The standard calls for 'periodic review' but does not define.

**2:52 Dirk Richwine:**

We will take a look at 4.1 and if need to be added we will do that. Our goal was for each agency to be able to develop their own time table about reviewing documents.

There was a lot of confusion about what a "regular review period" was and we could not clearly define it so we asked each agency to develop their own and include it.

**2:53 Comment From Bill Tschirhart**

Agencies can utilize either the large or small agency in PRORAGIS. The small agency data can be completed in under an hour.

**2:53 Comment From Ryan OConnor**

I agree that 2.10 creates some liability issues not to mention significant cost.

**2:54 Comment From Tracy Novak**

If this is the case, can there be some reference material provided that expands on the suggested evidence of compliance for revised standards, that currently the mgmt book provides?

**Danielle Price:**

We are working on providing this information in the NRPA Knowledge Center.

**2:54 Comment From Bob Hall**

As a frequent visitor I appreciate all the comments and responses. Since there appears to be a lot of concern about the 2015 standards, why not implement them One year after approval be the commission.

**Danielle Price:**

We will certainly be considering this at the next Commission meeting in March.

**2:56 Comment From Greg Mack**

Standards 1.2 and 1.2.1 are summaries of timelines and authorities. I suggest the timelines and authorities remain embedded in the specific standards and avoid the redundancy these new standards create.



**2:56 Dirk Richwine:**

We thought about that but our thinking was that it would be too confusing trying to explain it and for visitors to understand it.

**2:57 Comment From Linda Smith**

in 10.3, there is a very specific list of performance measures. Will agencies need to show information for all of these, or is this just a sample of different types of performance measures. My concern is not all agencies do all of the things to gather data for each item listed. Some reviewers tend to be very black and white, so if it's not clear, they will be asking for information on each one of these examples.

**2:57 John Henderson:**

Linda -- Thanks for your comment on 10.3. The standard does not prescribe what should be measured or how many measures. The list refers to possible sources of data to use for performance measures. The standard requires that the agency use performance measures to track achievement of agency goals and objectives. A performance measure requires reliable data -- so availability of data will limit what can be measured.

**2:58 Comment From Bob Bierscheid**

John, Dirk and Danielle, thanks for taking the time to listen!

**Danielle Price:**

Thank you for participating!

**2:58 Comment From Barbara Burkholder**

Thanks Bob Hall! I am one of those agencies that is up for re-accreditation in 2015. This is stressing me out thinking that I have to make all of these changes so quickly. I totally appreciate all of the work that is being done to correct inconsistencies and duplication of efforts. Thanks to everyone that is working to make the changes a reality!

**2:58 Comment From Ryan OConnor**

Implementation a year after the adoption seems like a logical step forward.

**2:59 Comment From Guest**

Is there a chance of setting up an Accreditation Roundtable at Congress? We are new (visitors are coming in March 2014), but an in-person discussion with others going through the process might be helpful/supportive

**Danielle Price:**

We will be offering an in-person half-day workshop on Monday in addition to the 1.25 hour training on Tuesday.

**3:00 Comment From Bobbi**

I agree that implementation a year after the adoption would make the most sense. However, we've been preparing off of the draft version, so for us to go back to the current standards would put us in an even tougher spot.

**Danielle Price:**

If the Commission decides to allow agencies to select the standards they want to use next year (that is for 2015 visits only) the agencies will have a choice between the 2009 or the 2015. It will be up to the Commission to make that determination at their meeting in March.

**3:01 Comment From Michelle**

Will you be emailing the transcripts from this chat? or will they be available somewhere online?

**Danielle Price:**

It will be posted online on the CAPRA website.

**3:01 Comment From Susie**

Thank you all for all your hard work on revising the standards! Although we are being increasingly challenged to meet a high standard, I believe these standards are fair, well thought out, and well written. Thanks again!

**3:01 Comment From Greg Mack**

Being involved in the 2009 standards re-write I recognize this is challenging work, but the standards are our foundation and deserve serious attention and dialogue. Thanks for giving us the forums to weigh in.

**3:01 Comment From Guest**

Going back to Johns answer to Greg's concern about the standards being too prescriptive. If a particular standard like the Recreation Plan states what needs to be in the plan is not fully met (i.e. one of the items is not in the plan) will the standard still pass or fail.

**3:01 Dirk Richwine:**

There was a significant amount of feedback from the initial surveys that some standards were too vague and this was causing confusion about some standards not being met because the "Suggested Evidence of Compliance" was not provided even though the agency felt that they met the standard.

Our goal was to provide the flexibility but enough clarity for each agency to meet the standard and provide enough information to the visitor.

**3:02 Comment From Guest**

I was thinking more of a discussion/roundtable with those going through the process currently...not necessarily the "experts". I attended the workshop last year, but it was more of a lecture...

**Danielle Price:**

Since this will be a newly developed training we can certainly consider this.

**3:02** **Comment From Gina Morais**  
I agree with Susie about the standards!

**3:02** **Comment From Michelle**  
Thanks Danielle

**3:02** **Comment From Guest**  
Thanks Danielle!

**3:03** **Comment From Barbara Burkholder**  
I remember when we were going for initial accreditation in 2010. We had the ability to choose either 2009 or the old standards. We chose the new ones, but now I see that some agencies don't have the time or people power to make so many changes so quickly. Please give agencies a choice.

**3:03** **Comment From Michelle Weinbaum**  
It sounds like agencies reviewing their practices for 2016 reaccreditation should stop using the 2009 standards now in favor of the draft 2015 standards? Would you agree? Also- would NRPA consider doing more chats like this, maybe even monthly chats on one section at a time for more specific questions about interpreting new standards? Thank you.

**Danielle Price:**

Hi Michelle, that would probably be a safe assumption at this point for agencies with visits in 2016 or later. NRPA has been hosting more chats recently and are finding them to be very useful. CAPRA may consider offering these more often.

**3:04 Comment From Randy Phillips**

To receive credit for participation in PRORAGIS do all sections have to be completed?

**3:04 Comment From Guest**

We understand WHY it is important to gather info in Proragis.. Please explain what the PROFILE entails: Data enter of a particular section or data entry for ALL of the sections.

**3:04 Comment From Guest**

To get credit for participation in PRORAGIS do all sections have to be filled in.

**3:04 John Henderson:**

The is a PRORAGIS "lite" profile that is simplified. I do not know the difference between a full profile and the "lite" version. We are a very large system with thousands of acres and hundreds of programs and facilities. I found the process of entering the information to be easy and straightforward. Updates are very simple because you can copy the prior profile and update what has changes. The sections include: jurisdiction, budget, programs, facilities and land. Doing a "lite" profile will meet the standard.

**3:04 Comment From Gina Rivera**

The Parks & Recreation Section is included in the City's Comprehensive Plan. The City's Comp. Plan is not reviewed annually. Should the review requirement of the 2.4 be a periodic review?

**3:04 Dirk Richwine:**

We understand the document is not reviewed annually.

Some documents are reviewed on longer term basis. The term "regularly" was too confusing. That is why we developed the standard 1.2 for each agency to develop their own time line for review of documents.

**3:05 Comment From Guest**

What if a component is missing?? Will the standard still pass or fail

**3:07 Dirk Richwine:**

What kind of component is missing?

**3:07 Comment From Guest**

the suggestion from Michelle to break down the discussion to a couple chapters at a time is a good one.

**3:08 Danielle Price:**

We still have about 6 questions to get to and then we are going to start wrapping it up. Thank you all for your very insightful questions - we truly appreciate your time and feedback!

**3:09 Comment From Guest**

I find standard 2.4 confusing. Can the strategic plan be the "comprehensive park and recreation system plan?" I thought that was the case until later it says "The system master plan shall implement policies adopted in the comprehensive plan for the jurisdiction." Is this Park master plan something most jurisdictions have in addition to a strategic plan?

**3:09 Dirk Richwine:**

Generally the Strategic Plan is an implementation tool of the parks and recreation Master Plan. The Strategic plan will specifically address what actions the agency will be taking to implement their long range plan.

**3:09 Comment From Tracy Novak**

Thanks for making this available!!

**3:09 Comment From Ryan OConnor**

I have a concern with 7.7.1. For old and large departments, having all plans for all buildings and facilities is not realistic. Some of our building are approaching 70 years old and the plans have been lost to time. It would require hiring an architect to do measured drawings - very costly.



**3:09 John Henderson:**

Ryan -- In response to comments, we have changed the EOC to cover only plans for "major facilities constructed since 1965" LAWCON grants started in 1965, which place restrictions on use/disposition of funded projects. We felt that limiting this requirement to newer and larger facilities greater than 10,000 s.f. would be reasonable.

**3:10 Comment From Susie**

Yes thank you! This was very helpful.

**3:11 Comment From Ryan OConnor**

What exactly are you looking for on 8.3? I'm not sure Dallas PD is going to give us their training program for this effort.

**3:11 Dirk Richwine:**

You are correct. A statement that their officers are P.O.S.T certified and have completed a standardized training program should be sufficient. It is important to make sure that there is some kind of certified, standard training.

**3:14 Comment From Bill Tschirhart**

Regarding 1.2, that's the issue...this standard does not reference standard 4.1. Are agencies to define their own periodic review and how will this be referenced?

**3:14 John Henderson:**  
Good catch Bill! -- We will need to add 4.1 to the list.

**3:15 Danielle Price:**  
While we are working on the last few questions, I wanted to ask a few poll questions.

**3:15 Do you work for an accredited agency?**

Yes

( 86% )



No

( 14% )

**3:15 Comment From Guest**

one of the listed components of the Recreation Plan (6.1)

**3:15 Dirk Richwine:**

It is kind of hard to respond to a specific issue when I do not know all the details. If you want to contact me off line I will be happy to review your plan and let you know if there are any issues.

**3:15 Are you a CAPRA visitor?**

Yes

( 38% )

No

( 62% )

**3:16 Did you find this chat helpful?**

Yes

( 100% )

No

( 0% )

**3:17 Would you like more of these chats to be offered throughout the year for CAPRA, in addition to the webinar trainings offered?**

Yes

( 100% )

No

( 0% )

**3:20 Comment From Guest**

Regarding standard 4.1 The standard now has a list of policies it SHALL include. What if our HR dept will not include one of the 5 listed. Will we fail this Fundamental Standard??

**Danielle Price:**

From Dirk: The policies identified in 4.1 are SUGGESTED evidence of compliance. The only shall is the that there be a approved set of personnel policies and that it be available to all staff.

**3:22 Danielle Price:**

We are finishing up on the last question. Before we close out for the day, are there any additional comments, concerns, questions?

**3:22 Comment From Ryan OConnor**

There seems to be some redundancy for 10.1, 10.2 and 10.3 . They are all referring to evaluation processes and the use of those evaluations. Can you please clarify the intent?

**3:22 John Henderson:**

Ryan -- 10.1 is your overall evaluation process -- making sure it is systematic, whereas 10.2 is emphasizing your assessment of outcomes (results). 10.3 is tracking of data over time to determine your success in meeting agency objectives. Performance measures can be an effective tool for evaluation. 10.1 is the fundamental standard. It is possible to meet 10.1 even if you choose to not have performance measures. Likewise you can also have a systematic program of evaluation the emphasizes outputs and efficiencies without meeting the outcomes emphasis of 10.2.

3:24

**Danielle Price:**

Okay, it looks like there are no additional questions at this time. We would like to thank all of you for your time and participation today. We will post a transcript of this chat to the CAPRA website in the next week or so. If you have any additional questions, please feel free to email [CAPRA@nrpa.org](mailto:CAPRA@nrpa.org).

Thank you!

3:25

**Dirk Richwine:**

Thank you all for your participation. We really appreciate your input.

3:26

**John Henderson:**

Thanks for taking the time to participate in this session. Your feedback is essential to making sure these are the best standards for our profession.

3:26

**Danielle Price:**

This is the conclusion of today's live chat. Thank you.

3:26

