ILLINOIS
CRIMINAL JUSTICE
INFORMATION AUTHORITY

110438

ANNUAL AUDIT REPORT FOR 1982-1983:

Data Quality of Computerized Criminal Histories

October 1983

ILLINOIS CRIMINAL JUSTICE INFORMATION AUTHORITY
William Gould, Chairman

J. David Coldren, Executive Director
James E. Lucas, Audit Unit Coordinator

Printed by authority of the State of Illinois
October 1983
Number of copies: 300
Printing order number: 84-8

CONTENTS

ILLINOIS
CRIMINAL JUSTICE
INFORMATION AUTHORITY

~ RESOLUTION ~

12 (1983)

Annual Audit Report 1982-83

WHEREAS the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority is responsible for conducting annual and periodic audits of the procedures, policies, and practices of the state central repositories for criminal history record information; and

WHEREAS the Computerized Criminal History (CCH) System maintained by the Illinois Department of Law Enforcement has been examined by the Authority for compliance with federal and state laws with respect to accuracy and completeness and delinquent disposition monitoring:

Be it **RESOLVED** that the Annual Audit Report attached hereto is hereby adopted by the Authority.

Be it **FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Chairman is authorized to release the Annual Audit Report, after providing the Department of Law Enforcement an opportunity to respond to these findings by October 15, 1983.

ADOPTED by the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority this 26th day of September, 1983, by unanimous voice vote.

William Gould
Chairman

ILLINOIS
CRIMINAL JUSTICE
INFORMATION AUTHORITY

120 South Riverside Plaza Chicago, Illinois 60606 (312) 793-8550

CERTIFICATION

The Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority hereby certifies that the criminal history recordkeeping procedures and practices of the Illinois Department of Law Enforcement have been tested to ensure compliance with Federal and State privacy and security laws and regulations. During the course of examination, consideration has been given to accuracy and completeness, and delinquent disposition monitoring procedures. The Authority's examination was conducted on a test basis and as such cannot assure discovery of all types of irregularities.

Attached hereto, is the full report of the Authority, its findings and recommendations for 1982-1983.

William Gould
Chairman

Dated: 10/21/83

Executive Summary

The Authority's Annual Audit focuses upon five major areas concerning the quality of criminal history record information: (1) the extent of missing identification information in the Computerized Criminal History (CCH) data base; (2) the accuracy of identification information in the CCH data base; (3) the accuracy of criminal history information on the CCH system; (4) the completeness of criminal history information; and (5) the cross-validation or triangulation of independently maintained automated criminal justice information systems.

Computer-generated reports of missing identification information for the entire CCH data base (1,184,984 persons) found that missing identification data was not a serious problem, being most prevalent for non-primary search items. Among the non-primary search items, the worst item was place of birth with a missing rate of about 1.9%.

A stratified sample of 780 records on the CCH system was manually compared against original source documents. The audit revealed that while 10.3% of the subjects had some kind of inaccuracy in their identification information, about 1.5% contained an inaccuracy serious enough to preclude a "hit" or positive response when an inquiry on a particular individual was made via the Law Enforcement Agencies Data System (LEADS).

Criminal history information for 400 persons on the CCH system was manually compared with original source documents to ascertain the accuracy of this information. Of the 1,776 arrests comprising this sample, about 82% had no error. Excluding statutory class, about 1.6% of the arrest events had an inaccuracy in their arrest information; 0.7% had an inaccuracy in state's attorney information. 0.7% had an inaccuracy in court information, 0.01% had an inaccuracy in custodial information, and 0.03% in bond information,

An analysis of the 1,236,807 arrest events on the CCH system at the time, which indicated the completeness of dispositional information, showed that approximately 58% of the arrest events on the CCH system had no disposition of any kind. The analysis also revealed that older arrests were more likely to have a disposition than newer arrests. This finding was corroborated by the manual audit, as well as the triangulation of the CCH and the Illinois Department of Corrections CIMIS data base.

Criminal history information of 525 inmates on the Correctional Institution Management Information System (CIMIS)

with the same information on CCH showed that about 47% of the inmates had a summary transcript on the CCH system, while the remaining inmates had only identification information on CCH. Comparison of these two data bases indicated that about 60% of CCH records compared with CIMIS were in agreement, while 40% were discrepant.

List of Tables

I. Introduction

Rap sheets are the most widely used records in the criminal justice process. Criminal justice agencies rely upon criminal history record information (CHRI) to make discretionary decisions at various decision points in the criminal justice system (CJS). If CHRI is to be used in the course of informed decision making, the quality of CHRI, which serves as the basis for these decisions, must be assured. Despite the importance of the quality of CHRI, a recent Office of Technology Assessment study (OTA, 1982:104) indicated that 36 of the 49 states surveyed (73.5%) have never conducted an audit of the quality of CHRI stored in state repositories.

This audit report attempts to bridge the gap between legislation regulations concerning the quality of CHRI and the procedures involved in conducting such an audit.1/ In the past, there have been several audit manuals concerned with the auditing of CHRI (Search, 1983; Connecticut Justice Commission, 1981). Typically, however, because these manuals have had to cover a wide range of audit issues--e.g., completeness and accuracy, dissemination, security, and access and review--they could not devote much time to data quality issues. This audit addresses

---

1/A methodological paper, which complements the present paper, discusses research design and methodological issues in more detail.

data quality issues in more detail, and shows, by example, how such an audit might be conducted.

The purpose of the annual audit of criminal history records is to ensure the quality of criminal history information. While such an audit does not guarantee the accuracy and completeness of each and every record, it provides a means for discovering and correcting errors in CHRI. This is essential for ensuring the privacy and security of the individual, and for informed decision making on the part of criminal justice agencies.

This year's audit of the Department of Law Enforcement's (DLE) Computerized Criminal History (CCH) system differs from previous audits of the Illinois CCH system in several ways. First, extensive use was made of available information technology. When possible, information management systems were used to produce reports relevant to particular issues. Moreover, "triangulation" was made possible through the comparison of independently maintained criminal justice information systems.2/ Second, the reliance upon information technology afforded a more extensive analysis than previously possible. This is reflected

---

2/Triangulation is a methodological rule of thumb based on the assumption that no single measure is a perfect indicator of a concept. To overcome the bias of a single measure, the researcher uses multiple measures of a concept. By using multiple measures obtained from independent samples, and by different methods, the researcher is able to "home in on" or "triangulate on" the concept.

in two ways: (1) sample sizes are much larger than in the past; and (2) a wider range of statistical reports are available because of the computer-assisted audit. Third, because of the focus on issues of data quality, the audit did not focus on issues of dissemination, security, and access and review. Past audits of the CCH system in Illinois have dealt with these issues extensively (ICJIC, 1980; 1981; Auditor General, 1982).

Five major areas concerning the quality of CHRI are examined: (1) The extent of missing data items in the identification segments on the CCH system was investigated; (2) The accuracy of identification segments of records on the CCH data base was checked against original source documentation; (3) On-line CHRI contained on "CCH Complete" records3/ was checked against original source documentation; (4) The dispositional status of arrest events on the CCH system was examined; (5) Finally, inmates from the Illinois Department of Corrections (IDOC) on the

---

3/The terms "CCH Complete" and "CCH Incomplete" are used by DLE to indicate whether, from a user's perspective, criminal history information is available on-line (i.e., whether an individual has a "rap sheet" on the CCH system). "CCH Complete" indicates that an individual has an on-line rap sheet. "CCH Incomplete" means an individual has only an identification segment on the CCH system, which refers inquiries to a manual rap sheet.

When a police department makes an inquiry about an individual, the type of response it receives depends on whether the individual's criminal history is on-line. If it is on-line, an inquiry will produce a summary rap sheet. If the record is not on-line, the inquiry will provide a file or jacket number where a manual rap sheet can be found.

Correctional Institution Management Information System (CIMIS) were checked against the CCH data base to see if: (a) they have records on CCH; and (b) whether their CCH records are up-to-date.

II. Missing Data Items in Identification Segments

As the first step in this year's CCH audit, a number of the fields in the identification (ID) segment of CCH records were examined. Several EASYTRIEVE programs were written and run against the CCH data base in order to provide the data necessary for a large scale analysis of record completeness in the CCH data base.4/ These programs provided us with a breakdown of ten variables on the ID segment of a CCH record, which enabled us to evaluate the extent to which missing information is a problem on the CCH data base.5/ Findings from this portion of the audit are reported below. These findings are interesting not only because they tell us something about the completeness of records, and potential problem areas, but also because they provide some interesting information about persons on the CCH data base.

4/EASYTRIEVE is an information retrieval and data base management system (DBMS) designed by Pansophic, Inc. primarily for IBM 360/370 systems. It is particularly useful for generating statistical reports from hierarchical data bases, such as the CCH data base.

5/The ten elements or variables examined were: record status, race, sex, hair color, eye color, height, weight, place of birth, date of birth, and fingerprint classifications.

The results reported are based on two samples. The first, was taken on September 30, 1982, and is comprised of some 1,184,984 subjects. The second sample was taken on October 6, 1982, and is comprised of 1,199,059 subjects.

There are four possible statuses a record may have: complete, incomplete, deceased, and one test record (FAX). For all practical purposes we will be concerned only with "complete" and "incomplete" records. A "CCH Complete" record is an on-line record which contains identification information as well as all criminal justice contacts and transactions reported to DLE. Full computer-generated "rap sheets" can be obtained from "CCH Complete" records (see Appendix A for a facsimile of a CCH generated rap sheet). A "CCH Incomplete" record is an on-line ID segment which refers to a manual file that contains criminal history information. The majority of the records (665,037, or 56.1%) are coded incomplete, while 515,459, or 43.5%, are coded complete. Less than 1% of the records on the system fall into the deceased or FAX categories.

A breakdown of the race variable is shown in Table 1. Almost two-thirds (65.5%) of the subjects on file were classified as white, while slightly more than one-third of the subjects (34.2%) were classified as black. Of the entire sample, only 3,979 subjects had a missing value for this variable--i.e., their race was unknown. This constitutes about 0.3% of the sample.

Table 1

Race/Ethnicity of All Subjects on CCH Data Base, September 30, 1982.

White	774,404	(65.5%)
Black	404,733	(34.2%)
American Indian	1,432	(0.1%)
Asian	436	(0.0%)
Unknown	3,979	(0.3%)
Total	1,184,984	

With regard to the gender of record holders on the CCH data base, it was found that 969,708 (81.8%) were males, and 215,276 (18.2%) were females. No subject had an unknown or missing value code for this variable.

Table 2 presents a breakdown of the variable hair color. Of those subjects on the CCH data base, 5,332, or about 0.5% of the sample had a missing value for this variable. The majority of these (4,397) had been left blank, while for another 935 subjects "XXX" had been entered as their hair color.

A breakdown of the variable eye color is given in Table 3. Again, about 0.5% (5,878) of the sample had a missing value for this variable. Most of these (4,956) had been left blank, while "XXX" had been entered for another 922.

Table 4 presents height for given categories. About 0.2% or 2,134 subjects had no entry for height. According to this breakdown there were 1,919 (0.2%) persons 7 feet or taller in height. This seemed an extremely high proportion when compared with the distribution of heights for the general population in the U.S. (DHEW, 1979). The proportion of persons 6 feet 4 inches in height or taller was better than twice that of the general U.S.

Table 2

Hair Color of All Subjects on the CCH Data Base
September 30, 1982.

Bald	694	(0.1%)
Black	496,016	(41.9%)
Blonde	104,353	(8.8%)
Brown	529,906	(44.7%)
Grey	24,163	(2.0%)
Red	23,338	(2.0%)
Sandy	351	(0.0%)
White	831	(0.1%)
XXX	935	(0.1%)
"Blank"	4,397	(0.4%)
Total	1,184,984	

Table 3

Eye Color of All Subjects on the CCH Data Base
September 9, 1982.

Black	7,717	(0.6%)
Blue	270,553	(22.8%)
Brown	731,898	(61.8%)
Green	70,596	(5.9%)
Grey	10,810	(0.9%)
Hazel	80,992	(6.8%)
Maroon	6,540	(0.6%)
XXX	922	(0.1%)
"Blank"	4,956	(0.4%)
Total	1,184,984	

Table 4

Height of All Subjects on the CCH Data Base
September 30, 1982.

Less than 5 feet	6,631	(0.6%)
5 to 5 1/2 feet	28,967	(2.4%)
5 1/2 to 6 feet	697,602	(58.9%)
6 to 6 1/2 feet	252,432	(21.3%)
6 1/2 to 7 feet	5,299	(0.5%)
7 feet or taller	1,919	(0.2%)
"000" (Missing)	2,134	(0.2%)
Total	1,184,984	

population.6/

Similarly, 3,048 (0.3%) of the subjects on CCH had no information concerning their weight. While there were no missing information categories for the place of birth variable, there was a generic catchall category labelled "US" which would not indicate the state and/or country of birth. Some 22,981 (1.9%) subjects had this generic code entered as their place of birth.

Table 5 shows a breakdown of year of birth for the entire sample. About 0.3% (3,542) of the subjects lacked information on date of birth. This includes all those for whom day, month, or year of birth were missing.7/

In Table 6, the percentage of records with a missing value code for a given ID element is presented. In addition, the number of records with missing fields which could be expected per 10,000 records is also presented. The analysis reveals that only a very small proportion of the sample has a missing value code for any

---

6/The subsequent manual audit of identification information on CCH revealed that this large proportion of persons 7 feet or taller in height was a result of a systematic error. This error usually occurred when height had been taken from older arrest cards--i.e., prior to 1976. Older arrest cards usually expressed height in inches, while CCH format expresses height in feet and inches. Thus, for example, someone who was listed as 72" tall on a pre-1976 arrest card was often coded as 7' 2" on CCH.

7/Presently, DLE allows only two columns for year of birth. Thus, it is difficult to distinguish between an individual born in 1870 and one born in 1970. DLE is aware of this problem, and is working on a solution.

Table 5

Year of Birth of All Subjects on the CCH Data Base September 30, 1982.

Period		
1901-1909	7,318	(0.6%)
1910-1919	35,037	(2.9%)
1920-1929	78,175	(6.6%)
1930-1939	119,501	(10.1%)
1940-1949	320,572	(27.1%)
1950-1959	470,708	(39.7%)
1960-1969	148,739	(12.6%)
Other	1,392	(0.1%)
Missing	3,542	(0.3%)
Total	1,184,984	

*/ Other includes those born prior to 1901, and those subsequent to 1969.

Table 6

Percentage of CCH Data Base with Missing Data by Element
September 30, 1982.

Element	% of Sample Missing	Missing per 10,000
Race*	0.34%	34
Sex*	0.00%	0
Date of Birth*	0.29%	29
Hair Color	0.45%	45
Eye Color	0.49%	49
Height	0.18%	18
Weight	0.26%	26
Place of Birth**	1.92%	192
Record Status	0.00%	0

* Indicates primary search item for LEADS/CCH inquiries.

**Place of Birth figures are based on the CCH Data Base for the date October 6, 1982.

given element on the ID segment. The variable with the largest proportion of missing data is place of birth (1.92%). This means that if we looked at 10,000 records on the CCH data base, we would expect about 192 to have been coded as having no place of birth.

These results are subject to two qualifications: (1) the arresting agency may not have provided DLE with the information when filling out the arrest card; and (2) many of the fields examined do not represent primary search items. There are five variables or elements which are employed by DLE to search the CCH data base: name, race, sex, date of birth, and state identification number. Generally, primary search items were less likely to contain missing value codes than non-search items.

III. Evaluating Data Base Quality: Classification of Errors

The Federal Regulations which govern such audits are not very specific in terms of an operational definition of accuracy. According to the Federal Regulations, an "accurate" record is one which contains no "erroneous" information (Search, 1983: 17).

In order to overcome such ambiguity, several coding procedures were developed. Our goal was to estimate the quality of the CCH data base, and to that end the current audit attempts to evaluate not only the extent, but also the types and seriousness of accuracy errors as well.

First, errors were classified as one of two types: (1) discrepancy error--a difference between the information that appears on the CCH generated records and that which appears on the source documentation;8/ and (2) omission error--information appears on the source documentation, but not on CCH.9/

Second, errors were also classified with regard to their seriousness--i.e., the extent to which they affect an inquiry's ability to make a "hit". There are five items or elements which are crucial for an inquiry: state identification number (key item), name, race, sex, and date of birth. Keeping these issues in mind, seriousness of an error was classified in one of three ways: primary error--if an error in one of the primary search fields precluded a "hit" when an inquiry was made; secondary error--if an error occurred in one of the primary search fields, but did not affect an inquiry; and tertiary error--if an error occurred in an item which is not a primary search item (i.e., in any of the elements other than name, race, sex, date of birth and state identification number).

This approach seems reasonable in as much as it allows an evaluation of the extent, types, and seriousness of inaccuracy errors that occur in the ID segment of CCH Incomplete records. Otherwise, such a detailed evaluation would not be possible.

8/One example of discrepancy error is when a subject's race is reported as "white" on CCH, and "black" on the source document.
9/For example, a subject is reported as having a "scar on forehead", while no scars or marks are reported on CCH.

IV. Accuracy of Identification Information on CCH Records

In order to assess the accuracy of ID information that appears on CCH records, a stratified sample was drawn.10/ Four hundred CCH Incomplete and 400 CCH Complete records were randomly selected from each stratum, yielding a total sample of 800.11/

On November 17 and 18, 1982, audit staff conducted an accuracy audit on a random sample of some 400 CCH Incomplete records. The state identification numbers of these 400 hundred subjects were randomly generated, and the manual file jacket for each of these records was subsequently pulled by DLE staff. A BCI check12/ was also generated for each of these subjects.

10/Stratified sampling generally consists of several steps. (1) The entire population of sampling units (in this case CCH records) is divided into distinct subpopulations called "strata". (The first stratum or subpopulation is comprised of CCH incomplete records, the second is comprised of CCH complete records.) (2) Within each stratum a separate sample is selected from all sampling units comprising that stratum. (3) From each stratum sample a separate stratum mean is calculated. (4) Each stratum mean is weighted to obtain a combined estimate for the entire population (i.e., all records on the CCH data base). A more detailed description of stratified sampling can be found in Kish (1965: 75-112). Also see Arkin (1974).

11/The "target" sample is the number of records one ideally hopes to audit, in this case 800. Once the audit had been completed, 780 records had actually been audited.

12/BCI stands for Bureau of Criminal Identification, which is the old name for the Bureau of Identification. A BCI check is a computer-generated report that consists mainly of identification information resident on the CCH data base. A facsimile of a BCI check is shown in Appendix A.

In terms of CCH Incomplete records, the accuracy audit focused on the extent to which ID information contained on the computer-generated BCI checks accurately reflects the information contained on the source documents in the subject's file jacket--e.g., arrest cards, master fingerprint cards, etc.13/ The audit focused on 13 elements from the ID segment: NCIC fingerprint classification, place of birth, date of birth, sex, race, height, weight, eye color, hair color, skin tone, scars-marks-tattoos, name, and social security number.

Each of these items that appeared on the individual's summary transcript was compared with the same information that resided on the source documents in the person's file jacket. Whenever a discrepancy or omission was encountered, the coders noted it. These "apparent" inaccuracies were in turn examined by one member of the audit team and a DLE staff person.14/

13/The primary source document for checking identification information is the master fingerprint card. Essentially, this is an arrest card with a high quality set of fingerprints. The use of this document as a primary source of identification information is problematic in that changes in the physical appearance occur over time and may not be reflected on CCH. Some physical identification information may be taken from other arrest cards. Thus, it is difficult to know where identification information came from.

14/The term "apparent" is used since a number of inaccuracies were resolved. Part of this problem arose from the different codes employed on arrest cards, and on CCH. For example, there is not always a perfect one-to-one matching of codes for race, hair color, and skin complexion between source documents and CCH.

A. Accuracy of ID Information on CCH Incomplete Records

Of the 400 records randomly selected, 380 were audited.15/ The majority of the records audited, some 74%, contained no inaccuracy. Ninety-eight of the 380 records audited contained at least one error. Seventy-three of these records contained only one error. Table 7 presents a breakdown of number of errors per record. The maximum number of errors on any record was 4.

Table 8 presents the percentage of records we would expect in the entire CCH Incomplete population, as well as the number of records with inaccuracies one would expect in the entire CCH Incomplete population. About 25.8% of the records audited contained at least one error. Thus, we would expect about 25.8%, or 166,780 records, of all CCH Incomplete records on the data base

15/We were unable to audit a number of records for various reasons. Several of the selected records were applicant records; for several others no master fingerprint card could be located at the time of the audit. This does not greatly detract from the results, nor their precision.

Table 7

Number of Errors per Record in the Identification Segment of a Sample of CCH Incomplete Records

Errors per Record	# of Subjects		# of Errors
No Errors	282	(74.2%)*	0
1 Error	73	(19.2%)	73
2 Errors	23	(6.1%)	46
3 Errors	1	(0.3%)	3
4 Errors	1	(0.3%)	4
Total	380		126

* Percentages do not add to 100% due to rounding error.

Table 8

Estimates of Error in the Identification Segments of CCH Incomplete Records

Seriousness of Inaccuracy	% Inaccurate Records Expected in Data Base	# Inaccurate Records Expected in Data Base
"Primary Error" Inaccuracy Precluding "Hit"	1.05% (0.0-6.08%)*	6,980 (0-40,430)**
"Secondary Error" Inaccuracy Not Precluding "Hit"	5.00% (0.0-10.03%)	33,250 (0-66,700)
"Tertiary Error" Inaccuracy in Non-Search Items	19.21% (14.18-24.24%)	127,750 (94,300-161,200)
Any Inaccuracy	25.08% (20.05-30.11%)	166,780 (133,330-200,230)

* Sample precision for these percentages is + or - 5.03%; figures in parentheses represent the 95% confidence interval.

** Sample precision for each of these estimates is + or - 33,450; figures in parentheses represent the 95% confidence interval.

to contain one or more inaccuracy errors.16/ Seventy-three records (19.21%) contained inaccuracies in the non-search items only. On the basis of this result, we would expect 19.21%, or 127,750 records, of the CCH Incomplete records to contain inaccuracies only in non-search items. However, only 23 (6.05%) of the records audited contained an error in the four search item variables. About 5.00%, or 33,250 records, of the CCH Incomplete records on the data base should contain an inaccuracy in a search item which would not preclude a "hit" when a LEADS inquiry was made. Only 4 of the records audited (1.05%), contained errors serious enough to preclude a "hit" when a LEADS inquiry was made. Thus, we would expect about 6,980 records in the data base to contain such errors.

A detailed breakdown of the type and number of errors for each ID element is presented in Table 9. The results in Table 9 indicate that the majority of the errors that occurred were

---

16/Sampling precision was calculated on the basis of a sample size of 380 records, and a 95% confidence level. The sampling precision is 5.03%. Thus, an error factor of + or - 5.03% must be added to each percentage in Table 8. An error factor of + or - 33,450 must be added to each estimate of the number of inaccuracies in the CCH Data base. Confidence intervals are calculated by subtracting the sample precision from an estimate to get the lower bound, and adding the sample precision to the estimate to get the upper bound. The confidence interval represents the range in which we would expect to find the estimate in 95 samples out of 100. The sample precision and confidence interval tell the researcher how much "confidence" he/she may have in these estimates. The narrower the confidence interval, i.e., the smaller the range in which we expect to find the estimate, the more confident one can be in the estimates.

Table 9

Type of Identification Segment Error for a Sample of CCH Incomplete Records

Item	Discrepancy Errors	Omission Errors	Total
Name*	8	0	8
Race*	4	0	4
Sex*	0	0	0
Date of Birth*	10	1	11
Subtotal	22	1	23
Fingerprint Classification	13	0	13
Place of Birth	9	0	9
Height	7	0	7
Weight	6	0	6
Eye Color	2	0	2
Hair Color	4	0	4
Skin Tone	13	0	13
Scars-Marks-Tattoos	3	17	20
Social Security Number	3	26	29
Subtotal	60	43	103
Total	82 (65.1%)	44 (34.9%)	126

* Primary search items for LEADS inquiries.

discrepancy errors (65.1%). The majority of the omission errors occurred in two items: scars-marks-tattoos and social security number. The starred items in the table represent primary search items. Only 23 of the 126 errors (18.5%) occurred in these items. Of the 4,940 items audited (13 items per record x 380 records = 4,940), 126 items were found to be in error. This represents about 2.57% of the items audited.17/

These results appear to indicate that accuracy is not a serious problem for CCH Incomplete records. The fairly high degree of accuracy among the primary search items is indicative of the quality of the data base. Nonetheless, inaccuracies in the ID segment should be corrected whenever possible.

B. Accuracy of ID Information in CCH Complete Records

The manual audit of the second stratum sample of CCH Complete records was conducted between December 7 and 13, 1982.18/ The records of 400 subjects were audited. The state identification numbers of these subjects were randomly generated, computer transcripts were generated, and the manual file containing the original source documents for each of these subjects was pulled.

17/All inaccurate records were noted and given to DLE to be corrected.

18/"CCH Complete" means that all criminal history information which the DLE has received on a given individual is on the CCH data base.

With respect to CCH Complete records, the accuracy audit focused on the extent to which identification information on the computer-generated transcripts reflected that on the source documents in the subject's manual file. In addition, every criminal justice system (CJS) contact and transaction--e.g., arrests, state's attorney dispositions, court dispositions, bond information, and custodial actions--that appeared on the CCH transcript was compared against source documents in the manual file. Thus, the focus was upon the accuracy of both the ID information and criminal history information on CCH.

Nine ID items were checked, including subject's: name, date of birth, sex, race, hair color, eye color, height, weight and fingerprint classification.

Each of these items was compared with the same information on the original source documents. Whenever there was a discrepancy or omission encountered, it was noted by the coders. These apparent inaccuracies were examined by a member of the audit team, and a member of the DLE staff.

As mentioned above, the records of 400 subjects were audited. The majority of the records audited (92.8%) contained no inaccuracy in their identification information. Twenty-nine of the records audited had at least one error. Table 10 presents the number of errors per subject. The maximum number of errors on any record was 4.

Table 10

Number of Errors per Record in the Identification Segment of a Sample of CCH Complete Records

Errors per record	# of Subjects	# of Errors
No Errors	371 (92.8%)	0
1 Error	24 (6.0%)	24
2 Errors	3 (0.8%)	6
3 Errors	0 (0.0%)	0
4 Errors	2 (0.5%)	8
Total	400	38

* Percentages do not add to exactly 100% due to rounding error.

A breakdown of the type and extent of error by item is shown in Table 11. A total of 38 inaccuracies were found; 17 of these (44.7%) occurred in the primary search items (name, race, sex, and date of birth), 21 (55.3%) in non-search items.

Table 12 presents the percentage and number of records with primary, secondary, and tertiary errors which are estimated to be in the "CCH Complete" data base. We would expect about 7.25% of the CCH Complete records in the data base (about 37,370) to have an inaccuracy of some kind in their identification information. About 4.5% or 23,200, can be expected to have at an inaccuracy in a non-search item. Approximately 2.25% of the CCH Complete records ,or 11,600, can be expected to have an inaccuracy in a search item which will not preclude a "hit" on a LEADS inquiry. Finally, we would expect around 2.0% of the CCH Complete records, about 10,300, to have an inaccuracy in a search item serious enough to preclude a "hit" on a LEADS inquiry.

C. Combining the Two Samples

The two stratum samples were combined to provide information about the CCH data base as a whole. Table 13 shows a breakdown of ID inaccuracies by item and type of error for the 780 records audited. Table 14 presents the percent of error types found in the sample, and uses these to estimate the number of inaccurate records one would expect to find in the CCH data base.

Table 11

Type of Identification Segment Error for a Sample of CCH Complete Records

Item	Discrepancy Errors	Omission Errors	Total
Name*	11	0	11
Race*	2	1	3
Sex*	0	0	0
Date of Birth*	3	0	3
Subtotal	16	1	17
Fingerprint Classification	11	0	11
Weight	3	0	3
Height	4	0	4
Eye Color	0	0	0
Hair Color	0	3	3
Subtotal	18	3	21
Total	34	4	38

* Indicates primary search items for LEADS inquiries.

Table 12

Estimates of Error in the Identification Segments of CCH Complete Records

Seriousness of Inaccuracy	% Inaccurate Records Expected in Data Base	# Inaccurate Records Expected in Data Base
"Primary Error" Inaccuracy Precluding "Hit"	2.00%* (0.00-6.90%)	10,309** (0-35,570)
"Secondary Error" Inaccuracy Not Precluding "Hit"	2.25% (0.00-7.15%)	11,598 (0-36,856)
"Tertiary Error" Inaccuracy in Non-Search Item	4.50% (0.00-9.40%)	23,195 (0-48,455)
Any Inaccuracy	7.25% (2.35-12.15%)	37,370 (11,712-62,630)

* Sample precision for these percentages is + or - 4.90%.

** Sample precision for these estimates is + or - 25,260.

Table 13

Type of ID Error by Item Combined Sample of CCH Complete and Incomplete Records

Item	Discrepancy Errors	Omission Errors	Total Errors
Name*	19	0	19
Race*	6	1	7
Sex*	0	0	0
Date of Birth*	13	1	14
Subtotal	38	2	40
Fingerprint Classification	24	0	24
Weight	9	0	9
Height	11	0	11
Eye Color	2	0	2
Hair Color	4	3	7
Subtotal	50	3	53
Total	88	5	93

Table 14

Estimates of ID Error in CCH Data Base

Type of Error	% Inaccurate Records Expected in Data Base	# Inaccurate Records Expected in Data Base
Primary Error	1.47%* (1.04-1.90%)	17,400** (12,300-22,500)
Secondary Error	3.79% (3.08-4.50%)	44,900 (34,500-53,300)
Tertiary Error	5.96% (5.09-6.83%)	70,600 (60,300-80,900)
Any Error	10.27% (9.16-11.38%)	121,700 (108,500-134,900)

* Estimates and ranges are based on systematic sampling estimation procedures. The two samples, CCH Complete and Incomplete records, are combined.

** Numbers have been rounded to the nearest 100.

Approximately 10.3% or 121,700 should have an error of some kind; however, the seriousness of these errors varies. This table indicates that one would expect about 1.5%, or 17,400 records in the CCH data base, to have primary errors. About 3.8% or 44,900, should have secondary errors, and 5.9%, or 70,600, will contain a tertiary error.

V. Accuracy of Criminal History Information

Criminal history information encompasses arrest, state's attorney, court, bond, and custodial information for an individual. All criminal history information that appeared on the CCH transcript (i.e., on-line transcript) was checked against source documentation (see Table 15 for list of criminal history items). Naturally, the number of items actually checked varied from subject to subject with the number of CJS contacts.

Each criminal history segment begins with an arrest segment, and may contain additional segments--i.e., a state's attorney segment, a court segment, a bond segment, and a custodial segment. Thus, it is possible, but not necessary, for this arrest information to have state's attorney, court, bond, and custodial information associated with it. Table 16 indicates the number of state's attorney, court, bond, and custodial information segments which were audited.

Table 15

Criminal History Items Audited

Arrest Segment

Arresting Agency
Document Control Number
Date of Arrest
Statute Citation
Charge Description
Statutory Class

State's Attorney Segment

State's Attorney
Document Control Number
Case Number
Date of Disposition
Statute Citation
Action (filed/not filed)
Charge Description
Statutory Class

Court Segment

Court
Document Control Number
Case Number
Date of Disposition
Statute Citation
Disposition
Charge Description
Statutory Class
Sentence/Action

Bond Segment

Type of Bond
Amount
Bond Forfeiture Warrant Issued
Bond Forfeiture Warrant Quashed

Custodial Segment

Institution
Document Number
Date of Action
Action

Table 16

Number of CCH Complete Records Checked for Various Data Segments

State's Attorney Segment

No Information	CCH & Source	No Source*	No CCH
1139 (64.1%)	203 (11.4%)	429 (24.2%)	3 (0.2%)

Court Segment

No Information	CCH & Source	No Source*	No CCH
1128 (63.5%)	297 (16.7%)	339 (19.1%)	11 (0.6%)

Custodial Segment

No Information	CCH & Source	No Source*	No CCH
1689 (95.1%)	66 (3.7%)	19 (1.1%)	1 (0.1%)

Bond Segment

No Information	CCH & Source	No Source*	No CCH
1645 (92.6%)	78 (4.4%)	51 (2.87%)	1 (0.1%)

* The accuracy of information could not be evaluated when source documentation was not available.

The majority of the arrest segments (64.1%) had no state's attorney information. Of the 635 which did, 203 (31.9%) had state's attorney information on both the CCH transcript and an original source document against which to compare it. Another 429 (67.5%) of these arrest segments had state's attorney information on their CCH transcript, but no source document against which to test its accuracy.19/ Another 3 (0.5%) of the arrest segments had no state's attorney information on their CCH transcript, but had source documents in their manual jacket.

Similarly, the majority of arrest segments (63.5%) had no court information of any kind. Of the 647 records which did contain court information, 297 (45.9%) had court information on both CCH and source documentation; 339 (52.4%) had such information on CCH, but no source documentation; and 11 records had court information on source documents which was not contained on their CCH transcripts.

About 95% of the arrest records had no custodial information. Of those 86 records which did have custodial information, 66 (76.7%) had both CCH and source documentation, 19 (22.1%) had

---

19/Information that appeared on a CCH transcript, but had no source document was often the result of information which had been entered directly by tape. That is, the court would send a magnetic tape, which contained dispositional information, to DLE in lieu of paper documents. The accuracy of such information could not be verified without source documentation.

information on CCH but no source documentation, and 1 record had custodial information on paper documentation that was not on CCH.

Nearly 93% of the arrest records had no bond information. One hundred and thirty of the records did contain bond information. Of these, 78 (60.0%) had this information on both CCH and source documents; another 51 (39.2%) had information on CCH, but no source documents; and 1 record had bond information on source documents that was not reflected in the CCH transcript.

Table 17 indicates the number of errors per arrest record. The maximum number of errors on any arrest record was 6. The majority of records (1,459, or 82.2%) had no error. There was a total 364 inaccuracies found in the criminal history information of the records audited.

In Table 18, an item by item breakdown of these inaccuracies is presented for each criminal history segment. The item with the greatest number of inaccuracies was statutory class on the arrest segment. Of the 1,776 records audited, 271 (15.3%) had statutory

Table 17

Number of Errors per Arrest Record CCH Complete Records

Errors per Record	# of Records		# of Errors
No Errors	1,459	(82.2%)	0
1 Error	290	(16.3%)	290
2 Errors	16	(0.9%)	32
3 Errors	5	(0.3%)	15
4 Errors	4	(0.2%)	16
5 Errors	1	(0.1%)	5
6 Errors	1	(0.1%)	6
Total	1,776		364

Table 18

Type of Criminal History Segment Error for a Sample of CCH Complete Records

Item	Omission Errors	Discrepancy Errors	Total
ARREST INFORMATION			
Arresting Agency	0	3	3
DCN	0	4	4
Date of Arrest	0	3	3
Statute Citation	0	17	17
Statutory Class	271	1	272
Subtotal	271	28	299
STATE'S ATTORNEY INFORMATION			
State's Attorney	1	0	1
Case Number	0	7	7
Date of Disposition	0	3	3
Statute Citation	0	1	1
Action	0	0	0
Charge	1	0	1
Statutory Class	0	0	0
Subtotal	2	11	13
COURT INFORMATION			
Court	0	0	0
Date of Disposition	0	6	6
Statute Citation	0	1	1
Disposition	0	1	1
Charge	0	2	2
Statutory Class	0	1	1
Sentence	1	0	1
Subtotal	1	11	12

Table 18 (Continued)

CUSTODIAL INFORMATION			
Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Document Number	0	0	0
Date of Action	1	0	1
Type of Action	0	0	0
Subtotal	1	0	1
BOND INFORMATION			
Bond Type	0	0	0
Bond Amount	1	4	5
Bond Forfeiture Warrant Issued	0	0	0
Bond Forfeiture Warrant Quashed	0	0	0
Subtotal	1	4	5
Total	276	54	330

class omitted on their CCH transcript.20/ In general, criminal history information appears to be fairly accurate.

Table 19 shows both the percentage and number of criminal history segments which we would expect to have inaccuracies in the CCH data base. For example, we would expect 16.84%, or about 335,700 criminal history segments, to have an error in their arrest information. If statutory class omission errors are excluded from the calculations, 1.58% of the arrest events contained an inaccuracy in arrest information (about 31,500 in the data base). About 0.73%, or 14,500, would be expected to have an inaccuracy in their state's attorney information; 0.68%, or 13,500, would be expected to have an inaccuracy in their court information. Only about 0.01%, or 200, would be expected to have at least one inaccuracy in their custodial information; and about 0.03%, or 600, in their bond information. In general, we would expect about 18.6%, or 370,400, of the 1.99 million criminal history segments, to have at least one inaccuracy. Again, if statutory class omission errors are excluded from calculations,

---

20/Statutory class of an offense is frequently difficult to determine at the time of arrest. Consequently, arrest fingerprint cards are often submitted to DLE with erroneous or missing statutory class information. This is especially problematic in the case of marijuana and controlled substances arrests where statutory class depends on a laboratory analysis to identify the substance, and its weight. This is also problematic for theft offenses, where statutory class depends upon dollar amount of the items stolen. As a result of such problems, DLE was not entering this field on the system for a period of time, but has resumed entering this item.

Table 19

Estimates of Inaccuracies in CCH Complete Records in the Entire CCH Data Base

Type of Information	% Inaccurate Records Expected in Data Base	# Inaccurate Records Expected in Data Base
Arrest Including Statutory Class	16.84% (11.94-21.74%)	335,714 (238,030-433,398)
Arrest Excluding Statutory Class**	1.58% (0.00-6.48%)	31,498 (0-129,182)
State's Attorney	0.73% (0.00-5.63%)	14,553 (0-113,234)
Court	0.68% (0.00-5.58%)	13,556 (0-111,240)
Custodial	0.01% (0.00-4.91%)	200 (0-97,883)
Bond	0.03% (0.00-4.93%)	600 (0-98,282)
Any Inaccuracy	18.58% (13.68-23.48%)	370,402 (272,718-468,086)
Any Inaccuracy Excluding Statutory Class**	3.31% (0.00-8.22%)	66,186 (0-163,870)

* Sample precision is about + or - 4.90% or 97,700.

**Statutory class errors have been excluded from calculations.

one would expect about 3.3%, or 66,000 of the criminal histories, to have at least one inaccuracy.

VI. Completeness of Criminal History Information

In Table 20 the number of arrests per subject is listed. The 400 subjects who were audited accounted for 1,776 arrests. A large proportion of subjects (34.8%) had only one arrest. These individuals accounted for only 7.8% of the 1,776 arrests. Better than 10% of the individuals audited had 11 or more arrests on their record. In contrast, these individuals accounted for 42.0% of the 1,776 arrests.21/ The average number of arrests per subject was 4.42, while the median number of arrests was 2.34.

Throughout, two units of analysis are used: the individual subject; and the arrest event or arrest segment.22/

While the manual audit was not primarily designed to be a completeness audit--i.e., to measure the extent to which current data are on the system--it affords an opportunity to evaluate the

---

21/Wolfgang et al. (1972:88) found that about 18% of the individuals in their sample were recidivists, and these recidivists accounted for 84.2% of the arrests. Approximately 28.5% of those in the present sample are recidivists, and these individuals accounted for 92.2% of the arrests.

22/An "arrest event" or "arrest segment" refers to an event which is initiated with a police arrest. An "arrest event" is not the same as a "charge." A given event could be comprised of several charges. Thus, an individual who is arrested may be charged with several offenses, e.g., assault and battery. Each "arrest event" may have a state's attorney disposition, a court disposition, bond information, and custodial information associated with it.

Table 20

Number of Arrests per Subject for Sample of CCH Complete Records

Arrest per Subject	# of Subjects		# of Arrests	
1 Arrest	139	(34.8%)	139	(7.8%)
2 Arrests	73	(18.3%)	146	(8.2%)
3 Arrests	48	(12.0%)	144	(8.1%)
4 Arrests	26	(6.5%)	104	(5.8%)
5 Arrests	16	(4.0%)	80	(4.5%)
6 Arrests	18	(4.5%)	108	(6.1%)
7 Arrests	11	(2.8%)	77	(4.3%)
8 Arrests	8	(2.0%)	64	(3.6%)
9 Arrests	12	(3.0%)	108	(6.1%)
10 Arrests	6	(1.5%)	60	(3.4%)
11 or More Arrests	43	(10.7%)	746	(42.0%)
Total	400		1,776	

Average # of Arrests=4.42, Median # of Arrests=2.34, Maximum # of Arrests=38

completeness of CCH Complete records. For this analysis, the arrest segment is used as the unit of analysis.

Of the 1,776 arrest events or segments posted by the 400 subjects audited, 1,122 or 63% had no disposition of any kind.23/ In Table 21, a crosstabulation of disposition status by year of arrest is shown. In general, older arrests are more likely to have a disposition than more recent ones.24/ For example, while 87% of the arrests from 1982 had no disposition, this percentage drops to 70% for 1981 arrests; 56% for 1980 arrests; 62% in 1979; 65% in 1978; and 58% for arrests from 1977 or earlier.

Another EASYTRIEVE program was written to obtain the breakdown of dispositional status, by year of arrest event, for the 1,236,807 arrest events in the CCH data base on February 16, 1983. The breakdown is presented in Table 22. Overall, 58.5% of the arrest events had no disposition of any kind. As with our survey results, older arrest events are more likely to have a disposition. These findings are consistent with earlier audit results both for the State of Illinois (Auditor General, 1982: 31) and for the State of New York (Doernberg and Zeigler, 1980:

23/That is, these arrest segments had neither a state's attorney disposition, nor a court disposition.

24/The chi-square test was significant at the .01 level, with 5 degrees of freedom. The gamma (-.180) was modest, but negative.

Table 21

Dispositional Status of Charge by Year of Arrest for a Sample of CCH Complete Records

Year	No Disposition		Disposition		Total
1977 or Earlier	405	(58.3%)	290	(41.7%)	695
1978	143	(65.0%)	77	(35.0%)	220
1979	133	(62.1%)	81	(37.9%)	214
1980	133	(56.1%)	104	(43.9%)	237
1981	154	(70.3%)	65	(29.7%)	219
1982	145	(87.3%)	21	(12.7%)	166
Total	1,113	(63.6%)	638	(36.4%)	1,751*

* Chi-square= 59.32, with 5 degrees of freedom; p [.01; Gamma= -.192. There were 25 cases for which arrest year had not been coded. These cases were not included in the table above..

Table 22

Dispositional Status of All Arrest Events on CCH
February 16, 1983

Year	No Disposition of Any Kind	State's Atty. Disp. Only	Court Disposition	Total Arrest Events
1976	9,021 (32.2%)	9,805 (35.0%)	9,222 (32.9%)	28,048
1977	47,924 (44.2%)	30,446 (28.1%)	30,157 (27.8%)	108,527
1978	109,134 (55.3%)	43,143 (21.8%)	45,222 (22.9%)	197,499
1979	126,842 (59.3%)	41,382 (19.3%)	45,650 (21.3%)	213,874
1980	101,026 (53.4%)	47,659 (25.2%)	40,560 (21.4%)	189,245
1981	144,975 (57.3%)	53,507 (21.1%)	54,707 (21.6%)	253,189
1982	165,557 (73.1%)	25,342 (11.2%)	35,671 (15.7%)	226,570
1983	18,570 (93.5%)	432 (2.2%)	853 (4.3%)	19,855
Total	723,049 (58.5%)	251,716 (20.4%)	262,042 (21.2%)	1,236,807

* Chi-square= 52,269.27, with 14 degrees of freedom; p [.01; Gamma= -.180.

1160).25/

We have tried to pinpoint the reason for the delinquency of dispositional information for arrest events by utilizing existing sources of data--e.g., Illinois Uniform Crime Reports, Annual Report of the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts, etc. Several causes appear to contribute to this. (1) There are approximately 6,000 arrests per year which police do not prosecute -- i.e., essentially a station adjustment. In many cases these police dispositions are not reported by the police to DLE. These could account for as many as 30,000 of the arrest events without a disposition.26/ (2) When state's attorneys do not file on a case they often do not report to DLE. Thus, if a case has not been filed, it is unlikely that such an action will be indicated on the record. It is estimated that "no file" decisions could ac-

---

25/A chi-square test was significant at the .01 level, with 14 degrees of freedom. Again, the gamma (-.192) was modest, but negative.

26/Based on the SAC Edition of the Illinois Uniform Crime Reports police disposition data, it is estimated that there are approximately 6,000 adults who are arrested, and subsequently released without charge per year. For the years 1977 through 1981, this would constitute dispositions for about 30,000 arrests.

count for as many as 75,000 felony cases between 1977 and 1981.27/

VII. Triangulation: A CIMIS-CCH Comparison

One way of testing the quality of a CCH data base is to compare it with another independently maintained information system. This type of "triangulation" or "cross-validation" will become increasingly important in the future as various criminal justice information systems continue to emerge.28/ This type of validation procedure is also attractive since it is much less labor intensive than manual audits of paper documents.

A file from the Correctional Institution Management Information System (CIMIS) was obtained from the Illinois Department of Corrections. This sample file was drawn on February 22, 1983. There were more than 14,000 inmates on the file at the time of the file's creation. Given the demands on the CCH system, it was unreasonable to check the entire 14,000 inmates against the CCH data base. Therefore, a systematic sample of inmates was

---

27/The number of "no file" decisions was estimated by taking the number of adult felony arrests 1977-1981, and subtracting from it the number of adult felony cases disposed, 1977-1981, and the number adult felony arrests which were released without charge, 1977-1981. Number of felony cases disposed is from the Annual Report of the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts.

28/The Inslaw Prosecutor's Management Information System (PROMIS), being used by a number of jurisdictions in the U.S., or the Rapid Automated Prosecution System (RAPS) in Illinois, are other potential candidates for such comparisons. Law enforcement information systems, e.g., the Police Information Management System (PIMS) in Illinois, also represent potential sources for comparison.

drawn.29/

Once the systematic sample of 525 inmates was drawn, an inquiry about each was made through the Law Enforcement Agencies Data System (LEADS).30/ LEADS is the system that is most frequently used to access the CCH data base. Such inquiries require the following information: name, race, sex, date of birth, and state identification number.31/ When on-line rap sheets were present, four items were compared between the CIMIS and CCH data bases: (1) charges;32/ (2) disposition; (3) original admit date to IDOC; and (4) current institution in which the inmate resides.33/

This intersystem comparison allowed us to address the

29/The sample was drawn from those inmates who were admitted to prison after January 1, 1977, to ensure the probability of their having a record on the CCH system, which became operational late in 1976.

30/Inquiries were conducted over a period of time--April 25, 1983 through May 16, 1983--in an attempt to avoid an excessive increase in LEADS system's response time.

31/When an inmate's state identification number was not present on the CIMIS file, a Chicago Police Department identification number was used when available.

32/Because the CCH and CIMIS systems use different table- or menu-driven code tables for charges, it is difficult to tell when the two systems are in agreement. When charges appeared fairly close, they were not recorded as discrepant. However, when they differed substantially, e.g. homicide versus possession of cannabis, a discrepancy was coded.

33/It should be noted that it is difficult to know which system possesses correct and incorrect information in some instances. Thus, a difference between CIMIS and CCH may reflect an error in either. This is the case for difference, and less likely to be the case for omissions.

following questions: (1) Was an inmate on the CCH system;34/ (2) If an inmate is on the CCH system, is his/her record an identification segment only, or a full transcript; (3) If an inmate had a full transcript on the CCH system, was the instant charge, disposition, etc., present?

Results of CCH inquiries indicated that of the 525 inmates sampled, 257 (49.0%) had identification information only on the CCH system--i.e., had CCH Incomplete records (see Table 23). This means that these individuals did not have an on-line rap sheet, but rather had a manual rap sheet. Another 246 inmates (46.8%) had on-line rap sheets--i.e, had CCH Complete records. Finally, we were unable to ascertain the record status of the criminal history information of 22 inmates (4.2%) sampled. This table also indicates that more recently incarcerated inmates are more likely to have an on-line transcript.

The majority (60.2%) of the rap sheets on CCH which were checked against CIMIS had no discrepancies or omissions.35/ Ninety-six (39.0%) of the rap sheets had at least one or more

---

34/It is logically possible for an inmate not to have a record on the CCH data base if the instant charge for which he/she was incarcerated was not arrest initiated. For example, if the inmate was indicted by a grand jury, served with a summons or a notice to appear, no fingerprint card was submitted to DLE, and therefore no record would exist on the CCH system.

35/Since both these systems represent secondary sources, it is difficult to tell whether a discrepancy indicates an error in CIMIS or CCH, or both.

Table 23

CCH Record Status of Inmates on CIMIS by Year

Year of Arrest	No On-Line Rap Sheet	On-Line Rap Sheet	Unknown*
1976 or Earlier	46 (82.1%)	9 (16.1%)	1 (1.8%)
1977	14 (66.7%)	6 (28.6%)	1 (4.8%)
1978	30 (81.1%)	6 (16.2%)	1 (2.7%)
1979	27 (49.1%)	28 (50.9%)	0 (0.0%)
1980	41 (56.2%)	28 (38.4%)	4 (5.5%)
1981	38 (36.8%)	60 (58.3%)	5 (4.9%)
1982	61 (33.9%)	109 (60.6%)	10 (5.6%)
Total	257 (49.0%)	246 (46.8%)	22 (4.2%)

* It could not be determined whether the individual did not have a record on the CCH system, or whether the information on the CIMIS data base was incorrect.

discrepancies or omissions when compared with CIMIS data (see Table 24).

Table 25 provides a breakdown of accuracy and completeness problems by item. The vast majority of the differences (87.0%) result from the omission of data elements, rather than discrepancies. The most problematic element on these rap sheets appears to be the institution in which an inmate is located. This would appear to indicate a backlog or time lag in the amount of time required to process and enter custodial changes (e.g., transfers) at DLE.36/ The omission of disposition information concerning the instant offense was also problematic.37/ The majority of those rap sheets for which dispositional information was missing (36/42 or 85.7%) were for commitments of 1981 or later. These results appear to point toward delays or lags in reporting and/or processing time, rather than accuracy problems.

36/A recent telephone conversation with John Loverude, Assistant Bureau Chief, Bureau of Identification, of the Department of Law Enforcement, indicated that institutional transfers, e.g., from one institution to another, are no longer being entered on the CCH data base. The date on which the individual was admitted to the Department of Corrections, and the date released are recorded.

37/Of the 42 rap sheets for which disposition information was missing, 31 were from Cook County.

Table 24

Quality of CCH Rap Sheets for a Sample of CIMIS Inmates

No Discrepancy/Omission	148
One or More Discrepancies/Omissions	96
Not Ascertainable*	2
Total	246

* The quality of these rap sheets could not be checked because of a lack of information on the CIMIS data base.

Table 25

Type of Inaccuracy by Item of On-Line Rap Sheets

Item	Discrepancy*	Omission	Total
Charge Information	18	20	38
Disposition	0	42	42
Date of Admitance	1	56	57
Institution	10	76	86
Total	29 (13.0%)	194 (87.0%)	223

The records examined in this table are those inmates on the CIMIS data base who had an on-line or "CCH Complete" record on the CCH data base.

* Since both of these data bases represent secondary sources of information, it is difficult to tell which data base is in error when a discrepancy arises.

VIII. A Comment on Methodology

While a more detailed discussion of audit methodology is provided in a companion report, several concluding remarks seem warranted.

Triangulation was an important methodological principle used throughout the course of the audit. It represents a basic rule of thumb that assumes that no single measure of a concept is perfect. Multiple, independent measures are more likely to lead to reliable and valid findings.

The results obtained using triangulation in this audit are encouraging. It was shown, for example, that survey sampling methods (i.e., manual audits of random samples of records) yielded results congruent with those produced by other methods, such as statistical reports of the entire data base for a given day, or the comparison of independently maintained data bases. When different methods yield similar results, the researcher can be more confident. If they yield different results the researcher should become more skeptical, and reevaluate the audit methodology being used.

This type of methodology allows the researcher to make comparisons with existing data (e.g., Uniform Crime Reports data or courts data), and obtain insights. By comparing results from the

audit to data reported in the Illinois UCR, we were able to estimate the proportion of missing dispositions which are accounted for by law enforcement's decision to drop charges.

It was revealed by both the analysis of missing value codes and the two manual audits that secondary identification items were more likely to be inaccurate or missing than primary search items. The analysis of the dispositional status of all arrests on the CCH data base, the manual audit of CCH complete records, and the CCH-CIMIS comparison all revealed similar results with regard to completeness of criminal history information on the CCH system.

The use of triangulation in research design allows the researcher to evaluate the reliability of findings, but the reliability and validity of the various methods used as well.

IX. Findings and Recommendations

Finding Number 1

Of those 1.18 million individuals in the CCH data base, 43.5% had "CCH Complete" records. Another 56.1% of the individuals on the system had "CCH Incomplete" records. This finding is significant when viewed in light of the fact that when a sample of Illinois Department of Corrections inmates was checked against the CCH system, 95.8% had records on the CCH system. Of those inmates on the CCH system, 48.9% had "CCH Complete" records.

Recommendation

The Authority recommends that the Department of Law Enforcement should increase the proportion of records that are "CCH Complete," especially for current serious and/or repeat offenders. At a minimum, Illinois Department of Corrections' inmates should have "CCH Complete" records on the system. The Department of Law Enforcement should institute a policy which will ensure that the complete records of serious and/or repeat offenders are converted to CCH whenever a record of arrest for such an individual is received by the Department.

Finding Number 2

Missing data values were not a serious problem for CCH identification information. With the exception of place of birth, items were better than 99.5% complete.

Recommendation

None.

Finding Number 3

When evaluating the seriousness of inaccuracies it was found that approximately 1.5% of the rap sheets audited (an estimated 17,000 records in the data base) had an inaccuracy in a primary search item serious enough to preclude a "hit" when a LEADS inquiry was made. Another 3.8% (an estimated 45,000 records in the data base) had inaccuracies in a primary search item that did not preclude a hit to an inquiry. Finally, about 5.9% of the records audited (an estimated 71,000 records in the data base) had an inaccuracy in a non-search item that would not preclude a hit.

Recommendation

The Authority recommends that more sophisticated edit or field checks be employed at the time of data entry. This can be accomplished partially through the correlation of data elements or data range checks (e.g., date of birth might be checked

against state identification number). Data range checks might be used on items such as height and weight. Upon entry, any extreme value, such as a height of over 7 feet, or a weight over 300 lbs., would be flagged.

In addition, the Department of Law Enforcement should continue to conduct periodic accuracy audits of CCH. Triangulation audits of CCH with other criminal justice information systems should be employed.

Finding Number 4

Physical identification information was not always in agreement with the most recent arrest card. Often, it was difficult to tell from which arrest card the information had been taken. There is a need for current physical identification information. An individual's physical description should reflect changes which are generally associated with age. Individuals frequently become taller and put on more weight as they get older. There may be a change in hair color, or a loss of hair. The individual may acquire scars, marks and tattoos over time.

Recommendation

The Authority recommends that physical descriptor information be updated as necessary with each new fingerprint card submitted, where changes are warranted.

Finding Number 5

The audit indicated that missing dispositional information continues to represent a serious problem for the CCH system. Of the 1.24 million arrest events on the CCH system on February 16, 1983, nearly 59% had no disposition of any kind. This finding was corroborated by results of a manual audit of records, and by the triangulation audit of the Department of Corrections' CIMIS system and CCH. Previous audits have documented this problem (ICJIC, 1980; 1981), as did the Auditor General's (1982) recent audit. The lack of dispositional information seriously compromises the integrity of the CCH data base.

There were several factors which account for the delinquency of dispositions on the CCH system. The audit revealed that the decision by police to "release without charge" may account for the missing dispositions of as many as 30,000 arrest events in the CCH data base. In addition, it was found that the failure of state's attorneys to report a "no file" decision could account for as many as 75,000 missing dispositions.

Criminal justice events received out of chronological sequence cannot be entered to the CCH system. For example, custodial information cannot be entered prior to the entry of a court disposition, or a court disposition can be entered only after a state's attorney disposition has been entered.

Recommendations

The Authority recognizes that up-to-date dispositional information is crucial to decisions made at various points in the criminal justice process -- e.g., preliminary hearings, presentence investigations, and sentencing. It is recommended that the Department of Law Enforcement develop procedures to assure compliance with the Uniform Disposition Reporting Law (Public Act 83-752). In line with this goal, the Authority has several recommendations.

The Department should issue periodic reports on a regular basis to those local agencies, including police departments, state's attorneys and clerks of court, which are not in compliance with the disposition reporting statutes. In addition, such reports should be issued to the Authority and other agencies. Similar recommendations have been made in several previous audits (ICJIC, 1980; 1981; Office of the Auditor General, 1982).

The Authority recommends that the Department redesign the CCH system to allow the entry of a valid criminal justice event when it is received. Thus, custodial information could be added before the court disposition was received, or a court disposition could be added prior to the receipt of a state's attorney disposition. This would provide a better delinquent disposition monitoring system (DDMS) than the present system, which cannot

distinguish between a delinquent and a missing disposition. Recommendations to redesign the DDMS have been made by previous audits (ICJIC, 1980; Office of the Auditor General, 1982).

Finding Number 6

Excluding the statutory class item, approximately 1.58% of the arrest events audited had an inaccuracy in their arrest information; 0.7% had an inaccuracy in state's attorney information, 0.7% had an inaccuracy in court information, 0.01% in custodial and 0.03% in bond information.

Recommendation

The Department of Law Enforcement should continue to conduct periodic audits of criminal history record information.

STATE OF ILLINOIS
DEPARTMENT OF LAW ENFORCEMENT
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

September 15, 1983

JAMES B. ZAGEL
DIRECTOR

Mr. William Gould, Chairman
Illinois Criminal Justice Information
Authority
120 South Riverside Plaza
Chicago, Illinois 60606

Dear Mr. Gould:

The Department of Law Enforcement has reviewed the Findings and Recommendations of the Annual Audit Report, 1982-83: Data Quality of Computerized Criminal Histories. Since November 1982, we have been working toward a complete redesign of the manual and automated procedures utilized in the Criminal History Record Program. The recommendations of this audit will be included in this effort.

In particular, the redesign is examining means to remove the structural constraints which do not allow for some records to be complete on CCH since events are received out of chronological sequence. Improved editing of input data and updating of physical descriptions are also being reviewed. Further, the Department will be working with the Authority Committees to implement the Uniform Disposition Reporting Act.

The Department has substantially improved the timeliness and quality data provided in its Criminal Records Program. This audit will be utilized to continue those improvements.

Very truly yours,

James B. Zagel

Director

JBZ:ck

Bibliography

Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts

1977-81 Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts: Annual Report, 1977-81. Springfield: State of Illinois.

Arkin, Herbert

1974 Handbook of Sampling for Auditing and Accounting. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

Campbell, Donald and Julian Stanley

1963 Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Design. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Connecticut Justice Commission

1981 Audit Manual: Information Systems Security and Privacy. Hartford, Conn.: Connecticut Justice Commission.

Doernberg, Donald, and Donald Zeigler

1980 "Due Process versus Data Processing: An Analysis of Computerized Criminal History Information Systems." New York University Law Review, 55 (Dec):1110-1230.

Dyba, Jerome

1977 "To Edit or Not to Edit." Pp. 151-156 in Elise Jancura (ed.) Computers: Auditing and Control. New York: Petrocelli Charter.

Illinois Criminal Justice Information Council

1980 Annual Privacy and Security Audit Report. Chicago: Illinois Criminal Justice Information Council

1981 Annual Privacy and Security Audit Report. Chicago: Illinois Criminal Justice Information Council

Kish, Leslie

1968 Survey Sampling. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Office of the Auditor General, State of Illinois

1982 Management and Program Audit, Criminal History Components, Criminal Justice Information System, Illinois Department of Law Enforcement. Springfield, Illinois: State of Illinois.

Office of Technology Assessment, Congress of the United States

1982 An Assessment of Alternatives for a National Computerized Criminal History System. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Search Group Inc.

1983 Audit Manual for Criminal History Record Systems. Sacramento, Calif.: Search Group Inc.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

1979 Weight and Height of Adults 18-74 Years of Age: 1971-74. Hyattsville, Md.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Wolfgang, Marvin, Robert Figlio, and Thorsten Sellin

1972 Delinquency in a Birth Cohort. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Appendix A: Types of Rap Sheets

BCI CHECK

```
SID/12345670
FBI/           INCOMPLETE RECORD        FPC/09101120170918161813
POB/IL      DOB/052040   SEX/M   RAC/B   HGT/510   WGT/185
EYE/BRO     HAI/BLK      SKN/DBR         SMT/
NAM/SMITH, JOHN                  SOC/231-99-0769  MNU/
ICO/
MLS/        DLU/           SYS/I 052076
TYP/     FOID ID/          SUB ORI/                ID FLG/
       AGENCY IDENTIFIER NUMBER/IR152440
NEW FORMAT ARREST DCN/CP90054777 DOA/111261
       ORI/ILCPD0000 IID/IR152440   DLU/       SYS/  030279
   ACH/01 CIT/38-28-1       CLS/  CSA/  DLU/       SYS/030279
END BASED ON SID CHECK IN ILLINOIS CCH FILES
```

SUMMARY TRANSCRIPT

```
ILLINOIS SUMMARY                    SID/IL07654321 SIDN
EH SMITH, JOHN-   M B IL DOB/052040 HGT/510 WGT/185 EYE/BRO
HAI/BRO SKN/DMR FPC/25PM0711081215110906   IR/IR123456
ADDITIONAL IDENTIFIERS
AKA/SMITH, JOHNNIE
AKA/SMITH, JACK
AKA/JONES, JOHN
TOTAL ARRESTS-    5
CHARGES CONVICTIONS OFFENSE
   3          4       HOMICIDE
   3          2       WEAPON OFFENSE
LAST ARREST STATUS (INCLUDED ABOVE)-
  091281    CHICAGO
01  38-9-1-1        MURDER
STATES ATTORNEY STATUS-
SA ORI COOK CO S A
01 FILED      38-9-1-A      CSA/  CLS/
   MURDER                   DISP DATE/092181

02 FILED      38-9-1-A      CSA/  CLS/
   MURDER                   DISP DATE/092181
COURT STATUS (INCLUDED ABOVE)-
COURT ORI COOK CIR CRT
01 CONVICTED           CIT/38-9-1-A      CSA/  CLS/
   CIT LIT/MURDER
   SENT/IMPRISONMENT
   TERM/LIFE

02 CONVICTED           CIT/38-9-1-A      CSA/  CLS/
   CIT LIT/MURDER
   SENT/IMPRISONMENT
   TERM/LIFE
CUSTODY STATUS-
  A   JOLIET REC COR CTR              082882 RECEIVED
  B   JOLIET REC COR CTR              092582 TRANSFDIN
  C   PONTIAC CORR CTR                092582 RECEIVED
END
```

Department of Law Enforcement
Division of Support Services
Bureau of Identification

515 East Woodruff Road,
Joliet, Illinois 60432

DEPT OF LAW ENFORCEMENT
SUPPORT SERVICES
515 EAST WOODRUFF ROAD
JOLIET
IL 60432

NAME TEST, RECORD ONLY
BIRTHDATE 010220 SEX M RACE W
ALIAS DOB 010215 02211
MISC. NO.
HAIR BRO EYES BLU
HGT. FT. 5 IN. 07 WEIGHT 180
HENRY FP CLASS NCIC FP CLASS
00 AA 01 A AAAAAA AA AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AA 01 A AAAAAA

ILL. BUREAU NO. IL99887760 REQ/
FBI NUMBER
CHICAGO IR NO. 998877
AGENCY CONTROL NO. IR998877

NUMBER OF BONDS 00
BFW ISSUED 00
BFW QUASHED 00

WARNING: RELEASE OF THIS INFORMATION TO UNAUTHORIZED INDIVIDUALS OR AGENCIES OR MISUSE IS PROHIBITED BY FEDERAL LAW TITLE 42 USC 3771b PERTAINING TO CRIMINAL HISTORY INFORMATION.

CONTRIBUTOR DOCUMENT CONTROL NO. AGENCY CONTROL NO.	TRANS CODE	DATE OF TRANS.	ACH	STATUTE CITATION	ACTION	NAME USED
		05/27/81			DATE OF TRANSCRIPT	
ARREST						
CHICAGO CP99887766 IR998877	A	01/01/56	01	38-12-3	BATTERY	
S. A. DISPOSITION						
COOK CO S A CP99887766	S					
			01	38-12-3	FILED BATTERY	
COURT DISPOSITION						
COOK CIR CRT CP99887766	J					
		01/05/56	01	38-12-3	CONVICTED OF BATTERY SENTENCED TO IMPRISONMENT FOR 1Y-10Y	
CUSTODIAL INFORMATION						
JOLIET REC COR CTR G0000[redacted]	C	01/06/56			RECEIVED	

89

123

Appendix B: Source Documents

DOCUMENT CONTROL NUMBER: D01712651

ARRESTING AGENCY-NCIC NO.-ORI: IL

STATE BUREAU NUMBER-SCI: IL Ø

ARREST CARD

CONTRIBUTOR-NCIC NO.-ORI: IL

FBI NUMBER-FBI

ARREST JACKET NUMBER-JID

ARRESTEE HELD FOR PROSECUTION ☐ YES ☐ NO

LAST NAME-NAM | FIRST NAME | MIDDLE NAME

SEX | RACE | POB | DATE OF BIRTH-DOB | HEIGHT | WEIGHT | EYES

HAIR-HAI | SKIN-SKN | SCARS/MARKS/TATTOOS-SMT

SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER-SOC | MISCELLANEOUS-MNU

ALSO KNOWN AS-ANA | ALIAS DOB

ALSO KNOWN AS-ANA | ALIAS DOB

STATE USE ONLY

CLASSIFICATION

REFERENCE

DATE OF ARREST-DOA | DATE OF OFFENSE-DOO

SIGNATURE OF OFFICAL TAKING FINGERPRINTS | IDENTIFICATION NO.

NCIC FINGERPRINT CLASSIFICATION-FPC

SIGNATURE OF ARRESTEE | DATE PRINTED

NOTICE: THIS INFORMATION MAY BE COMPUTERIZED IN LOCAL STATE AND NATIONAL FILES.

CAUTION ☐ | BASIS FOR CAUTION-CO

CITY OF BIRTH | RESIDENCE ADDRESS | CITY | STATE | ZIP CODE | COURT CASE NUMBER | COURT CLK. NO.

ARRESTING OFFICER-NAME | ID OR BADGE NO. | DEFENDANT'S DRIVERS LICENSE | NUMBER OF DEFENDANTS | NUMBER OF CHARGES

BOOKING NUMBER | REPORT REFERENCE NO.

TIME OF ARREST | BEAT | SUB-BEAT

ARREST LOCATION CODE | TYPE WEAPON

ARREST LOCATION/DATE

RESISTED YES ☐ NO ☐ | ASSAULTED OFFICER YES ☐ NO ☐ | INJURED OFFICER YES ☐ NO ☐ | SOBER YES ☐ NO ☐ | NARCOTICS YES ☐ NO ☐

PHOTOGRAPHED YES ☐ NO ☐ | PHOTO NUMBER

WARRANT NUMBER | WARRANT CLEARED LEADS YES ☐ NO ☐

OFFENSES

CHARGE NUMBER	CHAPTER	ARTICLE	SECTION	SUBSECTION	DESCRIPTION OF OFFENSE	CSA	§	M
1								
2								
3								
4								
5								
6								
7								
8								

WAIVED BY | WARRANT NUMBER | ISSUE DATE

BOND SET BY: (1) RULE OF COURT OR (2) JUDGE-ENTER JUDGES NAME

SEND CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORD TO:

NCIC AGENCY

NCIC AGENCY

BOND NUMBER | BOND AMOUNT

AGENCY INFORMATION:

TYPE BOND: CASH ☐ CARD ☐ BOND DEPOSIT ☐ PROF BOND ☐ 10% BOND ☐ ROR ☐

INITIAL COURT DATE | TIME

INITIAL COURT LOCATION

CC-1135(7/78) COPY 1 ARRESTING AGENCY

DOCUMENT CONTROL NUMBER

DATE OF ARREST

DISPOSITION REPORT

STATE USE ONLY

SCI

LAST NAME | FIRST NAME | MIDDLE NAME | SEX | RACE | DATE OF BIRTH

STATE'S ATTORNEY DISPOSITION

STATE'S ATTORNEY NCIC NO. IL

☐ REVISION

☐ ADDITIONAL

ARREST CHARGE NUMBER	CHARGE NOT FILED	CHARGE FILED	CHAPTER	ARTICLE	SECTION	SUBSECTION	C S A	CLASS	DATE OF DISPOSITION	CASE NUMBER
1										
2										
3										
4										
5										
6										
7										
8										

COURT DISPOSITION

COURT'S NCIC NUMBER IL

☐ REVISION

☐ ADDITIONAL

ARREST CHARGE NUMBER	DISMISSED	LEAVE TO REINSTATE	ACQUITTED	CONVICTED	CHAPTER 56½ SECTION 1401, 710 PROBATION	CHAPTER	ARTICLE	SECTION	SUBSECTION	C S A	CLASS	DATE OF DISPOSITION	CASE NUMBER
1													
2													
3													
4													
5													
6													
7													
8													

ARREST CHARGE NUMBER	SENTENCE: DEATH	IMPRISONMENT	PERIODIC IMPRISONMENT	PROBATION	COURT SUPERVISION	FINE	TERM: YEARS	TERM: MONTHS	TERM: DAYS	AMOUNT IN DOLLARS
1										
2										
3										
4										
5										
6										
7										
8										

BOND INFORMATION

___ RELEASED ON RECOGNIZANCE

___ REMANDED TO COUNTY JAIL

___ BOND

___ AMOUNT

BOND FORFEITURE WARRANT ISSUED

___ YES ___ NO

BOND FORFEITURE WARRANT QUASHED

___ YES ___ NO

DEPARTMENT OF LAW ENFORCEMENT
DIVISION OF SUPPORT SERVICES
BUREAU OF IDENTIFICATION
108 ARMORY BUILDING
SPRINGFIELD, ILLINOIS 62706

COPY 1 - STATE'S ATTORNEY

COPIES 1, 2 & 3 ARE TO BE RETAINED BY INSTITUTION FOR REPORTING FUTURE STATUS CHANGES.

COPIES 4 & 5 ARE TO BE FORWARDED TO BUREAU OF IDENTIFICATION UPON RECEIPT OF RESIDENT.

DCN: C00150000	AGENCY RECEIVED FROM ORI: IL	STATE BUREAU NUMBER-SCI: IL Ø	LAST NAME NAM / FIRST NAME / MIDDLE NAME
CONFINING INSTITUTION ORI: IL	DATE RECEIVED	FBI NUMBER FBI	SEX / RACE / DOB / DATE OF BIRTH-DOB / HEIGHT / WEIGHT / EYES
	INSTRUCTIONS –TYPE OR PRINT ALL INFORMATION IN BLACK. TIC MARKS ARE USED TO STRUCTURE HAND PRINTING FOR LEGIBILITY. NOTE IF YOU TYPE DO NOT FOLLOW TIC MARKS.		HAIR HAI / SKIN-SKN / SCARS/MARKS/TATTOOS-SMT
INSTITUTION NUMBER-ITD	ALSO KNOWN AS-ANA		SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER SOC / MISCELLANEOUS NUMBER MNU
CONFINING OFFENSE DESCRIPTION	CHAPTER ARTICLE SECTION		STATE USE ONLY
CONFINING OFFENSE DESCRIPTION	CHAPTER ARTICLE SECTION		CLASSIFICATION
SENTENCE TERM			REFERENCE
SIGNATURE OF OFFICIAL TAKING FINGERPRINTS	IDENTIFICATION NO		NCIC FINGERPRINT CLASSIFICATION-FPC
SIGNATURE OF RESIDENT ▶	DATE PRINTED		CITY OF BIRTH / TIO
NOTICE THIS DATA MAY BE COMPUTERIZED IN LOCAL STATE AND NATIONAL FILES			

STATUS	CODE	STATUS	CODE
Absconded	401 ____	Mandatory Release Revoked	415 ____
Administrative Discharge	402 ____	Pardoned	416 ____
Cert. of Relief	403 ____	Paroled	417 ____
Commited Suicide	404 ____	Parole Revoked	418 ____
Commutation-Prior Sentence Rescinded	405 ____	Probation	419 ____
Conditional Release	406 ____	Probation Revoked	420 ____
Conditional Release Revoked	407 ____	Released by Court Order	422 ____
Deceased	408 ____	Released-Expiration of Minimum Time	428 ____
Discharged from Criminal Justice System	409 ____	Released on Appeal Bond	423 ____
Escaped	410 ____	Sentence Commuted	424 ____
Executed	411 ____	Work Furlough	425 ____
Furloughed	412 ____	Work Furlough Revoked	426 ____
Furlough Revoked	413 ____	Transferred	427 ____
Mandatory Release	414 ____	Accepted Parole Jurisdiction	429 ____
		Accepted Probation Jurisdiction	430 ____

DURATION OF STATUS CHANGE	DATE OF TRANSACTION	SIGNATURE OF OFFICIAL

Appendix C: Audit Coding Sheets

CCH AUDIT

CCH Incomplete - ID Segment Analysis

Bureau #_____ Coder_____

ELEMENT	CCH ENTRY	SOURCE ENTRY	COMMENTS
1. SID NUMBER			
2a. FINGERPRINTS (1ST TEN DIGITS)			
2b. FINGERPRINTS (2ND TEN DIGITS)			
3. PLACE OF BIRTH			
4. DATE OF BIRTH			
5. SEX			
6. RACE			
7. HEIGHT			
8. WEIGHT			
9. EYE COLOR			
10. HAIR COLOR			
11. SKIN TONE			
12. SCARS, ETC.			
13a. LAST NAME			
13b. FIRST NAME			
14. SOC. SEC. #			
15. MISC. NUMBER			

Page 1 of _____

CCH AUDIT

CCH Complete - Accuracy Audit

Bureau # _____ Coder _____

****

IDENTIFICATION SECTION

Element	CCH Entry	Source Entry	Comment
1. SID Number			
2a. Last Name			
2b. First Name			
3. Date of Birth			
4. Sex			
5. Race			
6. Hair Color			
7. Eye Color			
8. Height			
9. Weight			
10a. Fingerprints (1st Ten Digits)			
10b. Fingerprints (2nd Ten Digits)			

ARREST SECTION

Agency			
Document Control #			
Date of Arrest Year 19( )			
Statute Citation			
Description			
Statutory Class			

Bureau # _____ Page 2 of _____

STATE'S ATTORNEY SECTION

Element	CCH	Source	Comment
Agency			
Doc. Control #			
Case Number			
Date of Disposition			
Statute Citation			
Action			
Charge Description			
Statutory Class			

COURT SECTION

Court			
Doc. Control #			
Case Number			
Date of Disposition			
Statute Citation			
Disposition			
Charge Description			
Statutory Class			
Sentence/Action			

CUSTODIAL SECTION

Institution			
Document Number			
Date of Action			
Action			

BOND SECTION

Type			
Amount			
BFW Issued			
BFW Quashed			