1

A. 4 100

NCJRS

This microfiche was produced from documents received for inclusion in the NCJRS data base. Since NCJRS cannot exercise control over the physical condition of the documents submitted, the individual frame quality will vary. The resolution chart on this frame may be used to evaluate the document quality.



Microfilming procedures used to create this fiche comply with the standards set forth in 41CFR 101-11.504

Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the author(s) and do not represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION NATIONAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFERENCE SERVICE WASHINGTON, D.C. 20531

Date filmed,

11/13/75

IMPROVING PENNSYLVANIA'S CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM THROUGH UPGRADED STANDARDS AND GOALS -



of Pennsylvania Criminal Justice "Managers" to Determine Attitudes and Reactions to Standards Recommended by the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals.

PENNSYLVANIA JOINT COUNCIL ON THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

Committee for Criminal Justice Standards and Goals

A Survey

P.O. Box 866 Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17108



Table of Contents

2	1
espondent groups and issues	4
• • • • • • • • • • • • •	6
Responses	9
e-wide and by RPC Region	9
type of Standard	11
Standards	13
Standards	15
ion Standards	17
ty Standards	19
Individual Standards	20

Prefatory Note In this report the Committee presents the results of a questionnaire survey of some 650 public and private officials and citizens in all sections of the Commonwealth. In a very real sense, these individuals represent the "managers" of the State's criminal justice system. The intent of the survey was to (1) disseminate specific information and recommendations of the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals and (2) to obtain judgment and reactions on whether comparable standards could be adapted and implemented in Pennsylvania.

Response to this survey effort has been most gratifying and provides much information useful to the Committee in developing a state-wide action strategy for a continuing standards and goals implementation program. The Committee expresses its appreciation to the many officials and private citizens who took time out of busy schedules to respond to difficult questions about the operations of the criminal justice system in reference to acceptable standards and goals.

The Pennsylvania Committee on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals was created in early 1973 as a part of the Joint Council on the Criminal Justice System. The charge to the Council and its Committee is to develop and maintain a continuing effort to

i



adopt and implement improved standards and goals applicable in all components of the Pennsylvania Justice System.

The Council and its Committee have been recognized by Governor Shapp and assigned a leadership roles in working with all state and local criminal justice officials and agencies to adopt and implement upgraded standards. Lieutenant Governor Kline is an active participant in this continuing program. Yet the effort is broader than one sponsored by any single administration or level of government. It necessarily involves the support and continuing participation of public and private officials and leaders at all levels and, most importantly, a broad active base of private citizen support. The Membership of the Joint Council and the Committee reflect this kind of support structure and cooperation.

The survey was conducted and this report prepared with the assistance of the Government Studies and Systems of Philadelphia and the University of Pennsylvania's Management and Behavioral Science Center.

Pennsylvania Committee on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals

March, 1974

ii

Pennsylvania Joint Council on the 1.4 W. Thomas Andrews James Barger Charles W. Brown William Butler E. Barclay Cale, Jr. Frances DelDuca John A. Geisz Charlotte Ginsburg Thomas Jackson 1 Dwight L. Koerber -----John A. Craig Charlotte Ginsburg Dwight L. Koerber William G. Nagel Richard V. Snyder, Project Director Consultants: Rodney P. Lane, Government Studies & Systems iii

Criminal Justice System

Richard P. Conaboy, Chairman

William C. Kriner Israel Packel John N. Sawyer Anthony R. Scirica William R. Shane Henry R. Smith, Jr. Fred Speaker Stewart Werner Vincent J. Ziccardi

Suzanne Yenchko, Director

* * *

Pennsylvania Committee on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals

Henry R. Smith Jr., Chairman

William B. Robinson John N. Sawyer William R. Shane Margery Velemesis

* * *

Thomas Gilmore, Management and Behavioral Science Center University of Pennsylvania



Improving the Pennsylvania Criminal Justice System Through the Use of Upgraded Standards and Goals

Introduction and Objective

The Pennsylvania criminal justice system, like that of most other states, is in reality not a system at all. The administration of criminal justice is a highly fragmented governmental function operating in different bureaucracies within different levels of government as a combined responsibility of the legislative, judicial and executive branches. Yet, changes made in any component of the criminal justice system affect, directly and immediately, the functioning of other parts of the system.

Effective operation of the criminal justice system is vital to safeguarding the basic level of societal functioning and community life. Yet, it is a highly complex and technical governmental function which seeks to attain conforming patterns of human behavior while still safeguarding basic freedom and individual civil rights. Moreover, the criminal justice system operates in an arena of government and public affairs where there is often more heat than light -- where opinions and traditional views are strongly held, frequently lacking adequate justification or technical competence as their

-1-



base. Yet, the administration of justice is among the oldest functions of government and we know more than we have yet been able to implement.

In recognition and response to these difficult and delimiting conditions, citizens throughout the United States are demanding improved performance. Thus, the current climate features a potential, wide-spread political constituency which is the vital ingredient in a concerted, continuing effort to achieve needed improvement.

The development of a comprehensive set of standards and guidelines by the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals provides the opportunity to mount such a concerted effort in Pennsylvania and other states. The materials developed by the National. Commission are voluminous (428 standards, 66 recommendations in 1550 textual pages) including background justification and description, standards, recommendations, commentary and justification and bibliographic references. As such, these materials represent a vast reservoir of information and data which hold promise of guiding substantial improvement in all components of the criminal justice system. The task is to utilize effectively this vast effort to provide the impetus and general guidelines for a Pennsylvania implementation program. This does not mean that a

-2-



wholesale adoption and implementation of national standards can be envisioned. Some may be neither applicable, nor acceptable to Pennsylvania. Also, there is a primary need for the development of an implementation plan which reflects a system-wide strategy for change, which maximizes early positive results and controls possible negative impact, and which, to the largest extent possible, builds-in a selfenergizing force to induce subsequent change and further needed improvement.

This kind of approach cannot be viewed as a "blueprint" operation in which an overall plan can be concocted in isolation and imposed on the criminal justice system. For the reasons summarized above, it is of fundamental importance to involve the managers and decision-makers of the criminal justice system and a representative variety of public interest and civic groups as participants in the process of change.

In this context and with this objective in mind, a wide-spread dissemination of standards and goals, along with descriptive information, was made throughout the Pennsylvania criminal justice system. Public and private officials and leaders, selected because of their decisionmaking role in the system, were asked to respond to key questions concerning applicability of the standards and implementation possibilities. An overall review of surve;

-3-



responses' supports a number of quite positive observations which indicate the time may be right for launching broad improvement in all components of the criminal justice

æ

There is broad support for the general use of standards and goals as a means of upgrading Pennsylvania's criminal justice system. The support is evident in all of the groups who

(2) These informed officials and citizens are aware that a significant gap exists between present Pennsylvania practice and standards in all areas of the criminal justice system.

(3) A marked latitude and support for change to improve the system exists. Substantial and progressive development and implementation of standards appropriate to Pennsylvania is favored.

(4) They do believe that development and implementation of standards will improve fairness, efficiency and rehabilitation potential. And they are aware that additional funds probably will be required.

(5) Finally, they are aware that some degree of resistance can be expected, but the general judgment seems to be that it is not overwhelming.

The following sections of this report summarize and

Selection of standards, respondent groups and issues

Of the more than 400 standards and recommendations

developed by the National Advisory Commission on Criminal

Justice Standards and Goals, 205 standards were submitted for

the review and evaluation of a broad group of Pennsylvania

criminal justice "managers". The "managers" group consisted

of 651 officials and private citizens who share some responsi-

bility for the operation of the state's criminal justice system.

-4-

		. 66 County Com . 59 President
		, 9 State Pris
		. 26 County Pri
		. 73 Chiefs of
		greater . 73 Mayors (of
		. 27 National C
٥		. 67 District A . 67 Public Defe
		. 67 Probation (
		. 40 Private Or
		<u>. 77</u> Citizen Mer
		651
		All members of these
		questions (See Questionnai
		provide some degree of ins
		issues as:
		122462 42.
		. the extent to which
		conforms to the s
87 - Contraction (1997)		. the extent to which
		implementation
		. the priority they w
		. judgments as to the assignment in:
		. improved fai
		. increased et . improved reb
		or crime 1
		. effect on co
		. the degree of resis
•		that might be exp
		. whether the standar
		stated
		Through analysis of 1
		it is possible to evaluate
		¢
A REAL PROPERTY AND A REAL	1	and the second

ommissioners t Judges ison Officials f Police (municipalities with r than 25 full-time police staff) of the above municipalities) Conference Invitees Attorneys efenders n Officers Drganizations Members of the Regional Planning Councils

e groups were asked to respond to aire Form, Appendix 1) designed to nsight and judgment on such key

ch Pennsylvania practice standard

ch they favor full

would assign to implementation

he reason for the priority

airness efficiency ehabilitation potential reduction cost

istance to full implementation expected

lard is clearly and adequately

responses to the above questions,

te and take into account differences

in responses to standards in the various components of the criminal justice system. Differences in judgments as to what kind of changes are appropriate in different regions of the state are also discernible. The collective judgments of district attorneys, police officials, defense attorneys and all other groups can be compared.

Dimensions of the survey A total of 245 completed questionnaires were returned, a response rate of 38 percent. This number does not include six forms which were returned with insufficient data and, therefore, had to be excluded from the analysis.

survey and survey results include the following:

5

1.

A summary of key factors describing organization of the

(1) The 205 standards used in the survey were divided into 16 groups with no respondent receiving more than 16 standards. A computer randomization process was used for the assignment of standard groups to respondents thus eliminating any possibility of bias in distributing sets of standards to any respondent. The groups were divided as follows:

-6-

· . 🔓 Police Courts Corrections . Community Crime a second and a second and a second and a second a se as follows: 100 . County . Preside: . State P . County . Chiefs (. Mayors . District - E_ Î. RPC Cit . Probati . Private . Nationa . Public <u>.</u>, σ

Gro	oup	Numbe	r of St	andards
]			13 13 13 13	
	5 7 3		12 12 11 13 14	
10 11 12 13 14	L 2 3 1		16 8 11 16 14 12	
16	5		$\frac{14}{205}$	
 •				

(2) Respondents ranked their responses to the questions described above on a scale of 1 to 5 as follows (see Questionnaire Form, Appendix 1):

1	=	None
2	=	Minimal
3	=	Moderate
4	×	Substantial
5	=	High

(3) All respondent groups are represented in the analysis

Commissioners ent Judges Prison Officials Prison Officials of Police	16 25 7 13 41 24	
ct Attorneys tizen Members ion Officers e Organizations al Conference Invitees Defenders	14 24 30 21 9 21 245	

-7-



from the survey.

RPC

Allegheny Central Northeast Northwest Philadelphia South Central Southeast Southwest

A summary showing the number of questionnaires sent and received from each respondent group appears in Appendix II, Table I. The summary also shows the type (police, courts, corrections, community) of standard each respondent group received.

(4) All respondents were coded with an RPC designation. The following list gives the total number of returns possible from any individual RPC and also indicates the number which were returned

Possible		
Returns	# Received	Rate
55	24	438
97	26	26%
113	42	378
96	44	458
47	13	278
85	33	388
94	43	45%
64	20	31%
651	245	388

-8-

An	alv	7si	s	of	(
					- 24

A. Average Ratings State-Wide and by RPC Region

<u>ال</u>ہ ، جا

ن تابل

- reviewed.
- scores was 18%.*
- - low to high variance of 10%.
- among RPC regions.
 - lowest (3.65).
 - low to high variance of 9%.

*Maximum variance is determined by dividing the numerical difference between high and low average scores by the total possible range of 4.

Questionnaire Responses

(1) Respondents believe that Pennsylvania practice conforms moderately to the specific standards

- among the eight RPC regions, there was little variation from the overall state-wide average of 2.62. In Philadelphia, respondents thought the standards-practice gap to be the widest (2.18) while the Northwest region indicated a higher degree of conformity to standards (2.88).

- the variance between low and high average RPC

(2) State-wide, respondents favored full implementation of standards to a substantial extent (4.00), and this expression was generally representative of average responses in each RPC region.

- the extent to which full implementation was favored varied from 4.20 in Philadelphia to 3.82 in the Northwest region.

(3) The average priority rating for full implementation was substantial (3.83) with little variation

- the Southeast region indicated the highest priority rating for full implementation (4.01) while the South Central region rated the

(4) In terms of state-wide averages, respondents gave moderate to substantial ratings to "improves system fairness", "increases efficiency', and "improves rehabilitation potential or reduces crime" as the reason for their implementation priority rating. In general, respondents were slightly more sure that implementation would improve efficiency (3.62) as compared to increasing fairness (3.54) or improving rehabilitation potential or reducing crime (3.25); these differences cannot be considered significant.

-9-



- low to high rating of fairness

- low to high rating of efficiency

Central region - 3.40 (low) Southwest region - 3.89 (high)

- low to high rating of rehabilitation potential or a decrease in crime

> Northwest region - 3.05 (low) Southwest region - 3.62 (high)

the Southwest region is notable in its consistently higher ratings -- above all other RPC regions--assigned to all reasons on the guestionnaire for implementing standards.

(5) All respondents, in terms of a state-wide average, gave a low rating (2.38) to decreasing system cost as a reason for their priority rating.

- the pattern of agreement that implementation of standards would not necessarily result in decreases in system cost was guite consistent among RPC regions. The South Central region indicated the lowest rating (2.22) and the Southwest region the highest (2.77).

(6) Respondents viewed resistance to implementation as moderate (2.97) on a state-wide basis.

- judgment on this issue varied from a low of 2.74 in the Southeast region to a high of 3.16 in the Southwest region.

- low to high variance of 11%.

(7) In general, the standards were viewed by all respondents as being clearly and adequately expressed (4.13).

- clarity of standards ranged from a high in the Northwest region of 4.18 to a low in Allegheny County of 4.05 with a low to high variance of an almost indistinguishable 3%.

South Central region - 3.45 (low) Southwest region - 3.89 (high)

-10-

34 34			 _		1	 	ar an a		 	 	 	 		Chanel Sub			1					GARDER S
4 																						
																And and a						
																وتستق						
- un la tra Managira		•			. •		:													в.	Aver	ade
																	ł			2.	Aver Corr	ect
																					(1)	Ťŀ
																						to in co we
					-																	CC
																						We
																Ĩ						-
-			•																			
																6.00						-
and the second																						
Antonio de la constanta																						-
an and a state of the state of																5.4°						
undry and the set				1																		-
																	No. PERSONAL					
																- -					(2)	Re
																						Re st ty cc lc
								• • •									the states					cc
-																						lc
																	-					-
							1									4. ⁵					(3)	In
																						pc (4 (3 we
																ج						(3
																		•	Ó			
																						-
																					•	
	i.																					
																					(4)	Ba
																						in fo
																						fa
																						Ba in fo fa ti or
																		t.				
х 1																						
																	Sec. 1					

e Ratings by Type of Standard (Police, Courts, tions, Community), by RPC Region

the extent to which Pennsylvania practice conforms to the National standards was viewed to be highest in the corrections area (2.72) and lowest in the community area (2.20). Between these two extremes ere police (2.64) and courts (2.57).

the eight RPC regions returned data indicating fairly consistent ratings on the degree to which practice conforms to standards in the four components of the criminal justice system.

Allegheny County, the Northeast and the South Central regions indicated high conformity in the corrections area.

Philadelphia County, the Central and the Northwest regions indicated high conformity in the

police area.

the Southeast and Southwest regions saw highest conformity in the courts area.

espondents favored full implementation of police tandards with a higher average rating than other ypes of standards (4.42). Next highest was orrections (3.92), next community (3.85), and owest was courts (3.79).

implementation of police standards received highest ratings in all RPC regions.

n the priority assigned to implementation, olice standards received the highest rating 4.26). Next highest were correction standards 3.75), community standards (3.73), and lowest ere court standards (3.60).

police standards received the highest priority rating in all RPC regions.

the ratings for priority implementation were quite substantial with an overall state-wide average for all RPC's of 3.83.

ased on state-wide averages, respondents ranked mproved efficiency as the most important reason or their priority assignment (3.62). Increased airness (3.52) and improved rehabilitation potenial or a decrease in crime (3.25) were next in rder of priority.

-11-



- in all regions (4.22).
- (3.58).

- - P C C
 - C

- increased efficiency as the reason for priority assignment ranked highest for police standards

- improved fairness ranked highest for court and correction standards (3.76).

- improved rehabilitation potential or a decrease in crime ranked highest for community standards

(5) Respondents rated a decrease in system cost as a minor reason for priority assignment of implementation.

- the state-wide average was 2.38, with highest ratings being received in the corrections (2.50) and community (2.47) areas. This is quite consistent.

- RPC's low to high variation in average responses was 14%; the Southwest region gave the highest rating--a moderate 2.77 assignment to a decrease in system cost; the South Central region gave the lowest rating--a minimal 2.22 assignment.

(6) Respondents who received corrections standards expect a higher degree of resistance (3.10) to implementation than did respondents who received standards from other components of the criminal justice system; next highest was courts (3.01) and community (2.99); lowest was police (2.72).

- four RPC regions noted highest resistance expected in the corrections area.

- across all components of the criminal justice system, the Southeast region expected the least amount of resistance (2.74) while the Southwest region expected the highest (3.16) -- a 11% low to high variance in average scores among all RPC's.

(7) In general, all standards were viewed in all regions as being clearly and adequately expressed.

olice	-	4.23
ourts		4.19
orrections		4.04
ommunity	-	3,90

-12-

C. Response to Police St. (3) He response to po- (565 resure reter) - sew moderate on - standard of the second - standa	 74		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	 		() () () () () () () () () ()				 in the second						 				 1						· ·
 Knownie of provide to approach of the second seco																					14.12					
 Knownie of provide to approach of the second seco																										
 Knownie of provide to approach of the second seco											÷.,									a same water da						
 A Majorial de la construcción de la constr	1																									
 A Majorial de la construcción de la constr																										
 (1) In response to point states (2) In response to point states - say noderate comparation and the state state state of the state state																					1 		С		Rest	onses to Police St.
<pre>(55% return rates - saw modernia co practice and th usertation - placed a substa implementation - placed a substa improved 4.00 - thought affician - the start (2.62) - thought afficiant - the start afficiant - st</pre>																							•	-		
<pre>(55% return rates - saw modernia co practice and th usertation - placed a substa implementation - placed a substa improved 4.00 - thought affician - the start (2.62) - thought afficiant - the start afficiant - st</pre>																									(1)	In response to po
 Saw Rodorits co practice and the work Rubication - Saw Rodorits co practice and the method - placed a subtain inplomentation - thought fairnes inproved by isp - thought fairnes - thought implome (2.28) decrease - thought rates to moderate (2.62) (2) Mayors' judgments - tho ap coint up - tho ap coint up - though a valease - bouth anyors and efficiency as tide points' ingleme tatings average points' ingleme to faw respondent groups were his for an respondent groups were his 									,											· ;					(
<pre>practice and th were substatia implementation placed a substatia improved yi substation improved (4.18) thought sfilts improved (3.54) thought signers (2.28) Georesse (2.28) Georesse to both resists (333 seturn rate; (334 seturn rate; (335 seturn rate; (335 seturn rate; (335 seturn rate; (337 seturn rate; (338 s</pre>													s							and the second is	din					(000 1000111 1000)
<pre>practice and th were substatia implementation placed a substatia improved yi substation improved (4.18) thought sfilts improved (3.54) thought signers (2.28) Georesse (2.28) Georesse to both resists (333 seturn rate; (334 seturn rate; (335 seturn rate; (335 seturn rate; (335 seturn rate; (337 seturn rate; (338 s</pre>																										- saw moderate co
 were substantia amtution placed s substantia implomentation thought fairnes improved by imp improved by imp improved (4.18) thought sfiftise improved (3.58) thought resists moderate (2.62) (2.28) decrease (2.28) decrease (2.29) decrease (2.28) decrease (2.																					4					
 In the substantian in place of a substantian inplacementation in primer and improved by improved (4.18) thought fairness reduction in or improved (3.58) thought resistent in or reduction in or improved failing in or respondent groups were the or form responses to support groups where therefore not (See Table I) 																										practice and th
 mentacion placed a substa inplaced substa thought feirnes thought feirnes								4	, .											1						- wore substantia
- placed a subsca implementation - thought fairnes improved by imp - thought fairnes - improved (4.18) - thought improve reduction in er reduction in er reduction in er (2.28) decrement (3)% reducting return - thought resistes moderate (2.62) (2) Mayors' judgments (3)% return rate; - those of police of from low to high - the one point un was the standar gap was wider (1) - both mayors and efficiency as the police chicks (of improved fail - both mayors and efficiency as the police chicks (of improved fail - both mayors and efficiency as the police chicks (of improved fail - both mayors and efficiency as the return rate; - both mayors and - both mayors and efficiency as the return rate; - both mayors and - both mayors and efficiency as the - both mayors and - return rate; - both mayors and - both mayors and - return rate; - both mayors and - both mayors and - both mayors and - return rate; - both mayors and - return rate; - both mayors and - return rate; - both mayors and - both mayors and - return rate; - both mayors and - both mayors an																										
- placed a subsca implementation - thought fairnes improved by imp - thought fairnes - improved (4.18) - thought improve reduction in er reduction in er reduction in er (2.28) decrement (3)% reducting return - thought resistes moderate (2.62) (2) Mayors' judgments (3)% return rate; - those of police of from low to high - the one point un was the standar gap was wider (1) - both mayors and efficiency as the police chicks (of improved fail - both mayors and efficiency as the police chicks (of improved fail - both mayors and efficiency as the police chicks (of improved fail - both mayors and efficiency as the return rate; - both mayors and - both mayors and efficiency as the return rate; - both mayors and - both mayors and efficiency as the - both mayors and - return rate; - both mayors and - both mayors and - return rate; - both mayors and - both mayors and - both mayors and - return rate; - both mayors and - return rate; - both mayors and - return rate; - both mayors and - both mayors and - return rate; - both mayors and - both mayors an																										mencacion
<pre>implementation implementation implementation improved ly implementation improved ly implementation improved (3.18) implementation implem</pre>	Ì																									- placed a substa
 thought fairnes improved by improved (4.18) thought improve (3.54) thought improve (3.54) thought resista moderate (2.62) (2) Mayors' judgments (3) return rate; those of police of from low to high these on point up was the standar gap was wider (1 of improved fai both mayors and priority implem ratings warrage police chiefs (of improved fai potential or a i ratings warrages thought appendent groups we boo few respondent groups we boo few respondent groups we boo few respondent groups we 																					-					
 thought fairnes improved by improved (4.18) thought improve reduction in or improved (3.54) thought resistent (2.28) decrease thought resistent moderate (2.62) Mayors' judgments (324 return rate; those of police of from low to high - the one point up was the standar gap was wider (1 both mayors and efficiency as th priority impleam ratings average police chiefs (of improved fairnes police chiefs (of improved fairnes promy were charefore not (See Table I) 																										Imprementation
<pre>improved by imp - thought efficie improved (4.18) - thought improve reduction in er reduction in er reduction in er reduction in er (2.28) decrease - thought resists moderate (2.62) (2) Mayors' judgments (338 return rate; (338 return rate; (</pre>																										- thought fairnes
 thought afficie improved (4.18) thought improve reduction is or improved (3.54) thought impleme (2.28) decrease thought resists those of police di from low to high is those of police di from low to high is those of police di from low to high is the one polite di from low to high is the one polite di from low to high is both mayors and gap was wider (1) both mayors are police chiefs (1) is ratings were generating average police chiefs (1) the one point of promps were therefore not (See Table 1) 																				· ·						improved by imp
 Inbugit childse improved (4.16) thought improve reduction in or improved (2.54) thought resists moderate (2.28) (2.28) decrease thought resists moderate (2.62) (2) Mayors' judgments (338 return rate; those of police of from low to high swider (1 the ne point up gap was wider (1 both mayors and priority implement ratings average police chiefs (1) of improved fai potential or a : ratings were hit *some respondent groups we toom espondent groups we toom swe therefore not (See Table 1) 	}																									TWDTOVED DY TWD
 improved (4.18) thought improve reduction in cr improved (3.54) thought resista moderate (2.62) Mayors' judgments (3.33 yeturn rate; those of police of from low to high the one point u was the standar gap was wider (1) both mayors and efficiency as ti priority impleme ratings average; police chiefs (1) of improved fai potential or a : ratings were himproved fai potential or a: *Some respondent groups we too few respondes to supp groups were therefore not (See Table 1) 																										- thought officia
 thought improve reduction in or improved (3.54) thought implement (2.28) decrease thought resists moderate (2.62) Mayors' judgments (33) return rate; those of police of from low to high. the one point un was the standar gap was vider (1) both mayors and efficiency as til priority implement ratings average police ohiefs (1) of improved fai potential or a i ratings were himilar to save toom fersy to save toom fersy	a de la de la de la dela de la dela de la dela de																									improved (4 18)
reduction in cr improved (3.54) - thought impleme (2.28) decrease - thought resista moderate (2.62) (2) Mayors' judgments (33% return rate; those of police of from low to high - the one point u was the standar gap was wider (1) - both mayors and efficiency as ti priority implement ratings average police chiefs (of improved fai potential or a ratings were high - Some respondent groups were to few responses to supp groups were therefore not (See Table I)																										Improved (4.18)
reduction in cr improved (3.54) - thought impleme (2.28) decrease - thought resista moderate (2.62) (2) Mayors' judgments (33% return rate; those of police of from low to high - the one point u was the standar gap was wider (1) - both mayors and efficiency as ti priority implement ratings average police chiefs (of improved fai potential or a ratings were high - Some respondent groups were to few responses to supp groups were therefore not (See Table I)																										
<pre>improved (3.54)</pre>	- Jan 1990																									- thought improve
- thought impleme (2.28) decrease - thought resista moderate (2.62) (2) Mayors' judgments (33% return rate; those of police of from low to high - the one point u was the standar gap was wider (1 - both mayors and efficiency as ti priority impleme ratings average police chiefs (of improved fai potential or a : ratings were his too few respondent groups we too few respondent sto sup groups were therefore not (See Table I)																		•								
 (2.28) decrease thought resista moderate (2.62) (2) Mayors' judgments (3) areturn rate; those of police of from low to high from low to high those of police of from low to high those of police of those tandar both mayors and sefficiency as th priority implem ratings average police chiefs (of improved fai potential or a: ratings were hier too few respondent groups were too few res																				1000						improved (3.54)
 (2.28) decrease thought resista moderate (2.62) (2) Mayors' judgments (3) areturn rate; those of police of from low to high from low to high those of police of from low to high those of police of those tandar both mayors and sefficiency as th priority implem ratings average police chiefs (of improved fai potential or a: ratings were hier too few respondent groups were too few res																					-					
- thought resista moderate (2.62) (2) Mayors' judgments (33% return rate; those of police of from low to high - the one point u was the standar gap was wider (- both mayors and efficiency as ti priority implem ratings average: police chiefs (of improved fai potential or a: ratings ware hi *Some respondent groups we too few responses to supp groups were therefore not (See Table I)	-																									
noderate (2.62) (2) Mayors' judgments (33% return rate; those of police cd from low to high - the one point u was the standar gap was wider (1) - both mayors and efficiency as ti priority implem ratings average police chiefs (of improved fai: potential or a: ratings were hier *Some respondent groups we too few responses to supp groups were therefore not (See Table I)																										(2.28) decrease
noderate (2.62) (2) Mayors' judgments (33% return rate; those of police cd from low to high - the one point u was the standar gap was wider (1) - both mayors and efficiency as ti priority implem ratings average police chiefs (of improved fai: potential or a: ratings were hier *Some respondent groups we too few responses to supp groups were therefore not (See Table I)																										
 (2) Mayors' judgments (33% return rate; those of police di from low to high: - the one point u was the standar gap was wider () - both mayors and efficiency as wider () - both mayors and efficiency as arrange police chiefs - of improved fai potential or a ratings were hid - some respondent groups we too few responses to supp groups were therefore not (See Table 1) 	-																				and the second se					- thought resista
(33% return rate; those of police d from low to high - the one point w was the standar gap was wider (1 - both mayors and efficiency as ti priority implem marings average police chiefs (of improved fai : potential or a ratings were hid - both mayors and efficiency as ti priority implem tratings average police chiefs (of improved fai : potential or a ratings were hid too few responses to supp groups were therefore not (See Table I)						1																				moderate (2.62)
(33% return rate; those of police d from low to high - the one point w was the standar gap was wider (1 - both mayors and efficiency as ti priority implem marings average police chiefs (of improved fai : potential or a ratings were hid - both mayors and efficiency as ti priority implem tratings average police chiefs (of improved fai : potential or a ratings were hid too few responses to supp groups were therefore not (See Table I)	i.																									
those of police d from low to high i - the one point u was the standar gap was wider (1 - both mayors and efficiency as th priority implem ratings averaged police chiefs (of improved fai potential or a ratings were hid *Some respondent groups we too few responses to supp groups were therefore not (See Table I)																				-					(2)	Mayors' judgments
from low to high is - the one point up was the standar gap was wider (2 - both mayors and efficiency as ti priority implement ratings averageder police chiefs (of improved fai: potential or a : ratings were hid *Some respondent groups were too few responses to supp groups were therefore not (See Table I)																										
- the one point up was the standar gap was wider (1 - both mayors and efficiency as the priority implement ratings averaged police chiefs (of improved fai: potential or a : ratings were hid *Some respondent groups were too few responses to supp groups were therefore not (See Table I)																										those of police d
- the one point up was the standar gap was wider (1 - both mayors and efficiency as the priority implement ratings averaged police chiefs (of improved fai: potential or a : ratings were hid *Some respondent groups were too few responses to supp groups were therefore not (See Table I)																										from low to high a
was the standar gap was wider (1 - both mayors and efficiency as th priority implemention ratings averaged police chiefs (of improved faits) potential or a ratings were hid *Some respondent groups were too few responses to supp groups were therefore not (See Table I)																										
 both mayors and efficiency as the priority implement ratings averaged police chiefs (of improved fait potential or a ratings were hief too few respondent groups wee too few responses to supp groups were therefore not (See Table I) 																									,	- the one point up
 both mayors and efficiency as the priority implement ratings averaged police chiefs (of improved fait potential or a ratings were hief too few respondent groups wee too few responses to supp groups were therefore not (See Table I) 																										
efficiency as the priority implement police chiefs (of improved fait potential or a the ratings were him some respondent groups were too few responses to supp groups were therefore not (See Table I)																					All and a second se					gap was wider (:
efficiency as the priority implement police chiefs (of improved fait potential or a the ratings were him some respondent groups were too few responses to supp groups were therefore not (See Table I)																										
priority impleme ratings average police chiefs (of improved fai: potential or a ratings were hid *Some respondent groups we too few responses to supp groups were therefore not (See Table I)																										- both mayors and
priority impleme ratings average police chiefs (of improved fai: potential or a ratings were hid *Some respondent groups we too few responses to supp groups were therefore not (See Table I)																										efficiency as the
police chiefs (of improved fai: potential or a : ratings were hid *Some respondent groups were too few responses to supp groups were therefore not (See Table I)																										priority implement
<pre>potential or a : ratings were hid *Some respondent groups wer too few responses to supp groups were therefore not (See Table I)</pre>																										ratings averaged
<pre>potential or a : ratings were hid *Some respondent groups wer too few responses to supp groups were therefore not (See Table I)</pre>															ø		í í									police chiefs (4
<pre>potential or a : ratings were hid *Some respondent groups we too few responses to supp groups were therefore not (See Table I)</pre>																					VALUE AND A					of improved fai:
*Some respondent groups were too few responses to supp groups were therefore not (See Table I)							1													n de la composición d Composición de la composición de la comp	-					potential or a :
*Some respondent groups we too few responses to supp groups were therefore not (See Table I)																					Î					ratings were hid
*Some respondent groups we too few responses to supp groups were therefore not (See Table I)																					Taga An					
too few responses to supp groups were therefore not (See Table I)																										
too few responses to supp groups were therefore not (See Table I)																									· · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
too few responses to supp groups were therefore not (See Table I)																							*	ടറ	ne re	spondent groups we
groups were therefore not (See Table I)	I.																							to	o few	responses to supp
(See Table I)																					الفالي			ar	วนอร	were therefore not
																								(Se	e Ta	ble I)
																								, ,		•
																				ŀ						
	a																			i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i						
	a transitio	ing and an a	<u>l lati ku juga</u> u	 	 , singh weapons	<u>- 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1</u>	. ozosta	and stationers		 Local and the work		<u></u>		 		 			 	 	the statement	 Par- 1919-25-25			1.96 T.17 P.17 BQL T. 198 Q3101 PT12	n an

tandards, by Respondent Group* (Table IV-A police standards, police chiefs e; 41/73): conformity (2.66) between Pennsylvania he standards ally in favor (4.42) of full impleantial priority (4.26) on full ess would be moderately (3.32) plementation ency would be substantially 3) red rehabilitation potential or rime would be substantially L.) entation would only minimally se system costs ance to implementation would be s, in response to police standards ; 12/36), differed minimally from chiefs; the widest range in variance average scores was 7%. upon which judgments differed slightly ards-practice gap; mayors thought the (2.54) than police chiefs (2.66). d police chiefs rated increased the most important reason for their ementation assignment; mayors' ed higher (4.26) than those of (4.18), although on the questions airness and improved rehabilitation reduction in crime, police chiefs' igher. vere small in number or returned

port any generalizations. Such - ot included in this summary.

-13-

A L A MARK . 1

- standards implementation.
 - priority to implementation.

(3) Responses to police standards by RPC citizen members and private organization personnel were in general agreement with those of police chiefs and mayors. Major differences between these two respondent groups lie in the degree to which full implementation was favored, the priority assignment of full implementation, and expected resistance from

- RPC citizen members were more in favor of standards implementation and assigned a higher

- both RPC citizen and private organization members rated increased efficiency highest for their priority ratings; private organizations rated improved rehabilitation potential or a reduction in crime as their second highest (3.53) reason.

- private organization personnel expected higher degree of resistance (3.18) to standards when compared with other respondent groups.

-14-



D. Responses to Court Standards, by Respondent Group (Table IV-B)

(1) Respondents to court standards judged Pennsylvania practice as conforming moderately (2.57) to

- public defenders and president judges perceived the widest standards-practice gap while district attorneys and probation officers saw a higher degree of conformity.

(2) Respondents substantially favored both a full implementation (3.79) and a high priority assignment (3.60) of standards.

- probation officers and district attorneys gave highest ratings in response to these questions

(3) In terms of respondent averages, improved fairness of the criminal justice system received the highest rating (3.63 - substantial) as the reason for priority implementation assignments.

- only probation officers rated increased efficiency higher than improved fairness as their reason for implementation.

(4) Respondents thought that implementation would only minimally (2.35) decrease system costs.

- president judges and district attorneys gave the lowest ratings; probation officers and public defenders gave the highest.

(5) Resistance to standards implementation was expected to be moderate (3.01).

- probation officers and public defenders anticipate the least amount of resistance; president judges and district attorneys the highest.

- president judges see resistance to court standards implementation to be higher than all but one of the other respondent groups to court standards.

(6) All respondents felt that the standards were clearly expressed (4.19).

-15-

.

1 - 1

111

reduction of crime.

(7) On the average, president judges were more cautious in their ratings, when compared to other respondent groups. Only on the standards-practice question (evidence of a wider gap) and priority designation for implementation were public defenders lower and in both instances the difference was minor. As noted above, president judges also indicated higher expectations for resistance (3.22).

(8) District attorneys and probation officers expressed the highest desire for implementation of standards. They thought that Pennsylvania practice conforms moderately to standards (higher than all respondent groups who reviewed court standards); gave highest ratings for a full priority implemenation of standards; and gave highest ratings across respondent groups for improved fairness, increased efficiency, and improved rehabilitation potential or



Responses to Correction Standards, by Respondent Group (Table IV-C)

(1) Respondents saw Pennsylvania practice as conforming moderately (2.72) to standards. Ratings were very

- RPC citizen members and state prison officials viewed Pennsylvania's conformity as being slightly lower; president judges and probation officers saw a slightly higher degree of conformity.

(2) Respondents were substantially in favor of full implementa+ on of standards (3.92) and placed a substantial priority (3.75) on that implementation.

- state prison officials and RPC citizen members were the most highly supportive respondent groups for a full priority implementation of

- president judges gave the lowest ratings for both the full implementation and the priority assignment for implementation of standards.

(3) Improved fairness of the criminal justice system received the highest rating (3.76 - substantial) in terms of state-wide averages for all respondents to correction standards; next highest was improved rehabilitation potential or reduction of crime (3.54 - substantial); increased efficiency received the lowest average rating (3.38 - moderate).

- again, state prison officials and RPC citizen members gave the highest ratings for all three

- president judges, in comparison with other respondents, were less sure that implementation would improve fairness, increase efficiency and improve rehabilitation potential or reduce crime; only district attorneys rated lower on the question of improving rehabilitation potential

(4) Respondents rated a reduction in system cost moderately (2.50) as a reason for their implementation priority assignment of standards.

- president judges gave the lowest rating while state prison officials and RPC citizen members gave the highest; between these two respondent groups there was a fairly wide variance (22 percent) in low to high average scores.

-17-



- ratings.
- Pennsylvania.

(5) Resistance resulting from implementation of standards was viewed as being moderate (3.10) and there was a high degree of consistency in reported

(6) All respondents felt that the standards were clearly and adequately expressed (4.04).

(7) As noted above, state prison officials and RPC citizen members were in close agreement in their slightly higher expressions of the need and desirability of standards implementation in

(8) President judges indicated higher ratings on the extent to which Pennsylvania practice conforms to the standards (3.01) in the corrections area.

_ -18-



F. Responses to Community Standards, by Respondent Group (Table IV-D)

(1) Respondents saw Pennsylvania practice as conforming

(2) Respondents substantially favored full priority implementation (3.85 and 3.73, respectively) of

(3) Improved rehabilitation potential or a reduction in crime rated highest (3.58 - substantial) among all respondents as the reason for their priority assignment for implementation; increased efficiency was viewed as being the second highest (2.96); and improved fairness as the third highest (2.77).

(4) Respondents gave a low rating (2.47 - minimal) to decreasing system cost as a reason for their priority rating of standards implementation.

(5) A moderate degree of resistance (2.99) is expected by respondents to the implementation of standards.

(6) Standards were expressed clearly and adequately for all respondents (3.90 - substantial).

G.	Average	ratings	for	in

يبر الأيصي

,

- Andrew Saman

1.000.000

-

> 4

يهيرة بنعات

and have

4

on a 1 - 5 scale.

	Commu	nity
Question No.	Low	High
1	1.79	2.69
2	3.25	4.43
3	3.00	4.36
4	1.33	3.50
5	2.42	3.57
6	3.00	4.36
7	2.08	2.92
8	2.43	3.75
9	3.64	4.25

- and reactions.

dividual standards

(1) Analysis of question responses given for each standard indicates a wide range in the evaluative ratings

Type of Standard

Pol	ice	Cou	rts	Corre	ction
Low	High	Low	High	Low	High
1.69	3.85	1.32	4.00	1.46	3.50
2.83	4.64	2.31	4.79	3.06	4.86
2.75	4.55	2.31	4.86	2.69	4.78
2.67	4.60	2.50	4.93	1.83	4.23
2.18	4.53	2.31	4.50	2.87	4.78
2.08	4.64	1.83	4.07	2.33	4.36
1.50	3.82	1.25	3.68	1.08	3.81
2.08	4.00	1.43	4.20	1.46	4.22
2.86	4.55	3.50	4.64	3.79	4.50

(2) The wide response indicates that respondents exercised discrimination in recording their judgments

(3) Further detailed analyses, will assist in the prioritizing of standards and sets of standards within each functional area of the criminal justice system. Priority indications from the survey will be related and compared to priorities suggested by criminal justice agencies (the engagement process) as a basis for developing the state-wide strategy and action plan.

-20-







Appendix I

Pa. Criminal Justice Standards Implementation GSS-MBSC PROJECT

> APPRAISAL OF NATIONAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE STANDARDS FOR USE IN PENNSYLVANIA Selected Correction Standards

Instructions: Please review and rate each standard in response to the questions listed using the numbers in the following scale: (5) High, (4) Substantial, (3) Moderate, (2) Minimal, (1) None. Please return one copy of the completed form in the enclosed self-addressed envelope as soon as you can--not later than November 21, 1973, if possible.

Questions	Standard Identification Number										
	5.1	5.2	5.3	5.6	5.7	5.9	5.11	5.14	5.17	5.18	5.19
 To what extent does Pennsylvania practice conform to the standard? 						-					
2. To what extent do you favor full imple-	<u> </u>	T	r	·	۲	1	T	1	1	<u> </u>	<u>г. т</u>

mentation of the standard?

- 3. What priority would you assign to full implementation?
- 4. Evaluate each of the following possible reasons for your priority assignment:
 - a. improves fairness of the criminal justice system
 - b. increases efficiency
 - c. improves rehabilitation potential or decreases crime
 - d. decreases system cost



- 5. What degree of resistance to implementation might be expected?
- 6. Evaluate the extent to which the standard is clearly and adequately expressed.





Appendix II



Questionnaires Sent to and Received from Criminal Justice Personnel Responding to Standards Within the Four Components of the Criminal Justice System

SENT

RECEIVED

	Police	Courts	Corrections	Community	TOTAL		Police	Courts	Corrections	Community	TOTAL
County Commissioners		30	30	6	66			6	9	1	16
President JudgesCounty Courts of Common Pleas		30	29		59			13	12		25
State Prison Officials	·		9		9				7		7
County Prison Officials			26		26				13		13
Chiefs of Police*	- 73				73		41				41
Mayors*	36		24	13	73		12	·	7	5	24
District Attorneys		34	33		67			6	8		14
RPC Citizen Members	21	25	19	12	77		4	8	10	2	24
Probation Officers	· · ·		34		67			13	17		30
Private Organizations	7	17	10	6	40		4	7	5	5	21
People Invited to National Conference	7	8	10	2	27		2	4	2	1	9
Public Defenders		67			67	1		21			21
TOTALS	144	244	224	39	651	Î	63	78	90	14	245
							-				

Police	Courts	Corrections	Community	TOTAL		Police	Courts	Corrections	Community	TOTAL
	30	30	6	66			6	9	1	16
	30	29		59			13	12		25
· •		9		9				7		7
		26		26				13		13
73				73		41				41
36		24	13	73		12		7	5	24
	34	33		67			6	8		14
21	25	19	12	77		4	8	10	2	24
· . 	33	34		67		. .	13	17		30
7	17	10	6	40		4	7	5	5	21
7	8	10	2	27		2	4	2	1	9
·	. 67 _.			67		 .	21			21
144	244	224	39	651		63	78	90	14	245
	 73 36 21 7 7 7	$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	30 30 30 29 $$ 9 $$ 26 73 $$ $$ 36 $$ 24 $$ 34 33 21 25 19 33 34 7 17 10 7 8 10 67 $$	30 30 6 30 29 $$ 9 $$ $$ 26 $$ 73 $$ $$ $$ 36 $$ 24 13 $$ 34 33 $$ 21 25 19 12 $$ 33 34 $$ 7 17 10 6 7 8 10 2 $$ 67 $$ $$	30 30 6 66 30 29 59 $$ 9 $$ 9 $$ 26 $$ 26 73 $$ $$ 73 36 $$ 24 13 73 $$ 34 33 $$ 67 21 25 19 12 77 $$ 33 34 $$ 67 7 17 10 6 40 7 8 10 2 27 $$ 67 $$ $$ 67	30 30 6 66 30 29 59 $$ 9 9 $$ 26 $$ 26 73 $$ $$ 73 36 $$ 24 13 73 $$ 34 33 $$ 67 21 25 19 12 77 $$ 33 34 $$ 67 7 17 10 6 40 7 8 10 2 27 $$ 67 $$ $$ 67	30 30 6 66 30 29 59 9 9 26 26 73 26 73 41 36 24 13 73 12 34 33 67 21 25 19 12 77 4 33 34 67 7 17 10 6 40 4 7 8 10 2 27 2 67 -67 $$	30 30 6 66 6 30 29 59 13 9 9 $$ 26 26 $$ 73 73 41 73 $$ 73 41 73 $$ 73 41 73 $$ 24 13 73 12 $$ 7 34 33 $$ 67 $$ 6 21 25 19 12 77 4 8 $$ 33 34 $$ 67 $$ 13 7 8 10 2 27 2 4 $$ 67 $$ 67 $$ 21 $$ 67 $$ </td <td>$30$$30$$6$$66$$$$6$$9$$$$30$$29$$$$59$$$$13$$12$$$$$$9$$$$9$$$$7$$$$$$26$$$$26$$$$13$$73$$$$$$73$$41$$$$$$36$$$$24$$13$$73$$12$$$$36$$$$24$$13$$73$$12$$$$36$$$$24$$13$$73$$12$$$$7$$34$$33$$$$67$$$$6$$21$$25$$19$$12$$77$$4$$8$$10$$$$33$$34$$$$67$$$$13$$17$$7$$17$$10$$6$$40$$4$$7$$5$$7$$8$$10$$2$$27$$2$$4$$2$$$$67$$$$-67$$$$21$$$</td> <td>$30$$30$$6$$66$$$$6$$9$$1$$$$30$$29$$$$59$$$$13$$12$$$$$$$$9$$$$9$$$$7$$$$$$$$26$$$$26$$$$13$$12$$$$$$26$$$$26$$$$13$$$$73$$$$$$73$$41$$$$$$36$$$$24$$13$$73$$12$$$$7$$36$$$$24$$13$$73$$12$$$$7$$21$$25$$19$$12$$77$$4$$8$$10$$2$$$$33$$34$$$$67$$$$13$$17$$$$7$$17$$10$$6$$40$$4$$7$$5$$5$$7$$8$$10$$2$$27$$2$$4$$2$$1$$$$67$$$$$$67$$$$-21$$$$$</td>	30 30 6 66 $$ 6 9 $$ 30 29 $$ 59 $$ 13 12 $$ $$ 9 $$ 9 $$ 7 $$ $$ 26 $$ 26 $$ 13 73 $$ $$ 73 41 $$ $$ 36 $$ 24 13 73 12 $$ 36 $$ 24 13 73 12 $$ 36 $$ 24 13 73 12 $$ 7 34 33 $$ 67 $$ 6 21 25 19 12 77 4 8 10 $$ 33 34 $$ 67 $$ 13 17 7 17 10 6 40 4 7 5 7 8 10 2 27 2 4 2 $$ 67 $$ -67 $$ 21 $$	30 30 6 66 $$ 6 9 1 $$ 30 29 $$ 59 $$ 13 12 $$ $$ $$ 9 $$ 9 $$ 7 $$ $$ $$ 26 $$ 26 $$ 13 12 $$ $$ 26 $$ 26 $$ 13 $$ 73 $$ $$ 73 41 $$ $$ 36 $$ 24 13 73 12 $$ 7 36 $$ 24 13 73 12 $$ 7 21 25 19 12 77 4 8 10 2 $$ 33 34 $$ 67 $$ 13 17 $$ 7 17 10 6 40 4 7 5 5 7 8 10 2 27 2 4 2 1 $$ 67 $$ $$ 67 $$ -21 $$ $$

*All Chiefs of Police and Mayors from municipalities having a minimum of 25 full-time police staff are included.





Average Ratings Assigned to Each Implementation

Factor for All Standards, State-wide and By

Regional Planning Council

Regional Planning No. of Council Respondents Fl F2 F3 F4a F4b F4c F4d F5 F6 State-wide 4.00 3.54 3.83 3.62 3.25 2.97 4.13 2.62 2.38 245 Averages \$ Southeast 43 2.65 4.19 4.01 3.53 3.87 3.40 2.40 2.74 4.14 42 2.56 4.06 3.88 3.49 3.78 3.35 2.31 2.96 4.18 Northeast

Implementation Factors*

TABLE II

		 A second sec second second sec	•								
	South Central	33	2.73	3.83	3.65	3.45	3.42	3.07	2.22	3.02	4.16
	Central	26	2.39	3.84	3.73	3.60	3.40	3.14	2.43	3.11	4.12
- u .	Southwest	20	2.56	4.10	3.99	3.89	3.89	3.62	2.77	3.16	4.09
-	Northwest	44	2.88	3.82	3.68	3.46	3.51	3.05	2.32	2.99	4.14
	Philadelphia	13	2.18	4.20	3.98	3.59	3.42	3.22	2.62	3.05	4.06
-	Allegheny	24	2.61	4.10	3.83	3.59	3.50	3.31	2.26	2.88	4.05

*Implementation Factors identified as Fl, F2, etc., refer to the numbered questions on the Questionnaire form (See Appendix 1). Average ratings under Fl relate to question #1, F2 - question #2, etc.

TABLE III-A

Degree of Conformity to Standards

Regional Planning Council	No. of Respondents	Police	Courts	Corrections	Community	Averages Across All Functional Components
Southeast	43	2.56	2.98	·2.79	2.14	2.65
Northeast	42	2.43	2.54	2.66	2.53	2.56
South Central	33	2.66	2.66	2.82		2.73
Central	26	2.69	2.05	2.68		2.39
Southwest	20	2.46	2.63	2.49	2.57	2.56
Northwest	44	3.00	2.75	2.97	2.50	2.88
Philadelphia	13	3.27	1.93	2.03	1.96	2.18
Allegheny	24	2.53	2.10	2.83		2.61
TOTAL	245					
STATE-WIDE AVERAGES		2.64	2.57	2.72	2.20	2.62

Average Ratings of All Respondents in Each

Regional Planning Council By Type of Standard

TABLE III-B

Extent to Which Implementation is Favored

No. of Respondents	Police	Courts	Corrections	Community	Averages Across All Functional Components
43	4.29	4.23	4.13	3.90	4.19
42	4.44	3.96	3.91	3.64	4.06
33	4.53	3.58	3.69		3.83
26	4.50	3.74	3.84		3.84
20	4.81	3.84	4.35	3.64	4.10
44	4.46	3.44	3.78	3.86	3.82
.13	4.69	4.12	4.27	3.91	4.20
24	4.36	4.02	3.97		4.10
245	-				
	4.42	3.79	3.92	3.85	4.00
	Respondents 43 42 33 26 20 44 ·13 24	Respondents Police 43 4.29 42 4.44 33 4.53 26 4.50 20 4.81 44 4.46 '13 4.69 24 4.36 245	Respondents Police Courts 43 4.29 4.23 42 4.44 3.96 33 4.53 3.58 26 4.50 3.74 20 4.81 3.84 44 4.46 3.44 13 4.69 4.12 24 4.36 4.02 245	RespondentsPoliceCourtsCorrections434.294.234.13424.443.963.91334.533.583.69264.503.743.84204.813.844.35444.463.443.78134.694.124.27244.364.023.97245	Respondents Police Courts Corrections Community 43 4.29 4.23 4.13 3.90 42 4.44 3.96 3.91 3.64 33 4.53 3.58 3.69 26 4.50 3.74 3.84 20 4.81 3.84 4.35 3.64 44 4.46 3.44 3.78 3.64 13 4.69 4.12 4.27 3.91 24 4.36 4.02 3.97 24 4.36 4.02 3.97

Average Ratings of All Respondents in Each

Regional Planning Council By Type of Standard

TABLE III-C

Priority for Implementation

No. of Respondents	Police	Courts	Corrections	Community	Averages Across All Functional Components
43	4.06	4.03	3.97	3.84	4.01
42	4.37	3.60	3.76	3.57	3.88
33	4.48	3.45	3.40		3.65
26	4.34	3.58	3.78		3.73
20	4.73	3.70	4.28	3.36	3.99
44	4.33	3.24	3.68		3.68
13	4.34	3.90	4.10	3.69	3.98
24	4.11	3.92	3.62		3.83
245					
	4.26	3.60	3.75	3.73	3.83
	Respondents 43 42 33 26 20 44 13 24	Respondents Police 43 4.06 42 4.37 33 4.48 26 4.34 20 4.73 44 4.33 13 4.34 24 4.11 245 4.5	Respondents Police Courts 43 4.06 4.03 42 4.37 3.60 33 4.48 3.45 26 4.34 3.58 20 4.73 3.70 44 4.33 3.24 13 4.34 3.90 24 4.11 3.92 245 4.11 3.92	RespondentsPoliceCourtsCorrections434.064.033.97424.373.603.76334.483.453.40264.343.583.78204.733.704.28444.333.243.68134.343.904.10244.113.923.62245	RespondentsPoliceCourtsCorrectionsCommunity434.064.033.973.84424.373.603.763.57334.483.453.40264.343.583.78204.733.704.283.36444.333.243.683.86134.343.904.103.69244.113.923.62245

Average Ratings of All Respondents in Each Regional Planning Council By Type of Standard

TABLE III-D

Reason for Priority Assignment: Fairness

Regional Planning Council	No. of Respondents	Police	Courts	Corrections	Community	Averages Across All Functional Components
Southeast	43	3.30	3.90	4.09	2.90	3.53
Northeast	42	3.06	3.85	3.68	2.35	3.49
South Central	33	3.63	3.17	3.57		3.45
Central	26	3.07	3.64	3.64		3.60
Southwest	20	2.77	3.96	4.29	2.71	3.89
Northwest	44	3.45	3.25	3.74	2.93	3.46
Philadelphia	13	3.69	4.53	3.85	2.75	3.59
Allegheny	24	3.23	3.84	3.74		3.59
TOTAL	245					
STATE-WIDE AVERAGES		3.30	3.63	3.76	2.77	3.54

Average Ratings of All Respondents in Each Regional Planning Council By Type of Standard

TABLE III-E

Reason for Priority Assignment: Efficiency

No. of Respondents	Police	Courts	Corrections	Community	Averages Across All Functional Components
43	4.11	3.98	3.80	2.96	3.87
42	4.23	3.81	3.57	2.64	3.78
33	4.35	3.30	3.07		3.42
26	4.62	3.38	3.22		3.40
20	4.88	3.84	3.86	2.57	3.89
44	4.33	3.22	3.25	3.43.	3.51
13	4.30	2.89	3.54	3.09	3.42
24	3.93	3.44	3.23		3.50
245					
3	4.22	3.53	3.38	2.96	3.62
	Respondents 43 42 33 26 20 44 13 24 245	Respondents Police 43 4.11 42 4.23 33 4.23 33 4.35 26 4.62 20 4.88 44 4.33 13 4.30 24 3.93 245 245	Respondents Police Courts 43 4.11 3.98 42 4.23 3.81 33 4.35 3.30 26 4.62 3.38 20 4.88 3.84 44 4.33 3.22 13 4.30 2.89 24 3.93 3.44 245 3.93 3.44	RespondentsPoliceCourtsCorrections434.113.983.80424.233.813.57334.353.303.07264.623.383.22204.883.843.86444.333.223.25134.302.893.54243.933.443.23	RespondentsPoliceCourtsCorrectionsCommunity434.113.983.802.96424.233.813.572.64334.353.303.07264.623.383.22204.883.843.862.57444.333.223.253.43.134.302.893.543.09243.933.443.23245

					F.				J
	•								

TABLE III-F

Reason for Priority Assignment: Rehabilitation Potential or Decrease in Crime

Regional Planning Council	No. of Respondents	Police	Courts	Corrections	Community	Averages Across All Functional Components
Southeast	43	3.16	3.23	3.96	3.71	3.40
Northeast	42	3.42	2.85	3.58	3.68	3.35
South Central	33	3.65	2.24	3.41		3.07
Central	26	4.50	2.63	3.43		3.14
Southwest	20	4.65	3.18	3.98	3.36	3.62
Northwest	44	3.44	2.31	3.53	4.14	3.05
Philadelphia	13	3.23	2.43	3.49	3.26	3.22
Allegheny	24	3.31	3.40	3.28		3.31
TOTAL	245					
STATE-WIDE AVERAGES		3.43	2.72	3.54	3.58	3.25

8

TABLE III-G

Reason for Priority Assignment: Decrease in Cost

Regional Planning Council	No. of Respondents	Police	Courts	Corrections	Community	Averages Across All Functional Components
Southeast	43	1.98	2.70	2.71	2.80	2.40
Northeast	42	1.76	2.56	2.67	1.07	2.31
South Central	33	2.25	2.05	2.34		2.22
Central	26	3.42	2.23	2.46		2.43
Southwest	20	3.00	2.86	2.65	2.36	2.77
Northwest	44	2.66	2.07	2.29	3.29	2.32
Philadelphia	.13	2.11	1.63	3.32	2.49	2.62
Allegheny	24	2.38	2.23	2.20		2.26
FOTAL	245					
TATE-WIDE VERAGES		2.22	2.35	2.50	2.47	2.38

TABLE III-H

Degree of Resistance Anticipated

Regional Planning Council	No. of Respondents	Police	Courts	Corrections	Community	Averages Across All Functional Components
Southeast	43	2.60	2.83	2.86	2.91	2.74
Northeast	42	2.75	2.81	3.16	3.46	2.96
South Central	33	2.74	2.93	3.23		3.02
Central	26	2.38	3.26	3.08		3.11
Southwest	20	• 3.15	3.09	3.35	2.50	3.16
Northwest	44	2.91	3.06	2.91	3.71	2.99
Philadelphia	13	2.42	3.16	3.47	2.80	3.05
Allegheny	24	2.77	2.91	2.95		2.88
FOTAL	245					
STATE-WIDE AVERAGES		2.72	3.01	3.10	2.99	2.97

Average Ratings of All Respondents in Each

Regional Planning Council By Type of Standard

TABLE III-I

Clarity of Standards

43 42 33 26	4.21 4.16 4.68	4.13 4.29 4.06	4.06 4.10	4.03 4.35	4.14
33			4.10	4.35	4.18
	4.68	4 06	-	1	
26		1.00	3.98	<u> </u>	4.16
20	3.92	4.15	4.12		4.12
20	3.65	4.11	4.28	3.50	4.09
44	4.29	4.25	3.94	3.43	4.14
13	4.42	4.77	3.93	3.68	4.06
24	4.05	4.27	3.97		4.05
245					
	4.23	4.19	4.04	3.90	4.13
-	44 13 24	44 4.29 13 4.42 24 4.05 245 4.05	44 4.29 4.25 13 4.42 4.77 24 4.05 4.27 245 4.05 4.27	44 4.29 4.25 3.94 13 4.42 4.77 3.93 24 4.05 4.27 3.97 245	44 4.29 4.25 3.94 3.43 13 4.42 4.77 3.93 3.68 24 4.05 4.27 3.97 245 4.05 4.27 3.97

Average Ratings of All Police Standards By Respondent Group

TABLE IV-A

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Implementation Factors*									
Respondent Group	No. of Respondents	Fl	F2	F3	F4a	F4b	F4c	F4d	F:5	F6	
Police Chiefs	41	2.66	4.42	4.26	3.32	4.18	3.54	2.28	2.62	4.23	
Mayors	1,2	2.54	4.42	4.31	3.06	4.26	3.31	2.21	2.69	4.20	
		1					1 - 1		l		

								and the second second		
RPC Citizen Members	4	2.60	4.46	4.25	3.42	4.35	3.02	1.73	2.96	4.25
Private Organi- zations	4	2.60	4.15	3.79	3.43	4.17	3.53	2.10	3.18	4.15
People Invited to National Conference	2	3.15	4.88	4.73	3.73	4.69	2.57	2.23	3.77	4.42
TOTAL	63	······································								
AVERAGES		2.64	4.42	4.26	3.30	4.22	3.43	2.22	2.72	4.23

*See footnote Table II for a description of F1, F2, etc.

Average	Ratings	of	A11	Court	Standards
	By Re:	spoi	ndent	: Group	2

TABLE IV-B

							aobbib			
Respondent Group	No. of Respondents	F1	F2	F3	F4a	F4b	F4c	F4d	F5	F6
									·	-
County Commissioners	6	2.60	3.48	3.37	3.08	2.94	2.19	2.23	2.93	4.22
President JudgesCounty Courts of Common Pleas	13	2.64	3.46	3.35	3.47	3.34	2.34	1.97	3.22	4.37
District Attorneys	6	2.92	3.89	3.62	3.87	3.48	2.88	2.41	3,13	4.40
n						1		1	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	

Implementation Factors

				1				1	· · · · ·	1
RPC Citizen Merbers	8	2.09	3.86	3.69	3.64	3.44	2.84	1.95	3.39	3.73
Probation Officers	13	2.87	4.27	4.15	3.82	4.12	3.15	2.51	2.73	4.37
Private Organizations	7	2.09	4.02	3.90	3.94	3.39	2.90	2.42	3.02	4.34
People Invited to National Conference	4	2.26	4.08	3.77	3.86	3.96	2.59	2.61	3.02	4.20
Public Defenders	21	2.61	3.60	3.30	3.55	3.45	2.69	2.57	2.89	4.03
TOTAL	78								-	
AVERAGES		2.57	3.79	3.60	3.63	3.53	2.72	2.35	3.01	4.19

					•		-		

Average	Ratings	of	All	Community	Standards
	By Re	espo	onder	nt Group	

TABLE IV-D

Implementation Facto	\mathbf{rs}	cto	Fa	ation	ement	Impl
----------------------	---------------	-----	----	-------	-------	------

Respondent Group	No. of Respondents	Fl	F2	F3	F4a	F4b	F4c	F4d	F5	F6
County Commis- sioners	1	2.57	3.64	3.36	2.71	2.57	3.36	2.36	2.50	3.50
Mayors	5	2.26	3.91	3.89	2.90	3.17	3.65	2.76	3.09	3.86
RPC Citizen Members	° 2	2.53	3.64	3.57	2.35	2.64	3.68	1.07	3.46	4.35
Private Organi- zations	5	1.96	3.90	3.68	2.96	3.02	3.58	2.71	2.89	4.01
People Invited to National Conference	1	2.14	3.86	3.86	2.07	2.64	3.29	2.71	2.50	3.00
TOTAL	14		· .							
AVERAGES		2.20	3.85	3.73	2.77	2.96	3.58	2.47	2.99	3.90
	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~									

