

# **POLICY DEVELOPMENT SEMINARS 1974**

## **VOLUME 2**



**LAW ENFORCEMENT  
ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**

**ON THE ROLE OF THE POLICE  
EXECUTIVE**

**ON CORRECTIONS**

18165  
99181

# **POLICY DEVELOPMENT SEMINAR**

# **ON THE ROLE OF THE POLICE EXECUTIVE**

---

**JUNE 12-13, 1974  
ROCHESTER, MICH.**



**LAW ENFORCEMENT  
ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**

---

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
OPENING PLENARY SESSION	
The Police Executive - Information and Communications Technology by Mr. Lloyd Bastian . . . . .	1
Mr. Richard Velde (comments on the current state of the art in the computer business) . . . . .	20
Mr. David Farmer (brief summary of the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice police projects). . . . .	28
The Police Chief and Corruption by Mr. John Lucey . . . . .	47
Police Task Force Proposal - The Police Chief Executive Project	
Chief Edward Davis . . . . .	65
Deputy Chief Hoy . . . . .	72
WORKSHOP REPORTS	
Workshop A - Police Systems	
Colonel Richard Plants . . . . .	77
Workshop B - Police Task Force Follow-on Proposal	
Chief Allen Andrews . . . . .	103
Workshop C - Research Needs of the Police Chief	
Mr. Arthur Brandstatter . . . . .	107
Workshop D - Corruption	
Sheriff William Lucas . . . . .	136
APPENDIX A - The Police Chief Executive Project	
Project Narrative . . . . .	151
Project Staff . . . . .	157
Budget Narrative . . . . .	164
APPENDIX B - Participants . . . . .	168
APPENDIX C - Workshop Members . . . . .	172

## OPENING PLENARY SESSION

MR. BASTIAN: The police executive is faced with numerous problems and issues that relate to the development and utilization of information and telecommunications technology. Some of the problems and issues are caused by the overall impact of the technology on society itself. Others are a direct result of the use of the technology by the police, other parts of the criminal justice system, and the many other functional areas of public administration.

Of course, society is changing; and, as it changes, so change the responsibilities and services that are both placed on and expected of the police executive. On the one hand the police executive can look forward to the technology helping to solve problems, and on the other he must anticipate that it will create problems. This makes the technology a mixed blessing - a solution on one side and an enemy; a cause or means of certain crime, management, or resource problems on the other. These considerations must be addressed when contemporary and future police and criminal justice problems are being contemplated.

Too often the police have found that changes in technology caused or contributed to major problems that impact on the traditional - and in some cases non-traditional - police services. For example, consider the impact of the automobile on the police service in the last 30 to 50 years. Consider the impact of the airplane as a major transportation media. Contemplate the impact of the urban mass transit systems that are being operated or planned both now and in the immediate future.

What changes in police operations management and personnel - number,

skill or educational level, police, unions - will be required to cope with the demands that will be made on the police?

The question might be raised about what mass transit has to do with the stated subject of this paper: information and telecommunications technology. The answer is, of course, obvious: information and telecommunications technology permeate the entire area. This includes communications to and from the public safety operations resources, access to needed data banks, and data necessary for the many management functions, such as budgeting, resource allocation, etcetera.

We have experienced many times over the blessings and problems associated with changing technology. This does not mean that we avoid the technology but rather that we learn how to plan for it and how to maximize its contributions to solving law enforcement problems.

We are not too far removed from the disorders of the 60's and the inadequacies of many of the radio telecommunications capabilities that plagued a number of major departments. The question should be fresh in every police executive's mind: Will my radio telecommunications system support my operational needs? What contingency plans do I have for wide-area multi-jurisdiction situations where the resources of several agencies must be utilized? In reality, few departments have taken the steps necessary to plan for on-going evaluation of these and many other related communications questions.

Recently the National Advisory Commission addressed this area in the Report on Police. Chapter 23 is titled, "Communications." The following

quotes summarize in rather terse terms the problems under discussion:

"Police communications in the United States can best be described as a chaotic assembly of independent radio networks which somehow manages to move a monumental volume of radio traffic despite considerable inefficiency. It is a system that operates on the threshold of collapse, with radio traffic overloads the rule rather than the exception. Historically, (police communications) have been relegated to low priority status, expanding on an unplanned basis and behind the general development of the police function they serve. They suffer from patchwork repair and makeshift innovation. Given a major civil disorder, disaster, or other massive emergency, most police communications systems will break down."

The foregoing tends to be a blanket indictment of all police agencies. Of course, this is not the case in some of our more progressive departments. Many have well-planned systems, and the plans and systems are coordinated on an intrastate "master plan" basis. Unfortunately, it is too often the case that well-planned communications systems are in the minority. While we must recognize that there are a number of factors and/or problems that hinder coordinated planning, we cannot lose sight of the fact that police radio communications can either be an asset or a liability to the police departments' operations. As such, it is an area that is just too important to be left to the "technicians." The police executive must be involved and understand the "tradeoffs and benefits" for the present and future of his department's communications.

In the book Technology, Management, and Society, Peter Drucker states:

"We are becoming aware that the major questions regarding technology are not technical but human factors. What

does technology do to man as well as for him? For it is only too obvious that technology brings problems, disturbances, and dangers, as well as benefits... Better tools demand a better, more highly skilled, and more careful man."

Even though Mr. Drucker is talking about technology in a broad sense, there is an analogy to be drawn relative to the use of technology by law enforcement. First is the recognition that technology is too important to be left to the technicians. Again, the police executive must be involved and prepared to relate the benefits to the costs. He must relate the budget costs to the public relationship or public acceptance "costs." Second, there is the overall relationship to the administration and operation of the department; and third, what does all this mean relative to personnel? How much training will be needed to obtain the planned benefits? What are the "tradeoffs and benefits"? What will the police unions have to say about this?

The author of Future Shock expressed the same points in a slightly different manner:

"If we do not learn history we shall be compelled to relive it. True. But if we do not change the future, we shall be compelled to endure it. And that could be worse."

Needless to say, the police community needs technology for growth and survival, but we must also learn to understand and manage technology. This point was expressed very well by the National Advisory Commission:

"Local governments tend to hire radio technicians rather than engineers. These technicians, although highly skilled, have difficulty in viewing present state-of-art hardware as an integrated system. Frequently they have ex-

tensive design and purchasing authority that compounds the conglomerate approach to communications systems."

"The marketing ability of the business community has traditionally outpaced the administrative talents of the law enforcement community. In too many instances, the equipment or system available from a supplier defines the police communications problem rather than the problem defining the equipment. Some police agencies find themselves with costly gadgetry, non-compatible communications systems components, and even sophisticated computer-based systems that become obsolete with the arrival of a new model."

Certainly a case has been made for utilizing communications technology for police operations. However, can we afford to perpetuate and patch an out-of-date system by the addition of more radios, or the latest gadgets, without a complete reappraisal of what the current and future problems are and what the technology "tradeoffs and benefits" really mean? Can the major cities continue to plan independent of their surrounding suburbs? Why can't the state planning agency (SPA) be held responsible for working with all agencies to develop and implement "master plans" for integrated police communications systems? What needs to be done? What can be done?

Not too long ago a discussion of police communications was generally limited to radio. This is no longer the case. Now when we talk about and plan for police communications "systems" we rapidly involve ourselves in the companion area of police information "systems." We are now concerned with computer-based information systems and the many benefits that they are capable of providing to police operations.

In the past decade, especially since the beginning of the National Crime Information Center (NCIC) in 1967, the law enforcement commu-

nity in the United States has made rapid progress with this newfound capability for storing and retrieving the information so vital to police operations and management. As with other technology, we have had to learn how to use the "computer" and how to recognize the "trade-offs and benefits." The use of computer-based information systems did not help the problems with our communications system. We were soon to realize that strained radio communications rapidly became saturated as more and more officers attempted to access NCIC and other complementing data files. In fact, in many areas the computer based files cannot really be utilized by the operational police officer because the radio congestion will not allow access to the terminal operator. For want of a nail the war is lost.

Even today, in 1974, over seven years after the inauguration of NCIC, there are, unfortunately, too many police departments in the United States that do not have meaningful access to the NCIC system. A wanted person or vehicle check cannot be furnished without long distance telephone calls or multiple rapid relays. Several states don't even have plans for the future to provide this kind of information service to the police community.

Again, we can turn to the work of the National Advisory Commission in their "Report on the Criminal Justice System." Part II of this report addresses criminal justice information systems. It begins:

"Organizing the nation's criminal justice information into a useful body of knowledge has been talked about for

decades but little has been done. Recently, however the urgency of the nation's crime problem, the availability of computers and data processing equipment, and the emergence of highly skilled professionals have made integrated local, state and national information systems a possibility."

\* \* \*

"For the effective administration of justice, information must be rapidly available on the identity, location, characteristics, and description of the known criminal offender. To this end, there is a continuing national effort to develop computerized criminal history (CCH) files that will be stored centrally and will be instantly available to any qualified agency in law enforcement and criminal justice system in any state."

A question must be raised about the fact that only a few states are operational in the CCH program. Moneys have been available for development of statewide programs, such as OBTS/CCH and UCR, but the states are slow to develop the capabilities. This means that the urban police departments must either attempt to provide the service for themselves or do without this kind of information. What should the police executive do, or what action should he take to get these programs underway and operational in his state?

Of course, there are many complex problems related to computer-based information systems. The National Advisory Commission summarized it well in their report, "A National Strategy to Reduce Crime":

"Decisions must be made as to which information systems observe priority attention and which ones are less important. Choosing the right jurisdictional level at which to apply and use the developing criminal justice information systems technology is also a critical decision.

"At the present time, local, state, and federal agencies are spending considerable moneys for the hardware and impedimenta of incompatible and duplicative information systems. Money is being wasted, and the human resources,

technical talents, and skills available for development of a criminal justice information system are being diffused in many redundant development efforts.

"The availability for Federal funds has contributed to the diffusion of effort. Most state criminal justice planning agencies have been faced with decisions on a project-by-project basis where all projects appear to be reasonable and no setting of priorities is possible.

"As funding expands the demand increases. Nearly every state is in the position of having a plethora of information systems which cannot be integrated into a usable network. The price of neglected planning is often high. Millions of dollars are spent by state and local governments in large urban states without obtaining the necessary information in its most usable form."

The questions are many, and the answers are not readily available. What can the police executive do, or what should he do, about the criminal justice information system problems and needs in his city and state? Can the police executive afford to ignore the state-wide and future cost implications of computer-based systems? Should the larger cities continue to go their own way and hope the state will catch up?

One significant factor always raises its head to haunt the police executive and other top management decision makers when consideration is being given to information and communications technology. It costs a lot of money. Quite often the hard questions of cost versus benefit are not adequately probed. What appears to be a logical and reasonably inexpensive decision ends up only providing temporary relief to a communications problem.

In other cases we become enamored with the gadgetry and the promises of the salesmen or even our own technicians. Too often the police executive finds the decision virtually made for him; he really has no choice.

The problem has been only superficially defined and the alternatives have not been documented, yet the police executive must make a "decision" that not only will cost hundreds of thousands of dollars but will also heavily influence the options available for how the patrol and other field resources must be managed.

Too often we see police departments working around radio zones and dispatching consoles that were designed for another era. The police executive ends up having to consider his communications as a constraint of management alternatives. In other cases, the police officer must perform his tasks without the benefit of the very valuable and often life-saving information, such as wanted persons, stolen vehicles, etcetera.

Information and communications technology is expensive. It drains valuable resources from budgets that are already strained. Budgetary resource allocation questions must be addressed by the police executive prior to any information and communications technology decisions.

One example that is on point is the current interest in mobile digital terminals. These devices are being highly touted as the latest answer to many of the existing problems of radio congestion and access to computer-based files. They are quite expensive and may or may not solve all of the problems they are supposed to.

On the other side of the coin is the impact that these devices can have on police operations. They have the potential to allow police to consider computerized or automated dispatching. Just think of how

police operations could change under a fully automated dispatching system. What management and supervisory changes would be required? What part of these changes would be good? And what part would not be so good?

No discussion of contemporary information and communication technology in criminal justice can be complete without consideration of the many ramifications of security, privacy, and confidentiality.

How police and other criminal justice agencies collect, store, retrieve, and use information is being questioned throughout the United States. There are all kinds of philosophical, legal, and management questions and issues being addressed and discussed. Legislation has been introduced in many state legislatures and the Congress. In some cases the proposed legislation will severely restrict what police and criminal justice agencies can and cannot do with information. The impact on police operations and information systems will undoubtedly change many long-established procedures. The police executive needs to give this entire area careful and deliberate thought and be prepared to discuss all the ramifications of all the issues.

Another very interesting and emerging area that relates to the technology and the police service is the involvement of computers, one way or another, in crimes. This area has recently been focused on by several large cases of fraud where computers were "manipulated."

One can look across our society and see many ways that computers can be related to criminal activities. The major researcher in this

area, Mr. Donn B. Parker of Stanford Research Institute, sets forth a summary of this emerging problem area in his publication "Computer Abuse":

"Many of the methods, victims, perpetrators, and types of losses of abusive acts are changing with technological advances.... Computer technology and data communication technology are subject to increasing abuse as they penetrate into sensitive areas of human activity.

"The exchange, transfer, and recording of wealth and information have traditionally been performed manually, using the media of paper, films, postal service, telephone, and speech and validated by handshakes, handwritten signatures, affixed seals, and witnessing. A transition from these methods to the use of computers and data communications involving the electronic/magnetic media is now taking place in the post-industrial age.

"The Wall Street Journal frequently reports criminal acts where two men drive up alongside an elderly messenger carrying several million dollars worth of negotiable securities from one firm to another on Wall Street. One man jumps out, hits the messenger over the head, grabs the securities, and escapes in the car. This will be an obsolete crime in a few years. Negotiable securities will be stored magnetically and electronically as data inside computers and transmitted over communications circuits from one computer to another. Perpetrators of security thefts will use the skills, knowledge, and access associated with computer and data communications technology and will not be dealing with as simple a victim as the old messenger."

The police executive must be aware of how this technology is being used - and how it will be abused. Learning how to recognize, investigate, and prosecute "computer abuse" crimes will become a greater challenge as the technology expands. The police must accelerate efforts in developing an understanding of and capability to counter and/or investigate "computer abuse." The challenges will be complex and expensive.

In summary, the police executive must be prepared to cope with and take advantage of information and communications technology and to change as the demands change. However, he must change only after careful thought, deliberation, and planning.

There are a number of activities that are underway. I will run through them briefly.

We talk about OBTS (Offender Based Transactions Statistics) computerized criminal histories. I know many of you are familiar with those. The definitions and structure are well laid out in the Task Force Report.

We talk about OBTS/CCH and Uniform Crime Reports. Chief (Edward) Davis asked last night whether we really know how crime is changing. How many major city chiefs or how many heads of state agencies - or even LEAA from that standpoint - can put their finger on meaningful data about what is happening to the crime rate? We have Uniform Crime Reports and OBTS on the statistical or data side, and we have the CCH program or computerized criminal history on the other side.

These programs are funded under what LEAA calls "comprehensive data systems" - CDS program. A great deal of money is available for the CDS program which goes primarily to the states. The states are supposed to work with the cities and counties to develop statewide plans under this hierarchy of information concept that ties into the original NCIC concept. Many of the states have been reluctant to move. We appreciate the frustration on the part of the urban areas.

In some cases the urban areas have not been able to wait on the states, and they have had to move out on their own. We would hope that you would be able to provide some catalyst or stimulus to the appropriate authorities in your state so that the CDS program can move on, not for the sake of the CDS program but for the sake of the UCR, CCH, the OBTS, and the data we need there.

There are plenty of moneys available. Unfortunately, we have not been able to move it. Many of the states are moving, but many are not interested.

We have had a lot of activity with Project SEARCH. Some of the activities that relate directly with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) are telecommunications. I am going to talk about the NALECOM, or National Law Enforcement Telecommunication Project, which is being handled by NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory for LEAA. They are looking at the communications - that is, national communications needs for the entire criminal justice system, including police corps and corrections - for the next decade. They are trying to make sure that we understand what the problems and needs are going to be so that we can begin to plan for that kind of capability.

We have two major projects that must impact on the urban areas - state judicial information systems and the offender-based corrections information systems. In the state judicial information systems there are eleven states where the statewide court authority is working in common with Project SEARCH and the Institute for Judicial

Administration to try and develop a statewide module to feed in disposition data to the computerized criminal history and OBTS files.

We are all familiar with the problems we have had with the CCH program in trying to get disposition data from the court. This is one of the activities that is underway to try and solve that problem.

The offender-based corrections system is the same on the corrections side. We have ten states where the state corrections authorities are working with Project SEARCH to develop the corrections module to get the corrections data into OBTS and computerized criminal histories.

We have had a project on standardized crime reports - standardized field reporting and crime reporting. This project should be coming out soon. Inasmuch as they started digging into this area about two years ago, it became very complex and complicated to reconcile the differences. That project has been coordinated with the FBI/UCR program so that whatever we do, whatever recommendations we come out with - and they would be only recommendations - would be compatible with the existing UCR program.

We have had a major effort underway to develop a model state identification bureau. It is probably one of the best products to come out of Project SEARCH. Any state could adapt this model to its particular situation. If you are in a state where the state identification function is not moving ahead - and that tends to be one of the critical elements - it is one of the major areas where the major cities have to keep their own identification capability and deal directly with the FBI Identification Division.

This is a report that you need to push upon the appropriate state authorities - model state identification bureau - so that they can begin to develop the state "ident" function. This was coordinated with the Identification Division of the Bureau. It is consistent with the CCH policy that has been laid out now for several years - how this hierarchy of information will develop between the states and the FBI's "ident" and CCH areas.

There is another major project which we hope is going to be significant in addressing the communications problem. We realize that most of the urban areas have tremendous problems in working with the state planning agency to get statewide plans developed.

In the last couple of months we have provided a grant to APCO (Associated Public Safety Communications Officers, Inc.). APCO is going to do a review and assessment of the fifty state radio plans. Their first effort is to go in with the state planning agencies and sit down and look at the state plans where they exist.

Unfortunately, I have to admit that we are not pleased - and we are sure you are not pleased - that there are a number of states that do not have statewide communications plans. We have several significant projects that are underway with the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP). The one that is most important is the development of a standardized system for auditing of Uniform Crime Reports. The Research Division is working on this project which is coordinated with the FBI/UCR Section. They are working very closely on it. They are working

with some of the early efforts, such as in St. Louis, where they have had a means of auditing the UCR type of reporting for some time.

IACP is also working on a serialized stolen property project and is trying to dig in to how serialized stolen property files can be used and how they can be compared. For example, we have had some cases where they have the serialized stolen property file of NCIC on one side and state and local complementing files on another side. The two never come together.

They are going in to try to research the big cities to determine and demonstrate the utility that they can find, document how these files should be structured, and how we can get the left hand to know what the right hand is doing.

The most recent project that we have with the IACP, which we think is most important because of its potential impact on the future command and control systems which are being developed in the larger cities, is where the IACP is joined together with the U.S. Bureau of the Census on geographically-based files for law enforcement.

As you know, the automated geographically-based files - that foundation for any basic command and control system - came out of an earlier census effort. Many of the police departments have picked up on that. This has become the foundation for collecting data for comparability purposes and for dispatching.

We found that a number of cities were trying this way and that way. This is a project for bringing in the people who are actually doing the

work in order to work with the IACP and the Bureau of the Census and to come up with guidelines for those cities which are just getting into this business.

It is very expensive to develop geographically-based files, but it means that this is the foundation that allows you to relate your crime data to the utilities data, for example, in the city, to other planning data and other census data. It becomes the backbone not only for command and control but for crime analysis teams.

Another project which directly impacts on your operations is the grant that was made last year to the National Law Enforcement Teletype System (NLETS). It was given a grant to upgrade its capabilities to provide national communications capability. There is no data base here, but it has the capability of providing a message switch.

They made a phenomenal effort. We made the grant on June 28 last year, and the system went into operation the 24th of December. In that period they went out on competitive bids for equipment, and they have redundant or duplicative computer switches. They got them installed and had them in operation in less than six months.

Over half of the states have high-speed interfaces on NLETS. This means that one agency can communicate with another agency across the country. Unfortunately - and this ties back into the whole planning process - we still have some states where that national pipe usually goes into the state capitol or some city and stops. That is where we have an entire law enforcement community statewide that does not have

meaningful access so they can talk to their counterpart in other states, or even within their own state.

In the same states we found situations where NCIC services go into one or maybe two points at most, and then we have to call in the Pony Express to get NCIC services down to the man on the street. It literally does not make NCIC services - that vital information - available to the man who is on the street because nobody is trying to relate the process of communications to the information and its utility.

I have already briefly mentioned the NALECOM Project. It is a study effort being funded by LEAA to the Jet Propulsion NASA Laboratory to develop the requirements for National Criminal Justice Police Corps and Corrections for the next ten years. We should have some reports coming out in the very near future.

One of the reports talks about one of the things that we found out - the emergence of mobile digital devices. The potential is there, if these devices are utilized by major cities, to blow the lid off our national communications needs. Just think about it - if officers within a department have the ability to talk with each other and inquire directly to a data base, we will then avoid that constraint which we have had of going through the dispatcher and all the voice communications. This can literally blow the lid off of communications - communications within your city, communications within your state, and communications between the states.

That causes us to rethink the system. This is going to be an

ongoing process, trying and keep on top of these emerging requirements. In doing this, one of the things that we had to do was to develop planning guidelines for applications of mobile digital communications in law enforcement. This is a document that we will try to get out to you just as soon as it is available. It is in draft form now. It will give you some guidance as police executives. It is not a lot, but it is the best we have been able to accumulate to date.

These planning guidelines must be a prerequisite for any police executive who is considering utilizing this technology. All the answers will not be there. Hopefully we will at least get all the questions in, but you will have to go through it and be careful about going into some of this technology so that you do not make some big mistake.

On the other side, we recognize that we at LEAA have not been able to provide a great deal of direction to the locals in planning for their communications and information technology applications, nor to the state planning agency. We have a project that is underway now to develop policy procedures and guidelines relative to the whole grants process in communications and information technology. This will pull together all the requirements - Federal, LEAA, and state. It will show what has to be done for the procurement of equipment, what should be done prior to making the decision, and how to plan for it. It is going to take a little while to do.

In the meantime, while all of these things are underway, I think we need to look at these standards and goals, relate them to your situation,

and let you have a chance to give us some feedback as to what we are not doing. We realize that there are a number of things that we are not doing.

There are some things that you are not doing at the state planning agencies, helping to develop plans that go beyond your jurisdiction, and giving us guidance as to exactly what this policy development seminar is all about. We want to know how we can make the necessary adjustments, and how we can make recommendations to our leadership as to where the real priorities are in order to be of service to you.

MR. VELDE: I would like to add a couple of comments to Lloyd's paper, which was a comprehensive and excellent analysis about the systems work that LEAA is doing.

I would also like to look down the road a little and review the current state of the art in the computer business and what it looks like for the year or two at the most.

I have here a silicone disc. It is 8,000th of an inch thick and it has about a hundred little squares on it. Each square is called a chip. This is how they are made in the factory. Each chip has the equivalent of 7,000 electrical circuits in it, so this disc has about the equivalent of about six hundred thousand radio tubes.

These little chips are what are used in the hand-held calculators. As you know, that business has gone through a rather dramatic evolution in the last year or so. You can now buy these little hand-held calculators for thirty or forty dollars.

These chips are also used in the new electronic watches. They are now being used widely in computer systems. There are some dramatic developments occurring. I have here the literature on what is called a micro processor, which is a computer made with these integrated circuits. Here is a picture of one. It is a small box. It is roughly equivalent to an IBM 360-30, which is the second generation computer that IBM, until recently, was selling for a million and a half dollars. This box retails today for nine hundred dollars.

North American Rockwell is going into mass production on a computer to be put into trucks for anti-skid monitoring systems, which is a requirement placed by the Department of Transportation. That computer is about the size of a fist and looks something like a fuel pump - it is that small and uses several of these chips. That computer is going to retail at about a hundred and fifty dollars. It will be on the market this fall.

Within three years - and probably within five years at the outside - it will be possible to put the equivalent of the largest commercial computer now in the market - say the IBM 371-55 - into a patrol car. That computer will cost not more than a thousand dollars, perhaps less.

It will also have, using essentially the same technology, vast storage data bases which are miniaturized so that, if you wanted to, you could store electronic images of everybody's fingerprints in the country in that patrol car.

This is going to be a major revolution in criminal justice infor-

mation systems as well as in the rest of society. Literally every home - if the householder knew what to do with it - could have its own computer, just as everybody is now buying the hand-held calculators.

One of the things that we are sponsoring and are about to get a proposal on is what I call Project Dick Tracy. It is a small policeman's watch which will have one of these electronic watches in it. It will also have an electronic timer. It will be a method of measuring ambient temperature as well as having a pulse rate monitoring system built into the watch.

As you know, the largest line-of-duty cause of death among policemen is heart attacks; the same goes for firemen. This will give some sort of system for telling you the percentage of your maximum stress capacity under which you are operating.

We expect that this watch will probably retail at about fifty dollars, once LEAA pays for the development cost and the design cost of these little chips.

The first chips that they make on these are very expensive. I think they cost anywhere from a hundred thousand to five hundred thousand dollars. Once they are in production, each one of these little chips will retail for about five dollars, so you can get some idea of where we are going in the information systems area.

Incidentally, there are similar developments in the microwave business and in fiber optics to replace copper and wire for communications circuits. Already the Navy is using these glass cables to re-

place copper cables. They are more efficient and have a much higher speed. Using the same manufacturing technology, within five years, instead of sending electron pulses through these circuits they will be sending light pulses which will increase the capability of this circuitry about ten thousand times over what it is now.

We are in a day of rapidly developing new technology. The question is - what can you, as police executives, do about it? What impact will it have on your profession? Can we make the best use of it without its taking care of us?

So much for LEAA's systems programs and just a very brief look at the future.

Incidentally, my office is sponsoring a technology assessment of all this and its impact on criminal justice. We will have that study done in a few months, and we will be glad to send it along to you when it comes out.

This disc happens to be a product of National Semi-Conductor. It is a company in San Jose, California. They call it their micro processor. Actually the model that is equivalent to the 360-30 is the IMP 16 C-200. There are several companies that are making them: Micro Electronics Division of North American, a company called INTEL - also in San Jose - Synetics, and a couple of others. These are the only ones I recall.

MR. MACY: When would they be in production?

MR. VELDE: They are in production now. This is off the shelf.

You can buy it today for nine hundred dollars. Incidentally, within a

year, they will be selling for four hundred dollars. Any of you who are interested in trying this out, let us know.

There is an ad in U.S. News & World Report for the Micro-Electronics Division of North American that shows one of these circuits alongside of a penny. INTEL in San Jose is another company in the business.

Unfortunately, one of the limitations of this is that the companies prefer to deal in big numbers. They are currently turning out a million circuits a month, just for hand-held calculators. In other words, they like to do a big volume of business.

I was talking to them about automation of legal research and putting those micro processors in every court system in the country. The man just laughed at me and said, "Well, that is one day's production for this circuitry."

This is, incidentally, an obsolete model. The same company is now making a disc about three times as large. That disc has five hundred chips. I don't know how many discs a day they are turning out. All these circuits are designed by computer, and the entire production line is checked by computer. It is really quite impressive.

In San Jose there is an area called Silicone Gulch which has about six or eight of these companies within a one mile radius of each other. This is where all the governmental work is being done.

This little watch will have its own self-contained power system. It will not need batteries. There are several ways to accomplish this. One is through use of solar cells running off the bodies of electrical

systems or the earth's magnetic field. They have a new set of electronic numbers that will utilize this which has very little current.

We gave a \$250,000 grant to the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia to develop a hand-held mobile digital terminal. That contract has been awarded. I am not sure, but I assume that we will use this kind of circuitry; that is, with the chips. The circuits are all designed and readily available, so it should not be too much of a deal.

MR. BASTIAN: There are two bidders who are vying for this kind of contract. They are both very much aware of the importance of having something to show. The D.C. Police Department is pushing them to have something ready by the time of the IACP conference, so they hope to have something for you to see at the IACP conference next fall in Washington.

MR. BROWN: There have been startling developments. It looks as though I am going to have to stay around for another couple of years now to see what all this does. How much good is this going to do us now in the light of the Ervin bill and other pending state legislation? I am referring to restriction of access to criminal history information. I would hate to try to budget all the expenses and find out that the Congress said that I could not disseminate this information if I collected it.

CHIEF DAVIS: When we get all this stuff from LEAA, we will stop taking Federal money and this will help us to stay out of their clutches.

MR. BROWN: I am afraid Senator Ervin already has us clutched.

MR. VELDE: Congress is in the midst of consideration of these bills. It does not appear that Congress will act on the subject this year. As every day goes by, the likelihood of Congressional enactment this year is more and more remote, especially with the impeachment process tying up one or both bodies for a substantial period of time. There is some sentiment, however, that the Senate ought to pass a bill as a parting monument to Senator Ervin.

I think the pending bill generally will not substantially restrict criminal justice uses of criminal history records for routine processing information. There could well be some very significant limitations on intelligence information, however, for criminal justice uses. I am speaking here of automated intelligence systems.

MR. BROWN: I read the bill once. That is a dangerous situation. I thought our intelligence units would be wiped out with that.

MR. VELDE: The Ervin bill flatly prohibits automated intelligence systems. It does not regulate too much any other systems, at least in the draft that was introduced. The Justice bill applies to both automated and intelligence and sets up a "need to know" standard and prohibits dissemination outside of the criminal justice community with a couple of exceptions, such as national defense and the military.

MR. BROWN: Someone should get the IACP involved. We could do something about this. It may not be as bad as it looks on first reading, but we need someone to study that thing in language that we can

understand. Then we should adapt some attitudes and postures.

COMMISSIONER LOONEY: It has serious effects on police across the nation. We have addressed ourselves to the Ervin Committee indicating serious reservations about it. I have also discussed it with Mr. Saxbe, who assured me on behalf of the IACP that the bills would not be passed in their present form and would not inhibit the police in any way. So, we will watch it very carefully. The staff of IACP is on top of it, and they are keeping me informed.

There are serious drawbacks which I pointed out to the Committee. They were very sensitive to it and indicated that they did not want to do anything which would prevent us from carrying out our responsibilities.

I feel the bills will not pass in their present form. I feel that on the basis of information that I have received from the Senators and from the Attorney General.

CHIEF DAVIS: Be sure and vote in November because if we get more Greenbergs in there next year, the situation will be worse.

COMMISSIONER LOONEY: We will be watching the situation carefully.

MR. VELDE: This subject, incidentally, could be developed more fully in the workshop sessions. It is a transcendent issue that could directly affect the police operations.

Let us now hear from LEAA's National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice and get a brief summary of some of the projects that it has been supporting during its brief existence in the police area.

MR. FARMER: What should be the priorities of police chiefs in the area of research and experimentation? Where should we go in this area? These are questions that the third group is going to think about this afternoon. As a lead into this, we would like to talk about two things: first, what the Institute has underway and what has it completed; and secondly, what its tentative plans are for the future.

We all know that research results are in varying degrees of usefulness. Some are quite useful, some are not quite so useful and much research is quite useless. Therefore, it is quite important for us to have the input from chiefs as to what they want.

Since its establishment in 1968, the Institute has conducted a very active program of research and experimentation in the police field as well as in other fields - courts, corrections, crime prevention, etc.

Compared with the need, I think we will all agree the results have been limited. This is not very surprising when you think of the general condition of police science. All the missing chapters in police science are there. You will look in this and that book and see nothing about corruption. So, in view of the general state of police science, I think we have made a significant beginning. It might have been limited, but it is a significant beginning.

To illustrate this first, what is being done? I believe we have done some significant work in about five areas: first, police planning and management; secondly, police personnel; thirdly, police operations; fourthly, forensics, and, last of all, equipment.

In the area of personnel, I want to select two studies that we have completed. One is on psychological testing and the other on performance appraisal. They are good for illustrating two things: first, the good things that are possible to do and, secondly, the vast amount of resources it takes to do these things to get significant results.

The book that we will issue later on will have all kinds of other goodies that we have listed.

A police performance appraisal project has been undertaken by the Pennsylvania State University. This is to take a look at performance appraisal techniques in police departments. This certainly will not solve the problem, but it is a very interesting twist. The basic thrust of this study is to try to move performance appraisal away from listing a policeman's characteristics, - his traits, like honesty, hard work and that kind of thing - away to job performance and to job dimensions, as they are called. The study will try to devise some system for assessing people in terms of the jobs they actually do. For instance, in preliminary investigations how well does the policeman do that, how well does he interrogate, and how well does he perform emergency services? As I say, this will not solve the problem because you will still have supervisors putting down "accident" for their friends in every category. But at least it is a different approach. By the way, this is an approach which might be thought about with police chiefs. This thing is about a year away from completion.

Another study is the psychological testing. We are supporting work

by Personnel Assistance, Incorporated of Minneapolis to develop and test the psychological selection process. This is directed at patrolmen, sergeants, lieutenants, and the middle management people. It provides an assessment system, known as PCI for screening out undesirables and for indicating those who have a high potential for success as policemen.

If this is successful, it can be combined with some regional assessments center to look at the marginal people. This will hopefully improve police selection. The first center will be established in Minneapolis.

MR. MACY: Who is doing the psychological testing?

MR. FARMER: It is called Personnel Assistance, Incorporated in Minneapolis.

COMMISSIONER LOONEY: You mentioned the lower patrolmen. Is there any effort to psychologically test the upper brackets of the police, and then possibly extend it into the courts, the D.A., etc.? There was a suggestion made to psychologically test the patrolmen in New York. I made a strong recommendation that the other branches be included, but then it was dropped for some reason.

MR. FARMER: I think we have to start some place. We can start with these, and then hopefully work up to chiefs. In New York, as you know, there was a system for testing people above the rank of captain.

CHIEF BAUER: You are saying that the psychological testing is underway or has been completed?

MR. FARMER: It is underway and it will be completed in about a year's time. This psychological test will be tested in D.C., Dade County,

Portland, Minneapolis, and hopefully will be useful.

Under the heading of planning and management we will talk about the studies that we are now undertaking in four areas: resources allocation, criminal investigation, police unions, and internal discipline.

The first of these ten studies is being conducted in Washington, D.C., where we are supporting a computer simulation model of the police dispatch and patrol function. The thought there is to simulate the conditions of the city - the crime conditions, the geographical conditions - and then to have a system whereby you can put on the police services and change certain variables so you can test out different management options without actually doing it.

You can test out, for instance, the difference from using some one-man cars versus two-man cars. You can test out different response time strategies, and that kind of thing. Again, this will also be ready one year from now. The thought is that it will be installed in one area of Washington and then be gradually expanded. These things take time. This study is based on Richard Larson's work. The Washington, D.C. department is administering it.

We have a study also by the University of Pittsburgh to try to develop long-range planning capability which is automated. They are developing a model for this which they are testing in Buffalo. The intention of the system is to allow the chief to see what is happening in three or five years' time - what is happening to manpower needs and other variables. This is in its second phase. The first phase is developing, the

second phase is the testing out in Buffalo, and the third phase, which will be ready in a few months, I hope, will consider implementation.

There is a useful thing which has been developed by Nelson Hellier in St. Louis. There is a book that is appearing on this next summer. This is a computerized system for scheduling police manpower. It is useful for small departments and large departments. It is automated for deciding who is going to work when and for scheduling days on and off.

A study which I feel good about now is a police response time study being conducted in Kansas City, Missouri. This is likely to be a study which will have as profound a consequence as the present study being conducted on the preventive patrol in Kansas City. The object of the study is to find out how important police response time is in terms of specific crimes. By police response time, I mean from the time the citizen makes his complaint up through the different stages to the actual completion of the job. It breaks down all the different elements of the response and relates it to success in different crimes. It is a fair guess that some crimes can be more important than others.

This is being conducted by a man called Bill Beck under the direction of Major Louis Harris in Kansas City. Hopefully, it will be finished in 1975.

Another study I want to talk about is one which was started toward the end of last year by the Rand Corporation. It takes a look at the criminal investigation process. Of course, most chiefs are concerned about this. Hopefully the study will take a look at all cities, narrow

it down to ten, then take three cities and do an in-depth analysis of the criminal investigation process and come out with guidelines for improving the management and operation of the detective function.

Related to this is another study which we have just started to fund. It is conducted by Stanford Research Institute. It is called Felony Investigation Decision Model. This builds on the previous work that has been done on the west coast which is very significant for the investigative function. The object is to identify the cut-off point of an investigation, that is, when you should stop an investigation. I think we all know that most investigations are impossible. Most crimes cannot be solved. In New York, for instance, we have adopted a blanket approach that on the basis of certain criteria we cut off those cases and don't investigate them.

What many people have been doing for years is to identify the cut-off points, the points at which you should stop investigating a case on a very arbitrary basis and on the basis of experience. Hopefully, Stanford Research, building on Oakland where they have a very good enrichment program for cases, can identify more scientifically the point at which you should cut off cases and when you should kill cases.

Still another study was undertaken by the State of California. The object was to address the problem of how much the different elements of the criminal justice system cost. In New York we had very little awareness of how much they did cost, so they set out in California to try to measure the cost.

How much does each service cost? How much does each service call cost? How much does it really cost to patrol for vice? How much does it cost to arrest a prostitute. All the different elements of this system are being checked out. I don't think that, at this time, any particular use has been made of this completed study.

We have another study which has been done by Northwestern and which takes a look at police unions and their impact on law enforcement. They looked at unions in twenty-two cities. They sent questionnaires to fifty cities to find out what has been the result of having police unions. Their publication is due in two months' time. One of their conclusions is that unions have mixed results with which I think you all agree.

The ninth of the ten studies that I want to talk about is the one which has just been initiated by Commissioner Looney's organization, the IACP. It is a study of internal discipline. The objective of the study is to develop a set of rules and a set of procedures for internal discipline in the department. Hopefully the rules will be fair, comprehensive, and constitutionally permissible, and will include consideration of things such as the power of a chief to require cooperation, recommendations about punishment, and so on. The first phase is underway. The IACP is going to take a look at seventeen cities. The second phase will develop models and procedures. The third phase will be a field-testing. It will be over in thirty-four months, we hope.

Of course, we are also supporting some work in the area of patrol

strategies. There is a book appearing in July on neighborhood team policing. Everyone is talking about it and everyone is doing it, so it is about time that people got together and took a look at the thing in a definitive way.

This is an illustration of some of the things we have done. The police area is only one area addressed by the Institute.

What may be done in the future? God knows, but we have some idea because for the last few months we have been trying to prepare our plans for 1975-76. We tried to identify objectives. We will have them reviewed by outside people, and we will evaluate them against certain criteria.

Our first criteria is the impact our study is going to have on crime. This is of some significance to this task force for this afternoon. One of the things you have to figure out in determining your priorities is to know what your criteria are.

Therefore, the first one we have adopted is - What is the impact on crime? Some things have a very clear impact on crime; some things have an uncertain one. For instance, the study of corruption has a clear impact on crime.

Some other criteria are: What is the impact on fairness or efficiency. What is the feasibility of research? Some research is very necessary but is not feasible.

Is there continuity with our previous programs? Some things should be undertaken because they are unique opportunities. I think that women

in policing is an example now. People seem more receptive to this, so it is a good time to study that. Possibly five years ago it might not have been.

Another criteria is the feasibility of implementation. What are we thinking that we might do? One area is police planning. If you want to characterize police planning departments, I think you can say that in many small departments they are responding to crisis. They do not have the capability, and they are just floundering. It is clearly an area where the National Institute should take the lead to do a study to produce practical guidelines which would help people.

Related to this is the question of evaluation. There are a lot of sophisticated things happening in the area of evaluation now. Police departments on the whole don't have the capability for evaluation. They don't have the people on board. They don't have a tradition of doing it. Many chiefs, unfortunately, don't care about it, either. It would be nice to have, however.

A second area where we hope to do something very soon is in the area of performance indicators. What constitutes success? We now have a system measuring performance which distorts what people should do. People try to work toward things like clearance rates, toward certain ways in which to measure police departments which distort the activity.

Let us take a look at performance indicators and see what the situation is. Some people have taken a look recently.

We have the studies for the Commission on Productivity, which has

done some good work. Unfortunately, all the work they have done has been verbal. We can sit down right now and take an indicator like burglary clearances. We can write all the limitations of that and all the strengths, but what we would like to do is to get someone in there with some figures to tell us what the figures actually are, what the facts are, and what the relationship is, for example, between the speed of traffic and the number of tickets that are issued. We want to get hard data.

It is just like in economics. In economics, as you know, you have about twenty or thirty indicators of how well the economy is doing. This is what is going to happen in the police area, too. We will get to better understand what indicators are. We know that burglary clearances are not the answer. They don't tell you much about the burglary squad, but they tell you something. By getting the "figure man" in there, we hope to improve our knowledge.

We hope also to make some sort of contribution in the area of management training. I hate to mention England, but there is a great institution there. That is Bramshill. This is a college site where police management is trained. Why don't we take a look at Bramshill again and see how we should adapt their success to our situation? Perhaps we do not need a Bramshill, but we may need some sort of staff college for ranking officers. A feasibility study in this area is one of the things we are thinking about.

We want to do some work in the area of patrol strategies. We

have an interesting project funded by the Police Foundation in Kansas City taking a look at preventive patrol. It is a much maligned experiment, by the way. It does not prove the preventive patrols useless, as you know. We would very much like to replicate that. I think that no one is satisfied with what happened in Kansas City. We are not convinced because we ask: "What about this? What about that?" Well, let us get going in two or three other cities and see what it means. And if anybody wants to volunteer, they can ask for some money now. We would like to do it very much.

We would also like to do some work in the area of corruption. We are hoping to fund a special prosecutor's office in Pennsylvania so that he can have some research capability. We hope to add another grant to this special prosecutor's office so that somebody can sit in there, get the atmosphere of the special prosecutor's office, really take a look at corruption and see, for example, how a special prosecutor's office should operate.

We have an unusual situation when a new one is created. He will come along and ask, "What do you do? There are no guidelines." We would therefore like a researcher or two to sit in there to do some practical research. Unfortunately, many researchers are not so practical, but you have to hope for the best.

MR. VELDE: We would like to have those guidelines at the Federal level, too.

MR. FARMER: We also want to do a study about the role of women

and another one on the role of civilians. I think you will agree that one of the biggest lacks of police departments is not in technicians, nor clerks; it is in the policy-making level. We have a closed society and, unless we have a man like Patrick Murphy, civilians don't get their noses in the door. Police departments lack capability for this reason. Let us see what we can do about that.

They tell me that there are two classes of innovators. There are people who build castles, and others who build bricks. Such is the state of police science now. We in the Institute need to concentrate on the brick building. So, what we do is limited, but I think it has some significance.

As a finale, I want to give out these books. There is an article which begins on page eight called "Police: an Overview". (See LEAA Newsletter, April 1974.) At the end of the book there are about ten pages which discuss the various projects instituted by the National Institute.

MR. GREACEN: Let me have one word on the subject of corruption. As David said, we are right now in the process of developing the research plans for the Institute for the next two years. The more we look at corruption, the more we begin to develop a sense that, by talking only about police corruption and focusing on corruption as a police problem exclusively, we are doing a disservice to police, and we are also doing an inadequate research job.

The problem of corruption is a problem of public corruption.

Where you find corruption in police, you are bound to find it in the prosecutor's office and the courts as well. In doing this work on corruption we want to look at it in that sort of framework: in the sense of public corruption rather than focusing on it, as I think we have been wont to do in the past, as exclusively a police problem.

MR. FARMER: Of course, this is the way we are funding the project in Pennsylvania in the special prosecutor's office. His mandate, which is wider than Nadjari's, is to take a look at corruption in all areas. It just so happens that it is starting with police, but it will look into all areas.

CHIEF CAMP: Is there a separate study being made that we can refer to?

MR. FARMER: No; I was giving that as an example. Thinking about these things, I think it is very easy to find people who criticize the FBI figures. Of course, they should be criticized, but properly understood as indicators and with their limitations understood. Then they are interesting indicators.

They are not complete. There certainly should be a lot more. For instance, we should have indicators telling us what the public thinks about police departments. I am sure we should have indicators telling us what different categories of people in the community think about the department. I live in Staten Island, and we have a different attitude towards the police than the people in Harlem. There should be indicators that tell us this. This area is still a virgin

area. People have studied it, and they verbalize it; but they don't get out to the actual figures.

CHIEF CAMP: I think we need to get into all aspects of this subject because this is one of the areas of "stranger-to-stranger" crime under the Impact Cities Program. I think we have a reservoir of ignorance about burglaries.

MR. FARMER: I agree with you.

MR. VELDE: Lloyd, is the IACP study getting into the UCR area?

MR. BASTIAN: It is getting into the UCR area somewhat but not in the performance measurements and quantitative measurements criteria. One of the things in all of this - and this is one reason we jumped on the geographically-based files - was to get a common denominator for data that has been collected. One of the problems we have with the data in trying to compare economic and social data with criminal data being collected in police departments is some common denominators. The geographically-based file project that IACP and the Bureau of the Census will be working on, we think, is going to provide us the foundations for the data to be correlated and mixed.

A lot of police departments collect a lot of data, and then they have to either translate their data into the methodology being used by others or vice versa. Maybe many of the other social agencies have already collected data and used the geographically-based file format including the Bureau of the Census. We think this will give us a major breakthrough.

Most of the research that is done has to be collected on a one-time basis. It is very expensive, and it does not give you the built-in, on-going capability for further evaluation. I think from the UCR standards on one side we will address part of it, but not really the in-depth part you are talking about. On the other side, you want to stay on top of the geographically-based file project of the IACP.

LT. HOGUE: Considering the number of educational programs that are being offered to serve law enforcement and criminal justice communities throughout the country, and the pace at which information is being developed so rapidly throughout the nation, somewhere there ought to be an attempt to centralize this information. As you were talking here, the thought occurred to me that, with the number of police officers who are studying in undergraduate and graduate programs around the nation, there ought to be courses that acquaint these people, or at least inform them, about the developments that are taking place on the research front.

MR. FARMER: I agree with you.

LT. HOGUE: There is not only a tremendous opportunity to keep people informed in the educational institutions particularly, but there is probably the greatest opportunity to reach the largest number of people and inform a vast segment of the public. By the public I mean the future leaders of tomorrow who are also enrolled in courses offering these programs as electives in order to learn what is happening in criminal justice in America. There is a great opportunity to keep people across the nation better informed about the importance and

complexity of this system.

Somehow, what you are doing in terms of these programs ought to be cranked into these educational institutions, particularly in the advanced degree programs, so that we can have courses established on new issues confronting criminal justice. Some of this has been done, but we cannot possibly keep ourselves informed fully. I am not sure you are totally informed.

Perhaps you know there was a study done by the Illinois Institute of Technology which is a response-time study. It deals with a very serious problem. The objectives were to reduce response-time and to redistrict the community and use effective deployment of personnel.

One of the real problems that confronts communities is the fact that political problems and conflicts get in the way of these progressive developments. Right now, because of an inability of that community to maintain manpower at a certain level, the response time has gone from four minutes to about twelve minutes. This is because of a personnel issue muddied by the political issue. These are some of the problems in the real world that you have to recognize.

What I am suggesting by implication is that somehow at the state level or at the Federal level standards have to be established in order to try to avoid these kinds of conflicts or to exercise some kind of control over the level and degree of conflicts that occur at the local level in order to be able to implement some of these important decisions and programs that are developed at the local level.

LEAA has spent somewhere in excess of one hundred thousand dollars for this study, and it has gone down the drain. The chief has lost complete control because of the political situation that exists in his community.

We should crank information into the educational institutions because I don't doubt that there are people enrolled from every department represented here in educational programs around the nation. We ought to be informing them through this medium of what is really happening.

MR. GREACEN: We have, as part of the Institute, the National Criminal Justice Reference Service, which you are probably familiar with. That is our primary means of distributing information. We don't have a special mechanism to crank our research into schools offering programs to LEAP students. The way the information would get out would be that the professors or the students at those schools would become subscribers to the Reference Service.

I don't know what specific attempts were made in the past to use LEAP lists to get more subscribers to the Reference Service. That would be a good way to do it.

Pete (Velde) tells me that in some study we did the primary users of the reference service turned out to be LEAP students. It could be that the Reference Service has always provided the service of collecting together information on any topic that anybody wants, so it would be a really easy way to write a term paper. One could call the Reference

Service and ask for all the articles on response-time or minority recruiting.

MR. BASTIAN: With regard to the entire information and communications area, we have encouraged the academic institutions to stay abreast of this. They tend to be further behind with an understanding of the technology and its application to criminal justice than the criminal justice community. We have had a number of situations where the academicians are passing on information about records and records systems that is totally out of date.

We have tried, especially through materials in Project SEARCH, which took up a tremendous amount of money and involved a tremendous distribution list, to get some of the academic institutions to pick up on the results of Project SEARCH. The criminal justice system now has with this particular volume of Standards and Goals, the best work available in the country on criminal justice information systems. Not all of the answers are here but most of the questions are.

Anybody who wants to develop a course that has real relevance for the future and all the problems we are talking about, whether it is burglary, dispatching, communication - we are talking about data - should use this book.

In many instances we try to jump in and use technology to transmit data that really does not exist. The researchers are frustrated, the managers are frustrated because we never have taken the time to go back and, if you will, plow a field and plant the seeds.

The academic institutions can use this and can structure a number of very relevant courses around the data: What has to be done to collect data, and what has to be done to protect the data?

We have distributed thousand of copies of this at a major national conference on it where we invited over five hundred people directly from each and every state as well as from a number of the cities. That was coupled with Project SEARCH's International Symposium where we had sixteen hundred people to whom this was distributed.

There is no easy way to get information on what is happening on the front. With all of the discussion and push for a simple thing like UCR, it is appalling that the police agencies in this country don't have field reports and cannot contribute meaningfully to the UCR program.

We have money waiting for UCR reports programs. IACP has worked with us. The FBI is working with us. Unfortunately, your counterparts for one reason or another turn us off when we talk about basic accounting.

Mr. Farmer made an interesting point talking about economics and the criteria we have for measuring the economy of this country. We have fiscal guidelines for holding you accountable for every dollar, and we have not instituted them.

You represent the leadership in doing these kinds of things. It is the men out there who are not in such small police departments who don't want to be held accountable for their performance. We can use

your help in trying to develop this further if you can get your colleagues aside and tell them to get their records shaped up.

MR. VELDE: We will move on into the next report and just briefly summarize LEAA's interest in corruption. We have a joint effort by organized crime shops in our Police Program Division. Mr. Lucey will briefly summarize this topic.

MR. LUCEY: One of the most significant and beneficial by-products of increased police professionalism is the greater willingness of many police executives to air, acknowledge, and deal with corruption problems in an open, forthright manner. Such action has been motivated by, or has led to, three major conclusions.

First, although corruption exists in other components of the criminal justice system, in government generally, and in the private sector, this unfortunate fact does not constitute grounds for tolerating similar misconduct among police.

Second, despite corruption-inducing pressures exerted on police which originate outside of the department and over which police administrators may have little, if any, control, the chief is ultimately held responsible for the integrity of his force.

Third, in a very real sense the degree to which the top police administrator is successful in forging his department into an effective force depends on what he does about corruption. Systemic corruption, for example, can generate resistance to an organizational change considered desirable by police administrators from a crime prevention and

control standpoint. But many of the rank and file could regard the change as a threat to their ability to profit illegally from their profession. In short, the chief's objectives become more difficult to secure, for many of his officers are marching to someone else's tune. The task of law enforcement executives is further complicated by the disrespect for law or illegal behavior fostered in some citizens when witnessing or reading about officers doing, and contributing to the spread of, what they are supposedly paid to prevent.

All this helps explain (1) why the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals considered official corruption to be "one of the most damaging forms of criminal activity in society"; (2) why the Commission identified as a key element in controlling police corruption "the integrity of the police chief executive and his ability to run the organization"; and (3) why more and more departments are assigning top priority to corruption control.

While openly acknowledging the corruption problem and assigning it top priority are essential first steps, the most difficult tasks for the police executive are the subsequent identification and implementation of those procedures, methods, and policies that will permit his department to reach and then sustain an acceptable level of integrity. The complexity of this task and the time required for its accomplishment are often grossly underestimated by critics of police performance.

The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration is prepared to assist police executives identify and implement appropriate measures

by which to suppress and prevent corruption in their agencies as well as in the community. Illustrative guideposts pointing toward anticorruption measures that LEAA is willing to help police administrators and others establish are noted later. To put them in perspective, a brief review of past and proposed LEAA efforts in the area of corruption control is in order.

#### PAST ANTICORRUPTION EFFORTS OF LEAA

There are three principal ways of characterizing LEAA's anticorruption activities. First, corruption control programs and assistance have been directed at reducing misconduct not only in police agencies but also in other governmental units, within and outside of the criminal justice system, as well as in the private sector.

Second, in addition to focusing on those who have been corrupted, LEAA's activities have concentrated on major corruptors, such as organized crime and white-collar criminals.

Still another way one might characterize LEAA's anticorruption efforts is to distinguish between (1) those that have funded or otherwise assisted organizations whose direct target was corruption control and (2) those LEAA programs that have supported groups whose efforts had an indirect but nonetheless effective impact on corruption, such as would result from successful programs against organized crime.

From fiscal year 1969 through fiscal year 1973, LEAA has expended well over \$41 million on the above-mentioned types of anticorruption programs, projects, and publications.

For example, as part of its organized crime control program, LEAA has funded statewide corruption control units, which have investigated and combated corruption at the State and local levels. LEAA funding allowed the West Virginia Purchasing Practices and Procedures Commission, an ongoing legislative body, to increase its investigative and intelligence-gathering capability. Commission efforts resulted in a 59 percent decrease in state expenditures in one year, representing a savings of over \$100 million.

Operating at the local level, the LEAA-funded Knapp Commission probed the nature and extent of police corruption in New York City. LEAA also assisted the Pennsylvania Crime Commission undertake a similar investigation with respect to Philadelphia. Among the major recommendations of these commissions, both advocated the establishment of a prosecutive unit wholly independent from police: the Office of Special Prosecutor, which LEAA has financially assisted. In New York City, the special prosecutor covers the full spectrum of the criminal justice system, while statewide jurisdiction is planned for the Pennsylvania special prosecutor.

Since organized crime is a major corrupting influence on those both within and outside of the criminal justice system, LEAA's many other organized crime control programs have an indirect but no less heavy impact on reducing corruption. Such programs fall under the following categories:

1. Interstate intelligence, analysis, and dissemination systems.

2. Statewide organized crime intelligence units.
3. Statewide investigatory and prosecutory units (strike force concept).
4. Metropolitan area organized crime efforts.
5. Organized crime training for state and local law enforcement personnel.
6. State organized crime prevention councils.
7. Joint Federal, state, and local strike force program.
8. Cargo theft and fencing.

Often by-products of these programs, several LEAA publications have addressed the corruption issue. Police Guide on Organized Crime is geared to the patrolman and explains what organized crime is, what indications of it he may spot while on patrol, why it is essential to report what is observed, and how attempts at corruption should be handled.

Basic Elements of Intelligence is a manual LEAA prepared for use by law enforcement agencies endeavoring to move against organized crime. Another manual extensively distributed by LEAA is The Role of State Organized Crime Prevention Councils, which presents guidelines for the establishment of such councils. Cargo Theft and Organized Crime, a desk-book for management and law enforcement, resulted from a cooperative effort between the Department of Transportation and LEAA.

In addition to organized crime, a major corrupting influence within the community is the white-collar criminal. To assist law enforcement to control white-collar crime, LEAA prepared, through its National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, The Nature, Impact and

Prosecution of White-Collar Crime. LEAA has also funded the Economic Crime Project of the National District Attorneys Association which has secured the cooperation of the offices of 15 district attorneys in developing the organization and techniques to prosecute economic crimes.

Additionally, LEAA financial assistance has enabled the Association to distribute to the business community over 400,000 copies of Handbook on White-Collar Crime which was prepared by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. The Handbook proposes methods by which the business community can raise its level of integrity by initiating action against nine major categories of white-collar crime and how this action can be dovetailed with the efforts of law enforcement in such areas as bribes, kickbacks, and other payoffs.

The LEAA-financed National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals devoted portions of three of its reports (A National Strategy to Reduce Crime, Police, Community Crime Prevention) on corruption problems affecting not only the police but also government generally. Significant emphasis was placed on methods by which citizens can help promote integrity throughout government.

Reinforcing the impact of the aforementioned programs, projects, and publications, LEAA has sponsored or conducted numerous corruption-related seminars in all sections of the nation. Additionally, staff are assigned to each of LEAA's ten regional offices to provide on-the-spot assistance to state and local law enforcement agencies in designing, implementing, and evaluating projects directly targeted on corrup-

tion control as well as those aimed at two areas inextricably linked to the corruption problem - organized crime and white-collar crime.

#### FUTURE LEAA ANTICORRUPTION POLICY

Basically, the guidelines governing LEAA's anticorruption efforts for the future are extensions of the policies implicit in the past programs just recounted.

First, the focus of any given LEAA-initiated research or program dealing with corruption control is not to be limited to the police or any other component of the criminal justice system. If, through a state or local request, a project is funded to seek out known corruption in a particular segment of the system, the project's scope will be sufficiently flexible to permit pursuit and prosecution of corruption wherever and whenever it is found.

To do otherwise would be to overlook that corruption does not begin and end in one component of the system. For example, the Knapp Commission stated that its investigation made it clear that "police corruption does not exist in a vacuum and must be considered in the context of other elements in the criminal justice system." The attitudes, integrity, and efficiency of the prosecutor's office and of the courts, for instance, have a direct impact on the ability of the police executive to sustain an adequate level of integrity within his department.

Indeed, a similar impact - positive or negative - is generated depending on the nature of the practices and values espoused by the

community at large - that is, by what is or is not done by city halls, legislatures, businesses, professions, and the public. As a case in point, there is a strong correlation between professionally administered local government and the absence of serious corruption within criminal justice agencies.

In short, therefore, LEAA-initiated corruption-control efforts will not suffer from tunnel vision but will incorporate sufficient flexibility to encompass the entire criminal justice and governmental system.

A second major aspect of future policy is that when corruption is related to organized crime, LEAA will encourage and give priority to the development of projects exhibiting a multijurisdictional, multidisciplinary approach. This is best achieved through the use of a strike force or task force, which maximizes coordination, avoids duplication and fragmentation of investigators and prosecutors, and increases the level of information-sharing among all participants.

The third major facet of future policy is that LEAA will continue to utilize its existing discretionary grant system to support corruption-control programs.

Fourth, technical and financial assistance will not be imposed where it has not been invited. From a strictly pragmatic standpoint, chances are slim that anticorruption projects unilaterally implemented by LEAA will receive sufficient local cooperation for meaningful results. However, once a state or city is willing to take the lead as a

grantee, LEAA can then provide appropriate technical and financial aid with the assurance that at least a positive desire for corruption control has been expressed by local authorities.

#### ILLUSTRATIVE ANTICORRUPTION GUIDEPOSTS

Within the policy framework just described, any of a larger number of corruption-control measures could conceivably qualify for LEAA support, either in terms of an analysis to determine their applicability to a given corruption problem or in terms of actual implementation.

A brief sampling of guideposts pointing toward certain anticorruption measures follows. Each is keyed to, and appropriate for, consideration by police executives; many are equally applicable, in principle, to other governmental units and even to private sector organizations. Discussed first, and presented in question form, are those guideposts indicative of possible projects or measures that could be implemented within the agency or organization experiencing corruption problems. Reviewed next are those guideposts related to changes that may be desirable to effect in areas external to the affected organization.

#### Questions Highlighting Possible Internal Anticorruption Measures

1. What type of behavior constitutes corruption? The common answer is intentional misuse of, or failure to use, one's position and authority in return for such personal benefits as money, goods, services, or status. But within this definition, should there be a distinction between petty infractions or relatively minor dishonesty and more serious misconduct? If so, where should the line be drawn and

what advantages/disadvantages will this distinction create for corruption control? If a police chief, for example, placed such things as free meals and gratuities outside his definition of corruption, this might enhance the credibility of a subsequent anticorruption effort in the minds of subordinates. But such an approach could also work at cross-purposes with corruption control inasmuch as receipt of "little favors" can develop a state of mind among recipients that paves the way for serious systemic corrupt practices.

2. How can subordinates be told effectively what is expected of them and be assured that upon reporting corrupt activity, they will not suffer in terms of bad assignments, lack of needed cooperation from colleagues, demotion, and even dismissal? While a patrolman often plans to remain in a given department throughout his career, the relative high turnover among police chief executives raises questions such as these among subordinates: "Reporting breaches of integrity may be supported by the present chief and his staff. But how long will he remain with the department? And will not conditions deteriorate under a new chief? If I cooperate now, what will happen to me later?"

3. Where does one draw the line when employee associations begin bargaining in areas relating to corruption control? As noted by the National Advisory Commission, some police employee associations have questioned certain internal procedures, including the duties and rights of subjects of internal discipline investigations. The Commis-

sion noted that where these rights and duties have not been established, published, and circulated to employees, some police agencies have had restrictive procedures established for them during employee contract negotiations, even though such restrictions find no support in current case law.

4. To what extent can corruption-prone employees be identified and terminated during training and their probationary period? One recent study of a large police agency found that the most reliable predictors of a policeman's ultimate performance were how he performed in recruit training and what he did during his probationary period as patrolman. Had the agency terminated at the outset those who scored worst during recruit training and who conducted themselves the poorest as probationers, the department would have nipped in the bud the careers of an appreciable number of corrupt policemen, according to one view.

5. What should be the nature of anticorruption orientation during recruit training? In one department, the old theory that discussing details of corruption might teach some recruits tricks they did not know has been abandoned in favor of what is regarded as a more realistic approach. Recruits undergo intensive instruction about the extent of the corruption problem, the forms it takes, and the steps to follow if confronted with corrupt activity. Courses include tape recordings and other documentary evidence pertaining to corrupt practices. Similar anticorruption indoctrination is given during pre-promotional and field training.

6. How might unrealistic performance standards contribute to a higher incidence of corruption? Undue emphasis on evaluating performance on the basis of number of arrests made can induce corrupt arrangements among police and criminal elements to the effect that the latter "give up" for arrest a number of low-level associates in return for immunity for higher-ups. Informal arrest quotas have led to what one investigation terms "flaking" of individuals, such as the planting of narcotics on a suspect. One department is dealing with this problem by stressing quality arrests, not their quantity.

7. Is the present job structure exerting a positive or negative impact on integrity? Despite good performance most police officers never reach a rank higher than patrolman. They are in dead-end jobs in too many instances. Within three to five years, they reach a pay level where they are likely to remain throughout their career, during which they are equally likely to be exposed to illegitimate opportunities offered by corruptors. Such proposals as those calling for multiple pay grades within the rank of patrolman deserve careful study.

8. Could the administrative structure of the organization be strengthened in ways more conducive to the promotion of integrity? Vague lines of authority, fuzzy delegation of responsibility, and the absence of clear-cut accountability breed an unhealthy climate. When these elements cannot be fixed, neither can blame nor discipline.

9. Should discretion in certain areas be administratively regu-

lated? Payoffs resulting in selective nonenforcement of "victimless crime" laws have been curbed through appropriate directives from the police chief executive. For example, one department ordered all officers to enforce Sunday blue laws only upon receipt of public complaints. When this happened, according to one study, "incidents of shakedowns by police officers dropped dramatically."

10. Are there weaknesses in the process by which allegations of misconduct are received, recorded, investigated, and adjudicated? Police, a report of the National Advisory Commission, contains several suggested standards for the administration of internal discipline. The Commission noted that (1) employee participation in drafting or revising rules of conduct can be a key to acceptance and observance; (2) allegations, whether originating internally or externally, should be permanently and chronologically recorded in a central record; (3) anonymous complaints should not be dismissed automatically; (4) the chief executive of every police agency should assure that allegations are investigated by a specialized individual or unit within the agency; (5) and administrative adjudication of internal discipline complaints involving a violation of law should neither depend on nor curtail criminal prosecution.

The relevance of these and of the literally dozens of other possible guidepost-questions can be determined by analyzing how the management of each facet of one's operation - from recruitment to pensions - might be affecting, for better or ill, the maintenance of

a sufficient level of integrity throughout the organization. To the extent negative impacts on integrity exist, administrators must decide whether the corruption-control benefits associated with possible procedural or policy changes outweigh the potential drawbacks. Police executives know all too well that such decisions are not always clear-cut or without complications.

#### Questions Highlighting Possible External Anticorruption Measures

As noted earlier, there are many outside corruption-inducing pressures over which police executives have little or no control. Although these pressures cannot be alleviated through the authority possessed by law enforcement administrators, police officials can at least lend their support and insight to those who do have the necessary power.

1. Which laws require, in effect, police to enforce a moral code that some members of society are not willing to obey? These so-called victimless-crime statutes are a major - some would say the major - source of police corruption. "Victims" of these crimes are usually willing participants, seldom complaining to police. If a police officer decides to tolerate a violation - for whatever motive - he need only fail to report it. This is an invitation to corruption.

Numerous studies and commissions have advocated that police be relieved of the responsibility for the enforcement of gambling, Sabbath, prostitution, and certain business regulation laws. To the extent these laws are not repealed, many recommend that enforcement should be transferred to other agencies. However, such recommendations should be very

carefully reviewed from two standpoints. First, corruption hazards may be simply transferred from the police to some other agency. Second, activities such as gambling and prostitution are closely linked to organized crime - a prime enforcement area for police.

2. What kind of legislation might substantially raise the level of integrity throughout government generally and thus improve the overall environment in which police function? For example, citizens have been demanding enactment of open-government laws on the premise that secret meetings by public officials beget connivance and corrupt decisions that would not be tolerated if known. The National Advisory Commission advocated State legislation that would achieve the following:

- (a) Establish an ethics code to be enforced by an ethics board.
- (b) Require certain public officials to disclose their financial and professional interests.
- (c) Define as violations of the criminal code certain situations involving conflicts of interest.
- (d) Disclose to the public all significant receipts and expenditures by every candidate and organization seeking to influence any election.
- (e) Impose limits on sums that can be spent to advance the candidacy of any aspirant for office.
- (f) Prohibit campaign contributions, and other spending relating to politics or campaigns for state and local offices, by persons who

transact an annual business of more than \$5,000 with those units of government, or who are directors or shareholders owning or controlling 10 percent or more of a corporation, business, or association engaged in such transactions.

(g) Establish a centralized state procurement function which will provide safeguards against corruption and abuse of the purchasing function.

(h) Assure equitable criteria for, and public review of, zoning, licensing, and tax assessment procedures and decisions.

3. What type of agency might be created with (1) the independence to supplement the internal anticorruption efforts of other government units and (2) the breadth of jurisdiction and powers to be effective against such major sources of corruption as organized crime? The National Advisory Commission advocated a statewide office having authority to initiate investigations of corruption within and outside of the criminal justice system, to prosecute cases, and to provide corruption-control assistance to state and local government units, commissions, and authorities.

In New York State, a special unit was established in the existing State Commission of Investigation to perform ongoing corruption-monitoring throughout the criminal justice system. Additionally, a special deputy attorney general was appointed to supersede the district attorneys in the five counties of New York City with respect to corruption in the criminal justice system. This appointment was motivated

by the belief that district attorney reliance on police to investigate police corruption is a handicap as well as a conflict of interest in appearance if not in fact. Such a conflict was thought to have eroded public confidence in the district attorneys' willingness to prosecute policemen and that this had inhibited some people from reporting allegations of police corruption to the prosecutors.

According to a recent study, such an external investigative unit meets many former objections of police in that the unit does not single out police but moves against prosecutors, judges, etc., as well. These units are said to be providing a place for officers to turn to if they are worried about how they might fare, now or in the future, after reporting corruption activity to department superiors.

4. Is there a model guideline governing the relationship of the police chief executive to the head of local government, particularly with reference to questionable attempts by the latter to interfere with law enforcement? One of the criminal justice standards developed by the American Bar Association with respect to the urban police function states that the mayor or city manager should have ultimate responsibility and formulate overall directions for police services. However, he must also insulate the police department and its administrator (1) from inappropriate pressures including such pressures from the mayor's office, (2) from pressures to deal with matters in an unlawful or unconstitutional manner, and (3) from inappropriate interference with the internal administration of the department.

## CONCLUSION

Clearly, the police leadership - as well as that of other governmental and private sector organizations - has an obligation to pursue aggressively the control of corruption. Though corrupt practices cannot be completely eliminated, they can be adequately controlled. The task is frustrating at best. Certainly, it is a challenge to every administrator's skill.

As briefly indicated by the examples cited earlier, there is no dearth of possible corruption-control measures. But the identification and implementation of those measures most appropriate for any given organization is not easy. Assistance is often required. Upon receiving an expression of local or state willingness to tackle the job, LEAA is fully prepared to do its part.

MR. VELDE: Thank you very much, John. Certainly this is a program which needs continued backing. The Organized Crime Program which Jim Golden heads is vitally interested in this whole area and keeps coming back to us for more and more money. We are pleased to provide it.

I would now like to turn the program over to Chief Ed Davis and to Vernon Hoy to summarize for us the proposal that has been submitted to LEAA for doing a follow-up and a study on the role of the police chief executive.

I might say we are extremely excited about this proposal, one which I think will have a tremendous impact on policing business if it is

carried out in accordance with the rather ambitious outline in the proposal.

CHIEF DAVIS: Our president of the IACP, Commissioner Looney, has this year appointed committees that are designed to provide a service to the membership which is composed of the police. One of the committees that he appointed was the Committee on the Police Chief Executive and another one is on Crime.

Burglary is the subject this year. These things did not exist before. When he appointed me as chairman to this committee, I went to Pete Velde and to Don Webster, and said that we could really do something with this committee if they could give us some money. We could write a chapter which we were unable to do in the Police Task Force report on police chief executives.

We have a certain tentative indication from LEAA that the staff will be composed of representatives who will hit the major cities, the medium-sized cities, the small cities, the state agencies, and the county agencies. Michael Codd, Commissioner of New York, will be my Vice-Chairman. Harold Adamson, Chief of the Metro Toronto Police Department, will be my Vice-Chairman. We will get the free services of a very distinguished jurist, Arthur Alarcon, Judge of the Superior Court of the County of Los Angeles, who has been the Governor's Executive and Clemency Secretary, who was head of the Parole Board, who was Deputy District Attorney, who is a distinguished author in criminal law, and who is eminent in criminal procedure and criminal

law itself. He served with us on our police task force and was of an inestimable value.

We also have Bruce Baker from Portland, Oregon, who is a former Chief of Berkeley. We have Willie Bauer from Beaumont. We have Colonel Camp from St. Louis, Dale Carson, the Sheriff of Jacksonville; Richard Clement, who will go in as our first Vice-President; and we signed up Peter Drucker, who is teaching out there in Southern California. He is going to be a member of our committee for free, just as Alarcon is.

You all know Peter Drucker, the author. Tom Jenkins, Assistant Director of the FBI, is also on this committee, as are Clarence Kelley who was on the task force - we figured he was pretty good.

We also have David Kelly, who runs an outstanding state police force, Peter Pitchess, the distinguished veteran Sheriff of Los Angeles County - he is generally a pretty good fellow except for his position on gun control; Walter Ruckgarber, Chief of Police of Great Neck, New York; and Walter Stone, of the Rhode Island State Police.

One of the reasons why we are messed up in policing in this country is probably due to the chiefs. The reason they are inadequate is that we have to take them out of the ranks of policemen. I have been a major city chief for just under five years. For thirty-two cities of over half a million there is only one man who has served longer. This is incredible.

When I took over my department five years ago, I found it pretty

much resembled a museum. I revolutionized it considerably. I think most chiefs tend to perpetuate their department more or less as museums. Look at the way departments are organized. You have detective bureaus and traffic bureaus. They copy one another. The chief is there only a short time. We meet twice a year and we have a moment of silence for those who have departed in the last six months. Last time in San Francisco we had a memorial service for eight chiefs who had departed in that brief period. There is a lot of weakness at the top. There is a weakness in conceiving intelligently different organizations that fit.

If you look at those arches, each one has different stones. The man who put those in was not constrained that each arch had to be the same. This fireplace is uniquely different on each side. It makes it so much more interesting. The piece over the fireplace is not centered. The tapestry is more interesting than the wood back there. And yet, most police departments look like the wood. They are all about the same. Therefore, organization is the great problem.

Organization for unusual occurrences are generally not geared to respond appropriately to the emergencies. The setting of objectives by the chiefs of police is poor. When asked, "What are you in business for?" most of them will respond that they are in business to survive. They should be in existence for some useful social purpose, such as reducing crime.

Communications internally is a big problem which we hopefully will

address. There are techniques for really knowing whether you have a big or a small organization if you can communicate. You cannot do it through conventional hierarchies, I will guarantee that, unless you are a radical and you use different methods than going through the conventional way. Any chief who goes through the conventional hierarchy is doomed to failure. You cannot totally ignore it. We will probably discuss that area.

Next is the matter of external support and the need for broad-based support in the community. How do you get this? This, too, will be addressed.

The selection of key subordinates is an important problem. The reason Sheriff Pitchess survived for sixteen years is because he selected Jimmy Downey. That was a wise choice on his part. A good job is not always done in terms of getting the right kinds of people to do the job. I think one reason I survived is because I got my three competitors in and made them assistant chiefs. I brought in none of my friends. I brought these people in for their ability, not for reasons of loyalty.

Knowing the business is, I think, extremely important. This is a very complex business. I don't think you can bring in just any administrator from outside. Most major corporations are probably in as bad a shape as most major police departments, oil companies included. There is a great inadequacy of people who fill the spots at the top. In matching the current needs of a community with successful innova-

tion an imaginative and creative chief is an important thing. We will address ourselves to that, also.

Control mechanisms, which involves awareness of what is going on before the house burns down, and the entire inspection and control process will be addressed, as well as external communications and internal progress reporting. There is probably very little internal progress, probably very little criteria set by chiefs executives, to require reporting which will require performance. We need timely data. Here it is the middle of 1974 and no one knows what the crime rate in this country is up through one half of one year. To me, this is absolutely incredible. That is the business we are in. If we are going to reduce crime, we have to know where it is relative to us.

We do a weekly hand tally and I know we are up about two percent. But I don't know what that means unless I know what is happening around me. You cannot find that out. We took a poll last night. It sounds like crime is up ten to fifteen percent in the first half of this year, but you know when we will find this out? Officially we will find it out in October or November. That will be too late to do anything about it for the first half of the year.

We will talk about not getting cut off from your enemies. I think that one of my reasons for survival is that I have made it a point to work with people who normally would be considered the enemies of police; for example, the ACLU. At least, I have a dialogue going with them. Sometimes it is a very heated dialogue. They really have not done any-

thing for us, but I generally know what they are thinking. You can not be insulated from them. You must know how hard you can push - and we will address this - and how much you can get out of your subordinates before they are ready to revolt. I think that that is extremely important.

Knowing the degree and severity of discipline necessary to get something accomplished is a touchy sort of thing. How much is really needed?

I know that the chief between Parker and me sort of did away with discipline. So, all kinds of things happened in terms of traffic accidents and conduct of many other kinds.

You need the use of appropriate staffing so that a chief can have power steering to get his job done. If you go home on a Saturday and try to do things, you find you are the most incompetent man in the world because you never get all the projects done. Do any of you have that problem? In the office, however, if you have a good staff, you can do a fantastic amount of work because you have power steering, power brakes, power shifting, and the whole works.

One requires gamesmanship in terms of being two or three moves ahead, having strategy ready to cope with various situations, the judo technique of destroying your questioner with your answer. Rather, we see police officials on the run from the press and from critics. I think we can talk about all that.

Honesty and integrity detection: I sort of disagree that people

get what they deserve and I disagree that you have to have an honest culture before you can have an honest department. I think weeds grow anywhere in any garden. There are no sprays or anything for them - you have to pull them out. Some of the weeds you have to pull by the roots and for some of them you have to use a spading fork. If you let the garden go too long, you will never get them. That, too, will be addressed.

The methodology of the study will be addressed by Vern, but I have talked about the possibility of using the success and failure models. The problem is getting people to volunteer discussion of the success or failure models.

You might go out and talk to Chambers of Commerce, to public officials, or to newspapers - "What about X, Y or Z, who was chief of police here, and what were the characteristics that made for the difference between success and failure?"

We will not have time nor the budget in a year to do a big job like this. I don't know whether we can get anybody from New York to volunteer as a model, but since I have been chief there have been four commissioners of New York City. I am not sure that I can get Murphy to volunteer. We are going to try to do this.

When we put a book out it will perhaps for the first time update that terrible book of Wilson's that has misled many generations of students at the university in which people allegedly learn police work. They have nothing to do with doing the job. If we get a new chapter,

then I think the natural follower will be a Bramshill for police chief executives who would bring in what we would learn in this project, maybe attempt to take a younger generation of police managers, and expose them to over a year or eighteen-month study as to some of the things that they have to know so that some day we might have fairly competent leadership with some sustained period of getting something done in the cities of America.

DEPUTY CHIEF HOY: I think it might be best if we took a look at this application which I just passed around to you. If you would turn to page 19, which is the project narrative (see Appendix A, page 151), you will see the things that my boss just talked about.

We have here a brief justification. I asked my staff not to go overboard in justifying it because we don't need to. We are well aware of the need for the study, so we summarized it. We did not waste words on it.

We have the list of the Committee as it stands. There is some justification for getting people like Alarcon and Peter Drucker, who are not members of IACP but whom we wanted on the committee.

In the middle of page 21 (see Appendix A, page 155) we are getting into the guts of some of the things that, as we see them now, we want to address. These are some of the things that Ed Davis talked about.

Going to some of the nitty-gritty on page 11 (see Appendix A, page 164), we have the items of the budget. Here we are talking about a grant for \$425,000, a staff consisting of four full-time researchers

and myself as a full-time project director, and four other clerical and administrative people.

On page 12 (see Appendix A, page 166), you will see that looking at the salaries of these people, under first year, there is no overhead. That is just the direct salary. You will see that they are pretty high-powered. They are just typical Los Angeles police officers.

In the Police Task Force many people asked us whether these people were typical Los Angeles police officers. Well, of course - this is just the routine typical L.A. police officer. We have gathered together a much higher powered staff than we had on that police task force.

You see a captain three - that is a pretty high-powered man. On the graph of polls, we wrote in one captain three and a research analyst and allowed thirty thousand dollars for him. Now we would have two captains three and the thirty thousand dollars will buy 11 1/4 months of a captain three, that is a slight change from what you see on page 12.

We have budgeted for nine meetings of the police committee and we propose to have those meetings in Los Angeles. That involves a lot of meetings and a lot of work, but we think it is essential. This will not be a staff effort, but a committee effort. We think it is very important that we, the staff, are working for the committee.

I have commented on the high power of the staff. Chief Davis has commented on the high power of the committee. We think we have an excellent committee. We also think we have an excellent staff.

Beginning on page 23, you will see the project staff (see Appendix

A, page 157). There is also a brief biographical sketch of the people on the staff. The five people here represent over one hundred years of police experience. It is very important, I think, to have practitioners who do the research, who understand the problem, and who are talking to police chiefs and top brass in departments. They are academically qualified. They all have at least a baccalaureate degree. They all have command experience. They have all been working policemen for a long time. They are well grounded in research techniques. So you can see that they are typical Los Angeles types.

In the Police Task Force we learned some lessons. We learned that we took on a monumental task and that we did not have a lot of time to do it. I told Pete we could do this thing in six months, but it would not have a lot of depth. With a year we could get a lot of depth into it.

There are some parallels with the police task force report. There are also a lot of differences. The report on the police is kind of a cookbook. It does not get into depth but it hits standards in just about every area.

In this report we want to get into great depth in limited areas. You might say for sure that anything a police chief does is covered here and that is true, but we want to get greater depth. With a year to do this, I think we can do it.

The grant for which we are asking is actually thirteen months and the staff is for twelve months, with the exception of the eleven

and a quarter months' captain. The thirteenth month is a little bit of "get organized" time and "go out of business" time. So we are actually asking for thirteen months. The one-month salary addition would be for me, my secretary and my administrative sergeant.

I felt that these men should get on the ground floor. They are going to do the ground work under the guidance of the committee. I wanted them to be well grounded in what we talked about here and to get psychologically set so they can start in with the wheel spinning. They have not started yet inasmuch as they are all working in various assignments.

I am very confident that, with the staff that we have put together and under the guidance of the committee, we can produce an outstanding report. I am told that a report on police is a best seller. I am confident that the report we would turn out will also be a best seller.

CHIEF DAVIS: As the person wrestling with the money, let me tell you that those dollar figures allow us to hire substitute positions to fill jobs that are left vacant during this report. They continue to get their regular paychecks.

DEPUTY CHIEF HOY: Actually the city will be losing money because the actual overhead is 72.8 percent, and we have here 30.6 percent, so it is really not paying our pensions or sick leaves and all that. The city is willing to make the sacrifice, however.

CHIEF BAUER: I have never been able to live in Los Angeles on \$25 a day.

MR. MACY: LEAA per diem is based on one and a half, two days, and a lot of times you draw on the percentage of the day; and it is based on the full \$25, not just on the food, so you draw on the percentage of the day and you draw for a room that you don't use. The point I am making is that you draw one and three-quarters per diem if you spend one night.

CHIEF BAUER: It allows you ten dollars to travel, so that is a maximum of sixty dollars.

CHIEF DAVIS: We assumed that nobody would want a hundred dollars as a consultant.

If we have some basic textbooks and material, then maybe some place there could be put together a good qualified course that would qualify a man to be a chief of police. Let him try to minimize the number of mistakes after he has made them.

MR. BRANDSTATTER: You see models where educational institutions - and I am sure Drucker is familiar with most of them - have been involved in training executives for increased responsibilities in the business and industrial communities. There is one right here in Detroit. If that is pursued, I would suggest that some of these models be examined in terms of their application to this field, that is, police management and police executive. There should be some very interesting kinds of skills required for this.

CHIEF DAVIS: If we have a follow-up, let us get someone else to chair it.

#### WORKSHOP REPORTS

COLONEL PLANTS: There was some concern in our group - rather a universal concern - as to LEAA's overall plan for the country, as to what they intend to propose in terms of legislation, regulations, and so forth. They are concerned that they do not know which way LEAA is going. There has been very little information coming out of LEAA with respect to systems.

PARTICIPANT: With respect to security and privacy?

COLONEL PLANTS: It goes beyond that - with respect to the police community itself and the criminal justice community.

PARTICIPANT: Where are you going?

OTHER PARTICIPANT: To spell out a way as to what your relationship will be to the other Federal agencies, particularly your attitude toward Uniform Crime Report.

COLONEL PLANTS: We are expected, for example, when we are provided with a grant, to have a multi-year programming. We are asking LEAA: What is your long-range programming?

MR. VELDE: I find that amusing because I thought that was where we were really ahead, that is, in developing long-range LEAA plans.

In the systems area, we have had a pretty consistent program now for about three years - the CDS program.

COMMISSIONER LOONEY: If the directions could be spelled out very quickly, this would help.

MR. VELDE: We just spent three days with our top management doing that.

COLONEL PLANTS: Another concern is the role of the SPA's in their relationship to the criminal justice community. I think that that is broader than just systems. What does LEAA intend the role of the SPA to be? We know that LEAA has programs, but they have not been articulated to the group, that is, to the clients out in the field.

MR. GREACEN: Did you get any consensus from your group as to the direction in which the SPA's should be moving in their relationship with the criminal justice community in their state?

COMMISSIONER LOONEY: We feel it should be spelled out by the LEAA. Then the guidelines should be spelled out to the SPA's not to further restrict the guidelines issued by LEAA. We find that many State Agencies are being even more restricted than LEAA. We feel that it would be helpful to the police if we could have some coordination, that is, some uniform coordination. Maybe you haven't, but we have not been advised.

What we would like is for the LEAA to spell out to all the states, and particularly to the police, what the role would be of the State Planning Agencies. Will they be taking over the role of the state police, as they seem to indicate in some states; and will the State Planning Agency control some things that were traditionally police operations?

There is a strong feeling on the part of many police that LEAA and the SPA's will move in, and it will not be in the best interest of the police of the nation.

We don't want to make an accusation until we know exactly what the SPA's intend to do.

COLONEL PLANTS: As I read the notes, there is a general apprehension about not knowing what the long-range plans are. Many people are concerned about how far LEAA will go in controls.

CHIEF DAVIS: The intent of Congress was that the SPA's in the fifty states should be relatively autonomous. So, when they choose not to go through a centralized agency, they build in a potential for fifty different plans. There was really no authoritative constraint from LEAA. I thought it was messed up by design of Congress.

MR. VELDE: The concept behind block grants was to decentralize the authority for the administration of the funds and the programs to the state level under the control of the governor. So, there is a fair degree of flexibility given the strings that Congress has cast to the overall expenditure of the funds. You have got to spend it for purposes of crime control and the improvement of the criminal justice system. You cannot spend it for some non-criminal justice use.

With a statutory planning required later on, each state has to set up a planning mechanism. But beyond that, in the general guidelines in the statute, there was a deliberate intention not to have the decision-making process come from Washington. It would be a matter for each state to decide, each governor for each state. So, if New York State wants to merge the State Planning Agency with NCJISS, that is pursuant to the state law in New York State - I guess signed by the governor - and

it is a matter for New York State policy. In California the SPA, with the governor's approval, decides that they don't want any discretionary money from LEAA - which is a rather foolhardy statement in my opinion - then, if they don't like our strings, they don't have to take them.

CHIEF DAVIS: The confusion is by legislative design.

COLONEL PLANTS: There is no indication in these notes that they want LEAA to take over a more centralized role, but it is a question of direction. We want to know more about the direction in which LEAA is going. There are some things that LEAA has centralized. We want to know what LEAA is going to do in the future.

MR. VELDE: I made that statement in the context of block grants, but, as you know, LEAA operated three block grant programs and six categorical grant programs. The standards which apply to the lead programs are entirely different from either block grant programs or research systems. It is a different ball game in terms of who sets policy, how they are managed, and so on.

I would like to get comments from Al Andrews, who has been through the mill from both perspectives, as an SPA director and as a chief of police, and who has that broad background.

CHIEF ANDREWS: I am having trouble getting the sense of what the committee wants. The clearest thing here is that when the subject of Federal financial aid to reduce crime came up, Congress was so opposed to the idea of a national policy of law enforcement that it created an entirely new - never-before-discussed - concept of financing. They

explicitly rejected it.

COLONEL PLANTS: Having said that and made that statement, they are now exercising more and more control over the system.

CHIEF ANDREWS: That is true. There is an inevitable thrust that the Federal government will have toward the control takeover. From the day that the block grant program was conceived, it started. They are always the experts. I suspect that no other part of the local government has as many self-appointed experts as in law enforcement. The result is that there is constant pressure at the Federal level - and incidentally on the SPA's - to impose standards and do all those "noble and good things."

On the other hand, the SPA's in the states impose tremendous pressure on LEAA to cut that out and quit telling them how to do the job, quit taking over state and local programs and quit messing around. There is a real tug of war.

I think, though, that the basic area of action is the systems area.

COMMISSIONER LOONEY: Pete, we are not looking for more Federal control at the state level, but what we are looking for is Federal control. For example, we have the two bills - Senator Hruska's bill and Senator Ervin's - on which we addressed the Congress. Then we had that fouled up by LEAA guidelines which the states are constantly indicating are being mandated by the Federal government. In many ways, we find these more restrictive. So we have a sense, not only in the State of

New York but in the nation, that maybe the State Planning Agency will ultimately be the agency that will be operational as well as a planning agency. We also feel that maybe LEAA will be headed in the direction of becoming operational, that it will be the Federal agency that we will be dealing with for all purposes in the criminal justice system.

We have no quarrel with LEAA and the SPA's. We realize that we must have a combined planning agency, but we also recognize that, traditionally, we have been effective because we have been working through the FBI, for example, on the national level and through the State Police on the state level.

We think the relationship between the basic police functions has been very good. We would hate to see that lost, where the police of the nation would lose control over charting their own destiny. We have no interest in the Federal Government's infringing on the rights of the states. We think it will reduce our effectiveness.

The issue is: What role does LEAA plan? Will they play a large role? If they do intend to do that, then we would like to be alerted to it so we can speak to it throughout the states and throughout the nation.

CHIEF DAVIS: Things like the thrust to divert the FBI from being the recipient of the UCR figures and LEAA saying, "Let us take it out of there and put it with some other third party" - I know major city chiefs reacted very strongly to that. We feel the FBI is a pretty honest bookkeeper in keeping figures. We resent LEAA's saying to the Federal Government, "Take it away from the FBI and put it somewhere else."

While LEAA is not setting up in-house, they are talking about putting the crime report somewhere else. And the victimization study, which cost thirty million dollars, without consultation with law enforcement, now they are going to spend \$10 million a year doing that. There is a unilateral thrust that we deeply resent in San Francisco.

They are going operational as if they are reorganizing government as it has to do with law enforcement. The NLETS and NCIC controversy sort of thing is what I am talking about. We have a good relationship with the Federal policemen and we trust them after working with them for fifty years. Now we have not yet sized up the new LEAA thrust.

MR. VELDE: With respect to the statistics program, the current administrator felt strongly and stated publicly several times that the UCR program should be taken from the FBI, and also LEAA's current statistics program should be taken from LEAA, and put into a separate independent group within the Justice Department. He has been the advocate of that proposal long before he came to LEAA when he was in the Deputy Attorney General's Office. He has made several proposals like that.

I take a somewhat different view, but have not articulated it publicly since he has been on board.

With respect to the NCIC-NLETS controversy, LEAA does not, nor does it ever, intend to have an operational role of its own. We invested \$1.6 million to upgrade the NLET system, which is a private

dedicated Western Union system manned by police and which has been in business for some time - and inasmuch as that is now a fully operational system we were concerned about the FBI's potentially taking that system over from the states. Our basic mission is to assist state and local governments to build up their capabilities, not to establish a Federal presence.

If there is one underlying philosophy in the overall legislation it is that. The Federal role should be a limited one - a junior partner, if you will.

In some of our programs we are operational in the sense that we operate our own research program. We have some national statistical collection efforts, such as our organizational surveys of police, court and corrections agencies, but those are done for us by the Bureau of the Census. In that sense we are operational, but not in the sense of being an investigative agency or a prosecuting agency or a correctional agency. There is no intent on the part of Congress for us to become that.

CHIEF DAVIS: There are times when we would disagree with the Bureau and maybe some U.S. attorney when they send them in on civil rights. We say we will not have anything to do with it because of a certain U.S. attorney who uses the FBI. We have told the FBI that we will not cooperate. They did not control us. They did not try to control us. But when LEAA puts out very restrictive rules, most of us are accommodating.

We resent these directives coming out of LEAA that have to do with very sensitive issues. Yet, we have to live with those guidelines. They are published in the Federal Register with no prior consultation with the profession. We don't have any consultation at all on those "high standards."

MR. VELDE: There were some public hearings held. IACP and other groups did testify before those directives were put into effect. There were public hearings that were announced in the Federal Register.

There have been a few well-publicized disputes between LEAA and the FBI in the systems area, but there is a great deal of close cooperation and joint effort in a lot of areas that does not get any publicity. I would say on balance the disputes are very small and insignificant in contrast to the broad levels of cooperation, especially in the last year, in a number of areas.

I am really excited about the long-term prospects for relationship in the two agencies. I am not nearly as concerned about the public posture of a conflict between the two agencies as a lot of other people are.

Congress has a habit of sticking in to our legislation, as it does to others, its current notions as to what ought to be done and what ought not to be done, notwithstanding the basic underlying philosophy of the program. That is why last summer in our '73 set of amendments we got four different amendments which have resulted in new LEAA guidelines.

There is very strong civil rights language in the 1973 LEAA legislation which goes far beyond Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. We are bound to enforce that provision of the law. The privacy and security amendment, which was a Senate Floor amendment that was not requested by us, resulted in these new privacy and security guidelines.

We got an amendment that was a Senate Floor amendment added by Senator Burdick which required any correctional institution receiving LEAA money to have a treatment program for addicts and alcoholics. That is opposed to our basic philosophy, and yet we have just issued guidelines in that area because this is the mandate of the Congress.

We are obliged to administer the law as the Congress provides it for us. Sometimes those are not exactly in tune with the basic underpinning of the law.

On the other hand, many of you have experienced the so-called "revenue-sharing" legislation where a substantial amount of the two-thirds of the share is now being spent in the public safety area. That is general revenue-sharing where supposedly there are no strings. Yet, those of you who have dealt with that program realize that there are probably more strings on that money than there are on ours.

Ours is a special revenue-sharing as opposed to general or block grants. We have strings and we have exceptions that we have to deal with also. In a program which has as many inter-governmental relationships as ours there is bound to be a lot of slippage in coordination. There is no doubt about that.

Overall we have done a better job than most in the coordination area, but it is hard to keep forty-five thousand criminal justice jurisdictions and about three thousand county governments and many state agencies and local governments informed of what you are doing.

We are one of about fourteen hundred Federal-aid programs and they are all competing for interest at these various governmental levels. It is not an easy job and sometimes we do slip. On those occasions, we appreciate your candid comments which will help us to do a better job.

CHIEF DAVIS: To buy the Federal Register costs enough so that I have to put it in the budget. I don't get letters with regard to changing the high standards, nor do I read about it in the newspaper, and maybe the executive director did not tell us. So, next year the budget will contain the Federal Register and I will have to read it every day so that we can get back and raise hell in advance because now, when we see something come out, it is almost a "fait accompli."

MR. VELDE: On this new set of guidelines on systems, we ran off two thousand reprints of the draft guidelines and mailed those to every criminal justice agency that had an automated system, so we did learn a little bit there.

You are absolutely right in that these high standard guidelines should have been mailed to all the police agencies, but at the time we didn't really have access to a comprehensive mailing list. It was

published in our newsletter which theoretically everybody is supposed to get. We have about 30,000 addressees on that. However, we find that a lot of people who should read it don't have access to it for one reason or another.

CHIEF ANDREWS: This was the thing that I was speaking to. The clear lesson for those of us involved in law enforcement is that it is great to beat LEAA over the head, but the real problem is that somehow the law enforcement at the local level has got to get a little better organized in its dealing with Congress, because the inherent tendency of this program from the day it was passed was to start having these experts demanding more regulations, and there is more and more pressure in Congress to slowly categorize the block grant programs and provide more and more instructions to LEAA. That is what is going to take the freedom away from the LEAA and the flexibility of its programs.

MR. VELDE: Trying to eliminate these amendments accounts for more of our time on the Hill than anything else. We have a battle right now in juvenile delinquency. There is a proposal, which was just reported out of the House Labor Committee yesterday, to set up a parallel program for funding of equal size in LEAA and HEW for juvenile delinquency. You talk about problems of coordination, overlapping duplication, and conflicting signals. If you think it is bad now, wait till you see something like that set up.

COMMISSIONER LOONEY: We have not heard about it until Mr. Velde mentioned it here. Every single issue that has been brought to my

attention since October we have addressed to the Congress and the Executive Branch of government. We have not overlooked talking about every single issue since I have been President.

Unfortunately, many of these things were passed last year or the year before when there was a feeling on the part of some officers of IACP that there might be a conflict of interest and we might lose our tax exemption if we spoke out on these issues. I do not share that feeling.

Certainly since last October we have spoken out on every single issue. So, Ed, we do probably have a communication gap within our own organization which will be corrected before long.

MR. VELDE: Another example is the staff benefits bill where the House added the firemen and a whole new standard of line-of-duty death rather than pursuing some criminal act which increases the cost of that program about four times over what was originally intended. That is supposed to be an annuity for all local municipal police, which it is pretty close to being now.

I would say that the large majority of our time is spent on the Hill in trying to keep the program as pure as possible and according to the original congressional intent.

I can tell you now that there will be a major presidential campaign issue in 1976 - as there was in 1968 and in 1972 - as to what form and direction this program should take. It will not be toward giving the states and local governments more authority. They will be

centralizing more power in the Federal government. Our efforts will be to maintain the status quo as far as we know now and consistent with the new Federalism concepts.

COMMISSIONER LOONEY: It might be helpful to the associations if matters such as that were brought to our attention. I think particularly of whether juvenile delinquency funds should be placed in HEW or LEAA. I know we have very strong feelings on that. We feel they should be in LEAA. We think we could be supportive of that not only from the IACP but through the various chiefs' associations throughout the country.

MR. VELDE: The time for action on that is right now or it might be too late because it is going to be coming up on the Senate floor within two weeks. The Senate version places it in LEAA but the House version reported out yesterday places it in HEW. There will be a Floor battle on that. Probably Congressman Quie, of Minnesota, will offer an amendment on the floor to put it in LEAA.

CHIEF DAVIS: We meet a week from Monday. We can get this stuff in the mail in the middle of next week.

MR. VELDE: It may help but it is right in the middle of the congressional meeting.

COLONEL PLANTS: We had some concern about the REGIS turndown by the policy advisory board of NCIC. If any of you are not familiar with REGIS, it is the system down in St. Louis where a great number of police agencies, courts, and correction agencies have gotten together and have formed by county ordinance and city ordinance a service group

called REGIS. REGIS' only concern, only rule and only objective is to provide criminal justice information services for criminal justice agencies.

As many of you also know, the NCIC policy guidelines had seven categories under which people could access either directly or as a satellite to CCH information. REGIS did not fall into any one of those categories.

It was proposed on a Tuesday night or Tuesday afternoon at a policy board meeting in New Orleans to put in an amendment which would allow REGIS to come in. It passed eleven to two. There must have been a lot of lobbying being done overnight because the next morning they reconsidered it and it was defeated nine to two.

So, there is some current concern in our group that the kinds of systems such as REGIS ought to be allowed access to CCH. Their only purpose is to serve criminal justice. The fact that they are not assigned to a specifically aligned agency should not make that much difference, but it does right now in NCIC.

CHIEF CAMP: While it does not seem to fit in any of the seven categories, it is not as bad as it sounds. It is clearly a criminal justice program all the way through. I don't know why they would be barred. It was well resourced except for getting clearance at that final phase. Everyone knew of the thing. They went to great detail in forming a non-profit corporation. It is the St. Louis police, the county police, every agency that is represented in any other facet of this program.

COLONEL PLANTS: The problem was, though, that it had to fit under one of those seven categories to be accepted as receiving or passing through CCH information. Unfortunately, you have a very old draft of the policy guidelines - the concept paper for NCIC - and it did not match the present one. They had changed that two or three years ago.

CHIEF DAVIS: Couldn't the county or the city just take it over?

COLONEL PLANTS. That is precisely what they don't want to do. They don't want to put it in a police agency or the courts. They want a non-aligned agency so that everybody will participate.

CHIEF DAVIS: There are some systems that we have and others that the sheriff has. We just get things running and maybe subsidize the cost.

COLONEL PLANTS: Except that this particular function is going to be one of the answers to dedication. I think one of the logical answers to dedicated systems is that courts don't want police handling them, and nobody wants corrections to handle them. So, what they have done down there is sixty or seventy agencies together to handle it for them. And the system is completely dedicated. That is its only function - to provide those criminal justice services.

I personally saw nothing in it, but I do know that the members of the policy board were concerned that this might be the forerunner of other ways that computers can take the systems away from them and

**CONTINUED**

**1 OF 4**

put them in non-aligned agencies. There was a concern over the REGIS system.

CHIEF ANDREWS: It is becoming one of the most common ways that law enforcement agencies are merging functions and overcoming inter-departmental conflicts which prevent them from subordinating one department to the other, so this has broad implications.

COLONEL PLANTS: My concern - and I am sure the concern of the FBI - is that the Policy Advisory Board is closing door after door. They are in effect not approving anything that is not aligned specifically with the criminal justice agencies. They are not allowing anything such as transparent switches at the local level and many cities can not afford their own computers. Micro computers may be the answer, as Pete says.

There is a certain philosophical bend in some of these places that even if the computer is cheap, they will not get it because they want to centralize it.

If you have that kind of philosophy, then the local police departments are in real trouble if you don't allow them transparent switches operated by the county or city data center.

A couple of us have been trying for at least a year and a half to two years to get that transparent switch philosophy approved by the policy board, and it will not do that. The REGIS operation goes one step further in the dedication. They have an agency doing nothing for criminal justice services, and they still turn that down.

The concern among some of us is that the Policy Board is being far too rigid in not providing NCIC with some flexibility to handle other than completely totally dedicated systems.

CHIEF DAVIS: Who appoints that board? The Director of the FBI?

COLONEL PLANTS: Yes. The board is partially appointed by Kelley while the majority is elected by their counterparts across the country.

Let me say that Kelley was on the REGIS board. Kelley and the FBI are, I think, in support of REGIS, but the Policy Advisory Board turned it down.

CHIEF DAVIS: Even if you have a data service in your county or city and if they are doing it as a service to the whole county, they don't qualify because they are civilians.

COLONEL PLANTS: They don't qualify because it is a non-dedicated system. They don't qualify because under the present situation they do not have the provision for transparent switches in the NCIC policies.

CHIEF DAVIS: That is ridiculous.

COLONEL PLANTS: Yes, I agree.

CHIEF DAVIS: You should not have police agencies running computer systems.

COLONEL PLANTS: Are you saying that they should not have police agencies running computer systems?

CHIEF DAVIS: I think it is a lot better to have civilian computer operations. It is a lot more efficient for the city or county govern-

ment not to have any law enforcement dedicated computer and to have one data service bureau run with real professionalism.

COLONEL PLANTS: I disagree with that.

CHIEF DAVIS: We have been successful in utilizing their expertise. Our system's design has a long and successful marriage. We fought the other battle. We said we wanted to do it ourselves. I am very happy that we lost the battle. This, then, would preclude us.

COLONEL PLANTS: You would be precluded if you intended that.

CHIEF CAMP: We are like that only in the criminal history area.

COLONEL PLANTS: There was some concern about privacy and security. I was not here when my group discussed the ABC-TV program on "paper prisons." Personally I thought it was the most distorted program I have ever seen. I am familiar with that subject, and I thought ABC did a terrible job.

MR. GREACEN: I am not familiar with the "paper prisons" program.

COLONEL PLANTS: It was an ABC program on NCIC. They "sandbagged" Clarence Kelley and the prosecuting attorney. It was terrible journalism.

MR. BASTIAN: There probably is an issue there. Police people and other criminal justice people need to be better read on the information systems issues, especially as they relate to privacy.

The one man that they interviewed down there in Kansas was being very unfair to the police profession in some of the statements that he was making.

COLONEL PLANTS: One of the suggestions of the group was that there should be in every police training curriculum an item on how you handle information, the secrecy of certain criminal histories, and how you handle that information so you don't have people making foolish statements like the man did in Kansas.

Many police departments, including my own, do not tell people, do not teach them in recruit schools or in service schools the importance of how you handle information.

COMMISSIONER MURPHY: That is not a recruit school problem; that is an administrative level problem. Here are two topflight administrators who get sandbagged because somebody let them get out on a limb. It must have been their computer people or someone who let them give the answers they gave.

COLONEL PLANTS: I know Clarence Kelley enough to know that what he said was what he meant.

COMMISSIONER MURPHY: I agree that it was vicious journalism, but my point is that the problem is not for every police officer in the country, but that in these highly sophisticated issues of privacy and computer systems it is the top-level people who need more information and a deeper understanding of these things.

COLONEL PLANTS: I agree, but this was also saying that there ought to be definite procedures or policies for information-handling by people of the lower level who handle information.

CHIEF DAVIS: Someone in our group stated that the police should

take the initiative and conceive and legislate through the constraints on the use of criminal history intelligence and all other information systems instead of responding to critics in Congress and people who will wreck our usefulness. This makes a good point.

COLONEL PLANTS: One of the reasons that we are what we are is that we have not been doing that. We have been talking about privacy and security long before most other elements of criminal justice talked about it.

MR. GREACEN: Project SEARCH has drafted legislation which was presented to Congress.

CHIEF DAVIS: It has been presented to Congress?

MR. GREACEN: Yes.

COLONEL PLANTS: Big chunks of LEAA guidelines, the Hruska and the Ervin bill are offshoots of the SEARCH project.

MR. BASTIAN: IACP has not involved itself in the whole information communications area. This is the issue. IACP is really not up on what is going on.

CHIEF DAVIS: If SEARCH has this proposal, then we should go in to Congress with a broad base of criminal justice support.

MR. BASTIAN: One of the problems we have is that you can not get people with four years of education into our meeting. The police, the district attorneys, the judges, corrections as generalized bodies, have not tried to keep up with the technology. This is coming down on us very fast. These are issues which the IACP is not prepared to deal with.

As far as articulating a position on behalf of police departments it has not been done. That is one of the things that we were talking about. The Standards and Goals Report on the criminal justice system, especially in the area of communications, was identified by the Commission. People are turning over a lot of major administrative policies and management decisions to technicians, and the manager in many instances does not understand these issues.

CHIEF DAVIS: I think SEARCH and all these other things - I hear about them, I see a picture in the paper - can take the time to go and meet with the National D.A., or the National Association of District Attorneys or Sheriffs rather than running unilaterally to Congress. Some congressman will ask, "Davis, what do you think of the SEARCH bill on confidentiality and information." And I will say, "I don't know anything about it."

COLONEL PLANTS: Is that SEARCH's fault or yours?

CHIEF DAVIS: It is SEARCH's fault, whoever SEARCH is. I don't know who they are.

COLONEL PLANTS: You have got people in your department who do know what SEARCH is all about.

CHIEF DAVIS: No. They appointed one of my commissioners. He enjoyed the trips, but I still don't know who they are. I am just saying that to get effective legislation they should come back and educate us so that we can be effective in Congress. If we brought police associations, prosecutorial and judicial associations in, I

think we could have some effect, particularly if it were interdisciplinary.

COLONEL PLANTS: What Lloyd is saying is that there is an expertise in IACP. I have been screaming about this for at least seven years. There is no expertise there in the systems field. Their surveys have eliminated huge portions of automation and technology because they have had no one competent enough to look at it. They still haven't gotten anyone.

CHIEF DAVIS: Yesterday you were criticising our doing the police executive thing. Who did they have?

COLONEL PLANTS: We were criticizing its being an LEAA project, not the fact that you were doing it.

One of the things that has concerned me particularly is that from the time we started talking about it, it was an LAPD (Los Angeles Police Department) proposal.

CHIEF DAVIS: By whom?

COLONEL PLANTS: By everyone around the table with whom I was talking.

My concern is that if this is seen as strictly an LAPD proposal it loses a lot of its credibility. I understand why it did not go through IACP, but somehow it has to be made broader.

CHIEF DAVIS: There is only one LAPD member on the entire committee.

COLONEL PLANTS: You and I know that, but I am thinking that a

lot of people will not read it because of the narrow denotation.

Another problem is the narrow methodology. You are going to interview policemen, police subordinates and police superiors to find out what they think about tenure and what they think they ought to be paid. Therefore, it is a biased report to begin with. It would have no basis for validity among statisticians or academicians.

We are saying that if you are going to investigate the role of the police chief to find out what he ought to be to society, you have to go way beyond the police to find it out. Otherwise, it is just an opinion survey.

CHIEF DAVIS: We are going to the chambers of commerce, and the like.

COLONEL PLANTS: You aren't saying that in the methodology.

CHIEF CLEMENT: I think if you wait until we have our report, then you will find out what our committee has in mind.

COLONEL PLANTS: We were asked to comment on it.

CHIEF CLEMENT: We haven't talked about that yet.

COLONEL PLANTS: Oh, I am sorry. I thought our committee was asked to comment on it. If you have something else, then disregard my comments here. However, knowing what we knew, that was the conclusion we drew.

MR. VELDE: The other committee that was given this as its primary focus has gone into it in some detail.

COMMISSIONER LOONEY: I think Pete has indicated this as a "Po-

lice Task Force Proposal." This is misleading because we appointed a committee within IACP to deal with the problems of the police chief executive. It had no relationship to the Task Force at all. The only relationship was that the committee has to be funded by LEAA to look into the role of the chief executive.

MR. VELDE: I was speaking in the context of the Standards and Goals Commission, and what was then the Police Task Force. The principles of that group were principles that generated this proposal.

COLONEL PLANTS: I have no quarrel with you, Ed. You have the best department in the country. You also have one of the best research staffs that I know of.

MR. GREACEN: The Advisory Committee is broad-based and the people who are involved represent a very broad spectrum. You need to emphasize that.

COLONEL PLANTS: There is the question of needing input into OBTS from some of the other elements besides police.

Another thing that we think ought to be considered is that somewhere there ought to be training or consideration given to computer crimes. There are crimes being committed by people who are dealing with computers and who are defrauding their companies. It is a crime, but I don't know of any police department who is equipped to investigate that kind of a crime, including the Bureau. I don't know whether the FBI is working on it.

MR. JENKINS: We have just completed a seminar for Assistant

or U.S. Attorneys on the prosecution of this white collar crime, as we call it. We did it in cooperation with the Criminal Division of the Department of the Executive Office of the United States Attorney.

We suggested to the Attorney General that he approve this. As a result of it, these men have asked for more training and the prosecutor has asked for it, too.

We are moving ahead on this and we are probably going to run some schools at the local police levels.

CHIEF DAVIS: We have some men in L.A. who are very good teachers. They were involved in the Equity Funding thing.

COLONEL PLANTS: Our committee was concerned that a lot more be done on this, since it is an emerging area of crime. The last thing I would like to bring up is that LEAA has a requirement that every state, before they go into some of the programs, must submit a comprehensive data systems plan. You must have a plan as to how you are going to integrate all the data collecting systems.

We think you ought also to require a statewide communication plan so that the State Police Agencies - not the SPA's, although it would come through the SPA's, but the police agencies in that state - should have a plan developed for the communication apparatus in that state. Many states have them now. We have one in Michigan, and when the grant comes in through the SPA, we can hold our plan up against the SPA plan, so you don't have a communication system which completely disregards the other plans for the state.

MR. VELDE: Are you referring to radio communications?

COLONEL PLANTS: Yes.

CHIEF ANDREWS: We noted - and our committee was quite satisfied - that the LAPD staff on the project has made very good sense and, in my opinion, feels very urgently a need to get this out and make it far more than just police. We can reassure those of you who were not in our meeting that that is the case.

We probably had two significant concerns. One is that the scope of this thing is going to tend to run away with the staff because of the time available to do the job. I think the staff convinced us that they are well aware of it and they are going to have to exist with the pressures.

The second area of concern was evident in a discussion of ways of collecting data, ways of determining whether you have real problems going.

You may be in a cyclical situation among the agencies involved. I am speaking particularly of the attrition of police chiefs. Do you have just a maturing situation? A lot of cities and suburbs grew up under certain conditions? Do you have attrition rates that are due to undesirable things, and so forth?

Again, this gets back to the question that the survey may well open up more areas of inquiry and questions than it can resolve. I think our committee is satisfied that the staff is alerted to this.

We did not discuss one issue which Colonel Plants brought up,

that is, the LAPD title. I am personally aware that the Task Force Report is being labeled LAPD, and I think the purpose of that labeling is to weaken its influence and its effectiveness.

I did not bring the issue up yesterday in our committee. I was waiting to see whether others did. Apparently those present did not feel that this is a problem. I think that it might well be worth discussing in the open right here.

There are jealousies of LAPD and I would hate to see those who were jealous of that department tag on a label that they can use to weaken the results of this particular project. I am sure the IACP would be very concerned to have something as important as this weakened in that way. I don't know how to judge the significance of that. Maybe it is something that we should discuss.

CHIEF DAVIS: I instructed the staff that you are never to write down LAPD. On some occasions the Task Force members, such as Clarence Kelley and General Manger Davis, and a bunch of strong-minded people - this is a strong and mighty group that we have now - could have said LAPD but didn't, by design.

In this one, we will do the same thing. We have one LAPD member on the committee. We did have a Kansas City man and a Michigan State captain on the last one. On this one it is not practical to bring men from across the country.

With the limited amount of money and the short amount of time, we could go on a talent search to try to put together a staff from

around the country, but I don't think the staff is going to make the decisions. The people who are going to make the decisions are the Mike Cods and Gene Camps and the pushover rubber-stamp Rick Clements.

We will do our best to avoid the label "LAPD".

CHIEF ANDREWS: To the extent that it is being labeled, I doubt it is avoidable. I think that those who want to detract from that kind of report will use whatever techniques they can to damage it. Labeling it this way is just one of the minor ways of doing it harm.

JUDGE ALARCON: I was on the Police Task Force and every effort was made to find some other place that did something we felt was good as a model. We wanted to avoid this. However, it cannot be avoided.

COMMISSIONER MURPHY: Let me ask a question. I apologize that I could not be here yesterday. Has any thought been given to having some representation on the Advisory Committee from the people who appoint chiefs, such as mayors and managers, or would that be inconsistent?

I don't claim to clearly understand all of the objectives. I gathered that one product of the work will be a book or a report. You talked about credibility. I just wondered whether there is any validity to that notion that it would have some credibility if there were some representation from mayors or managers.

MR. VELDE: As I recall, there was a representative of ICMA and the League of Cities on the Police Task Force. I don't think there is any representation like that in this group.

COMMISSIONER LOONEY: In the IACP committee we recognized that

indeed the head of the municipality might be a problem. Therefore, we particularly did not include them. We wanted the IACP to conduct this, to direct it, guide it, and from a police viewpoint make the judgment. Maybe there will be another study from the viewpoint of the mayor, the county executive, and others. But I think we should have a determination from our own professional organization as to what we view the problem to be. We would work through Ed's staff as well as through the IACP committee. We would like to keep it basically an IACP function all the way through so that we can as an organization make that decision.

CHIEF DAVIS: We could proceed with the interviewing of success and failure models where we would go to chambers of commerce, to mayors, and to people within the community for evaluation of why they keep a man like Pete Pitchess for sixteen years. Why didn't they dump him after four years? What is there about Pete Pitchess that makes him a good man? And in cases where chiefs have had to depart, as most major city chiefs do, what are some of the causes for failure? We will try to seek this information without identifying any individuals. We will try to seek this from newspapers clippings, from chambers of commerce, from mayors, and from legislative officials at the local levels with no identification of the person.

Our goal is to find out what makes for effectiveness, what makes for ineffectiveness, what makes for the capacity of survival.

COMMISSIONER MURPHY: I think that this is so important, and can have a tremendous impact, that we all hope that as early as possible

it will carry a great weight with those decision-makers such as mayors and managers. My thought is whether it would add some credibility if the names of some members of those groups would be included to this committee.

CHIEF DAVIS: We have Peter Drucker. We have Judge Alarcon. We picked them up because they look good and they are cheap. They don't have to spend the airfare and the hotel bills. We would have to get some additional funding to bring in other people. If we have a mayor, I suppose we would have to have a councilman, a governor, etcetera. How many would you need? There is no end to it.

COMMISSIONER MURPHY: This, of course, is only one option. Maybe at the end of the work it would be possible to get some endorsements from those decision-makers and this would add to the credibility.

CHIEF DAVIS: Maybe we can get together a meeting of mayors and go to a governors' conference.

COMMISSIONER MURPHY: Yes, I think that would add a lot to it.

MR. MACY: Yes, that input would be good.

MR. BROWN: They are going to have a substantial part of the input information according to the discussion we had. I think that answers Commissioner Murphy's question.

MR. GREACEN: Are there any more issues? If not, we will go on to the Research Needs of the Police Chiefs.

MR. BRANDSTATTER: We were asked to address the following questions: What are the priorities in police research and experimentation?

What are the major issues which should be addressed by a program of research and experimentation? What should the LEAA's priorities in this area be? There is also a comment on the Task Force proposal.

I think we covered everything except perhaps the latter part of it. We concentrated on what we felt were issues of national priorities.

The first one that we discussed was the need to consider some form of consolidation of law enforcement services throughout the nation. We talked about a number of those that have been developed over the years, beginning with a discussion of the very fine program and the leadership that was given the country in the LA county contractual services arrangement with a number of cities and their county indicating the extension of services from the county level to individual and autonomous communities as a form of regionalization or consolidation.

We also mentioned some of the others that have developed with a long history of success - Nassau, Suffolk County, Dade County, St. Louis County. We pointed out during the discussion what the British did back in 1962 with the Royal Commission on the Police in England. It made its study when there was somewhere in excess of a thousand police departments in that country. As a result of the recommendations of that particular commission study, progress has been made today in achieving one of the objectives of that study. There are now fifty autonomous police departments, all of which function on a local level.

In the British study the optimum size police department is considered six hundred. We are moving in that direction as a result of

the recommendation of the National Standards and Goals by suggesting ten as a minimum in this country. Although that is a very modest figure, nevertheless that is a start in the right direction. We hope that that figure will be upgraded in the years ahead. It is a step forward and represents progress.

One of the concerns that we discussed was that we need to do more than what has been done on a piecemeal basis. We thought there should be some kind of research or a model should be developed in a given state so that we could replicate that model throughout the nation, or at least it could be considered for application. We could incorporate contractual services, metropolitan authorities, relationships between city-county operations.

We could modify these or develop them in such a way that it would be applicable within an entire state so that we would have a state plan which an SPA or a governor may want to consider for his state. That would be a useful service for LEAA, to fund a research project with that objective in mind. It would deal with all the questions such as personnel matters and legal and economic issues.

The second item had to do with the need to develop a research and planning capability for the police departments across the nation. I think that implicit in the discussion was the fact that we did not feel all the police chiefs have Ed Davis' skills.

It was suggested that perhaps we might look to the academic institutions and hire people who are highly skilled and trained in research methodology so that they could deal competently with the com-

plex problems that are required to be addressed and could give information that is essential to a police chief to make a better judgment and decisions with regard to the requirements of his personnel.

We talked about the need to develop a model management information system which would include studies of crime analysis, manpower deployment and analysis, crime prevention activities, the allocation of resources, and also the evaluation of all existing programs as well as other programs which are experimental in nature, and even those developed by individual police departments across the nation whether funded by LEAA or some other project.

We discussed the need for continuous evaluation in determining whether or not the missions have been accomplished, whether the individual programs or the objectives have been achieved - and, if not, why not? This kind of thorough analysis is essential.

The committee felt that many departments in the country are unable to develop this kind of capability from within their own ranks. They need to hire highly trained technicians to do this role. We felt that this was essential. We thought that you could hire academics.

MR. GREACEN: One thought that came up in that group was that the problems are two-fold. One is providing the resources for that kind of planning in terms of funds, and the other is the resources in terms of how to do it.

One proposal that is pending before us now is to establish some sort of institute.

MR. BRANDSTATTER: Yes, That reminds me that we also talked about the development of some kind of a document that would incorporate a case study where this sort of thing has been done in other departments - for example, with the proposal we just discussed - so that when police officials read such a document they would have some insights and be exposed to knowledge of programs that have been successful. We felt there was a need for a case study in terms of what is really done in a department, in terms of making a manpower study or a response-time study. This hopefully would be a pragmatic approach.

CHIEF DAVIS: I would like to make one comment about bringing in the academic or civilian types. In trying to do some of this we find that there are some real problems in bringing in academics. You cannot offer them any place to go within the police community. They take off like big birds to bigger jobs, that is, to other agencies or to city government in general.

There is a tremendous investment in training. When you get them up to where they are effective, then you lose them. If you take a bright young lieutenant and get him up to speed, and this poor devil is trapped for a minimum of twenty years before he can get out on a pension, you can get your money's worth. Time and time again we developed fantastic academic types. They then will go somewhere else to become city manager.

I don't know what the answer is. Maybe you can hire a whole firm.

OFFICER MC PARTLAND: We did talk about that. That is one of the costs of doing business. What we suggested in our discussion was that we bring in civilian analysts in highly technical fields, like quantitative analysis. There is a certain service that they can provide. They can provide it fast when you have put them on to a bright supervisor or officer who knows the system. Then they work together as a team.

I think that we all have to recognize that this turnover is going to exist, but for the period that they are employed, there is a benefit that we get, and if we weigh the benefit against the cost of losing this analyst, we think it is worth it.

One of the big costs is to bring the person up to speed. When you put him to work in a team situation, you reduce that time in getting him up to speed.

I also think that we have to try and provide a ladder for the civilian analyst type to move into significant roles. I am running the research division in New York City which is called the Officers' Organizing Policies. I have a civilian director in one of my divisions. He is equivalent in pay scale and authority scale to the captain.

CHIEF DAVIS: That is true, but that is only one and the rest have to leave.

OFFICER MC PARTLAND: Maybe you have to look for some slots. Live with the best of the group and live with the turnover.

MR. MACY: You both can develop that expertise, but, when you

look at the majority of the departments, we don't have that expertise. We are unable to develop it. We have to go outside or else we don't have it.

OFFICER MC PARTLAND: Yes. And your suggestion is that you have to look at it from a cost-effective basis.

COLONEL PLANTS: We have a program in Michigan. What they are developing is this kind of consulting expertise at the state level. The state is paying for it, but it is operated in the metropolitan area by the Criminal Justice Institute, which is a training facility for all kinds of criminal justice agencies of the metropolitan area. We will have a consulting group that we can send off if the police department wants to have it. It is paid for right now from LEAA funds, but it will be paid by state-sponsored funds. This will provide the kind of expertise for departments of your size which cannot afford it or don't want to go in that themselves. In this way you will have consultants who know their business without having to waste time to bring them up to speed.

OFFICER MC PARTLAND: Another way, of course, is to work out an accommodation with an institution of high learning. M.I.T., for example, has done some significant work in police areas, specifically with respect to models for police manpower allocation and things of that nature. For a department which cannot afford to bring in a civilian analyst full time - because of the big turnover - it might be possible to work something out with the local college.

CHIEF DAVIS: St. Louis used to have one through some private funding to try to inject civilian expertise from the outside. Do you still have that? Didn't they come in and try to help you with the computer center?

CHIEF CAMP: No, we don't have that anymore.

CHIEF DAVIS: Wasn't there some privately funded effort in the older days of your computer center? Allegedly I was told there was a civil group that injected some expertise from the outside.

CHIEF CAMP: The only thing I can think of right now is when we bought our television by private subscription in the city. When they started the computer, there might have been something of that kind, but I was a sergeant at that time.

COMMISSIONER MURPHY: Maybe you are thinking of Governmental Research?

CHIEF CAMP: Yes, but they are not that skilled.

MR. BRANDSTATTER: What Officer McPartland suggests, I think, is another alternative; that is, to establish a relationship with the institutes of higher learning, particularly those which have developed some capability, expertise and knowledge in the criminal justice system. These institutions are there forever, and we have been doing some of that as we developed and increased our research capability.

We are finding increasing demand from police departments to assist them in some of the very difficult and complex internal problems that confront them. We are trying to respond to the extent that we can.

I believe that if you are in an urban development, and even if

you are not, you can do what one department in Illinois did which has used the Illinois Institute of Technology - it used their mathematics program to develop a response-time study out of which came two or three PhD dissertations and masters programs. All of this was done with highly-trained technical people who understood the issues involved and who worked closely with their internal advisor. So, there is this potential that Mc Partland suggests and which I would highly recommend to you if you have that kind of capability and that kind of interest in your locale.

CHIEF ANDREWS: The Illinois Chief Association is struggling now with the concept of a police service bureau. It may or may not go, but it has potential as an idea.

I would like to suggest that part of the problem of research is the planning. I think many, many police chiefs view this as an essentially non-productive but high-hazard type of thing that is more likely to get them in trouble than it is to get them any significant advantage.

Many of them are also struggling with the idea that the city government view the idea of research as nothing but increased cost and demands for more money. I think research is probably good in some individual departments, but to create a climate so that chiefs in general and local government officials in general will accept it is something that ought to be looked at.

MR. GREACEN: Don't use that word "research". Talk about doing management, analyzing what your problems are, and coming up with responses to problems.

CHIEF ANDREWS: Yes, but you are working in a climate where the idea of study is suspect, disregarding the political risk of having labeled something that is not working well. I think this needs to be addressed. In the long haul, this is a major obstacle.

MR. GREACEN: That is a real problem and it is one that counsels in favor of developing your own in-house capability or using people within the criminal justice system rather than going to outside consultants who dump a report in your lap critical of you and which you have to decide to make public or not.

CHIEF ANDREWS: Sometimes you don't have a choice if you have a law of open data.

CHIEF DAVIS: The Department of Defense, MITRE, and all these organizations have gone to the moon. I want to commend LEAA for picking up some of these people. We have one from MITRE. After he got broken in, his expertise in the area of electronics has been very helpful. My assistant really leans on this man. It may well be that the Institute can spawn MITREs and ITREs within law enforcement which can be picked up in states and regions.

In the military, you can not expect generals and admirals to be able to respond to the technological problems of today. Without the MITREs, they could not have gone to the moon. This goes for us. We cannot become technologists, but we can have an appreciatory knowledge. We cannot attract and keep in one agency distinguished scientists, but maybe the Institute ought to look at and try to replicate what the

military had in the late forties and fifties.

MR. VELDE: We do have a big program - \$5 million with Aerospace and \$2 million with the National Bureau of Standards. The one with MITRE is phasing out.

CHIEF ANDREWS: LEAA's Technical Assistance Program needs to be kept in mind also because it has turned out to be non-threatening. Generally, it has been accepted as a problem-solving type of thing which is getting good acceptance from the departments with which I am familiar.

COMMISSIONER MURPHY: Everything that Ed Davis has just said is so important to all of us. I do have one scare, though - that we think too much about it in the highly technical scientific areas and we don't think enough about the need for this research and exchange of information, about very basic day-to-day things. One of our great weaknesses in the police world is that we don't know what is going on in the other police departments as much as we think we do.

I have been a great admirer of the Los Angeles Police Department for years. As a matter of fact, with the LEAA grant that we had in New York for the middle management exchange program, one of our bright young captains came back from Los Angeles so impressed that we let him have a precinct in Brooklyn where you can do things like that - I refer to it as our Los Angeles Police Precinct.

Just let me mention a few things that so impressed this captain. He had a typical New York Police Department cynical attitude, that west of the Hudson River nobody knows what life is all about. But when he

saw some of the things that were happening, when he saw Ed's basic car plan, although we had already begun to experiment with neighborhood police teams, when he saw the duty schedule - which is unbelievable for a New York policeman because the PBA and everybody else always thought that you had to have the same number of men on during the night as during the day - he took this precinct; unbelievably, in a short period of time, he had the men voluntarily, with PBA cooperation, do things I never dreamed I would see happen.

When we had the patrol chiefs conference at Quantico sometime ago, some of your distinguished representatives from Los Angeles, Ed, couldn't believe what they were hearing about how other police departments were still operating - I mean departments with very enlightened leadership - because in Los Angeles twenty-five years ago everybody concluded: "That is not the way you go." - and they changed.

The need for research and exchange of information of such basic things as deployment across the 24-hour period, a percentage of your total personnel assigned to patrol function, criminal investigation function, juvenile function, is so tremendous.

In talking about these two options, don't use the word "research". I agree generally that we have a real hang-up in the police world when we use the word, but I think that when the Committee for Economic Development looked at criminal justice, the business executives, the people who spend all the money in this country, when they saw how little research was going on maybe they overreacted and made a proposal that is

not feasible at this point in time when they put a great emphasis on research.

There may be another alternative to bringing in consultants or trying to do it with the person that you now have, and that is to try to get positions created within police departments to bring on board as your own employees, and not consultants, some of the researchers and others who can help you. I think they will be helping a great deal just by finding out what is going on in the rest of the police world.

CHIEF DAVIS: Whether it is a state association, a county association, or a national association, chiefs of police never want to talk about how you cut crime and how you get the job done. The men who are really interested are down the line - they are lieutenants, they are captains or inspectors. I have yet to belong to an association where any of my colleagues as chiefs were really interested. Their preoccupation is for survival, and they will talk about what Congress does not do, what the state legislature fails to do. They will talk about politics. They will listen to speakers and talk about national things. But they don't care about cutting the crime rate.

Maybe we cannot do it with chiefs. Maybe it is too late for chiefs ever to get interested in crime, but I always thought that was their mission - so maybe we should have associations for little management people where there is some hope, not have just IACPs but professional associations.

One of our problems is hierarchy and rank. Unless you are a

sheriff or a police chief you don't count. Maybe the real failure is the failure to have real organizations of professionals. The push in our department has always been from the bottom. If you don't get out of the way you are stampeded.

Parker did not want any change in his museum. I guess Ed Davis has not become this way. The solution then may be who gets together and talks. It should not be the old grey-haired headmasters.

COMMISSIONER MURPHY: That is what it is all about. However, you need to involve the chiefs so that the bright ideas actually happen. We can spread the bright ideas around through the lower people, but then when do they get implemented? How do they get implemented?

CHIEF DAVIS: And how do you make it non-subversive? You have to involve the old chief.

MR. GREACEN: Ultimately it has to be his idea.

COLONEL PLANTS: The chief, of course, has to sell it to the mayor, the legislature, and so forth.

MR. BROWN: And to the people who work for him. I disagree with Ed's description of a chief of police. I don't think an emphasis or a change or a reform comes from the level he described; it would never get any place. I think it comes from the chiefs of police.

COLONEL PLANTS: The problem is that having come up with these bright ideas - and they come only from people underneath the chief, I agree with that - the chief is still the man who carries the program to the legislature and to the people who provide the money to do the things

that actually need to be done. So it cannot be done in a vacuum. The chief has to be involved in this. There has to be a meeting of the minds between the chiefs and the young men with the bright ideas. When I was a captain, I came up with quite a lot more ideas than when I was the director.

CHIEF DAVIS: Then you got in a lot of trouble.

COLONEL PLANTS: Yes. There has to be a rapprochement and rapport between the police chief and the bright young men who are coming up with those bright ideas. I agree with Ed that they come from the ranks. They have a lot more to gain. You got there; you don't have to do that anymore.

MR. VELDE: I would like to return to a comment Chairman Brandstatter made, that is, the prospect of utilizing university resources to solve police management problems. We had very good luck with the School of Architecture of the University of Illinois (the National Clearing House of Criminal Justice Planning and Architecture). They have been in business now for almost four years. Although their principal clientele today have been correction agencies - and there are about 750 projects of those where they have provided architectural planning and computer specialists - they are just completing two new planning books. One is for police station houses and the other for courthouses.

Both in the police and in the courts area, it is strictly voluntary. They come in upon request. They now have a staff of about a hundred. As far as I know, they have the only real competence in crim-

inal justice architecture there is anywhere, other than just on an ad hoc one-shot basis, because architectural firms don't do enough of that business in their professional careers.

At the University you now have assembled this resource and - I might add - university pay scales, for better or worse, are not all that high in contrast to private consulting firms. We made very good use of that resource and it is one that others in policing and criminal justice could take better advantage of.

MR. BRANDSTATTER: You develop not only expertise but you develop new knowledge and information that you can turn back into the classroom and affect the students.

OFFICER MC PARTLAND: To put that in the context in which it was raised, the first point, I believe, was that ideally you try and hire people into your department who would provide that kind of expert assistance. Because of budgetary problems a small department cannot afford to do that, so you then attempt either to hire consultants or to get affiliated with colleges, unless the budget department should exclude affiliation.

Since we were addressing the needs of police chiefs nationwide, not just in the major cities, we have to also consider the fact that there are small departments that need this kind of research capability, cannot get it from within and cannot afford to hire from without.

COLONEL PLANTS: Isn't this just one of the aims of the Center of Excellence? Wasn't one of their programs designed to do that?

MR. VELDE: It is called the Educational Consortium.

MR. GREACEN: There are now seven schools that are developing major programs in advance degrees in criminal justice. One of their early goals was to have what they would call a technology transfer aspect to their programs. They are now focusing much more on developing their own higher education (PhD) programs. That is where their energies are going. I think it would be great to go to them. These schools are - the University of Maryland, Michigan State University, Eastern Kentucky, the University of Nebraska in Omaha, Arizona State University, Northeastern University in Boston, and Portland State University.

COLONEL PLANTS: This is not a think tank operation, is it?

MR. GREACEN: No, it is not. It is an establishment of a PhD program.

MR. BRANDSTATTER: And also, where the programs are established, we are really thinking of transfer of technology and dealing with the issues that concern the field in terms of providing service.

MR. GREACEN: When Art spoke about using university centers, my immediate response was that there really are not that many universities which have that kind of expertise. Michigan State University stands out as one where the faculty has shown an interest in the day-to-day problems that law enforcement faces. When I think of a typical academic approach to law enforcement, it is to show that the same kind of person who becomes a criminal becomes a policeman. That kind of sociological inquiry is not a tremendous help to you.

COLONEL PLANTS: There has been a fifteen-year-long discussion about creating a think tank operation where the Ed Davises and others could get together upon retirement and ponder the problem. They could come up with useable ideas. That has been kicked around for a long time. The time when this can be done is now ripe.

An operation like that would be very productive because these people would be free of all administrative and other pressures and they would do nothing but think about alternatives to the way we do things.

CHIEF DAVIS: Why don't you fund that like a Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions?

There are outfits like Rand which studies Los Angeles County at the request of the Los Angeles County District Attorney. They came in with Joe Busch who, when the study was finished, had the courage to say that things were really messed up. Some of the people who previously worked in New York City had joined Busch.

It is going to be very unfortunate if other prosecutors around the country don't pick up that team from Rand and have them come in because they have already gone through a learning period and they have been very effective with operations research methods. They can get in and do a good job much faster.

Probably nobody is going to hear about the Joe Busch study but, because Joe implemented the insights rather than the recommendations, he has improved our County Attorney's office immeasurably. It is eventually going to transcend the whole Superior Court system.

JUDGE ALARCON: Yes, I agree. It is the greatest argument you could use from our standpoint to stop plea bargaining. We were able to illustrate the inequality of justice where we had judges making deals.

MR. VELDE: We used that Rand team to evaluate the work of the Center for Prosecution Management. There was a rather intense competition, but they have built expertise in that area.

MR. BRANDSTATTER: The third issue that we identified is the union movement which occurred throughout our country.

We talked about the study that the Institute is making which will be published within a few months on this major issue.

We talked about the objectives of the unions and the need for police management to have a representation when arbitration agreements are being discussed with city officials and, apparently, with some feeling that management is not properly represented. Therefore, the contracts which have developed tend to encroach on management prerogatives, which is bad and concerns the police officials throughout the country.

We also talked about IACP's addressing this issue more carefully rather than discussing this within the LEAA program.

We did feel very strongly that there are some major research issues that LEAA might consider. For instance, it would be useful to examine contracts which have been developed and, before you begin to negotiate another contract, to evaluate those contracts to determine the impact upon management. This would permit management do deal with

these kinds of questions rather than to find themselves impacted by the decisions that have been made.

There is a need to do research on a model contract and legislation for police officials throughout the country, to conduct research with regard to the current contracts that now exist, and to pick out their strengths and weaknesses and to seek some legislative or statutory relief from some of the issues that encroach upon administrative prerogatives.

These were some of the issues we discussed with regard to the union movement. We felt that there was a need for IACP to do more with this.

COMMISSIONER LOONEY: In the IACP we have formed another committee which will deal particularly with the problems of personnel. We have conducted seminars across the country. We have the Labor Reporter which will update the chiefs of police on current trends throughout the nation. In addition to that, we are collecting contracts of all police agencies throughout the nation, and we are going to upgrade the status of that particular section of the IACP, hopefully very shortly. We will address ourselves more and more to it. We began that only last October.

Much more has to be done, but we do have some very aggressive police chiefs and commissioners on that committee. I know that they will have many ideas to direct the staff properly.

On the point of affiliation with colleges, I would like to mention that, when I was commissioner of police in Nassau County, I formed an Advisory Committee on Research and Science, but I did not involve just

one college. Indeed, I involved five leading colleges in the county, I met monthly with them, and received the benefit of their thinking - not only in the area of the sciences but also in community relations and the like.

We did not limit our association to police science programs and criminal justice programs, but rather I dealt with the colleges in a much broader way; and, in that way, I received an unlimited amount of information without any cost to the county.

Many of the suggestions which they gave me - not only in the area of laboratory and the sciences, but in community relations and dealing with the public - were very, very helpful. Rather than have one large police department identify with one college, I think it is better to bring in a cross-section of several colleges.

On the basic question of police unions, I think it is important that we do much more about that. I raised the issue in the IACP. Four or five years ago I urged that we have a committee to deal with that problem and indicate a position paper.

We were clearly advised by sections other than the eastern section of the nation that this was an eastern establishment problem peculiar to the State of New York and the eastern seaboard, and there might be a little bit of it on the west coast, but basically it was not a problem - so we are a little behind, but hopefully we will catch up within the next few months.

CHIEF DAVIS: I attended this meeting about labor unions in Washington. I was shocked that most of my colleagues were represented by lower echelon people. Chiefs were conspicuous by their absence.

One chief I talked to said that, in the eyes of the chiefs, asking them to sit down with the so-called unions was like asking them to sit down with NAACP leaders ten years ago. This is an attitude that we in the IACP have to try to change.

Police unions are not going to disappear. They are policemen. The most supportive people for police professionalism work are in the unions. They are supportive also of the city management people and even of some of the chiefs.

I think we have a mission of trying to say to the chiefs that this problem will not go away, that consequently we will have to sit down with our unions and work with them directly at the executive level. We have to try to make them see that if they don't take care of it, the same thing is going to happen to them that happened in Boston, in Buffalo, and in many other eastern establishments because - whether they like it or not - unions are going to take over as they did in Missouri despite a statute which prevents it. We therefore should work on that attitude problem.

OFFICER MC PARTLAND: The communications gap between the chiefs and the union leaders is true. One of the results might be that the union leaders would be driven into the arms of the national labor organizations. I have had them tell me this.

The symposium which I attended in Washington, run by IACP and funded by the Police Foundation, was an excellent one. I am sorry that there were not more chiefs there. In fairness, the major city police chiefs were there. But to sit down with union people was helpful.

COMMISSIONER LOONEY: I think we have to look beyond the relationship between the police chiefs and the men. We have to look to the political structure.

For example, in the State of New York we have what is known as "The Taylor Law". When that was passed by the State Legislature there was strong advocacy on the part of the government leaders that the chiefs of police or the commissioners not get involved in negotiations.

The law provides that all negotiations take place between the head of the government and the police organization. They particularly excluded the police administrators. I thought this was not good. Fortunately, in my own jurisdiction, I always participated in the discussions as an observer, but the law itself really is exclusive.

I think we have a big job to do in getting back to the bargaining table because the municipality many times bargained away the administrative prerogatives of the commissioner and the chief of police. It is much easier to give away one of the chief's administrative responsibilities than it is to give away an extra day or two of pay a year or a five percent raise.

That is one of the struggles that we had in the area of police, particularly in New York. The government is willing to bargain away

that which does not involve money. They will even give away time - unlimited amount of vacation - because it will not cost additional money. Yet we know that, when the time comes, we cannot give the same type of service if men are working twenty or thirty days less a year. It is a big problem.

We have to be more vigorous in the legislative field if we are to be successful. We are now back in most big cities and towns as observers, but we do not have a final say.

CHIEF DAVIS: That is the point in line with the National League of Cities and the National Conference of Mayors. They say that you cannot let any one general manager deal with unions because then you have to let the garbage collectors get in. Therefore, some representative of a mayor - a city manager or a city officer - has to be the bargaining agent. It is a real problem.

MR. BRANDSTATTER: The next major issue that we identified was the need to study and research the current police management systems. We talked about the things that you are all familiar with - the need to have more civilians replace more personnel, more highly-trained technicians to replace uniformed officers, the need for ladders and ratings within grade, and so on.

We felt this should be researched and discussed more in regard to the impact upon careers and with regard to the systems. Perhaps we could encourage the development of more systems like this across the nation.

The fifth item was police patrol techniques or strategies. We discussed the need to have continuous evaluations of these demonstration projects and new experiments that are going on - the neighborhood policing idea, etcetera. We discussed the Kansas City model, the early model that was developed in Berkeley many, many years ago where an officer is responsible for everything that happened on his beat for a twenty-four-hour period. We discussed the need for the cadet officers to take care of the nuisance calls to relieve the officer for more important jobs.

There is also the need for specific crime control such as the New York Police Department has, and the use of patrolmen to augment the investigative service of the department on a temporary basis, where they rotate personnel in and out of investigative units to determine aptitude and ability to perform. The result of this kind of rotation is that it modifies and minimizes the conflicts which normally occur between detectives and uniformed personnel.

We discussed weighting systems and priorities in calls for services within a department to determine how to respond to these. There is the need to train personnel to perform specific roles in the department - such as community relations and the like.

The sixth item was corruption. We defined this as an organized and systematic way of obtaining illegal funds or services or gratuities of one form or another. We talked about the level of internal discipline in departments and the need to develop more self-policing and reports of misconduct by other officers. Some departments are more suc-

cessful than others in dealing with this issue.

We discussed what kind of corruption may exist and its impact, whether the political system supports corruption. We discussed how to control the problem.

We also reviewed the techniques of investigating corruption that does exist. This was categorized as "corruption technology". I guess LEAA is funding some programs designed to deal with corruption.

We think there are solutions to corruption. Some departments claim they are not corrupt. They should be studied to see how they avoid corruption.

COLONEL PLANTS: I like that term "corruption technology".

MR. FARMER: In Commissioner Murphy's place I think the full term is "Anti-corruption Management Technology".

COMMISSIONER MURPHY: At this conference that ended yesterday in Washington - the police-labor relations conference - they adopted a policy statement yesterday morning. Part of that policy statement, with support from the police labor leaders, is that police departments should have a continuing corruption management program at work. It is very encouraging that the union leadership supported this policy statement that police departments should have a continuing program for measuring whether there is corruption.

While Bill McCarthy was in New York he did a great deal of work in trying to test whether there is corruption out there. It is a very sophisticated thing. So, a little work has been started on it.

COLONEL PLANTS: Is there anything in the mill to go further than that, to have a continuing systematic search into this corruption problem?

COMMISSIONER MURPHY: We have an effort underway in that direction at the Police Foundation. Our board funded this. We have had one or two meetings with just a handful of chiefs. We are exploring now where to go from here. We hope that one of the things we might be able to produce would be a document with some suggestions for measurement techniques.

COLONEL PLANTS: That is the kind of book that this "think tank" I mentioned before might produce. It is very difficult to know whether you have corruption in your department.

COMMISSIONER MURPHY: Yes. It is important to know how you apply the inspection techniques. A problem in New York was that local commanders were always denying that they had corruption in their department. We tried to fix<sup>2</sup> accountability on them and impose a system of inspection which was made available to them. They were given the inspection book and told they could use these techniques themselves to test whether they had corruption in their commands. If a higher level of command found it before the local commander did, he was in hot water.

There are deliberate techniques that have to be used and which experienced police people can develop because they know from their own years of experience what the hazards are and what techniques you can use to try to test those things.

CHIEF DAVIS: Before it gets lost, someone ought to get to George

Ball, the U.S. Attorney of Maryland in Baltimore, and document the investigative and prosecutorial methodology of getting into the Baltimore County case - the Agnew case. When you listen to Ball talk about this you realize that there were distinctive uses of the law and of investigative technology that somebody else would have to invent all over again in other places. We should not have to do this if we just can study the approach of Maryland.

COMMISSIONER MURPHY: LEAA, of course, funded the KNAPP Commission. Its report is very valuable. Mike Armstrong, the staff director, and Maurice Nadjari, whom I don't think you are funding, have a gold mine of information and knowledge - for example, how to use the turnaround policeman (which is a relatively new technique) and not to turn around everybody else, including high level people.

MR. VELDE: The problem came up in Maryland. The U.S. Attorney staff there had to go to New Jersey to find out how to prosecute and investigate this kind of case.

So this is, therefore, an excellent suggestion and it should be done.

COLONEL PLANTS: In the justice area, there is also a need to develop expertise in the computer-related crimes as well as in the public corruption area.

MR. BRANDSTATTER: We discussed the role of minorities in law enforcement - Chicanos, blacks, women - and the experiences some depart-

ments have had in that area. We had some interesting comments about whether women should be trained like men, because at this time they are being trained as such. We felt that we ought to recognize that women are different from men and that perhaps they need some extra training.

The question was raised that all men don't perform at the same level of ability, talent and expertise, so why do we expect women to perform at the same level as outstanding male personnel? So far the programs that were represented reported in glowing terms the success that they have had with some of the women.

In Los Angeles, I understand, they hired eleven out of a thousand women who applied for the department. They were admitted to the Academy and six graduated. They have had fine experience with their performance to date.

The last item was to do more studies of experimentation with police discretion - such as the authority to arrest. For example, police officers at the operational level are now authorized to arrest under certain circumstances and must get authority to make arrests.

We talked about height and weight. They are not necessarily good indicators to one's performance. Issues like this were discussed with regard to police discretion, and also the fact that in some cases the State Civil Service System personnel programs dictate the policies of local police departments. Sometimes local governments are unable to do anything about these matters. Nevertheless, the general consensus was that we ought to look at the whole question of discretionary authority

by the police officer at the operational level.

COLONEL PLANTS: You concluded that height and weight had no relation to performance?

MR. BRANDSTATTER: Yes. We discussed that and wondered why we emphasize that and adhere to such rigid standards.

COLONEL PLANTS: But obviously there has to be some limitation here.

MR. BRANDSTATTER: Yes, we agreed on that.

CHIEF DAVIS: Really and truly, job-related criteria are significant. UCLA made them up for us so that men and women have to perform equally to get in, and they have to be up to a short, significant training. They have to be able to perform on the street in a satisfactory way while they are on probation. The test of performance is performance, not other artificial criteria.

COLONEL PLANTS: I agree with you that that is the best approach. When that looks as though it is screening out a disproportionate number of people, then I think we need to look at it.

Earlier Chief Davis asked the question about the selection of the Advisory Policy Board of NCIC. I indicated that they were appointed. Some of them are, but non-police members are appointed only by Kelley. The other members of the board are elected by their counterparts across the country.

SHERIFF LUCAS: We broke our topic - corruption - into four major parts: Individual corruption, departmental corruption, system corrup-

tion and societal corruption.

Under individual corruption, we mentioned such things as a free meal, tickets for a ball game - the very beginning of a police officer's direct contact with corruption. The fact is that, immediately after having been told by the police academies about the high degree of requirement that they be honest, and after having been indoctrinated about what is expected from them, they are told by someone down the line where to go to get a free meal and how to get to a ball game, etcetera. This begins in some instances right at the academy.

We ran into the Christmas phenomenon of gifts. We thought that, having started off in this way, an individual - as he worked his way up in the ranks - accepted this form of gratuity and saw nothing wrong at all in getting involved individually. This, of course, has an effect on the department.

We felt that, among many things, as far as the role of a police chief is concerned, in some instances he has no direct control over the corruption of his men. In some instances he had to be concerned about his own tenure, about his own job.

The recommendation was made that, in order to combat this, first of all, the men had to be well-selected and the chief should be a selected individual who came into the department with great expertise and great personal integrity. We believe that one of the ways to protect the chief and to give him the ability to combat corruption and have an effect in the community is to give him some kind of security.

The suggestion was made that it might be possible to give him either a contract or to utilize a merit system so that he would be able to do the job as he saw fit. There is also the alternative to have a police board elected, which is an increasingly growing tool in some communities. They, in turn, select the police chief. Therefore, he does not necessarily rise and fall with the coming and going of an administration. He is able to withstand the possible corruption of an administration. He would be able to speak out against the mayor.

MR. VELDE: That is not a civilian review board, is it?

SHERIFF LUCAS: No, it is not a civilian review board. It is a new type of police board being appointed. In Detroit the new charters require that the mayor appoints a police board, not a review board. They have it in Los Angeles.

MR. VELDE: I just want to make sure that you were not calling for a civilian review board.

SHERIFF LUCAS: It is expected that these people would be a buttress between the police commissioner and the funding bodies.

We discussed the need for the police chief to have some supervision control in that way and the ability to fight corruption within the system itself. We felt that since organized crime really cannot exist within a community without the involvement of the police initially, it was agreed that some control should be given to the police chief because, without that, he would be totally ineffective.

Going back to individual corruption, we also mentioned the unwillingness of many patrolmen and officers to testify against a person who is either a corrupter or is corrupted. That still exists despite the fact that some of the newer recruits in police work may be more willing to expose certain forms of wrongdoing within a department. Many of us felt that this is very limited and that, when it came to deep-down corruption, there was still a reluctance on the part of these police officers to testify against each other. We did admit, however, that they are more willing to drop hints and to point out some of the infractions and violations, particularly in the field of narcotics. However, the in-depth corruption still exists.

An example was given of a lieutenant in one of our departments who was completely corrupt. Everyone knew about it, and yet no one advised the chief until that lieutenant was finally indicted. Even then, very few came forward to testify. The system, sometimes, is corrupted so that the police chief cannot properly perform.

We had specific examples and we went into great depth about the law enforcement agencies doing a great deal of soul-searching. They do ongoing soul-searching, continuing to bare their breasts in public while, at the same time, other elements of the criminal justice system are not doing it. If the system is going to purify itself, other elements of the criminal justice system, the courts and others, should do it likewise.

A great deal of emphasis is placed on the police and the courts,

but if the system itself is corrupt - tying that back in with organized crime - our feeling was that as police were corrupted at the basic level by people in organized crime as they move up the line - and we admitted that there seemed to be evidence that more and more people in organized crime moved up the scale and became more involved and sophisticated and started moving into private industry, watched their money and became so-called "respected" citizens - their built-in corruption accordingly increased so that instead of corrupting the policeman on the beat or the sergeant or the lieutenant, they moved up the scale and became bigger and bigger so they now are moving to corrupt courts and - beyond the criminal justice system - they could very well and, in fact, do corrupt those elements who control the criminal justice system. They are now controlling members of legislative bodies and up. We felt that that was an area of corruption within the system that makes it very difficult for us in police work to control corruption at our levels.

Finally we got into societal corruption. We discussed the influence of gambling on society and the acceptance of wide elements of our society to the initial steps of gambling - everyone is going to gamble, so why not permit it?

The logical step that follows, in combination with the establishment of casinos in cities all over the country where they have not been before, is that we felt that all that this did was to enlarge the number of gamblers in our society. Society, by accepting more and more an extension of gambling, might very well be increasing that situation and at the same time not benefit.

We looked into the relative merit of the claim made by many people that there is money to be made from it. There is some evidence to indicate that there is not much of a national gain offset by the increasing immorality and damage to the citizens.

Chief Davis made a suggestion that ties in there. He suggested - along with taking the studies that were made in Baltimore and in other areas - that we might ask LEAA or the Police Foundation to consider funding a study of a city that has been corrupt and has cleaned itself so that a comparative study can be made to discover what steps were taken to eliminate that corruption and what steps are taken now to keep it clean.

CHIEF DAVIS: We could make it a multi-city study. We could look at Denver and Seattle and see how they got that way, how they got out of it, and what was done to keep them out of it. There would be probably half a dozen cities that could be considered.

COLONEL PLANTS: I think you should first see whether they really got out of it.

CHIEF DAVIS: I think Denver is better off and Seattle is probably better off.

COLONEL PLANTS: I think so, too, but I would like to know.

COMMISSIONER MURPHY: I read an editorial in the San Francisco newspaper a few months ago. It read simply like this - "An Investigation Has Begun." Maybe they will catch one or two policemen, but we all know that corruption was eliminated thirty years ago. I understand that

they are picking up a few more bodies along the way. That, in fact, is a problem of media reporting.

I am sure that the whole nation believes that the New York Police Department is the most corrupt in the country just as it believes that New York has the most crime in the country - and all the other things - because New York City is a news center and it is a real risk to try to get at the problem on the basis of newspaper reports or media coverage as distinguished from getting basic data which is very tough data to get.

MR. GREACEN: Chief Davis suggested that we use investigative reporters to get at this data.

COMMISSIONER MURPHY: That is good as a part of it. Probably the best example in the country is Los Angeles. What happened to change Los Angeles from the corruption problem it had in the Police Department in the late thirties to the present situation? What are all the ingredients of the management system? So much of the problem is management.

The bottom line of the New York City problem was accountability. Honest commanders - they have still not caught anybody above the rank of captain - were not held accountable. The real problem was how do you fix accountability.

The trouble in New York was that the men who were themselves honest because they had not been put "on the dime," could stay on the shore and watch corruption float by in their precincts, and nobody held them accountable.

The management administration is the real problem. I don't want to make it sound easy because it is not. There is a great deal to be learned from a police department that has been perfected and has developed through the years a system of management and accountability, supervision, motivation and leadership, and all of those things. There is nothing about the California climate that makes those fellows purer than in New York City before they became policemen.

CHIEF DAVIS: This is a recommendation in the Police Task Force Report which has been ignored like all recommendations. This would have a lot of value - not just to police administration but the mayors, chambers of commerce, citizens of the community, prosecutors, judges, etcetera.

COMMISSIONER MURPHY: Who evaluates police departments in the United States?

CHIEF DAVIS: The three ingredients who started us on the way to Egypt were a newspaperman, a so-called "civic" leader, and a very honest judge, who had charge of the grand jury. Then later everyone helped.

COLONEL PLANTS: Ultimately, however, somebody had to turn attention to their own perception of themselves. How a policeman looks at himself has to be changed. That is part of the combat against corruption. How you get from the first image to the second is very important.

You cannot stop corruption, but you can handle it once you find it. There is a big difference in saying, "My department is not corrupt" and in saying, "This is how we deal with it when we find it."

MR. GREACEN: PROMIS (Prosecution Management Information System) was used at one point in D.C. to identify some corruption there. Patterns of arrests and dismissals, is that what it was?

COMMISSIONER MURPHY: Yes, the cases that were being thrown out.

MR. GREACEN: You could see that some officers were having bum cases. Looking at the data from a sophisticated point of view, if there were corruption here how would it show up in the data we have? Running it through, you find the answer.

SHERIFF LUCAS: Chief Bauer brought up an interesting point. The effect of corruption on businesses coming to the community was the first point he brought up. The second was, and it tied in with the suggestion of a task force idea, that in his particular instance in Beaumont he was limited by LEAA guidelines in the selection of a task force.

We discussed the assistance of a Federal task force to a local task force, of various elements of the criminal justice system in a community working together to rule out corruption.

Chief Bauer pointed out that, in his instance, there were probably just one or two honest and trustworthy elements. However, he felt that he should not have to go as broadly as LEAA guidelines seemed to indicate he had to. We discussed whether in each area of this country guidelines are not to be varied so that they fit that particular area.

MR. VELDE: It sounds as though these were the guidelines laid down by the State of Texas SPA rather than the national LEAA guidelines.

MR. GOLDEN: What we were addressing was a redirection of effort

into more multi-jurisdictional type joint projects as opposed to funding a specific departmental project.

MR. VELDE: Focusing in on police corruption?

MR. GOLDEN: Yes.

SHERIFF LUCAS: As far as businesses were concerned, we discussed whether someone could figure out how to approach a business that was about to locate in a particular area to find out - as an indication of what corruption might exist in that locale - if it had to do business under the table, why it did locate there, what kind of arrangements were made, etcetera. This would be one way of testing a community. We had no positive solutions but there were suggestions.

The multi-organizational task force of various groups in the criminal justice system working together was a suggestion.

We recognized, again getting back to the societal corruption, that corruption cannot exist in a community without some acceptance by the public. It was thought that it was the responsibility of the police chief to generate a program of informing the public.

We discussed the risks implied. There is the risk of tenure, outlined before. On the other hand, it may be that a chief ought to sacrifice himself if he thought this was a necessary step. We discussed whether this program and other ongoing programs might be more beneficial if they were not put through continued exposure through the press.

Some of the situations that exist in the area of corruption might be easily solved if the situation were not dramatized by getting the

thing out in public and having them see how horrendous the situation is rather than to confine it merely to where there is corruption. Give them specific examples of corruption and hope thereby to involve them in it, even against their own propensity to stay back. Maybe if it is dramatized enough, they will get involved.

The suggestion of involving investigative reporters was again something that was thrown out. We mentioned we had an investigative reporter working in narcotics in our area who got so carried away that he began to fabricate stories. Fortunately he was caught.

Finally, it was determined that one of the things chiefs would have to do, either individually or collectively, was to take some responsibility for informing and educating the public as to what was going on, and that it was extremely necessary to keep corruption to a minimum through vigilance and supervision. They should be informed regarding what was going on in their departments and in the community, not only in law enforcement but in the entire governmental structure.

It all boiled down to the fact that if the public wanted corruption it would be difficult to turn it around, but we had an obligation to try, recognizing the risk involved.

CHIEF DAVIS: I would like to tell an anecdote where the sheriff, the district attorney, and I got together, said that there were a few bad outfits in the county, and decided to operate bookmaking jointly. Then we called the chief in. His face was red when he came in and white after we told him his men were going to join with our men this afternoon

to make some busts in his community. We broke them off sucking eggs. This had to be done in a couple of other cases.

The point of this is that if you tolerate neighboring corruption eventually it will spread.

Am I one of my brother's keepers? I am just the Chief of Police of Los Angeles, but I have an obligation to protect my neighbor. I will go to my friends - like Sheriff Downey - and we get together.

SHERIFF LUCAS: One more thing that was important is the idea of the joint task force. We felt that many times the IRS is a helpful agency that can do many things that we are unable to do as police organizations. We ought to consider using IRS a lot more and get them involved in our investigations.

COLONEL PLANTS: Some of the states have a tax structure within their state that is very helpful. We are just starting prosecutions in Michigan working on net worth. We use that as an indication of non-payment of taxes. Whether or not there will be criminal enforcement, I don't know.

MR. BRANDSTATTER: I think that the point Chief Davis just outlined is an important position of leadership that ought to be exercised by police officials. I wonder how many police leaders in the nation take that stand in terms of what you described. It is extremely significant and important.

CHIEF DAVIS: Good can exist in the middle of evil. We cannot rationalize corruption by pointing a finger and saying that prosecutors

are as bad as we are or as bad as judges or the politicians. We as police, are the only catalytic agents in society and the ones who really initiate anything. Therefore, we have responsibility - regardless whether it is societal, systems, or individual - to at least say within our own island that our island will be clean. We will try to do the rest of it if we can. We should not involve ourselves in finger pointing and rationalizations to get ourselves off the hook. If everyone took the approach of rationalization we would never get rid of corruption.

COLONEL PLANTS: The question you brought up - are we our brother's keeper - I think Michigan is relatively free of a systematized corruption. One of the reasons for that - though we are not completely free - is that most of the departments recognized they could not be corrupt very long without their fellow police departments doing something about it or saying something about it. There are ways in the state for outside forces to come in and take care of it.

COMMISSIONER MURPHY: That is the point. That is a very good question as to the role of the state if there is a state police agency that has jurisdiction.

Since Dave Kelly has been superintendent in New Jersey, the role of the state police has been changed completely. The state police in New Jersey are the gambling enforcers. They come in to other jurisdictions regularly. I gather he has a working relationship with chiefs where they attend the press conference when the announcement is made, or maybe

they make the announcement. With the changing role of the Federal government, it occurs to me that maybe the Federal government today is the strongest force against police corruption that we have. That is a new role since the 1970 Act. As a matter of fact, I remember discussing that whole issue with the special agent in charge of Detroit who came in that year with regard to the new authority given the Bureau and the Federal strike forces.

If you look at the work of the U.S. attorneys across the country in the last two or three years, the number of indictments of police and local officials they have gotten, a dramatic change is occurring. I think there is a responsibility at these levels of government to fit that all together because, no matter how ideal the police are, if the fellows are worrying about the possibility of the state police coming in over their heads, or that the Federal gambling task force of the Bureau will be at work, it just motivates them a little differently than the feeling that used to exist years ago that people did not come in over your head.

COLONEL PLANTS: There were colleagues that were wide open in the state, but they don't do it anymore.

CHIEF DAVIS: For the record, the advice Commissioner Murphy is talking about is the Organized Crime Control Act of 1970. It cites an X number of individuals and dollars that are involved without the necessity of any interstate action against Federal jurisdiction before the Federal Government is allowed to get in on corruption. I think that

is relatively unknown by police officials.

COLONEL PLANTS: We have a task force in operation here but it is generally in the larger jurisdictions. The lower levels are not touched, however.

CHIEF DAVIS: It is just a few thousand dollars involved.

MR. VELDE: Five thousand dollars as far as the gambling portion goes. As far as corruption is concerned there is no amount.

COMMISSIONER MURPHY: That is right.

MR. VELDE: It is now a Federal offense to corrupt a Federal, state, or local official.

CHIEF ANDREWS: I think LEAA should do something about the SPA's to make them sensitive and encourage them to make funds available to local jurisdictions which try to deal with corruption.

MR. VELDE: We have, of course, the Organized Crime Program.

CHIEF ANDREWS: There is a lot of worry about the public record and the open access with regard to that. A lot of jurisdictions are too small to do it from within and they need some kind of outside resources that would not attract political attention from their leadership until it is enacted.

CHIEF DAVIS: I would like to commend Pete Velde and the staff of LEAA for bringing us together. I would also like to thank the members of the committee who participated. It has been a great occasion for me.

MR. VELDE: Let me thank the LAPD staff, the IACP, and Colonel Plants, our generous host.

APPENDIX A - THE POLICE CHIEF EXECUTIVE PROJECT  
PROJECT NARRATIVE

Police agencies at all levels of government are striving to improve the police service, often with great success. Excellent ideas are being financed to implement innovative programs to increase the effectiveness of police resources. In reality, however, some programs are less than successful. The difference between success and failure is often dependent upon the management of the programs. The high cost of police service requires increased efficiency in the management of police agencies. This points to the need for carefully selected and developed police chief executives.

The rapid turnover of police chief executives is further testimony to the need for careful selection and development of police chief executives. Unfortunately, little information is available to persons responsible for making the selection to assist them in choosing the most qualified candidate, and the information that is available is not directly applicable to law enforcement agencies. In short, there are no specific guidelines available to those persons selecting a police chief executive.

The same void exists for the chief executive once he is appointed. He can turn to the Reports of the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals to determine what standards he may want to establish or what goals he may wish to seek. However, there are cur-

rently few places he can find guidelines to assist in successfully administering the agency.

The President of the International Association of Chiefs of Police has appointed a Committee on the Problems of the Police Chief Executive to attempt to fill this void. The committee, of which Edward M. Davis is the Chairman, consists of ten Police Chief Executives from throughout the United States and one from Canada. Additionally, a representative of the FBI, a Superior Court Judge, and a noted authority on management round out the committee. The committee members are as follows:

Chief Edward M. Davis, Los Angeles Police Department,  
Los Angeles, California - Chairman

Commissioner Michael J. Codd, New York City Police Department,  
New York, New York - Vice-Chairman

Chief Harold Adamson, Metro Toronto Police Department,  
Ontario, Canada

Judge Arthur L. Alarcon, Judge, Superior Court,  
Los Angeles, California

Chief Bruce R. Baker, Portland Police Department,  
Portland, Oregon

Chief Willie Bauer, Beaumont Police Department,  
Beaumont, Texas

Colonel Eugene J. Camp, Metropolitan Police Department,  
St. Louis, Missouri

Sheriff Dale Carson, Duval County Sheriff's Department,  
Jacksonville, Florida

Chief Richard C. Clement, Dover Township Police Department,  
Toms River, New Jersey

Dr. Peter F. Drucker, Claremont Graduate School,  
Claremont, California

Assistant Director Thomas J. Jenkins, FBI Academy,  
Quantico, Virginia

Colonel David B. Kelly, New Jersey State Police,  
West Trenton, New Jersey

Sheriff Peter J. Pitchess, Los Angeles County Sheriff's  
Department, Los Angeles, California

Colonel Walter E. Stone, Rhode Island State Police,  
North Scituate, Rhode Island

The inclusion of Dr. Peter F. Drucker and Judge Arthur L. Alarcon as special members will provide the committee with an even wider range of perspectives and expertise. Arthur L. Alarcon is a Judge of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County. He was formerly Deputy District Attorney for Los Angeles County, Executive and Clemency Secretary for the Governor of California, and Chairman of the California Adult Authority. Also, for many years, he has been co-author of criminal law books designed to assist law enforcement officers. He will bring important legal and constitutional insights to the committee.

Dr. Peter F. Drucker is a noted economist, management consultant, lecturer, and author. From 1942 to 1949, Dr. Drucker was a professor of philosophy and politics at Bennington College. From 1950 to 1971, he was a professor of management at New York University's Graduate School of Business. Since 1971, he has been a professor of social science at Claremont Graduate School in Claremont, California. His books include *The Effective Executive*, *The Practice of Management*, *America's Next Twenty Years*, *Landmarks of Tomorrow*, *Managing for*

Results; Technology, Management, and Society, The Age of Discontinuity, and Men, Ideas, and Politics. His most recent book entitled Management: Tasks, Responsibilities, Practices was published in 1973.

As a follow-on to the highly successful Report on Police, the goal of this project is to improve the police service in State, County, and local agencies. This will be accomplished by providing guidelines for selecting a Police Chief Executive, assisting the Chief Executive in administering his agency, and suggesting ways of increasing the tenure of Police Chief Executives. These guidelines will be presented as positions formulated from the data gathered during the research. They will be published, with supporting commentary, by the Government Printing Office.

In the preliminary states, criteria will be developed to assist in evaluating what constitutes success in each of the types of agencies studied. Existing literature will be researched and a preliminary questionnaire will be designed to obtain data not otherwise available. State and County agencies as well as local agencies in large, medium, and small cities will be queried. The results of this research will provide data beneficial to the study and will help determine which agencies will be studied in greater depth.

In each of the agencies selected for further study, personal interviews will be conducted with the Police Chief Executive, his appointing authority or superior, and subordinates. Prior to the interviews, an interview format will be designed to ensure consistency. The informa-

tion gathered by the interviews, the responses to the preliminary questionnaire, and the results of the research will be used in formulating the positions.

Follow-up interviews will be conducted as needed. When the positions have been formulated, supporting commentary will be drafted. It is anticipated that the format will be similar to the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals' Report on Police.

In suggesting guidelines to the persons responsible for selecting a Police Chief Executive, the following specific considerations will be addressed:

- \* Whether the Police Chief Executive should be selected from within the organization or whether testing should be open to all eligible candidates will be explored and selection criteria will be suggested. Also, the elected versus selected Police Chief Executive will be examined.
- \* Unless the Police Chief Executive is elected, there is a Mayor, City Manager, Police Commission, or some other person or body between him and the people he serves. The Police Chief Executive's methods of handling such relationships will be explored.
- \* The type and amount of experience most apt to lead to success as a Police Chief Executive will be discussed.
- \* The relationship of the salary of the Police Chief Executive to other Chief Executives will be examined in each of the agencies studied.

To serve a community well and succeed as Police Chief Executive implies more than mere "survival." In establishing guidelines, approaches to situations both inside the organization and outside the organization will be considered. Some of these considerations include:

- \* The ability of the Police Chief Executive to select and maintain competent and incorruptible command officers and members of his personal staff is a key to his success and will be discussed.
- \* Effective control measures, such as internal discipline and open lines of communications will be examined. Included in this are his application of the degrees of discipline and where to apply or withdraw pressure from subordinates; his ability to avoid being isolated from his supporters or critics; and written and oral reports of internal activities.
- \* The Police Chief Executive's ability to meet current needs with innovative approaches and solutions will be discussed.
- \* The establishment of goals and the Chief's authority to implement programs to achieve them will be studied.
- \* The ability of the Police Chief Executive to gather support and gain the trust and respect of the community will be examined. Techniques used to garner this support will be studied.

- \* The Police Chief Executive's ability to interact with the other Chief Executives within the criminal justice system, and approaches to accomplishing this, will be examined.
- \* A Police Chief Executive's ability to manage individual requests from members of bodies such as a Commission, Board, or Council will be addressed. Where a body by majority vote may order an action, individuals acting alone may not. Effective managers distinguish between individual and group requests.
- \* The anticipation of problems by the Police Chief Executive and strategy in dealing with problems will be discussed.

There is an unusually high attrition rate among Police Chief Executives. This rapid turnover often has an unsettling effect on the agencies involved. Therefore, the reasons for, and suggestions to minimize, the high attrition rate of Police Chief Executives will be studied.

#### PROJECT STAFF

The staff will consist of police practitioners who are qualified by experience, education, and research capability.

Deputy Chief Vernon L. Hoy has been appointed staff director. Deputy Chief Hoy, during the past 25 years, has served with the Ingle-

wood, California Police Department and the Los Angeles Police Department in all ranks from Policeman to Deputy Chief. His service includes assignments in patrol, traffic, detective, and staff functions. For nearly four years he was the Executive Officer to the late Chief of Police William H. Parker. As a police captain he commanded the Training Academy in Los Angeles and served as the Chief Investigator for the Los Angeles Police Commission. As Commander, he directed the operations of the Advance Planning and Management Services Divisions. As Training Division Commander and later as Assistant Commanding Officer of the Personnel and Training Bureau, he was responsible for initiating many innovative changes that have taken place in the area of police training. He is presently the Commanding Officer of the Planning and Fiscal Bureau where he administers the Los Angeles Police Department's \$160 million budget and directs the planning efforts of the Los Angeles Police Department.

During 1972, Chief Hoy was Executive Director of the Police Task Force for the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. That effort resulted in the Report on Police published by the Government Printing Office in 1973 establishing standards for the police in America.

After receiving his Associate of Arts degree from El Camino College, Chief Hoy attended the University of Southern California, where he earned his Bachelor of Science degree and later his Master of Science in Public Administration degree. He is a graduate of the FBI

National Academy and the USC Summer Executive Program and has attended numerous executive seminars. Chief Hoy was an adjunct Professor of Police Administration for 13 years at a college in Southern California.

Chief Hoy is a member of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, FBI National Academy Associates, and the California State Peace Officers Association. He served as President of the 7000-member Los Angeles Police Revolver and Athletic Club. He is currently chairman of the Los Angeles Regional Criminal Justice Analysis Steering Committee, and also chairs the Police Facilities Committee and the Review and Concurrence Authority for the Los Angeles Police Department. Additionally, he is a member of numerous boards and committees of national, regional, and local scope.

The following personnel have been appointed to the research staff:

#### WILLIAM D. BOOTH

Captain William D. Booth has been a member of the Los Angeles Police Department since May 17, 1954. His service has included Patrol, Traffic, Internal Affairs, and various staff assignments.

Captain Booth has served two duty tours in Internal Affairs Division for a cumulative total of six years. As a Sergeant of Police he was assigned to Internal Affairs for two years as an investigator of personnel complaints. As a Lieutenant of Police he was reassigned to

Internal Affairs for four years. During that time he functioned as the Chief Investigator, Administrative Lieutenant, and Assistant Division Commander. Prior to assuming his present command of Rampart Uniformed Division in July 1973, Captain Booth was the Executive Officer for Chief Edward M. Davis.

Captain Booth graduated from California State University at Los Angeles in 1962 with a Bachelor of Science Degree in Police Administration. In 1972, at the request of officials from a neighboring California city, he researched the operations of their police department and made several administrative and operational recommendations which were immediately adopted. He has presented numerous lectures on internal discipline and participated in management panel discussions at various training seminars.

#### GEORGE W. LEWIS

Captain George W. Lewis has been a member of the Los Angeles Police Department for 20 years and his work experience includes assignments in Patrol, Vice, Administration, Systems Research and Design, and Investigation. In his present assignment as Commanding Officer of Hollywood Investigative Division, Captain Lewis directs the activities of 60 investigators in providing follow-up investigation services to the Hollywood Area.

In a prior assignment, Captain Lewis participated in the original research, design and development of computerized tactical information

systems for the Department. He was a project member of Phase I of the LAPD Pattern Recognition and Information Correlation System Project, which was one of the first projects funded by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

As a Lieutenant, he served for over three years as Executive Officer to Chief of Police Edward M. Davis.

After joining the Department in 1954, Captain Lewis completed his military obligation by serving a tour of duty in Korea. He obtained a Bachelor of Science Degree in Business Administration from UCLA in 1958.

#### WILLIAM E. HOGUE

Lieutenant Hogue first served in law enforcement as a patrolman with the Jersey City, New Jersey Police Department from 1947 until 1950. He joined the Los Angeles Police Department in 1951. During almost 26 years of service, he has been assigned to Traffic, Jail, Patrol, Planning and Research, Detectives, Business Office, Public Relations, and Youth Services.

Lieutenant Hogue was the editor of the Los Angeles Police Department annual reports for 1964 and 1965. The latter was the only Department published report on the Watts riot. In 1966 he created and supervised radio and television publicity for the first large-scale crime prevention campaign in Los Angeles. He was in charge of operations for a successful \$26,000,000 bond issue on the ballot for police

buildings in 1968. When the Police Role in Government Project was authorized in 1969 whereby uniformed officers were detailed to teach full-time in high schools, Lieutenant Hogue was selected to set up and initiate the program. Again in 1972, he and a Fire Department counterpart jointly directed a campaign with a one-third of a million dollar budget for a voter-approved ballot issue that substantially upgraded pension benefits for both services.

He obtained a Certificate in Public Administration (A.A. Degree) from the University of Southern California and a Bachelor's Degree in Police Science from California State College at Los Angeles. Later he acquired postgraduate credits in Education at the University of California at Los Angeles. Certificates from several Career and Management Development programs have also been earned by him.

For the past six years he has been a part-time police science instructor at Long Beach City College and on occasion has lectured at the Police Academy. After four years' service in the Marine Corps in World War II he remained in the reserve and holds the rank of Major. In addition, he is a member of local and state civic and professional associations.

#### DAVID G. BRATH

Lieutenant David Brath has been a Los Angeles Police Officer for eleven years. After four years in patrol assignments in four widely diverse divisions, he was assigned to the Los Angeles Police Academy

as Adjutant to the Commanding Officer. While there, he was involved in the Department's conversion to multi-phased training of recruit officers and later transferred to the unit which developed and implemented the Department's Management Development Program. He was later selected to prepare and edit the narrative journal of the "Investigation into the Assassination of Senator Robert F. Kennedy," a five-volume report issued by the Los Angeles Police Department in 1969.

From 1969 to 1973 he was the Research Officer in the Office of Chief of Police E. M. Davis. His responsibilities in this assignment included the preparation of staff reports, articles for professional publications, and personal correspondence for the Chief. During this time he also served as Research Assistant on the staff of the Police Task Force of the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. Upon promotion to Lieutenant, he was assigned to Hollenbeck Investigative Division where he assumed command of the Team Policing experiment in that area.

Lieutenant Brath received his Bachelor of Arts degree in History from California State College at Los Angeles in 1969. He has a California Teaching Credential and is currently instructing part-time as a United States Government teacher in the Los Angeles City Schools Adult Education Program.

## BUDGET NARRATIVE

## A. PERSONNEL

Project Director. One Deputy Chief I will be assigned full-time for 13 months as Project Director for this project. He will have overall responsibility for the completion of the project objectives and the performance of project personnel. The Project Director will be directly involved in the research, as well as coordinating the activities of the other researchers.

Research Leader. One Captain III will be employed full-time for 12 months as Research Leader for the project. The Research Leader will be responsible for supervising the research team and will perform duties similar to the other researchers. In the absence of the Project Director, the Research Leader will assume the duties of Acting Project Director.

Research Analysts. Two Lieutenant II's will be employed full-time for 12 months as research analysts. Additionally, one practitioner will be selected for a 10-month period as a research analyst. They will be responsible for designing data collection methods, collecting and documenting data, conducting personal interviews with Police Chief Executives and their superiors and subordinates, and documenting the results.

Administrative Manager. One Sergeant II will be employed full-time for 13 months as Administrative Manager. He will assist in

the development of a PERT chart and coordinate scheduling throughout the grant period. He will be responsible for preparation of minutes for the nine committee meetings, and bi-weekly progress reports. The Administrative Manager will maintain liaison with and coordinate activities between the staff and officers of police agencies to be studied. Additionally, he will provide editorial assistance to the staff, and will perform functions necessary to the smooth operation of the project and supervise the clerical staff.

Clerical Support. One Principal Clerk Stenographer and one Senior Clerk Stenographer will be employed full-time as clerical support for the project. The Principal Clerk Stenographer will be employed full-time for 13 months; the Senior Clerk Stenographer will be employed full-time for 12 months. They will file, type, maintain records, and perform other clerical functions to support the project and project staff.

Student Worker. One Student Worker will be employed for 12 months, 9 months at 20 hours a week and 3 months at 40 hours a week. He will assist in office tasks and provide support for the Administrative Manager.

With the exception of the Project Director, Administrative Manager, and Principal Clerk Stenographer, the project staff will be employed full-time for one year. The Project Director, Adminis-

trative Manager, and Principal Clerk Stenographer will be employed for an additional month to begin and close out the project. This includes arranging for office space, furniture, and other equipment before the research leader and analysts join the staff; and to make final arrangements and reports necessary to close out the project. Salaries for the additional month are included in the second-year funding. Salaries for the project, including funds allocated for the additional research analyst for ten months, are as follows:

	<u>First Year</u>	<u>Second Year</u>	<u>Total</u>
(1) Deputy Chief I	\$ 37,746	\$ 3,303	\$ 41,049
(1) Captain III	32,051		32,051
(2) Lieutenant II	48,873		48,873
(1) Research Analyst (10 months)	30,000		30,000
(1) Sergeant II	20,766	1,817	22,583
(1) Principal Clerk Stenographer	12,293	1,077	13,370
(1) Senior Clerk Stenographer	10,426		10,426
(1) Student Worker	<u>3,904</u>		<u>3,904</u>
TOTALS	\$196,059	\$ 6,197	\$202,256

Overtime. The overtime needs for the project staff have been estimated at four hours per week for the two Lieutenants, one Sergeant, one Principal Clerk Stenographer, and one Senior Clerk Stenographer. This is a total of 208 hours per person. Overtime, at the time-and-one-half rate, has been allocated as follows:

(2) Lieutenant II's - 208 hrs x \$16.96 x 2	=	\$ 7,055
(1) Sergeant II - 208 hrs x \$14.41	=	2,997
(1) Principal Clerk Steno - 208 hrs x \$8.78	=	1,826
(1) Senior Clerk Steno - 208 hrs x \$7.45	=	<u>1,549</u>
TOTALS		\$13,427

Salaries	=	\$202,256
Overtime	=	<u>13,427</u>
TOTAL PERSONNEL	=	\$215,683

## APPENDIX B - PARTICIPANTS

ALARCON, Arthur L.  
Judge, Los Angeles Superior Court  
Los Angeles, California

ANDREWS, Allen  
Chief of Police  
Peoria, Illinois

BASTIAN, Lloyd  
Acting Director, Systems Development  
Division, NCJISS  
LEAA

BAUER, Willie  
Chief, Beaumont Police Department  
Beaumont, Texas

BENNETT, Lawrence  
Executive Assistant to the Deputy  
Administrator for Policy Development  
LEAA

BOOTH, Bill, Capt.  
Los Angeles Police Department  
Los Angeles, California

BRANDSTATTER, Arthur  
Director  
School of Criminal Justice  
Michigan State University

BRATH, David, Lt.  
Los Angeles Police Department  
Los Angeles, California

BROWN, Donald K.  
Under Sheriff  
Duvall County Police Department  
Florida

CAMP, Eugene  
Chief, Metropolitan Police Department  
St. Louis, Missouri

## APPENDIX B - PARTICIPANTS (continued)

CLEMENT, Richard C.  
Chief, Dover Township Police Department  
Toms River, New Jersey

DAVIS, Edward M.  
Chief of Police  
Los Angeles Police Department  
Los Angeles, California

DOWNEY, James S.  
Under Sheriff, Los Angeles County  
California

FARMER, David  
National Institute of Law Enforcement  
and Criminal Justice  
LEAA

GOLDEN, James  
Acting Director, Organized Crime Division  
LEAA

GREACEN, John  
Deputy Director  
National Institute of Law Enforcement  
and Criminal Justice  
LEAA

HOY, Vern  
Deputy Chief  
Los Angeles Police Department  
Los Angeles, California

HOGUE, William, Lt.  
Los Angeles Police Department  
Los Angeles, California

JENKINS, Thomas  
Deputy Associate Director  
FBI

## APPENDIX B - PARTICIPANTS (Continued)

KELLY, David B., Col.  
Superintendent  
New Jersey State Police

LEWIS, George, Capt.  
Los Angeles Police Department  
Los Angeles, California

LOONEY, Frank  
President, International Association  
of Chiefs of Police

LUCAS, William  
Sheriff, Wayne County  
Detroit, Michigan

LUCEY, John  
Law Enforcement Specialist  
LEAA

MACY, Robert  
Deputy Public Safety Administrator  
Public Safety Agency, Florida

MC PARTLAND, Mathew F.  
Commanding Officer, Programs & Policy  
New York Police Department  
New York, New York

MURPHY, Patrick  
President  
Police Foundation

POPE, Ray  
Law Enforcement Consultant  
Waycross, Georgia

PLANTS, Richard  
Director  
Michigan State Police

## APPENDIX B - PARTICIPANTS (Continued)

REED, William  
Executive Assistant to the Director  
FBI

RINKEVICH, Charles  
LEAA Regional Administrator  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

VELDE, Richard W.  
Deputy Administrator for  
Policy Development  
LEAA

## APPENDIX C - WORKSHOP MEMBERS

## WORKSHOP A - Police Systems

Plants, Chairman  
Looney  
Bastian, Sub-chairman  
Camp  
Pope  
Brath

## WORKSHOP B - Police Task Force Follow-on Proposal

Andrews, Chairman  
Hoy  
Jenkins  
Clement  
Brown  
Hogue  
Lucey

## WORKSHOP C - Research Needs of the Police Chief

Brandstatter, Chairman  
Downey  
McPartland  
Macy  
Rinkevich  
Farmer  
Lewis  
Greacen

## WORKSHOP D - Corruption

Lucas, Chairman  
Davis  
Kelly  
Bauer  
Alarcon, Sub-chairman  
Golden  
Reed  
Booth  
Bennett

**POLICY  
DEVELOPMENT  
SEMINAR**

**ON  
CORRECTIONS**

**AUGUST 1-2, 1974  
ROCHESTER, MICH.**



**LAW ENFORCEMENT  
ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

FIRST PLENARY SESSION

Opening Remarks by Mr. Richard W. Velde . . . . . 1

NALECOM/ATS Satellite by Mr. Patrick J. Rygh . . . . . 11

Question-Answer . . . . . 15

NLETS by Major C. J. Beddome . . . . . 18

Question-Answer . . . . . 23

Micro-Processors by Mr. Jerry Ogdin . . . . . 29

Question-Answer . . . . . 35

PLATO by Mr. Michael J. Moore . . . . . 51

Question-Answer . . . . . 64

LEAA Programs by Mr. Nick Pappas . . . . . 68

OBSCIS by Dr. Charles M. Friel . . . . . 75

University of Maryland Extension Program for  
the Military by Dr. Peter P. Lejins . . . . . 86

Question-Answer . . . . . 91

Military Correspondence Schools by Colonel  
John Sullivan . . . . . 96

SECONDARY PLENARY SESSION

WORKSHOP A - Mr. Norval Morris . . . . . 102

- Dr. Peter P. Lejins . . . . . 103

- Dr. Donald A. Deppe . . . . . 109

- Mr. Frederick D. Moyer . . . . . 114

- Colonel John Sullivan . . . . . 115

WORKSHOP B - Mr. Anthony Trivisono . . . . . 118

- Mr. Maurice Sigler . . . . . 123

WORKSHOP C - Mr. Paul W. Keve . . . . . 125

- Dr. Edith E. Flynn . . . . . 135

WORKSHOP D - Dr. Lawrence Bennett . . . . . 138

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
National Institute of Corrections by Mr. Craig D. Dobson . . . . .	164
APPENDIX A - Participants . . . . .	175
APPENDIX B - Workshop Members . . . . .	180
APPENDIX C - LEEP Participant Summary . . . . .	181
APPENDIX D - Part C and Part E Allocations and Corrections Expenditures by Program and Fiscal Year . . . . .	182
APPENDIX E - Dr. Friel's Exhibit 1: Project Schedule . . . . .	183

FIRST PLENARY SESSION

MR. VELDE: Welcome. We are pleased you could be here to share with us some ideas which eventually will translate themselves into a policy development seminar on correctional education.

We have a rather diverse group assembled here today. I might add that this is deliberately so. We have brought together people of different backgrounds, disciplines and perspectives, along with some hard-core correctionaries, to expose you to what we think are exciting - in some cases radical and revolutionary - ideas in the field of systems development and education. We would like to explore potential applications of these to some of the chronic problems of corrections which all of us here can recount rather readily.

I would like to refer briefly to a publication which is yet unpublished by LEAA although it has been scooped rather unwittingly by the Deputy Administrator at a conference in Chicago earlier this week. It was not realized that it had not yet been put out.

This is the second LEAA survey of jails. You will recall the first one was done in 1970. However, this focuses on inmates in jails, and by "jails" we mean institutions which have a capacity of more than forty-eight hours at the local and county levels. You

will recall the first jail survey was in 1970 when there were about 4,000 such jails.

This 1972 survey was an in-department look at the inmates in these institutions. Let me read to you from the introduction.

Thirty-nine hundred twenty-one jails at mid-year 1972; approximately 141,000 inmates.

This incidentally is about twelve percent fewer inmates than were incarcerated in 1970. This is a rather significant change.

The biggest decrease in that is represented by those pre-trial detainees. There are about 30,000 fewer pretrial detainees in 1972 than in 1970.

About ninety-five percent were male. Six in ten were less than thirty years of age.

Half have earned in the preceding year income below that officially described as the poverty level.

About one-fourth of them were totally unemployed at the time of incarceration.

About half never had been married.

About forty-three percent were black.

The educational level was approximately four years lower than their counterparts in the populations outside of the institutions.

Those are some of the important features of this report. I feel this highlights one of the chronic problems of corrections. Inmates, customers, clients of corrections are under-educated, they

are poor, they have been failures in our social, economic, and, in some cases, political systems, and for the most part corrections has not really been able to do much about these characteristics as inmates have passed through their systems.

That, I think, is the basic problem we want to address ourselves to today. Can education and training programs, or euphemisms that generally pass for education and training programs in corrections, be concerted into something which is meaningful, efficient, cost-effective, and at the same time do something to remedy the educational training deficiencies which many, if not most, of the inmates have.

I talked in the perspective, first of all, of the jails, jail settings, and inmates in those jails. The scope of our discussion here today will not be limited to that setting by any means. We will also consider the very similar kinds of problems faced in prisons. However, we want to look, also, at the possibility of developing educational tools and aids with those acquainted with the corrections system currently, whether they be institutionalized or not. We might see here a little later on some possibilities whereby probationers or parolees could take advantage, perhaps as a condition of their release, of certain kinds of educational opportunities - correspondence courses, CAI computer-assisted instruction where the parolee or probationer would stop by his friendly parole office, sit at the control, and run through the

basics of how to open a bank account, how to finish a post-graduate course in college, finish high school, and what have you.

Technology is really here, as you will hear later on this morning, to make this kind of thing very possible and within the budgets of even the most modest correctional programs.

There are numerous programs and activities, some of them funded by LEAA, some of them totally supported out of state and local resources, which pass for correctional, educational, and training activities.

Incidentally, we do not want to limit our scope of attention simply to the problems of the inmates. We want to look at the staff educational and training needs as well.

I should add one further qualification: that although the focus of this meeting is corrections, what we are really talking about is criminal justice because there are educational and training needs in police and in courts, where some of the machinery and systems we will be talking about here today are equally as applicable to police and courts as they are in corrections. Therefore, although the principal focus will be in the correctional setting, certainly our perspective should not be limited to this.

Shortly we will be hearing from several people who have no prior contact with corrections, as far as I know, and who really know very little about it. I have not checked their criminal history records, but I think I can safely make that statement.

They know what is happening in criminal justice and also what is happening in the general field of computer development with respect to some very exciting systems which are either now operational or on the drawing boards.

You will hear briefly from Larry Beddome, although he is not on the schedule. Larry is a retired major of the Arizona Highway Patrol. He is currently the Executive Director of NLETS, the National Law Enforcement Telecommunications System.

NLETS, which has a computer located in Phoenix at the Arizona Highway Patrol, is a dedicated private Western Union serving about 5,000 police agencies throughout the country.

MAJOR BEDDOME: Fifty-two hundred police departments.

MR. VELDE: They have high-speed telecommunications links to thirty states, computer-to-computer interface. The system has a capability currently of handling 15,000 messages an hour and it is currently processing some 20,000 to 25,000 messages a day. This involves all kinds of traffic, anything two or more police agencies want to talk about. It is possible for one police agency to address communications to any one, all, or any combination thereof of the 5,200 police agencies linked to this system.

This is a system funded, supported, and paid for by state and local participating police agencies. It has had some hardware acquisition grants to support and upgrade from LEAA, but we look on it as a one-shot supplemental grant to support their operations.

There is no ongoing subsidy of the program by LEAA. Mr. Beddome will talk about it a little later on in detail.

We will also hear from Pat Rygh. Pat is the Project Director on a study effort we call NALECOM, the National Law Enforcement Communications System. Pat is with the Jet Propulsion Lab of Cal Tech under contract to NASA in Pasadena, California.

JPL has been under contract with LEAA since last summer to do a feasibility survey and a design study for a national criminal justice communications network. They are specifically exploring the possibility of satellite-based communications networks, or something less than that, to meet the present and projected needs of criminal justice for telecommunications support. You will hear a brief description of that activity.

Mr. Rygh will also tell us about an incredibly exciting experiment which is now going on called ATS-6. ATS, Advanced Technological Satellite, is a piece of hardware, literally advanced research satellite, owned by NASA, which is orbiting at some 23,000 miles in space. Currently two experiments are being conducted, one for HEW and one for the Veterans Administration. The Veterans Administration is demonstrating the feasibility of remote medical diagnosis and medical teaching through a satellite system with very low-cost ground stations on the receiving end so that doctors can talk to patients and diagnose what is wrong as well as to give teaching in a medical school setting or to

para-professionals. These ground stations cost some \$3,000 to \$4,000 each in production.

HEW is using it as a potential method of teaching in remote areas, such as Indian villages and reservations as well as remote areas which do not have access to a well-structured educational system at either a primary, secondary, or college level.

The HEW experiment is a one-way system. They can receive but they cannot send back. That is the basic difference between it and the VA experiment. However, both are being conducted on the same satellite.

There may be some potential application in the correctional setting. I think there are some correctional institutions in somewhat remote settings, so it would not take too much to figure out that there might be some transferability.

Next we will hear about the revolution, and I mean revolution, which is happening in the computer business today, micro-processors. Jerry Ogdin is a consultant in Reston, Virginia, who has his own firm and is as knowledgeable in this field as anybody else we have come across, although I must say we are still somewhat neophytes in the field, though we have spent a lot of money checking out computerized systems in LEAA, some \$300,000,000 in the last five years.

You are aware of what has happened in the field of the hand-held calculator in the last two years, or calculators in general. Today you can buy a pretty good calculator for less than \$30, and

according to the recent issue of Business Week by the end of the year you will be able to buy them for less than \$10.

The same thing essentially is happening in the computer business. Today it is possible to buy off the shelf a very sophisticated computer for less than \$1,000. You can buy a good one for around \$100, or in quantity for around \$50, as I understand it. These are not quite as big, as fast, nor do they have the capability of an IBM 370-155, but I think when the second generation of these things comes around there will not be many sales for 370's any longer. There is really a revolution going on in this business.

Then we will hear a little bit about what is happening in some other educational fields, in the field of correspondence. The military has been in this business for quite a number of years with correspondence courses.

Dr. Lejins will tell us a little bit about the massive program which Maryland has had with the military over the years. I hope I can also prevail on him to tell a little bit about the educational consortium which LEAA has been supporting to develop PhD programs in criminal justice studies at seven participating universities, three of which now are offering a PhD. We look on this as a resource help in this effort.

Although he is not on the program, I think perhaps it would be appropriate for Craig Dobson to tell us a little bit about what

NIC is doing in the field of training and education of correctionaries. This is particularly appropriate inasmuch as the Senate worked its will last Thursday and passed enabling legislation to give the National Institute of Corrections a full Congressional mandate. Whether or not that will survive the conference I do not know inasmuch as the Senate and House also passed the Juvenile Institute bill at the same time. I had better not editorialize any further. That is briefly an idea of what is in store for us.

You will notice in your schedule there are some assignments and chairmen.

This afternoon, and if necessary this evening, we shall break up into these small group meetings. You saw in the main building several places which are quite suitable for these small group discussions.

Tomorrow morning we shall reconvene in plenary session, at which time we shall hear fairly structured reports from each of the chairmen, summarizing the thoughts, findings and conclusions of their small group sessions. Then each participant, as reports are being presented, will have an opportunity to comment in order to supplement his views or to retract them in the cold light of morning.

These proceedings, as I have already indicated, are being transcribed. We will have a transcript available for all of the

participants shortly, which means you will have an opportunity to revise, extend, or retract anything that you have said. This will then be published as part of a series of policy development seminars. This is the fifth or sixth in the current series, at least the last this policy development will have. We have had them on statistics, gun control, organized crime, and police executives.

We hope this will be a free-reining and thorough discussion of some of the contemporary issues of correctional education and training as well as a brief stimulus and exposure to what is happening in the field of systems development and computers.

Although we do not want to pre-judge nor do we want to try to arrive at any set conclusion before the session begins, it would appear that many of these developments you will be hearing about offer tremendous opportunities and potentials for correctional education if they can be put together and managed in a way which is cost-effective and meet the needs of correctionaries and their customers. That is the reason we have one major group session which will be devoted to the management and organization of a correctional educational network.

We also have one which hopefully will focus somewhat on the overall status and the needs of correctional education. We have some outstanding educators in that group.

Then we will have a group which will focus pretty much on systems and technology for correctional education and training.

# CONTINUED

2 OF 4

As to the third group, I hope they will not read any suggestion into the title concerning what they should be talking about. I hope they are out in the wild blue yonder somewhere planning ahead for the next five, ten, to twenty years regarding some of the things which ought to be done, whether the resources, manpower, and will power are there to do it.

That pretty well covers the format of the program. Are there questions on what we are about to do at this point?

If not, I will ask each of those present to identify himself. Your names will then appear in a listing on one of the appendices to the transcript (see Appendix A, page 175).

Are there questions or comments at this point?

If not, I would like to turn the program over to Pat Rygh briefly to tell us about NALECOM, what it is all about and its potential.

MR. RYGH: The study we have been doing for LEAA, an acronym called NALECOM, is really wrong because we are studying criminal justice information systems all the way through courts and corrections.

This is in two parts. LEAA has asked us first of all to look at whether we can estimate the requirements for interstate, state and national criminal justice traffic over the next ten years. After we have determined what those requirements are, we are then to synthesize a large spectrum of possible configurations

of a communications system, and then evaluate those relative to their usefulness for this particular purpose.

In the requirements analysis there are really two parts. One is to extrapolate the kind of information which is already flowing in Larry Beddome's net, the NLETS net, as well as the FBI net.

If you really look at the arrest rates, and so on, it seems as though traffic in that type of message flow will increase by a factor of 22.

The other part of the requirements analysis is to try to estimate what the new things are, and that is much more difficult because video, for instance, is in its embryonic state and it is difficult to extrapolate from essentially no data to some ten years into the future. Hopefully some inputs will come from this particular meeting.

We are in a difficult position in trying to estimate the kinds of use there might be for video in the future.

In the second part, synthesizing the configurations which might be used for this kind of traffic, we looked at everything from the new commercial packet switching networks, wherein the criminal justice data would be mixed in with business data and everything else being switched around the country, to full satellite systems where each state would have a satellite terminal switched into a main switcher and then back to the addressee. We

looked at seven or eight different configurations of that type.

It became apparent that the development of a network perhaps would have to be split into two parts mostly because of our difficulty in estimating requirements.

The option we are pursuing more actively right now, therefore, is an option wherein you start out with a ground system with land lines which would handle the type of traffic which is currently being used times 22, but with the idea of future growth into possible satellite use and possible use of video in the future. As I say, we have difficulty in estimating exactly what that video role will be.

As Mr. Velde mentioned, there are some experimental satellites up now. ATS is up there. There are no results from ATS as yet inasmuch as it is too early. I believe it was launched on May 30.

The difficulty with ATS is that it has many experiments on it in addition to the video experiment, and it is also a satellite with a very narrow footprint. That means the down link illuminates only about a three-hundred-mile by one-thousand-mile target on the ground, so you have to point it.

Those of us who have been involved in the space business know that the operational problems of pointing spacecraft is an expensive business.

Another part of that experiment which Mr. Velde did not mention

is that after a year in orbit it will be moved further east so that the Indian Government will be using it for community education. In fact, that may be a more pertinent experiment than the HEW experiment in this country.

There is another satellite on the horizon which is perhaps even more pertinent and may have more results applicable to the kinds of things to be talked about here, a joint U.S.-Canadian venture. This is called CTS, Communications Technology Satellite. This is really a community broadcast satellite. It is operating in the twelve gigahertz range where there is no international restriction on the down-link power. In fact, you can use an eight-foot antenna, down to the size where people are interested. It has a bigger footprint on the surface of the earth, not big enough to cover the whole U.S.A. but big enough so you can point it in various bands across the U.S. and show the same program each hour in each different time zone.

That will probably be the last of the NASA-development satellites because if that turns out to be successful, the commercial people will move in - if they can find a spot up in the Equator to put up another one - and they will be launching that kind of thing for commercial service.

I think one of the things that I would recommend, and I will perhaps be recommending this in the other meeting today, is that

if this group thinks there is real interest in that area that some activity get underway to use that satellite. I think the program for that satellite has not settled down as of the moment, and it is quite possible that correctional education might get in as a co-investigation on that particular program. I am not that familiar with it but as far as I know the use of that satellite is not yet settled. It is scheduled for launch in late 1975.

There are some interesting experiments going on in education with satellites. The community broadcast-type of thing is coming in fast. I don't see how it can be avoided at this point. I feel this joint U.S.-Canadian satellite is the one most pertinent to the broad coverage we are talking about. It would provide the one-way type of education with the return voice link currently being used by Stanford and USC out in our area.

As a matter of fact, the Jet Propulsion Laboratory is currently tied in with USC in an educational link of this very same type. Although I have not been taking courses on it, some of my people have, and they find it works very well. I think there are some exciting things to look forward to.

MR. MORRIS: Will you describe the link you were just talking about? Is it tele-broadcast of a lecture with a voice?

MR. RYGH: Yes. What they do is this: You pay a certain fee, a pay-your-own way type of thing. We have a set of monitors at the Laboratory.

The lecture comes in on TV. You can ask the lecturer questions over a voice link. The voice return line is apparently a very key part of the thing. It does not work very well without that.

The lecture takes on a whole new dimension with your being able to ask questions.

MR. MORRIS: Then if a person misses a lecture is there a tape they can pick up and replay?

MR. RYGH: I believe so. Of course, then you cannot ask questions, but you can listen to the lecture.

Stanford has also been in this for quite some time.

MR. VELDE: If you think this sounds exotic, consider the system that JPL is designing, which would meet the needs of criminal justice, at least as best they can identify over the next ten years, roughly one-thirtieth of the telecommunications support which is required for Sunday afternoon football today. It sounds like something for the future, but it is with us already.

MR. MORRIS: Am I correct in understanding that the equipment to pick up such telecommunications from the new satellites is not very sophisticated? The important point is the reduction of costs?

MR. RYGH: That is the real thing that these newer satellites are bringing about.

MR. MORRIS: I do not have a clear conception of that difference.

MR. RYGH: The current domestic satellites used for point-to-point communications require a thirty-foot antenna. It is quite a large antenna.

MR. VELDE: How much does it cost?

MR. RYGH: The antenna cost is not terribly bad, but you normally have to locate it outside of town, which costs about as much as the antenna.

MR. MORRIS: You have a special reception station whereas you now do not have it with the new ones.

MR. RYGH: With the new ones you still would have to have them, but it would be an eight-foot antenna, a circular dish which would be large enough. At the higher frequencies you can locate them locally so that the cost would go way down, to just a few thousand dollars.

MR. MORRIS: It would be within the financial capacity of the various institutions?

MR. RYGH: I assume that is the case.

MR. MORRIS: That is the point, I think.

MR. RYGH: The key thing is that you do not get into large educational usage until you get the cost of the ground receiving station down. The technology of using the higher frequency, where they can put more power into the down link, is crucial.

There are all kinds of international rules as to the amount of power you can put into a satellite because there are so many

up there and they are already interfering with each other.

MR. MORRIS: They can be blocked and jammed. It has to do with propaganda, does it not?

MR. RYGH: There is a lot of international activity having to do with what you can put on which other citizens can see. Some countries are sensitive about that.

MR. VELDE: Thank you very much. I have heard several similar presentations now by Pat, and they have gotten to the point where they are almost in translatable English.

The space business is almost as acronym-happy as the Navy.

Next I would like briefly to call on Larry Beddome to tell us about NLETS and what is happening there.

Larry, you might also mention NCIC.

MAJOR BEDDOME: The National Law Enforcement Telecommunications System started out many years ago as a regional teletype system (inter-department, inter-agency) and then it began to be interstate. Little regions then popped up around the country until about 1964, when the loop closed up with a switching center in Phoenix, Arizona.

At that point every one of the continental states, plus the City of New York and the City of Washington, D.C., were included in the system. It was a party-line kind of operation. Initially I believe there were eight circuits, so that in effect you had forty-eight, plus two, fifty users divided into the eight circuits.

The speed of the system was very slow. Over a period of time the traffic volume built up to where it became necessary to overhaul the system. They put electronic switching equipment in Phoenix, at the same location as opposed to the old telephone type of gear they had earlier; and again, as in any improved system, the pipe became full again and it was then necessary to overhaul it once more.

At that time the Board of Directors, a group of people comprised of communications officers generally from the state police agencies in the various states, elected to send their president over to LEAA to see whether we qualified for assistance in upgrading the system.

They came through with \$1.2 million, and then a supplemental grant of approximately another \$.5 million. This assisted us greatly in buying some new computer equipment, going from party-line operation to a star system. In effect, a star system in this context is a line to the switcher from each of the states. We had a point of entry in each of the states.

MR. VELDE: A switcher is a computer. Is that right?

MAJOR BEDDOME: Yes. The computer serves the purpose of being an electronic switch. In effect, it gives the capability of connecting this gentleman to this other gentleman if they are in opposite states through the switch. It is a selective operation from that standpoint.

We had a cut-over to the new computerized system on December 24, 1973, so it is really very recent. We ran in a paralleling operation for a little over thirty days. On February 1, we were satisfied the new system was solid, and, in effect, we pulled the plug on the old computer and switched over to this new operation.

The original design concept we figured would have some twenty-six states by 1974 which would want to use a high-speed operation. What we meant by high speed then was some twenty-four hundred bits per second of information traveling up and down the links between the computer and the states. The rest of the users of the system, we assumed at the time we designed it, would still be using teletypewriter terminals at a lower rate of speed, some 150 bits per second.

Presently, the system has been so successful that we have already exceeded our hopes of having the high-speed states up. I think I have twenty-five states already at the high speed and four or five which have a computer link on the lower speed line.

The U.S. Treasury Department joined the system in May. Treasury has a system called the TECS (Treasury Enforcement Communications System). They have terminals at every international airport in the United States and the major border-crossing stations in the country, so that any kind of activity they generate they can communicate with the National Crime Information Center in Washington or

with other local law enforcement or state law enforcement agencies within the country.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation runs a system called NCIC, National Crime Information Center, a data bank comprised of wanted people, stolen and identifiable property, wanted cars, and that type of thing. NCIC has links to Alaska, Hawaii and Puerto Rico, which NLETS does not, so that by going from the NLETS computer to the NCIC computer we now have point-to-point communication with Alaska, Hawaii and Puerto Rico.

The last "quick and dirty" survey or census which I took was about some six weeks ago. Somebody in the Department of Justice asked me the number of agencies with direct access to NLETS. Believe it or not, nobody could really say. This is because it is such a dynamic thing.

Technology is developing so rapidly that the states develop these switching centers which are intrastate with a link to the outside world, if you will. That then generates interest and activity on the part of correctional institutions, police agencies, prosecutors and courts, as well as other kinds of legitimate criminal justice users, so that the terminals literally build up faster than you can really keep track of.

However, the last time I did this check there were in excess of 5,200 local police agencies - I define a local police agency in this context as a police department of any size which runs

twenty-four hours a day or a sheriff's office with the same kind of criteria. We had some 500-plus state police barracks or posts on the system. I identified them because in many states a state police function, a highway patrol or whatever name it goes by in that particular state, literally is a community of interest for communications and other kinds of services, so I thought that was significant.

I tried to identify the number of courtrooms in the country which had terminals on the system and found there were approximately 500 courtrooms which are equipped today with a local, regional, or state terminal on some kind of information system which has direct access to NLETS, which in effect makes that courtroom capable of communicating with somebody else in the country.

Then I had a category called "Other Law Enforcement" which might include anything from a local FBI office in some city which would have a terminal on a state or local system and others. There were several hundred of those, so they were pushing 6,000 terminals, the last time I got a count, with direct administrative message capability with one another.

The system at the moment is probably not designed to handle the kind of traffic which Mr. Velde mentioned earlier or which Mr. Rygh is talking about because we have inhibited messages longer than 1,000 characters in length. That does not mean we

can send only 1,000 character messages, but it means you are, in effect, limited to 1,000 character messages by page. You can send up as many pages as you feel obliged to send if it meets the system criteria, but it complicates things technically in that environment if you wanted to send a lengthy broadcast.

Before we updated the system it was running at a capacity of 13,000 messages a day. Therefore, in the design criteria we said we wanted a minimum capability initially of 13,000 messages per hour. The system can accommodate a little better than that now. That is where Mr. Velde came up with the 15,000 per hour figure.

We have had confirming evidence from the maker of the hardware that we are in a position to increase the capacity of the system more than double, which again was a design criteria. We asked to go up to a maximum of 26,000 messages per hour. We feel we can go from two to five times capacity with a minimum expenditure, again using dedicated lines, and one line to one agency type of thing so we do not have contention for the lines.

That gives a thumbnail description.

QUESTIONER: Are there correctional uses for the system?

MAJOR BEDDOME: There are several institutions on the system. In fact, my survey indicated 300 to 500 terminals in correctional institutions. That might mean that the survey I took was so loosely drawn that probation or parole officers in a large community

might have a half dozen terminals on a system and each got counted as a separate institution.

MR. VELDE: How do you count sheriffs' departments?

MAJOR BEDDOME: As an agency. We were specific on law enforcement. Many agencies would have numerous terminals.

MR. VELDE: You would not distinguish a sheriff who has correctional responsibilities from one who does not?

MAJOR BEDDOME: No. I was looking at the county or state institutions or Federal institutions.

MR. VELDE: It should be pointed out that NLETS is a transparent system in that it does not monitor the message traffic that it handles. This is the business of the sender and the receiver. There is no central data base. It just simply switches the messages, such as the old telephone operator did by inserting or removing plugs. In fact, I don't believe Larry can even listen to it. It is therefore called a transparent system. Two law enforcement agencies may discuss anything they want to talk about.

QUESTIONER: Is there any control of that? You cannot say it is law enforcement when there is that number of outlets.

MAJOR BEDDOME: The point of entry is the state-controlled terminal. Generally that is the State Police, the State Department of Justice, or the State Department of Law Enforcement.

We then expect that that agency will exercise control because we do have some rules and regulations over the terminals they have

on the system. We have designed the system to be primarily an administrative message traffic kind of thing. If you want to discuss a problem with your counterpart in another state, you would form a 1,000-character message and send it to him. He then would respond. You would have a kind of delayed conversational mode. That is the intent of the system.

Yes, there is some control over the kind of traffic that is on there.

QUESTIONER: The control is the extent to which each of your 5,200 appears to be up to your expectation. That is the weakness.

MAJOR BEDDOME: From that standpoint that is the weakness. It was not designed to be an intelligence system or a highly secure kind of traffic system. It was meant to be a facility to help exchange operational data between agencies as opposed to sensitive traffic.

MR. VELDE: It serves much the same function as AT&T and Western Union. It is a service function.

MAJOR BEDDOME: Presently we are charging \$613 per month to each state, so that in effect there is some \$30,000 of income a month to operate the system. We need subsidization at the moment because we are running some \$48,000 a month in telecommunications costs.

Initially, and in this upgrading plan, LEAA agreed to a forty-two-month concept here to get us rolling. By that time

we will have established a more economical way of doing business or get new user fees to support it totally.

QUESTIONER: You are talking mostly about transmission of messages. What about storage of data? To what extent is the communication a matter of communicating with the machine to extract case data?

MAJOR BEDDOME: We put data banks in touch with one another. NLETS does not maintain anything but a simple storing operation. If your line is disabled for up to a few minutes the computer will store your messages until the line becomes alive again and puts the message out at that time. Once it has transmitted to your line we have a technique called truncating the message. It reads the header down to where the text starts, counts the number of characters in the text and picks up the end of the transmission indicator, so that I have a way of monitoring the system for utility, how it is being used, the number of characters, the time of day, the type of message, whether it is an access to a driver license file or motor vehicle file. That is the only other kind of file accessing we use on the system.

There are six or seven states which allow any user to NLETS to format a message and inquire into their driver registry or their motor vehicle file. It is only an operational type of message response. It is not driver history or that type of thing but just "yes", and so on. "This man does have a California

driver's license and it is valid at the moment." That is the type of thing which would come back.

Of course, it is an operational requirement of a policeman on the street in the middle of the night.

QUESTIONER: So your system does not retain massive data collection but only links to where people want the link.

MAJOR BEDDOME: We are providing a communications service; that is right.

MR. VELDE: A good example of how this system works is this: Shortly after it went on line last February there was a killing of a Pan American employee in Washington, D. C. out at a local television station. When the police arrived on the scene, there was no identification around at all. There was a car with Massachusetts tags on it nearby.

They used NLETS to run a check to address the Massachusetts license file, and in seven minutes they had a positive identification on the victim because it turned out to be her car.

It then was possible for the D.C. Metropolitan Police computer to talk to the Massachusetts computer to address the license tag files and come up with an identification of the car, which then turned out to be registered to the victim. In that sense you can address files.

However, NLETS itself does not store any of that kind of information.

MAJOR BEDDOME: If I can embellish that comment about the murder in the District, the fact there was timely identification of the victim then connected that crime to a suspect almost immediately, and it turned out that had it taken several days, as is the normal case in running down that kind of lead information down, then the suspect would probably have eluded arrest.

QUESTIONER: How long did that hook-up take?

MAJOR BEDDOME: I think they made their arrest within an hour or so.

QUESTIONER: After the identification?

MAJOR BEDDOME: After the identification of the victim it took seven minutes.

MR. VELDE: It is safe to say that police agencies are about five or six years ahead of courts and corrections agencies in their use of computer technology. The work which has been done and the experience which has been gained hopefully can be transferred over and taken advantage of without all the problems, trials and tribulations encountered through the years by police agencies in learning how to make effective use of automated systems. Perhaps that is one of the things we can gain from this meeting.

Next we have Jerry Ogdin, who will tell us something about the state of the art in computer technology.

Also, I hope you will talk to us a little bit about this

interesting proposal you have generated for CAI, Computer-Assisted Instruction in a medical school environment, a proposal submitted to NHA a year or so ago. I imagine they did not have the foresight, the wisdom or the money to take advantage of it.

I don't know whether or not it has been picked up to this point, but it seemed like an interesting idea which might have some application in some of the things in which we are interested.

MR. OGDIN: Most of you probably have gotten an introduction to computers. I want to draw a familiar block diagram here of some things you have seen before.

Because all computers are composed of five basic parts, I shall start with what we universally refer to as input, getting things from the outside world to a computer.

Next we have an output, a method for a computer to control something in the outside world. If you do not do that, the whole operation is useless.

Next we have a storage capacity and capability, sometimes referred to as memory.

Generally we need some sort of arithmetic capability to perform information processing, to do something to the things coming in.

Generally, then, we need some control function to decide when to do these various functions.

Heretofore, we have generally referred to these two blocks,

arithmetic and control, as the central processing unit, or CPU. If you will stop and think of the CPU's you have seen, things you see in the movies or on television, I don't know what you visualize, but most of us visualize these big monstrous kinds of things.

Imagine that you had a box about five feet high, about four feet wide, and about three feet deep. That is the size of a machine which was fairly popular for many years, the 1401. It came out in about 1957. It cost about \$250,000. That was the central processing unit.

I just brought along a couple of things you might be interested in. Here are a couple computers which do the same amount of work of that old 1401. The size is about one-inch long, a half-inch wide. We buy those things now in quantities at a price of around \$50.

That is just the central processing unit. I brought along a whole computer, too. This happens to be the whole thing, this being the central processing unit right there. The whole board is about eight inches by eleven inches. It contains storage, some of these little integrated circuits.

We have here some of the necessary logic which controls some of the details, and a bunch of pins at the bottom for connecting to the rest of the world, input and output.

Then there is another box about the same size as this with

the power supply. We connect the Teletype to that and you have an entire computer.

This, now, will not take over the control function of NLETS. It will not take over data-base storage of NCIC. It will not take over any of the really large functions. However, the reason these things are rather important - these are called micro-computers or micro-processors - is that the cost of computing is going down so far that things that heretofore have just been prohibitively expensive are becoming very attractive.

MR. VELDE: How much does that board cost?

MR. OGDIN: That entire board is about \$395. They range in capacity from these up to fairly large machines and up to several hundred thousand dollars.

The important thing is that other things we have ignored, services we have never been able to provide, things which are always blue sky, are now practical. I can think of several things. I thought I would relate some of these in general in some areas which might be applied to the corrections community.

One is the whole region of cost reduction. There are things you do; there are sequential activities you would like to monitor, just controlling the physical plant itself, monitoring alarms, and so forth. These things are useful in that area.

Whole new opportunities open up in the second stage of technology. The first stage tends to do the same old things you did

before. The second stage is where the technology is constant and you change uses of it. You then find new uses for the thing.

I might mention some of these new uses. One is privacy controls. Privacy controls can come only in the first instance from the legislative world. However, once you have decided what they are, you can enforce many of them with a device such as this because we are talking about putting these kinds of things on board police cars.

Now you can enforce a lot more requirements in the way of identification of an individual. There have been cases of people who have asked for a rap sheet by name and gotten the same name but the wrong individual. Age, name, height, and so on, could be confusing. You can enforce the provision of that information now in order to get at the system and ensure some of the privacy controls.

The area of terminals, in allowing more controls at who gets at the system (the problem of never preventing the authorized user from making unauthorized use of the data) that is a problem which cannot be controlled by technology; but controlling the rest of it, preventing unauthorized use, preventing unauthorized users from masquerading as authorized users, and so on, all this can be done.

The other area which is important is the area of communications and education, two very important parts of the meetings here.

In providing the kinds of services you would like to be able to provide to a large number of users it is very important to get the cost of the equipment down as far as possible. You have to multiply it by the number you install.

I think this was a point being made a while ago in the discussion of ground stations for satellites. This is an area where the micro-processor is being used, to cut down the cost of the electronics to about half. Heretofore we could not afford to put a computer into those systems.

In particular we produced - we did not do a proposal for the National Library of Medicine - a study on design of a system to deliver computer-assisted instruction to medical school students, medical and dental school students, throughout the United States, and in a system we designed which was based on mini-computers and micro-processors of the kind being passed around the room.

We got the system down to the point where we could deliver computer-assisted instruction to a medical student at a cost of around fifty cents per student hour. This is fairly remarkable. People have been trying to break the one-dollar-an-hour barrier for a long time. That is for the ongoing operating cost and not the initial set-up cost, nor does it include the cost of developing course materials. A lot of these course materials can be developed fairly early and left in the system for a long time.

We can get into some details of how we did this, but basically

we built a set of detached computers at the school or at the institution which, when a demand was made by a user of the system for a particular "script" (as they are called in computer-assisted instruction), the mini-computer dials up a central computer, gets the script back very rapidly, and then hangs up the 'phone. It then maintains a dialogue for the student for as long as necessary, so we reduce the communications cost. You use the standard telephone network, a dial-up system.

One last area I might bring up is an area where the micro-processor might be useful in this context, and that is an opportunity for many of the people, particularly the bright people, to learn a little more about the subject of computer programming. There has been some effort at some institutions to teach computer programming to inmates because there is a tremendous demand for computer programmers.

There is a short fall of about 75,000 to 80,000 programmers this year in terms of need.

The difficulty here, as I see it, and this is a personal opinion, is that it looks as though they have been teaching the wrong things. They have been teaching commercial data processing.

You send a guy who is a "con" out in the world to develop programs like payroll, accounts payable, accounts receivable, and as a small businessman I don't think I would want to hire one. I would have some reservations.

However, the whole areas of scientific programming, or communications programming, or systems programming, these are technological areas and it is not true you need a college degree or even a full high school education to learn how to do this kind of program work.

You can go out and buy all the equipment necessary to get these people started. This is something they can work with themselves at a total acquisition cost of less than a couple thousand dollars. That also offers some real opportunities.

I have tried to cover a lot of different topics. I am not sure which of those you might want to pursue, but I will be happy to entertain questions.

QUESTIONER: Would you put some meat on the bone of computer-assisted medical instruction? Would you describe the content of it?

MR. OGDIN: Let's define two ways of teaching people. One is a broad exposure to a limited amount of information. You want to teach somebody an elementary skill - how to solder a wire, for example. That is a limited depth to a broad audience.

The other is detailed depth to a fairly limited audience. In the first area, such as the area of video, this is very important. Video tapes and transmission of live video signals is important.

When you get to presenting detailed information to a narrow

audience what we are doing in this particular case is a wide range of things. Some were simply drill and test. If you had these kinds of symptoms what would be the preferred course of treatment, for example? It went all the way down to interesting kinds of scripts where you literally play doctor at the terminal.

The terminal types out a paragraph, something like: "a 45-year-old overweight Caucasian male admitted to the emergency room complaining of stomach pains." If you want to be quick, you type all in an instant diagnosis, and experienced specialists often do just that.

What happens with these experienced specialists is this: The computer comes back and gives you about twelve reasons why that diagnosis is not right because you have not looked at enough detail. It is really useful at detailed skill-producing levels.

QUESTIONER: Would it include mortality rate, morbidity rates, and that kind of information?

MR. OGDIN: I don't know of any kinds of scripts like that. We are not talking about --

QUESTIONER: Is this not all a statistical measure?

MR. OGDIN: I don't think the doctor cares about the probability that such and such is the case as much as he is in trying to narrow down his choices. What you are trying to teach the student doctor in this case is how you eliminate those things it cannot possibly be.

The first thing you do is to take vital signs. Next you have to interpret the vital signs and call for a lab test, and so on down through the course of action. At a certain point you arrive at three possible things it could be. Normally, I don't think a doctor says, "It is probably that one." What he does is to treat all three if he can.

QUESTIONER: Where is computer-assisted instruction being used today in a well-established way, a well-evaluated program with faculty acceptance? Is it in being?

MR. OGDIN: Yes, sir. As a matter of fact, the study we did was only a way of more widely distributing that which already is being done today through an existing communications commercial network "TYMET". This uses the computers at the National Library of Medicine in Washington.

There are medical schools in this country today which assign to the student the requirement that sometime over the next two weeks he sit down at a terminal at a school library, dial the National Library of Medicine, and go through those scripts.

QUESTIONER: Is it going on in any other field?

MR. OGDIN: Someone on the schedule will talk on PLATO. That is one of the better known efforts in that area. There are quite a few CAI efforts going on. We have a lot to learn about how students learn. That is the major impediment.

The technology is there, but I don't think the skills and

understanding of how people learn is there yet.

QUESTIONER: In talking about payroll and accounting systems, you introduced the possibility of a whole new set of clients for correction. Are there any controls in the program itself which would do something about monitoring the system itself in terms of embezzlement?

MR. OGDIN: If there were I can think of several companies which would like to know them. No, there are not.

There are companies which have internal and external auditors who write computer programs to verify validity, but there are some things you cannot check except to go through the effort of doing exactly the same data processing again and verifying it. That is very expensive.

If you spend \$150,000 to develop software to do a particular function, such as updating the interest file on a bank, in the bank's savings system, you have to spend another \$150,000 to do it again, and then you may not be sure that is right.

QUESTIONER: I have an observation more than a question. One of the problems in the correction area is that we feel bad every time you get up. I ordered a calculator. Now you say they will be down to \$10 at the end of the year. It discourages the first person in because of the developmental costs. Have we about reached the point where the \$50 one you showed will be it?

MR. OGDIN: I have two comments. First of all, you can

always tell the pioneers by the arrows in their backs. The second observation is that at a certain point the cost of these components can go to zero but the system cost does not.

The \$10 calculator, for example - when you figure it out, you have twenty-five cents per key, so you have \$2.50 there. You have about seventy-five cents' worth of parts inside the calculator. You have about \$1.00 worth of case, cabinet, display, and so on. It turns out that if I gave you that, if I reduce that cost to zero, the cost of assembling it, distributing it, marketing it, all the rest of the things drive the cost up so high that is a major part of it. Therefore, the cost of technology is not the only factor.

QUESTIONER: In your applications with regard to medicine, have you arrived at a cost per medical hour?

MR. OGDIN: We took some measures of what we thought were likely student usages. We came up with an actual model and ran it. Under our expectations of normal usage we can get a per-student-hour cost of about fifty cents. That was done a year ago.

By the time you actually build the system and run it, I feel the cost will perhaps go up somewhat, ten percent inflation alone eating up considerably. That was communications, line operating cost, maintenance cost, and the like. It did not include the initial acquisition of the equipment, preparation of the scripts, nor cost of central computer.

Our thesis in this context was that a university can easily get a grant to go out and buy equipment, but you cannot get a grant to operate.

QUESTIONER: In the area of privacy control, how do micro-processors enhance the problem of access? Are lock-out devices easier?

MR. OGDIN: They are less expensive. What happens is that we can impose controls. Those controls heretofore may have cost us something on the order of 300 to 400 chips of this size in conventional technology, so we are now talking about a raw cost of just those parts, on the order of \$200 to \$300 for the manufactured product.

It is economical now for us to consider replacing all of that with a couple of these small processors and doing the same amount of work less expensively. In other words, by merely reducing cost we make it practical.

That is not to say all the controls are possible. Those kinds of unambiguous controls which can be instituted can perhaps be a lot more economically implemented.

QUESTIONER: I reflected this morning that this entire system was the great hope ten years ago, the great hope of teaching machines. The amazing thing is that it is now entirely absent from the entire educational system. I was therefore intrigued that we may have a medical profession beginning to develop this

as an integral part of how new professionals are trained. I raise that point because I would be terribly interested in how that was worked.

I recognize the burden of what you are talking about, cost to make this feasible, but are there barriers beyond that, such as standard satisfaction? Can anybody agree on a solid diagnostic back and forth course? I think these are critically relevant to using this technology in education for corrections.

MR. OGDIN: I think it is that. I will also take a moment to indict the people in the computer business for blindly rushing ahead into areas where they know absolutely nothing. We mentioned privacy and we mentioned computer-assisted instruction. There are a couple of cases in point.

They say, "Yes, all I have to do is this." Suddenly when he builds a system and it does not work right he is not quite sure why because he does not understand the basic problem, such as privacy and security, such as Project SEARCH found out. They had notions earlier as to what they would do. They found out the problems were not there.

I look at IBM spending vast amounts of money to retrofit into an unreliable system privacy controls which you will have to live with in 360's or 370's in the future. It is absurd. I think that is perhaps the area in education which has been the greatest lack. Perhaps I do not understand the problem, but I think the major area is not the availability of technology but knowing how

we should present this stuff.

Program learning, for example, sounds like a fantastic idea until you really do it and find out the typical user gets bored to tears while you go through all this pedantic "BS" of giving him the same stuff he knows to be sure you have a standard established so you can get to the real meat of the thing.

QUESTIONER: There is a conflict here I do not understand. You speak in one area of education where there are restrictive trade practices precluding sufficiency of good education, medical education in this country. There is a massive need, ample educational resources potentially there, restrictive trade practices precluding their availability, and in math the most unlikely area of all.

Take our situation. Everyone is in favor of making available educational programs for people in corrections. There is total lack of any restriction, total desirability of helping them to do it. It is a very odd thing. I don't understand it.

MR. OGDIN: If I may contrast it another way. I think if you look from the public-at-large's vantage point, the roles are exactly reversed.

If you ask the man on the street where he would rather spend his education dollar, I think he would rather spend it on his doctors than inmates.

MR. SKOLER: The doctors' restriction is not the question of available computers and people to do it. There are ample numbers of qualified doctors to do clinical education. It lies in the restrictive trade practices by the doctor. They don't want a sufficiency of doctors.

MR. OGDIN: I will not get into that discussion. The biggest problem we have is not the issue you raise but the issue of a general unwillingness on the part of educators to change the way they have done things.

DR. LEJINS: The question Mr. Skoler raised is a good one. At the University of Maryland we went in the early '60's through a fad of putting on television courses. The proposition was extremely simple and logical. You have a group of one thousand students listening to the same lecture in a huge hall or forty-five sessions where individual instructors relate to groups of thirty or forty the same material.

Why could not these instructors be replaced by a TV set where one experienced well-prepared instructor gives this lecture, the lecture lasts thirty-five minutes, and the remaining ten minutes a junior faculty member answers in person and live all the questions? You have such resistance to this.

I was involved in this because at that time I handled the Department of Sociology. We wanted to do it in the manner I described. The university had a major building program in mind at that time.

It was not the faculty, though they sort of resisted in favor of conventional type of education. It did not work because of the tremendous resistance on the part of the students. Their attitude was, "What the hell. I come here to sit before a TV set? I have to ask a few questions." When the lecture is over, most of the students usually sneak out while the questions are asked and answered.

I don't claim that I have learned from anybody exactly what the situation is, but it is not popular in large courses. Natural science courses still use it, and sometimes you see these small rooms and TV sets with thirty students sitting there and one graduate assistant yawning, sitting there and looking at the lecture with the student to be able to answer questions, and everybody thinks, "This is just the crummiest way of educating anybody." That is the general attitude.

This situation should be explored and analyzed. Why did it not work? I understand it is being done and I know there is some enthusiasm for it yet, but in this case it did not work in spite of a very enthusiastic support of the administration because of the budgetary situation.

MR. OGDIN: There are a couple important things to bring up here. One is the subtlety of interaction between a student and teacher in a classroom which is missing in a video link. The way a good teacher presents his material is directly affected by

the facial expressions on the faces of the people in the classroom.

DR. LEJINS: The teacher is on TV.

MR. OGDIN: But he is not getting feedback from the people in the classroom. The experiment which does work in this area is where the guy is before a classroom but he is also being picked up with a camera and sent elsewhere.

The second thing is that the British have been relatively successful with this. Again the reason is that you do not feel as though you have to drive to school, spend forty-five minutes trying to find a parking place, walk halfway across a campus to sit in front of a boob tube. You do it at home. I think that has a lot to do with it.

QUESTIONER: Interaction is not with the teaching assistant, which I think devastates the program.

MR. OGDIN: It is a second-class educational experience.

COLONEL SULLIVAN: I think your presentation brought us around a very important question for people who are in the administration of corrections arena. We had to go through this in the Department of Defense. Our business is defense. We have two million people. If we want to be a decent organization, we should do something about the quality of their lives.

Do we go into education to do it? We did some on our own, but we finally came to the basic policy point. There is an

establishment in this country. It does the educating. We do the correcting. We do the defending. It is up to the educators to push the state of the art.

If I were sitting here with a state responsibility for correctional institutions, I could understand how one person would be telling me about the possibilities of satellites and the meaning satellites will have for educational systems while another is telling me about the computer and its possibilities, and as one gentleman pointed out, "When do I buy because if I buy today it may be on the shelf tomorrow and there will be something better and cheaper." I say go to your state educational system and buy from them, wherever they stand. I am perhaps jumping the gun because this is an informational portion of the seminar.

MR. VELDE: I would like to offer a different view, though not a dissenting view necessarily.

The purpose of corrections, at least in part, is to correct or to rehabilitate. Based on the numbers which our survey indicated earlier, one of the principal things we have to deal with is the fact that for the most part we are dealing with the rejects, or, if you will, failures of the educational system. Therefore, if you are really trying to rehabilitate, you have to make up for certain deficiencies which have resulted from lack of various social systems to do their job in the first place.

Perhaps this is not the proper role of corrections. However,

it may be. That is a question we should all take a hard look at during the course of this meeting and in other forums as well.

Perhaps one advantage corrections has is that it does not have too many psychiatrists and it does not have too many educators to worry about, at least not professional ones. You have a lot of inmates and staff. The staff, by and large, is not made up of trained educators, as they are not much trained in anything else. Perhaps this could work to our advantage.

COLONEL SULLIVAN: I think you are at a crucial question. You will always have reliance on one another, the correctional institution going to the educational institution, and this will inevitably result in a lover's quarrel. There will always be a love-hate relationship working through there. When you think of the community college, the title is significant. If the people who occupy the correctional institutions are not part of the community what are they? If the community college concept does not reach out to find ways to embrace and deal with these people, then I say it is failing in its institutional role.

MR. VELDE: Your comment bothers me a little. I think about it because, to my way of thinking, I have looked on the military as being the best professional educators we have. You look at the average military career, and more formal time in that career is devoted toward formal and informal educational pursuits, from the staff college level on down to GED along with the correspondence

courses which we will be hearing about later.

That has been one of the basic strengths of the military. They have had the resources to provide a phenomenal array of all kinds of technical courses and other means of making up for the educational deficiencies of the people who enter into the system. It is an ongoing process throughout just about every military career.

COLONEL SULLIVAN: However, we came to the point where we got confused about why we were doing it and confused our institutional role. Historically you can go back to the '20's after World War I where the call was for universal military training - "Send us your rejects and drop-outs, those which the other institutions of society have failed, and we in the space of a year will do it." They reduced the budget to almost nothing. There was a 100,000-man standing army and we stayed that way until World War II.

While we are doing it to serve our mission, and we do it very well, let's give the person all the credit possible for having done that, but let's not confuse why we are doing it and who we are as we are doing it. That is the point I make.

MR. OGDIN: Just to respond to Colonel Sullivan's comment, if you are establishing policy, the first thing to do is to not go by the ground rules. If you want a policy for the next ten to twenty years, the first thing to do is to say, "All right, let's ignore what the existing technique is. Let's establish policy first."

You may say, "All right, use the existing educational facilities. Use the community colleges."

However, if you try to establish policy, the best thing to do is to relax all your constraints.

MR. VELDE: Incidentally, there is not necessarily an assumption that we will have a super satellite-based system in all sorts of technology available.

Let me give you a footnote in the "gee whiz" category.

The first item Jerry sent around for you to see has integrated circuitry, two little chips, silicone glass-based chips. Each of those chips is roughly equivalent to 7,000 radio tubes in terms of the functions they perform.

Technology is being developed now so that on that same sized chip you can get as many as the equivalent of 100,000 radio tubes and at essentially the same manufacturing cost as this. Each of those chips retails from the manufacturer at about \$5 each.

Within three to five years it is probable that using the same manufacturing techniques, in fact the same equipment, and replacing electron beams with light beams and using integrated circuitry with putting light through it rather than electricity, you will again increase the capacity by a factor of about 10,000 with the same manufacturing cost.

This means, then, that you will be able to have a computer

in a patrol car which is the equivalent of the larger commercial computer we now have, perhaps even larger, and coupled with a storage data base so that if you wanted to you could put fingerprint images in that patrol car of everyone in the country.

Obviously, there are a lot of threshold policy questions which must be addressed before we consider application of the technology in this fashion, but there is literally a revolution going on not only in the CPU end of it, the central processor and these other factors, but also in the storage area. Trillion and fifty trillion memory storage cores of desk-top size are beyond the drawing board stage now. Although they would be somewhat expensive right now, the history of the technology development is that costs are crashing down very rapidly.

In a sense we are doing an informal technology assessment regarding the impact of such developments as satellite communications and micro-processors and what all this means in a criminal justice setting.

Next we should hear about PLATO. If there are bigger and better and larger CAI systems, I have not heard about them, although there may well be. This involves computer-assisted instruction.

PLATO happens to be housed at the University of Illinois. I imagine there are something like 2,000 separate programs, that is correctional courses, in this system.

Mike Moore, let's hear more about it.

MR. MOORE: I will be using the project for most of my presentation.

PLATO (Programmed Logic for Automatic Teaching Operations) is a system born out of an idea back in the early '60's.

Don Bitzer is mainly responsible for the development of PLATO both in the hardware as well as implementation of the software. He makes a differentiation between computer-assisted instruction and what he prefers to call computer-based education. It is mainly a matter of emphasis.

Although he would maintain there is no educational technology which will ever replace teacher interaction in the classroom, the teacher interaction can be one of the things which comes from this type of program because these are programs which can be made by teachers, whereas many of the other computer technology educational systems are programmed by professional programmers, people who understand the language, programming it for others.

This is a programming system which can be programmed by people who do not understand or have no desire to understand computers. The language is called TUTOR.

I will show you first an overall view. The central computer complex is connected via telephone lines. The video channel supplies cables through as many as 1,000 terminals. Currently there are PLATO terminals in a number of states from coast to coast,

in Toronto, Canada, and in Germany, connected by a telephone line to any terminal in the world. However, when there is a cluster of more than thirty terminals in a given area, such as now exist in Chicago and San Diego, coaxial cable split into individual terminals is economically more feasible.

Telephone lines can go directly to the computers if they are within the University of Illinois complex or to a single terminal such as the one in Vienna, Illinois.

This is another slide which is an elaboration of the diagram put before you a moment ago. The one major difference in the PLATO system is that in this little box at the lower left-hand corner the extended core storage is a memory bank. The central processing unit is not working eighty-five percent of the time searching for something to do here. The information is in the extended core storage, and when the individual at any given terminal has put some input into the terminal it runs through the system very quickly. The time that the electronic circuits are waiting for the mechanical discs to get around to where the information which they need is contained is cut down by an incredible amount.

This is one of the things available on the terminal. This is the PLATO IV terminal. There is a touch panel available, and I have some slides showing that operation. There is also a slide-selecting type of thing, a microfiche card with 256 positions in it.

When you set up the program, you simply tell the computer to go to a certain numbered slide at a certain time. We are talking about medical types of things here. One of the things they use it for is setting up a model of the human heart, for example. The system has capacity for animation so that you can set up a model of a heart, for example, ask a medical student various questions about it, have him ask the computer questions, capability for animation is there, and you also have the numerical display. This is one of the things you can do on this plasma panel which you cannot do very easily in a conventional cathode tube type of computer system.

The touch panel mentioned at the top is an infrared selector. You program it to react when a certain part of the screen is touched. If the student wants to know what is happening in a part of the heart, he touches that part of the heart and information comes to him.

If he wants to listen to the heart, there is a random access audio device so he can hear the heart beat.

Essentially what happens in the system is that the student presses a key. It goes through the TUTOR logic and it combines with the lessons. Then you get the output which goes back to the student terminals.

This will mean something to computer people more than to me, but it cuts down on echoing. You do not have to have as much

memory within the thing because every key pressed goes through the entire system. This is in micro-seconds so there is almost no visible time lag.

This is one of the first PLATO classrooms at the University of Illinois, where I spent many hours myself when I was first playing around with this system.

When a person signs on to PLATO this is what he sees. This is the display panel. These are displayed on a black matrix. The way it is set up, talking in terms of bits and these sorts of things, the bit message goes out. It tells a certain intersection on the wires in back of the grid to light up. You develop your characters that way.

This slide shows a new typeface which was just designed this summer. It is good for labeling, especially on slides where you have a lot of color and you are afraid of losing the message, or for programs for young people or people who have limited vision.

As you can see here, almost any type of character is available. If it is not already in the system, the lower case-upper case alphabets are all in there as well as other types of signs and functions.

This is an example of a graphic display. When I first got the terminal, I tuned into this thing. It starts as a little bit of a dot, the triangles unfold, and it ends up this way as you see it on the slide in about a second and a half.

It grows in front of you on the screen.

QUESTIONER: What is the utility of that?

MR. MOORE: Only to show that it can be done if you need to make a graphic display. There are many types of things you can do. The computer will generate graphic displays based on the types of inputs you put into it. You can change your angles and the number of lines, and this will generate an infinite number of figures which are similar to roses.

This slide shows one of the best types of things that PLATO has, and some of the examples will show this. This is from a high school physics example and shows what the student sees at a point in the lesson. When he sees that arrow, he is expected to give an answer. He types it in with the key set. It looks like a standard typewriter key, but it is modified somewhat.

He types in his answer. Not only has this person who set this up told the computer to say "No", after the computation because he set up a correct equation, but he tells him how to find out the reason he is wrong.

In the next page he puts the thing into numerals and gives an example of why that particular equation would not work.

The man says, "All right, I will fix the computer. I know what it is. I will give something off the wall." He types in something which is right but much more than he needs.

The computer says that is right but at the same time gives

him a simpler form of the equation.

QUESTIONER: It is programmed to encompass all errors?

MR. MOORE: You can program it that way. What happens on a program like this is that you simply feed in --

QUESTIONER: The most typical errors?

MR. MOORE: You don't have to program it for all contingencies. You can simply set it in. The computer will make a decision based on the input that the student gives back, make the computation to see whether it is the correct type of answer, and if not give the reasons why. You have to put in the contingencies, such as what happens if he gets it wrong. You can put those in random order, too. The computer does all the computation.

This is another program. One of the first programs which was up was called "Fruit Fly". What it does is to take the parts of fruit flies, tells you that you have a couple stocks, and it shows you what the possibilities are for these types of flies - various mutants, and so on.

What do you want to do next? You want to mate the flies? Fine. It gives you an offspring. You can keep going on.

This student wanted to save, so he saved number two. We asked what he wants to name it. He said Jerry.

Then he saves another number. "What do you want to call it?" He says, "Mary". That is fine. He probably says he wants to breed them with cross flies.

The male parent - Mary? No. Wrong sex. It tells him to press a "help" button, and it tells him what to do. It states the female abdomen is longer and more pointed.

Then he takes the offspring and finds some characteristics popping up.

In the general ethics lab they used to go through fruit fly experiments and it would take almost a semester to do some of these generations of fruit flies. The continuity of the whole experiment was really lost on a student when he was starting back in September and sometimes runs through to February. If somebody opened the door in December at the wrong time, the whole experiment was wiped out.

This, then, gave the man at least an idea of what could happen and give an appreciation of how to go about exploring these kinds of things.

Another tremendous area of computers is simulations and games. This is one on population dynamics. The computer processes these based on the kind of information the student gives it. It gives him a table of the kinds of things he wants to do.

He has chosen the U.S.A. He wants to talk about the total fertility rate. All right, currently the total fertility rate of Mexico is at 200,000,000 marks before the year 2020. This is graphed out.

Then he will change that fertility rate from 6.11 live births to 3.0 live births gradually over the next fifteen years.

I said I wanted it changed to two-thirds within a year and a half. PLATO came back and asked, "What are you trying to do to those four people?" That was one of the contingencies programmed in.

Then he wants to see what that looks like compared with the data he had before. It is graphed up here. They will still be growing but only to the year 2050 when there will be a population of 200,000,000 whereas they otherwise would have had it in thirty years.

Comparing populations? In 1970 these were the age group populations of the United States and Mexico. By 1990 what will it look like based on current kinds of population growth rates, fertility rates, and these kinds of things? The computer will make that project.

This program crashes into the "W" and changes one plus three times four. It is a race between the train and the stagecoach. The student is on a track. He draws it out and it tells him how to play the game. He can play it against PLATO, another person at this terminal, or a person at another terminal.

He spins these little dials and comes up with a certain number of numbers. You can use those in any combination of operations as long as you use each number once and each operation once.

You then write out your equation, press "Next", and it tells you to total it up. If you get the right answer, it tells you you

are right, and if it is wrong, it tells you that you have lost your turn.

This game now is well on its way. There are a number of other rules we will not go into.

There is also a second version of this game which deals with sign numbers which can really do a job on you if you have not worked with sign numbers for one hundred years such as I have.

QUESTIONER: What is the game test?

MR. MOORE: How the West was won?

QUESTIONER: Yes.

MR. MOORE: It gives a man an idea of how he can use numbers to his advantage in a gaming situation. I put that up on the terminal and let some people fool around with it. I have people who have been struggling with multiplication, and so on. Now that they see how multiplying can be used, what it is there for, they are actually understanding the process more and using it in this game. It is a motivational device, plus the fact it gives them numbers practice.

QUESTIONER: This will be multiplication practice?

MR. MOORE: Multiplication, addition, division, subtraction. You can use any of the four basic areas of operation, but you can use it only once.

QUESTIONER: Very basic education?

MR. MOORE: Very basic, but yet it is not silly.

The next one coming up is specifically for children. The animal bagger is shown here. From the left-hand side of the screen a "B" comes across. When the "B" gets over the bag a hand reaches up and grabs the "B".

This is Mr. Harry Wiggle. This will get a child familiar with and comfortable with a computer. There is a touch panel around it. He explains his plight. He tells him that if you want to take a turtle out of the tub, touch the turtle.

You put your hand on the thing and the turtle disappears. I have seen kids touch the turtle, it disappears, they look at their hand, and they couldn't figure out where it went.

Then you put it back into one of the other baskets. Eventually a fraction lesson comes out of it. Now he talks in terms of fractions, half the turtle, and so on.

This is a student using the touch panel. You point to your position on the board and the computer program reacts to the cutting of that infrared light beam trying to get across there at that particular point.

This is the random access audio device. It looks a little like our record player but instead of having a record on top it is a magnetic disc. The access time is between one and two-tenths or one and two milliseconds. I cannot remember the exact random access time.

With this the individual puts on the headset. The computer communicates with him by voice. It is the teacher's voice.

This is one of the things that perhaps has the best application to corrections networks kinds of things. If you are setting up a course, you can also set up a program for that course to find out how your people are doing in that course. The computer takes care of the computations. It will show you at any given time how each student is doing, what area he is in, how long he has been there. You can bring it down to what the average time in the class is in each of the areas, which gives you some idea of how that program was set up.

If this area is particularly difficult, how can you simplify it? How do you cut down the time on it or do whatever else you want to do?

You can also use it as a device for working validity and test questions. If you are getting ninety-five percent of one test question wrong, there is something not there that should be there or vice versa, then you can get the response.

Here is a chemistry program. He is looking for a particular student and how he did with each lesson. This is the number of questions he got wrong, the number of times he had to get help. With that kind of record available, with the kinds of inter-institutional transcripts you run into all the time, it would cut down tremendously and augment tremendously the validity of information

that the new education department was getting from the old education department.

The use of a computer as a medium for storing information is familiar to all of you. PLATO also has those abilities.

I talked about TUTOR language before. This is perhaps the most beautiful part of PLATO. On the left-hand side the basic building block of the PLATO programming is the unit. You start off by saying this is a unit. They have identified it as 1.

It states, "Draw". It gives the grid drawing on the screen. That will come out to a triangle.

Then it says, "At 2214". This is 64 lines down and 32 lines across. 2214 means 22 lines down and it starts 14 characters in.

At 2214 write what kind of figure this is.

The arrow is at 2214. It tells the computer you are expecting an answer.

You tell the computer the answer you want is right triangle. "Triangle" is a word which needs to be in there. "It", "is", "a", "the" are words that can be in there but they are not necessary. Wrong is square.

When you put this into the student mode, it comes out looking like that. It is a simple operation, merely touch of a key.

The student says, "It is a pretty nice tringle."

Right? The computer says "No". It says, "'Pretty' and 'nice' are not needed words. 'Triangle' has been misspelled." The student

coming into the system learns that from the computer.

Under the word "right" there is an arrow which indicates that word is in the wrong place. It should be back in this other part of the sentence.

Then the student retypes the answer. It is a right triangle. The computer says, "Okay."

This is another program for drawing the last thing you will see on this, just another one of the graphic possibilities that PLATO has. This display is brought to you by PLATO IV.

PLATO can display all your alpha numerical characters, graphics, computational operations, judging, random access audio device which is improving with time.

In about another year it will be perfected. You have a touch panel which is already in operation in many places. It has branch programming throughout the system, which is a big capability. Also, it is silent. You do not have this noisy teletype.

You have a display panel instead of the cathode tube so there is no problem of fade-out. You do not have the echoing effect because everything goes through the terminal. It gives simple language that everyone can understand.

It operates through a telephone line. That is how we are connected up to the University of Illinois.

It has been suggested that courses could be put on this to upgrade the correctional staffs of various institutions around the

country, giving correctional officers the opportunity to take professional courses and this sort of thing. It would certainly allow for that - simulations, games, tremendous possibilities.

As far as basic adult education, the area I am working in right now, the possibilities are not unlimited because nothing ever is, but the possibilities right now are beyond my scope to see the limit.

The one thing it will never do is to replace a human being. It is a computer system. It is not a computer take-over.

QUESTIONER: What is the administrative shape of PLATO? Is it a department of the University? Do you need technicians? How large is it? How many dollars a year are involved?

MR. MOORE: They don't discuss the budget with me. Currently it is pretty much the project of the CERL, Computer Education Research Lab. Donald Bitzer runs it. It has been a ten-year project as of this fall.

I will not be able to give any information other than that the projected cost is fifty cents per student contact hour. I cannot give any other information on cost factors because as of this fall Control Data Corporation are taking over all the marketing for it. The University will still be in the developmental end.

QUESTIONER: How many terminals do you have in Vienna?

MR. MOORE: Only one. It came in last week.

QUESTIONER: How many terminals are on the system?

MR. MOORE: Right now there are 1,000. I am not sure of the exact number, close to 500 actually operational at this point. The system will take 1,008. This is what it will take right now.

MR. VELDE: Through how many educational systems are these dispersed?

MR. MOORE: In terms of people subscribing to it?

MR. VELDE: Where are the terminals located?

MR. MOORE: When I was in the corrections systems they were located in universities, in Aberdeen, Maryland, located in Chanute Air Force Base and San Diego.

QUESTIONER: Where are they located in corrections and what are they doing?

MR. MOORE: I believe the only one that is inside of corrections is the one we have at Vienna.

MR. VELDE: At one time was there not an idea of putting one at Joliet?

MR. MOORE: Yes, but it was never placed there.

QUESTIONER: Is the student targeted through staff, inmates, or both?

MR. MOORE: Right now the student is targeted through the residence. There are a number of reasons for that. That is where we need to do our development right now. Eventually it has other possibilities.

MR. PAPPAS: It would seem to me that the elimination of the human element has some pluses. Where you have situations where people have had negative learning experiences, educational experiences, getting rid of the human factor perhaps eliminates a real detriment to learning.

MR. MOORE: That is one possibility, the individual starts off with a mistrust of teachers. This individual often will be drawn almost as a moth to the flame because it is a fun thing to work with. Before he realizes it he is building up a skill or learning something. The teacher can step in at the appropriate time.

MR. MOYER: I can give some testimonial to this. I have had kids on this system. They are used in elementary schools and I have had them from kindergarten through the eighth grade. They come after us to keep working with them. It does not replace the teacher, but it complements the teacher and the teacher can communicate with students. After school hours kids are still there. There is a motivation factor.

The other thing is that you have a reverse problem. You have to face the problem of whether you want kids in high school at the age of thirteen. Learning is accelerated. We have had to face that. If he wants to progress that fast in terms of outpacing his physical development, he has that capability.

MR. PAPPAS: One of the real applications is in literacy training

where people are reluctant to participate in a classroom and the interaction process where they could really learn without having the human element involved.

MR. MOORE: Another thing you reminded me of - a person at a terminal can talk to a person at any other terminal within the system simply by pressing two of the auxiliary buttons, typing in their talk, and they will ask you whom you want to communicate with. A number of times I have called Champaign and talked to people there, talking about various problems I was having because I was away from it a year. It is like taking French 1 and finding yourself a year later in a room full of French majors.

MR. KEVE: It seems to me you have cultural ethnic special situations it might adapt to rather nicely. In Minnesota, for instance, in terms of my own experience with the Indian culture, with the tremendous problem we faced in trying to reach the Indian group, and there are many of them, I would think the Federal Bureau would find the same thing at Englewood. There is an acute bashfulness, to put it mildly, on the part of the Indian group which feels their own strangeness in the white man's culture and great reluctance they have to "expose their ignorance" by being in a classroom asking questions which they feel would expose them to ridicule for even asking.

Coupled with that you have their own need for greater awareness of their own cultural backgrounds.

At the same time you have a dearth of people who can teach in their cultural context. It might just be great to have something like this which is, you might say, a computer talking Indian to a group of Indians. You might reach them where nothing else we have ever would.

MR. MOORE: A program has been put up in Chicago which teaches English in terms of street dialects - comments, recognizing sentence structure, and that sort of thing.

QUESTIONER: A second language?

MR. MOORE: Not a second language, standard English but in a straight voice.

MR. VELDE: I will ask Nick Pappas to proceed with his statement.

MR. PAPPAS: The Omnibus Crime control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 gave recognition to the need for education and training in criminal justice for staff members in the system and to the offenders who are caught up in it. For corrections the support of educational and training programs has had a special urgency. Numerous commissions over the years have cited the need for improved education programs for offenders and concomitant training and education for staff.

Traditionally education programs for offenders have been a major component of all correctional programming efforts. Over the years, these programs have provided a major thrust in the correctional approach to the treatment of the offender.

The training and education of staff has not, however, had the strong tradition associated with inmate programs. Although some correctional systems have in the past attempted to train staff, the major effort has been limited to the occasional training programs provided by universities. The universities have also been the major source of professional correctional manpower, such as teachers, social workers, and psychologists.

The passage of the Crime Control Act of 1968 and its amendment in 1973 gave focus to correctional programming and through Part E provided a new impetus to training and education in corrections.

The Part E provisions of the Act provide both Discretionary and Block Funds exclusively to corrections with the objectives of improving correctional programming in all areas, and upgrading correctional facilities. Although Part E highlighted corrections, states have become increasingly aware of correctional needs in education and training for inmates, and have used action funds (Part C) for programs in this area. Thus both Part E and block moneys have funded a variety of programs for inmates in job training, secondary education, education release, and college education.

The table below reflects funding for inmate education and training programs for two years based on reports from the computerized data system. 1974 figures are not available since they are not entered in the system at this time. Gross figures are

provided below, and further detail is given in Appendix B. (See Appendix D to this transcript, page 182.)

	Allocations		Expenditures	
	Part E	Part C	Part E	Part C
1972	97,500	698,000	6,958	23,682
1973	113,000	850,000	10,844	11,831
TOTALS	210,500	1,548,000	17,802	35,513

These figures do not include programs funded in years prior to 1972 that have not been entered on the reporting system and therefore not available.

In addition to the above, LEAA is currently involved in the development of grants that will address inmate education programs in other ways. The American Bar Association has recently submitted a grant to improve for literacy education in institutions. Although such programs have been a part of prison education for many years, it has been difficult to elicit a great deal of inmate participation by those who need it. The current proposal will train trainers to teach literacy teaching techniques to teachers, inmates and volunteers. It is anticipated that expanding the base of teaching personnel and the use of inmates and volunteers may provide a fresh approach to teaching of illiterates.

The training and education for offenders is concerned with more than education per se. It reflects a concern for providing the participating inmate with more options, an opportunity to be

aware of more choices and the ability to make decisions based on better information than he has had in the past. Education provides some basic skills in dealing with the world, for example improving literacy may improve his ability to find work; vocational training may provide work competence.

Another current proposal has been submitted by the Education Commission of the States. The project proposes to examine the issues and problems of education in correctional institutions, and develop recommendations and guidelines that can be used by correctional administrators and legislators in reshaping programs in their states. The project will address both administrative issues, and the impact of new technology in correctional education.

The Part E also addresses the need for staff training and has language making it incumbent upon the state to provide "satisfactory assurances that it is engaging in projects to improve the recruiting, organization training and education of personnel employed in correctional activities."

In addition to the Part E, Section 402 of Part D, and Section 406 specifically address training and education of personnel. Section 402 addresses staff training, while Section 406 established an educational assistance program for personnel.

As a consequence, programs have been funded for offenders in education and training, and a number of major program categories have been established for personnel.

Funding in correctional training and education, exclusive of the LEEP program is shown below (in thousands):

FISCAL YEAR	<u>1972</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>
Part E	6,587	7,108	3,606
Part C	11,687	9,246	1,200
Other	<u>445</u>	<u>552</u>	<u>64</u>
TOTALS	18,719	16,906	4,870

A number of program thrusts in personnel training have been supported by LEAA. One of these is the Law Enforcement Education Program (LEEP). This program provides financial assistance to allow in-service criminal justice personnel to continue their education at the college and university level. It also provides funds to men and women preparing for careers in criminal justice. Two types of financial assistance are offered under LEEP:

- a. Grants of up to \$250 per academic quarter, or \$400 per semester for qualified full-time employees of publicly funded law enforcement and criminal justice agencies.
- b. Loans of up to \$2,200 per academic year for qualified students enrolled in a program of study directly related to law enforcement and criminal justice.

Appendix A (see Appendix C to this transcript, page 181) is a breakdown of LEEP expenditures and criminal justice participants.

To date the LEEP program has had heavier participation by police: eighty percent.

Another major program in the education of personnel is the recent funding of the National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium. In 1973, LEAA funded the establishment of a seven university consortium whose primary purpose is to develop and strengthen the research activities and criminal justice graduate programs in each member institution. The consortium schools will contribute to the education of correctional personnel since they will evaluate the criminal justice curricula of other colleges in addition to their other activities. It is anticipated that some of their graduates will enter the personnel structure of the criminal justice system.

Five million dollars will be allocated to this project over a three-year period.

Staff training is aimed at improving work performance, and during periods of increased program and organizational change, provides a basis for increased training readiness. Changes in corrections require well trained staff, individuals who are capable of assuming new roles, and able to be trained for this purpose.

Finally, programs that provide educational opportunities for offenders, must be paralleled by similar programs for staff. The inequity resulting from college programs providing for offenders

in the institutions cannot help but widen the distance between the offender and the custodial staff that must relate to him.

In order to meet the need for the training of correctional personnel, LEAA and the Bureau of Prisons, have since 1973 jointly funded the National Institute of Corrections. This organization has a program development function, providing assistance to the states in the development of training grants that are supported by LEAA funds. To date, LEAA funds for training grants in this area have exceeded \$1,000,000.

Training programs in corrections, as in all other fields, have depended on traditional methods, with the support of relatively traditional technology. The problem in both education and training is one of providing information, and stimulation, in combination with an economic and effective delivery system. In this regard some progress has been made in converting training material for use with sight sound machines, tape recorders, and video tape. Telephone line transmission of televised lectures originating in a university classroom have made it possible to conduct training and educational programs throughout a state.

Education and training materials are available that can be converted to use by the new technology. Although the initial cost may appear great, it will afford to corrections an opportunity to reach more of its clients and personnel quickly and effectively. Hopefully the new technology will help us solve some of the more

difficult problems of staff training. It will bring a standardization of basic procedures to many small jails. It will give the agency that cannot afford a training officer the ability to plug into training expertise otherwise not available. And it will provide a quick and inexpensive method of disseminating new methods and new technology to the field.

MR. VELDE: Would the Bureau of Prisons like to make a statement at this point?

DR. DAY: We are looking for any kind of goodies to steal, borrow or beg from anybody who has ideas on training for managing treatment. We will be glad to pick the brain of every person here in the room for ideas you have to assist us.

MR. VELDE: Next I would like briefly to call on Charles Friel to tell us a little bit about OBSCIS.

DR. FRIEL: Thank you, Mr. Velde. The goal of the Offender Based State Corrections Information System (OBSCIS) project is to design, implement, and evaluate a prototype computerized prisoner accounting system applicable to prisoners in state penal institutions. To reach this goal, the following objectives have been set:

- . Perform a requirements analysis of the information needs of state prison administrators, other criminal justice agencies relative to state prisoners, planners, researchers, and legislators.
- . Prepare an information system design based on required data elements including data collection forms, and output tables.

- Test the system design by actual implementation in ten state prison systems.
- Report the results of the test, including recommendations for multi-state implementation as part of the OBTS/CCH module of the comprehensive Data Systems Program.

In the area of technological advance, automated information systems have had the greatest impact on the operations of criminal justice agencies. They create a new dimension for routine management tasks, statistical research, administration, and planning. They provide a common denominator for transforming the non-system of criminal justice into a functional entity. Through system-wide exchange of information, agencies can actually develop, plan for, and participate in meaningful cooperation. And the overall system view to which automated information contributes, permits high-level decision makers in the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of government a clearer perspective for establishing basic policies.

Historically, correctional agencies have been the weakest link in applying and benefiting from automated information. The great majority of agencies have not taken advantage of even the minimal opportunities which automation offers. The OBSCIS project proposes to take the first step toward developing major uses of automated information in the area of corrections. It proposes to begin with the operations of statewide correctional agencies; more specifically, it selects state prison systems as the logical

starting point for development of a prisoner accounting information system.

Prisons occupy a pre-eminent, yet precarious, position in contemporary state correctional systems. Their role is currently under intensive scrutiny. The President's Crime Commission found in 1965 that 38% of the adult felon population was undergoing imprisonment. This proportion is gradually decreasing because of increased interest in non-institutional correctional alternatives and this shift in philosophic emphasis will have an impact on the nature of the prison population. There may be a trend toward limiting incarceration to those from whom the public cannot be protected in any other way. At the same time, pressure will continue for prison authorities to increase the variety of treatment programs and services, and to extend the range of available types of facilities. As this trend continues, particularly with the use of state assistance funds, state agencies may find that an important contribution they can make to local treatment programs is centralized record keeping and management.

But whether decision making focuses on how to decrease prison utilization or how to make existing facilities consistent with prisoner requirements for treatment or restraint, prison administrators, researchers, and legislators will need reliable, timely information.

Automated information services are needed to permit correctional

agencies the same capabilities in performing their role in the criminal justice system that law enforcement agencies, and to a lesser extent the courts, are obtaining. Without an adequate data base, there is a danger that the prison establishment will become static, defensive, and irrelevant. An equal danger is that a comprehensive view of that is happening throughout the criminal justice system becomes impossible to establish.

Many factors make the time right for the development of a corrections information system that can be implemented in many states. The CDS program of LEAA requires that states develop an OBTS and CCH capability - both require standard input from corrections. A design and implementation project coordinated at the national level will ensure that minimum data requirements were compatible on an interstate basis and that the most relevant corrections applications are available to all state corrections. In addition, the OBSCIS project will bring together correctional administrators with diverse needs and problems. Thus, the resulting information system will serve many situations. The OBSCIS project will provide detailed documentation that will permit state corrections to rapidly participate in the state CDS development.

Four approaches to information use are proposed as the basic structure for carrying out the prisoner accounting information system; each contributes a new capability to policy making.

#### Individual Offender Accounting

Computerized individual records provide the basis for keeping track of individuals. They record all changes in status from initial commitment to final discharge. They contain notification procedures that an individual's status should be under review.

Statewide and national computerized criminal history-offender based transactional statistics, and in particular the National Prisoner Statistics system, will be among the prime beneficiaries of data extracted from individual records.

#### Management Information

Management information concerns the need for operational control and routine decision making. It works within the realm of aggregate data, whether population capacities, offender classifications, program assignments, staff allocations, or budgetary allotments. It provides notification when conditions vary from established standards; it serves day-to-day activities as well as the planning function. Most important, management information can equip correctional administrators for more flexible and responsive decision making as they face the issues affecting institutional corrections today.

#### Research Capability

The application of information to research requirements shades into management information at the point where statistical

data is used to measure achievement of such simple program objectives as the number of prisoners who can successfully complete a program.

But information can accomplish far more in the institutional research setting. The two uses of research are program evaluation and experimentation.

Thorough program evaluation requires examination of a number of different levels of performance. These range from whether the program accomplished its numerical objectives to the relevancy of these objectives in the overall correctional structure and alternative methods of accomplishing the same results. Experimentation, as with evaluation, requires the ability to take into consideration data collected over long spans of time. With automated information capabilities, the researcher can aggregate and manipulate the large quantities of detailed data necessary to perform evaluation and experimentation adequately. The system will enable administrators and planners to take a more sophisticated look at the range of correctional programs and environments they create in their institutions. They will permit an in-depth look at the sentencing mechanism as created by the legislature and implemented by the judiciary.

#### Ad Hoc Inquiries

Many items of information useful to administrators, researchers, judges, or legislators do not have to be reported regularly. But

when that information is needed, whether about individuals, offenses, programs, or trends, the answer must be both immediate and accurate. Automated information systems create this capability.

The development of prisoner accounting information systems at the state level also fits in well with the need to strengthen such national systems of criminal statistics as National Prisoner Statistics (NPS). While state level systems are designed primarily for state needs, attention can also be given to making them responsive to present and contemplated development in the NPS. Automated systems ensure state reliability as respondents in national reporting.

The uses of state penal agencies for automated prisoner accounting system can be summed up in one sentence: Prisons in this nation need to change and they are already changing; reliable, readily accessible information is needed to permit change in an orderly, intelligent manner.

Creating the system within state prison agencies will also benefit other components of corrections. Prisons have relatively immobile populations and are in a better position to apply, test, and refine information modules than those agencies like parole, probation, and local facilities with more transient populations. Furthermore, because of the economics of size, prison agencies are in a financially superior position to build large-scale

systems. But the end results will almost certainly guide the development of more adequate offender and program information techniques for the entire correctional field.

The potential impact of the OBSCIS project is further strengthened by its identification with Project SEARCH. SEARCH has been deeply involved in the prototypal development of information systems. It undertakes only those projects which have multi-state utility for the application of advanced technology to criminal justice. Placing the OBSCIS project under a project committee of SEARCH ensures its compatibility with other national and state information systems concerned with criminal histories, offender-based transaction statistics, and judicial operations. Since SEARCH is composed of all fifty states, and maintains a lengthy mailing list of regular respondents, the project will receive the kind of national exposure required as the first step toward its widespread adoption.

The OBSCIS project concerns requirements analysis, design, and monitored implementation of a state-level information systems for corrections. The result will be a model prisoner accounting system that, assisted by the documentation produced, can be implemented in all states. The requirements analysis and system design will be accomplished by a project committee established within Project SEARCH and reporting to the SEARCH Executive Committee.

As part of the system definition, the committee will determine the relative differences in capabilities and experience with corrections information system that exists within the states. Based on this review, a multiple level of system design sophistication will be arrived at to assure that the system will have utility across the spectrum of states. A number of basic functions will be incorporated into the system definition.

First, the design will consider the need for information to support departmental budget activities. Second, the broad categories of data for administrative decision-making will be explored to assure that information is developed for program administration, daily operations and departmental management. Third, the needs for long-range planning and forecasting and corrections population projection will be explored. Finally, the system definition will examine the requirements to provide evaluative information to relate outcomes to the decisions that preceded them.

In addition to the operational requirements just enumerated, the system definition will consider the information and data necessary to support ongoing corrections research.

The end result of this task will be a statement of system objectives in terms of the characteristics and nature of the system to be designed and tested.

A private consulting firm has been selected through competitive

bidding to coordinate the project, provide the technical services, and support the project committee. The committee is composed of correctional administrators and individuals with expertise in corrections information and statistics. Participation by the American Correctional Association and its affiliate, the Association for Correctional Research and Statistics, will be sought.

The actual scope and requirements for a prisoner accounting system in state penal institutions will be defined by the OBSCIS Committee. In performing this task, the Committee will require its staff to analyze existing literature, annual reports of corrections agencies, and to survey correctional administrators. It is the Committee's responsibility to identify the actual fields of inquiry and desirable level of depth. In addition to satisfying defined information needs and uses, the data elements must be compatible with a national prisoner reporting format and the need of computerized criminal history (CCH) and offender-based transactional statistics (OBTS) for data on correctional dispositions. The project staff will also review the requirements of existing state-level systems for correctional data. Careful consideration will be given to the methods by which corrections data can be "linked" to other criminal justice data to provide complete tracking of individuals.

Second, the staff will develop a set of data collection

forms to be used in the demonstration phase of the project. Although it is recognized that the actual methods of data collection will vary from state to state as a function of laws and procedures, alternative concepts for the collection of source data will be detailed. The implementation will provide tests of some of these alternatives.

Third, output reports will be designed. The reports will incorporate the objectives of the system by displaying operational information to administrators in a format useful to them. Various output formats will be designed for evaluation during the demonstration. An analysis will be made of the report designs from the standpoint of their utility to operational corrections personnel.

(Dr. Friel's Exhibit 1: Project Schedule appears as Appendix E to this transcript, page 183.)

The staff will produce flow charts and write programming specifications to assist the state in computer processing of the collected data. They will prepare the various output formats which the system generates. The software will be used to process the data collected during the implementation.

- . Examination of the implementation process in the test states so that strengths and weakness related to implementation can be documented.
- . An extensive critique of the usefulness and relevance of the system's output.

- . Analysis of the extent to which the system interfaces with OBTS and computerized criminal histories.
- . A report for the committee and LEAA containing recommendations that may be embodied in system re-design by the committee or in the final report of the project itself.

MR. VELDE: Next we have Dr. Lejins.

DR. LEJINS: I would like to say to Dr. Friel, perhaps in honor of Tony Trivisono, who is present for the first time as Director of the American Correctional Association, that as early as 1951, if my memory is correct, the American Correctional Association voted a resolution which was proposed by the Research Council and the Director of the FBI requesting the development of what is now called offender-based statistics. They were referred to as criminal career statistics in addition to the types of statistics that the FBI has.

Regarding information with regard to the University of Maryland, I shall proceed with some cold figures rather than a description of the history. After I give you these figures, then you can gauge the level of attention from your point of view, whether these figures merit great attention. The University College of the University of Maryland in its extension work had in the year 1973-74, the past academic year, 118,000 enrollments in the off-campus extension program. This does not mean 118,000 students. It means the number of courses for which the students enrolled.

Inasmuch as there is a large percentage of students enrolled for one course the figure is not so much lower.

The college awarded the following degrees, again in that one academic year - BA's, 786; BS's, 327; AA's, 861.

These off-campus courses were taught in the European Division, in the Far East Division, State-side Division, and the Far East Division, being primarily military enrollments.

The college maintains what could be referred to as campuses, from 150 to 200 campuses currently, some of them having as few as fifteen students, some having as many as 800 students.

State-side, as far as military involvement is concerned, teaches at the Pentagon, Bolling, Andrews and some other nearby military installations.

Again to continue with figures, in extension there are law enforcement courses taught and the criminology courses taught. Altogether there were 4,300-plus enrollments in these criminal justice courses combined. Approximately 2,700 were in law enforcement and 1,552 were in the criminology-type courses in this one academic year.

To indicate the military enrollment, in the European Division, in the combined law enforcement and criminology courses, there were over 2,000 enrollments in the study of criminal justice. In the Far East Division there was a smaller number, approximately 80 enrollments in the criminal justice courses.

The so-called University College was started in 1947 under a different name. The military program started in 1949, so that very recently the twenty-fifth year anniversary of the military program was celebrated. The military program coexists every year with the Army and with the Air Force. There are letters of understanding with the Navy and Marines.

The program consists simply of the fact that the University of Maryland establishes - and this, by the way, is entirely undergraduate education but leading to the bachelor degrees - a small center usually for the entire country where the U.S. military forces are located, and undertakes to teach classes in a wide variety of subjects. The military usually pays three-quarters of the tuition, and one-quarter of the tuition is paid by the individual himself or herself.

The students are primarily military personnel, but their dependents are allowed to enroll as well as any U.S. Federal Government employees who happen to be in the area. These, then, are not purely military courses.

Historically, and we are interested in development right now, the University of Maryland is a state university and it had a considerable amount of pressure for extension training and education, usually in the evening, the non-working hours.

Pressure was especially strong from the educational system for teachers who came to summer school, and, in order to increase

their qualifications and get raises, incentives were there, also, to come in the evenings. I taught that program for a number of years and I remember very well how a student in an evening course in Baltimore argued with me that she should be getting at least a "C" and not a "D" because this makes a difference of \$35 in her paycheck from now on if she does not get a grade of at least a "C".

Then, beginning with 1949, the interest of the military came to bear. I thought the second course I taught was in criminology, a course in the Pentagon. The military since that time maintained an interest in having this instruction at the Pentagon and surrounding military installations, then transferring it to Europe.

The moment any military units of the United States moved somewhere, almost immediately several courses moved with it. In Vietnam and everywhere the University College has been teaching.

The instruction of the University College is not modern. I discussed this point in connection with Mr. Velde's asking me to make a brief presentation here. I went to the Dean of the college. He said that we are extremely old-fashioned in our instruction in that sense, that because of this great mobility of courses, types of courses, what we do is to employ an instructor, and this instructor then goes to the particular military installation and gives a course. The military personnel then takes the course which is taught in the same way it would be at the University of Maryland,

and that is that. They then get a grade.

The taking of these courses is recognized by the University of Maryland as being in residence, so there is no problem of establishing residence requirements. You can be stationed in any country of Europe or Africa, Greenland, Vietnam, and while you were in Vietnam or in Okinawa, all of a sudden you have accumulated the necessary amount of credits and get your bachelor's degree. You do not have to set foot on the University of Maryland campus.

Academic controls of this program are extremely straight in the sense that all instructors in the program must be approved by the subject matter department at the regular university. This is one of the major chores, approving instructors for these thousands of students throughout the world, particularly in the area of criminal justice which is my responsibility.

The University has ruled that the person who gives approval should ask the question whether this person who offers to teach psychology would be hired by the department on the campus as an instructor in that course. If not, they refuse. I will say I refuse perhaps eighty percent of those who have applied for instruction.

As to instructors, most of them are part-time. Again the University College prides itself on the fact that because it can be part-time instructors by correspondence, they snatch from Washington sometimes extremely competent people in respective

departments of government and elsewhere who are competent to teach an academic course but cannot take on a full-time load. They are, however, willing to teach a course in the evening.

They also employ full-time personnel. For instance, I signed a contract for all those who are employed full-time for the University College, an extremely independent operation except for the quality controls and the fact they use textbooks which we prescribe. I routinely get all the grade distributions from all the instructors from all over the world for review, so quality controls are there.

As I say, the instruction is extremely conventional. You have the lecturer, classroom, considerable care in establishing the libraries in the vicinity of the military installations which have a considerable number of students, and there is always a hassle with the textbooks. If we change a textbook, there is a problem with shipping the proper textbooks. Sometimes a whole load of textbooks have been changed and that causes a problem.

Four universities were selected to start this program. The University of Maryland has the only program which has been thoroughly implemented and at the present time the enrollment is very small, only 400 students, but it is also the first year of its operation.

QUESTIONER: What geographic range does that cover?

DR. LEJINS: At this moment it is very small - Washington,

D.C., Virginia, a little of West Virginia, Maryland.

MR. VELDE: Would you elaborate on the concept of open universities?

DR. LEJINS: It is really teaching students at home and receiving correspondence courses which are organized into a program. For instance, there are courses which are now available in humanities, behavioral sciences, mathematics, management, urban development, psychological perspective, sociological perspective, and so on.

QUESTIONER: Is this done by television?

DR. LEJINS: Yes. This extension program with the military has instruction as I have described it.

MR. PAPPAS: Is there a time limit on completion of the course for a degree?

DR. LEJINS: There is on campus, but for this program it is adjusted in accordance with needs. This is an extremely profitable program. The University College is one unit of the University which is not state-funded. They earn all their money.

Of course, the Division of Conferences earns quite a bit of money. There is an extension now and the building now costs between \$11 million and \$12 million.

There is an extensive conference facility. It was all built by money earned from the University College. There are no state moneys involved. In many ways it operates almost as a private

enterprise responding all the time to wherever the demand is demonstrated. The major area for it always has been contact with the military.

MR. VELDE: Would you mention the consortium very briefly?

DR. LEJINS: I don't know how many of you are aware of the fact that there exists a consortium which briefly, as the original contract called it, was called Educational Development Consortium. Now it has been more elaborately identified as the National Criminal Justice Educational Development Consortium. It is based on a contract, a consortium agreement, signed on the 16th day of November, 1973, in the presence of Mr. Velde, who then took us for a luncheon in the Attorney General's private dining room, and the presidents and chancellors of seven universities involved selected by LEAA.

The charge of the consortium agreement is that these universities are being supported, and agree to develop stronger, to develop or strengthen the graduate, especially doctoral programs, in the area of criminal justice for the purpose of increasing the supply of teachers and researchers specifically for the purpose of evaluation of criminal justice projects of various kinds, and also operational programs.

It seemed to me, at least, and here I go to my personal interpretation, that thousands of institutions are involved now instead of several hundreds, from less than 100 to over 1,000 programs

offering instruction in the area of criminal justice.

As to the number of instructors, nobody knows. We have community colleges, two-year colleges, four-year colleges, AA degrees, bachelor's degrees, master's degrees, and so on. All this has led to the fact that in many cases the quality of the instruction staff had to be very low, very unprofessional, though it was good in many cases, and there was the idea that one had to produce more teachers.

On the other hand, the need to evaluate the effectiveness of funded projects by LEAA and by the states, and also to evaluate operational programs in view of this growing request to know how successful our work is, requires evaluation of our research. Therefore, there is the effort to produce the doctoral level personnel.

These seven universities are supported by separate grants, each one getting a separate grant for this agreement. I could not quite legally figure out the exact relationship. The university received a considerable grant for three years, through June 30, 1976, when the present mandate of LEAA expires, though it can be renewed.

The consortium was funded up to that point in developing this type of graduate program.

I would say that this seems to be a very stimulating experience in the sense that those universities which had such programs

already, such as Michigan State, which had at least a science degree, there are some PhD degrees though not directly in that line but still available at Northeastern University, and the University of Maryland had this, these programs definitely are strengthened.

There are possibilities of hiring additional instructional personnel of high quality and level. There is the possibility of funding graduate students, and that is the crying need. Practically nobody in the field can afford just to study nowadays, not only in criminal justice but in other ways as well.

Funding for the students who are full-time and often pre-service students is absolutely essential. This is the way the consortium was started. This is perhaps the most important thing done in that sense.

Those universities which did not have these graduate programs were working on this, and by now there are at least master's degree programs in criminal justice carefully prepared and very extensively discussed, as Mr. Bohlinger will attest. The last meeting of the Board of Directors reviewed the principles on which the master's programs should be organized.

I personally consider that this is a very sound attempt to strengthen the general criminal justice system because, as I see it, teachers, researchers and evaluators are needed. That is what this particular consortium attempts to do.

MR. VELDE: Now I am privileged to be able to call on Colonel Sullivan, who really agreed to be with us above and beyond the call of duty. He is in the process of changing jobs and entering into a new career with the Council on Education.

For several years during his tour of duty in the military he had direct responsibility over the monstrous correspondence courses being conducted there. I am not sure what happened - either the Postal Service did them in, or everybody just learned so much they were satiated and did not require any more, or whether Congress started breathing down their necks.

However, I understand the military are phasing out of the business, or, in some cases, might have phased out some of their programs.

Colonel, we would like to have you share your experience with us and give us your reflections on correspondence courses and whether or not they have any applicability in the correctional or criminal justice setting.

COLONEL SULLIVAN: Thank you. I want to start off by saying that I am very bullish on technology. I did not mean to come across negatively earlier.

Further, I did not mean to suggest that institutional roles and boundaries should put correctional institutions into a passive mode with respect to educators. There has to be a lot of interplay there. Boundaries are not that sharp and distinct, but I

shall not dwell on that now.

As to the matter of correspondence, this piece of paper mentions military correspondence schools. There are many of these. The Air Force has The Extension Correspondence Institute. The Marine Corps has The Marine Corps Institute. The Army's program of correspondence to supplement training is quite extensive, but it is decentralized to about fourteen schools. I am not altogether certain about the Navy's program at this moment. That is because that was really outside of the scope of my administrative responsibilities.

What I have talked about thus far has been correspondence to supplement a person's resident training so he can develop in his career field.

Here the experience has not been altogether bad with correspondence. It has been quite good. Probably, although I do not have any scientific results to back this up, this is because the participation in the correspondence program in terms of training and career development was geared into the rewards system of the military.

"Take this course. Your commanding officer wants to know why you have not completed it. If you take it, you have a better chance on the test for promotion."

The experience was altogether different with the United States Armed Forces Institute, USAFI, which came about during World War II

for the purpose of providing academic correspondence work for men and women in the armed forces free of charge.

It stuck after the war. It was an organization which wound up, when it finally got disestablished, with about 200 people, and about a \$6 million a year budget was dispensing correspondence materials and materials in bulk to go to installations where an instructor would be hired and a course conducted.

Over recent years we focused attention on this correspondence effort coming out of USAFI and concluded that if we were really serious about the business of education in the armed forces - I am not talking about military training but educational opportunities - that we would have to de-emphasize the reliance that system had developed on correspondence.

In the first place, only about half of the people who sign up for a correspondence course would start the course, "start" being defined as submitting a lesson. Of those only about twenty-five percent would ever complete the course, so that meant in gross terms completion rates on the order of eleven, thirteen, fourteen percent.

Those who were advocates of correspondence would say, "Well, there is something of educational value being done if a person held a book in his hand."

We say, "If we want to argue that, you can say there is something of educational harm being done because he held it in his

hand, found he could not cope, turned away from education and never came back to it again."

The long and short of it are that for several reasons, one of them being wanting to increase our reliance, let the educators do the educating; number two, to provide classroom instruction where possible, especially for people trying to get on to a high-school-type diploma level; three, to revitalize a staff which for twenty-five years had been using - perhaps this is unfair - but in my judgment good people using a patent remedy of "Sign up for a correspondence course where specific educational help and treatment was required."

Therefore, I thought our system was - and others thought so, too - in need of overhaul with respect to correspondence. None of us expected Congress to wipe it out, but they did, so it may have been a blessing in disguise.

My message is a simple one - I would not rely exclusively on it. I would not urge and recommend the establishment of a correspondence course institute although the circumstances are quite different. I think mobility accounted quite a bit within the military for the low completion rates with correspondence.

I certainly would encourage any correspondence program to be supported with additional materials and opportunities as the open University of Britain is. Here the learning center enters into play. It is fundamentally and basically a correspondence

operation. Nevertheless, it is supplemented by visual materials, supplemented by being able to go, visit, and talk to a tutor at a learning center.

In this connection, and again going to the point of reliance of what is going on in the educational community, I do not have exhaustive information about what is going on in this field, but I do know of one program which appears very promising - the Sun Program at the University of Nebraska at Lincoln.

This program is operating under a grant now and developing materials using some of the best people in the business in the disciplinary areas combined with technologists and others to produce a break-through in correspondence.

I want to say one final thing in addition to this correspondence matter. However, before closing out on correspondence, I think it served many people quite well. The trick is, if we are talking from a policy and program standpoint and educational cost-effectiveness, not cost in terms of dollars only but cost in terms of people lost to opportunity, the trick is how do you find a person who will do well? That is the challenge in designing a program and trying to figure out what the correspondence component ought to be.

I have a pamphlet with me which I shall pass around later. It has more to do with the general voluntary education program of the military than correspondence specifically. However, I want to wind up with one thing.

For thirty years, since World War II, military training has been evaluated by the American Council on Education, credit recommendations have been made with respect to it, and wide usage has been made of these so that people do not have to go through redundant training.

I am very happy to say that the project I am now working on is to extend this concept to programs of government, business, and industry. This is commercial in a way, but I think it is something worth knowing. We are doing this in conjunction with New York State in hopes of devising a national effort in this area.

I think New York has already evaluated the State Police Academy for twenty-four credit hours applicable to an associate of science degree in law enforcement or whatever, I don't know the specific degree. I was to go up later this month, where the New York City Police Academy is opening up negotiations.

In terms especially of the staff and the training given within the correctional system for staffs, if you are looking to professionalism, having people go into higher education and get degrees in the field, this is something that you should think about in the system.

As I said, I will hand around a pamphlet later on.

MR. VELDE: Thank you, Colonel Sullivan. Hopefully we will get a chance to talk with all of these people individually throughout the afternoon and tomorrow and get more information.

SECOND PLENARY SESSION

MR. BOHLINGER: Mr. Morris, if you would proceed with your statement on Needs of Correctional Education - Staff and Inmates.

MR. MORRIS: The general approach of our excellent group was one of recognition of the great and awesome range of educational needs for staff and inmates in correctional education, and a welcome for any techniques to improve technology for delivery of educational services. This was, I think, a reflection of our dissatisfaction with the quality of educational support in most prisons - and from here on in when I say "prisons" we include half-way houses and correctional facilities - and dissatisfaction with the present unsupported correspondence courses, almost to the point of seeing them as a waste of time.

We were not very clear as to how the developing technologies from satellites to computers would aid in these matters, but we had a sort of skeptical contentment about their potential.

The first issue which we approached was the question of the methodology of ascertaining the needs of correctional education for staff and inmates.

Here, in the manner of the House Judiciary Committee, I propose to yield four minutes of my time to the gentleman from Maryland, Dr. Lejins.

DR. LEJINS: I was selected to speak on methodology. Before we really start discussing the needs of education we should establish the methodology through which we arrive at the concept of what the needs are.

The committee, as soon as it met, felt uneasy about the proposition that we would assume that we know what the needs are. The feeling was that we would speak about the need for education for offenders and then separate somewhat. We spoke to the needs of educational personnel, not with the idea of our establishing what these needs are but to explore what they actually are.

I suggested at the beginning of the discussion that one of the ways of doing this would be if the satellite footprint is directed to a certain area of the United States territory we should go to the institutions in this area and find out what is being taught in the prisons and in the community-based programs as the first indicator of what the needs are. We should analyze the kinds of courses being taught, with the assumption that somehow people who plan their teaching have been exploring to a certain extent what the needs are.

Then the next step would be again with reference to the offender courses, to make some surveys of the offender opinions, even if they are already reflected in the curricula of the courses taught.

We then should go to the offenders being taught, to the programs being taught, to derive some wisdom regarding identification of the needs.

Similarly we should do this with personnel, namely, of LEAA. They have penetrated the country with its LEEP grants which are responsible for the creation, also, of many institutions of higher learning, junior colleges, community colleges especially, to which innumerable people from Corrections go to study.

Their survey as to what actually is being studied again is an indication of what this personnel feels as to the needs. Again one should supplement this by an additional exploration, perhaps directly, regarding some samples as to what the ideas of correctional personnel are as far as needs are concerned. The work of the Manpower Commission should also be called on as an aid.

If we are thinking in these terms, we should resort to the concept of different publics - the inmates, the teaching personnel in the institutions or in the community-based facilities, perhaps the educators, and so on, as well as the general public, which may have different ideas about both education and the staff and inmates. The idea further was explored that after we get the ideas of various consumer publics or general publics on this subject perhaps we would find there would be a question of fact and research, some common thread regarding the ideas of all of these publics with regard to what the needs are. In that way we would or should arrive at the concept of needs based on this exploration, and then from there we should proceed regarding what is the best methodology or technology to satisfy these needs.

MR. MORRIS: I should note that the group was joined in its discussion by George Bohlinger and Bill Morrisey.

There are some distinctions we need to draw at this point. We had a problem of how widely we should define correctional education. There is a risk in defining education like treatment - you know, everything that happens in an institution is education. This theory of the development of the well-rounded personality I would regard as bunk, though Carpenter defines it in terms less respectable. We settled on a narrow definition for our purposes, though we recognize that you may disagree with it.

We think it is wise to start with possibly ascertainable educative goals, so we think of correctional education as covering vocational training, academic training as a continuum from literacy to doctorate, and recreational and cultural education. There is some dissent from this - they do not wish to include social education, education in living, education in getting a job. There was some dissent about that, but I have to report that from here on in we are thinking about a narrow definition - academic, vocational, recreational, cultural. The other distinction is imposed on us between staff-correctional education and inmate-correctional education.

First, prisoners: Why should one provide educational services for prisoners? There was a general rejection of the idea we should do that in any effort to diminish crime. There was a general

acceptance of the idea, put forth best by Colonel Sullivan, "you take care of your people," and again I must repeat for the late arrivals that when I say prisons I include all correctional facilities. Prisons do contain a disproportionate number of the ill-educated, illiterate, vocationally untrained, psychologically disturbed, socially disadvantaged people of this world. That fact is enough to justify an effort in the way of provision of educational service for them. If there is a spin-off, collateral advantage in the diminution of crime, a better social life for the rest of us, that is fine. However, that is not the justification. Decency is what pushes us here, because they have disproportionate need. That is all one needs to say to justify meeting this need. Whether one should say that politically, whether one should say that at the time of the budget, whether one should say that for those purposes is another matter. However, if we cannot be honest in this room, then we are really wasting our time.

Why should there be correctional education provided for staff? It is the same concept we came to, predominately because that is what a decent employer does, and that is the type of world we want to live in. I come back to that. Therefore, defining prisoner education narrowly - vocational, academic, cultural, recreational - the first principle we offer for your consideration is that it must never be compulsory. It must always

**CONTINUED**

**3 OF 4**

be voluntary. The unpacking of that principle is not the easiest thing in the world.

The reason that the unpacking of that concept is not so simple is because there is a shortage of educational resources. Staff wish to appear nine to five, Monday through Friday, not evenings and weekends. Here technology may help us. There sometimes have to be choices between institutional programs and education, but the principle can easily be stated: Every effort should be made to make programs voluntary - as a reality, not supported by incentives, not compelled by any form of punishment, and not part of any coercive programs.

The other principle, the second big principle we are all in favor of - it is like being in favor of virtue - is no tokenism. There has been too much tokenism. If they are not decent programs, let's not have programs. That is particularly true in the vocational education field.

As to priorities, given the needs within prisons and other correctional facilities, a priority should be given to primary and secondary education within academic education, simply because in one way or another advanced educational degrees can more easily take care of themselves, fewer numbers are involved, some sort of arrangements can be made. They don't need as much support.

A preference was expressed for outside educational resources, though there was some dissent from this, but a preference was

expressed for the use of outside educational resources rather than intramural support for educational programs.

There was recognition that there is a great role for the merging technology of support to educational programs from satellite teaching machines, a general enthusiasm for LEAA experimenting with, supporting, testing out these ideas.

Stress was placed on the proposition that prisoners and others in the correctional system, if educational programs of these three types are made available, require continuity of supportive services. Continuity is difficult to achieve when the patterns of lives of people run through local correctional facilities, state correctional facilities, Federal correctional facilities. They need continuity from institutional training programs to their availability on parole, and thereafter when they are out. The problem of providing continuity through the balkanized system of criminal justice we have is a difficult task.

On that, for the second and last time, I do the yielding of time because two people - Sherman Day and Donald Deppe - have faced this problem. I yield four minutes of your valuable time.

The gentleman from the District of Columbia, Dr. Day.

DR. DAY: Since Don is the author of that program, I will yield my time to Don.

DR. DEPPE: Let me describe as quickly as I possibly can, the nature of the problem we faced as we began to think about educational programs within three similarly designed metropolitan correctional centers now under construction - one in New York City, one in Chicago, and another in San Diego.

To begin with, these facilities are being built in urban areas where one has to face the high cost of property; as a result they are being built vertically rather than horizontally.

Furthermore, the very brick and mortar of these structures reflects the concept of functional unit management, which, as you know, is a way of trying to break down a larger total institution into smaller and more manageable units in order to increase staff-resident contact and to improve, hopefully, the quality of interaction between staff and residents. Very little movement is expected of inmates between units. Our chief problem was one of finding an effective way of delivering educational programs and services to each of those rather distinct and highly separate units.

We wanted to do this on a highly individualized and flexible basis, that is, in such a way that a person could start and stop the learning process at any time which is convenient. We were also eager to provide highly transferable kinds of programs in the sense that it would be easy not only to continue such programs within the institution at different times, but also possible to

re-enter the same or similar programs at another institution, or on parole and eventually in the community.

MR. MORRIS: And while on probation, I hope.

DR. DEPPE: That is right. In view of our interest in individualized, flexible, and transferable programs within this unique structure, we decided to design a specialized capability for educational television. Programs will be put on the head end of the system and delivered to each of the units on an as-needed basis. Two-way communication will be possible between functional units and the central "broadcast" facility.

Software for the system will consist primarily of programs which have been developed in the community so that follow-up will be facilitated when a person is released. While making maximum use of outside resources, we will also work on the production of programs designed to meet the special needs of persons housed in detention centers. We think this is the only way we can manage to deliver educational services in this kind of setting, a setting in which, traditionally, education has not been provided at all.

MR. MORRIS: Relevant to the transfer, if there be credits for correctional educational programs, it is of first importance they be made transferable to the limit that one can achieve.

Let me turn, then, to vocational training of prisoners. The central point that emerged from discussions was the necessity of

planning vocational training programs in relation to the reality of available vocational opportunities for prisoners. It is worse than wrong, it is mischievous, to train people in vocations in which there are statutory or trade union or similar obstacles to their employment. That point should be expanded a little when it is linked with the use of outside resources. Here it is particularly important to try to mobilize vocational training program representatives of the unions, of the craft in which one is trying to train people, so there can be some possible continuity of vocational training and employment. It is trite, but it has to be said. As we look at many programs we train bricklayers when they cannot get into the building trades.

Prisoners, academic and vocational training, recommendation to LEAA: that LEAA consider establishing a center for correctional education, or a clearinghouse for correctional education, whose task might be to set and maintain standards in this field, to facilitate the transfer of programs and technology within and between jurisdictions, local, state and Federal, make available pools and facilities for the central distribution of audio-visual aids, tapes, and teaching materials.

Whether this should be a specially established center or clearinghouse we were not sure. However, that this was an important role for LEAA we were quite clear about, and if that could emerge from this conference we hoped it might be a useful product.

Funding something linked to that was another express recommendation for consideration by LEAA. There is at present a diversity of resources for funding prisoner education.

One of the most interesting developments, as in Texas, Illinois and Iowa, is the correctional school district system. But other funds go in from state vocational and rehabilitation services, and others from LEAA and through state planning agencies, so we recommend for consideration that LEAA might bring together funding sources doing this work, to plan some conjoint experimentation in prisoner academic vocational and cultural education.

Let me turn to staff training and staff. Again I will make some distinctions. Broadly there are three types of problems: First, professional training, such as police academies, outside colleges offering training courses in corrections.

Secondly, liberal arts training, by and large outside correctional institutions.

Thirdly, training in professional skills within correctional departments. I will use those three distinctions, but I want to make a first point.

There was some imprecision about the degree of assent - Fred Moyer goes a little further than some of the rest of us - but I think the proposition that emerged was that everything that is available by way of academic, vocational and recreational cultural programs to prisoners must also be available to staff.

The next step: It must be available to dependents of staff unless there is some impediment of age or some other reason they cannot come to the course.

The next interesting step: Given the geographic situation of most prisons - selected because they are in remote areas of declining prosperity - educational programs in prisons should also be available to people in the community who wish to make use of them, as they are, for instance, in Illinois in the oddly named institution at Vienna. Quite a number of people are there coming from the community into training programs given for prisoners within the institution, and we thought that was an entirely healthy and entirely desirable way of "breaking down the walls", community influences are brought in.

Next, professional training in liberal arts: There should be, we think, incentives for staff self-development professionally and academically outside the prison. It is the role of a decent employer in this society to support educational opportunities for his staff. It may be that such support can cut down on the chronic and threatening and rapid staff turnover in many correctional institutions.

The final point, you will be relieved to hear, is training for staff within institutions in professional skills. We thought it important that LEAA should give high priority and technical

support to this. Here might be an area where the emerging technology of more sophisticated teaching aids might be appropriate. Here might be an area where we can do something for the benighted people working in city jails, as well as for those working in state facilities.

Here is an area where the very remoteness of correctional institutions gives great justification for innovative and experimental ideas in relationship to the improvement of professional training skills for staff within institutions: satellites, tapes, the whole lot being here appropriate.

MR. MOYER: In approaching this subject, we should attempt to make prisons more viable. There is a need to improve these programs.

I think there is another mission for this whole subject of correctional education, and that is in the community and county jail level, which I hope we are also bringing in. It is typically at that level that we have no programs. We usually have some programs in prisons and we are trying to make them better here. At the county level there is virtually nothing.

If we talk about community-based corrections being a network of programs, services and facilities at the community level, that is where the community is, at the county level. There is a scarcity of resources, no staff, no professional people in most of these situations, and if anything will come in at all it will have to be

packaged, pre-programmed, widely available, and delivered by satellite or the postman, somebody not there now.

The other thing was the eligibility which you touched upon. I think the eligibility of the community itself to be a participant is not only pertaining to the remote prison where the community services might not exist in any place but in the prison, but again also at the community level, the urban area. That eligibility is important.

If the community is eligible for programs which are there, you might find you have overloaded your capability to service them. I put it out as an issue to be addressed, that perhaps one should not have to commit a crime and get caught in order to get into a vocational training program.

MR. MORRIS: It is a problem of priorities and why we should put resources here rather than in slums.

COLONEL SULLIVAN: A minor point on language: We have developmental education, remedial education, awkward terms such as deficiency education, and I am afraid we are on the border of adding another horrible term to the language: correctional education. We are talking about education in a correctional setting.

I merely wanted to make this point.

MR. MORRIS: I accept the correction and point out it was worded this way by LEAA.

DR. LEJINS: I have a couple of criticisms I want to make.

From the point of view of the legal thinking and legal education you are not particularly concerned about the specific terms and concept in this area. For those of us involved in the nitty-gritty of trying somehow to produce professional education in the field of criminal justice, except criminal law, this is rather important. I would like to say that I and others have stated the clear distinction which has been established, and which incidentally appears rather systematically in the recent writings of LEAA, a distinction between training, which means specific functions-directed education, and more general education background, education called education. The training is in service and it deals with any kind of nuts and bolts of being a policeman, being a prison custodial officer, a correctional officer, and so on, including a psychiatrist who would be in-service or pre-service prepared to work with the offenders. Those are usually produced in the police and correctional academies.

Then there is education. Education can be general. Usually it is referred to as liberal arts. This is anything, such as history, English, speech, anything which broadens the mind of the person.

Finally there is what we consider professional education, namely, to convey the body of knowledge and the body of experiences accelerated in the field of dealing with crime.

In ~~the~~ sense I pose what Colonel Sullivan said, saying there is no correctional education. I would not say there is correctional education necessarily, but in terms of the last seven years, since the beginning of this commission, there is an education in the area of criminal justice which conveys a specific body of knowledge, a specific accumulation of experiences, and in that sense I think there is a professional education for that field, and the entire LEEP program, insofar as it finances higher education at the colleges and universities, is directed toward that type of education.

It is different from police academy training. It is not general liberal education because for that we do not give LEEP grants, but it is a specialized professional education in the criminal justice field.

I think we should not get confused once these concepts have been established through primarily LEAA acceptance.

MR. MORRIS: I don't think there is a conflict between the two definitions. I think Colonel Sullivan will accept this. If it is a criticism I bear it with equanimity.

The final conclusion: As people interested in education, we welcome the new technology. We keep saying, "It will never take over." What we really think is that perhaps it will take over, but, thank God, by then we will probably all be dead.

DR. FLYNN: I read one of the speeches of former Attorney General Mitchell on the occasion of the first national conference

on corrections. He did announce, I remember distinctly, some kind of a clearinghouse on correctional education.

MR. BOHLINGER: That was mentioned in our group by a number of people. The normal question was asked: What happened to it? There was a moment of silence.

One of our tasks is to find out what did happen.

MR. MORRIS: It was mentioned in our group. We thought we should make it a formal recommendation, again because LEAA has not been unusually expeditious regarding this.

MR. BOHLINGER: It is fairly clear that the issue here is one of a recommendation having been made and very clearly that it has not been followed up. That is something which behooves us to look into.

MR. TRAVISONO: Our group generally said there was common agreement that an educational correctional network of some type should be established within the entire field. It is at this stage perhaps too early for such a network to be designed. Many questions still have to be answered; therefore, our first recommendation is that an assessment following the recommendations of the previous group should be made by a competent group of those people involved in corrections, correctional education, and from those outside the system so that a proper consortium could be brought together to look at many of the issues which will permeate the discussion this morning and which have been discussed on prior occasions.

It was further agreed that LEAA should fund this assessment and relatively soon. It should be an extensive assessment; in other words, a substantial grant to a group which has the capability, the interest, and the desire to really put together the issues we have been talking about this morning.

What can a network do? This perhaps should be one of its major components of study. What its strengths would be, how it can be delivered, its parameters, what the organizations would be like, who could administer it, the kinds of national vehicles should be established to do this: all these points were considered. Our group generally concurred that the appropriate agency would be the National Institute for Corrections.

At this point it is perhaps too early to determine how that board of directors, the LEAA, the Bureau of Prisons, or whoever will have responsibility for that agency, would anticipate its future. Our group wished to go on record as indicating we felt that LEAA should look to that group and should give it the leadership and the responsibility for this network.

We felt that regardless of whoever accepted the responsibility, that assessment is primary and this organizational structure must be quite well spelled out by that assessment.

There are some comments which we felt should be addressed in the mandate of whoever accepted this responsibility. First, early

intervention at the juvenile level is mandatory. Those of us who have seen both sides of the fence have seen some very poor programming in juvenile institutions throughout our country, both in institutions and in programming which was not there in some of the public aspects of our educational programming, and the public educational programs are still spawning delinquents. Delinquents come to us and we at one time or another are required to invent programs to meet the needs of young people who in many instances move ahead and graduate through our adult correctional institutions.

LEAA, NIC, or whatever other agency should perhaps be in the position to fund the public school system - to do their job and be more cognizant of their role in the spawning process or in the prevention of a spawning process.

Education should be goal-oriented at that early level, perhaps in the same way that Mr. Morris indicated. We should never fail to recognize that with all the kinds of programs we have in corrections, or those to be developed, whether through technology or through the most sophisticated kind of development which may still be on the drawing boards, that the causes of delinquency and crime are still discernible and important to us. The programs are responsibilities of other agencies, such as Health and Welfare, and are still significant to our development, and we should support the elimination of the depths of poverty and the depths of nutritional deprivation of children and young people who carry this

problem with them as they move on and as we see them wind up with us in institutions.

Another point we felt very strongly about is that no educational program for inmates can proceed independently without a program for staff development.

In fact, as an administrator, I have felt that this is perhaps one of the major problems I have experienced within the last several years, that is, seeing the hostile competition set up between inmates and staff as to who will get what and when. It appears that our system has had to cope with an intense sibling rivalry. We have not been able to balance the two sides because we have not had resources made available to us to equalize the struggle.

Our group felt that a staff educational program had to be a commitment and programmed with as much expertise as we might program an inmate developmental and educational program, along with the proper incentives, whatever they might be.

Again, as the previous group indicated, for organization and management of these programs there should be continuum. There is no magic way of creating excitement in the way we provide programs to men and women when they come to the institution. We have had no glamor, no excitement in helping people while on probation or parole. Our continuum should be at the entry level and continued on as long as necessary. We should find a mechanism

for making this happen. We all know it is quite difficult to accomplish.

We felt strongly that NIC, if this is the agency, and we think we would like it to be the agency, should work very closely with the Commission on Accreditation, that an independent body be commissioned shortly - and many of their recommendations for improvement in the educational components should be allowed to be developed. This network agency should have resources at its disposal to give that state, county, or city agency the wherewithal, strength, moral support and physical support as well as financial support to come within the accreditation concept.

We feel that this agency should have the ability to pilot programs, to be allowed to enter into an arrangement with host agencies, to go into a state or county, and with their staffs to develop and demonstrate how a program can be arranged, and/or perhaps package it and leave it, or package it and give it.

We also felt that whatever training or education is allowable in this system for both staff and inmates there should be transferability within the state boundaries, and also available on an interstate basis. He should be able through the mechanism that the network sets up to have a continuing educational program for his own future development and, of course, for the future of the field of corrections.

These were the main points our group saw with regard to some

of the ideas in the way of organization and management.

MR. SIGLER: I want to bolster something you said. Echoing Mr. Morris and those of you who did not hear what Mr. Carpenter's description of what educational programs are, I don't think we should limit it to education as far as phoney programs are concerned within corrections.

I want again to reemphasize what you said, that corrections never in any instance has had any minimum standards to work by. We have been an autonomous operation wherever we have been. We do whatever we think is good for what our situation happens to be and the amount of money we have to work with.

I think that our committee felt strongly that this matter should be recognized and that minimum standards should be set by this group, and together with the recommendations which come up perhaps use the accreditation commitment to a point this consortium you talked about could do this study.

I personally think this would be the best place to begin.

MRS. GOODRICH: I would like to stress that at least from my viewpoint we are doing a lot of talking about community-based programs. As a community member looking at organization, I think that the stress of education, whatever we are going to do for an individual, a lot of concentration should be on the probationary level, whether it be a juvenile or an adult.

It is a little late to put all the concentration into the institution, which we seem to have a tendency to do. We will never get anywhere in community-based programs until we quit putting people on probation with nothing. I would hope at this conference we look long and hard at what we can do for a person who begins to get into the system, look at what happens after he or she gets into the system.

MR. HAMM: Did we mention something about going back to the responsibility of the educational institutions themselves, trying to emphasize the failures there - not in pointing fingers but in trying to find some remedies so that more work could be done at the public school?

MR. TRAVISONO: I think I indicated we should help the public schools, stop the spawning process.

DR. DAY: I would like to use the group's phraseology Mr. Morris did not use, although he made the point. We suggested that the standard, even initially, should be no lower than that offered in the community at the present time. We should continue to initiate work toward even greater programming standards. However, in the absence of a current standard, we can use the level offered presently in the community as a base line.

MR. SIGLER: Using that as a minimum.

DR. DAY: That is right.

MR. BOHLINGER: Next we have Paul Keve. One of the things

our group found is that there is a great deal of overlap. I am sure everyone felt that with regard to these four topics. It is difficult to discuss these topics independently of one another.

MR. KEVE: I was just noting the same thing as I sat here listening to the previous speakers. We all seem to be saying some of the same things. I think this is a good sign. It perhaps reinforces the validity with regard to some of the points we are making.

A comment Mr. Morris made leads me to start this with an anecdote to illustrate a little of what I am up against in at least one of my counties in Delaware. The anecdote has further usefulness than that, however.

In Sussex County, which is rural, conservative, somewhat smugly religious, and so on, and I can talk this way inasmuch as I am a good distance from my home at this moment, we recently had a public meeting and hearing to give the citizenry an opportunity to express its indignation at some of the outrageous things I was proposing there and which did not seem to take into account the fact that our prisoners are there for punishment, and what more is needed than that.

The chairman of the meeting was a prominent local businessman and himself of conservative and religious bent and possessed of all the good old American virtues except vision.

He was expressing some dismay with regard to some of the

newfangled notions and said, "What we need to get back to is spiritual counseling for these people." He then proceeded to needle us rather extensively.

There was at least one person in the audience who had a little more perspective on things, and he spoke up rather promptly.

He said, "You cannot do that, you know. The Supreme Court already has said you cannot impose religion on people, not even if they are prisoners."

The chairman came back very promptly, very straight-faced, very seriously, without any realization of the import of what he was saying, and said: "That is all right; we would make it perfectly voluntary and tell prisoners they don't have to accept spiritual counseling at all if they don't want to; they can just stay longer in the prison."

I didn't know whether to laugh or cry. There were some members of the audience who caught the significance of it, but the man who said it never did.

For those of you who are not working in corrections and might not otherwise know it, I will assure you that that is rather expressive of one of the areas of much less nobility of the corrections field, that we do have this confusion to deal with constantly, everything from parole board meetings to more ordinary confrontations as to what is voluntary and what is virtuous or

not about voluntary offerings.

With regard to the report on our workshop, the members of this discussion group found themselves intrigued with the presentations of yesterday morning regarding sophisticated electronic technology. I think we were well able to see the possibilities for application of such devices to correctional settings. However, we were somewhat soberly aware that our field of work has much catching up to do before it is ready to make fully profitable use of the emerging generation of educational systems techniques.

There are some fundamental problems, we noted, inherent in the correctional field which tend to frustrate the effectiveness of good technology. I have tried to organize several of these points as follows:

- 1) The education or training of correctional clients is to a considerable degree dependent upon the training and education of the staffs which control them.
- 2) Correctional staffs too often are burdened with attitudes which produce self-fulfilling prophecy of inmates not being deserving of or motivated for education.
- 3) Correctional staffs have no tradition of training such as the police have, for instance.
- 4) Course content is difficult to produce because correctional staffs are too busy to give thought to this need and seldom has

anyone on our staffs been assigned for such an effort, and we have no incentive for the staffs to produce such educational content.

5) The rewards for the average correctional worker are not rigged in favor of academic progress.

6) The corrections administrator is massively frustrated by the difficulty of taking a person off his post in an institution in order to put him into a training situation.

7) Correctional staff training is limited by the limited resources of its state instead of enjoying the increased resources to be found by interstate pooling.

If any of you have traveled in other countries and seen this sharper perspective in England, for instance, for all correctional institutions under the home office for the entire country, they can afford to have a staff training college, which they do have at Wakefield, and they also have a good centralized continuing training effort there.

We discussed another impediment to the correctional process which is not peculiarly related to corrections. It seemed to be our consensus that a major need in education of both staff and inmates is to accomplish attitude change. At the same time, however, we felt that for the student bodies we face, inmates and staff, the changing of attitudes through education ranges somewhere between difficult and impossible.

It was felt, instead, that the changing of behavior is more feasible, and that if we are successful in that it is likely to

lead to eventual attitude modification.

We see, for instance, the effects of court suits and realize that we have correctional officers these days accepting procedures, processes, and approaches in the operation of prisons which they perhaps could not possibly have accepted on the basis of graduate education, except upon being forced to procedural changes by court decisions where they find through actual practice of it within a year or so that actually you can still keep operating, after all; in other words, attitude change tends to follow forced behavioral change.

Accordingly, our conversation about teaching methods tended to explore ideas for simulating social episodes which would give a synthetic but useful exercise in constructive problem-solving. Here there could be a useful application of hardware items. Perhaps some experimentation has been going on at the University of Wisconsin in which a variety of "teaching machines" present the inmate student with a described situation and offers him a choice of responses mechanically transmitted, registering ideas for the proper approach and solution mechanically with regard to his choice of problem-solving solutions.

It was also mentioned that psych-drama, in which inmates devise and act out either fabricated episodes or reconstructions of actual episodes can be made extra useful by being put on video tape. It could then be played back for their own edification and

could be very useful in training sessions for correctional officer staff. Interstate use of such tapes could further extend their value.

We also observed that the upgrading of a correctional system is achieved uncertainly and most inefficiently if it is attempted on a piecemeal basis. To be really effective it must result from comprehensive planning and as far as possible it should be applied to all parts of the system at the same time.

This means it is crucial to have the understanding and support of middle and top management staff regarding any improvement measures being instituted.

This might seem obvious, that it will not be instituted unless top management approves, but this is not always true. Accidentally sometimes we have in our correctional agency staffs some bright-eyed people at the rank and file levels who have the spunk to think up some new ideas and get them going but find it a very discouraging process if there is not an equal commitment to it on the part of the prisoners' program.

Consequently, whether we are talking about education or inmates or for staff, we must include education for management or administrative staff, so we were talking here about the need for educational efforts in the area of management as such.

Already mentioned here is the fact that there is not a well-rooted tradition of staff training in corrections. In fact, we noted

that the rewards for a typical corrections officer are almost rigged against the acquisition of education. By taking training or college courses he does not add to his salary, and usually it is not nearly as effective - that the education that he acquires is not as effective - as seniority is in helping him toward promotion. This condition becomes a solid barrier to staff training when coupled, as it always is, with the also already-mentioned fact that the best of training programs is useless if the correctional institution has no budget to pay an extra guard to take a post while the guard to be trained is taken off his post for that purpose.

Therefore, we need to provide time for training and incentives. These twin provisions will be costly, but unless these two factors are dealt with probably no other part of the effort will be fully worthwhile. To a certain extent this is prerequisite to effective education of inmates.

Echoing what Mr. Trivisono said in his report, guards who are uneducated themselves and cut off from opportunities for education and seeing themselves unable to finance their own children through college tend to be resentful and obstructive of higher education for inmates.

In any long conversation, such as ours all afternoon yesterday, a potpourri of ideas emerges, and here is a disconnected offering of some of these thoughts that emerged.

Television can be very useful as a training tool, regarding anything from psycho-drama to parole board hearings for later playback. However, it was observed, administrators tend to be afraid of it and there is high risk that if expensive equipment is acquired it may have very inadequate use. There are gross examples of this which I have seen.

Training programs might be more effective if organized on a regional basis, encompassing a bloc of several states. The cross-over experiences for guards in training would be broadened and the larger training program would be able to afford better quality with regard both to faculty and equipment.

Some type of accreditation system for educational programs might be very useful. It might be good and helpful to correctional administrators to be able to say to their legislatures that they must have more support for either inmate or staff education programs in order to meet the minimum standards set by an accreditation commission.

We see, also, the desirability and usefulness of tying this to funds so that perhaps a national subsidy of certain aspects of training programs would be a continuing and regularized sort of thing, but tied strictly to the meeting of real standards.

We thought there might well be more experimentation with the use of private contractors to provide educational programs with payment being made on the basis of achieved results.

We discussed the pros and cons of the central or national training academy idea and noted that there has been resistance to this concept on the part of corrections administrators who for some reason disliked the FBI academy model, so we did think there could be merit in the idea of an incorporated correctional college on a regional basis.

The Federal Bureau of Prisons seemed to us to have some unfulfilled potentials in this area. We would like to hear some day that a prescribed fraction, ten percent or more, of the Bureau's budget is mandated for expenditure in areas of research and experimentation with innovative programs.

There was discussion of education for detainees in jail settings. We noted contrasting sorts of things here. Sheriff McCandless in California has a notable program for education of detentioners, and at the other end of the country a Major Case has accomplished much in the same area in the Bucks County Prison in Pennsylvania.

To people who believe in it and who offer dynamic and relevant kinds of teaching it seems adequately apparent it is effective. However, in between these occasional administrators with vision there is a wasteland of jail administrators who illustrate perfectly this self-fulfilling prophecy with their firm conviction that it is no use in trying to motivate prisoners.

Somewhere at a national level there is need for a concerted effort to awaken jail administrators to a different view.

We noted that Rhode Island is starting a new educational effort, a teacher corps program in which inmates will have the opportunity to be trained as teachers and then be employed as such. It reinforces the view that there is a special dynamic quality in any program which offers the client an opportunity then to turn around and help others and other clientele.

With the proliferation of community-based programs we saw the opportunity to reduce the stigmatic nature of these and at the same time to enhance the educational potential by uniting educational and correctional agencies in a common endeavor. Why not, for instance, instead of having a half-way house occupied only by ex-prisoners, have a facility which is occupied as a joint half-way house and college dorm with all of the endless potentials which that has for varied kinds of ways of exploiting the opportunities this would present?

We wish that LEAA would select a small cooperative professional institution in some state to engage in a substantial program of inter-marriage, so to speak, with a nearby college or university to explore the many potential ways that the two could interact for the benefit of both.

We concluded our conversation on the recommendation that the Institute of Corrections should establish a technology desk to experiment, to field test and evaluate new technology ideas.

This is the point at which I will yield to other members of the committee.

DR. FLYNN: One of the key observations we made was that frequently the prerequisite for employment in correctional offices to begin with is merely military service. If you have veterans' status and three years of MP experience, and I have nothing against that, these people are employed and given preference as to employment as opposed to someone who has even an undergraduate degree.

I think we also noted the disparity which exists between the technology to which we were exposed yesterday morning and what really exists in the area of both institutional and correctional education, as well as academic education.

I think we need to add to that the fact that most administrators are less than inclined to really do more in that area than what is necessary to keep institutions running.

On the overall I want to make the observation I would feel terribly uncomfortable if we came away from this conference just thinking that what we need to do is to improve institutional educational programs. I think this was reverberated by Edna Goodrich's comment and Fred Moyer's comment. We have to focus on the overall happening in the country in this respect.

To that extent I thought we should stress the point of the need for overall comprehensive planning in correctional education. We observed yesterday afternoon that perhaps the way to do this would be on the state level, to have some comprehensive agency,

either under the SPA - though we did not address ourselves to that too specifically - or at least on each state level to have one agency in charge of planning and development in education. This is needed or we will have nothing but patchwork.

I would also like to say that perhaps NIC may be quite suitable for overall guidance, but I do not think in terms of delivery to each state institution and each of these many county institutions and in each of the development community-based programs in ten years could we get NIC to the point where they could really be getting delivery of service to those points.

DR. DAY: The Federal System is currently designing an institution at Miami, Florida in conjunction with the University of Miami. The planning for the programs is being accomplished in concert with the Institute of Behavioral and Legal Services at Miami and Bureau staff.

Top-level Bureau staff will have appointments at the University of Miami. The top university people will be working with and at the institution in supervisory capacities. We are excited about the prospects of this joint venture.

MR. PAPPAS: There was one other aspect. We felt trying to experiment with a new technology should be included in any kind of program which puts together the institution and the college.

DR. DAY: That is a good point. We have not done that as yet.

MR. PAPPAS: It is a kind of wry point. I envision some day a total institution which is transistorized, computerized, and

everything else where the inmate sits in front of a video camera or some machine which states, "And when did you first become aware of your feelings?"

DR. DAY: It is quite possible this has been visualized.

MR. BOHLINGER: We will have time for open comments at a later point.

It was observed in our group, Group A, that the innovations people are talking about and programs which are being described, those either in the formulation stages or in actual operation stages, are really not that new.

One of the things in corrections that anybody in corrections is fully cognizant of is the fact that somewhere in this country, or somewhere in the English-speaking world in corrections, or in penology, almost everything we are talking about has been tried or is being tried. What brought this to mind was the idea of putting prisoners in dorms with college students. It is being done somewhere, though I cannot remember where.

MRS. GOODRICH: I do it.

MR. BOHLINGER: These things are being done, however. This all points up the need for this coordination center and of getting this information together so that it can be disseminated to other people. Many of these things are being tried and many pitfalls people encounter can be checked out.

My next comment is in the way of being pleased that Dr. Bennett

is with us to give his report for the fourth group. Dr. Larry Bennett.

DR. BENNETT: Our group had a highly structured meeting. We immediately focused on the problem facing us. In order to achieve this atmosphere we constructed essentially a multi-dimensional matrix system.

Think for a moment in terms of a cube. Along a horizontal axis you have stages which an offender might pass through, things like the pre-adjudication phase, pretrial detention, and then on through local incarceration, state level incarceration, and somewhere in between there you have probation, and after state-level incarceration you have parole.

The probation and parole are lumped together because some of the training needs are very similar in that area.

Then along the vertical side we can look at the kinds of training needs that emerge. We had no qualms about taking on the problem of defining the training and educational needs. We decided, one, we could not design a technology for something we did not know what it was we would do, so we decided some of the other groups would be bashful about this. They decided large Federal grants could do this. However, we did it first and got it out of the way.

Then, if you look at the depth dimension of this cube, we looked at such things as production, delivery, and evaluation as aspects of the situation which had to be looked at.

We then moved to the fourth dimension, which is a little more difficult to visualize. Here we talked about what I call two levels, staff and participant. If we talked about inmates, this gets us back into the old bag - that we would deal with people in institutions. We are talking about participants in the criminal justice system who may be on the street, who may not even really be totally into the criminal justice system.

Then we tried to define what education was, how big a scope it should cover, how big a swath we would cut in that area, and we got involved in other discussions.

However, a couple highlights parallel some of the work of the other groups. We decided we are talking about not only academic education but vocational education. We did not deal with the recreation or cultural, but we did move into the social skills area, not in terms of psycho-therapy but more as education for living where specific skills could be transmitted.

When we tried to determine why we were getting involved in education there was some tendency to move toward this being a rehabilitative tool, so we decided to avoid that issue in order to get on with other aspects of the problem, leaving it somewhat in mid-air with the idea that like milk, education it is good for everybody. In the vocational training area we felt that here again we could not make any kind of a strong case for its being rehabilitative but our national ethic has something to do with work, some feeling of comfort is provided if people are employed and earn

some portion of their keep.

In line with that, then, we decided that rather than the old telephone operator kind of situation where you give the individual one skill and he has to find the right socket to put that one skill into, we decided that if we are going to improve things through the application of technology we should ensure that any individual leaving any segment of the criminal justice system has at least three employable skills to offer the world so that he can have some options depending on targets of opportunity.

It is very nice for those of us who have reserves to talk about waiting until the right opening comes along, but the guy coming out of a county jail with zero dollars does not have that kind of waiting power.

If he had two or three possibilities, he might have a better chance.

Look at some of the needs we discovered using this elaborate matrix system. Most of the things have already been talked about so I shall only skim through and touch on those items which I think are unique. One area to look at is that of the pre-adjudication phase. Here we have an opportunity to help people to avoid the system. Let us package some neat little units which people could deal with on an individualized basis - they can start at any time, stop at any time, pick up and go at any time. These, perhaps, would be short-term pre-vocational applications, specialized training, vocational support skills. This means learning how to

find a job. Polish your shoes before you go for a job.

Again, moving through other phases, no unique problems or suggestions are involved which have not already been touched upon.

Pretrial detention is one of the wastelands in our total system as far as our assistance to people is concerned. We must have something - again, packaged modules, short-term vocational training. Here we vastly underestimate our potential to do a good job, in my opinion.

I think probably part of the problem is that we have to throw the educators out and start over. Education is steep in tradition and talks about the hundreds of hours required to do this or that.

When we got caught in a war, we found out we can train radio operators in three weeks, shipbuilders in three months, train others in a matter of weeks. Then you talk to somebody at the juvenile hall where people are there for only nine months and they say, "We don't have them long enough to train them." I say to that: "Baloney."

I was very fortunate to have observed a Job Corps training center in Lincoln, Nebraska, which was run by a for-profit organization designed by a psychologist. It was a total concept immersion system which really worked. They would train meatcutters in, say, thirty-one training days. They would train auto mechanics in forty-two training days.

They looked at construction trades and decided they could

not even set up a training program for the construction trades because they could not get more than four and a half training days in terms of transmission of skills.

Just think if you could pull some of those types of packages into a county jail sentence. The man waits two and a half months to go to trial. During that time he might come out with a skill to look at a trade.

Let us be quite honest. We are not talking about these people being master auto mechanics or meatcutters, but they have every skill required to do every job in that setting.

In addition to that, of course, to make a well-rounded person you need the experience, but the skill meanwhile has been transmitted.

Local incarceration involves some of the same things. Here we see a real need which has been mentioned but needs to be highlighted again, and that is the problem of the operator of local facilities. Many of these people are law enforcement-oriented. They get their Brownie points for getting educated as law enforcement people, which is quite appropriate and I have no quarrel with that, except they are doing a correctional job and no one has ever looked at what their training is for doing a correctional job and for doing the job they are actually doing. In some way there has to be a set of standards developed which will force people to move toward getting the appropriate training which can also be part of the motivation.

If you say you cannot be in that job unless you have this kind of training, then somebody will start trying to get that training, which means the training then will be provided.

When we get to some of these other points, I shall cover them quickly. The institution has been dealt with extensively. There are a couple of minor points here to be emphasized. One is that there needs to be much greater emphasis on opportunities for college work. The educational level of inmates is moving up constantly for a variety of reasons. We still run into the prejudice mentioned earlier - I cannot send my kid to college so why should we provide a college education for prison inmates? However, here is a definite potential to do something which looks like rehabilitation.

I am perhaps one of the strongest opponents of claiming anything done in corrections is rehabilitative but in this area I back off from that a little bit because there is some suggestive evidence that college-level involvement increases the level of self-esteem, and self-esteem is one of the few variables that I have been able to observe which has any relationship to subsequent outcome following incarceration. The evidence is not strong, but certainly hopeful, and on that basis I would urge maximum utilization of this rehabilitative tool.

On the other hand, and perhaps in a different direction, we have to pay some attention to the special needs represented by people placed in isolation, segregation, confined situations. It

is very well to plan big packages for people who are going to walk across the campus to the classroom, but there will always be a group of people, and I think an increasing group of people in our institutions, who have to be buttoned down.

The more proficient we become in shifting the load toward the community, the only result we can anticipate is that what we deal with in the institutions will be much more difficult to deal with, which means lock-up, and which means we cannot simply say they are bad boys, lock them up and forget them. We have constantly to be exploring new ways and better ways of providing those people with educational and developmental opportunities.

The probation and parole concept needs to be looked at. Here something like the idea of a drop-in learning center might be something which should be explored. It is a matter of building onto some of the things started in some other segment of the system. Everybody has talked about continuity and transferability. I think it is particularly important here that if the individual is in, say, pretrial detention, and he gets involved in a training program, his probation officer comes along and recommends probation for him and he then gets out, there should be some opportunity for him to continue that effort which has been started in the institution. Perhaps a drop-in learning center is a possibility.

What are some of the technologies needed to do some of the things we are talking about? We really did not discuss satellites

a whole lot. We were not sure this would solve the problems we had outlined for ourselves. We looked around for things that might, and one was a typewriter. We get enamored of computers, video tubes, earphones, study booths, and this sort of thing, but the fact of the matter is that one of the greatest educative tools available to men is a typewriter. That has been demonstrated in correctional institutions specifically. It is a very fine tool for literacy training, for example. Yet, trying to get typewriters for inmates is really a big battle.

Some of the other advanced technologies we wanted to take advantage of and ensure they be spread widely were such things as overhead projectors, movies, microfilm, and then moving to video tape.

Computerized instruction we looked at quickly. Three possible modalities appear. One, for dispensing information where you are more or less passive and try to pour stuff into the heads of people. The next level would be interactive. The last would be the use of the computer as a tool. However, I am not sure that helps us too much in our understanding - but it was mentioned.

Another aspect we dealt with was the application of the systems approach to the educational process for a variety of reasons, one being to try to increase the fit between the needs of the individuals and the instruction provided. I am sure you have had an experience where you have this real neat class, a fine instructor and this great program, except you do not have any inmates to

fit it. You holler at the classification committee to get the right inmates to fit this great program. But maybe with a little systems work we can do it the other way and try to figure out what the inmates need and then get the right instruction to them, and also get that educational opportunity to them on a more timely basis.

Another area of technology which we felt was worthy of exploration, and some parts of it were mentioned earlier, is the development of simulation models. We think this could be expanded greatly. We are talking not only about models which would fit into the computers so you get a better understanding of some process but mockup models of training equipment, and then the simulation of the various man-to-man situations, computerized counseling, a whole array of possibilities in this area.

Rather than constructing a factory or purchasing mammoth pieces of expensive equipment, check out the potential for training by using simulations.

Also in the area of technology we felt there had to be a great deal of work done in the enhancement of the learning environment. Too often education is treated very much like the brooms and mops. It is tucked into some of the dirtiest corners of the institution.

I remember asking someone about a college program that people were enthusiastic about, I think somewhere in Illinois. They said, "Yes, they have a great program except it is in the basement, lights are dim, I don't see how anybody can read there let alone learn." Yet this was a nationally touted program, but the institution itself had done nothing to enhance the potential of people learning.

Therefore, in planning new institutions and in re-working some of the old ones, we should keep in mind that education can be speeded up by certain external factors.

If you can remember my floating cubes, another dimension had to do with production, delivery and evaluation. We touched on production, and this already has been discussed in a little different way, and that is what someone else has done is perhaps the most economical. Go out, look, and find out what is available. Too often we decide we have specialized needs and we start getting our own video cameras and tooling up. Maybe the job already has been done.

Then, if we find the job has not been done and we have to do it, there should be the development of some sort of standard-setting body to say what should go into these things. If you are going to have a video tape program, should it be half-inch tape, inch-and-a-half tape, two-inch tape? If someone could set minimal standards and guidelines, this would ensure that when the product was finished then you could ship it across to somebody

else rather than finding out that it would have been a great program except it cannot be played on our monitors.

One of the things we were fully convinced of is that in the production, whether it be of a new technologically advanced package or in the old instruction system, we need just a lot more community involvement. There is a lot of potential out there we have not tapped. We need to get the community involved with us.

We also need to look within our own system, both in terms of the participants or inmates and the staff.

I think one of the tragedies that struck me most was finding out that a correctional officer was a master jet mechanic and his duties were to watch this line of people going into disciplinary hearings every day. I kept thinking - what a wealth of knowledge that man had to share if we merely set up a little structure to get his knowledge to some of the inmates. The same holds true for many of the inmates. Many of them have well-developed skills which could be transmitted to others. It would take some study to ferret these things out.

The potential for development of technical aspects is also within the realm of the inmate group.

In terms of delivery we would here echo some of the earlier comments that there be a centralized library of resources. We would ask that some portion of such centralized system also

deal with supplying information nationally on job markets, training needs, employment restrictions, and so forth.

It is all very well for each of us to struggle and get it done for our own state, but the contention in the group is that there is a great deal of mobility from state to state. It boiled down to the fact there was a batch of inmates moving from Texas to California, but at any rate some of them do stop off in Arizona and elsewhere, so everybody needs to know what kinds of job opportunities there are and the kinds of things we should be training people for.

With such a multitude of sub-units we are trying to tap into, it would be impossible for some national centralization to cover it all. There should then be a network of regional, state, sub-state regions and so forth in order to allow an exchange of technical packages, training modules, a sharing of the resources which have been developed. This was mentioned earlier by Dr. Flynn.

We think that in the delivery service one of the biggest needs is a constant awareness of looking at the motivational factors - what is the pay-off? For staff we need to think CEU, getting a specialized kind of recognition for an in-service training type of activity - Continuing Education Unit.

Other incentives include college units. Many people are very interested in achieving an advanced degree, so wherever possible their effort should be tied in with fully accredited colleges, pay raises if possible.

One of the biggest values of the new technology and motivation applies to the participants or inmates, and that is that the gimmicks associated, the bells and whistles of a computer-assisted program, will often intrigue people, whereas sitting in a classroom will not.

We move then to evaluation. Evaluation is needed for a variety of aspects. One is to ensure some feedback to the educators. Give them some sense of what it is they accomplish.

Another is to provide the basic data for development of the system we want to look at. There needs to be individual tracking to be sure there is a good fit of needs and program delivery, this having been mentioned earlier.

Then there is the planning effort itself, determine which programs, what techniques, what efforts should be made with regard to the pay-off.

Another area we talked about, and this somewhat anticipates what might happen given certain circumstances, is an emerging technology which might make some of our planning efforts of little value, things such as cable television, which will give us potential for running a lot of educational activities into the system, particularly into locked systems, much more economically and directly than now is possible. The potential is just around the corner for interactive cable television, so not only do you get what they ship you but you can also interact with the communications

center and say, "I would really like an advanced course in trigonometry this afternoon." They could then dig around and be sure you got it. Again this makes for a very marked potential in available resources which probably no correctional system could manage to develop.

Then we have the possibility and likelihood of the emergence of video phones, where you are in direct communication, both auditorily and visually with another person. Repeatedly the interactive phase is seen as having tremendous impact. This kind of system might allow for marked enhancement of the quality of instruction within an institution. We can call up Dr. Lejins and have him give a course to our inmates at San Quentin. He would be comfortable in his office and the San Quentin inmates would be comfortable in their setting.

With that, committee members may now comment in any way they see fit.

MR. OLSEN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to surface and comment on two issues that were discussed at various times during our committee meeting.

The first of these issues addresses the notion of developing programmed education, training and social skill packages for inmates. While correctional administrators theoretically have the responsibility for planning such activities to meet individual inmate needs, budgetary and personnel constraints frequently

restrict the quality and delivery of such services to unacceptable levels.

The second issue, similar to the first in many respects, involves the development of training and education programs for correctional staff. While a melange of programs are presently available from state to state, a review of these programs suggests that the majority are training activities which address only the most rudimentary needs of correctional employees. The dearth of training and educational opportunities are, as in the previous case, the result of many factors, the greatest of which is budgetary.

Yesterday we observed a demonstration of the type of technological advances that may provide vehicles for the amelioration of each of these problems. One can envision, for example, the National Institute of Corrections or state departments of correction developing libraries of video cassette programs, or interactive cable television networks capable of delivering training and educational materials nationally or state-wide to both staff and inmates at virtually any time of the day or night.

While the original expenditure for equipment and program development may be high, the accessibility of these materials to inmates and staff, as well as the fact that personnel requirements would be minimal, should lower the per capita costs of training and education programs significantly.

MR. KEVE: We should sell the idea it is not a dead-end career to be a correctional officer, but one of the things we have to do first is to change it so in fact it is not a dead end.

Going back to my Minnesota experience, I was so aware that at the main prison at Stillwater a guard could work his way up to lieutenant, but that was not terribly high and it is about the limit.

There was one position above that and that was captain. That captain had been in that job some twenty years or so, so for the average guard there is perhaps a ten percent chance he could become a lieutenant. However, after that, there was virtually no hope to go any higher.

I saw a lot of evils stemming from this awfully dead-end character of the situation.

We tried to start something which would change that, and that was staff training which would be tied to wider opportunities so that depending on the training the staff member would elect to take, all of which training would go toward college credits, he could pursue either of two career tracks - one in custody or the other in at least a para-professional counseling or treatment area. Someone else can tell you where that stands currently because I don't know how fully it has developed since then.

I would add one more observation as to Delaware. Currently we are installing a group therapy program for our adult inmates

and the therapists are the correctional officers. We sent them for training and we are giving them continuing consultation and sharpening their skills as group therapists. They are doing it in addition to their custody duties. It is a step toward eventual development of more actual career opportunities to be built into merit system positions, we hope.

MR. BOHLINGER: Before we open this up with general conversation I would like to tie together this fourth group.

One of the things we are seeing here is that there are a number of common threads among these groups but there are some major differences being expressed here in very subtle ways. It might be interesting if anybody else sees these to discuss them.

What I think we can do is to follow through on this.

DR. BENNETT: This emphasizes the need for evaluation. In California we have this similar opportunity. A number of our lieutenants have become parole agents or corrections counselors. However, evaluation is needed because when we begin to look at inmate perception and when we are trying to figure out what some of the roots are for institutional violence, the inmate says, "That is no way. The correctional counselor is supposed to be helping me get out of here and that son-of-a-bitch is just another screw." He can get the education, we can change his attitude, but the inmate who had to live with him under one set of rules has a hard time changing his perception about that

individual. We may do great things for the career ladder but screw up the operation we are trying to control. Therefore, I think you need some subtle evaluation as you move through this.

MR. SIGLER: There is another dimension here we have to look at from a practical standpoint, and that is that there are so many correctional officers as opposed to the rest of the people in an institution, they comprise such a great proportion of the total personnel structure that for us to sit here and say too many of these people are going to be able to promote themselves for whatever reason I think is an exercise in futility because it just will not happen.

I believe we can take a good lesson from some police departments where they are giving credit for patrolmen to improve their educational levels and paying for it. Someone said last night they knew of police departments where a patrolman could not take an examination for the position of sergeant unless he reached a certain educational level, but that while he was acquiring this educational level with very few credits he got an incremental raise.

We can do some good with the correctional officers, and that is where I spent most of my life, that is, the first thirteen years were spent in the uniformed correctional part of this program.

Somebody pointed out here the proportionate number of lieutenants as opposed to the regular line officers. They are

just not there. I think we can take a lesson from our police departments.

MR. BOHLINGER: You also might look at this as a challenge, and some people have, looking at a total restructuring of the organization within the institutions between uniformed and non-uniformed staffs.

MR. SKOLER: I will refer to a common thread. Every group seemed to be finding functions for the National Institute of Corrections. Should it have a college? Should it have a technology desk? I found that interesting.

Perhaps we are in the happy situation of having gotten a critical mass of support, a bill through two houses which now can be designed to really meet this tremendous need for coordination, experimentation, some kind of leadership.

I wanted to draw attention to that as one of the common threads, but I also think now might be the time to hear a little from Mr. Dobson on what the design element is.

Having heard this thread, I am now intrigued regarding the care with which the feasibility studies and program design efforts and program formulations will take place.

MR. BOHLINGER: But you have uncovered our plot to keep you here beyond your designated time.

One of the reasons I wanted to spend a little more time on this was in the event there were points which needed to be related

back to speakers on rehabilitation.

MR. OLSEN: I would like to comment on Mr. Sigler's observations on the field of law enforcement.

At the present time, approximately thirty states have established agencies to develop mandatory training and educational standards for the sworn personnel of all state and local law enforcement agencies. Such organizations have motivated the state and local agencies to focus on employee recruitment, training, education and retention programs. In general, the development of new programs and the enhancement of existing programs has resulted in an increase in employee morale, an improvement in employee-agency relationships and an increase in the level of the delivery of services. More importantly, however, these agencies have assisted in the development of career ladders for employees - not only in the traditional sense for upwardly mobile employees seeking top administrative positions, but also in terms of the establishment of new career patterns through role definition, role expansion and specialization. The career patterns present a relatively new option for those employees not able, or not interested in seeking the few-and-far-between administrative positions that become available.

Perhaps the field of corrections could profit by examining the law enforcement experience and developing an appropriately modified model for corrections.

DR. DEPPE: One of the areas of lack of consensus, an area which reflected varying opinions, was the whole area of what we might call attitudinal education. There was a lot of talk about the importance of it and there was some apparent desire to dismiss it entirely on the part of others.

I would make one plea, and that is that we not give up on the job of trying to deal with the problem, however difficult, of changing the attitudes and values which residents or staff may hold or entertain currently.

We look at a little bit of research that indicates that attitudes and values are caught and not taught. We jump from that to saying it is impossible to change attitudes.

I would make a plea that we as a group in LEAA, in particular in our magnificent obsession with technology, not overlook this very human dimension and the need for further research, demonstration and experimentation in that area.

COLONEL SULLIVAN: Excuse me if I relate again to military experience, but the analogies are very useful in that a military base has its job to perform, and its chief job is not educational in that very narrow construction of literacy training, vocational, and so forth.

If you think of a system broadly, you think of the leadership, the management committed, and that can go up to the legislature and to the person in charge of the institution.

Next is the professional staff to support him, which is the key element and the one I want to stress most.

Third is a technical support system which broadens the opportunities for the professional staff member to work within a framework of leadership support - what is going on elsewhere, and so on.

This third item is crucial but not indispensable. The indispensable items are the leadership commitment and the good staff person. With those two, relying on some external opportunities, local colleges, so forth and so on, a lot can be made to happen without any reference to what is going on far away.

I wondered whether much attention was paid - and I may have missed it - to the necessity of having academic advisors, an education officer at the institution to make things happen, given a favorable management environment if he has the leadership support. If he does a good job, he can often create that.

Was that brought up in any of the groups?

(No response.)

DR. LEJINS: I would like to give a reaction to what we have heard today with regard to reports from the four groups. I would like to raise the question of whether what was done in the four groups was in line with what was sort of expected from this conference.

Inasmuch as this sounds somewhat critical, let me say that I

think the discussions were extremely interesting. I enjoyed the discussion of our group and I enjoyed the presentation of the various chairmen, and all this is very valuable information. I think we have really covered the field of correctional education in such a manner that one feels himself within the pulse of the situation. LEAA perhaps can profit from this conference.

However, the seminar was directed quite clearly toward somewhat different issues from those which emerged from our group discussions. One of these was contained in the kind of materials received before the conference. I received some materials, for example, and I don't know whether you all received what I did. For instance, I received the PLATO report and a report from the University of Illinois. I also have considerable material with regard to the satellite.

Let us also look at the agenda as scheduled for the general meeting, the first presentation on satellites, micro-processors. There is another presentation on PLATO. These clearly stress the modern technology in three groups. The special group on technology did deal with that subject, but the three groups dealt with educational issues in general without any reference to technologies.

In most of the reports the remark was somewhat skeptical with regard to satellites. They covered it as something somewhat nebulous, not too important, and not our task.

I have the feeling that you are asking - why are you talking? Why are not LEAA people asking this question?

Well, they are our hosts and they will probably say that you have provided us with good material and a lot of things and they are appreciated. Actually, however, the conference was supposed to, as Mr. Velde indicated at the SEARCH Symposium in San Francisco, involve itself with these wonderful opportunities technology offers.

Most of our good TV programs come via satellites. I don't know how many of you have been at the FBI Academy. It looks practically like a B-747 pilot seat. I was told they need a course of more than one month to instruct the instructors on how to utilize all the facilities available, in the sense, for instance, of giving a test at a moment's notice, formulating five or ten questions, getting responses of the students immediately computerized, the scoring of the tests given back - and not only that but an item analysis for every question already conducted to indicate to what extent these questions may represent the valid lack or presence of knowledge on the part of the students. The number of questions are idiosyncratic with the instructor because there is too much variance in the answers, and so on.

I thought the plan for this symposium was primarily to address ourselves not to the general theory of education, though perhaps we had to do that, but it should have been related to the extent the general theories are applicable to these modern methods of tapes.

Larry Bennett clearly explained the computer possibilities in the sense of pure information of give and take, where the student

can discuss the questions and finally where the computer answers the questions. To what extent should we consider what should be done in education and to what extent can they be accomplished by technological means?

Attitudinal changes were mentioned. I think what should have been done is to ask to what extent through these mechanical means can attitudinal changes rather than behavioral changes be accomplished. Is it completely out in the sense that for that we need person-to-person contact in a small group or individual counseling, and therefore attitudinal changes is an item which has to be left out of the mechanized technological procedure? We have not touched on these items.

While I myself participate in these groups, and therefore if I am critical of anything I am also critical of what I have done, I have a little of this feeling and I would like it to be registered. As far as contribution of the state of affairs and aspirations in general in the field of correctional education, I think this seminar has done really good and important things.

As far as answering this particular issue, unless we want to say the very fact we didn't address ourselves to it shows our skepticism toward it, sort of not worthwhileness, of not wasting time on it, unless we do that we have not addressed ourselves sufficiently to these modern technologies.

We have the first three papers presented and planned for

by the planners of the seminar with regard to this topic and we have related very little in the field of education with regard to these modern technological possibilities.

MR. BOHLINGER: I cannot totally agree with that.

Dr. Flynn would like to respond to that. I would first like to make a personal observation, certainly not speaking for Mr. Velde and possibly not even for LEAA.

DR. FLYNN: Speaking for our group, options for program development, we were very much aware of that particular program. Perhaps it did not come out in our summary statement, but our consensus was, number one, that the time devoted yesterday morning to these very intricately complex problems was just too brief for any lay person in any of those areas - and I would consider myself a lay person - to really become terribly cognizant as to the potentials of these activities. Inasmuch as they have certainly not been applied in the corrections field our recommendation to LEAA was very specific, and that was that we would like to see any of these developments field-tested with regard to their viability for the corrections field before any massive investment in any of them for the sake of correctional education was gone into by LEAA.

I think frequently, at least in corrections, we have a history of searching for panaceas. All through the history of corrections they crop up. Before adequate testing as to that

viability we have a tendency, because we are so desperate and are suffering under this terrible criticism of our system, we go for it, spend sometimes millions of dollars on those projects without really making sure that we will get the pay-off. Then, more often than not, we find we have wasted our money.

Again what we would like to see would be to have LEAA pursue these things on an individual field-testing basis, get the evaluation in, and then, by all means if something works well, invest more dollars into it.

MR. BOHLINGER: Mr. Dobson, will you proceed with the National Institute of Corrections?

MR. DOBSON: A National Institute of Corrections does exist. In the next few minutes I hope to elaborate on what that means. Three NIC Advisory Panel members are here. If there are any major gaps, I will depend on them to pick up the ball.

NIC is a creature of the Williamsburg National Conference on Corrections, at which time the Attorney General said there will be "a national academy." The thought was that through the academy concept would be provided a center for correctional learning.

As the concept evolved through several meetings, the idea of mobile delivery of training services through the grant process to universities and colleges, private non-profit corporations, and operation correctional organizations became the accepted approach.

NIC operates under co-sponsorship of the Bureau of Prisons and the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. We have been funded at the level of two million dollars a year since inception. Funds come from the Part E discretionary fund.

We operate under the general direction and policy guidance of a fourteen member Advisory Panel.

I will describe generally what our operations have been to date and a look at planned future program thrusts. Then you can pick up on anything that might interest you with regard to those operations.

Mr. Keve raised the issue of getting top administrator commitment and therefore entry into the system. NIC's strategy has reflected that approach and thus our initial projects were Criminal Justice Executive Institutes. We are still engaged in that process in a continuing way. The Universities of Southern California and Pennsylvania have scheduled Executive Institutes for October 14 - November 1 and November 11-21, respectively. NIC through the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) has operated three middle-management institutes which involved participants at all levels of management down to the first-level supervisors.

Also in concert with WICHE we have run three organizational development interventions - a county sheriff's office which included both law enforcement and jail aspects, a State Department

of Corrections and a State Penitentiary. We plan to continue organizational development type intervention with an emphasis on task and result orientations. OD appears to hold considerable promise in terms of being a more effective approach to improving organizations.

Six regional training-trainer institutes were directed by California Youth Authority personnel. Over 130 correctional trainers participated.

An important role-change activity, which was tested out substantially in the Federal Bureau of Prisons, developed agency capability to train correctional officers in communication skills to effect their interaction with offenders. Forty-five trainers were developed.

Under Vince O'Leary's direction a correctional educators' workshop was run in Albany. Correctional curriculum development in higher education and related issues for both two-year and four-year colleges were examined.

NIC sponsored a comprehensive evaluation of a major state department Management by Objectives effort. The project is yielding data on major problems, obstacles, and organizational readiness issues as well as impact on the total system.

Newer projects we are getting into include one called Community Resources Management Team. Taking a page out of standards and goals this project implements a change in service

delivery to offenders in the community from the probation/parole office standpoint.

A program to develop Labor Relations/Conflict Resolution Skills is about to begin the first of five regional institutes. Comprehensive team planning in a State system will pull together every chief decision maker in the state's correctional system. Administrators of adult and juvenile services, probation, parole, jail and private half-way house delivery systems in the state will be involved in development of a comprehensive correctional plan for the state.

Additional role-change type activities for line-level people are in development stages. Correctional goal planning, which can be described as MBO at the line level is one of those. The line officer and the offender, either in the community or an institution, collaborate to establish realistic, reachable goals based on needs. "Just Community" interventions also include substantial role change for line officers. Ten such interventions are planned in selected agencies around the country.

A project to develop internal OD capability is being planned by the University of Colorado. Agency trainers who have access to all parts of the organization will be developed to serve the agency as internal organization development consultants.

Other activities include: training volunteers in literacy and reading tutoring, development of treatment technology skills, operating half-way houses, developing a technical training team for delivery of training services in a regional area, and parole decision-making institutes. At this moment we are looking for the appropriate vehicle to address a need which has been brought to our attention over the past year. The problem is one of ever higher concentrations of difficult, special problem, offenders in institutions. Identifying the kinds of treatment programs, supervision, staff ratios, staff training, equipment, etc., that are required to be effective is the task of such a project.

That is where NIC is at this point in time. Legislation to establish an Institute is working its way through the Congress.

MR. BOHLINGER: Are there comments on the presentation just completed?

DR. BENNETT: One of the things I did not mention in my report was the recognized need in management training for corrections personnel, to upgrade skills in understanding research and evaluation.

Is that built into your management curriculum?

MR. DOBSON: Yes.

DR. BENNETT: Great.

MR. DOBSON: We try to address in each of these executive development sessions the evaluation questions, planning issues, things

that the correctional administrators today and tomorrow will need in order to perform their jobs.

We are also open to suggestions in terms of new things we might include within the program.

DR. BENNETT: One of the problems as a researcher in trying to deal with management is the tendency on the part of management to be extremely creative and fast-moving, and then halfway downstream make the comment - "Get me an evaluation on that." If people can move more smoothly into that cycle, it would enhance our forward movement.

MR. DOBSON: Would it be useful to have a combined kind of researcher-administrator training program? Would this be useful?

DR. BENNETT: Having researchers and administration in the same training session?

MR. DOBSON: Researchers and administrators, yes.

DR. BENNETT: Very definitely, yes.

MR. PAPPAS: I don't think so. You are going to do one thing or the other. If you are going to try to do both, you will do nothing.

MR. BOHLINGER: We had an experience in running the Institute for Correctional Administration - it was very advantageous in exposing administrators to researchers and what they were trying to do, not to make them researchers but giving them an appreciation for it. This appreciation might come from an exposure one to the other.

There is usually a great deal of animosity between the two, especially among institutional administrators being skeptical of evaluators coming in and messing with what they are doing.

MRS. GOODRICH: It is not always animosity but fear.

MR. BOHLINGER: Animosity arising out of fear, perhaps.

DR. BENNETT: We have touched on a problem which needs exploration in the educational area.

MRS. GOODRICH: One of the things that has concerned me since we started this conference is this talk about staff training, more education, and so on. What concerns me is that this relates to institutions specifically and nowhere at any time do we ever sit down and look at our structure within an institution. I always worry about the fact we have somebody go to college, come back in to his post area, and we never look at what we need in post assignments. We usually have eight-hour post assignments. If you look at most of them about four to six hours are needed and two hours are spent in just nonsensical work. We never look at job satisfaction as something which is needed within the institutional structure.

It seems to me some day we will have to tackle the problem of the management in the institution as to what post assignments are. We will just end up frustrating people otherwise.

The other point which concerned me was talk about staff turnover. I hope we do not lose sight of the fact that staff turnover

is not necessarily bad. It is from a management standpoint because they are always breaking in new staff. However, staff turnover can be healthy provided we are not losing people to industry, for example. If it is staff turnover and they are moving on to other areas of a helpful profession, that is healthy and we should look at the fact, then, we have done a fairly good job if we have kept them motivated to help the profession.

MR. DOBSON: We have some pretty good evidence that one of the OD efforts we have done in Boulder County Jail in the law enforcement system itself has gone a long way to addressing your problem of posts and jobs in terms of how that OD effort impacted on that.

Organizational development is one way to address that issue because it was a total job restructuring which took place.

MR. KEVE: With regard to staff turnover, in some cases it is an accomplishment devoutly to be wished for. John Ellington, as you know, has a saying which is one of my favorite sayings: Where there is death, there is hope.

What is established in your minds, policy practice or otherwise, about how the Institute of Corrections engages with any particular state correctional agency? I ask selfishly as an administrator myself. Who takes the initiative and in what manner?

MR. DOBSON: Initiative probably should be taken by the

state system. Get in touch with us.

We have had low visibility. We have been short-staffed, and there has not been a lot of visibility for NIC except for those people we have touched, and that has been only five to six hundred people.

I think the initiative properly should be with the state operating agency. We are just now getting out a mass mailing of brochures which have been developed which describe the National Institute of Corrections, and the fact it is a grant program. You should have one of those in your hands shortly.

MR. SIGLER: I am on that advisory committee. Mr. Dobson has been the leader in this effort so far. This has been without benefit of any real support. We do not have any law. We don't have an institution as yet. He is like a locomotive trying to get up the hill with a half head of steam.

Therefore, Mr. Dobson, you have been working under this difficult situation. It looks now as though we will get some legislation. Then they can go ahead and make plans with some degree of confidence.

Is that about right?

MR. DOBSON: I would not disagree with what you said.

MR. BOHLINGER: I would like to respond a little to what Dr. Lejins said earlier. In the formulation of this seminar and conference I was a little surprised at the looseness with

which it was devised. However, I see now that that looseness was for a good purpose.

I certainly feel from my personal viewpoint it has been beneficial because in gathering together a group of people with the diverse backgrounds which you people here represent, with what I see as some degree of skepticism, a little bit of saying that the task is overwhelming, all this is not necessarily bad. I think it gives people here the idea that not only are they faced with difficult tasks but that there are people who are concerned with these issues who might be looking at it from a different angle from the person developing the technology, from the person implementing it, from the person on the line trying this with inmates, and that everybody has major problems - not necessarily that we do not look at technology as being possibly a great advancement. Certainly it is not a panacea. It is, however, a great advancement.

This degree of pessimism and addressing basic issues is very beneficial. Maybe the issue of technology and satellites is a topic for a subsequent conference, people getting together and just discussing the basic problems in education.

We came across some of these things in our group. What are we talking about in education and training? Who needs them? What is the justification for various client groups?

This does one other thing which is most important - and it is a reason this conference could not have come at a better time - and that is Pete Velde's taking over LEAA. This conference was his design, his idea. The people here have thrown a lot back to LEAA in the way of a challenge of things that we should be doing with this fantastic amount of money which is being disseminated every year.

I think a challenge coming from a group of this stature, tied in with Pete Velde's direct interest, should bear better results than what was raised by Mrs. Goodrich and a number of other people, the promise of a clearinghouse or something else going in and then a couple years later people asking, "What happened to it? Where is it?"

Aside from being at a beautiful setting such as this and getting away from the office for a couple of days, this has been most beneficial. I would hope there will be a follow-up in addition to the dissemination of the proceedings.

Are there further comments or observations? If not, in behalf of Pete Velde and LEAA, I thank you for your participation.

APPENDIX A - PARTICIPANTS

BEDDOME, C. J., Major  
Executive Director  
Arizona Highway Patrol  
1202 East Maryland Avenue  
Suite 1-E  
Phoenix, Arizona 85104

BENNETT, Lawrence, Dr.  
Director of Research  
California Department of Corrections  
714 P Street  
State Office Building No. 8  
Sacramento, California 95814

BENNETT, Lawrence T.  
Special Assistant to the Deputy Administrator  
for Policy Development  
LEAA  
Washington, D.C. 20530

BIRCHER, Robert  
Assistant to the Commissioner  
Department of Corrections  
State of Minnesota  
310 State Office Building  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55155

BOHLINGER, George  
Chief, Corrections Division  
Office of Research Programs  
LEAA  
Washington, D.C. 20530

CARPENTER, Lawrence  
Regional Director  
Board of Parole  
Suite 1  
3883 Turtle Creek Boulevard  
Dallas, Texas 57219

DAY, Sherman R., Dr.  
Federal Bureau of Prisons  
101 Indiana Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20534

DEPPE, Donald A., Dr.  
Administrator of Education  
Bureau of Prisons  
101 Indiana Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20534

DOBSON, Craig D.  
Acting Director  
National Institute of Corrections  
101 Indiana Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20534

ESAREY, J. Clark  
Department of Education  
Illinois Department of Corrections  
School District #428  
Springfield, Illinois 62708

FLYNN, Edith E., Dr.  
Associate Director  
National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice  
Planning and Architecture  
505 East Green Street, Suite 200  
Champaign, Illinois 61820

FRIEL, Charles M., Dr.  
Director of Research  
Institute of Contemporary Corrections and  
the Behavioral Sciences  
Sam Houston State University  
Huntsville, Texas 77340

GIMELLI, Joseph J.  
Recorder  
1718 House Office Building  
Washington, D.C. 20515

GOODRICH, Edna, Mrs.  
Superintendent  
Purdy Treatment Center for women  
Purdy, Washington

HADI, Lucy, Mrs.  
Service Administration Coordinator  
Office of Grants Management  
Division of Corrections  
1323 Winewood Boulevard  
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

HAMM, Carl  
National Institute  
LEAA  
Washington, D.C. 20530

KEVE, Paul W.  
Director  
State Division of Adult Corrections  
Smyrna, Delaware 19977

LEJINS, Peter P., Dr.  
Director, Institute of Criminal Justice  
and Criminology  
Room 3121  
University of Maryland  
College Park, Maryland 20742

MEEKER, James  
Staff Director  
U.S. Senate  
Senate Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries  
Washington, D.C.

MOORE, Michael J.  
Vienna Correctional Center  
Vienna State Prison  
Vienna, Illinois 62995

MORRIS, Norval  
Law School  
Laird Bel Quadrangle  
1111 East 60th Street, Room 422  
Chicago, Illinois 60637

MORRISEY, William  
Public Information Specialist  
Public Information Office  
LEAA  
Washington, D.C. 20530

MOYER, Frederick D.  
Director, National Clearinghouse for Criminal  
Justice Planning and Architecture  
505 East Green, Suite 200  
Champaign, Illinois 61820

OGDIN, Jerry  
Software Technique, Inc.  
11227 Handle Bar Road  
Reston, Virginia 22091

OLSEN, Ray  
National Institute  
LEAA  
Washington, D.C. 20530

PAPPAS, Nick  
Law Enforcement Specialist  
Corrections Section  
Office of Regional Operations  
LEAA  
Washington, D.C. 20530

RYGH, Patrick J.  
NALECOM Project Manager  
Civil Systems Program Office  
Jet Propulsion Laboratory  
4800 Oak Grove Drive  
Pasadena, California 91103

SIGLER, Maurice  
Chairman, U.S. Board of Parole  
101 Indiana Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20534

SKOLER, Daniel L.  
Staff Director  
American Bar Association  
1705 DeSales Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036

SULLIVAN, John, Colonel  
Office of Secretary of Defense  
United States Army  
Room 2D, 261  
The Pentagon  
Washington, D.C. 20301

TRAVISONO, Anthony  
American Correctional Association  
4321 Ardwick Road  
College Park, Maryland 20740

VELDE, Richard W.  
Deputy Administrator for Policy Development  
LEAA  
Washington, D.C. 20530

VENTETUOLO, Donald  
Director of Education  
Division of Corrections  
Cranston, Rhode Island 02920

WELDON, Paul  
Deputy Director  
South Carolina Department of Corrections  
P.O. Box 766  
Columbia, South Carolina 29202

APPENDIX B - WORKSHOP MEMBERS

WORKSHOP A - Needs of Correctional Education - Staff/Inmates

Morris, Chairman  
Carpenter  
Day  
Lejins  
Moyer  
Meeker  
Sullivan

WORKSHOP B - Management and Organization of a Correctional Education Network

Sigler, Chairman  
Bircher  
Esarey  
Goodrich  
Moore  
Travisano (for Sigler)  
Weldon

WORKSHOP C - Options for Program Development

Keve, Chairman  
Brown  
Depepe  
Flynn  
Skoler  
Ventetuojo

WORKSHOP D - Systems and Technology of Correctional Education

Bennett, Chairman  
Beddome  
Dobson  
Friel  
Hadi  
Ogdi n  
Rygn

APPENDIX C - LEEP PARTICIPANT SUMMARY

	FY 1969 (6 Months)	FY 1970	FY 1971	FY 1972	FY 1973 (Estimated)	FY 1974 (Estimated)	FY 1975 (Projected)
Appropriation	\$ 6,500,000	\$18,000,000	\$21,250,000	\$29,000,000	\$40,000,000	\$40,000,000	\$40,000,000
Expenditures for Grants and Loans	\$ 3,201,592	\$15,630,021	\$24,735,812	\$29,427,000	\$38,127,042	\$40,000,000	\$40,000,000
No. of Institutions	485	735	890	962	992	1,040	1,063
No. of Recipients	20,602	54,778	73,953	87,000	95,000	99,000	96,000
Total In-service	19,354	46,869	60,516	70,436	78,740	88,000	87,950
Police		38,229	49,329	56,700	62,540	69,000	
Corrections		5,689	8,757	9,736	12,000	14,000	
Courts & Other		2,951	2,430	4,000	4,200	5,000	
Total Pre-service	1,248	7,909	13,437	16,564	16,260	11,000	8,050
% of Recipients who are In-service	94.0	85.56	81.83	80.96	82.88		
% of In-service who are Police		81.56	81.51	80.49	79.42		

APPENDIX D - PART C AND PART E ALLOCATIONS AND CORRECTIONS  
EXPENDITURES BY PROGRAM AND FISCAL YEAR  
(in thousands)

Secondary Education	1972			1973		
	Allocations	Expenditures All Corr.	Program	Allocations	Expenditures All Corr.	Program
Part C	\$698,000	\$250,000	\$ 3,110	\$850,000	\$300,000	\$ 2,156
Part E (block)	\$ 48,750		\$ 736	\$ 56,500		\$ 1,267
(DF)	\$ 48,750			\$ 56,500		
Job Training						
Part C (block)			\$14,701			\$ 5,847
(DF)			\$ 480			\$ 760
Part E (block)			\$ 1,098			\$ 1,844
(DF)			\$ 3,056			\$ 4,471
Education Release						
Part C (block)			\$ 2,036			\$ 1,670
(DF)			\$ 304			\$ 67
Part E (block)			\$ 158			\$ 596
(DF)			\$ 561			\$ 998
College Programs and Related Programs						
Part C (block)			\$ 3,051			\$ 1,331
(DF)			-			-
Part E (block)			\$ 992			\$ 659
(DF)			\$ 357			-
TOTALS	\$795,500	\$250,000	\$30,640	\$963,000	\$300,000	\$21,666

- 182 -

APPENDIX E - DR. FRIEL'S EXHIBIT 1: PROJECT SCHEDULE

TASK	MONTH																							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
.Appoint Project Committee	-x																							
.Select Technical Consultant	x	-----	x																					
.Survey Existing/Systems		x	-----	x																				
.Determine System Design Approach			x	-----	x																			
.Determine National Requirements				x	-----	x																		
.Establish Data Elements			x	-----	x																			
.Develop Data Forms					x	-----	x																	
.Design Output Reports					x	-----	x																	
.Produce System Flow Charts					x	-----	x																	
.Write Software Specifications						x	-----	x																
.Produce Committee Final Report								x	-----	x														
.Implement State Systems										x	-----	x												
.Monitor Implementation												x	-----	x										
.Produce State Final Reports																					x	-----	x	

- 183 -

**END**